

Young Children Living with Grandparents Are More Likely to Be Missed in the Census.

By

Dr. William P. O'Hare

1. Introduction

Over the past couple of years, the U.S. Census Bureau has produced several studies showing how the relationship of a young child (age 0 to 4) to the householder¹ impacts the risk of the child being missed in the Decennial Census. A key finding from this research is that children who are not the child of the householder have a higher risk of being missed in the Census. This paper reviews that research and then provides detailed data on young children in terms of their relationship to householders. First, data are examined by race and Hispanic origin, then data are provided for each state based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS).

Young children are the focus of this report because they had the highest net undercount rate and highest omissions rate of any age group in the 2010 Census. In the 2010 Census the net undercount rate for the population age 0 to 4 was 4.6 percent and the omissions rate was around 10 percent (O'Hare 2019a, Chapter 5). (For more information on the distinction between net undercounts and omissions see O'Hare 2019b).

¹ See Appendix A for information on the Census concept of a householder.

2. Research on Relationship to Householder and The Risk of Being Missed in The Census for Young Children

Data on the relationship of a young child to the householder and the risk of being missed in the Census show that children other than biological or adopted children of the householder have an elevated risk of being missed in the Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). This line of research is closely related to similar work on complex household types showing young children living in complex households were more likely to be missed in the 2010 Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2018).

A summary of recent U.S. Census Bureau (2019a, page 4) research reports on this topic concluded, “several analyses found that young children who were biological children or adopted children of the householder had a lower risk of being missed than young children who were grandchildren, other relatives, or not related to the householder.” In other words, children other than biological and adopted children have a higher risk of being missed in the Census.

Another recent report (O’Hare et al. 2019) found that household relationship measures were closely related to differences in net undercount rates among large counties even after other variables were controlled. This suggests household relationships are closely related to county differences in net undercounts rates for young children.

Fernandez and her colleagues (2018, Table 7) compared 2010 Census records to administrative records for young children and found that the odds of being missed in the Census was 39 percent higher for grandchildren compared to biological or adopted children even after other factors have been controlled. Young children who were other

relatives of the householder (not biological/adopted or grandchild) were 53 percent more likely to be missed than biological or adopted children. Young children who were not related to the householder were three times as likely to be missed and foster children were five times as likely to be missed. (Nonrelative young children may be related to other people in the household, just not the householder.)

The research above underscores the idea that young children who are not the child of the householder have a higher risk of being missed in the Census. Looking at the young children who are not children of the householder by state and by race/Hispanic origin can help us gain a better understanding of the location and characteristics of households where this vulnerable population is living.

The findings reported above are consistent with a broader theoretical understanding of why people are missed in the Census. Martin (1999 and 2007) contends that people more remotely linked to the person filling out the census questionnaire (usually the householder), are more likely to be missed. Children other than children of the householder are more remotely linked to the householder so it is not surprising they have an elevated risk of being missed in the Census.

The findings are also consistent with the idea that many young children are missed in the Census because respondents are confused about whether to include a young child in the Census (National Association of Latino Elected Officials 2018). Some people say they would not include a young child in the Census because they feel the government does not need to know about a young children or that the government already has information about a young child. The findings here are consistent with forthcoming research which shows respondents are often confused about whether a

young child should be included in the Census response and respondents say they are less likely to include a child on the census questionnaire who is not a child of the householder (Partnership for America's Children 2019). Correcting this misunderstanding could help get a more accurate count of young children in the Census.

In this study, young children are sorted into two broad groups based on their relationship with the householder. The first group is labeled child of the householder and include biological and adopted children of the householder. The second group is everyone who is not a biological or adopted child of the householder. Evidence suggests stepchildren are missed at a higher rate than biological or adopted children (U.S. Census Bureau 2017, Table 10) so they are put in the second group

While young children other than the child of the householder have a higher probability of being missed in the Census, it is important to recognize that the numerical majority of the young children missed in the 2010 Census were the child of the householder. More than 80 percent of all young children living in households in 2017 were the child of the householder. Census Bureau research shows that 73 percent of young children missed (technically these are non-matched records) were the child of the householder (U.S. Census 2017, Table 5).

3. Data By Race And Hispanic origin

Results of the 2010 Census show young Black and Hispanic children have much higher net undercount rates than non-Hispanic white children. O'Hare (2015, Table 3.4)

shows that the official data from the 2010 Census found a net undercount rate of 7.5 percent for young Hispanic children and 6.5 percent of young black alone or in combination.² Net undercount rates for other racial categories of young children are not available.

Data presented here show that minority children are less likely to be the child of the householder Table 1 shows the number and percent of young children in terms of relationship to the householder by race and Hispanic origin. The race categories used in Table 1 are inclusive, in that they include any young child for whom the person filling out the census questionnaire selected that race group even if they also selected another race group as well. The figures for race also include Hispanics who selected that race. The exception is the non-Hispanic white alone category which is meant to reflect the demographic group that is often thought of as the majority group in the country. This categorization is consistent with the recommendation of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget which suggests that when data are used in a civil rights context, the race alone or in combination is the best grouping to use (U.S Office of Management and Budget 2001). Since some young children are counted more than once, the figures add up to more than 100 percent.

² Unofficially, estimates for the net undercount of young Hispanic children have been updated and lowered but are still much higher than other age groups (Jensen et al. 2018).

Table 1. Relationship of Young Children (Age 0 to 4) to the Householder by Race and Hispanic Origin					
	Child of the Householder		Not a Child of Householder		Total
	Number	Percent of Group	Number	Percent of Group	
Non-Hispanic White Alone	8,683,382	88	1,173,218	12	9,856,600
Hispanic	4,083,712	80	1,047,397	20	5,131,109
Black Alone or in Combination	2,689,923	77	821,973	23	3,511,896
Asian Alone or in Combination	1,249,546	89	149,038	11	1,398,584
American Indian or Alaskan Native Alone or in Combination	317,795	76	102,164	24	419,959
Pacific Islander Alone or in Combination	89,190	74	30,776	26	119,966
Total	16,634,462	84	3,192,694	16	19,827,156

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

Nationwide, 16 percent of young children were living in a household where they were not the child of the householder. But this figure masks big differences by race and Hispanic origin. The rate for non-Hispanic white alone young children was 12 percent and for young Asian children it was 11 percent. The group with the highest percentage was Pacific Islander at 26 percent.³ Hispanic (20%), Black (23%) and American Indian/Alaskan Natives (24%) also have relatively high rates. In other words, in most minority groups the share of young children who are not a child of the householder is about twice as high that for non-Hispanic white alone.

³ The IPUMS website defines the Pacific Islander group as the population of people who are "Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander alone or in combination." Pacific Islander races listed on the form were: Native Hawaiian; Guamanian or Chamorro; Samoan; and "other Pacific Islander".

The high share of young children who are not a child of the householder in most minority groups may help explain why the net undercount rates for young minority children are high (O'Hare 2015).

Table 2 provides more detailed data on young children who are not a child of the householder by race and Hispanic origin. Table 2A shows the numerical data as a percentage distribution. For every race/Hispanic group, grandchildren are the majority of young children who are not children of the householder and the share of children who are grandchildren does not vary much across groups. In all of the groups around 70 percent of the young children who are not the child of the householder are the grandchild of the householder. Other relatives of the householder is the second largest category for all the groups.

Table 2. Detailed Relationship of Young Children (Age 0 to 4) to the Householder by Race and Hispanic Origin

	Grandchild	Other Relative	Non-Relative	Stepchild	Foster Child	Other*	Not a Child of Householder
Non-Hispanic White Alone	824,169	105,451	97,339	87,346	40,720	18,193	1,173,218
Hispanic	729,225	171,739	51,702	48,160	17,174	29,397	1,047,397
Black Alone or in Combination	602,527	111,436	37,607	29,982	25,599	14,822	821,973
Asian Alone or in Combination	105,049	27,749	7,376	4,255	1,460	3,149	149,038
American Indian or Alaskan Native Alone or in Combination	74,748	13,578	4,534	4,011	3,538	1,755	102,164
Pacific Islander Alone or in Combination	21,129	5,116	1,948	776	943	864	30,776
Total	2,258,903	417,814	195,379	169,484	85,755	65,359	3,192,694

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

* includes siblings, children of roomers/boarders/lodger, and children in group quarters

Table 2A. Detailed Percentage Distribution of Relationship of Young Children (Age 0 to 4) to the Householder by Race and Hispanic Origin

	Percent Distribution						Not a Child of Householder
	Grandchild	Other Relative	Non-Relative	Stepchild	Foster Child	Other*	
Non-Hispanic White Alone	70	9	8	7	3	2	1,173,218
Hispanic	70	16	5	5	2	3	1,047,397
Black Alone or in Combination	73	14	5	4	3	2	821,973
Asian Alone or in Combination	70	19	5	3	1	2	149,038
American Indian or Alaskan Native Alone or in Combination	73	13	4	4	3	2	102,164
Pacific Islander Alone or in Combination	69	17	6	3	3	3	30,776
Total	71	13	6	5	3	2	3,192,694

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

* includes siblings, children of roomers/boarders/lodger, and children in group quarters

Note that the data presented here regarding grandparents does not reveal whether a parent or both parents of the young children are also living in the household. In addition, it does not specify that the grandparent is financially responsible for the young child. The Census Bureau produces another tabulation which shows the number of grandparents who are responsible for children, but the data for this measure are only available for children age 0 to 17 and not broken out separately for young children. The Census Bureau table for young children living with grandparents is for children age 0 to 5 rather than 0 to 4. For this analysis I used the data from IPUMS which allowed data to

be tabulated for the 0 to 4 age group which is the more traditional age group for young children.

The number of foster children reported in Table 2 (85,755) is far short of the number of foster children shown in administrative records. There are two reasons for this. First, research shows foster children have high net undercount rates. Second, many of the kids in foster care are in kinship care and may be reported as a grandchild or other relative rather than a foster child (O'Hare 2008).

Table 3 shows data for subgroups of young Hispanic children. There is not much variation among these groups in terms of the percent of young children not a child of the householder. Cubans are the group with the lowest percentage of young children who not the child of the householder (16%) and Mexicans have the highest rate at 21 percent.

Table 3. Relationship of Child to Householder for Young (age 0 to 4) Hispanic Children by Hispanic Subgroup					
	Child of the Householder		Not a Child of the Householder		Total
	Number	Percent of Group	Number	Percent of Group	
Mexican	2,727,116	79	728,141	21	3,455,257
Puerto Rican	379,823	80	95,294	20	475,117
Cuban	105,768	84	20,450	16	126,218
Other	871,005	81	203,512	19	1,074,517
Hispanic Total	4,083,712	80	1,047,397	20	5,131,109
Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system					

Table 4 shows data for subgroups of young Asian children. Table 4 only includes Asian groups for which there were at least 1,000 young children in the ACS sample from 2013-17. There is a lot of variation among the Asian subgroups. The groups with the lowest percent of young children not living in a household where they were the child of the householder are Asian Indians and Koreans each at 6 percent. On the other hand, 24 percent of young Filipino children were not living in a household where they were the child of the householder.

Too often Asians are treated as a homogenous group, but the data provided here indicates it is important to look at subgroups of Asian children separately. O'Hare (2017) provided census-related socioeconomic measures for Asian subgroups in looking at the population in California and highlighted the importance of looking at subgroups of Asians separately whenever possible.

Table 4. Relationship of Young (Age 0 to 4) Children to Householder for Selected Asian Subgroups					
	Child of Householder		Not Child of Householder		TOTAL
	Number	Percent of Group	Number	Percent of Group	
Chinese	7,191	91	711	9	7,902
Filipino	3,559	76	1,131	24	4,690
Asian Indian	11,276	94	667	6	11,943
Korean	2,211	94	150	6	2,361
Vietnamese	2,777	82	593	18	3,370
Hmong	983	85	170	15	1,153
Pakistani	1,194	84	226	16	1,420
Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system					
Only Asian subgroups with as least 1,000 young children in the sample are shown here.					

4.State Data

Table 5 shows states ranked by the percent of young children who are not the child of the householder, i.e. young children at the highest risk of being missed in the Census. I examined the distribution of young children by relationship to householder for each year from 2010 to 2017 and there were no detectable trends over time across the categories so that data is not shown here.

Five-year data from the ACS were used for this table because the larger sample size of the five-year data provides more reliable estimates. This was especially

important for smaller states and categories with smaller numbers. The overall sample size for age 0 to 4 in the 2013-17 ACS is almost 820,000. Since there did not seem to be any trends since 2010, using the large sample of the 2013 to 2017 ACS was more important than using the more recent 2017 ACS data alone. Table B in Appendix B shows the number of young children age 0 to 4 in the sample for each state. There are more than 1,000 young children in the sample for each state which means these state level estimates are likely to be reasonably reliable.

Table 5 shows that nationwide 16.1 percent of children were not children of the householder, but state figures range from a high of 27.3 percent in Hawaii to a low of 9.1 percent in Minnesota. Other states with a high percent of young children who are not children of the householder include Mississippi (24.2%), California (19.1%), Alabama (19.1%), and South Carolina (19.1%). Other states with low percentages are geographically clustered in the Northern Plains and include Nebraska (9.5%), Iowa (9.9%), North Dakota (9.9%) and Wisconsin (10.4%).

Table 5. States Ranked by Percent of Young Children Who Are NOT a Child of the Householder					
relationship of young child (age 0-4) to the householder					
Rank*	State	Number of children of the householder	Percent of all young children who are children of the householder	Number of young children who are NOT a child of the householder	Percent of all young children who are NOT a child of the householder
1	HAWAII	66,524	72.7	24,947	27.3
2	MISSISSIPPI	144,683	75.8	46,067	24.2
3	CALIFORNIA	2,014,559	80.9	476,683	19.1
4	ALABAMA	235,825	80.9	55,726	19.1
5	SOUTH CAROLINA	234,506	80.9	55,225	19.1
6	ARIZONA	353,854	81.5	80,453	18.5
7	ARKANSAS	155,490	81.9	34,326	18.1
8	GEORGIA	538,826	81.9	118,790	18.1
9	NEW MEXICO	107,330	81.9	23,656	18.1
10	TEXAS	1,623,907	82.0	356,959	18.0
11	DC	35,751	82.1	7,771	17.9
12	LOUISIANA	255,073	82.2	55,348	17.8
13	FLORIDA	908,394	82.2	196,204	17.8
14	WEST VIRGINIA	83,200	82.5	17,589	17.5
15	NEVADA	149,554	82.6	31,480	17.4
16	Delaware	45,661	82.6	9,603	17.4
17	TENNESSEE	332,473	82.6	69,898	17.4
18	KENTUCKY	226,231	82.7	47,383	17.3
19	MARYLAND	303,324	82.8	62,849	17.2
20	NEW YORK	980,602	83.4	194,726	16.6
21	NORTH CAROLINA	508,805	84.3	94,769	15.7
22	ILLINOIS	665,227	84.8	119,327	15.2
23	OKLAHOMA	223,804	84.8	40,111	15.2
24	PENNSYLVANIA	602,693	84.9	106,808	15.1
25	MICHIGAN	485,222	85.0	85,586	15.0
26	ALASKA	45,939	85.4	7,850	14.6
27	INDIANA	357,338	85.5	60,757	14.5
28	RHODE ISLAND	46,792	85.5	7,925	14.5
29	MISSOURI	318,255	85.6	53,499	14.4
30	VIRGINIA	436,681	85.6	73,202	14.4
31	OHIO	595,340	85.8	98,401	14.2
32	OREGON	199,732	86.1	32,273	13.9
33	NEW JERSEY	455,356	86.5	71,260	13.5
34	NEW HAMPSHIRE	55,947	86.7	8,597	13.3
35	WASHINGTON	389,243	87.0	58,106	13.0
36	SOUTH DAKOTA	52,258	87.2	7,670	12.8
37	MASSACHUSETTS	316,184	87.3	45,977	12.7
38	MONTANA	53,390	87.4	7,699	12.6
39	CONNECTICUT	162,287	87.6	23,075	12.4
40	COLORADO	294,247	88.0	40,009	12.0
41	UTAH	223,767	88.2	29,883	11.8
42	KANSAS	174,214	88.3	23,127	11.7
43	VERMONT	26,404	88.4	3,461	11.6
44	WYOMING	33,002	88.6	4,260	11.4
45	IDAHO	100,749	88.7	12,836	11.3
46	MAINE	57,128	89.0	7,079	11.0
47	WISCONSIN	300,544	89.6	34,895	10.4
48	NORTH DAKOTA	46,785	90.1	5,167	9.9
49	IOWA	176,771	90.1	19,333	9.9
50	NEBRASKA	118,370	90.5	12,478	9.5
51	MINNESOTA	316,221	90.9	31,591	9.1
	US TOTAL	16,634,462	83.9	3,192,694	16.1

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Pums file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

* Ranking is based on unrounded data

The differences across minority groups and the differential distribution of these minority groups across states helps explain state differences. Note that the states with the highest share of children who were reported in the census as not being the child of the householder (at the top of Table 5) are mostly states with relatively large minority populations. That makes sense considering the data in Table 1 showing the number and percent of young children who are not children of the householder are higher for racial and Hispanic minorities. States at the bottom of the distribution shown in Table 5 are states with disproportionately large non-Hispanic white populations.

Table 6 shows the states ranked in terms of the percent of young children who are grandchildren of the householder. States range from a high of 19.5 percent in Hawaii to a low of 5.6 percent in Minnesota.

Table 6. States Ranked by Percent of Children Age 0 to 4 Living with a Grandparent who is the householder:: 2013-17 ACS FROM

	Population age 0 to 4 Living with a Grandparent Householder	Total Population age 0 to 4	Percent of Population age 0 to 4 living with a Grandparent householder
HAWAII	17,795	91,471	19.5
MISSISSIPPI	36,486	190,750	19.1
SOUTH CAROLINA	40,870	289,731	14.1
NEW MEXICO	18,252	130,986	13.9
ALABAMA	40,452	291,551	13.9
LOUISIANA	43,069	310,421	13.9
CALIFORNIA	338,936	2,491,242	13.6
DC	5,816	43,522	13.4
TEXAS	264,653	1,980,866	13.4
WEST VIRGINIA	13,123	100,789	13.0
ARIZONA	56,132	434,307	12.9
GEORGIA	83,865	657,616	12.8
FLORIDA	140,139	1,104,598	12.7
MARYLAND	44,919	366,173	12.3
TENNESSEE	49,089	402,371	12.2
ARKANSAS	22,926	189,816	12.1
Delaware	6,492	55,264	11.7
NEW YORK	136,255	1,175,328	11.6
KENTUCKY	31,674	273,614	11.6
NEVADA	20,920	181,034	11.6
PENNSYLVANIA	78,728	709,501	11.1
NORTH CAROLINA	66,918	603,574	11.1
ILLINOIS	84,804	784,554	10.8
ALASKA	5,506	53,789	10.2
VIRGINIA	52,027	509,883	10.2
MICHIGAN	57,805	570,808	10.1
RHODE ISLAND	5,495	54,717	10.0
MISSOURI	37,189	371,754	10.0
OHIO	68,051	693,741	9.8
INDIANA	40,978	418,095	9.8
NEW HAMPSHIRE	6,307	64,544	9.8
OKLAHOMA	25,734	263,915	9.8
NEW JERSEY	50,847	526,616	9.7
VERMONT	2,750	29,865	9.2
MASSACHUSETTS	32,787	362,161	9.1
OREGON	20,838	232,005	9.0
CONNECTICUT	16,629	185,362	9.0
UTAH	21,532	253,650	8.5
WASHINGTON	37,614	447,349	8.4
MONTANA	5,089	61,089	8.3
SOUTH DAKOTA	4,900	59,928	8.2
COLORADO	27,149	334,256	8.1
KANSAS	15,558	197,341	7.9
IDAHO	8,218	113,585	7.2
WISCONSIN	24,153	335,439	7.2
MAINE	4,476	64,207	7.0
WYOMING	2,588	37,262	6.9
NORTH DAKOTA	3,395	51,952	6.5
IOWA	11,885	196,104	6.1
NEBRASKA	7,582	130,848	5.8
MINNESOTA	19,508	347,812	5.6
U.S.	2,258,903	19,827,156	11.4

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

Table 7 shows how young children who are not the child of the householder are distributed among detailed categories of relationship to the householder including:

- Grandchild
- Stepchild,
- Other relative
- Other nonrelatives
- Other (Siblings, Children of roomers/boarders/lodgers, Foster children, children living in Group Quarters)

Note the sample sizes for some categories and some states are very small so one should use those figures cautiously. Table 7A shows the numerical data as a percentage distribution.

The data in Table 7 show most of the children who are not a child of the householder are the grandchild of the householder in every state. At the national level, of the 3.1 million children who were not children of the householder, 2.3 million (72%) are the grandchild of the householder. Table 7A shows that in every state at least 60 percent of the children who are not a child of the householder are the grandchild of the householder.

	Relationship of the child to the householder						Total Not Biological or Adopted Child of the Householder
	Grandchild	Other Relatives	Other non-relatives	Stepchild	Foster child	Other*	
ALABAMA	40,452	7,347	2,790	3,080	1,680	377	55,726
ALASKA	5,506	829	604	270	526	115	7,850
ARIZONA	56,132	10,792	4,352	3,743	3,374	2,060	80,453
ARKANSAS	22,926	3,812	3,103	2,993	1,203	289	34,326
CALIFORNIA	338,936	78,567	21,888	14,759	9,636	12,897	476,683
COLORADO	27,149	5,206	2,283	3,007	1,249	1,115	40,009
CONNECTICUT	16,629	2,684	1,679	781	931	371	23,075
DC	5,816	1,157	437	89	89	183	7,771
Delaware	6,492	1,366	874	532	82	257	9,603
FLORIDA	140,139	25,465	12,209	10,823	4,147	3,421	196,204
GEORGIA	83,865	15,986	6,624	7,586	3,079	1,650	118,790
HAWAII	17,795	4,218	1,275	482	288	889	24,947
IDAHO	8,218	1,323	1,276	1,453	343	223	12,836
ILLINOIS	84,804	15,776	6,708	5,966	3,740	2,333	119,327
INDIANA	40,978	6,230	6,302	4,078	2,241	928	60,757
IOWA	11,885	2,175	2,527	1,434	564	748	19,333
KANSAS	15,558	2,515	1,233	2,275	1,026	520	23,127
KENTUCKY	31,674	5,327	4,671	3,181	1,961	569	47,383
LOUISIANA	43,069	5,221	3,054	2,643	991	370	55,348
MAINE	4,476	552	912	519	425	195	7,079
MARYLAND	44,919	10,228	3,582	2,192	573	1,355	62,849
MASSACHUSETTS	32,787	5,794	2,402	1,833	1,645	1,516	45,977
MICHIGAN	57,805	9,876	7,326	5,481	3,263	1,835	85,586
MINNESOTA	19,508	4,170	3,204	2,484	1,064	1,161	31,591
MISSISSIPPI	36,486	4,621	1,825	2,549	463	123	46,067
MISSOURI	37,189	5,381	4,184	3,707	2,392	646	53,499
MONTANA	5,089	669	525	771	553	92	7,699
NEBRASKA	7,582	1,962	851	945	565	573	12,478
NEVADA	20,920	4,593	1,853	2,512	876	726	31,480
NEW HAMPSHIRE	6,307	688	633	602	93	274	8,597
NEW JERSEY	50,847	10,736	4,453	2,143	1,707	1,374	71,260
NEW MEXICO	18,252	1,939	1,360	1,672	261	172	23,656
NEW YORK	136,255	29,754	10,522	5,279	4,002	8,914	194,726
NORTH CAROLINA	66,918	10,821	6,233	6,660	2,571	1,566	94,769
NORTH DAKOTA	3,395	452	351	490	325	154	5,167
OHIO	68,051	10,936	8,466	6,200	3,360	1,388	98,401
OKLAHOMA	25,734	4,519	2,970	4,226	2,295	367	40,111
OREGON	20,838	3,871	2,809	2,260	1,852	643	32,273
PENNSYLVANIA	78,728	12,807	6,152	4,868	3,021	1,232	106,808
RHODE ISLAND	5,495	987	342	441	399	261	7,925
SOUTH CAROLINA	40,870	5,971	3,384	2,942	1,163	895	55,225
SOUTH DAKOTA	4,900	1,188	395	639	380	168	7,670
TENNESSEE	49,089	7,092	5,819	5,398	1,684	816	69,898
TEXAS	264,653	43,420	15,305	21,680	7,225	4,676	356,959
UTAH	21,532	4,058	1,555	1,353	535	850	29,883
VERMONT	2,750	257	146	160	148	0	3,461
VIRGINIA	52,027	10,794	4,775	3,037	1,059	1,510	73,202
WASHINGTON	37,614	8,505	4,416	3,400	2,390	1,781	58,106
WEST VIRGINIA	13,123	1,058	1,321	1,151	689	247	17,589
WISCONSIN	24,153	3,688	3,032	2,057	1,493	472	34,895
WYOMING	2,588	431	387	658	134	62	4,260
						0	
US TOTAL	2,258,903	417,814	195,379	169,484	85,755	65,359	3,136,968

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

* These are siblings, children of Roomers, Boarders, and Lodgers, and children living in Group

Getting more accurate counts of young children who are the grandchild of the householder would go a long way toward improving the overall accuracy of the 2020 Census count of young children in every state.

5. Discussion

Data examined here indicate that children who are not the child of the householder are more likely to be missed in the Census and a large share of this group are young children living with their grandparent(s). The share of young children who are not a child of the householder is higher among most minority groups. The share of young children who are not a child of the householder varies across states, at least in part, based on the race and Hispanic origin characteristics of the state.

As we approach the 2020 Census, advocates can use the information in this report to develop more effective and tailored outreach messages and materials. This data will also help us design more targeted outreach efforts in states and localities. The figures presented here could be helpful in tailoring state and community messages and communications campaigns around the 2020 Census, and in deciding how much time and resources to dedicate to reaching specific groups defined by location, race and Hispanic origin or the relationship of children to the householder. The data could guide the selection of the kinds of family photographs for inclusion in outreach materials that explain how children in these categories should be counted. For example, in states where a relatively large share of children are living with grandparent(s) showing a grandchild living with a grandparent in communication material would be appropriate.

Likewise, if one was designing outreach material for the Filipino community (where a large share of young children are living with grandparents) it might be wise to show young child with a grandparent. But if one was designing outreach material for Asian Indians or Koreans (where relatively few young children live with grandparents) it might be better to focus on other problematic situations for young children.

The data could also be used to identify which messengers and outreach strategies will reach the most families with children at high risk of being missed. For example, in Hawaii 19.5 percent of young children are a grandchild living with a grandparent but only 5.6 percent of young children in Minnesota fit this description. This suggests that Hawaiian get out the count efforts may want to dedicate a higher share of its resources to working with grandparenting support groups, senior citizen programs, and other avenues of reaching these households than Minnesota would, and Minnesota may want to dedicate a bigger share of its get out the count resources to reaching out to “couch surfing” or doubled up families.

Similar data could be produced for large counties based on the 2013-2017 American Community Survey, using the data.census.gov website or the Census Bureau’s American Factfinder website.

5. Summary

Research shows that young children who are not the biological or adopted child of the householder have an elevated risk of being missed in the Census and the largest group of young children who fall into this category are grandchildren of the householder. This paper shows the share of young children in the higher risk categories varies among

racial and Hispanic origin groups and across states. Racial minorities tend to have a larger share of young children living with a grandparent householder, and states with relatively large minority populations have a larger share of young children living with a grandparent. The data provided here can help advocates focus census outreach efforts on places and groups where the chance of missing young children in the 2020 Census are the highest.

Appendix A What is a Householder?

Householder is a term used by the Census Bureau to collect data in the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Decennial Census. A householder is defined by the Census as:

“The householder refers to the person (or one of the people) in whose name the housing unit is owned or rented (maintained) or, if there is no such person, any adult member, excluding roomers, boarders, or paid employees. If the house is owned or rented jointly by a married couple, the householder may be either the husband or the wife. The person designated as the householder is the "reference person" to whom the relationship of all other household members, if any, is recorded.” (U.S. Census Bureau 2019b)

Once a householder is established, the Census Bureau asks for the relationship of all other members of the housing unit to the householder based on a standard set of categories. The relationship of individuals in the household to the householder is important because the householder is usually the person who completes the Census questionnaire. A study of the ACS revealed 83 percent of the people listed as the householder were the respondent and most of the other respondents were the spouse of the householder (U.S. Census Bureau 2008).

Appendix B State Sample Sizes in the 2013-17 American Community Survey

Table B. State Sample Sizes for Young Children (age 0 to 4) in 2013-17 ACS	
State	Sample Size
ALABAMA	11,597
ALASKA	2,584
ARIZONA	18,661
ARKANSAS	7,759
CALIFORNIA	99,410
COLORADO	14,562
CONNECTICUT	7,879
DC	1,625
Delaware	2,086
FLORIDA	42,682
GEORGIA	26,663
HAWAII	3,896
IDAHO	4,981
ILLINOIS	32,975
INDIANA	17,941
IOWA	8,681
KANSAS	8,455
KENTUCKY	11,818
LOUISIANA	11,887
MAINE	2,617
MARYLAND	15,331
MASSACHUSETTS	15,673
MICHIGAN	24,217
MINNESOTA	14,605
MISSISSIPPI	7,614
MISSOURI	16,283
MONTANA	2,658
NEBRASKA	5,658
NEVADA	7,407
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,761
NEW JERSEY	21,950
NEW MEXICO	5,154
NEW YORK	48,394
NORTH CAROLINA	24,679
NORTH DAKOTA	2,308
OHIO	30,072
OKLAHOMA	11,056
OREGON	9,816
PENNSYLVANIA	30,066
RHODE ISLAND	2,291
SOUTH CAROLINA	11,674
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,775
TENNESSEE	16,814
TEXAS	76,694
UTAH	11,616
VERMONT	1,326
VIRGINIA	21,751
WASHINGTON	19,899
WEST VIRGINIA	4,086
WISCONSIN	14,305
WYOMING	1,782
US TOTAL	819,474

Source: Authors analysis of Census Bureau's 2013-2017 American Community Survey Pums file on University of Minnesota IPUMS system

References

Fernandez, L., Shattuck, R., and Noon, J., (2018) The Use of Administrative Records and the American Community Survey to Study the Characteristics of Undercounted Young Children in the 2010 Census, Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications, CARRA Working Paper Series, Working Paper Series #2018-05, U.S. Census Bureau. Washington, DC.,

Jensen, E., Benetsky, M. and Knapp, A.(2018). "A Sensitivity Analysis of the Net Undercounts for Young Hispanic Children in the 2010 Census," Poster at the 2018 Population Association of American conference, Denver, Colorado April 25-28 downloaded May 5, 2108, at <https://paa.confex.com/paa/2018/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/20826>.

Martin, E. (2007). "STRENGTH OF ATTACHMENT: SURVEY COVERAGE OF PEOPLE WITH TENUOUS TIES TO RESIDENCES," *Demography*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp 427-440.

Martin, E. (1999). "Who Knows Who Lives Here? Within-Household Disagreements as a Source of Survey Coverage Error." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 63, pp 220-236.

National Association of Latino Elected Officials (2018)."Census 2020: Research and Messaging" Power Point Presentation.

O'Hare, W.P. (2008). Data on Children in Foster Care from the Census Bureau,' The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Working Paper, <http://www.aecf.org/m/pdf/FosterChildren-July-2008.pdf>

O'Hare, W.P., (2015). *The Undercount of Young Children in the U.S. Decennial Census*, Springer Publishers.

O'Hare, W.P. (2017). *Counting all Californians in the 2020 Census*, The Census Project, <https://censusproject.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/calif-report-10-16-2017-format-final.pdf>

O'Hare W. P. (2019a). *Differential Undercounts in the U.S. Census: Who is Missing?*, Springer publishers, available open access at <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-10973-8>

O'Hare, W.P. (2019b). "Understanding Who Was Missed in the 2010 Census," Population Reference Bureau, Washington, DC. <https://www.prb.org/understanding-who-was-missed-in-the-2010-census/>

O'Hare, W.P., Jacobsen, L. A., Mather, M. Vanorman, A., and Pollard, K. (2019) What factors Are Most closely Associated with the Net Undercount of Young Children in the U.S. Census? Population Reference Bureau, Washington DC. Available online at

<https://www.prb.org/what-factors-are-most-closely-associated-with-the-net-undercount-of-young-children-in-the-u-s-census/>

[Partnership for America's Children \(2019\) "Census 2020 Messaging Testing Results" PowerPoint Presentation](#)

U.S. Census Bureau (2008) "Study of Respondents Who List Themselves as Person 1," DSSD 2008 MEMORANDUM SERIES, # G-09, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington DC.,

U.S. Census Bureau (2017). "Investigating the 2010 Undercount of Young Children -- Analysis of Census Coverage Measurement Results." 2020 Census Memorandum Series. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/2020-census/planning-management/memo-series/2020-memo-2017_04.html

U.S. Census Bureau (2018). "Investigating the 2020 Undercount of Young Children - Analysis of Complex Households, Eric Jensen, Laurel Schwede, Deborah Griffin and Scott Konicki, 2020 Census Memorandum Series, December <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/final-analysis-reports/2020-report-2010-undercount-children-complex-households.pdf>

U.S. Census Bureau (2019a)," 2020 Census Memorandum Series Investigating the 2010 Undercount of Young Children - Summary of Recent Research O'Hare, W.P., Griffin, D., and Konicki, S." <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial/2020/program-management/final-analysis-reports/2020-report-2010-undercount-children-summary-recent-research.pdf>.

U.S. Census Bureau (2019b) documentation retrieved 4/19/2019 <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/technical-documentation/subject-definitions.html#householder>

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (2001). "Guidance on Aggregation and Allocation of Data on Race for Use in Civil Rights Monitoring and Enforcement," accessed online at <http://raceandhealth.hhs.gov/sidebar/sbwhats15.htm>