

**ETHNOGRAPHIC EVALUATION OF THE
1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS REPORT SERIES**

REPORT #8

ALTERNATIVE ENUMERATION OF HAITIANS IN MIAMI, FLORIDA

Final Report for Joint Statistical Agreement 90-08

March 1992

Submitted by:

**Alex Stepick
Carol Dutton Stepick
Principal Investigators
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199**

Sponsored by:

**Center for Survey Methods Research
Bureau of the Census
Washington, DC 20233**

Peter Wobus, Technical Representative

This research was supported by a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Bureau of the Census. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Bureau of the Census position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

DISCLAIMER

Attached is the final report for one of the 29 independent Joint Statistical Agreement projects which conducted an ethnographic evaluation of the behavioral causes of undercount. All 29 studies followed common methodological guidelines.

This report is based on analysis of the results of a match between the author(s)' Alternative Enumeration to data from 1990 Decennial Census forms for the same site. Each ethnographic site contained about 100 housing units. Information was compiled from census forms that were recovered through October 10, 1990.

The data on which this report is based should be considered preliminary for several reasons:

- o Between October 10, 1990 and December 31, 1990, additional census forms may have been added to or deleted from the official enumeration of the site as a result of coverage improvement operations, local review or other late census operations. Differences between October 10 and final census results as reported on the Unedited Detail File will be incorporated in later analyses of data from this site.
- o The consistency of the author's coding of data has not been fully verified.
- o Hypothesis tests and other analyses are original to the author.

Therefore, the quantitative results contained in this final JSA report may differ from later reports issued by Census Bureau staff referring to the same site.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Washington Plaza 433, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233. Telephone: (301) 763-7976.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| SITE PROFILE | 1 |
| General Background: Little Haiti, The Neighborhood | 1 |
| Potentially Confusing Cultural Issues | 3 |
| Tenancy - Garage apartments, subdivided houses and home buying | 3 |
| Immigration Status | 3 |
| Temporary residence for "just comes" | 4 |
| Taking in children | 4 |
| Haitian cousins | 5 |
| Marriage styles | 5 |
| Haitian names | 6 |
| Race and Ethnicity | 6 |
| Discrimination | 7 |
| METHODS | 8 |
| Factors Influencing Site Selection | 8 |
| Roles and Contributions of Researchers and Assistants | 9 |
| Dates of the AE and Follow-up Fieldwork | 10 |
| Extraordinary Events Affecting Censusing and the AE | 10 |
| Political change in Haiti | 10 |
| Immigration and Reform Control Act | 10 |
| Localized riots | 10 |
| Hypotheses | 11 |
| QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS | 11 |
| Missed Housing Units | 12 |
| Missing Persons | 13 |
| A Rough Count | 14 |
| Differences in Demographic Information | 14 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 15 |
| REFERENCES | 17 |

INTRODUCTION

The following report is submitted as the ethnographic coverage evaluation report accompanying the coded "resolution" of differences between the census and the Alternative Enumeration of two blocks in the City of Miami, Florida, where Haitians are the predominant ethnic group.

Information relevant to this coverage report appears in the final report submitted for the ethnographic research on the possible undercount of Haitians in Miami, entitled "What's in it for Me? What's in it for You?". That research was conducted under Joint Statistical Agreement 88-26 with technical guidance from the Center for Survey Methods Research, Bureau of the Census. We will refer to that earlier report as Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990.

Rather than repeat information in that background report, this report will be confined to updating information or relating information not included in the previous report, and that specifically deals with the Alternative Enumeration.

SITE PROFILE

General Background: Little Haiti, The Neighborhood-

The two blocks selected as the sample area for the Alternative Enumeration (AE) were in Little Haiti. The vast majority of Haitians in Miami, and especially the recent immigrants, live in Little Haiti, which lies about 3 miles north of Miami's downtown and encompasses a rectangular area approximately 50 by 10 city blocks. This is an area which for three decades has been experiencing demographic changes. During the decade of the 1980's transition accelerated as this large "neighborhood" became the locus of Haitian settlement in Miami.

To the east of Little Haiti, towards Biscayne Bay is a narrow residential strip that remains primarily populated by "Anglos" (Whites who speak English). Some of this strip is gentrified: one part is a walled enclave containing the residences of some of Miami's most economically and politically powerful individuals. The border between this residential area and Little Haiti is a wide commercial-lined boulevard and parallel railroad tracks. To the west lies Liberty City, Miami's largest Black community. In between, in what is now Little Haiti, is one of Miami's oldest neighborhoods, the northern part having emerged before the turn of the century and the southern section comprising Miami's first affluent suburb in the early 1920's.

Until the 1960's, the area was primarily Anglo and blue collar with accompanying business and commercial development. In the 1960's, Cubans began to settle there at the same time that Black Americans moved east from Liberty City. In 1970, 38.2 percent of the area's population was non-Hispanic white, 29.8 percent Black and 31.1 percent Hispanic. According to the 1980 census, 14.7 percent was non-Hispanic White, 68.1 percent Black, and 10 percent Hispanic. The City of Miami estimated that approximately 11,500 Haitian refugees settled in the area after the 1980 census. The racial and ethnic changes lowered relative real estate values and made the area affordable to the Haitian refugees. In 1982 a city and county financed study revealed that Haitians constituted about 40 percent of the neighborhood's population.

In 1970, the mean family income in the area was \$7,411. In 1980, it had risen to \$12,599, an increase of 70 percent. Nevertheless, the 1980 mean was 28.5 percent, or \$5,020, below the citywide mean. In 1980, 31.2 percent of the area's population and 32.3 percent of its families were below the poverty level, an increase in both cases over 1970. The number of female-headed households also increased between 1970 and 1980, from 5.3 percent to 13.5 percent of the households in the area.

The number of owner-occupied housing units decreased in the area by 11.4 percent between 1970 and 1980. While the vacancy rate decreased from 4.1 percent to 3.1 percent during the decade, the number of overcrowded housing units rose 102.3 percent. In one area, once grand houses constructed in the 1920's and 1930's have been subdivided into multi-family units. The percentage of renter-occupied housing units lacking complete plumbing facilities also rose by 16.4 percent. These trends continued into the following decade.

Between 1970 and 1980 business activity in the area declined. Because of the evolution of the suburban shopping mall, many once thriving small retail establishments in the area simply closed or relocated. The changing ethnic and racial composition of the neighborhood and the disinvestment associated with "white flight" also contributed to producing vacant storefronts and warehouses.

However, in the mid-1980's the Immigration and Naturalization Service moved its offices from downtown Miami to the northeastern edge of the neighborhood. The City of Miami also attempted to reinvigorate the area by investing in the "Design Plaza" at the southern edge of the neighborhood. The Design Plaza is an area approximately 6 blocks by 4 blocks that contains primarily wholesale outlets for interior designers. The City of Miami financed the Design Plaza's infrastructure, including street resurfacing, curb and gutter installation, and street lighting. The general area's image suffered tremendously from the nearby four major riots during the decade in Liberty City and Overtown. In the late 1980's, to protect the investment, the businesses, and their well-to-do customers, the city increased police patrols in the Design Plaza. Nevertheless, because of the general area's negative image, many businesses migrated out of the Design Plaza to Broward and Palm Beach counties, just north of Miami and Dade County.

The full spectrum of the socio-cultural, political and economic factors we consider relevant to censusing the site in which we worked are reviewed in detail in Stepick & Dutton Stepick 1990. That review of Haitians in Miami before Census Day 1990 reveals two significantly different sub-populations. There is a Haitian middle class, made up primarily of long settled immigrants who are literate, know English well and are dispersed throughout the county. Then there are the more recent immigrants who are primarily in the working class. They either do not speak English or speak English poorly and have low or no literacy skills (except in French and only for some individuals). They are severely stigmatized vis-a-vis the larger Miami population and are persecuted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). This second group suffers among the most severe economic privations of any contemporary immigrant or refugee group in the United States. They are also socially isolated and extraordinarily distrustful of any outsiders, especially government representatives. In short, the more recent immigrants among the Haitians present all five of the barriers to census coverage hypothesized by Brownrigg and

Martin 1989. With confidence, we could predict that their behaviors would tend to be undercounted. Virtually all of the Haitian residents of the Alternative Enumeration site are members of this larger, more recent immigrant group, and thus, we predicted were likely to be in the undercounted.

Potentially Confusing Cultural Issues

Tenancy - Garage apartments, subdivided houses and home buying

Previous longitudinal research within this population reveals there is evidence of some upward economic mobility (see Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990). We know that for those Haitians who have been in the U.S. since 1983, joblessness is dropping, median income is up and fewer are receiving food stamps or other welfare support. At the same time the number of homeowners is increasing. Haitian immigrants are buying houses within the vicinity of the AE sample area. When they do, they tend to subdivide the houses in order to rent back rooms or one floor of a two story house, as well as creating garage apartments. These newly created units are often in violation of zoning restrictions, have no separate address and are typically home for the more recently arrived Haitians.

When funds allow, some former residents of the sample site buy homes in nearby, somewhat "higher rent," more racially mixed neighborhoods and simply move out of the "old" neighborhood. In these cases, duplexes are the favored purchase objective allowing the house owner to live in one side and rent the other to help offset the mortgage. The renters in these cases are usually, but not always, Haitian. When they are Haitian, typically the households are small and someone is steadily employed. The reasons often given for moving out of the sample site and into one of these higher rent dwellings is access to better schools and avoiding crime.

Although increased home buying would seem to indicate an increasingly stable population, in fact, in the short run and more specifically during the period of the 1990 Census and concomitant research, this phenomenon has contributed to the residential fluidity of this population. Since 1983, we have conducted two large scale longitudinal surveys which included the sample site. In each, over a two year period 40 to 50 percent of our sample had moved at least once with many households moving twice or more. With each move the probability of household composition change increases. Between the AE, which started in April 1990 and the follow-up field work in March 1991 we found no decrease in the frequency of movement.

This relatively high amount of residential movement within the sample site directly affects censusing and the resolution work. In some cases we were unable to track down residents picked up by census workers visiting in May, June or July after the AE. These were people who moved in after the AE, then moved out before the follow-up field work.

Immigration Status is a critical factor in determining where people will live, with whom and for how long. We estimate that at least 10% of the sample population is presently totally undocumented (Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990). Such individuals tend to be residing with other Haitians who have some legal claim to be in the U.S., thus putting the whole household on the defensive relative to outsiders. About 20,000 Haitians in Florida have applied for legalization

under provisions of Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). In our ethnographic study to determine causes of a possible undercount of Haitians, about 50% of our sample were awaiting regularization of their legal status under the various provisions of the IRCA. Many of these still have only a tenuous claim, especially farm workers, many of whom had their application for legalization rejected by INS. Moreover, most undocumented Haitians caught by INS attempting to enter the country are indefinitely jailed in a detention center on the outskirts of the Miami metropolitan area.

Another 40 percent of the sample area population already have a legal immigration status. They, too, are distrustful often because a member of their household has no legal status or they anticipate bringing a relative in who will be illegal. (See Fjellman and Gladwin 1984 who discuss Haitian strategies for other family members immigrating to the United States.)

Temporary residence for "just comes" is usually in the home of a relative and may last for a couple of weeks or a couple of years. A "just come" is the community's term for someone literally just off the boat who has entered the U.S. undetected, someone just off the airplane who has arrived typically with a tourist or student visa, or someone just released from detention. When there is no relative to stay with a "just come" will typically be taken in as a boarder by a friend of a friend. Although most "just comes" have little or no money, many people explain their reason for taking them in as simple acts of kindness to people who are in the same situation they themselves once experienced. The hospitality is usually short-lived because the "just come" represents a serious drain on already very limited resources. Even so a person's first job contacts are usually a result of their host's networks. Typically, the new arrival moves to another residence with his first paycheck. For single men and single women the new residence is often a group living arrangement, or as a boarder in a different household from their first host, or most desirable of all renting their own room or apartment. Sometimes liaisons are formed between men and women shortly after their arrival and when funds allow they will seek an apartment to share. These apartments tend to be in run-down apartment buildings, converted garages or efficiencies carved out of single family dwellings. They are generally in poor repair, small and just barely affordable to the new arrival with his or her minimum wage job.

Taking in children is a special case with innumerable variations. In this sample we encountered children "adopted" by their mother's cousin and others "adopted" by their aunt and uncle. We found grandchildren being raised by their grandparents while their parents remained in Haiti, and nieces and nephews being boarded by their aunt and uncle while their parents worked in the Bahamas. We also found some children who had simply been taken in by relatives and friends because their parents had fallen on hard times. Finally, we found a few children who had recently arrived from Haiti for the Easter holidays and might or might not stay indefinitely. These latter were included by the adult household members as residents in their homes and so were listed in the AE. On other blocks we know of godchildren staying with their godparents to go to school in the U.S. or to escape unpleasant home situations.

All of these cases and others are examples of temporary residency although temporary may mean two weeks in one case and four years in another.

Haitians will often refer to a child they have taken in to raise even temporarily as their "adopted" child. In Haiti it is not uncommon for wealthier relatives to "adopt" a child from poorer relatives. The child is fed, housed and sometimes sent to school usually in exchange for domestic labor. Occasionally, there is also a money transaction involved between the two families. During previous ethnographic work we have seen some evidence of this practice being carried over to Miami.

Haiti is officially a Catholic country and many respondents in this sample are strict and devout Catholics. Haitian Catholicism includes the practice of godparenthood and Haitian godparents take their roles seriously. It is not uncommon for a godchild to reside with his or her godparents, especially in times of trouble.

These patterns of extended family households are similar to those documented for Afro-Americans in the U.S. The only difference with Haitians is a higher likelihood of children living with more distant relatives and fictive kin.

Haitian cousins may represent the furthest outreach of the extended family. Cousins are often raised together either in the same housing unit or units within sight or walking distance. Cousins may sleep and eat at their parents home or at that of their aunt with equal frequency. In rural areas of Haiti fellow villagers greet each other as cousin assuming some familial link albeit generations ago. In the cities of Haiti and in Miami, people will call one another cousin to denote good friendship and a sense of equality. Sometimes people who have simply been good neighbors for a long time will call each other cousin.

In the AE sample several of the boarders we encountered had a "cousin" relationship with their hosts as did several children. A "just come" who has been taken in will often be explained away to outsiders as a visiting cousin from Haiti. Thus, relationships within the Haitian households are commonly more complicated and different from that permitted on Census forms or identified to the Census Bureau.

Marriage styles among Haitian immigrants are at least as varied as those found in the broader U.S. population. One of the households within the ethnographic site (A03 101) demonstrates a case of "placage," or a kind of free union which is very common. Individuals numbered 05 and 06 have a child but have never declared their relationship. They were coded as being single because that is how they were identified by the main informant and by themselves, however they could also be recognized within the household and the broader community as having a "placage" relationship if they so chose. The closest equivalent in English for "placage" is common law marriage, except that in the Haitian system time does not confer any legal sanctions as in the U.S. common law marriage. This particular couple is young and still not self-supporting, but we encountered couples in their fifties supporting large families and claiming "placage" marriage.

The issue of marriage for Haitians is further complicated by the practice of having civil and religious ceremonies. Some Haitians call themselves married only if they have been married both civilly and religiously. Others claim marriage status with only one and others claim it for placage. Still others in a placage relationship may claim an unmarried status.

Throughout the Alternative Enumeration we accepted individual's self-classification if the individual was present, even if that individual was not our principal informant. In cases where an individual resident was not present at the interview, we accepted the principal respondent's definition.

It is not uncommon for immigrant men and women to enter into liaisons with the opposite sex, while still married to a person back in Haiti. Within the household coded A03 014 the adult woman was coded as unmarried partner, although she is married to a man still in Haiti and not to the adult male in this household, with whom she is cohabiting. This is not an isolated case, although it is more typical for a man to be married to a woman still in Haiti while starting a new family in Miami. The child in this household is her son and is coded as a stepson to her unmarried partner because that is how he was defined by his mother and because her partner is the child's main source of support.

Within the AE sample area we also found examples of single women headed households, which were visited by a man who may have been the father to one or more children in the household. In these cases the man had one or more other residences and usually one or more families to whom he contributed financial support.

Haitian names. Depending on the strength of the informal or "placage" relationship, children resulting from these unions may be given the father's or the mother's name. If a child is given the father's name the father has formally recognized the child as his and will probably contribute to its support. If a child is given the mother's name, a father may still recognize the child as his and contribute to its support, or the father may also simply abandon child and mother. At any time in the future the father might recognize the child as his and in Haiti the child would simply use either name according to his want. In the U.S. as soon as the child is entered in school or a Women and Children (WIC) program the name he or she is using at that time generally becomes the official name, although within the household and community the name may change. We noticed that the census was always given the official name as used by the schools or on other institutional documents.

As with so many other immigrant groups, Haitian names are confusing to native English speakers. The way names are used in the U.S. is also confusing to Haitians. In Haiti, it is standard practice for people, especially men who have attended school to call each other by their last or family name. In Haiti it is not uncommon for all the sons in a family to be known only by what in the U.S. would be considered their last or family name. Girls tend to be more commonly called by their first name. Those who can write even sign their family names first. Many Haitians demonstrate confusion on official forms in the U.S. whereon they are asked to list their last name first. Consequently, in this sample, the census is riddled with examples of reversed names.

Haitian women do not typically use their husband's name. The match report contains several examples of the AE reporting the woman's name and the census listing her with her husband's name.

Some people have assumed names in order to use a legalized immigrant's social security number to procure work. Others go by aliases to avoid deportation. These are the people most likely to be censused at one household under one name and at another under a different name. They are also the most likely simply to avoid the census.

Spelling Haitian names can be a nightmare. Many Haitians find their names changed dramatically on their immigration documents. A few who have attained U.S. citizenship are having their names legally changed back to the original. Others who are illiterate are not sure of how their names are spelled. Still others prefer a Creole spelling over the French spelling or vice-a-versa. On the census, name spellings were badly garbled and in the case of some houses visited by census workers, the French sounding names were Anglicized.

Race and Ethnicity are clearly defined differently by the census and by Haitians. In Haiti where everyone but a small minority of mulattos is Black, race plays a far less dominant social role than in the U.S. Although increasingly aware of racism in the U.S., Haitian immigrants on the whole do not identify with the American Black population, nor with any of the other Black ethnic groups such as Cubans, Bahamians or Jamaicans. First and foremost they see themselves as Haitians. With time, racial and ethnic self-identification are changing.

One household in the AE exemplifies differing racial self-identification across generations as seen in several households in these blocks. Adults classify themselves racially as Haitians or Haitian Americans, whereas their school-age children often classify themselves as Black or Black Haitian American. Previous research has revealed that many adult Haitians do not wish to be identified with Black or Afro-Americans, many claiming to have been mistreated or victimized by them. At least one elementary school serving this part of the city classified Haitian children simply as Black. Almost certainly some Haitian children are accepting that definition of themselves as they generally are taught by their parents to accept the authority of the school in general. Teenagers in high school and junior high represent a more complex case, caught between their recognition that the rest of American society classifies them as Black and their emerging self-identity, which increasingly in Miami includes ethnic pride and the wish to stand apart from Black American age peers. Haitian teenagers are most likely to categorize their race as Black-Haitian-American.

The census categories for race are not flexible enough to reflect this widespread diversity. Therefore, if one of the goals of analyzing the census is to identify Haitians, then many individuals may be misclassified, especially children. For example, in one household all adults identify their race as "Other, Haitian" (for the Grandmother) or "Other, Haitian American" (for the two parents). The two teenagers say their race is Black/Haitian American, while the younger children report their race as Black and their ethnicity as American. The parents reported the race and ethnicity of an infant the same as for the younger children.

In some cases we found race and ethnicity were interpreted by the respondents as citizenship.

Various respondents noted that the mailed census forms allowed no way for them to identify themselves as Haitians.

Discrimination has plagued Haitians from the start of their exodus to the U.S. (Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990). Unfounded and eventually retracted claims of Haitians as a source first of tuberculosis and then of AIDS created negative stereotypes and cost many their jobs. In addition, throughout the 1980's Haitians have consistently had the lowest asylum approval rate of any national group as well as the highest rejection rate for applications for legalization under the farm workers provisions of IRCA: the Special Agricultural Worker section of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. Many people in the United States, including government officials, simply treat all Haitians as if they were illegal, even though the majority had a claim to remain here legally. The INS frequently attempted to deport those who still qualified for rights to hearings; and, state agencies often denied benefits to those who qualified for them.

In 1981, the Reagan administration started incarcerating newly arrived Haitians who entered the United States without visas. Of the recently arrived Haitians surveyed in 1983, more than one third had been imprisoned upon arrival for an average of 33 weeks each. Many became profoundly depressed and a few attempted suicide.

Differences in language, dress, values placed on education, respect for authority and virtually every other cultural element relevant to life as a teenager created often violent reactions by established age peers against Haitian high schoolers in the early 1980's. As their numbers increased, victimization was replaced by ethnic pride among Haitians at one high school in the city formerly dominated by Afro-Americans.

Although Haitians are generally credited with being hard, uncomplaining workers by their employers, they often experience poor treatment in the work place. Our ethnographic work abounds with tales of individuals being laid off with no notice, of being underpaid and of being overlooked for promotion, while other ethnic groups are hired, paid better and promoted over Haitians.

Recent Haitian immigrants have translated their negative experiences into perceptions of discrimination. Previous survey research revealed that Haitians believe all major ethnic groups in South Florida discriminate against them. Moreover, these perceptions seem to be on the rise. By 1985-86 almost all recent Haitian immigrants we interviewed perceived at least some form of Anglo discrimination. About 75 percent believed that American Blacks and Cubans discriminated against Haitians. These figures were up by about 25 percent from 1984-85. Most recently, resentment in the community has reached the point of militancy for some. (See the section on riots below under the section on "Methods - extraordinary events.")

Certainly an attitude of perceived discrimination and resentment could have an impact on attitudes toward cooperating with the census.

METHODS

Factors Influencing Site Selection

The factors influencing the selection of the two blocks under consideration are explained in extensive detail in Stepick and Dutton Stepick (1990). In summary, we selected two blocks that would assure it represent the entire range of residential styles. These two blocks also had high concentrations of ethnic Haitian residents.

Previous research had revealed much about the Haitian community's socioeconomic background and adaptation experiences. However, prior to our research on the possible causes for an undercount of Haitians in Miami little was known about their household composition and the types of housing and residence structures they preferred, although both irregular housing and unusual households were hypothesized as factors in underenumeration. Our background research for the Census Bureau revealed at least 13 distinct types of households (Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990). For our sample area we selected two blocks to assure that the entire range of residential styles was represented: single family dwellings, apartment complexes, boarding houses, and group living arrangements. Another criterion in our choice was sufficiently detailed familiarity with the blocks to insure representative types of households. Finally, we knew that within the large area of the city where Haitians have settled, the residential concentration of Haitians varies dramatically from one block to another. Some blocks may have only one or two Haitian households, while others may have as high as 80 percent Haitian households. We, therefore selected blocks that reflected a mixture of race and ethnicity, but with majorities of Haitian residences. With these criteria we could have chosen any number of other similar blocks equally representative of our selected universe, that is, the Haitian neighborhood. Blocks 03 and 04 were selected because they met all of our criteria for residential and household type differentiation, concentration of Haitians and detailed familiarity by being part of the previous research on possible causes of an undercount.

Roles and Contributions of Researchers and Assistants

Alex Stepick as co-principal investigator guided the site selection and dealt with all aspects of public relations such as explaining the project to community leaders. Although no enquiries ever came, his name and telephone number were given to all households in case there was any concern about anything regarding the AE, especially confidentiality. He contributed to site selection and the administrative aspects of the project. Finally, he has shared responsibility for data analysis and reporting.

Carol Dutton Stepick as co-principal investigator designed the data forms used for reporting the AE and instructed and supervised the assistants during the AE and follow-up fieldwork. She also reviewed all work and met continuously with the assistants. For the follow-up fieldwork, instructions were conveyed to research assistants in Miami by courier or telephone from Mexico where the co-principal investigators conducted research beginning in mid-1990. Finally, C. Dutton Stepick completed the coding required to express final match and resolve discrepancies between the Alternative Enumeration and the census, and she has contributed to the administrative aspects of the project, to site selection, and to the data analysis and reporting.

All interviews were conducted by three female assistants whose native language is Haitian Creole and who also speak English and French fluently and Spanish almost fluently. For more details concerning the background of the co-principal investigators, the site selection, and the training and survey research experience of the research assistants see Stepick and Dutton Stepick 1990.

We designed our own AE data forms, which included space for noting unusual observations, respondents' remarks and notes about employment and the possibility of finding the respondents at the same address in six to nine months. We also asked each household if it had received a census form. Our assistants worked patiently and carefully with respondents to help them remember ages and birth dates. Frequently documents like birth certificates and baptismal records were shown to them. Our assistants are sensitive to the difficulty many Haitians in the United States have about their names. The assistants double checked both the names and their spellings, again often being shown documents.

At the beginning of each enumeration visit the assistant carefully explained the purpose of the AE, which frequently entailed explaining the purpose and history of the census in the United States. The confidentiality of both the AE and the census were emphasized. At the end of each enumeration each household was offered a listing of public and private services available or targeted especially to Haitians in the city and county. They were also given the principal investigators' name and telephone number with instructions to call him with any questions they might have about the AE. They were told the principal investigator and his secretary, who would answer the telephone, speak Creole.

After combing through the Draft Match Report, the co-principal investigator prepared written instructions for the assistants' follow-up field work. These instructions directed the assistants to specific addresses within the sample site to obtain specifically detailed information concerning mismatches. Once the necessary information had been gathered the assistants prepared detailed reports for each address, which was then incorporated into the coding of the final link, match and resolution.

Dates of the AE and Follow-up Fieldwork

The AE was conducted between April 2, 1990 and May 14, 1990. This time period roughly corresponds to the interim between which the Miami population received census forms by mail (ie, the last week of March) and when the Miami Herald newspaper reported that census workers would begin visiting door to door. In addition, casual observation and participant observation started on April 1, 1990 through Easter Sunday, April 15, 1990. During this period selected community leaders were informed of the AE.

On February 15, 1991 we received a computer print-out draft match report in Mexico. A copy sent by the Census Bureau earlier in December 1990 to our home university was not forwarded. Between February 15 and February 21, 1991 this draft match report was carefully analyzed and instructions for resolving differences between the census and the AE were formulated and sent to the research assistants. Between March 1 and March 12, 1991 specified follow-up fieldwork was conducted and the results returned to the co-principal investigators who reviewed them. On April 10, 1991 the packet of guidelines and instructions pertaining to the match report was

received in Mexico. Coding work sheets and the first draft of this report were prepared between April 20 and May 2, 1991.

Extraordinary Events Affecting Censusing and the AE

There are three notable recently occurring events that we believe may have influenced censusing in this population: recent political changes in Haiti, recent changes in United States immigration law, and localized riots involving Haitians in Miami.

Political change in Haiti Haiti has experienced considerable political change and uncertainty since February 1986, when Jean Claude Duvalier fled the country ending more than twenty-five years of uninterrupted dictatorship. A number of coups and interim governments ruled from 1986 through the beginning of 1991 producing a tremendous back and forth flow of Haitians between south Florida and Haiti. At the time of the 1990 Census, Haiti was preparing for presidential elections, subsequently won by a populist Catholic priest, Jean Baptiste Aristide. Political maneuvering and incidents of repression during this period further increased the movement to and from Florida.

Immigration and Reform Control Act Access to the Haitian population in Florida is difficult because of a complex of legal statuses stemming from persistent efforts by the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Justice Department and the INS to deter the arrival of Haitians and to return those Haitians already in the U.S. For example, Haitians have the lowest asylum approval rate of any national group. It was with high hopes that the U.S. Haitian population received news of the amnesty provisions for farm workers in the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). However, in the ensuing years Haitians have experienced the highest rejection rate of applications for amnesty under that provision. IRCA has thus increased the willingness to cooperate with outsiders, such as Census workers, of Haitians who qualified and received permanent residency. At the same time, for those Haitians who did not qualify for legalization, IRCA also fueled the fear and distrustfulness of interaction with the U.S. government.

Localized riots In July of 1990, after the completion of the Census and follow-up work, the Little Haiti section of Miami nearly rioted over an altercation between a Cuban shopkeeper and a Haitian customer. A few months later, a neighborhood adjacent to Little Haiti exploded for one night of violence, looting and burning: Miami's fourth major riot in ten years. Although none of these events took place during periods of the Census, we mention them because they recur so commonly and so close to the neighborhoods where Haitians live that one easily could affect censusing.

Hypotheses

The main problems for enumeration that we predicted are:

1. Access, which includes
 - a. illiteracy,
 - b. lack of English,
 - c. extraordinary mistrust; and
2. complex household structures, which include
 - a. polygyny,
 - b. temporary household residents, and
 - c. high residential mobility.

These hypothesized problems are closely related to the hypothesized causes of a Census undercount presented in Brownrigg and Martin (1989), that is: mobility, illiteracy and/or lack of fluency in English, concealment to protect resources coupled with lack of trust in census confidentiality, and resistance, both active and passive, to non-community members, particularly the government.

Our analysis of the role played by these predicted problems is based on both qualitative and quantitative evidence. The quantitative analysis is from previous research and has already been thoroughly treated in Stepick and Dutton Stepick (1990). The qualitative analysis of ethnographic evidence gathered during previous studies and especially that gathered during the Alternative Enumeration itself as well as interviews during the follow up fieldwork are presented in the following section of this report.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

We believe that on the whole we have been able to resolve virtually all of the differences between the AE and the census for the two blocks constituting the sample. There is one six year old boy found by the census but not by the AE whose Census Day residence we are unable to confirm, but whom we believe probably should be included in the census. In addition, the census was correct about two addresses for which we had erred. One of our errors was not noting the street number and another was a coding error.

The census included numerous John and Jane Does and no names. Many of these unidentified people also were not listed with ages or dates of birth. For these cases we gave the census the

benefit of the doubt and confirmed a match if there was a reasonable similarity of identifying markers between the actual person and the unidentified one. To make these decisions we followed the study's Guidelines Part V.

Missed Housing Units

On Block 03 we calculate that the census missed as many as 14 occupied housing units out of the forty housing units that were occupied on Census Day. In these housing units resided a total of forty-six individual persons who were also missed. In addition, up to twenty-five other individuals were missed in housing units which were included in the census. These omissions demonstrate what appears to us as a significant number of people missing from the census for one single block.

Most of the housing units missed by the census on Block 03 are garage apartments or apartments partitioned out of larger single family dwellings. Many of these units exist in violation of local zoning regulations. Nearly all of them have no separate address apart from the main house on the lot where all mail is delivered. Because they are among the smallest and therefore least expensive housing accommodations available, they tend to be the residence of the most recently arrived immigrants. In general, these are also the people whose immigration status is most tentative and who stay in the shadows out of direct contact with government authorities. Although some would avoid the census, we do not believe that most of these people necessarily would. In fact, some individuals asked our assistants where they could obtain census forms. Two women from separate households who told us they went to the post office to seek census forms.

Our rough count indicates that only about eight households on this block were visited by a census worker. At five of those addresses the census workers failed to count seven additional households representing 21 individuals. In the follow-up field work respondents told us that census workers never asked them if there were any other households on the property.

On block 04 a much larger proportion of housing units were visited by census workers. Here, there are also fewer irregular housing units lacking separate addresses. In general, fewer housing units and fewer individuals were missed by the census in block 04 than in block 03. On the contrary, the census duplicated housing units. In one case the census counted a household of seven residents three times.

In one case of duplication a census worker visited a household that had already returned a mailed form. In another, the same residence was visited by a census worker in May, again in June and again in July. The residents patiently cooperated with each census worker visit. But, they told us that because they wanted to cooperate and be courteous, they did not insist that they had already participated in the census. In the cases of duplication on the part of the census, addresses of the housing units were clearly marked and correctly reported. The Census Bureau is in a better position than we are to determine the cause of such double work and duplication of data.

Missing Persons

Within households counted by the census a few themes emerge to explain why individual residents were missed. One problem which we speculate accounts for many of these misses is the attempt to shield those household members with illegal or tentative immigration status from any risk of discovery and/or threat of deportation. This is the most difficult to prove of all our hypotheses. We assiduously avoided probing our respondents' immigration status. After many surveys and much contact, including ritual and actual forms of reciprocity a level of trust has been established such that many of our respondents volunteer information about their status. Consequently, we speculate with confidence that at a minimum between 10 percent and 15 percent of the households situated on the two blocks of the AE have at least one member whose immigration status is either outright illegal or pending deportation or highly tentative. An equal percentage of households are home to individuals who are attempting to adjust their immigration status, many of them through the legalization provisions for farm workers under IRCA.

Another theme appears to be difficulty understanding and correctly filling out the mailed census forms. Many people who received them do not read English or Spanish sufficiently well enough to be able to know what they were or to complete them correctly.

We also noted that in many cases boarders were not listed on mailed census forms, nor reported to visiting census workers. Again, some of them may have been shielded due to their immigration status. In addition, many boarders are taken in by a family renting a housing unit in violation of their rental agreement.

In still other cases, resident landlords living in the main part of a subdivided house returned the census form mailed to the house address, but did not mention that there were one or more separate households also living at the same address. This was true when census workers visited, too. The main reason appears to be that the additional housing units in garages or carved out of a main house are mostly in violation of zoning regulations. In a few cases, Haitian resident landlords may also have thought they were shielding their tenants with tentative immigration status.

Several of the households with members omitted from the census told us they had never been visited by a census worker and since they had not returned a mailed census form, they had no idea how the census counted any of them. In most of those cases we noted from the computer match sheets that the source of information was either missing or a proxy from a neighbor. Relying on a neighbor's report -- rather than making a return visit -- seems to accumulate census undercount.

Several mismatches occurred because of the high residential turnover in this community. In order to assure that we would know who was resident where on Census Day, we started the AE on April 2nd. However, by the time census workers were making their first door to door visits sometime after mid-May several households had changed residence. In two cases residents received their mailed census forms during the last week of March, returned it and moved on or before March 31st.

In general, the most frequently occurring reasons for missed cases by the census or mismatches in which the census was in error conformed to the hypothesized obstacles already mentioned. Only about three cases of misses by the census were caused by the practice of polygyny. In all three cases, the missed individuals were listed as predicted misses by the AE precisely because they maintained multiple residences. Household A04 035 is an example of polygyny which does not affect the count. The adult male in this household is married to a woman residing in Haiti. At the same time he is living with another woman in this country.

A Rough Resolved Count

The Census found 256 of the confirmed Census Day residents. The AE found an additional 129 confirmed Census Day residents in the same sample area. The above two sections detail how whole housing units and people within housing units were missed.

The Census also mistakenly listed 48 individuals who either moved in after Census Day, or were duplicates or not did not reside in the sample area. When the number of actual Census Day residents found by the Census is divided by the total number of actual (resolved) Census Day residents, it appears that the Census found only 66 percent of those who were actually there. As noted above, most of the undercount occurred on one of the two blocks. Omissions on the census of one third of the Census Day population in the sample area are not balanced by the erroneous enumerations. Therefore, there was a net undercount at the Haitian Miami ethnographic site.

Differences in Demographic Information

For those individuals not missed by the census there were many, many errors in listing names and demographic elements. That names were badly garbled on the census merits mention because of the extent of this particular problem. In the follow-up visits we rechecked names, gender, ages and birth dates for about 20% of the sample, confirming our original data. Garbled names, incorrect sex, age and birth date arise in part because of census workers' errors, but also in part because of cultural confusion on the part of respondents as explained above in the section on "site profile." This problem will presumably be of importance particularly for future census bureau surveys.

Addresses, particularly unit designations on apartment buildings were almost consistently confused on the census listing for Block 04. This block was selected because it is the site of several medium and small sized apartment buildings. Many of these mislabeling problems should have been sorted out by the numerous census worker visits to this block. Instead, their visits compounded the problem because they tended to duplicate visits to the same places.

Another issue which is not strictly speaking an error on anyone's part is the issue of racial and ethnic identity. The census listings rarely identify individuals as Haitian. Those who mailed in census forms had even less opportunity to identify themselves as Haitians than those visited by a census worker. As one respondent resentfully put it, Haitians were not recognized as any kind of category on the mailed census form. She said,

"They did not put Haitians on the form...that means that they don't recognize the Haitians in the country. I filled out the form unwillingly."

She is correct in that the census has allowed no way to recognize this immigrant group, at least on the short form. Racially, Haitians will be lumped together with Afro-Americans with whom they do not identify. Haitians typically self-identify both their race and their ethnicity as Haitian yet in the race question on the 1990 form, Haitian was not among the choices offered.

CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that the 1990 Census undercounted Haitians in the two blocks studied in Miami. The single most important factor was that entire households were missed. These households were mainly in extra housing units that most likely did not receive mailed forms and were not censused by field enumerators.

The second most important source of an undercount was the census workers' missing of residents within a household. Missed individuals were most frequently not members of the immediate, nuclear family. They were extended family members, friends (usually from the same village in Haiti), or boarders. However, immediate nuclear family members were also missed.

The fundamental causes of the undercount confirm the hypotheses delineated by Brownrigg and Martin (1989): illiteracy, concealment, inhabitants who are likely fearsome of and resistant to enumeration by representatives of the government.

The more immediate causes, however, relate to the shortcomings of the list of addresses and field enumerators. Garage and other converted apartments abound, nearly all serve as residences in violation of zoning ordinances. What mail they do receive usually comes via the main house. Those living in them move frequently and many are likely to be undocumented immigrants fearful of contact with government officials. Yet, our alternative enumeration reveals both that Haitians are there and that with proper field techniques they can be counted.

One of the surprises of the research was the desire to participate and cooperate with the 1990 Census exhibited by the Haitian community in Miami. As described in the above text, some people went out of their way to try to obtain Census forms to complete. However, they were not always successful. Mailed census forms need to be more multilingual. When targeting Haitian neighborhoods they should ideally be in English, Spanish, French and Haitian Creole.

We believe census coverage could be easily and significantly improved by better training and supervision of census field enumerators. In our earlier study, we recommended that enumerators, if they are to be successful, must be of Haitian descent, native speakers of Haitian Creole, and they must be dedicated, persistent, and specially trained. The results of the enumeration indicate that these conditions were not fulfilled. Every block in this section of the city is riddled with irregular housing units, a fact well documented and known throughout

Miami. The group housing arrangements of many immigrants has been written about in the local newspaper.

Because of the illegal nature of many of the missed housing units, improving the mail list will be difficult. The inconsistent and anglicized spelling of Haitian names by the enumerators raises the question of whether they were fluent in Haitian Creole. The high percentage of back and garage apartments missed along with a recurrent reliance on neighbors for data demonstrates that the census enumerators were not sufficiently dedicated or persistent, or were never instructed to seek out households or irregularly addressed housing units. The census workers sent to the two blocks in our sample should have been instructed to seek out irregular housing units. Enumerators should work on Sundays when immigrant communities are typically all at home. If they were so instructed they evidently did not follow their instructions. Assuming that census workers are available to work the streets with the flexibility required to find irregular housing units, and that they speak the appropriate language, they must also be sensitized to the fears and biases of their target populations. In the case of Haitians that translates to simply taking a moment to explain the purpose of one's visit in more detail than "I'm here to take the census," and to assure confidentiality.

It appears that at least in Haitian neighborhoods - and we suspect in most low income and recent immigrant neighborhoods - the census is missing significant numbers of people. In Haitian neighborhoods the Census is probably systematically missing disproportionate numbers of a certain subclass of Haitian immigrant, i.e. the more recently arrived.

REFERENCES

- Brownrigg, Leslie and Elizabeth Martin. "Proposed Study Plan for Ethnographic Evaluation of the Behavioral Causes of Undercount," Background paper prepared for the Census Advisory Committee of the American Statistical Association and the Census Advisory Committee on Population Statistics at the Joint Advisory Committee Meeting, April 13-14, Alexandria, Virginia 1989.
- Fjellman, Steve and Hugh Gladwin. "Haitian Family Patters of Migration to South Florida," *Human Organization*, vol. 44, no. 4, winter 1985: 301-312.
- Stepick, Alex and Carol Dutton Stepick. "What's in it for me? What's in it for you? Ethnographic research on the possible undercount of Haitians in Miami." Final Report for Joint Statistical Agreement JSA 88-26. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1990.