

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(*Survey Methodology* #2009-08)

**Cognitive Pretesting of 2010 Alternative
Questionnaire Experiment (AQE) Race and
Hispanic Origin Treatment Panels**

Leticia Fernández
Eleanor Gerber¹
Matthew Clifton
George Higbie
Mikelyn Meyers²

¹ Gerber Consulting
² Abt SRBI

Statistical Research Division
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20233

Report Issued: November 25, 2009

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

**COGNITIVE PRETESTING OF 2010 ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE
EXPERIMENT (AQE) RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN TREATMENT PANELS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
PHASE I – TREATMENTS X2, X3, X4, X5 AND X9	7
1. Goals of AQE Race and Hispanic Origin Phase I Research	7
2. Methods in Phase I.....	8
2.1 Protocols	8
A. Layout and formatting	8
B. Changed response requirements.	9
C. Changed example sets.....	9
D. Terms and concepts	9
2.2 The Cognitive Interview	9
A. Probing strategy.....	9
B. Comparison of forms	10
2.3 Respondent Selection.....	10
<i>Table 1. Phase I Respondent Characteristics by Form and Race/Origin</i>	
3. Findings in Phase I.....	12
3.1 Combination of Race and Hispanic Origin.....	12
A. Understanding of “combined” Hispanic origin and race questions.....	12
B. Understanding of the terms “race or origin”	14
C. “Hispanic origins are not races”	17
3.2 Examples and Terminology	18
A. General comments about the usefulness of examples	18
B. Specific comments about example sets	19
<i>Examples in the White category.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Centrality of examples</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Countries that do not clearly represent the category</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Examples in the Black, African American or Negro category.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Examples in the Hispanic category.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Examples in the American Indian or Alaska Native (AIAN) category.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Examples in the Asian category.....</i>	<i>21</i>

C. Other Terminology	21
<i>Negro</i>	21
<i>Caucasian</i>	22
<i>Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin</i>	22
<i>Chicano</i>	22
<i>Chamorro</i>	23
<i>Mexican American</i>	23
<i>“Some other race”</i>	23
3.3 Multiracial and Multiethnic Reporting	24
A. Readability of “Mark one or more” instruction in race and race/origin questions. .	24
B. “Mark one or more” in the Hispanic origin question.	25
C. Patterns of multiracial reporting.....	25
D. Search for single-term identifiers for mixed backgrounds.....	26
4. General Issues and Recommendations for Phase I Panels.....	26
4.1 Issues Spanning the Set of Treatments	26
4.2 Navigation Issues and Recommendations by Specific Treatments	27
A. Form X2	27
B. Form X3	30
C. Form X4	31
D. Form X5	34
E. Form X9.....	36
PHASE II – TREATMENTS X14, X16 AND X17.....	39
5. Goals of AQE Race and Hispanic Origin Phase II Research.....	39
6. Methods in Phase II	39
6.1 Protocols	39
A. Layout and formatting.....	40
B. Changed race question stem and instructions	40
C. Ordering in example sets.....	40
D. Terms and concepts.....	40
6.2 The Cognitive Interview	40
A. Probing strategy	40
B. Comparison of forms.....	41
6.3 Respondent Selection.....	42
<i>Table 2. Phase II Respondent Characteristics by Form and Race/Origin</i>	

7. Findings in Phase II	43
7.1 Reactions to Alternative Treatments.....	43
A. Alternate wording of the race question stem	43
B. Spanners over Asian and Pacific Islander race categories	44
C. Removal of term “Negro”	45
D. Ordering of examples under Other Asian	45
E. Note preceding the Hispanic origin question	45
7.2 Examples and Terminology	46
A. Comments about the examples	46
B. Other Terminology - “ <i>Some other race</i> ”	47
7.3 Multiracial and Multiethnic Reporting	47
A. Readability of “Mark one or more” instruction in race question.....	47
B. Patterns of multiracial/multiethnic reporting.	48
8. General Issues and Recommendations for Phase II Panels	48
8.1 Issues Spanning the Set of Treatments	48
8.2 Navigation Issues and Recommendations by Specific Treatments	49
A. Form X14	49
B. Form X16	50
C. Form X17	51
9. Summary of Findings and Concluding Remarks.....	52
References.....	54
Appendix I: Treatments Pretested in Phase I – Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9	55
Appendix II: Treatments Pretested in Phase II – Forms X14, X16 and X17	60
Appendix III: Phase I Respondents’ Rankings -- Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9	63
Table III-A. Main and Secondary Forms Shown to Respondents	
Table III-B. Ranking of Forms by Respondents in Phase I	
APPENDIX IV: Phase II Respondents’ Rankings -- Forms X14, X16 and X17.....	66
Table IV-A. Ranking of Forms by Respondents in Phase II	
APPENDIX V: Phase I Expert Review Board Recommendations.....	68
APPENDIX VI: Phase II Expert Review Board Recommendations.....	75
APPENDIX VII: Phase I Respondents’ Comments about Term “Negro”.....	81
APPENDIX VIII: Phase II Respondents’ Comments about Term “Negro”.....	84

COGNITIVE PRETESTING OF 2010 ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE EXPERIMENT (AQE) RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN TREATMENT PANELS

ABSTRACT

During the 2010 Census, the U.S. Census Bureau will conduct several experiments to explore alternate content and ways to enhance data quality for the 2020 Census. One of these planned experiments is the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE), which tests alternate content regarding race and Hispanic origin for the 2010 Census mail questionnaire. This report documents the findings from two phases of cognitive pretesting that involved eight experimental race and ethnicity panels. The general research goal for the cognitive research was to examine respondent reactions to a number of new features. Key findings are that (1) respondents had no difficulty understanding and answering “combined” formats that collect data on Hispanic origin and race in a single question; (2) although most respondents found the examples helpful, White and Black respondents did not easily identify with a particular ethnicity; (3) respondents favored forms that contain the term “race” in the question stem rather than a more neutral, “Is this person...” (4) respondents also favored spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander categories. However, form navigation issues associated with these spanners were observed during the interviews; (5) most respondents considered the term “Negro” offensive.

COGNITIVE PRETESTING OF 2010 ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE EXPERIMENT (AQE) RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN TREATMENT PANELS

INTRODUCTION

During the upcoming 2010 Census, the United States Census Bureau will conduct four experiments to explore alternate content and ways to reduce cost of data procurement and enhance data quality for the future 2020 Census. One of these planned experiments is the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE), which tests coverage and alternate content regarding race and Hispanic origin for the 2010 Census mail questionnaire.

The aim of this report is to document the cognitive pretesting of a subset of the 2010 AQE experimental race and ethnicity panels. In general, the goal for this cognitive research was to examine respondent reactions to a number of new features. However, because of the conceptual differences among the AQE treatment panels, the testing was carried out in two phases. Five panels were pretested in Phase I, which focused on respondent reactions to, and understanding of, the addition of features to the separate Hispanic Origin and race questions and to alternative “combined” race/ethnicity questions. In Phase II, three additional panels were pretested, which concentrated on respondent reactions to changes to the race question alone. Findings for Phase I and Phase II are presented separately. Below we provide a brief overview of the motivations for the various AQE treatments (see Humes 2009 for a more in-depth discussion).

Phase I treatments tested modifications to the Hispanic origin and race questions, as well as several versions of a “combined” Hispanic origin/race question. Specifically, modified examples in the race and Hispanic origin questions were tested. These additions were motivated by research findings that examples tend to have a positive impact on the reporting of detailed race data. In the past, examples were listed only for Hispanic, Asian, and Pacific Islander groups; in these treatments, examples are now introduced for all other groups (Cresce and Ramirez 2003; de la Puente and McKay 1995; Gerber and Crowley 2005; Martin 2006). Another feature in Phase I panels is to allow for multiple reporting of Hispanic origins. Previous findings suggest that some respondents provide “mixed” or multiple Hispanic origins, and as such it is of interest to obtain a measure of the proportion of Hispanics that may identify this way (Ramirez 2005). The motivation for the combined-question formats is that research consistently finds that race and ethnicity are not separate concepts for many groups, and that using a single question may reduce confusion (National Research Council 2007; Gerber and Crowley 2005).

In Phase II, the treatments apply only to the race question, and the Hispanic origin question remains unchanged. These panels experiment with limiting the use of the term “race” in the race question stem, and removing the term “Negro” from the “Black, African Am., or Negro” response category because these terms have been found to bring about strong (often negative) reactions from people. The panels will shed light on whether response rates would be impacted by removing these terms (Humes 2009; Gerber and Crowley 2005). Phase II panels also test the use of spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander categories in order to experiment with ways to convey that these groups are considered races, and that the groups under them are national origins or ethnicities, not separate races (Humes 2009). Finally, these panels test different

ordering of examples (alphabetical and population size) to examine whether the order has an impact on reporting of detailed responses (Humes 2009).

The cognitive interviews were carried out with 76 respondents over the two phases of research. (There were 61 in Phase I and 15 in Phase II). These respondents were selected from diverse race and ethnic groups, although the proposed alterations in the questionnaires required a concentration on the groups most affected by the changes. Because of time limitations, a relatively small number of interviews could be carried out with members of each group. For this reason, except where specifically noted, results are presented by form type rather than by racial/ethnic group.

Two expert review panels, each convened prior to the respective Phase of research, informed the specific issues on which research protocols focused. The results of these expert panels are presented as appendices to this report (see Appendix V and Appendix VI).

PHASE I – TREATMENTS X2, X3, X4, X5 AND X9

1. Goals of AQE Race and Hispanic Origin Phase I Research

Phase I concentrated on modifications to the separate Hispanic Origin and race questions and on new features for presenting a “combined” race and Hispanic origin question to collect these data in a single item. The purposes of this Phase were to assess usability of the forms, wording, relevance of examples, reaction to various terms, and respondents’ preferences regarding layout and level of detail elicited in the form. Because questionnaire formats allowed respondents to report more than one race and/or Hispanic origin, we also probed how respondents would report multiracial and multiethnic backgrounds.

The five questionnaires pretested in Phase I are labeled as X9/B1b+B1c+B1d (referred to as X9/B1 for the remainder of this report), X2/B2a, X3/B2b, X4/B2c and X5/B2d. Each of these forms features significant differences in their layout and design. The forms are shown in Appendix I.

The first of these panels, X9/B1, is closest to the 2010 Census questionnaire control panel. Race and Hispanic origin are collected in two separate questions. The item concerned with Hispanic origin contains check boxes with single answers for the most frequent choices (Not Hispanic, Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban) followed by a modified set of Hispanic/Latino examples and a single write-in box. Another modification tested in this panel is that multiple answers are permitted under the Hispanic origin question. Following the Hispanic origin question, the race item contains check boxes with single answer options that feature new detailed examples next to White, Black, and American Indian or Alaska Native categories, and a modified set of examples under Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander. It also has write-in boxes for the American Indian or Alaska Native, Other Asian, Other Pacific Islander, and “Some other race” answer choices.

The next of these forms is X2/B2a. Unlike the previous questionnaire, this panel uses a single item that lists both Hispanic origin and race choices. It includes check boxes for specific national origins for Hispanic, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander categories, and both a check box and a write-in box for White, Black, Other Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Other Asian, Other Pacific Islander, and “Some other race” or origin. The write-in boxes are preceded by detailed examples of ethnic or national origins for each group.

The third of these panels is form X3/B2b, a more streamlined version of X2/B2a. As in the previous form, it uses a single question item that lists both Hispanic origin and race choices. It contains both a check box and write-in boxes for each of the major group categories: White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and “Some other race” or origin. Detailed examples of ethnicity, tribes, or national origins precede each write-in box.

Form X4/B2c represents the next of the panels. It is radically different from the other forms in its layout. It uses a single item divided into two parts to collect Hispanic origin and race data. The first part includes check boxes for each major group with no examples. The second part uses a single set of three write-in boxes for all respondents to enter their specific race(s), origin(s) or enrolled or principal tribe(s) and includes a single set of example categories just above the three write-in boxes.

The final questionnaire in this group is form X5/B2d. This acts as an alternative control in the present set of experimental forms. It combines the Hispanic origin and race questions into one single item but keeps all categories in a similar format and level of detail as in the 2010 Census mail questionnaire (control panel). This form includes checkboxes for White, Black, specific national origins among Hispanic, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander groups; it also has both check boxes and write-in boxes for Other Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Other Asian, Other Pacific Islander, and “Some other race” or origin. Detailed examples of ethnic or national origin are included only for Other Hispanic, Other Asian, and Other Pacific Islander.

2. Methods in Phase I

2.1 Protocols

The protocols used in this research phase focused on respondent understanding of new concepts, features, and navigation through the new question layouts. An expert review panel informed the development of the protocols. In general the expert review panel had the following concerns:

A. Layout and formatting. Major changes to formats were included in these forms—for example, placement and number of write-in lines and the mixture of vertical and horizontal layouts in some panels. Direct probing on matters of layout is problematic because respondents often cannot verbalize navigation problems caused by confusing formats. It is generally accepted practice to observe the respondent's navigation without comment in order to evaluate these

issues. Our protocols addressed these matters in several ways. First, we adopted a retrospective mode of probing, allowing the respondent to navigate and answer the first page completely prior to discussion. Second, we noted for interviewers the potential navigation problems that had been identified. Third, we allowed respondents to compare different formats as the final task in the interview, which was sometimes successful in stimulating verbalizations about the formats.

B. Changed response requirements. In some panels, new instructions were given and new information was required of respondents, such as providing options for White and Black respondents to give detailed ethnicities. Panel members commented that the write-ins for these groups might increase non-response because many White and Black respondents may not know or identify with an ethnic origin or ancestry. These issues were addressed by consistently probing on whether respondents saw the instructions, how these instructions were interpreted, and why respondents provided a particular response or failed to provide one.

C. Changed example sets. Panel members expressed concerns about the number of examples in some of the race/ethnicity sets since these could be interpreted as all-inclusive lists. In addition, some members of the expert panel mentioned that the examples given were not common or recognizable, which may cause respondent confusion. We specifically probed respondents on their understanding of the example sets for their own and other's categories. We also attempted to assess, by direct probing and observation, whether or not the respondent had spontaneously noticed the example sets. The best evidence of this was taken to be mention of the examples prior to probing.

D. Terms and concepts. Expert reviewers pointed out that using the word "origin" may be confusing for recent immigrants who may interpret it as "geographic origin." In addition, there was concern about "Some other race" because of its placement on the forms (low visibility) and that the word "Some" in this response category may be considered insensitive or dismissive. Respondents were probed about the meaning of "origin" used alone, the use of "Some" in "Some other race," and other terms and concepts that came up as relevant during the interviews.

2.2 The Cognitive Interview

A. Probing strategy. The specific type of cognitive interview used was the retrospective think-aloud method, in which respondents were asked to describe their experiences, feelings, and interpretations after completing items of interest (Willis 2005). At the start of the interview, respondents were told that the purpose of the study was to test new survey questions, and that the information they provide would be confidential and their anonymity would be preserved. They were instructed to read and sign a consent form before the interview began. Respondents were also asked for permission to tape record the interview.

Respondents were asked to make themselves Person 1 for the interview since an important objective was to explore racial/ethnic self-identification. Researchers did not probe while the respondents were answering the Hispanic origin/race question(s). After the respondents completed their answers, they were asked how they came up with their answer and their interpretation of the question. They were also probed about terms, examples used in the form,

and other issues that emerged during the interview. While respondents were answering the form, researchers made notes about how the respondent went about answering the instrument and probed later about reactions to the form, whether the respondent had read the full question or not, whether the respondent had changed his or her answers, and any other notable behaviors.

Respondents were then asked to complete the form for the next person in the household. After they answered for Person 2, respondents were probed about instructions in the form. Answers about the rest of the household members (up to 6) were probed only when they allowed for exploration of how responses were handled for multiracial children and U.S.-born children of immigrant parents since they would be ideal respondents to exercise the “Mark one or more” instructions.

B. Comparison of forms. At the end of the interview, each respondent was shown two other pre-selected questionnaires and asked to compare these with the one just completed. The respondents were not required to fill out these alternative questionnaires; however, they were probed about their reactions to the comparison and their preferences. In this report, we refer to the comparisons only as they shed light on specific evaluations.

General respondent rankings of the formats pretested in Phase I are shown in full detail in Appendix III. The forms most preferred by respondents were X4 and X3. Among those who saw these forms, 49 percent (19 out of 39 respondents) chose X4 as their favorite, and 38 percent (12 out of 32 respondents) ranked X3 as their favorite.

However, as detailed in the appendix, these rankings are conditional on the forms that were shown since no respondent saw the full set. Therefore, the rankings may not be stable. Moreover, respondents often “assumed” that certain changes would be made to the forms, such as “... The only thing I would improve in X5 is to add examples of Black, African American and Negro (as in X2).” In addition, respondent preferences were at times contradictory. For example, some respondents said they prefer to check a box, but also acknowledge that too many boxes make forms look “too busy” and confusing (see Appendix III for a detailed discussion).

2.3 Respondent Selection

Respondents were recruited using formal and informal social networks, by posting fliers in community organizations and churches advertising the study, by contacting local community centers for referrals, and by using personal contacts of the researchers. Respondents were interviewed in the Washington, D.C. Metro area and in Chicago, Illinois. A contractor hired for this project carried out the recruitment and interviews conducted in Chicago. Each respondent received \$40.00 in cash as compensation for his or her time and travel in order to complete an interview. This cash incentive was also used to motivate participation.

Table 1. Phase I Respondent Characteristics by Form and Race/Origin

Main form completed	Secondary form for comparison	Race/origin at recruitment	Sex	Age Group	Education	Reported race/origin in Census form
X2	X9,X4	AIAN	F	18-24	Some college	AIAN - UMATILLA CAYUSE
X2	X9,X4	AIAN	F	30-34	Some college	WHITE-IRISH & AIAN-PAWNEE AND SKIDI
X2	X9,X4	AIAN	F	45-49	College or more	AIAN - PISCATAWAY CONOY
X2	X9,X4	ASIAN	M	18-24	Some college	CHINESE
X2	X9,X4	ASIAN	M	55-59	College or more	CHINESE
X2	X9,X4	BLACK	F	18-24	Some college	BLACK - AFRICAN AM & FILIPINO
X2	X9,X4	BLACK	F	25-29	High school/GED	BLACK - (BLANK write-in)
X2	X9,X4	BLACK	F	80-84	High school/GED	BLACK - (BLANK write-in)
X2	X9,X4	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	MEXICAN (wrote MEXICAN in OTH HISP write-in)
X2	X9,X4	HISP	M	35-39	High school/GED	MEXICAN (wrote MEXICAN AM in BLACK write-in)
X2	X9,X4	HISP	F	60-64	Some college	WHITE - ARGENTINEAN & OTH HISP - ARGENTINEAN
X2	X9,X4	WHITE	F	45-49	Some college	WHITE - (BLANK write-in)
X2	X9,X4	WHITE	F	60-64	College or more	WHITE - (BLANK write-in)
X2	X9,X4	WHITE	F	74-79	College or more	WHITE-PORTUGUESE & SOR-SPAIN
X3	X2,X5	AIAN	F	18-24	High school/GED	AIAN - SENECA
X3	X2,X5	AIAN	M	50-54	College or more	AIAN - KIOWA
X3	X2,X5	ASIAN	F	40-44	College or more	ASIAN - CHINESE
X3	X2,X5	ASIAN	M	55-59	High school/GED	ASIAN - LAOTIAN
X3	X2,X5	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	HISP - MEXICAN-SPANIARD
X3	X2,X5	HISP	F	30-34	College or more	HISP - GUATEMALAN
X3	X2,X5	HISP	M	30-34	College or more	WHITE- IRISH & HISP- MEX
X3	X2,X5	HISP	M	40-44	Some college	HISP - SALVADORAN
X4	X9,X5	AIAN	M	35-39	High school/GED	AIAN - AMERICAN INDIAN
X4	X9,X5	AIAN	F	50-54	College or more	WHITE-IRISH & BLACK-AF AM & AIAN-PISCATAWAY CONOY
X4	X9,X5	ASIAN	F	18-24	Some college	ASIAN - TAIWANESE
X4	X9,X5	ASIAN	M	18-24	Some college	ASIAN - VIETNAMESE
X4	X9,X5	BLACK	M	25-29	College or more	BLACK- AFRICAN AM
X4	X9,X5	BLACK	F	30-34	Some college	BLACK-AFRICAN AM
X4	X9,X5	BLACK	F	55-59	College or more	BLACK- BLACK
X4	X9,X5	HISP	F	18-24	College or more	HISP - DOMINICAN
X4	X9,X5	HISP	F	18-24	Some college	WHITE-CAUCASIAN & HISP-MEX
X4	X9,X5	HISP	M	18-24	Some college	HISP - MEXICAN
X4	X9,X5	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	HISP - MEXICAN AMERICAN
X4	X9,X5	HISP	F	30-34	College or more	WHITE-IRISH & HISP-PTO RICO
X4	X9,X5	WHITE	M	25-29	College or more	WHITE - WHITE
X4	X9,X5	WHITE	F	50-54	Some college	WHITE-WHITE & AIAN-CHEROKEE
X4	X9,X5	WHITE	M	65-69	College or more	WHITE - EUROPE
X5	X2,X3	AIAN	F	18-24	High school/GED	AIAN - SEMINOLE
X5	X2,X3	AIAN	M	40-44	Some college	AIAN - LUMBEE
X5	X2,X3	ASIAN	F	40-44	College or more	CHINESE
X5	X2,X3	BLACK	M	40-44	High school/GED	BLACK
X5	X2,X3	BLACK	F	45-49	College or more	BLACK
X5	X2,X3	BLACK	M	70-74	College or more	BLACK
X5	X2,X3	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	MEXICAN
X5	X2,X3	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	WHITE & OTH HISP - ARGENTINEAN
X5	X2,X3	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	MEXICAN
X5	X2,X3	HISP	M	35-39	College or more	MEXICAN
X5	X2,X3	NHPI	F	55-59	High school/GED	SAMOAN
X5	X2,X3	WHITE	M	18-24	College or more	WHITE
X5	X2,X3	WHITE	F	35-39	High school/GED	WHITE
X5	X2,X3	WHITE	F	60-64	College or more	WHITE
X9	X3,X4	AIAN	M	40-44	Some college	No HISP, AIAN - LUMMI NATION
X9	X3,X4	AIAN	F	45-49	Some college	No HISP, AIAN - UTE INDIAN
X9	X3,X4	ASIAN	F	40-44	College or more	No HISP, CHINESE
X9	X3,X4	ASIAN	F	45-49	College or more	No HISP, FILIPINO
X9	X3,X4	BLACK	F	25-29	Some college	No HISP, BLACK
X9	X3,X4	BLACK	F	35-39	High school/GED	No HISP, BLACK
X9	X3,X4	HISP	F	25-29	College or more	Yes - MEX, WHITE
X9	X3,X4	HISP	F	45-49	High school/GED	Yes - MEX, (BLANK race)
X9	X3,X4	WHITE	F	30-34	College or more	No HISP, WHITE
X9	X3,X4	WHITE	M	55-59	College or more	No HISP, WHITE

By following the above respondent recruiting strategy, this project was able to obtain sixty-one useable interviews. Their racial/ethnic self-identification at recruitment time was as follows: 11 respondents self-identified as White; 11 self-identified as African American; 11 self-identified as American Indian; 18 self-identified as Hispanic; nine self-identified as Asian, and one self-identified as Pacific Islander. Hispanic respondents were intentionally overrepresented to better examine the impact of the combined question on this group. All of the respondents underwent uniform amounts of cognitive interviewing. Table 1 shows characteristics of respondents organized by the form they were asked to complete.

Because of time limitations, we did not set specific age or education goals in the recruiting phase of this project, and as a result the respondents tend to be more highly educated and older than the average for their racial/ethnic groups. The effect of this is likely to make them more successful at negotiating these forms, so any indication of difficulty is likely to be magnified rather than reduced in a general population.

Eight respondents (13 percent) were multiracial. In fact, multiracial individuals, either as respondents or co-residents, were present in 21 of the 61 cases (34 percent). In addition, 24 of the respondents in Phase I (39 percent) lived in a household with someone of a different race.

3. Findings in Phase I

Note that four of the five forms that were chosen for pretesting in this phase were selected because they encompass the various modifications or treatments on the “combined” panels. Modifications to the separate questions are tested using form X9/B1. However, these are only a subset of the forms that will be fielded during Census 2010.

Some of the features, such as the combined race/ethnicity question formats, certain terminology, and example sets are used in more than one form. Rather than repeating findings for these issues form by form, we will discuss results for cross-cutting issues together. Then, we will discuss specifics of format for each form.

3.1 Combination of Race and Hispanic Origin

A. Understanding of “combined” Hispanic origin and race questions. The most important aspect of the CPEX experiment will be the new format for including Hispanic origin in the same question as the race categories. Four of the questionnaires (X2, X3, X4 and X5) used this single-question format, while the fifth questionnaire (X9) preserved the traditional two-question format. It was therefore important to assess whether respondents of all groups were able to respond accurately to the new single-question format and understand the concepts included in them. Specific reactions to the format will be presented in discussions of each format. Below we discuss the revised question concepts.

The concepts governing the race and Hispanic origin questions have traditionally regarded such origins to be distinct features of an individual’s identity. However, past research has demonstrated that many respondents see them as essentially the same (Gerber and Crowley

2005; National Research Council 2007). Thus, the two-question format has often resulted in respondent confusion, nonresponse to one of the questions, and widespread use of “Some other race” by respondents who could not find a place for themselves in the race question. For example, 2000 Census data show that 42 percent of Hispanic respondents gave a response that was classified as “Some other race,” and Hispanics made up 97 percent of the respondents classified as “Some other race.” As a result, experiments in the 2005 National Content Test attempted to identify combined formats that would result in Hispanic respondents providing a race mark as well as adequate detailed data about a national origin. One feature designed to help with this was to instruct respondents that the two concepts are regarded as different. The sentence “For this census, Hispanic origins are not races” was included in the Note preceding the question sequence (Gerber and Crowley 2005).

The current formats are somewhat similar to those in development for the 2005 Content Test. The finding from the 2005 Content Test indicated that when the “Hispanic” option is provided in the race question, few Hispanic respondents mark “Some other race” or any other race choice in addition to marking Hispanic and giving a national origin. Exceptions to this are respondents who are trying to indicate multi-ethnic identities, citizenship or degree of assimilation. For example, “Mexican American” might be written into “Some other race” if the respondents' children had been born in this country or seem “Americanized.”

An important aspect of our assessment of the current formats is respondents' understanding of the concepts underlying the question, and whether Hispanic respondents provide both a race and a detailed country of origin.

The results in this respect are clear. Most respondents had no difficulty in understanding the concept of including Hispanic origin and race together in a single question. This was true for Hispanic and non-Hispanic respondents alike. In fact, the combination of race and Hispanic origin works well and produced almost no difficulty in response. Out of 18 Hispanic respondents, only three of them had difficulty answering the forms. One skipped the race question altogether in the two-question format (X9), and the other two were not sure how to report their U.S.-born children. In one case, the child was reported as Hispanic but no country of origin was provided; in the other, the child was reported as White even though one of the parents was Hispanic (in forms X2 and X3, respectively). However, these latter cases can be attributed to issues related to immigrants' understanding of what needs to be reported and was also documented among Asian reporting their U.S.-born children. Moreover, only four respondents marked “Some Other Race”: two Asian respondents reporting U.S.-born household members, and two White respondents reporting, respectively, “Jewish” and “Spain” under “Some Other Race.”

These formats, however, do not seem to elicit both a race category and a detailed national origin from Hispanic respondents. Out of 16 Hispanic respondents answering the combined formats, five also marked White either because one of their parents was non-Hispanic White or, in one case, because the respondent considered herself a White Hispanic (Argentinean). It is interesting to note that this does not relate to whether or not the respondent sees “Hispanic origin” as a race or as something different. Some respondents expressed the idea that as far as they were concerned, Hispanic was a race, and therefore belonged in the list. For others, Hispanic was not

seen as a race, and they expressed the idea that the concept of race was not applicable to them at all (for example, “Hispanic people don't have a race”). Nevertheless, the term belonged in the list of categories because it was the relevant identifier for their social group.

Respondents were less familiar with the opportunities to supply detailed origins and with the extensive lists of examples that were provided. White and Black respondents, in particular, were not sure what to write when presented with write-in boxes (forms X2, X3 and X4). Out of 12 White and Black respondents, four did not write anything, and the rest simply wrote “White,” “Caucasian,” “Black,” or “African American.” Similarly, when respondents from other groups reported White or Black household members, they wrote “American,” “White,” or simply left the write-in box blank. Foreign-born Asian and Hispanic respondents had no difficulty reporting an origin in the write-in boxes when applicable.

When presented with comparisons between combined and traditional two-question formats, respondents found the difference to be highly salient. That is, it drew frequent spontaneous comment. Most of these comments were positive. Respondents seemed to approve of the combined formats. Among those who were specifically asked to rank the two-part format compared to the combined formats, only 8 out of 39 respondents preferred the two-part question (X9), and 19 out of these 39 ranked it as their *least* preferred format. Among the eleven Hispanic respondents who evaluated the two-question format relative to the combined-question formats, seven said the former was more confusing to them.

Respondents of all groups frequently expressed approval of treating all the categories “the same.” Some said that it struck them as odd, or even suspicious, to have the Hispanic origin question set apart and put first. This was seen in a negative light as “singling these people out” for unspecified purposes or as excluding a group of people from a list that should represent everyone.

- “...There being a lot of Hispanics in the United States, and so since they’re such a big part, you’d get that out of the way first, otherwise I don’t really know why.”
- “Why are you trying to label those poor folks? Is this due to illegal aliens up in the country or what? See. Makes you wonder.”

It is notable that these comments were made both by Hispanic and non-Hispanic respondents. Another factor that contributed to favoring the combined-question formats, in addition to “inclusiveness,” is that it seems conceptually familiar to respondents from all groups. They often commented that the question was the same as those seen on other forms such as for job applications.

B. Understanding of the terms “race or origin.” The new combined formats use the phrase “race or origin” in the question stem. This wording was not included in the experimental formats used previously in 2005. Since these new terms have the potential to change the basic meaning of the question, we included probes in our protocols to examine how respondents interpret “race” and “origin.” Since earlier cognitive research has included similar probes, particularly for “race,” it

is possible to see if changes in respondents' definitions have emerged (Gerber and Crowley 2005; Gerber et al. 1998).

Findings in this respect indicate that there seems to be little effect on respondents' choice of categories, but that there are some differences in their understanding of the stem question between those who answered "race or origin" and those who answered "race" alone. The inclusion of both terms in the single phrase makes it far easier for respondents to ascribe different and contrasting meanings to the terms; thus, meanings that were formerly folded into the single concept of "race" have now been separated.

In this sample, the majority of the respondents (36 out of 51, or 71 percent) who answered "What is Person 1's race or origin?" said that 'race' is *different* from 'origin.' In most cases, they associated race with skin color, phenotype and 'bloodline,' while origin was understood as tied to geographic origins, or cultural heritage. Only 15 of these respondents (29 percent) understood race and origin to mean the same: "where you are from." A Hispanic respondent said, "I guess they mean the same thing because if I tried to explain either I'd explain them the same way." And an American Indian respondent said, "Race or origin to me means...what type of blood you have, what your culture is, and what those two equal is your race...origin." A White respondent said that they both refer to "ethnic background."

In contrast, a full half of the 10 respondents who answered, "What is Person 1's race?" said that race means nationality or the ancestor's country of origin (An American Indian respondent even used the word "ethnicity" to explain "race"). The other half said that race refers basically to skin color.

"Race" in the combined questions seems more clearly attached to physical attributes than it has been in the past. In previous studies, race was often defined geographically in terms of continents ("It's like people from Africa or Asia or Europe") or with concepts like "where your ancestors derived from." This was actually fairly close to the way that OMB defines race, and was not viewed as problematic. Definitions of race in the previous research sometimes included physical attributes such as skin color or features, but this was less common than in the current strategy. Although geographical races are occasionally mentioned, the concept of race is identified mostly with skin color, but also occasionally with "DNA" or specific facial features, etc. Geographical definitions are attached to the term "origin" and respondents often refer to the lists of countries that are included in the examples. Thus, the effect of placing "race" in the context of the term "origin" is to move the concept of race toward a biological definition and away from former cultural/ethnic attributes.

The answers also showed that respondents are aware of possible conflicts between race and origin. These conflicts arise when they examine the examples, such as Russian in the White example set, since you could be from Russia and not be White. Some respondents took issue with the suggestion that all people from the listed countries are White. One pointed out that there are white people everywhere, including in Latin American countries, while another mentioned that one could actually be German and Black.

One observable effect of this is to make respondents more aware of the contrasting elements in the question, since White and Black are the only color terms included. One respondent suggested that these two should be in a separate question because they were different from the rest of the identifiers. Respondents also occasionally look for identifiers like “brown,” and one respondent chose skin tone identifiers like “tan” to write into “Some Other Race” for his children.

“Origin” is clearly understood by nearly everyone as having a geographical basis. However, a range of geographical definitions is used. For most immigrants, origin meant “where you were born.” This created some difficulties in defining origin for U.S.-born children of immigrants, who wanted to be able to indicate this fact. For others, it was the place of origin of more distant ancestors, like grandparents, etc. The stress on place of birth for such respondents may also influence their understanding of race. For example, one Hispanic respondent believed that only persons born in the U.S. could be marked as White: “If they were born in Middle Eastern or Russian, then they’re not White.”

The difficulties that respondents experience with the term “origin” are similar to the difficulties encountered for the term “ancestry” in past cognitive research (Gerber and de la Puente 1996). When countries of origin are too distant or too mixed (as it was for many White respondents who have been in this country for many generations), it is irrelevant or unknown. In addition, complex migration patterns sometimes make it difficult for respondents to know what we are looking for. Thus, a Taiwanese respondent who was born in Costa Rica did not know whether to provide the more distant or more recent country of origin.

Despite the different meanings ascribed to “race” and “origin,” respondents do not understand the question to be asking them to provide *both*. Even in formats X2 and X3, where the rest of the instruction is “AND write in the specific race(s) or origin(s),” and they are presented with country examples after each race category, respondents think that providing one or the other is clearly sufficient. Their question interpretations indicate that respondents often see the question stem as presenting an “either/or” option: the question requires *either* race *or* origin. As one respondent said, “...because they say race OR origin then you don’t know which one you want. Because OR can be either/or and and/or.” A respondent mentioned that should be AND and not OR, “race and origin” if our intent is to collect both. The exclusive interpretation of the two terms allows respondents to skip the write-in elements if they choose to do so. This has differential effects. Some groups appear to be more affected than others: White and Black respondents feel they do not have to search hard for an answer when write-in spaces are provided. One respondent said that the request that Whites provide a specific origin is “ridiculous” and the quality of data would be suspect. Hispanic respondents feel that they are correct in giving only an origin and not providing race. Thus, in effect, “origin” is seen as relevant only for certain groups, primarily for respondents such as immigrants, who are highly motivated to provide a country of origin. Using “race or origin” in the stem question, however, did not seem to deter multiracial/multiethnic respondents from reporting more than one race or origin. The issues that were observed among these groups, rather, refer to seeking a single-term identifier. See discussion on Section 3.3 “Multiracial and Multiethnic Reporting” below.

It has sometimes been suggested that the term “ethnicity” might be used to clarify the concept of “origin.” Past research indicated that some respondents were not familiar with this term (Gerber and Crowley 2005). Although the term is not used in our formats, we kept track of their use by respondents. The terms “ethnicity” and “ethnic background” did arise often in conversation with our respondents about race and origin. Twenty-five of the sixty-one respondents (41 percent) brought up these terms when verbalizing what the stem question was asking for (6 American Indian, 4 Asian, 2 Black, 8 Hispanic and 5 White). One of the American Indian respondents said, “...I know what race and ethnicity mean, but I’m not sure what origin means...ethnic is more of your culture, and race is... your blood, I guess.” Two respondents (American Indian and Hispanic) suggested to change one of the forms (X4) to read: “Please answer questions 8 and 9 that will refer to your ethnicity [sic] background,” and “write in specific ethnicity or tribe.”

However, it should be noted that half of these respondents were college educated (one even referred to a sociology class), and only five had high school or lower education. The usefulness of this term for less educated persons cannot be established. In addition, the definition of “ethnic” and “ethnicity” are not stable even for these educated respondents. It varies between more biological definitions similar to that given for “race” and more geographical definitions, similar to those given for “origin.” This occurs even within a single discussion. The vagueness of the term may make it difficult to incorporate into these questions, even if it proves familiar to a wider population.

C. “Hispanic origins are not races.” The traditional two-question format in X9 maintains the “Note” prior to the question sequence:

→ NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

The first sentence is intended to discourage item nonresponse, and the second to give respondents the sense that race and ethnicity are considered to be different concepts. However, it did not serve to clarify these concepts for our respondents. Both Hispanic and non-Hispanic respondents often expressed confusion over what the second sentence in the Note was getting at. For example, “I don’t understand why they are saying they are not races; it doesn’t seem like is very important that note. Even though it says ‘NOTE’ it doesn’t explain exactly what they are trying to say.”

Various meanings were ascribed to the statement. One Hispanic respondent said it meant that he was not supposed to write “Hispanic” but instead to provide a country of origin. This response does not convey the concept that two responses are required. Even when respondents agree that Hispanic is not a race, they may not see the race concept as relevant to themselves. Another Hispanic respondent thought that the statement was telling her not to complete Q.9. because “Hispanics don't have a race.” It may also be taken as an assertion that the category is not meaningful. Two other respondents thought that the Note was reminding them that “Hispanic was not created as a race, just as a category for the Census.” It appears, therefore, that the attempt to distinguish the two concepts is not effective in motivating respondents to provide two different answers in Question 8 and Question 9, regardless of whether or not they regard “Hispanic” as a race.

Other respondents (both Hispanic and non-Hispanic) assert that they regard “Hispanic” as a race. For these respondents the statement that “Hispanic origins are not races” sometimes seems rather exclusionary: “It’s kind of like you’re excluding a group saying ‘not’ when this country has got a lot of people from this origin...”

3.2 Examples and Terminology

Examples are provided in these formats to help respondents find a category to mark and to cue appropriate write-ins for those formats where they are required. In some formats, examples were included where none had been placed before, such as in the White, Black, and American Indian and Alaska Native categories. We were interested to understand the reaction of respondents to these new examples. Cognitive interviews can provide some information in this regard, but it is primarily based on specific probing. Under natural conditions, most respondents interacting with our questions look briefly at the category titles down the left side of the question, until they find the one that they think is relevant to themselves. They are unlikely to look at anybody else’s example sets, and may not look at their own. Our probes very likely elicited a more careful examination among our respondents. Thus, their remarks are likely to have been stimulated by the interview situation. The following analysis is drawn from probing, in which we specifically asked respondents to read and react to the examples. In addition, it should be pointed out that this method cannot predict the example effects that might be found in a field test.

A. General comments about the usefulness of examples. In general, examples were seen as helpful and drew positive comment. Thus, for some respondents the examples appear to have assisted in the interpretation of the required response. For example, a respondent said that they “help you realize what they want...It makes you be very specific...You are Black, but where are you from?” Another respondent said examples make it clear that one is supposed to write a country of origin. The examples also assisted respondents in understanding how specific and detailed an answer was required. A respondent said the examples guided her to write Mexican instead of just Latino because it had the word Mexican and because “all the other ones were just kind of nationalities or even specific groups or tribes.”

However, the examples did draw some negative comment. This was largely because the number of specific country designators made the form seem overwhelming or busy. Respondents often did not make any distinction between country names used as parenthetical examples and countries used as category designations as in the Asian and Pacific Islander categories:

- “The number of examples made the options confusing”
- “The whole thing is really choppy...All these other things like ‘Pacific Islander’...do they have to be separate if they’re all of the same race?”
- A Hispanic respondent said there were an unusual number of examples since normally it just says Mexican and Latin American, but on this form it has Colombian and Dominican.

Another reaction was that some of the examples included were unfamiliar to respondents, which slowed them down or puzzled them. For example, one respondent said, “It was kind of more of

a hindrance, especially things like ‘Sioux and Aleut.’ I don’t even know how you pronounce that.” Other terms mentioned as unfamiliar were Hmong, Tongan and Yup’ik.

B. Specific comments about example sets. Once respondents began looking at the examples, some noticed that certain expected or favorite categories were not included. In general, they were looking for “completeness” in the category set. For example, one respondent said the Chinese category should have examples like “from mainland China, from Taiwan, from overseas, Asian overseas Chinese.” Another respondent expected to see Venezuelan, but understood that their population may be too small to be included. In X4, which included examples from all groups in a single example set for the “origin” follow up, some respondents did not see enough examples from their own group. An American Indian respondent said none of the examples looked like tribes and there should be more tribal examples, “There’s a whole bunch of [examples] missing here as far as tribes.” The sections below examine respondent reactions to particular example sets.

Examples in the White category. Three of the forms listed “German, Moroccan, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian, and so on” as examples for White. The other two forms that were pretested did not list examples specific to White. Respondents identified two main problems with these examples: first, there was a perceived lack of centrality for the examples; second, there were objections that some of the countries listed do not clearly represent the White category. Below we elaborate further on each of these issues.

Centrality of examples. There was some complaint that the examples were not central enough to the category. One respondent thought that “German” was unfortunate for historical reasons. Others wanted more Northern or Western European examples, or specific places they saw as more central to their concept of “White.” “It’s just funny that they named all these [countries] but they didn’t put Italian in there.” Some White respondents did not identify with the examples, “...I marked White, but then I saw German, Moroccan and Portuguese and I thought, ‘Well I am not any of those but I am White.’”

A related difficulty was that many respondents who marked the White category do not identify with European ancestries of any kind. Two White respondents said that there is no “White origin or Caucasian origin” because Whites have a “mixed bag of national origins from Europe.” The presentation of countries of origin therefore is not helpful to them and may be confusing. Since they identify with “American” they are looking for that as a country designator in the example set: “So where are the White Americans? Where would the White American fill it out?” (It should be noted that we did not see any White respondents failing to choose the category on these grounds, probably because such respondents do, in fact, identify with “White.”)

Countries that do not clearly represent the category. The inclusion of Middle Eastern and Moroccan among the examples for White was generally negatively received. Although we had no Middle Eastern respondents, members of other groups said that they did not believe Middle Easterners regarded themselves as White. For example: “I would never think a Moroccan or Middle Eastern would ever consider themselves to be White.” And “...Moroccan they are African. Morocco is in Africa. Why are they considered White?”

The addition of “Portuguese” to the White category was also puzzling, because respondents thought it should be included with the Hispanic examples. In one instance it was used as evidence that Hispanics should NOT mark White, because Spain was only mentioned in the Hispanic category. For one respondent, the inclusion of Portuguese in the White category and the inclusion of Spain in the Hispanic category seemed to imply that we did not regard Spaniards as White: “And yet Spain is in Europe they should be considered White.” Other respondents pointed out that Spain and Portugal were next to each other and that Spaniard should be considered White if Portuguese is considered White, “People from Spain don’t like to be considered Latinos.”

Examples in the Black, African American or Negro category. Three of the forms required a written answer and listed “African American, Haitian, Nigerian, and so on” as examples. In these formats, the presence of examples was critical to inform respondents of the expected response. In particular, the example “African American” was an important cue. Most of the examples are countries of origin for oneself or one’s ancestors, and this often gives the impression that “American” is not an adequate response. It may seem that a country or tribe in Africa is being requested, but as respondents pointed out, “African Americans probably have no idea about their origin or what tribe in Africa they came from.” Similarly, respondents who think of their origins as multiracial rather than multiethnic may lack guidance here: “My grandfather was a White man and my grandmother was half Indian and half Black, African, Negro but that doesn’t produce any helpful useful information as far as I can see.”

Examples in the Hispanic category. The examples used in the Hispanic category were generally acceptable. There is some evidence that “Spaniard” is unfamiliar; and some respondents think that Spain or Spanish persons do not consider themselves to be Hispanic and should not be in the category. Others suggest additional inclusions, like wanting to see “Venezuelan.” There is some confusion as to the specific boundaries of the category. Thus, a respondent suggested that Haitian, since it is a Caribbean nation, could be moved to the “Hispanic” category. As we have seen, some respondents think that Portuguese belongs with the Hispanic identifiers.

Because many Hispanic respondents are concerned with issues of immigration, and place of birth, the identifier “Mexican Am.” is important in these examples. That is, they are interested in clearly identifying children who are born in this country. Some respondents dislike the ‘Mexican Am.’ abbreviation and would prefer to see the “whole word ‘Mexican American’” instead of an abbreviation because some people may not know what it means.

Examples in the American Indian or Alaska Native (AIAN) category. Three of the forms list “Sioux, Aleut, Mayan, and so on” as examples. Another form lists “Sioux” and “Yup’ik.” A few respondents commented that they were not familiar with Yup’ik or Aleut, and some wanted more well-known tribes as examples. (Cherokee was suggested.)

For American Indian respondents, it appeared that the examples were really not as important as the category title and the terms “enrolled or principal tribe” in cueing their response. They seemed familiar with the terms “American Indian or Alaska native” and were looking for that option, and for a way to indicate specific tribal affiliations. Some mentioned that they had not read the examples because they already knew what they would write. Respondents varied in how

specific they were in the write-in response. Although some of our respondents offered the name of their particular enrolled membership unit, nothing in the examples tells them that this information is of interest. (In former iterations of the examples, “Rosebud Sioux” was intended to do this.) However, respondents pointed out that often there would be insufficient room in the write in box to write this information, anyway.

The inclusion of Mayan in the example set drew negative comment from our respondents. It was intended to indicate to Central and South American Indian respondents that they were included in this category. However, it was not useful in attracting these respondents to the category. Only one respondent, born in Honduras (Central America), briefly considered marking the category as a result of seeing this example. Others said that “American Indian” did not sound like it included them. Respondents objected to putting Indians from Latin America under American Indian and Alaska Natives for two basic reasons. For some, the term "American Indian" seems to preclude non-U.S. Indian identities, for example: "American Indian would be to me Indian tribes from the United States up but they include Mayan here, that's really weird" Or: “well, technically they are not American Indian.”

Others thought that “Mayan” did not give specific enough information about country of origin:

- “Oh that’s weird, Mayan people are considered as American Indian when Mayan people can either be born in Mexico or Guatemala or Peru; so if you are Tarahumara you have to put American Indian?”
- “I would put Mayan in the Hispanic section, because they give you the option of writing the country of origin, which in my case might be Guatemalan, and Mayan are from Guatemala and the south part of Mexico as well, so you might miss it if they keep it there.”

It should be noted that most respondents stop reading after finding a category to suit themselves, and it is unlikely that many of our Hispanic respondents would have noticed the “Mayan” example under the American Indian or Alaska Native response category outside of the cognitive interview because once they selected “Hispanic” they moved to the next question.

Examples in the Asian category. The Asian examples were generally adequate according to Asian respondents. Some criticisms of the terminology were voiced. For example, one respondent was confused by the term Asian Indian, “I don’t see people called ‘Indian’ as ‘Asian Indian.’ They are Indian, from India.” The countries included in the category are not entirely clear: A Hispanic respondent said that Filipinos have Spanish descent although it is in Asia.

C. Other Terminology

Negro. The most commonly criticized term in this research was the term “Negro” in the category designator, “Black, African American or Negro.” Because of the frequency of comments, and because of the emotional nature of the comments, specific responses are listed in Appendix VII. This section provides only a brief overview. It was significant that many respondents mentioned the term spontaneously. Five of the twelve African American respondents and 8 of the 49 respondents from other racial/ethnic groups brought up the subject without probing. Although two elderly respondents self-identified as Negro, most comments

were negative. These results are consistent with findings in previous research (Gerber and Crowley 2005.)

By and large, those who objected to the term found it extremely offensive. Some respondents said that they personally were not offended by the term, but that others would be. One respondent misread the word and thought the form featured another, even less polite, N-word. In all, out of 13 respondents who talked about this term, 10 had negative things to say. One respondent said that he would throw the form away if he received it in the mail and it featured the word 'Negro.' Another respondent said that the word would tip her off that the form was a joke.

Some Hispanic respondents were bewildered by its inclusion in the Census form, presumably because 'negro' is the Spanish word for 'black'. One respondent said, "Negro is considered Black, is like White and do you put Blanco?" ('Blanco' is Spanish for 'White'). The issue for them, apparently, was the confusion of languages.

Caucasian. Some respondents believe that the term "Caucasian" is somehow more correct or proper, and used it in discussions with us. Some said that they usually see "Caucasian" on forms that ask about race. Some Hispanic respondents equated "White" with being born in the U.S. One of these respondents chose not to identify as White even though one of his parents is a U.S.-born non-Hispanic White. He explained that because he had been born in Latin America, he did not consider himself "White."

Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin. This phrase is generally recognizable, but respondents clearly do not agree on the definitions of the three included terms. The majority of respondents see the two terms "Hispanic" and "Latino" as closely allied or synonymous. However, there were also several respondents who said that they thought these terms all meant different things, although they were not sure what those differences were. When the terms are seen as different, they are given a variety of ad hoc distinctions based on geography. Thus, sometimes Hispanic means "Mexico" and Latino means South America; sometimes Latino means Central America and the Caribbean, and Hispanic means South America. There was no specific agreement on the meanings of the separate terms. Spanish origin, however, was consistently said to refer to persons from Spain.

The tendency was for respondents to associate these terms with geographic regions or specific countries, but a few respondents took a linguistic approach and said that they applied to Spanish-speakers in general. Only one respondent said that 'Hispanic' carried no meaning, and was invented by the U.S. Government.

Chicano. Another term used in some of the formats is the term "Chicano." There is some evidence that this term is becoming unfamiliar, and that as a result, there is uncertainty and disagreement about its meaning. Some respondents did not recognize it at all. A few respondents did not see a difference between "Chicano" and "Mexican American." One respondent said the term refers to "people who live in California and speak Spanglish," another respondent said a Chicano is a person of "Mexican descent," while another respondent said it refers to a Mexican

of American descent. In addition, some respondents find the term to have negative connotations or to be out of date.

Chamorro. Although the term is not part of the Hispanic category, it should be noted that one respondent thought that the term “Chamorro” refers to an indigenous group in Mexico.

Mexican American. Many respondents are looking for a term to indicate a country of origin with the modifier “American.” Especially for immigrants, this is an important way to indicate that their children were born in this country, or that they themselves are naturalized citizens. Thus, there is an important conceptual distinction between Mexican and Mexican American, and respondents are frequently looking for the latter term. Two formats, X3 and X4 include only the example of Mexican, with no other equivalent terms, and this was considered inadequate.

For many respondents, this term served as a hybrid birthplace-nationality marker. It was important for many Hispanic respondents who are naturalized citizens or who have U.S.-born children to be able to annotate their citizenship status.

- One respondent said this means one was born in the U.S. to Mexican parents
- One respondent said it means one was born in Mexico of Mexican parents but now lives in the U.S. as a naturalized citizen.

In a few cases, Mexican American is used to indicate levels of assimilation judged by a person's friends, activities, and individual preferences. Two respondents said that Mexican American indicates a person's level of assimilation into mainstream U.S. culture; they would use it to describe, for example, a sister who “listens to English music,” etc. This can result in siblings born in the same place being given different identifiers. It should be noted that this response pattern was also encountered among Asian immigrants, who used hyphenated nationalities to distinguish degrees of assimilation as well. It is also worth noting that occasionally hyphenated terms are used to indicate multiracial backgrounds. Thus, in one formulation, “Chinese American” meant Chinese and White, because “standard Americans” were White, according to this respondent.

“Some other race.” Respondents clearly understand that “Some other race” should be used to designate people who do not fit into the categories provided in the rest of the question. However, one respondent said that the word “some” in the category lent a dismissive tone to the option, as though other races are not important.

Some respondents see the category as accommodating people who do not wish to respond to the race question, or who wish to give responses that do not fit our definitions of either race or ethnicity. For example:

- One respondent said that if someone were opposed to the race question, they would select this category and write “Homo sapiens” in the write-in boxes. Another said “extremists like myself, who might put down ‘human race’ or someone who is really off the charts of these examples...”

- For another respondent, this category did not make sense unless it was for “Martians” or “Bigfoot.”
- One respondent wrote “Jewish” in this area and cited historical references to a “Jewish people.”

However, the category is most commonly seen as appropriate to people who are multiracial, and is used to indicate “hyphenated-American” identities.

3.3 Multiracial and Multiethnic Reporting

It was of interest to us to see how multiracial reporting would be affected by the combined “race and origin” formats. Since some combination question formats require both a race and origin response, it was unclear how this might affect respondents’ willingness or ability to mark more than one race category. In addition, the traditional X9 format contained an innovation: the ability to “mark one or more” in the Hispanic origin question. This would allow persons of multiple Hispanic ethnicities to record them by making more than one mark.

Patterns for multiracial reporting are similar in this study to what we have seen in previous studies (Gerber et al. 1998; Martin and Gerber 2005). That is, it is important for some respondents to offer all elements of their backgrounds; others discussed all the elements of their backgrounds while marking only one. We were concerned with two issues: the conceptual understanding of multiracial reporting and the way in which our instructions functioned to inform respondents of this response option.

A. Readability of “Mark one or more” instruction in race and race/origin questions. Some respondents use the multiple race option, while others of similar background do not do so; however, these observed behaviors appear to be little influenced by the “mark one or more” instruction that is included in the question. That is, some marked more than one without reading or absorbing the instruction; for others, reading the instruction cued a discussion of varied elements in the person’s background, while they chose to make only one mark. Some respondents did not realize that they were allowed to mark more than one box in this question, and once they decided they wanted to mark more than one, they went back to read the instructions.

The reading of this instruction has been problematic since the instruction was introduced. In Census 2000, the bolding of the stem was continued through the “mark X one or more” in order to render the instruction more visible. This was removed in these iterations. In addition, new elements of the format may have compounded the problem, such as (a) the increased amount of text around this instruction, which makes it harder to find; and (b) the inclusion of many examples that make the page look cluttered and difficult to read. In addition, in two formats, X2 and X3, the instruction after the race stem question has been changed to accommodate the “race or origin” wording. The questions and instructions read:

In X2: **What is Person 1's race or origin?** Mark [x] one or more boxes
AND write the specific race(s) or origin(s).

In X3: **What is Person 1's race or origin?** Mark [x] one or more boxes **AND** write the specific race(s) or origin(s).

In effect, this places the “one or more” wording between two bolded pieces of information that may tend to hide it since it is possible that the capitalization and bolding of the AND may draw the eye over the information in the middle. It should also be noted that respondents have a prior experience with the “Mark [x]” formulation in the tenure question, which informs respondents that only one mark is permitted, “Mark [x] ONE box.” It seems possible that respondents may stop reading after “Mark [x] one...” because they have the (incorrect) sense of knowing what it says.

In addition, it was noted on two occasions that respondents read the question stem as “What is this person's one race or origin” rather than “What is Person 1’s race or origin.” These respondents may have at least momentarily understood this as an instruction not to mark more than one, although this was not evident from their answers or discussion. (The introduction to the Person 1 concept, in the extensive instruction at number 5, is routinely missed by informants, so they are figuring out “Person 1” in the race question for the first time.)

B. “Mark one or more” in the Hispanic origin question. In the traditional two question format, the “mark one or more” instruction is also used in the Hispanic origin question. It is also very difficult for respondents to find, and they generally did not spontaneously discover it. In the X9 format, the instruction appears to be very crowded. The prior Note in the X9 formats and the large amount of text added by the examples also contribute to this effect.

This instruction proved to be conceptually problematic for some respondents, who thought it was illogical to offer both No and Yes responses within one multi-mark question. They did not see how one could sensibly interpret someone marking No and one of the Hispanic categories at the same time, although the question appears to permit this “contradiction.” We encountered one respondent who had an Hispanic and a non-Hispanic parent, and this instruction caused her great difficulty. In the end, she chose only to mark one of the “Yes” boxes for her Hispanic parent, and to ignore the seemingly illogical “No.” Instead she marked the other parent’s race in the race part of the question.

C. Patterns of multiracial reporting. There is some evidence that the awareness and acceptability of multiracial identity is increasing. Some of our respondents expressed the idea that the U.S. is not only diverse by having many separate groups, but that “most people” have more than one background. We anticipate that many respondents will choose to mark more than one category in the 2010 Census.

These interviews took place shortly after the 2008 presidential elections. Having a multi-racial candidate, and the attention given to matters of race in the media, form a background to these results. We believe that this created a heightened awareness of multiracial identities. Several respondents offered Barack Obama as an example of someone for whom the instruction “mark X one or more boxes” would apply. In addition, several adopted the new president's joking use of the term "mutt" in a positive sense: One respondent mentioned writing in “mutt” in

as an origin identifier in form X4. Another respondent said that “[in] Latin America, we’re all mutts [...]”

D. Search for single-term identifiers for mixed backgrounds. Some respondents are looking for a single identifier to indicate multiracial/multiethnic backgrounds. These respondents did not feel comfortable making two marks, and were looking for a unitary way to express dual identities. That is, they feel uncomfortable in making two marks to indicate one person, and would prefer to indicate mixed backgrounds within a single category. They tended to use the “Some Other Race” category for this purpose, and in fact that became the most common use of the “Some other race” category.

These included mothers of children who were Asian and White and some respondents who wanted to indicate both White and Hispanic choices, but wanted to be able to do it on the same line. As we have seen, one parent chose color terms for his children (such as “tan”). Other parents choose multiethnic designations, like Chinese American to indicate both racial and ethnic backgrounds. In other cases, hyphenated identifiers are used to indicate citizenship or degrees of assimilation.

4. General Issues and Recommendations for Phase I Panels

4.1 Issues Spanning the Set of Treatments

Certain issues cut across several or all of the formats, and this section presents such issues and our general recommendations for ameliorating them.

- Visual clutter, perception of burden: Except for X4, the formats are seen as very long and wordy, and can be somewhat overwhelming at first glance. This sense of burden often dissipates when respondents see that they only have to deal with one of the categories. In order to facilitate respondents scanning and finding their answer category, we recommend increasing spacing and eliminating as many words as possible.
- Check boxes vs. Write-ins: People often say they want check boxes rather than write-ins, but they simultaneously say the question is too complex, too long, and has too much to read through. However, they did not have difficulty in providing write ins in those formats requiring them. We do not regard write-in boxes, per se, as problematic. The difficulties, as described above, stem from lack of knowledge or motivation to provide a write in, and not from lack of understanding of how to use this feature. However, we are recommending indenting the write-in boxes to make navigation down the left side of the question easier.
- We have recommended some changes to avoid confused or redundant formats. These include using one form of punctuation for both instructions and examples (no parentheses). We have also eliminated the redundant “print race or origin” in the “Some other race” category, because it is repetitious.

- We are recommending using “etc.” instead of “and so on.” This saves space. In addition, “and so on” is difficult to translate into Spanish, while “etc.” is used commonly among Spanish speakers.
- We are recommending removing the “[x]” in “Mark [x] one or more” to encourage respondents to read this instruction. They have previously encountered “Mark [x] ONE” as an instruction to mark only one. Similarly, we think that this instruction should be in bold, as it was in 2000.

Based on our findings, we are also recommending some changes in terminology across all of the questionnaires, where applicable. This includes eliminating the terms Negro, Chicano and Chamorro. In addition we are recommending changing the “Some other race” term to “Other race.” As shown in Appendix VII, the term Negro is offensive to most respondents; and Chicano and Chamorro are not readily recognized; finally, some respondents mentioned that “Some” in “Some other race” seemed dismissive.

- We are recommending spelling “American” in African American and Mexican American, since respondents do not favor the abbreviated forms.

Where they are used, we are recommending using more central examples in the White category. Three of the forms listed “German, Moroccan, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian and so on.” White respondents did not identify with these examples and some suggested using examples from Northern or Western Europe, which would be more central to their concept of “White.” Other White respondents said that rather than a specific European ancestry, they saw themselves as a “mixed bag of national origins from Europe.” In general, respondents were surprised to find Middle Eastern and Moroccan among the examples for White. Portuguese was also puzzling because some respondents thought it should be included with the Hispanic examples next to Spaniard since the countries are next to each other.

4.2 Navigation Issues and Recommendations by Specific Treatments

Ease of navigation is critical to the success of a format in that respondents must be able to move easily through the form, finding the necessary categories and absorbing intended concepts and information.

The formats tested in Phase I have new features, which present certain challenges for respondent navigation. These include the use of write-in and check boxes, combinations of vertical and horizontal navigation (as when some categories are arranged left to right, amid an overall vertical structure), and navigation between two separate parts of a single question. This section details the navigation issues for all five formats, and presents our recommendations for revision of the formats.

A. Form X2. This is a combination format which uses horizontally arranged checkboxes for Hispanic origins, Asians and Pacific Islanders, along with “Other” write-in boxes with examples.

Examples and write-in boxes are provided for White, Black, and American Indian or Alaska Native.

Mixed horizontal/vertical formats did not prevent respondents from finding their categories. Mexican and Puerto Rican respondents were generally able to find their check boxes despite the horizontal format. The category furthest right among the Hispanic categories was “Cuban,” and since we did not have Cuban respondents, we were not able to assess issues related to placement of this check box.

However, despite their success in finding the categories, there is evidence that respondents had some difficulty in searching for them. In this format, “Other Hispanic” occurs on the line below the three Hispanic checkbox categories. The search pattern we observed was to scan the left hand side of the question looking for the word “Hispanic.” This is encountered underneath the checkboxes, and then the respondents scan the area to find the check boxes above the line. Thus, “Other Hispanic” is an important marker for the location of these categories. Some respondents are looking for “Hispanic” as a header, and tend to react to the “Other Hispanic” as the closest thing to the “Hispanic” category they are searching for. They may even read and refer to the category as “Hispanic.”

Thus, although they are able to find the general location of the Hispanic responses, they sometimes react as though the responses are out of order, with the more general term underneath the specific terms. As a result, they find the placement of the check boxes above the presumed header to be puzzling and difficult to interpret. If they interpret the “Other Hispanic” category as a general term, they may believe that they should complete the write in even if they are Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban and have already marked a check box. This may result in uncertainty about whether the “Other Hispanic” category is requesting redundant information. One of the three Hispanic respondents who answered this form wrote “Mexican” in the write-in box for “Other Hispanic.” Another one wrote “Mexican American” in the write-in box for “Black.” Both said they wanted to clarify which group among “Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano” they identify with. In order to reestablish the natural order of the general and specific terms, we have recommended including a banner of “Hispanic, Latino or of Spanish origin” above the check box categories

The Asian and Pacific Islander categories are also arranged in a mixed horizontal/vertical format. This structure is traditional and did not appear to be problematic for our respondents. However, for consistency with the category format above, we recommend adding an “Asian” banner above the check box categories and a banner over “Pacific Islander” if there is enough space.

The format is difficult to interpret for other respondents as well. We noted that they often scanned it for a moment before beginning to fill it out, as though it caused them some hesitation. When comparing this format to other formats, respondents said “it doesn't flow” or “it's busy.”

The question appears segmented by write-in boxes for some respondents. The checkboxes do not stand out from the write-in boxes. An Asian respondent thought that the question ended after the first write-in box and wrote “Asian” in the box for “White” before realizing that the choices

continued below. It was suggested by a few respondents that it would be better to indent the write-in boxes so that it is easier to scan the general categories.

Recommendations for Form X2:

- Shift all write-in boxes to the right as far as possible.
- Use more central examples for White.
- Eliminate “Negro” and write out African American.
- Bold “Mark one or more boxes,” eliminate [x], and keep “AND” on the first line.
- Use spanners for “Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin,” “Asian,” and if possible, “Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.”
- Eliminate “Chicano” and write out Mexican American.
- Space between groupings.
- Eliminate “Chamorro.”
- Change category title to “Other race or origin” and eliminate “print” instruction in this category to reduce clutter.

Modified Form X2:

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes AND write in the specific race(s) or origin(s).

White -- Print origin(s), for example, Swedish, Italian, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian, etc.

[] []

Black or African American -- Print origin(s), for example, African American, Haitian, Nigerian, etc.

[] []

Hispanic, Latino or of Spanish Origin

Mexican, Mexican American Puerto Rican Cuban

Other Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin -- Print origin(s), for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, etc.

[] []

American Indian or Alaska Native -- Print name of enrolled or principal tribe(s), for example, Sioux, Aleut, Mayan, etc.

[] []

Asian

Asian Indian Chinese Filipino

Japanese Korean Vietnamese

Other Asian -- Print origin(s), for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, etc.

fact, the respondents spontaneously found Part B. It is unclear if the extra attention required of them in a cognitive interview might have made this performance more successful than it would be in a field test.

However, although they were successful in finding Part B, respondents often did not feel that they were required to fill it out. As we have seen, some respondents, particularly White and African American respondents, do not identify with origins, and therefore saw Part B as irrelevant or redundant. They are reinforced by two features: first, Part A asks for “race *or* origin” and they interpret this as asking for either a race OR an origin. Second, Part B has very similar wording and some respondents commented it was redundant. Respondents commented that it would be easy for someone to skip this part, and some did not think it would be an error.

We have recommended several changes to encourage answering Part B. These include the addition of an instruction to specify that both a race and an origin are required:

“Check your race(s) or origin(s) in Question 8, then ALSO provide detailed origin(s) in Question 9.”

We have also changed the numbering of the question from 8A and 8B to 8 and 9. We believe that it is less likely for respondents to interpret a question at a new number as being optional than in a Part A and B format.

For respondents who are motivated to supply an origin in Part B, the main response problem was interpreting the write-in boxes. Because there are three write-in boxes, a few respondents concluded that the first write in was for race, the second for origin, and the third for tribe. This might be difficult for machine processing if the write in begins on the second or third line and the first line is left blank.

Issues for American Indian and Alaska Native response. In Part A, American Indian respondents were occasionally somewhat uncomfortable when they did not have the opportunity to provide a tribe identifier immediately. They told us that was what they were used to doing in other venues. It seems at first that they will not have the opportunity to provide a detailed tribe, until they find Part B.

The list of examples in Part B is also problematic for American Indians. This is because both the examples, Sioux and Yup’ik, occur late in the list, as a result of alphabetization. In addition, Yup’ik was not familiar to some of the American Indian respondents, and was similarly unfamiliar to respondents from other groups.

There is some evidence that American Indians have a bit more difficulty in finding their place to write in Part B. Although they were successful in doing so in the end, some respondents had to search for “enrolled or principal tribe” before they were sure that this was the place to write. This may have been because this is the last identifier in a long question stem, following “specific race, origin, or...” It should be noted that “enrolled or principal tribe” sometimes serves as a cue to other groups of respondents, who think it is applicable to tribes elsewhere in the world, such as Africa or Asia.

Other Examples. Respondents found the example of Australian to be somewhat confusing, since it is understood that Australian is a multiethnic society with people drawn from many countries of origin. We have recommended replacing this with Austrian, since it represents the White category, and begins with the same letter.

Since this list of examples is very long, there is a strong possibility that respondents will take it as an extensive list, from which they are required to pick one of the choices. In order to counter this impression, in this format we have changed “and so on” at the end of the examples to a slightly stronger form: “or any other origin.”

Recommendations for Form X4:

- Use altered Note to encourage response to both questions.
- Use “8” and “9” for question numbers.
- Bold “Mark one or more boxes” and eliminate [x].
- Eliminate “Negro” and write out African American.
- Change category title to “Other race or origin.”
- Eliminate term “race” from wording of Q.9. and make “origin” plural: “origin(s).”
- Include “Mexican American” in example set for Q.9.
- Use “Austrian” rather than “Australian” in example set.
- Replace “and so on” with “or any other origin.”

Modified Form X4:

→ **Check your race(s) or origin(s) in Question 8, then ALSO provide detailed origin(s) in Question 9.**

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other race or origin

9. Write in Person 1's specific origin(s), or enrolled or principal tribe (for example, Austrian, Chinese, Dominican, Haitian, Iranian, Mexican or Mexican American, Nigerian, Sioux, Samoan, Thai, Tongan, Yup'ik, or any other origin.)

[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []

D. Form X5. This is a combination question format, which presents detailed Hispanic origin check boxes vertically in the main list, and triple banks Asian and Pacific Islander check boxes. Write-in boxes and examples are only presented for Other Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander. This format presented significant problems in navigation. These are due to the visual segmentation of the question by the write-in boxes and the order of presentation of the categories, and from the mix of horizontal and vertical structures.

Visual Segmentation. In the past some respondents have seen the race question as divided by the American Indian write-in box. This has made it more difficult for respondents whose categories are below this line to find the appropriate place to mark. On occasion, this resulted in inappropriate write ins in the American Indian line.

In the current format, two write-in boxes segment the question (Other Hispanic and the American Indian or Alaska Native write-in boxes). Thus, the appearance of segmentation is more marked, and response is more affected by it than in the traditional format. The appearance of segmentation was commented on by respondents from all groups, who often remarked that they were not certain at first if there were one or two questions. Additionally, some remarked that the question was not inclusive and left out some groups, including Asians and American Indians. In fact it made it difficult for some respondents to find an appropriate category to mark, and resulted in them getting “stuck” in the upper part of the question. For example, an Asian respondent and a Samoan respondent both thought the end of the question was the write-in box for Other Hispanic, and read the categories over and over trying to figure out how to answer it. One of them actually wrote his origin in the Other Hispanic write-in box before realizing the choices continued below the write-in boxes.

Although most respondents were eventually successful in locating and marking an appropriate category, it should be pointed out that the cognitive interview situation made them more highly motivated to overcome frustration. It is likely that in the field situation, some respondents will either leave the question blank or write responses in one of the top write-in spaces. In order to ameliorate the appearance of segmentation, we are recommending changing the order of the categories to separate the write-in boxes for “Other Hispanic” and “American Indian or Alaska Native.” This can be achieved by moving the AIAN category into its traditional position as the third category. This puts three check boxes (Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban) in between the two write-in boxes. We believe that these intervening categories will be easier to see and will support the perception that the question continues below the write-in box.

Order of Presentation. This format presents the Hispanic categories in a vertical list, with Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican and Other Hispanic all to the left. The order of presentation of the Hispanic categories proved to be problematic. As in form X2, the categories in the list seemed to be out of order for some respondents. If they were searching for a category that said “Hispanic” they often read or interpreted the “Other Hispanic” line to be this header. It was puzzling to have the more general term follow the specific checkboxes for Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban. This sometimes made them respond twice, by marking the check box and by writing their country of origin again, into the “Other Hispanic” line.

The order of presentation was puzzling to respondents in another way. The Non-Hispanic respondents sometimes commented that the specific countries listed after White and Black were at a very different level of specificity. That is, people from many countries could respond in either of the two top categories, but then the list switches to single-country answers. This appeared puzzling to some respondents, who indicated that it looked like two different lists.

Mixed formats. In the comparison portion of the interview, respondents often expressed negative reactions to this format. They commented that they found it to be “confusing” or said that “it doesn’t flow.” This last comment is probably a reaction to the mixed format, using vertical lists, a long block of write-in boxes that run too far out to the left, and triple banked check boxes all within one question.

Recommendations for Form X5:

- Shift all write-in boxes to the right as far as possible.
- Bold “Mark one or more boxes” and eliminate [x].
- Change order of presentation – put American Indian before Hispanic categories.
- Leave spaces between AIAN and Hispanic, between Hispanic and Asian/NHOPI and between Asian/NHOPI write in and Other origin.
- Change category title to “Other race or origin.”
- Eliminate “Negro” and write out African American.
- Eliminate “Chicano” and write out Mexican American.
- Eliminate “Chamorro.”

Modified Form X5:

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native – Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
- Mexican, Mexican American
- Puerto Rican
- Cuban
- Other Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin – Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, etc.
[] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] []
- Asian Indian Japanese Native Hawaiian
- Chinese Korean Guamanian
- Filipino Vietnamese Samoan

for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai
Pakistani, Cambodian
Bangladeshi, etc.

Print race, for example,
Fijian, Tongan, Marshallese,
etc.

[]

Other race

[]

PHASE II – TREATMENTS X14, X16 AND X17

5. Goals of AQE Race and Hispanic Origin Phase II Research

Phase II focused on testing form usability and respondent reactions in three panels that feature changes in the race question alone (does not involve changes to the Hispanic origin question). The changes that were tested in this Phase are independent and different from those tested in Phase I, which involved combined race/ethnicity formats. In Phase II, the treatment panels include removing the term “race” in the race question stem, removing “Negro” from the Black or African American category, adding spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander categories, and alphabetizing the presentation of examples in the Other Asian groups. Although the changes pretested do not include the Hispanic origin question, findings involving the ethnicity question will be presented when relevant as these might affect the response to the race question. In addition, we present findings obtained in the last part of the interview in which respondents were asked to rank the three forms in order of preference and to explain their choices.

The three questionnaires that were pretested are labeled as X14/B4a, X16/B4c, and X17/B4d. These panels are shown in Appendix II.

The first panel, X14/B4a, introduces spanners over the Asian and the Pacific Islander response categories. The purpose of the spanners is to convey to respondents that each of these is a race, and that the categories within each grouping are national origins (Humes 2009). In addition, the term “race” has been removed from the instructions to print “Other Asian” and “Other Pacific Islander” to further emphasize that they are considered national origins instead of races. Finally, in this form the examples under Other Asian are alphabetized.

The second panel, X16/B4c, removes the term “race” from the question stem (which now reads “Is this person...”) and from the instruction to print “Other Asian” and “Other Pacific Islander.” In this form, examples are not alphabetized. The purpose of this modification to the race question stem is to test respondents’ reactions and elicit their opinions as to whether this would affect their interpretation or the likelihood of answering the question.

The third panel, X17/B4c, combines changes introduced in the two other forms. It has the spanners over the Asian and the Pacific Islander response categories, and removes the term “race” from the question stem and from the instructions to print “Other Asian” and “Other Pacific Islander.” In addition, this panel tests reactions to removing the term “Negro” from the Black or African American category.

6. Methods in Phase II

6.1 Protocols

The protocols in this phase focused on respondents’ reactions to several modifications in the race question item. These alternatives include changes in the wording of the race question stem; visibility of text such as the “Note” that precedes the Hispanic origin question and the “Mark

more than one” instruction; interpretation of spanners; removal of “Negro”; and ordering of the examples under Other Asian and Pacific Islander categories. As in Phase I, an expert review panel informed the protocols. The following concerns emerged from the expert review and informed the development of the protocols:

A. Layout and formatting. Two of the forms feature spanners that may be perceived as segmenting the race question. Reviewers were concerned as to whether these might increase cognitive burden on respondents or reduce the prominence of the “Some Other Race” response category, which in these forms is aligned under the Asian categories and may be misinterpreted as exclusively belonging to this group. We used retrospective probing, first observing how respondents engaged with the instrument and answered the first page, then probing about the spanners and any other issues identified.

B. Changed race question stem and instructions. In two of the panels, the term “race” was removed from the question stem. One concern was how this would change interpretation of the question, and whether it would increase cognitive burden on respondents. Respondents were observed as they completed the forms, and subsequently probed about the information they were being asked for. In addition, since the question includes instructions to “Mark one or more,” respondents were asked if they saw this instruction, how it was interpreted, and why they answered the way they did. Finally, all respondents were also probed about their interpretation of the Note preceding the Hispanic origin question.

C. Ordering in example sets. Respondents were specifically probed on their opinions about the example sets under Other Asian and Pacific Islander. We also attempted to assess, by observation and direct probing, whether or not the respondent had spontaneously noticed the ordering (alphabetized or not alphabetized) in these example sets.

D. Terms and concepts. There were concerns about the use of Negro on the forms, as well as how the category “Some other race” is understood. During cognitive testing, spontaneous comments or reactions were followed up after the race question was answered, and further probing took place during form comparison, “Did you notice the differences in the Black/African American category? Which do you prefer? Why?”

Similarly, we probed directly about “Some Other Race” after the respondent finished answering the race question for Person 1, “Did you notice ‘Some Other Race? To whom do you think this applies?’”

6.2 The Cognitive Interview

A. Probing strategy. As in Phase I, we used the retrospective think-aloud method whereby respondents were probed about their interpretations and experiences after they answered specific sections of the questionnaire (Willis 2005). The purpose of the study, to test new survey questions, was explained to respondents at the start of the interview. Researchers gave and explained to respondents the consent form, which informed them that their participation was voluntary and anonymous, and that their answers and any other information they provide in the

course of the interview would be confidential. Before the interview started, the respondents signed the consent form and were asked for permission to record the conversation.

Respondents were asked to make themselves Person 1 for the interview so that we could probe about their specific answers. Researchers did not probe while the respondent completed the first page of the questionnaire. After they finished answering the Hispanic origin and race questions, respondents were asked how they came up with their answer and their interpretation of the questions. They were also probed about how much of the questions they had read, whether they noticed the spanners (when applicable) and what they thought of them, whether they noticed the examples under Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander and what they thought of their ordering, and whether they noticed the “Some Other Race” category and to whom it would apply.

Respondents were then asked to complete the form for the next person in the household. After they answered for Person 2, respondents were probed about whether they noticed and how they interpreted the “Mark one or more” instruction and the Note preceding the Hispanic origin question.

Similar to the procedures in Phase I, answers about the rest of the household members were probed only when they allowed for exploration of how respondents reported multiracial children and U.S.-born children of immigrant parents because of previous findings that suggest these are challenging situations in which the “mark one or more” instruction is likely to apply.

B. Comparison of forms. At the end of the interview, each respondent was asked to examine the other two forms pretested in this phase and to comment on the most noticeable differences (they were not asked to complete the forms). Subsequently, they were probed directly about whether they would have answered any of the forms differently; whether they noticed, and what they thought, of the different question stems; the terms under the Black or African American category; having or not having spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander categories; and the preferred ordering of examples under Other Asian. After this discussion, respondents were asked to rank the forms and to give an explanation for their rankings. Specific respondent rankings in Phase II are shown in full detail in Appendix IV. An important finding is that these rankings were strongly influenced by the presence of the term “Negro” in the Black or African American race category. Many respondents specifically mentioned that they chose the form that *did not* use this term because they found it inappropriate or offensive. Appendix IV also lists other factors that respondents mentioned as influencing their rankings.

In addition, because reactions to the term “Negro” were very negative at times, we have gathered them in Appendix VIII for the sponsors to assess its impact on respondents. We also give an overview of these findings in Section 7.1.C (“Removal of term ‘Negro’”) because it is one of the modifications on which this Phase focused.

6.3 Respondent Selection

Fifteen respondents were recruited in the D.C. metro area. Strategies were the same as in Phase I: Researchers tapped formal and informal social networks, posted fliers in community organizations and churches, and contacted local community centers and personal contacts for referrals. Respondents received \$40.00 in cash as incentive and compensation for time and travel to complete an interview.

Table 2. Phase II Respondent Characteristics by Form and Race/Origin

Main form completed	Secondary form for comparison	Race/origin at recruitment	Sex	Age Group	Education	Reported race/origin in Census form
X14	X16,X17	ASIAN	F	40-44	Some college	No HISP, ASIAN INDIAN
X14	X16,X17	BLACK	M	40-44	Some college	No HISP, BLACK
X14	X16,X17	HISP	F	30-34	College or more	HISP - BOLIVIAN, WHITE
X14	X16,X17	WHITE	F	45-49	High school/GED	No HISP, WHITE
X16	X17,X14	AIAN	M	65-69	College or more	No HISP, AIAN - PISCATAWAY CONOY
X16	X17,X14	ASIAN	F	20-24	Some college	No HISP, KOREAN
X16	X17,X14	BLACK	F	20-24	College or more	No HISP, BLACK
X16	X17,X14	HISP	F	55-59	College or more	HISP - PERU, WHITE
X16	X17,X14	WHITE	F	45-49	College or more	No HISP, WHITE
X17	X14,X17	AIAN	M	30-34	College or more	SKIPPED HISP Q, WHITE & AIAN-CHEYENNE RIVER/SIOUX
X17	X14,X17	ASIAN	F	75-79	High school/GED	No HISP, OTHER ASIAN - BLANK & SOR - SINHALESE SRI LANKA
X17	X14,X17	BLACK	F	70-74	High school/GED	No HISP, BLACK
X17	X14,X17	HISP	F	20-24	Some college	HISP - BOLIVIAN, WHITE
X17	X14,X17	NHPI	M	25-29	College or more	No HISP, WHITE & OPI - SAMOAN
X17	X14,X17	WHITE	F	35-39	Some college	No HISP, WHITE

The racial/ethnic self-identification at recruitment time was as follows: three respondents self-identified as White; three as African American; two as American Indian; three as Hispanic; three as Asian; and one as Pacific Islander.

Every effort was made to recruit individuals in different age groups and educational levels within each race/ethnic group. However, given time constraints and regional demographic characteristics, the respondents tend to be more highly educated than average. It is likely, therefore, that barriers to navigating, understanding and answering these forms are minimized compared to the issues that the general population may experience.

Although this was not a focus at recruitments, two of the respondents were multiracial (13 percent, as in Phase I), and another respondent reported for a multiracial co-resident. In addition, in this sample four respondents (27 percent) lived in a household with someone of a different race. Table 2 shows characteristics of respondents organized by the form they were asked to complete.

7. Findings in Phase II

In this section we present finding associated with modifications to the race question items, including changing the question stem to “Is Person 1...,” adding spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander groups, dropping the term “Negro,” alphabetizing examples in Other Asian, and visibility of the Note that precedes the Hispanic origin question. Since some of these features are shared in two or all of the forms, we report findings together. Issues that pertain only to a specific form are discussed in a later section.

7.1 Reactions to Alternative Treatments

A. Alternate wording of the race question stem. After completing the information for Person 1, respondents were asked what information Q.9. was asking for. In one panel, this question was worded as “What is Person 1’s race?” and in the other two panels, it was worded as “Is Person 1...” The four respondents who answered the version “What is Person 1’s race?” said this question was asking for their race. When probed about the meaning of race, their responses spanned genetic characteristics (skin color) as well as cultural or ethnic background (“what you were originally born as”). That is, the concept of race involves not only phenotype, but also national origin and ancestry.

Eleven respondents answered the alternative form that asks “Is Person 1...” Their answers to the probe of what this question was asking for also implicated race, national origin and ethnicity. Four respondents said the question was asking specifically about their race. Two said it was asking for the national origin “for yourself or your parents if you came from any of these areas [on the form].” And five respondents said it was asking about ancestry or ethnicity, “Where my past generations are from.”

In the last section of the interview, respondents were shown the alternative version of the form they completed and asked how they would have answered it. Significantly, all the respondents said both forms of the question stem are asking for the same information, and that they would have answered the same way in either version.

Respondents were further probed about which of the two wordings they prefer. Eight of the 15 respondents said they prefer the question wording “What is Person 1’s race?” because it is “clearer” and gives specific guidance. An American Indian respondent said that this wording reinforces for him the need to “make your numbers count” and that there is an “element of pride in the word ‘race’.” Other comments include:

- “I think they are asking the same thing but only because [in “Is Person 1...”] you see the answers right away on [the category choices]. If the answers weren’t here, you could be asking anything, ‘Is Person 1 happy?’, ‘Is Person 1 sad?’ you know what I mean?” (Other respondents also mentioned the instructions in the Note told them that Q.9. is about “race.”)
- “It’s amazing how much that word ‘race’ makes a difference. It’s more definitive. It’s more of what we’ve been conditioned to think when we fill out job applications.”

There were five respondents who said they prefer the stem “Is Person 1...” because it allows them to self-identify by race, national origin or “ethnic features.” One of these respondents said that this wording “doesn’t make me feel like I’d be singled-out for any type of specific race.” Two other respondents said they found this stem easier to read.

There were two respondents who did not have a preference. One of them commented, “People who aren’t going to answer this question, aren’t going to answer this question just because the word ‘race’ has been left off.”

B. Spanners over Asian and Pacific Islander race categories. Two of the panels (X14 and X17) featured spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander race groups. Respondents were observed as they filled out their pre-assigned forms and then probed about what they thought of them. In the last part of the interview, when they were shown alternative panels, they were asked whether they preferred the form with or without spanners.

During the analysis, it was observed that respondents answering the form without spanners (X16) had only slight or no difficulty finding their response categories. In contrast, six respondents (two Asian, one Pacific Islander, two Hispanic and one American Indian) who answered the forms with spanners had some trouble finding their category or answering the race questions appropriately. While spanners do not necessarily explain all these instances, they do seem to affect the responses for the Asian and Pacific Islander respondents. These specific instances were:

- One Asian (Indian) respondent completing X14 thought the question ended at the American Indian and Alaska Native write-in and that the spanners belong to the next question: “Oh! There it is!...So [the] next question is Asian...this [Asian categories] is like the next question.”
- Another Asian (Sri Lankan) respondent thought Q.9. was three separate questions. She read “White, Black, American Indian” and said, “No, nothing. This one I’m not answering because there is nothing that I want there.” Then she continued reading and checked “Other Asian” in what she interpreted as the next question. Then she continued reading and checked “Some other race” and wrote in “Sinhalese Sri Lanka” next to “Some other race.”
- A Pacific Islander did not notice the Samoan category under the spanner. He marked Other Pacific Islander and wrote “Samoan” in the write-in block.

These findings stand in sharp contrast to respondents’ preferences regarding spanners. When asked to pick one, most respondents (10 out of 15) said they preferred the forms *with spanners* because they look “organized” and would help people find their response category faster “instead of looking at the whole list, they could look to what applies to them.” The Pacific Islander and two of the three Asian respondents in the sample favored the forms with spanners. Only one of the four Asian respondents did not like the spanners. She thought they were not useful since the checkboxes were already there. She also saw these spanners as “dividing people into different things.”

Another factor associated with the spanners was the sense of group recognition. For example, a White respondent said that the headings “Give respect to people from Hawaii” instead of lumping them together with Asian. She also mentioned, however, that some may think that these groups are being “singled out” for some reason.

Overall, five respondents out of 15, including the Asian mentioned above, said the headings were not necessary: “I don’t think they need to outline every single [race],” and “If you’re Japanese, I think you can tell you’re Asian.” Only one respondent was confused by the role of the headings and mentioned possible resentment from Native Hawaiians that they were placed with Asians.

C. Removal of term “Negro”. In Phase II, each respondent was probed about their views regarding the use of the term “Negro” on these forms. Consistent with findings in Phase I, this term elicited negative reactions from most respondents. Two out of the three Black respondents who were interviewed in this Phase II were offended by the use of this word on the forms. One of them said that she would not answer forms with the word Negro on it, and equated it to the N-word. The one Black respondent who did not object said that her grandmother has used that word but that she would not use it herself. Among 12 non-Black respondents, nine objected to having this term on the form, and only three said that some Blacks may identify with it. Overall, 11 out of the 15 respondents indicated that it was inappropriate to use this term. In fact, respondents often mentioned that they favor one of the forms (X17) *because* it did not contain the term “Negro” in the Black or African American race category. Reactions from all respondents to this term are summarized in Appendix VIII.

D. Ordering of examples under Other Asian. Two of the panels alphabetize the order of the examples in the Other Asian category (X14 and X17), and one (X16) does not. When probed about these examples, most respondents (10 out of 15) said they had not paid close attention to them. Respondents were again probed about the examples under Other Asian in the last part of the interview, when they were asked to compare alternative panels. Eight respondents said they prefer alphabetized examples because it is “polite,” “neater” or “doesn’t show any favoritism.” The other respondents did not think the order was important, and one added “as long as you have all you need.”

E. Note preceding the Hispanic origin question. These forms all preserve the traditional two-question format in which Hispanic origin is asked before race. These two questions are preceded by a Note meant to encourage answering both and that clarifies that Hispanic origin and race are different domains. The Note was the same in all the forms and read:

→ NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

Probing about the Note took place after respondents finished answering the questions for Person 2. Researchers asked whether the Note was read and how it was interpreted. Nearly all respondents, except for two, said they saw the instruction. Among those who saw it, however, only five interpreted it as telling them to answer both questions; even so, a respondent who understood the intent of the Note decided to skip the question about Hispanic origin “because I usually just fill out for American Indian.”

The rest of the respondents focused on different elements of the Note. In particular, two respondents said the Note was telling them to specify where they came from; four other respondents said the Note was telling them that one question was about Hispanic origin and the other about race, and that Hispanic origin and Hispanic race were different. There were also two respondents who admitted that they saw it but did not pay much attention to it.

Respondents were also probed about the meaning of the last phrase in the Note: “For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.” There were only three Hispanic respondents in this Phase; significantly, two of them understood the phrase as intended (that they had to choose a race in addition to Hispanic origin). The other Hispanic understood that she should pick a category from the race question, but did not know why: “if it’s asking me a race, I would have put ‘Hispanic,’ but it’s not considered a race, so I just put ‘White’...I don’t consider myself that much white [be]cause we have that mentality that White, is, like, American person.”

Consistent with findings reported in Phase I, the rest of the (non-Hispanic) respondents were puzzled or did not understand the reference of Hispanics not being a race. For two of them, this phrase was a way to target Hispanics because of immigration concerns. Others tried to affix an interpretation to the phrase, and their suggestions included that:

- “Hispanic” is not a nationality. Rather, “everyone has an origin and then within that we got races of people” such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.
- Hispanics should not answer the race question because they are not a race.

Although the three Hispanic respondents answered White in the race question, there was some evidence that two of them made exceptions based on shades of skin color. In one case, a Hispanic co-resident was described as “dark skinned” and reported as “mixed race” under “Some other race.” In the other case, one Hispanic parent had European ancestry and the other had South American Indian ancestry, so their child was reported as “Mestizo” under “Some other race.”

7.2 Examples and Terminology

Ordinarily, respondents tend to look for their own race category and give little attention to the examples for other groups. After completion of the forms, researchers asked respondents if they had noticed the examples for Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander, and what they thought of them. Most respondents said they had only skimmed them, and only five said they had actually read them. Respondents were asked to look at the examples if they had not done so before, and to tell researchers what they thought of them.

A. Comments about the examples. The main reaction that the examples elicited was surprise at the presence of Pakistani among the Other Asian examples. One respondent suggested that Pakistani should be listed with Indian or Arab groups. Another wondered if Pakistanis were being tracked for security reasons because there were no other Middle Eastern groups on the form: “I’d question kind of why that’s there, not sure whether it’s good or bad thing.” In

addition to these comments, some respondents mentioned that they were not familiar with “Hmong” or “Chamorro.”

In terms of the categories listed on the panels, a Hispanic respondent did not know at first what “African Am.” meant, although she was able to figure it out. No other issues were identified.

B. Other Terminology - “Some other race.” Respondents were about equally divided in their interpretation of “Some other race.” Six said that it was for groups not already listed on the form, another five said it was for multiracial/mixed-ethnicity persons, and four could not come up with an answer or example of who would fit into this category.

Those who said that “Some other race” was for groups not already listed suggested that people from the Middle East, India, Africa, and the Caribbean would fit in this category. A Sri Lankan respondent selected “Some other race” as her answer and said “they want to know about us who are not specified in these [other] categories...otherwise we would be excluded.” She also reported her U.S.-born child in this category and wrote “Sinhalese American” in the write in.

The respondents who said that “Some other race” was for multiracial/mixed-ethnicity persons gave as examples a person who is “Japanese and American,” “half Hawaiian and half Samoan” or people who “marry a person from a different race.”

As mentioned above, two Hispanic respondents selected “Some other race” and wrote “Mestizo” or “Mixture of races” in the write-in boxes for Hispanic co-residents they considered as having “darker skin.”

7.3 Multiracial and Multiethnic Reporting

Since these panels allow marking more than one race category, we were interested in how multiracial and multiethnic respondents would be reported. There were only four multiracial respondents reported in the sample.

A. Readability of “Mark one or more” instruction in race question. Respondents were asked if they had noticed the instruction “Mark one or more boxes” that followed the question stem. One third of the respondents said they did not see this instruction until probed about it. One issue may be that it is in small print and italics, so it is easily overlooked. One respondent suggested that this instruction would be more visible with a bold font and that the “X” mark was confusing. Another mentioned that an alternative location for the instruction could be as part of the Note above Q8 “because, otherwise, you just go straight through.”

Even though the “Mark one or more” was not always noticed, a few respondents said that they specifically looked for the instruction because they wanted to mark more than one race for themselves or a household member. A multiracial respondent said that even without the instruction he would have marked more than one.

When probed about how many races one could mark, some respondents said that the maximum number of origins could be two, but others said as many as applicable.

Consistent with Phase I, respondents varied in their propensity to report their multiracial backgrounds. One respondent said that he only marks American Indian. “Although I have European ancestry, I would never identify as European; I’ve always identified as being Native... If you mark both, somehow you are diminishing the count for American Indians.”

An Asian respondent said that multiple answers only applied to certain groups, such as “People in America. White people, Black people, American Indian people, Alaska Natives. Not to other nationalities.”

B. Patterns of multiracial/multiethnic reporting. There were only four multiracial persons in the sample for Phase II. In general, these respondents marked the boxes of the different groups they belong to with no difficulty. Only one respondent mentioned that he first looked for a single “multiracial” category before marking both White and Black.

During the interview, another respondent mentioned that he was part White and part American Indian, and asked, “Am I compelled to divulge if I’m a multi-racial person, do I have to put down each? Or the one that I identify as?” He said he was raised as American Indian, and that was the only one he marked.

Another issue that came up in this set of interviews is the difficulty of reporting U.S.-born children of immigrants. There were two instances, one Hispanic and one Asian parent trying to report their children born in the U.S. The Hispanic respondent wondered, “he was born here, so should I write ‘USA’ or the whole word?” She marked Other Hispanic and wrote ‘USA’ in the write in box. In the race question, she marked “Some other race” and wrote ‘Mestizo’ since “He is not total White, he is not Black...There’s no option here. He’s Mestizo...how do you say Mestizo in English?”

In the case of the Asian respondent, she also chose “Some other race” for a U.S.-born child and wrote “Singhalese American” in the write-in box. She added, “They don’t ask if you are American...they should specify somewhere if you’re American.”

Both situations suggest that some respondents are searching for a single identifier that would apply to “Americans” that are not White or Black.

8. General Issues and Recommendations for Phase II Panels

8.1 Issues Spanning the Set of Treatments

Except for issues related to the headings, all of our recommendations apply to the three forms that were pretested.

- Indentation of write-in boxes: Several respondents thought that the write-in boxes for American Indian and Alaska Native signaled the end of the question. We recommend indenting the write-in boxes as far as possible to the right to reduce visual separation between race categories.
- The headings or spanners over Asian and Pacific Islander also contribute to the appearance of segmentation within the question such that some respondents saw Q.9. as three questions instead of one. We recommend that the impact of the spanners on non-response be further assessed from the field data. Our findings from cognitive testing suggest that these headings may hinder rather than improve reporting.
- Respondents noticed that only “Other Pacific Islander” was underlined in one of the spanners, and wondered about the reason “Native Hawaiian and” was not underlined. We recommend that both lines be underlined.
- The instruction to “Mark [x] one or more” is easily overlooked. We recommend using the same bold font as in the question stem. In addition, respondents have seen that in earlier questions the instruction reads "Mark [x] ONE" so they may assume it is the same instruction. Removing the [x] may help indicate that this instruction is different.
- Negro was found to be offensive and considered inappropriate by most respondents. We recommend the permanent removal of this term. We also recommend spelling out “African American” since some respondents may not understand its abbreviation.
- Several respondents noticed that the font in the examples for Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander in form X16 was larger than the same items in X14 and X17 and commented that it was much more readable. We recommend that this be adopted whenever possible.
- Respondents also noticed that there was additional space between the Note and Q8 in one of the forms (X16) and suggested this should be the case in all the forms since the instructions are easier to see when they are not sandwiched between Q7 and Q8.

8.2 Navigation Issues and Recommendations by Specific Treatments

The formats tested in Phase II have features that are challenging for respondent navigation. These include the write-in boxes placed too far to the left, which when combined with spanners give the impression of several questions instead of a single one. This section details the navigation issues for the three formats, and presents our recommendations for revision of the formats.

A. Form X14. This form uses the wording “What is Person 1’s race?” and features spanners over the Asian and Pacific Islander categories. There was one instance of a respondent (American Indian) who read the stem as “What is a Person’s number one—number one’s—race?” Although we do not think this altered his particular response, we noticed similar situations in Phase I. The

In Phase II, three additional experimental versions were cognitively pretested with 15 English speakers from various racial/ethnic backgrounds recruited in the DC area. In Phase II, Hispanic origin and race data were collected in two separate questions. Pretested variations included the removal of “race” from the race stem question; the removal of “Negro” from the Black/African American category; addition of headings over the Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander categories; and alphabetizing the examples under Other Asian.

The main findings in Phase II include: (1) Respondents favor the forms that contain “race” in the question stem, although they also said their answer would not change if they received the form that shows a question stem without the term “race”; (2) respondents gave various reasons for which they like the headings over the Asian and NHOPi categories. However, headings also seem to make navigation more difficult particularly for Asian respondents; (3) the order of the examples under Other Asian did not seem to have any impact, but respondents said they preferred some rationalization for the order, either alphabetized or by population size; and (4) as in previous research, Hispanic respondents often were confused by the statement that “Hispanic origins are not races,” which in some cases was interpreted as the race question not being applicable to them.

A finding in both phases was that the term “Negro” was offensive for most respondents. A second finding common to all forms and Phases was that the “Mark X one or more” instruction was difficult to see because of its font size and type. Navigation was also difficult because the write-in lines were not indented and they seemed to segment the question. Some recommendations resulting from pretesting were implemented prior to printing the final forms, such as modifications to the example sets. Other recommendations and findings will be useful for evaluating the resulting data after Census 2010. In particular, changes in the “Some Other Race” category may reflect issues associated with usability of the formats, which may make it difficult to find some categories because of their location.

Emerging issues concern the need for further study about how immigrants of all races report their U.S.-born children, and whether this may lead to misreporting or misinterpretation of the data collected by the Census.

REFERENCES

- Cresce, Arthur and Roberto R Ramirez. 2003. "Analysis of General Hispanic Responses in Census 2000." *Population Division Working Paper No. 72*. U.S. Census Bureau.
- de la Puente, Manuel and Ruth B McKay. 1995. "Developing and Testing Race and Ethnic Origin Questions for the Current Population Survey Supplement on Race and Ethnic Origin." Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.
- Gerber, Eleanor R, and Melinda Crowley. 2005. "Report on Cognitive Testing of a Shortened Sequence of Hispanic Origin, Race and Modified Ancestry Questions: Content Development for the 2005 National Content Test". Report for the Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Gerber, Eleanor R, Manuel de la Puente, and Michael J Levin. 1998. "Race, Identity and New Question Options: Final Report of Cognitive Research on Race and Ethnicity." Report for the Center for Survey Methods Research, U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Gerber, Eleanor R and Manuel de la Puente. 1996. "The Development and Cognitive Testing of Race and Ethnic Origin Questions for the Year 2000 Census." *Proceedings of the Annual Research Conference*, U. S. Bureau of the Census. pp. 190-232
- Humes, Karen. 2009. "2010 Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment: Race and Hispanic Origin Treatments." *Population Division Report*. Revised June 15, 2009.
- Martin, Elizabeth A. 2006. "The Effects of Questionnaire Design on Reporting of Detailed Hispanic Groups in Census 2000 Mail Questionnaires." *Statistical Research Division Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2006-11)*. U.S. Census Bureau.
- Martin, Elizabeth A and Eleanor R Gerber. 2005. "Results of Recent Methodological Research on the Hispanic Origin and Race Questions." *Statistical Research Division Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2005-04)*. U.S. Census Bureau.
- National Research Council. 2007. "Experimentation and Evaluation Plans for the 2010 Census: Interim Report." Panel on the Design of the 2010 Census Program of Evaluations and Experiments. Lawrence D. Brown, Michael L. Cohen, and Daniel L. Cork (editors). Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Ramirez, Roberto R. 2005. "Analysis of Multiple Origin Reporting to the Hispanic Origin Question in Census 2000." *Population Division Working Paper No. 77*. U.S. Census Bureau.
- Willis, Gordon. 2004. *Cognitive Interviewing, A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX I: Treatments Pretested in Phase I – Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9

Figure 1. FORM X9/B1

→ **NOTE:** Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

- 8. Is Person 1 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin? Mark one or more boxes.**
- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
 - Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
 - Yes, Puerto Rican
 - Yes, Cuban
 - Yes, another Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin — *Print one or more origins, for example, Colombian, Dominican, Ecuadorian, Guatemalan, Honduran, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- 9. What is Person 1's race? Mark one or more boxes.**

- White (*For example, German, Moroccan, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian, and so on.*)
- Black, African Am., or Negro (*For example, African American, Haitian, Nigerian, and so on.*)
- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe, for example, Sioux, Aleut, Mayan, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean | <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese | <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian — <i>Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, Bangladeshi, and so on.</i> ↘ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander — <i>Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, Marshallese, and so on.</i> ↘ | |

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race — *Print race.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 2. FORM X2/B2a

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes AND write in the specific race(s) or origin(s).

White — Print origin(s), for example, German, Moroccan, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Black, African Am., or Negro — Print origin(s), for example, African American, Haitian, Nigerian, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano Puerto Rican Cuban

Other Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — Print origin(s), for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe(s), for example, Sioux, Aleut, Mayan, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Asian Indian Chinese Filipino

Japanese Korean Vietnamese

Other Asian — Print origin(s), for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Native Hawaiian Guamanian or Chamorro Samoan

Other Pacific Islander — Print origin(s), for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on. ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Some other race or origin — Print race(s) or origin(s). ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 3. FORM X3/B2b

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes AND write in the specific race(s) or origin(s).

- White — *Print origin(s), for example, German, Moroccan, Portuguese, Middle Eastern, Russian, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Black, African Am., or Negro — *Print origin(s), for example, African American, Haitian, Nigerian, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — *Print origin(s), for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe(s), for example, Sioux, Aleut, Mayan, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Asian — *Print origin(s), for example, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander — *Print origin(s), for example, Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro, Samoan, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race or origin — *Print race(s) or origin(s).* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 4. FORM X4/B2c

→ Please answer BOTH Questions 8A and 8B about race and origin.

8A. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Some other race or origin

8B. Write in Person 1's specific race, origin, or enrolled or principal tribe (for example, Australian, Chinese, Dominican, German, Haitian, Iranian, Mexican, Nigerian, Sioux, Samoan, Thai, Tongan, Yup'ik, and so on).

Write in the specific race(s), origin(s) or tribe(s). ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 5. FORM X5/B2d

8. What is Person 1's race or origin? Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Puerto Rican
- Cuban
- Other Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — *Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Asian Indian Japanese Native Hawaiian
- Chinese Korean Guamanian or Chamorro
- Filipino Vietnamese Samoan
- Other Asian — *Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.* ↘
- Other Pacific Islander — *Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race or origin — *Print race or origin.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX II: Treatments Pretested in Phase II – Forms X14, X16 and X17

Figure 6. FORM X14/B4a

→ **NOTE:** Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

8. Is Person 1 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — *Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

9. What is Person 1's race? Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Asian

Native Hawaiian and
Other Pacific Islander

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean | <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese | <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian — <i>Print for example, Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Pakistani, Thai, and so on.</i> ↴ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander — <i>Print for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.</i> ↴ | |

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race — *Print race.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 7. FORM X16/B4c

→ NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

8. Is Person 1 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — *Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

9. Is Person 1 ... Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean | <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese | <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian — <i>Print, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian, and so on.</i> ↴ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander — <i>Print, for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.</i> ↴ | |

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race — *Print below.* ↴

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Figure 8. FORM X17/B4d

→ NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 8 about Hispanic origin and Question 9 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

8. Is Person 1 of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — *Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

9. Is Person 1 ... Mark one or more boxes.

- White
- Black or African Am.
- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Asian

Native Hawaiian and
Other Pacific Islander

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean | <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese | <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian — <i>Print for example, Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Pakistani, Thai, and so on.</i> ↘ | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander — <i>Print for example, Fijian, Tongan, and so on.</i> ↘ | |

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Some other race — *Print below.* ↘

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX III: Phase I Respondents’ Rankings -- Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9

This appendix presents information on the respondents’ ranking of forms in Phase I. The reader is reminded that respondents were shown two additional forms after they completed their assigned form, thus these rankings are conditional on the subset of forms respondents saw. The plan for selecting the comparisons is presented below in Table III-A. The rows show the forms that respondents filled out as their primary form, and the columns show the forms that were shown to respondents in the last part of the interview. For example, respondents who answered form X9 were shown forms X3 and X4 in the last part of the interview for their assessment and feedback; and, respondents who answered form X3 were shown forms X2 and X5, and so on. The main criterion was to match forms that had contrasting features, such as checkboxes vs. write-in boxes, examples vs. no examples, etc., in order to elicit respondents’ views about them.

Table III-A. Main and Secondary Forms Shown to Respondents

Main form filled out by R	Secondary Forms seen for comparison				
	X9/B1	X2/B2a	X3/B2b	X4/B2c	X5/B2d
X9/B1: Hispanic origin and race are two separate questions. May choose more than one Hispanic box and shows modified examples in the Hispanic category. In the race item, examples provided for White, Black, AIAN, Other Asian, and Other Pacific Islander. Write-in box for AIAN, Other Asian, Other Pacific Islander and Some other race. White, Black, and specific Asian origins feature checkboxes.			√	√	
X2/B2a: Combined race and Hispanic origin question. Examples given for White, Black, Other Hispanic, AIAN, Other Asian, and Other Pacific Islander. Write-in box for every category except some specific Asian and Hispanic origins that feature checkboxes.	√			√	
X3/B2b: Combined race and Hispanic origin question. Asian races and Hispanic origins condensed into broad ‘Asian’ and ‘Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin’ categories. All checkboxes have an additional write-in preceded by detailed examples.		√			√
X4/B2c: Combined race and Hispanic origin question. Very condensed; contains two parts, labeled ‘8A’ and ‘8B’. First part lists only major racial/ethnic categories with no examples. Second part consists of three lines of write-in space to provide “specific race(s), origin(s), or enrolled or principal tribe(s).”	√				√
X5/B2d: Alternate control. Combined race and Hispanic origin questions. Write-in boxes and detailed examples for Other Hispanic, Other Asian, and Other Pacific Islander.		√	√		

In Table III-B we show the patterns that emerged from the combined rankings. The first column shows the forms as they were shown to respondents for their evaluation and feedback. The second column shows the percentage and number of respondents who preferred the form they

filled out first. This varies substantially by form. Those who filled out X4 and X3 as their main forms were more likely to say that it was their favorite compared to those who filled out X2, X9 and X5. The third column shows the percentage and number of all respondents that preferred a form when they saw it either as their primary or secondary form. The last column in Table III-B shows that overall the preferred forms were X4 and X3; and, the least preferred were X2 and X9. Specifically, 19 out of the 39 respondents (49 percent) who saw form X4 and two other forms said they favor X4 over the others. Similarly, 12 out of the 32 respondents (or 38 percent) who saw X3 favored it over the others.

Table III-B. Ranking of Forms by Respondents in Phase I

Form # (other forms shown)	% Rs who preferred the form they filled out	% of Rs who preferred this form (but did not fill out; saw it as secondary form)...		Cumulative % of Rs who preferred this form (saw it as principal or secondary form)
X2 (X4/X9)	1/14 (7.1%)	N=22 saw it with X3,X5	8/22 (36.4%)	9/36 (25.0%)
X3 (X2/X5)	3/8 (37.5%)	N=10 saw it with X9,X4 N=14 saw it with X5,X2	5/10 (50.0%) 4/14 (28.6%)	12/32 (37.5%)
X4 (X5/X9)	6/15 (40.0%)	N=10 saw it with X9,X3 N=14 saw it with X2,X9	2/10 (20.0%) 11/14 (78.6%)	19/39 (48.7%)
X5 (X2/X3)	4/14 (28.6%)	N= 8 saw it with X3,X2 N=15 saw it with X4,X9	3/8 (37.5%) 6/15 (40.0%)	13/37 (35.1%)
X9 (X3/X4)	3/10 (30.0%)	N=14 saw it with X2,X4 N=15 saw it with X4,X5	2/14 (14.3%) 3/15 (20.0%)	8/39 (20.5%)

Respondents' preferences were often highly conditional. They told us they liked a particular form but "assumed" certain changes in it would be made. Respondents' comments confirmed the relative nature of their assessments. Sometimes these "conditions" appeared contradictory, such as a stated preference for a "concise" format, but with the proviso that extra examples be added:

- "X5 is better, it's more concise. The only thing I would improve in X5 is to add examples of Black, African American and Negro (as in X2)."
- "X4 has a simple layout, easy to read, and space to write two or more origins. Not overwhelming like X2 and X9."
- And, in contrast, another respondent said, "[X4 is] not as good as X3 because it looks for very general information."

Similarly, respondents often prefer to check a box, but also mention that too many boxes make forms look "too busy" and confusing.

Because these judgments are conditional on the other forms they saw, and sometimes the answers were contradictory, we do not consider these rankings stable. However, these comparisons allow us to see what features overall respondents mentioned in a positive and

negative light. There were some recurring themes associated with the forms that respondents said they liked best, as well as some frequently mentioned undesirable characteristics.

Visual complexity

- Respondents said they prefer straightforward layouts such that they are able to glance at the form, digest what is being asked, and quickly see choices that are relevant to them.
- Forms are easier to read when they have “good flow,” visually neat and organized, simple layout.
 - Forms that have clear instructions, less wordy, and with a shorter list of examples to skim through are “easier to handle.”

Checkbox and write-in boxes

- In general, respondents prefer to check a box, but there was mention that too many boxes make forms look “too busy” and confusing.
- Where respondents prefer write-in boxes, they say they prefer having more freedom to specify background/origin. “There is more space, and it’s less broken.” “Could list more of her tribal affiliation.”
- Some Rs like having a single write-in box for each race/origin: “You only check one box and then you decide what your country of origin is.” “Gives more freedom to define yourself.” “Whatever you want to put in the box, you can”.

Examples

- Some respondents liked the examples next to the checkbox and other preferred a single list of examples, “You just mark whatever you think is best without reading everything.”

One or two questions

- Several respondents said that one question is better than two, “It’s a lot clearer to me, probably because it’s just one question.” “I liked the organization a lot better, and I like that it’s one question [for race and Hispanic origin].” Some Hispanic respondents said they would skip the race question since it does not seem to apply to them.
- There were some respondents who liked the separation of Hispanic origin from race, “Takes you step by step and breaks it down instead of (you) having to pick only one.”

Undesirable features in a form

- Forms that require too much reading.
- Visually complex forms where everything seems jumbled together.
- “Too many boxes close together, you don’t know if you’re Asian Indian or American Indian.” “At first glance you just see a bunch of boxes...”
- A respondent said that having a checkbox plus a write-in box seems like an essay, too much work.
- Too many choices, people can easily make mistakes when choosing the write-in box. Several respondents said the write-in spaces seem to cut the question into different parts.

APPENDIX IV: Phase II Respondents' Rankings -- Forms X14, X16 and X17

In this appendix we present information on the respondents' relative ranking of forms in Phase II. Each respondent was shown the two other alternative forms after they completed their assigned form. In Table IV-A (below) we show the combined rankings. The first column in Table IV-A shows the form that was assigned for completion to respondents (alternative forms shown are in parentheses). The second column shows the percentage and number of respondents who preferred the form they filled out first after comparing it to the two other forms. The third column shows the percentage and number of all respondents that preferred a form when they saw it after they had completed their assigned form. The last column in Table IV-A summarizes the overall ranking for each form, combining all responses.

Unlike the rankings in Phase I, this group of respondents had clear preferences. In general, they rejected the forms with the term "Negro" in the Black or African American race category and preferred the forms with banners over the Asian and Pacific Islander groups. Since X17 contains both features, it was the most popular form, with 7 out of 15 respondents giving it top ranking. The least preferred form was X16 (respondents often mentioned that this was their lowest ranked form because of the term "Negro" and the absence of spanners) with only 2 respondents choosing it as the best.

Table IV-A. Ranking of Forms by Respondents in Phase II[§]

Form # (other forms shown)	% Rs who preferred the form they filled out	% of Rs who preferred this form (but did not fill out; saw it as secondary form)...		Cumulative % of Rs who preferred this form (saw it as principal or secondary form)
X14 (X16/X17)	2/4 (50.0%)	N=11	2/11 (18.2%)	4/15 (26.7%)
X16 (X14/X17)	0/5 (0.0%)	N=10	2/10 (20.0%)	2/15 (13.3%)
X17 (X14/X16)	5/6 (83.3%)	N=9	2/9 (22.2%)	7/15 (46.7%)

[§] Note: Two respondents (both answering X16) liked some features in one form, and not others. They could not provide a ranking or refuse to choose a preferred form.

Reactions to the term "Negro" were, at times quite negative, and the individual responses have been summarized and documented in Appendix VIII. Only two respondents suggested conditional rankings associated with changes in the forms. These were:

- One respondent said he liked X17 the best, but with the stem "What is Person 1's race?"
- Another respondent preferred X14, but without "Negro" on it.

In addition to the term "Negro," the rankings shown in Table 3 hinged on three other features that respondents mentioned as liking or disliking, either spontaneously or after probing: The wording in the question stem, the use of spanners and, after probing, the ordering of the examples under Other Asian. These factors are discussed in the Findings for Phase II section.

Desirable features in a form

When asked to justify their rankings, respondents consistently mentioned some features they considered positive. The list below shows these features:

- Short, can be filled out quickly.
- Forms that look organized, structured. Spanners were perceived as improving the appearance of the form and speeding the search for the response category.
- Familiar formats that do not demand too much effort to figure out (In this phase, respondents commented this in connection with the question stem, “What is Person 1’s race?”)
- Clear and full wording of questions so that there is no doubt about what is being asked. “What is Person 1’s race?” was considered clearer than “Is this person...”
- Logical order, such as alphabetizing examples.
- Space in the form and between the questions, as well as between the Note and the question.
- Larger print size. Respondents commented that they liked the bigger font used in one of the forms for the Other Asian examples.

APPENDIX V: Phase I Expert Review Board Recommendations – Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9

**Alternative Questionnaire Experiment Race and Hispanic Origin Items
PANELS X2, X3, X4, X5 AND X9
Expert Review Panel Meeting – Summary of Findings/Recommendations
November 20, 2008**

Background

During the 2010 Census, four experiments will be conducted to explore alternate content and ways to reduce cost for the 2020 Census. One of these planned experiments is the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE). The AQE tests alternate content for the 2010 Census mail questionnaire, including items on overcount and race and Hispanic origin. Testing this alternate content involves including new items on the mail questionnaire, testing these items with a sample of census respondents, and then analyzing the effects of the alternate content. Before these new items can be field tested with census respondents, they must undergo study to meet the Census Bureau's pre-testing standards.

To meet the pre-testing standards, the questionnaire items for the AQE are undergoing cognitive testing to gauge respondents' reaction to and understanding of the items being presented. In addition to this cognitive testing, an expert review panel was convened to examine the five race and Hispanic origin experimental panels undergoing cognitive testing. The panel was comprised of 7 subject matter experts in the areas of race and Hispanic origin, and questionnaire design and content. Several of the members had conducted cognitive testing of race and Hispanic origin content in the past, and had knowledge of respondent reactions to different types of content and item layouts. In addition, several of the panel members had an understanding of the history of race and Hispanic questionnaire content in the census as well as other venues.

Panel members reviewed the five experimental panels and wrote summaries of their findings, focusing on six general areas: layout, instructions, wording, assumptions, response categories, and sensitivity. The panel then met on November 20, 2008 to discuss their findings. What follows is a compilation of findings of the reviewers, taken from their summaries and discussion. Overall comments on the forms, including common concerns across forms are presented first. Each experimental panel is then discussed in more detail with comments specific to that form.

Panel members: Dee Alexander, Eleanor Gerber, Terry DeMaio, Patti Goerman, Caribert Irazi, Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, and Yuling Pan.

Report prepared by: Heather Madray

Overall Comments

In both the summaries and the discussions, common themes arose with regard to the experimental panels, with many concerns and issues found in many or all of the forms. These concerns are listed below:

- **Write-in boxes** – It was the general consensus of the expert panel that the write-in boxes for all but one of the panels were too far to the left. Panel members raised concern that the placement of the write-in boxes gives the impression of several distinct questions instead of one question. The placement of the boxes on the left may also overshadow the check boxes below, causing respondents to miss items. The panel was in agreement that the write-in boxes should be aligned under the text, as in panel X3, form B2b.
- **Examples** – Panel members raised concern that there were too many examples given for response categories in some panels. Instead of offering possible response options, reviewers were concerned that examples looked like an all-inclusive list and would limit responses rather than encourage them. Several reviewers also commented that the examples given were not common, or readily recognizable, to most respondents and may cause confusion. The recommendation was made to reduce examples, where possible, and provide more common, easily recognizable ethnicities and origins. One suggestion to reduce confusion was to use country names rather than adjectives. The recommendation was also made to eliminate parentheses around the examples, as respondents frequently do not read information that is in parentheses.
- **Abbreviations** – In all the panels, the word ‘American’ is abbreviated in some places and not in others. Panel members regarded this as a sensitivity issue and concern was raised that this may alienate, and even confuse, some respondents. The recommendation was made to spell out ‘American’ in all response categories.
- **Layout** – In several of the panels, there is a combination of horizontal and vertical layouts with the response options. There is also triple banking with the Asian and Hispanic origins. Visually, this mix of layouts may cause respondents to miss particular categories, especially those that are triple banked. Given space limitations on the form, no specific remedy was recommended other than this issue should be taken into account in future interpretation of results.
- **Hispanic Origin** – Many panel members raised concern regarding the treatment of Hispanic origin on panels X2-5. While the Census Bureau wants information on both Hispanic origin and race, these panels do not make it clear that both forms of information are needed. Census is making the assumption that respondents know that race and Hispanic origin are two different concepts. At the same time, the phrase ‘Hispanic origins are not races’ has caused confusion and alienation among some Hispanics. No specific recommendation regarding this issue came out of the group, other than this concern will need to be addressed when analyzing the AQE results. One participant during the panel meeting did note that by combining the race and Hispanic origin items, we will be challenging the notion of a separation between these two concepts. While combining these concepts is in opposition to the OMB definition of race and Hispanic origin, it was noted that combining them is more in accordance with the public’s view of race and ethnicity.

- **Use of the Word ‘Origin’** – There was some concern about the use of the word ‘origin’ alone, especially with recent immigrants of Hispanic origin. A panel member noted that many recent immigrants want to identify their children’s origin as the U.S. One of the panel members cited a report from the pretesting of the bilingual questionnaire in which the recommendation was made to use the term ‘ethnic origin’ or ‘origin of one’s ancestors’ to avoid this potential problem. This wording, however, has never been cognitively tested, with more research required to explore alternative wordings.
- **White and Black response options** – Many panel members noted that having write-ins for white and black respondents may be problematic, as many white and black respondents either do not know their ethnic origin or ancestry, or have multiple origins. Having these write-in categories may confuse respondents and increase non-response.
- **American Indian and Alaska Native response categories** – It was voiced by several panel members that the inclusion of ‘Mayan’ as an example in the AIAN category may confuse Hispanic respondents while alienating AIAN respondents. It was recommended that it be removed. In addition, as a special note, one panel member did voice the recommendation of tribal governments that a question be added to the questionnaire asking if the respondent is an enrolled member of a federally recognized tribe. Some panel members did say that a similar question has been cognitively tested in the past but has not been placed on the form due to space issues. If future revisions of the race and Hispanic origin question(s) allow for more space on the form, perhaps this item could be included as part of the 2020 testing cycle.
- **Translation Issues** – While the expert review did not cover the Spanish version of the forms, one reviewer noted possible issues if translation is undertaken. Problems with the translation of the word ‘origin’ was also noted, with the suggestion being made that Hispanic should come before the word origin in translations to avoid confusion. Translation issues were also noted for the word ‘tribe’ as Spanish speakers frequently misinterpret this word. The recommendation was made to use the term ‘tribu indigena’ on the Spanish form to eliminate confusion.
- **“Some other race”** – Some panel members raised concern that the “Some other race” category will not be very visible as it comes at the very end of the response categories. It was also noted that the phrase “Some other race” may be deemed as insensitive or dismissive. The recommendation was made to drop the word “some,” and instead have “Other race.”

Form X9/B1 – Modified Hispanic Origin and Race (Combination Question)

This panel is closest to the control panel in layout and design. The purpose of this experimental panel is to (a) test a modified set of examples in the Hispanic origin and some of the race categories (Other Asian and Other PI); (b) to test the addition of examples in some categories that did not have them previously (White, Black and AIAN); and (c) to test an instruction that allows reporting of multiple origins (e.g., ‘Mexican’ and ‘Cuban’) and mixed origins (e.g., ‘Not Hispanic’ and ‘Puerto Rican’) similar to the instruction that allows multiple race reporting. Panel members noted that it was busy and inconsistent in design, which may cause confusion among respondents. Also, many of the problems with the control are carried over onto this form.

The following specific issues were identified with this panel:

- There is not enough space between the note above item 8 and item 7. Respondents may become confused about which question the note pertains to.
- The first response category in item 8 may be missed due to its proximity to the previous instruction. While the ‘No’ is bolded to set it apart, the recommendation was made to put a space between the instruction and response category if possible.
- There is not enough space for AIAN respondents to write their enrolled or principal tribe. There is also not enough room, in general, for respondents to write-in multiple origins, despite the fact that they are given the option of doing so.
- The instruction ‘Hispanic origins are not races’ may be problematic for Hispanic respondents. The issue was raised that in previous testing, some Hispanic respondents view this as a skip instruction, telling them not to respond to the race question if they answered ‘yes’ to the Hispanic origin question. Other cognitive interview respondents, both Hispanic and non-Hispanic, have found this instruction offensive.
- The location of the “Some other race” category will likely be missed by some R’s, resulting in either non-response or respondents choosing categories that they do not identify with, but are easy to find.
- The instruction ‘Mark X one or more boxes’ wraps to the second line on item 8. Concern was raised that this might cause respondents to miss the instruction.

Form X2/B2a - Detailed Categories

The purpose of this panel is to test a combined question design that provides write-in areas for all major response categories, as well as includes the detailed group checkboxes found in the 2010 Census Hispanic origin and race questions. The inclusion of the detailed group checkboxes will test the level of reporting of these groups, when compared with panel B2b/X3. New examples and a special instruction are also included.

Overall, panel members were mixed about layout and design of this form. Some panel members believed that the layout was an improvement over X9, while others believed it was still too busy and complicated for respondents. Specific concerns regarding the form are as follows:

- The instruction for item 8 is incorrect. It asks respondents to ‘Mark X one or more boxes AND write-in the specific race(s) or origin(s)’. Not all response categories, however, have write-in areas. Respondents, therefore, cannot follow our instruction and may become confused or write their origin onto another line. The recommendation was made to change the instruction to reflect that origin should only be written when a write-in space is available.
- The instruction stem in item 8 is singular while the rest is plural. Since the stem is bolded, the rest may be ignored, leading respondents to mark only one race or origin.
- The suggestion was made to include a specific example from the Middle East, as all other examples are specific nationalities.

Form X3/B2b - Streamlined

The purpose of this panel is to test a combined question design that is streamlined and provides write-in areas for all major response categories. New examples and a special instruction area also included. Panel members noted that this item was well designed with a ‘clean’ layout. It was also noted that the inclusion of write-ins for all response categories was more egalitarian than many of the other experimental panels. In addition, the instruction for this panel was accurate and well matched to the response categories. Specific concerns regarding this panel are as follows:

- Because of the prominence of the write-in boxes on the form, the check boxes to the left may be overlooked. In previous cognitive testing, some respondents have noted that the checkboxes look like decoration.
- The suggestion was made to include a specific example from the Middle East, as all other examples are specific nationalities.
- The length of the question, along with the number of write-ins, may imply an increased burden to respondents. This could increase non-response.

Form X4/B2c – Very Streamlined

The purpose of this panel is to test a combined question design that is extremely streamlined. New examples and a special instruction are also included. While this approach may be reminiscent of the three-question approach tested in the 2005 National Census Test, there are important differences. This approach does not ask for the same information three times (i.e., a person reporting ‘Mexican’ for the Hispanic origin question, the race question, and the ancestry question). Further, this approach does not use a question on ancestry to capture detailed race and ethnic groups.

Panel members noted that this version is very streamlined and visually appealing because it is less crowded than the other experimental panels. In addition, item 8A has a format that respondents are used to seeing when answering questions regarding race and origin. There were some concerns noted with this form. They are as follows:

- The numbering of the questions as 8A and 8B was noted as a potential problem. It appears as though 8B is optional, and may result in individuals only marking their race or origin in item 8A. The recommendation was made to renumber the items as 8 and 9.
- The instruction above 8A is too close to item 7. It may be confused as referring to item 7 and be missed. The recommendation was made to create more space between item 7 and 8A. The arrow may also be ignored. The suggestion was made to remove the arrow and put ‘NOTE’ instead, as in the control.
- The instruction above the write-in boxes for 8B is redundant. It was suggested that the instruction be removed and replaced with an instruction that more than one response can be provided.
- Some of the examples in 8B are not readily recognizable ethnicities and may confuse respondents. The suggestion was made to have more ‘central’, easily recognizable examples and to possibly reduce the list so it is not mistaken as an all-inclusive list.
- Concern was raised that there may be too many write-in boxes for item 8B, increasing the possibility that Census will receive more information than needed, resulting in coding difficulties. The concern was also raised that we are asking for a race, origin, or tribe, and that we provide three lines. This may give the impression that respondents should provide one of each.
- It is not clear that enrolled or principal tribe in 8B is referring to AIAN groups. It was suggested that this be made clearer in the instruction.
- One respondent noted that the ‘specific race’ wording in 8B seems confusing. There is only one race, which has been reported in 8A and the intended write-ins are for specific origins. Changing this wording would be a departure from the wording in the other panels.

Form X5/B2d – Alternative Control

The purpose of this experimental panel is to provide an alternative ‘control’, which will be used when evaluating data from the combined question approach. It was believed that this alternative ‘control’ was needed due to the numerous design differences between the 2010 Census form and the experimental panels that utilize a combined question approach. Creating an alternative ‘control’ that also utilizes a combined question approach may help significantly reduce confounding effects.

Some panel members noted that this experimental panel is less crowded than B2a/X2 and B2b/X3, making it more visually appealing than some of the other forms, although opinions on this issue were mixed. The instruction on this version is also simple and is set apart from the previous item, making it easy to find. Most of the problems noted with this version were the common issues that were found with the other forms, such as a mix of vertical and horizontal layouts and non-central example lists for origins. A couple of specific concerns were noted:

- Due to the layout of the form, respondents may never get beyond the AIAN category. The write-in box for this and the previous response category looks like a divider and may discourage respondents from looking for an appropriate response category below these lines.
- The information below the AIAN response category is double and triple banked, with the density making it difficult to sort through. Since there is space at the bottom of this form, the recommendation was made to double bank the Asian response categories to make the section less dense and attempt to increase response to this item.

APPENDIX VI: Phase II Expert Review Board Recommendations – Forms X14, X16 and X17

**Alternative Questionnaire Experiment Race and Hispanic Origin Items
Panels X14, X16 AND X17
Expert Review Panel Meeting – Summary of Findings/Recommendations
January 26, 2009**

Background

During the 2010 Census, four experiments will be conducted to explore alternate content and ways to reduce cost for the 2020 Census. One of these planned experiments is the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE). The AQE tests alternate content for the 2010 Census mail questionnaire, including items on overcount and race and Hispanic origin. Testing this alternate content involves including new items on the mail questionnaire, testing these items with a sample of census respondents, and then analyzing the effects of the alternate content. Before these new items can be field tested with census respondents, they must undergo study to meet the Census Bureau's pre-testing standards.

To meet the pre-testing standards, the questionnaire items for the AQE are undergoing cognitive testing to gauge respondents' reaction to and understanding of the items being presented. In addition to this cognitive testing, an expert review panel was convened to examine the three race and Hispanic origin experimental panels currently undergoing testing. Previous testing has been conducted on five other AQE panels, including an expert review. Those results are compiled in an earlier report.

This panel was comprised of 4 subject matter experts in the areas of race and Hispanic origin, and questionnaire design and content. Several of the members had conducted cognitive testing of race and Hispanic origin content in the past, and had knowledge of respondent reactions to different types of content and item layouts. In addition, panel members had an understanding of the history of race and Hispanic questionnaire content in the census as well as other venues.

Panel members reviewed the three experimental panels and wrote summaries of their findings, focusing on six general areas: layout, instructions, wording, assumptions, response categories, and sensitivity. The panel then met on January 26, 2009 to discuss their findings. What follows is a compilation of findings of the reviewers, taken from their summaries and discussion. Overall comments on the forms, including common concerns across forms are presented first. Each experimental panel is then discussed in more detail with comments specific to that form.

Panel members: Dee Alexander, Terry DeMaio, Patricia Goerman, and Yuling Pan.
Report prepared by: Heather Madray

Overall Comments

Layout

- Indent the write-in boxes.

Instructions

- The arrows following the instructions are placed too high, especially for AIAN. Since the write-in boxes do not extend as far to the right as the arrow is. Perhaps in actual form the arrows will be placed so they have a better connection to the write-in boxes in the final version.
- There should be a period after the AIAN instruction to be consistent with all other.
- The wording “Print for example, ...” does not sound grammatically correct. It should be “Print name, for example, ...” or “Print race, for example, ...”
- Insert a comma after “print” in the instructions for the Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander categories.
- Make instructions consistent for Other Pacific Islander by having “Print, for example” in the first line.
- Remove the word ‘Other’ from the banner for ‘Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander’. The word ‘other’ is not consistent with the response categories below, as there is a Native Hawaiian category, an ‘Other Pacific Islander’ category, and then two other categories in addition.
- If possible, may be beneficial to fit ‘Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander’ banner on one line.

Wording

- The abbreviation of American as in “African Am.” is troublesome. The abbreviation of “Am.” is not a commonly used abbreviation, and this is the first occurrence of such an abbreviation in the 2010 census form. It may cause some confusion to respondents.
- Drop “some” from “other race” category (difficult to spot). This is also a potentially sensitive wording.

Sensitivity

- The word “Negro” sounds negative and outdated.
- Term “Some other race” may offend some respondents.

Response categories

- Add another example to the Other Pacific Islander category.
- Alphabetizing: The order of examples in Other Asian is not in any logical order for two panels. Item non-response or errors might vary for a given group based on the location of their example on the form. It was recommended to use alphabetical order in arranging the examples.

X14/B4a: This panel tests removing “race” from Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander, alphabetizing Other Asian examples, and including “banners” for Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander.

Layout

- Banners – Issues:
 - May increase the cognitive burden for respondents because they have to figure out what they mean. There are no checkboxes or instructions attached to them.
 - May give the impression that this is a new question.
 - May decrease the prominence of the “Some Other Race” response category (aligned under the Asian categories, and not otherwise delineated in any way).
- Suggestions: Move Asian banner further left on the form to line up on top of the check boxes. Move the response boxes for the second column (Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) closer to the first column (Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino). Alternatively, move the Asian heading to the left margin and inserting a vertical line between the Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander response options.

Wording

- The wording of the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander banner should be changed. Two of the categories in the column, Samoan and Guamanian or Chamorro, do not fit under the header. The word “Other” should be deleted because the column contains Native Hawaiian and several Pacific Islander categories.

Assumptions

- This form version assumes that the six categories of people listed under the “Asian” heading would describe themselves as such. May not be the case for recent immigrants.

Sensitivity

- The term “Asian” may be sensitive to some.

X16/B4c: This panel tests the overall strategy of removing the “race” term in the question by changing the question stem to exclude the term “race” and removing “race” from Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander instructions.

Layout and wording

- By using a question stem rather than an entire question, the question mark has been completely eliminated. The other option would be to put a question mark after each response category. This option was discussed but not recommended.
- Removing the word “race” from the question stem makes the question incomplete. This is not a full sentence. It does not have a key question word or a question mark at the end of each category.
- This wording may create extra cognitive burden for respondents to figure out what this question is asking. This can be more problematic for respondents with lower level of education.
- This incomplete sentence or lead-in question stem may create extra problems for translation.
- This version raises a new concern with regards to Hispanic respondents. The elimination of the term ‘race’ in the main question may cause confusion as Hispanic respondents have already responded to a question about Hispanic origin.
- It was suggested by one panel member that, if this form is used in 2020, that we drop the boxes and put a line in place of them.

Assumptions

- Form is assuming the respondent will know we want to capture race. This is a very important category that needs to be precise and clear to respondent.
- This form assumes that Hispanic respondents will find a category that they believe to be representative of themselves after having already filled out the Hispanic origin question.

Sensitivity

- May be sensitive for Hispanic respondents who have a difficult time filling it out.
- The word “Negro” sounds negative and outdated.
- The term “Asian” may be sensitive to some.

Response Categories

- Though this question version goes to great lengths to eliminate the word “race,” it still appears in “Some Other Race” category (but no changes recommend on this basis).
- The word “race” in “some other race” may be more confusing.

X17/B4d: This panel tests changing the question stem, removing “race” from Other Asian and Other Pacific Islander, alphabetizing Other Asian examples, and including “banners” for Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and deleting Negro from the Black category.

Layout and wording

- By using a question stem rather than an entire question, the question mark has been completely eliminated. The other option would be to put a question mark after each response category. This option was discussed but not recommended.
- Removing the word “race” from the question stem makes the question incomplete. This is not a full sentence. It does not have a key question word or a question mark at the end of each category.
- This wording may create extra cognitive burden for respondents to figure out what this question is asking. This can be more problematic for respondents with lower level of education.
- This incomplete sentence or lead-in question stem may create extra problems for translation.
- This version raises a new concern with regards to Hispanic respondents. The elimination of the term ‘race’ in the main question may cause confusion as Hispanic respondents have already responded to a question about Hispanic origin.
- It was suggested by one panel member that, if this form is used in 2020, that we drop the boxes and put a line in place of them.

Layout

- Banners – Issues:
 - May increase the cognitive burden for respondents because they have to figure out what they mean. There are no checkboxes or instructions attached to them.
 - May give the impression that this is a new question.
 - May decrease the prominence of the “Some other race” response category (aligned under the Asian categories, and not otherwise delineated in any way).
- Suggestions: Move Asian banner further left on the form to line up on top of the check boxes. Move the response boxes for the second column (Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) closer to the first column (Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino). Alternatively, move the Asian heading to the left margin and inserting a vertical line between the Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander response options.

Wording

- The wording of the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander banner should be changed. Two of the categories in the column, Samoan and Guamanian or Chamorro, do not fit under the header. The word “Other” should be deleted because the column contains Native Hawaiian and several Pacific Islander categories.

Assumptions

- Form is assuming the respondent will know we want to capture race. This is a very important category that needs to be precise and clear to respondent.

- This form assumes that Hispanic respondents will find a category that they believe to be representative of themselves after having already filled out the Hispanic origin question.
- Assumes that the six categories of people listed under the “Asian” heading would describe themselves as such. May not be the case for recent immigrants.
- Assumes persons would know to mark the ‘Black or African Am.’ category if they are Haitian or Negro.

Sensitivity

- May be sensitive for Hispanic respondents who have a difficult time filling it out.
- The word “Negro” sounds negative and outdated.
- The term “Asian” may be sensitive to some.
- There may still be a generation that relates to the word Negro but would mark Black, African American. One panel member was concerned about the removal of the word Negro from the Black category, as some individuals have expressed identification with the term.

Response Categories

- It seems odd that, though this question version goes to great lengths to eliminate the word “race,” it still appears in “Some Other Race” category (but no changes recommend on this basis).
- The word “race” in “some other race” may be more confusing.

APPENDIX VII: Phase I Respondents' Comments about Term "Negro"– Forms X2, X3, X4, X5 and X9

PHASE I FINDINGS ABOUT TERM NEGRO

During Phase I, there was no scripted probing of the term Negro. However, many of the respondents reacted and objected to this term spontaneously. Below we provided their comments by race (Black, non-Black).

Twelve respondents self-identified under the "Black, African Am. or Negro" category. Out of these, five (42%) discussed the term Negro without prompting from the interviewer. Three respondents found it offensive and two elderly respondents self-identified as Negro. Among non-Black respondents, 8 out of 49 (16%) brought up the term Negro, seven considered it offensive and one chose to write "Negro" in a write-in box for a member of his household.

By and large, those who objected to the term found it extremely offensive. Some respondents said that they personally were not offended by the term, but that others would be. One respondent misread the word and thought the form featured another, even less polite, N-word. In all, out of 13 respondents who talked about this term, 10 had negative things to say. Some Hispanic respondents were bewildered by its inclusion in the Census form, presumably because 'negro' is the Spanish word for 'black'. (One respondent said, "Negro is considered Black, is like White and do you put Blanco?" ['blanco' is Spanish for 'white']) One respondent said that if he received the form in the mail and saw the word 'Negro' written on it, he would throw it away. Another respondent said that she would be suspicious that the form was a cruel joke. Quotes of the responses follow.

1. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 80-84

R: "To be honest with you, I cannot stand Black and I don't like the word African American, so I'm a Negro or colored. Either of those two words."

2. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 70-74

R: "Because that's the way that I've always been identified. Um. Yeah. I'm mixed, but I'm identified as an AA or Black or Negro. It used to be Negro or colored." Later this R was asked if anything could be sensitive and he said that some people would object to the term Negro, but also to other terms such as Hispanic. He did not favor either side of the discussion.

3. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 55-59

After entering her response the R said, "This one where it's ethnicity as far as Black people are concerned, I would take African American or Negro out. That might be offensive to some people and just put Black...Just leave the Negro out."

4. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 30-34

When R started reading the question, she made a couple of "Oh!" noises as though she were surprised. Then she said, "Don't nobody use that word no more. At all. This word right here. They got, 'Check which ethical [*sic*] background you think you are.' So I checked 'Black'. They got 'Black, African American, or they got, or Nigger, so I'm just like, 'Hmm. Don't nobody use

that word no more.’ But I’m not offended by it or anything.” [NOTE: The form actually says ‘Negro’, but the fact that someone could read it as ‘Nigger’ must be considered a fatal flaw.]

5. BLACK MALE, AGE GROUP 40-44

R hadn’t looked at the question more than a few seconds when he said, “They’re still using the word ‘Negro’? That pisses people off!” He talked about how terminology has changed so much and mentioned examples such as ‘Afro-American’, ‘Black African-American’, ‘African American’ and ‘Negro’.

R: “Well, nobody wants to be ‘Negro’ anymore. Y’all could get rid of that shit.”

Int: Do you find that offensive, or do you think other people would?

R: “Yeah, I do. It sounds like the word ‘colored’. Like back in the day or something. And ‘Negro’ is actually the color ‘black’ itself, so I understand the word, but I don’t like the word. I like to be more modernized. To be honest with you, I’d rather be ‘Black’. All that ‘African-American’; all that other nonsense. It’d just be easier to say, ‘Hey, man, I’m black.’”

Non-Black respondents spontaneously objecting to term Negro (n=7 out of 49 respondents)

6. AIAN FEMALE, AGE GROUP 45-49

R said she is part African American, but did not mark it on the form because she considers herself AIAN.

R: “You know, I’ve got an issue with the whole thing of calling me Black or African American. I can deal with African American simply because it’s saying that I’m of African descent. So, I can with that more so anything else, and I don’t even look at Negro. Those…gone with the wind. So long.”

7. ASIAN MALE, AGE GROUP 18-24

R: “No one should be offensive if they asked about race, but in terms of the two offensive words that I saw (Negro and Chicano), if I was a black person and I checked in my mail and I saw a form that said ‘Negro’ I would think, this is not an important document. This is just a joke.”

8. NHPI FEMALE, AGE GROUP 55-59

R spontaneously mentioned the term ‘Negro’ while looking at form X3. “Why do they have to put that word down? It’s not for me, because I know I’m from another country. When I was going through this, I realized this word [was on the form]. If Black people fill this out, they’re going to have a fit and ask what the hell this word is doing on here. If they want to do a census, this is where the problem’s going to start. ‘Black’ is okay; it’s fine. But ‘Negro’?!?”

9. ASIAN FEMALE, AGE GROUP 40-44

R spoke directly into the recorder and said “Please take negro off!” R said that “there are a few words that maybe we should avoid” to not offend [negro].

10. HISPANIC FEMALE, AGE GROUP 25-29

R: “I don’t know why they put Negro because I know that is an offensive word to others.” [R seems to be confusing with the more offensive derivate word.]

11. HISPANIC FEMALE, AGE GROUP 30-34

R: "I don't like that word: Negro. I think it would be offensive to people, even White or Black. [It] might be offensive to some people, but some other people might take it just as something natural."

12. HISPANIC MALE, AGE GROUP 40-44

When shown form X5, R covered the word Negro in the form. When asked about it, he said "Isn't Black and Negro the same thing? Negro is considered Black, is like White and do you put *Blanco*?" And in the debriefing section, R mentioned that Negro could be used in offensive ways and that it was sensitive, "I have friends who are Black, and the word Negro is, could be very offensive the way you could use it."

Non-Black respondent neutral to term Negro (n=1 out of 49 respondents)

13. AIAN MALE, AGE GROUP 35-39

The R checked "Some other race" and wrote in Negro and Italian.

R: "I guess basically she is what her daddy is, right? Ain't that what they say?...It says Black, African American or negro. That would basically be here except she's got some Italian in her. I don't see that on here. I'm going to say "Some other race". Is that what you want me to do?"

R: They say you are what your daddy is. That's why I say I could basically just put Negro down for her.

APPENDIX VIII: Phase II Respondents' Comments about Term "Negro"– Forms X14, X16 and X17

PHASE II FINDINGS ABOUT TERM NEGRO

In Phase II, each respondent was probed about their views regarding the use of the term Negro on these forms. Two out of the three Black respondents who were interviewed in this Phase II were offended by the use of this word on the forms. One of them said that she would not answer forms with the word Negro on it. The one Black respondent who did not object said that her grandmother has used that word but that she would not use it herself. Among 12 non-Black respondents, nine objected to having this term on the form, and only three said that some Blacks may identify with it. Overall, 11 out of the 15 respondents indicated that it was inappropriate to use this term. Their responses are summarized below.

1. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 70-74

R said she would not answer a form that has the word Negro in it if she received it in the mail.

"What's the difference between a Black American and Negro? I don't think it should be on there. We have been called all kinds of names in our race, so the last thing they came up with, we were Negros, then they called us Black African Americans. So if that's what we're going to be named, we shouldn't have two names. We are not Negros. We are now Black Americans. So why should they put Negro on the Census Bureau? I don't think it should be there because our children don't know what a Negro is. All they know is Black African Americans. I think it should be deleted from the form." During debriefing she said, "The court said that you cannot use the N word. If you use the N word and I take you to court, you can be prosecuted for that word. (Probe: but this is not the N word, right?) It's the same thing. It's the N word!"

2. BLACK MALE, AGE GROUP 40-44

R: "I don't like to see Negro there because we don't use these terms anymore. This is like 50 years ago [that] we were calling ourselves that in this country. But now, President Obama doesn't refer to himself as a Negro. It's outdated. Change with the times, you know what I'm saying?" Later in the interview he reiterated that "Negro is definitely out. This shouldn't even be on here! [angry]. There's no such thing as a Negro race. There's no land called Negro-land...It has a negative connotation to me. Nobody refers to themselves as that....I would never refer to myself as that."

3. BLACK FEMALE, AGE GROUP 20-24

R: "I think people probably identify with one of those [terms]." R said that she has heard her grandmother [age 90] use the word Negro, but that she would "probably not" use the word herself, but "it's not offensive or anything."

Non-Black respondents objecting to term Negro (n=9 out of 12 respondents)

4. WHITE FEMALE, AGE GROUP 35-39

R laughed nervously when looking at X14. "I see what you're talking about, and frankly, from a personal standpoint, I don't like it [Negro] being on there at all!" [NOTE: R couldn't even bring herself to say the word Negro.] She said that her White boyfriend would definitely find the term

offensive and he would probably throw the questionnaire away if he saw Negro on it. R herself would “probably still fill it out”, though.

5. WHITE FEMALE, AGE GROUP 45-49

This respondent reported a multiracial child, part White and part Black. She was uncomfortable discussing the term ‘Negro.’

R: [When asked if she had noticed that one of the forms did not have the word ‘Negro’] “I did not. Now, on that particular thing, I do like X17 better [without Negro]. My preference. I don’t like that word.” During the debriefing she said, “I do think the sensitivity would be in the race area” (referring to the term ‘Negro.’)

6. AMERICAN INDIAN MALE, AGE GROUP 30-34

R: “I think [Negro] is culturally insensitive and racist...By putting the word ‘Negro’ on it is culturally insensitive and that would turn a lot of people off.”

7. ASIAN FEMALE, AGE GROUP 40-44

R: “...And another thing here that I found strange is this word...[Negro]...and I don’t know if it’s politically correct. Some might...I don’t know if that is right or wrong. That kind of has sometimes negative connotations. I personally prefer ‘African American.’”

8. ASIAN FEMALE, AGE GROUP 20-24

R: “[Probed about Negro] I just don’t think it’s appropriate or it’s necessary.”

9. HISPANIC FEMALE, AGE GROUP 55-59

R: “Well, I don’t think Negro is a race. Negro is the way they were called in a certain time of history. The race is Black. I don’t see it necessary to have Negro there. Now, African American, the United States invented that race in 1980-something I think, because not every Black is African American.”

10. HISPANIC FEMALE, AGE GROUP 30-34

R: “Well, I don’t have any problem with that word [Negro], but there are a lot of people that don’t like to read that or know about that word, so...probably ‘Black’ or ‘African American’ is a better word.”

11. HISPANIC FEMALE, AGE GROUP 20-24

R: “...you can’t call somebody like ‘Negro’ or ‘N-word’ or, like...Between them, they can call themselves that. If we call them...they get, like so offended. So, I think that it would offend them.”

12. PACIFIC ISLANDER MALE, AGE GROUP 25-29

R: “I would probably go with the one without...just because the word ‘Negro’ in today’s society has more of a negative connotation to it. And it is understood if you ask, ‘Are you Black or African American?’”

Non-Black respondents neutral to term Negro (n=3 out of 12 respondents)

13. WHITE FEMALE, AGE GROUP 45-49

R: “Coming from my perspective, I’d prefer the ‘Black, African American or Negro’ mainly because you might have people who are from Africa or Caribbean who might consider themselves Negro...I don’t know anyone who describes himself as Negro, but when I was in college, I know that I had some Black professors and they would talk about Black writing, sometimes they would talk about experience of the Negro or writers who had the Negro experience. So I know that it’s in their cultural aspects of how they would describe certain things.”

14. AMERICAN INDIAN MALE, AGE GROUP 65-69

R: “A lot of elderly Black people will still identify as ‘Negro’; the other terms are more temporary expressions.” R thinks that younger people might find ‘negro’ offensive.

15. ASIAN FEMALE, AGE GROUP 75-79

R: “That’s fine. There are African Americans, but Negros are people from Africa itself. But African Americans can be other nationalities.”