RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(Survey Methodology #2012-06)

**Observing Census Enumeration of Non-English
Speaking Households in the 2010 Census:
Spanish Report**

Christina Isabelli[1]
Yuling Pan
Stephen Lubkemann

[1]Illinois Wesleyan University

Report Issued: August 10, 2012

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.

Observing Census Enumeration of Non-English Speaking Households in the 2010 Census: Spanish Report

Christina Isabelli,[1] Yuling Pan,[2] and Stephen Lubkemann[2]

[1] Illinois Wesleyan University, [2]Center for Survey Measurement

U S C E N S U S B U R E A U

Helping You Make Informed Decisions

Abstract

This study was part of an ethnographic research project in the 2010 Census Assessment and Research Program to observe the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup interviews with households that speak a language other than English, in areas of the U.S. with heavy concentrations of residents with limited English proficiency. A multilingual research team consisting of seven sub-teams in the seven primary languages (Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese) was commissioned to carry out the research in the 2010 Census.

The objectives of this research were to identify: (1) how language and socio-cultural factors affect the enumeration of non-English-speaking populations during the Nonresponse Followup interview process; (2) what measures were taken by enumerators to negotiate and maintain access to non-English-speaking households and to collect the required census data from these households; (3) how in-language census materials were used in the field; (4) how non-English-speaking immigrant populations perceived and reacted to the census and its public messaging; and (5) what changes, if any, are needed to improve the enumeration process with households that have limited or no English proficiency. Findings from this study will help develop recommendations for planning the 2020 Census, including the Decennial Language Program, questionnaire development, translation of census questions, use of interpreters in enumeration interviews, and interviewer training.

This report presents findings from the Spanish research team of bilingual ethnographers who studied the Spanish community to highlight the issues observed in the research. While the findings clearly draw attention to the importance of linguistic competency among NRFU enumerators, they also demonstrate that we need more than linguistic competency, language aids, and minority language media campaigns in order to increase successful census participation among linguistic minorities. The negotiation of interview access, effective communication about the census' objectives, the translation of concepts that do not carry conceptual equivalence, the ability to successfully sustain the interview as a communicative event, and ultimately the ability to elicit the information that the census is designed to obtain —are all demonstrated to require robust understandings of the highly differentiated social and cultural contexts of particular immigrant communities. Drawing on findings from the ethnographic study, the report suggests recommendations for planning the 2020 Census.

Table of Contents

1.   Introduction

In 2010, the Census Bureau conducted the decennial census to enumerate the U.S. population, with a mission of counting everyone once, only once, and in the right place. Accurate enumeration of linguistically-isolated households in decennial censuses represents an enormous challenge for the Census Bureau. To meet this challenge, the Census Bureau developed a comprehensive language assistance program, which included the 2010 Census fulfillment form in the top five non-English languages (Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian, and Vietnamese), language assistance guides in 59 languages, and telephone questionnaire assistance in the top five non-English languages.

Yet, at the time of the 2010 decennial census, the Census Bureau still lacked an adequate understanding of how linguistic isolation might influence the census data collection process amongst households in which little or no English was spoken. Since many such households seemed unlikely to mail back census questionnaires, it seemed likely that data for these households would be obtained primarily through face-to-face interviews. Consequently, a comparative study was designed to ethnographically observe Non Response Follow-up (NRFU) interviews amongst seven different communities[1] in order to identify which, if any, social and linguistic factors were affecting the reliability and validity of the NRFU data collected from linguistically-isolated households.

This report focuses on the findings from the observational study of census enumeration conducted amongst Spanish-speaking households. Our overarching objective was to assess the extent to which the NRFU interview process obtained valid and satisfactory responses from respondents who were primarily or solely Spanish speakers, and to assess social, cultural, and linguistic factors that created barriers or otherwise mediated the goal of collecting census data. Consequently our observations and analysis focused on several broad questions addressed by all ethnographic teams in the broader comparative study, namely:

- How did the linguistic background of respondents whose sole or primary language was not English (and in this case was Spanish) affect their interaction with enumerators and, ultimately, their participation in the NRFU interview?
- How did social and cultural factors affect interaction between enumerators and respondents, and what effect did these have upon the communicative process?
- How was the challenge of translation addressed, and more specifically, what role did interpreters play, how were they recruited, and what effect did they have upon the communicative process?

Following a brief overview of the history and the specific Spanish-speaking community observed, this report describes the methods employed in this field study. This
is followed by a discussion of our findings and finally by recommendations for improving future NRFU coverage amongst Spanish speakers who have little, if any, English fluency.

---

[1] In these communities, the primary languages spoken were: Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

2. Community of Language Background: Spanish Speakers in the United States

2.1. Hispanics in the U.S.

The U.S. Spanish-speaking population is represented by four major Hispanic groups: Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Salvadoran. According to the 2010 Census Brief press released from May 2011, Mexicans comprise the largest Hispanic group nationwide followed by Puerto Ricans and Cubans. However, Mexicans do not necessarily make up the dominant Hispanic group in many metropolitan areas. For example, "Cubans are the dominant group in Miami, Salvadorans are the largest group in the Washington, DC area, and in the New York-Northeastern New Jersey area, Puerto Ricans are the largest group. Even so, in many metro areas, such as Los Angeles-Long Beach, Chicago and San Antonio, TX, Mexicans are the largest Hispanic origin group-by far" (Lopez & Dockterman, 2011, p. 4).

Each major Spanish-speaking group is identified by a set of circumstances that differ from each other. In this study we focus on Mexicans because of their high non-response rate. Before we present the study, a brief summary of comparing and contrasting the Mexicans with other three Spanish-speaking groups is necessary in order to understand our motivation of focusing on Mexicans in this study.

The first major Spanish-speaking group is Puerto Ricans, who are citizens of the U.S. by birth and can travel between Puerto Rico and the U.S. without visas or passports. On the other hand "Mexicans, Cubans, and others must enter the country as immigrants with alien status and must apply for citizenship in the same way as other immigrants" (Guisepi, n.d.). When considering the context of cooperating with governmental representatives in such cases as the NRFU interviews, Duany (1992) found that when members of the New York Puerto Rican community chose to withhold information from public assistance authorities, it was not due to fear of undocumented status issues, as is with Mexicans and Salvadorans,[2] but rather to protect illicit or irregular sources of income.

The second group is Hispanics of Cuban origin. The social status of Hispanics of Cuban origin or descent differs from that of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Salvadoran. In contrast to urban Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and Salvadorans, Cuban-Americans are not concentrated in the ghetto neighborhoods of cities. Their prosperity has enabled them to move to the suburbs. As residents of both city and suburb, Cubans have been more economically successful than other Hispanics. This situation is accounted for by the fact that they were mostly members of the middle class in Cuba (except for the Marielitos[3]), and they have established themselves in businesses and the professions in the United States" (Guisepi, n.d.). This is not the case with the other major Hispanic groups. "The average family income for Cubans in the mid-1980s was far higher than for other Hispanics, and far fewer Cubans live below the poverty level than do other

---

[2] "Mexicans remain the largest group of unauthorized immigrants, accounting for 58% of the total" (Passel & Cohn, 2011, p. 2) followed by Salvadorans.

[3] Marielitos were Cubans who emigrated from Cuba as exiles departing by boat from Cuba's Mariel Harbor. Many of these exiles (about 5,000) "were hard-core criminals and a larger number of persons who had been held as political prisoners" (Guisepi, n.d.).

Hispanics" (Guisepi, n.d.).

The third group is the Salvadoran immigrant population, which increased significantly between 1980 and 1990 in the U.S., increasing nearly fivefold from 94,000 to 465,000. The number has continued to grow as a result of family reunification and new arrivals fleeing a series of natural disasters that hit El Salvador, including earthquakes and hurricanes (Terrazas, 2010). The U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Office of Immigration Statistics has estimated that 5 percent of unauthorized migrants in January 2008 were born in El Salvador, which constituted "the second largest unauthorized immigrant group in 2008 after the Mexican born" (Terrazas, 2010). There is also a tendency for many people born in El Salvador to not report Salvadoran origin (as noted in Schmidley & Cresce, n.d.), possibly due to consequences of fear of undocumented status. Claiming to be from another ethnic origin may displace any perceived suspicion of being undocumented.

The differing circumstances of each Spanish-speaking group may explain why the census response rate for Cubans and Puerto Ricans is more similar to the U.S. native-born rate of response than for Mexicans. In this paper, therefore, we focus on Mexicans because of their high non-response rate and some unique characteristics. In addition to sharing a national origin, the observed Mexican respondents shared two homogeneous characteristics: recency of immigration and legality of status. We hypothesize that the findings based on this Mexican population can be generalized to populations of different Latin American nationalities sharing these characteristics.

2.2. Mexicans in the U.S. and the Midwest

Mexican immigration to the U.S. has always occurred, but saw an acceleration, particularly to the Southwest, in 1910 due to the effects of the Mexican revolution (Padilla, 1985). After this time period, the arrival of Mexicans to the Midwest was accomplished through two main employment channels (Farr & Domínguez Barajas, 2009). One group of immigrants was employed "[to do] farm work in the Midwest, or to the packing-houses of Kansas City, or to railroad track labor in various cities, and finally to the industrial areas of Chicago" (Padilla, 1985, p. 22), whereas another group was "directly recruited by employers and shipped to Chicago via railroad cars" (p. 23). Subsequently, "[d]ependent development in Mexico led to massive displacement of peasants who were then imported by U.S. employers and turned into a dominated segment of disposable, cheap labor" (Betancur, 1996, p. 1301). These immigrants that were admitted under special arrangements (e.g. the Bracero Program of 1942-64 and the Temporary Admissions Program of World War I) generated "a stream of undocumented and unprotected workers" (Corwin, 1978; Kirstein, 1977; Kiser & Kiser, 1979). Their importation encouraged others to follow and became the basis for "chain and circular migration ever since" (Betancur, pp. 1301-2).

The beginning of the free trade provisions of the NAFTA agreement, which went into effect on January 1, 1994, was another cause of massive Mexican immigration. Gonzalez (2009) reported that the rapidly rising level of migration in the mid-nineties reflected the country's deteriorating social and economic conditions and "[u]ltimately, the key factor would be Mexico's failure to provide its citizens a decent living" (p. 267). This resulted in "the sudden appearance of Mexican-origin populations in parts of the country where they had never resided in substantial numbers before. Most arrivals to these new destinations were immigrants, between one-third and

one-half of them apparently undocumented…" (p. 270).

The neighborhoods researched for this study have large Hispanic/Latino populations, particularly of Mexican origin. Walking through these neighborhoods, one could see and hear the store signs and music all in Spanish. People that worked in the stores were mainly addressing Spanish-speakers. The stores represented the cultural characteristics of Mexico that included candy stores with typical Mexican treats and quinceañera[4] and panadería[5] stores. There were many people walking around and children playing in the streets and yards. As is typical in Mexico, there were vendors in the streets selling ice cream, tamales (a traditional Latin American dish) and other typical Mexican snacks.

 Mexican immigrants also began going to non-gateway states between 1990 and 2000. Most of these new destinations consisted of "smaller towns and cities," where for the most part Mexican immigration has become a "family affair" (Katz, Stern, & Fader, 2007, p. 167). One of the three Illinois communities observed for this investigation occurred in one of these new, smaller-town destinations. Of the foreign-born population of this county, the American FactFinder states that 36.8% speaks Spanish, and of those, 28.9% were not U.S. citizens.

2.3.   Bilingualism and Literacy

Spanish-speaking monolinguals in the U.S. are inevitably involved in new experiences in the U.S. Like other residents, they apply for "marriage, vehicle, and driver's licenses; file tax returns, unemployment insurance forms, and mortgage documents; and obtain social security cards, birth certificates, and other credentials" (Farr & Guerra, 1995, p. 16). Because of this phenomenon, Elias-Olivares and Farr (1991) observed that Spanish-speaking monolinguals naturally borrow and adopt words from English in order to fill gaps in their native language, such as "las taxas" phonologically derived from "taxes" (instead of Spanish *los impuestos*) and "real estate" (instead of *bienes raíces*). McKay et al. (1996) also noted that "although equivalents of the English terms exist in standard Spanish, they were not part of the immigrants' vocabulary because they were not part of the immigrants' experience until they came to the United States" (p. 95).

Based on data from this observational study, of the Hispanic population in the neighborhoods chosen for this study, 25% entered the U.S. in 2000 or later, 35.2% entered 1990-1999, 39.8% entered before 1990. Regarding language, 15.2% speak English only, 84.8% speak a language other than English and 40.5% speak English less than "very well." Although many adult members of Mexican immigrant families "have relatively limited literacy skills due to restricted access to formal education in both Mexico and the United States, they nevertheless manage a variety of literacy practices that…serve their specific literacy needs" (Farr & Guerra, 1995, p. 7). Thus, as a network, "they are coping well with the demands for literacy in their lives" (p. 17).

---

[4] A celebration of a girl's 15th birthday in parts of Latin America and elsewhere in communities of immigrants from Latin America in the U.S.
[5] A bakery that sells predominantly typical Latin American sweet breads and bread.

<center>**3.   Methods**</center>

Fieldwork took place between May 11 and May 21, 2010 in three areas in Illinois, both rural and urban areas. Three research field members focused on these cities based on the information found on the Census Bureau American FactFinder regarding the density of Spanish speakers. Of the three research team members, two were trained and supervised by the third, an expert knowledgeable in both ethnographic interview methods and the subject matter of Hispanics in the U.S. All team members were bilingual in Spanish and English with extensive experience working with Hispanic immigrant populations in Illinois communities.

During the 11 days of fieldwork, the team members observed 88 completed NRFU visits, and conducted debriefings with the enumerators and the respondents of these NRFU interviews. The debriefing interviews aimed to obtain information regarding the enumerator's and respondent's perspectives of the U.S. Census and their participation in NRFU interviews.

Of the total number of 88 completed NRFU visits, the team observed and interviewed 63 Spanish-speaking respondents, the large majority (92%) of whom were monolingual Spanish speakers from Mexico with limited English speaking ability. The other respondents were Mexican-American (3), Bolivian (1), and Venezuelan (1). We interviewed 40 female and 23 male Spanish-speaking respondents with an estimated age range of 23 to 50, the majority being in their late 30s. See Table 1.

Table 1. *Demographic information – Spanish-language interviews.*

N	63
Gender	
Female	40
Male	23
Place of Birth	
Mexico	58
U.S. (Mexican-American)	3
Bolivia	1
Venezuela	1

The team observed 23 enumerators in the field for both English-speaking and non-English-speaking (NES) households. Of the 23, 18 enumerators interviewed monolingual Spanish households. Of those 18, 3 were English monolingual enumerators that had extensive experience with the Spanish-speaking population (as a free health clinic staff member, as the mother-in-law of a Mexican national and as a sales representative in a highly-populated Hispanic community). These monolingual English enumerators were familiar with the communicative conventions typical of the Mexican immigrant population. 15 were English-Spanish bilingual enumerators. These 15 English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were heritage learners of Spanish. That is, they were born in the U.S., had foreign-born parents and Spanish was spoken in the household when they were a child. These 15 English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were from the community and had high literacy and proficiency skills in Spanish. The enumerators were given the job as local enumerators because they were familiar with the Hispanic area, the Hispanic population, or

were Spanish speaking. Therefore the Local Census Office was able to hire locals to carry out the interviews.

4.   Findings

4.1.   Negotiating Access and Explaining the NRFU

The ethnographic interviews took place in 15 mobile homes, 21 apartments, 7 single homes, and 20 housing units. The majority of the interviews took place at the entrance of the household (on stairs, on a porch, on a sidewalk, through the gate or through a window), standing up. The second preferred location was inside the household sitting down.

We observed that respondents generally chose the location in which the interview was conducted. Respondents typically did not invite the enumerators into the house since they felt that the event would not take long, based on the claim of brevity by the enumerator. The respondents that did not invite us in were as elaborate with answering the questionnaire as were those that invited us in. As far as we could determine the process of establishing a location did not affect the interview. Thus, for example, some respondents who were tentative about answering questions at the onset ultimately invited enumerators in while others answered the questions at the door.

In all the NRFU interviews we observed, the enumerator was dressed casually, essentially mirroring a physical appearance typical of a person from that neighborhood; middle- to lower-class. No enumerator wore extravagant clothing, expensive brand names or formal business attire. The clothes were those commonly worn to go grocery shopping, in other words, the enumerators looked comfortable; that they were going to be walking all day in the heat and had made sure they were dressed appropriately. The physical appearance was also normal, with no outrageous haircuts, makeup, jewelry, or facial hair. Although the enumerators never made a point themselves about why they dressed this way, we assume that this dress-code signaled their own social understanding that they needed to avoid coming across as authoritative in order to effectively collect census information.

This physical appearance seemed to be well received by the respondents as all the enumerators we followed were treated with respect. One of the older female monolingual English enumerators (in her late 60s) received the most favorable treatment. All respondents invited her into the household and always offered her a seat on a couch even though she was very able to carry out the conversation standing up and in the sun and rain. Her age, along with her cheery disposition, seemed to account for this favorable treatment. Her favorable treatment may have been due more to her age than her cheery disposition. "The Latino view of age and aging is distinguished by the value of *respeto* (respect) for older people. Latino and Latina family and community members grant older people respect by simply acknowledging and being aware of their presence" ("Life Cycles," n.d.). Although we only observed one older enumerator, we believe that the monolingual Spanish respondents were showing the older enumerator respect, reflecting Mexican culture.

We observed that the person in the household that was ultimately designated the principal respondent was almost without exception (see below) the adult that either initially answered the

door, or the first adult called to the door by a minor who answered the door. In all but seven cases was there another adult in the household. In two of those cases, the other adults in the household were relaxing watching television or were working in a backroom; in the other case, an elderly mother sat on the couch next to her monolingual Spanish respondent daughter and listened to the conversation. In three of the cases there were children under 5-years-old present. In another, one interview started with an English-Spanish bilingual teenager old enough to answer the questions. When the monolingual Spanish-speaking mother arrived, she welcomed us in and continued the interview. In the last, a monolingual Spanish-speaking husband answered the door and started the interview. The monolingual Spanish respondent asked a few questions to his monolingual Spanish wife (who was inside the house) and she came to the door to answer those questions and continued with the interview as the husband left and went back inside the house. The questions dealt with birth dates that she knew more readily than her husband.

In all cases the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators identified themselves using the protocol introduction set forth by the Census Bureau. The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators used Spanish and the monolingual English enumerators used English. The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators knew they were in a Hispanic neighborhood, and when a person of Hispanic physical attributes answered the door, the identification was in Spanish. In a typical situation where two monolingual Spanish strangers meet, the level of comfort with the other person is neutral and indifferent. In the case of the enumerators (both monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual), the same was true with the level of comfort at the onset of the interview. It was neutral and indifferent, and by the end of the interview, the level of comfort rose to friendly but still distant.

After reading the protocol introduction, the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators made eye contact with the monolingual Spanish respondents. With those respondents that did not seem to know what was going on, the enumerators employed the following strategies to elicit participation: explaining less-formulaically (see discussion in section 4.6.1.) why they were there and showing them their badge, or even showing them the census paperwork hoping that the respondents (both monolingual English and Spanish) would recognize either the word "census," the format of the questionnaire as being similar to the one received through the mail, or that the form was not that long. The effect of these two strategies was positive in all cases. Those monolingual Spanish respondents that were hesitant of the purpose of the visit responded positively to the word "census" as most had seen or heard announcements on the Spanish-language cable channels, community contacts, school, or had seen the form in the mail.

The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators introduced the topic of the interaction following the scripted Spanish-language protocol and handed the Spanish Job Aid (containing a Spanish translation of the NRFU questionnaire) to the monolingual Spanish respondents to refer to. The monolingual English enumerators followed the English-language script but when interviewing monolingual Spanish respondents, they pointed to specific questions on the Spanish Job Aid (if it was used) so that the monolingual Spanish respondents could follow along.

In the cases that the monolingual Spanish respondents used gestures to indicate a lack of time for an interview (e.g., looking at their watches, looking at their toddlers that were standing in the

background, starting to close the door), the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators skipped through the protocol script (such as the gender question [see discussion in section 4.9.3] and listing all the possible responses found on the Spanish Job Aid) to speed up the interview and collect as much information in as short amount of time possible. The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators in particular inserted comments in Spanish such as "this won't take long," "it will only take ten minutes," "if not now, I will need to know when I can call you or when I can come back to ask these questions." The monolingual English enumerators used hand gestures and facial expressions to denote that the survey would not take much longer (holding up 5 figures, indicating "5 more minutes"). There was no differential success in the outcomes observed. We attribute this to a specific behavior that has been studied as being reflective of the Mexican social value called *bien educado*, "well mannered" or "well brought up." This term refers to behavioral expectations among Mexicans that emphasize "politeness, respect, familialism, and cooperation in their relations with others" (Knight, Cota, & Bernal, 1993, p. 293). It may be that the enumerators knew to employ this successful tactic because they were familiar with the community and its cultural behaviors.

A useful strategy that encouraged hesitant respondents to participate in the interview was to take the time to explain to the respondents how important and valuable the information collected from the census was for improving their community and, in a few cases, listen to any unrelated complaints the respondents may have had with the census or government in general. When the hesitant respondents were told that one of the uses of the census information was to make sure that their community had sufficient health centers and public schools for the number of residents (two important needs for the Hispanic community of low socio-economic status) the respondents agreed it was important for them to participate and made the following statements:

(1)   *De primero, no sabía que ganábamos nosotros con el censo, nada más eran cosas que no tenían importancia pero ya después me doy cuenta que era para saber, ayuda a las escuelas. Antes no tenía hijos, ahora ya veo todos los beneficios que ellos van a tener.*
        At first, I didn't know what we would gain by [completing] the census, it was only about things that weren't important [to me] but now, afterwards, I realize it's so that they know, to help with the schools. I didn't have children before, but now I see all the benefits that they will have.

(2)   *La mera verdad no pensaba que fuera, que fuera bueno el censo pero, hace bien, de los apoyos que te dan.*
        The truth is that I didn't think the census was good, but, it's good because of the support [government agencies] give you.

The few unrelated complaints dealt with the respondents' frustration with: receiving subsequent census forms in the mail even after having mailed in a completed form; why a disability check from Social Security was taking so long to arrive; and why the present administration did not follow through with the promise of amnesty for illegal immigrants in the U.S.

4.2.   A Specific Access Issue: Mistrust and Doubt about the Census

One important issue for this community that we observed was that of doubt regarding the uses of the information being requested. Several respondents indicated during the debriefing interviews our team conducted that even though the Spanish-language cable stations informed the audience that the census responses were kept confidential, they worried that their answers would still be shared with other entities of the government, as seen in excerpts listed in (3)-(6).

(3)   *No sé, todos tienen miedo. A lo mejor más publicidad para informar a uno.*
       I don't know, everyone is afraid. Maybe better advertising to inform people [to dispel fears].

(4)   *Que la información se va a usar mal.*
       [I'm afraid] the information [I give] will be used against me.

(5)   *Es posible que el gobierno engaña.*
       It's possible that the government [will] trick [us].

(6)   *Pues sí, que no sea compartido con la gente de migración.*
       Well, yes, hopefully [the information] will not be shared with people in [the Department of] Immigration.

Several monolingual Spanish respondents quite explicitly stated their distrust towards the purpose of the census. This can be seen in the response of several monolingual Spanish respondents to the ethnographer's question whether they were worried during the census interview process.

(7)   *Pues, a veces por las fechas de nacimiento que piden, es como, vayan a usar la fecha con otro fin o si se pierde, y es esa información, y alguien más la utilice.*
       Well, sometimes, when asking the birth date information, it's like, they could use the date for other reasons or if it's lost, and it's that information, and someone else could use it.

(8)   *Que es una invasión de mi privacidad. Sí, me preocupaba, hasta la fecha me preocupa.*
       It's an invasion of my privacy. Yes, I was worried, to this day I'm worried.

(9)   *Mucha gente cree que tiene que ver con la inmigración, si los van a dejar quedarse en los Estados Unidos y eso no tiene nada que ver.*
       Many people think that it [census] deals with immigration, if [the Department of Immigration] will let them stay in the U.S. but it has nothing to do with that.

(10)   *Dicen que para el bien de nosotros, yo creo que es bien para los políticos tomar las cosas que tienen que hacer, a ellos les conviene, no? Para el bien de nosotros, ¿qué te cuentes? Para que venga la migra?*
       They [Census Bureau] say that it's for our good, I think it's good for the politicians to do things they need to do, it's for their benefit, right? For our benefit, that you count yourself? So that immigration [officers] come?

(11)   *No, no me afectaron pero sí me preocupa, unos tenemos papeles, otros no tienen.*
        No, it [census interview] didn't affect [my desire to participate in the census] but I am
        worried, some people have papers [are legal], others don't.

The Spanish respondents' feeling of distrust was coupled with the fact that two weeks before
going into the field, the State of Arizona had enacted a bill on illegal immigration that made it a
crime not to carry immigration documents and gave the police power to detain anyone suspected
of being in the country illegally. Although the ethnographic interviews took place in Illinois,
immigrant groups are aware of immigration issues through the Spanish-language media available
to them. Examples are seen in (12)-(14).

(12)   *Las leyes en Arizona y muchos tienen miedo de eso.*
        The [new] laws in Arizona and many are afraid of that.

(13)   *A pues algo por la misma situación en que se viven en toda la nación, que es el
        conocimiento general. Bueno, no por lo latino. Pero siempre va a existir ese recela.*
        Well, because of the similar situation that we live in this nation [U.S. but referring to
        Arizona], it's general knowledge. Well, not for Latinos. But there will always exist this
        mistrust.

(14)   *Sí, ya se ve que tantas cosas están pasando, sí por miedo. Ya no sé qué decir.*
        Yes, we already see many things happening [referring to Arizona], yes, out of fear. I do
        not know what to say [about it].

Those that shared their opinion with us stated that they believed the census enumerators were
doing a governmental job and upholding the confidentiality agreement. However, they also
believed that the Census Bureau might have a hidden agenda; to reveal information to
immigration officials regarding undocumented status. As researched by Elias-Olivares and Farr
(1991), these concerns that "the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) will have access
to the information collected; …[or they will have] information used against them by the INS or
the IRS…" (p. 44) are common among this population.

Three excerpts from ethnographic interviews with monolingual Spanish respondents exemplify
this mistrust.

(15)   *Pues, al principio sí, como que tenía temor. La información que da uno, uno no sabe la
        información que da uno…que tal si la migración…pues con eso, de que está trabajando.*
        Well, at the beginning yes, I was scared. The information that you give, you don't know
        if the information you provide…what if immigration [the officials that enforce
        immigration laws] …it deals with that, that you're working [presumably without proper
        immigration documents].

(16)   *La mera verdad puede ser esto como no es uno de este país …y pues claro, te llegan así
        …es que es lo que uno puede pensar. Te pueden llevar… te pueden echar la migración.
        Por eso. El censo nomás puede ser cuántos están viviendo.*

The truth is that since you're not from this country…and, of course, they [Immigration] come out of nowhere…and what else can you conclude. They [Immigration] can take you…immigration [officers] can throw you out [of the U.S.]. That's why. [However] the census could only be asking about how many are living [in the household].

(17) *Pues de que podría deportar a uno o no sé, ¿qué más? Ahí dice uno todo…dos niñas me las fueran a quitar.*
Well, that you could be deported or, I don't know, what else? That says everything…they could take my two girls from me.

Although not all monolingual Spanish respondents came out and stated their fears and distrust, those that did share this information confirmed this was a shared concern among their circle of friends.

From our observations, any mistrust that may have existed was overcome because of one of the following reasons: the monolingual Spanish respondents were able to see that the English-Spanish bilingual enumerator was a person from his or her own community or that the patient but adamant enumerator (both English-Spanish bilingual and monolingual English enumerators) ensured the respondents that they understood the confidentiality issue. Another notion to dispel any misinformation was the need for the census' purpose to be clear, as shown in the following excerpts by two monolingual Spanish respondents.

(18) *Me imagino para calmar la gente…hablarles más claro…que uno entiende palabras …que uno no entiende ciertas palabras. Poner un papel que puede entender…uno a veces que los hijos tienen que explicarles a los padres.*
I think that in order to eliminate future uneasiness…talk to them [monolingual Spanish respondents] more clearly…so you understand the words…we don't understand certain words. Give an [information sheet] that we can understand [in Spanish]…sometimes we have to have our children explain it to us.

(19) *Dar más información, dar amplitud que se hace con el censo y que no se hace.*
Give us more information, explain more what is done and not done with the census [information].

The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were able to relay this information readily in Spanish by emphasizing the confidentiality issue and the separation of the Census Bureau from any sector of the U.S. government that deals with immigration issues. The monolingual English enumerators were also successful at gaining the monolingual Spanish respondents' trust by pointing to the written language about confidentiality on the Spanish Job Aid as well as stating in English "No one else would know," a phrase that was understood by the monolingual Spanish respondents.

We must note that our reflections on this issue are based on an overwhelmingly Mexican-origin population. We can state, however, that this trust issue is not one that is connected to the respondent's identity as defined by place of origin. Rather, the trust issue is connected to the identity of being a recent undocumented immigrant from Latin America. There is a tendency that

when an immigrant is recent, as defined as being in the U.S. for several months to up to 5-7 years, there is a lack of knowledge of their rights in the U.S. which leads to a perpetual preoccupation that any action could potentially lead to getting caught by immigration officers and being deported back to their country of origin. The undocumented immigrants that have been in the U.S. for more than 5-7 years have gained a certain confidence about their undocumented status, which leads to a stronger sense of security. The fear of getting caught by Immigration and Naturalization officers decreases to the extent that their preoccupation of being deported becomes a way of life. In addition, they usually become aware of civil rights afforded to them in the U.S., normally through local community centers or contacts, which leads to less apprehension in participating in government activities such as census surveys, going to public health centers for medical attention, or enrolling their children in local schools.

Although most of the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were Hispanic, and their ethnic appearance may have explicitly signaled membership into the same community as the monolingual Spanish respondent, not being Hispanic did not negatively affect any interactions. We should also note that there is a phenomenon that happens within the Hispanic community, especially between recent and established immigrant groups. Members of recent immigrant groups at times feel discriminated against by the established immigrant group, explained by the established group that the recent groups often come to the U.S. via easier (illegal) means than they did, and that recent groups seek to have equal rights that took the established immigrant group years to achieve. Established immigrant groups also frequently critique the recent immigrant groups for not acquiring the English language faster, and in a sense, sidestepping acculturation to the U.S. culture. That is, being a Hispanic enumerator could also potentially work against the completion of the questionnaire process. Thus in our observations, identity may have played a role in garnering trust among the monolingual Spanish respondents, but far more important than identity was the attitude and approach used by the enumerator. An enumerator that exudes a patient, insistent, and authoritative claim that information will not be shared with immigration offices is much more effective than merely one who is Hispanic or even who speaks Spanish.

However, we note that some respondents stated that fears might dissipate depending on any consequences from participating in the current census, as noted in the quotes below.

(20)   *Sólo se puede demostrar con acciones y años, si uno lo hace este año y no pasa nada pues, uno empieza a tener confianza.*
         You can only show [trust] through actions and years, if you do it [participate in the census] this year and nothing happens, well, you begin to trust [the confidentiality of the census].

(21)   *Porque hay una preocupación de que esto no sea confidencial, esto va a ser la prueba de que esto es realmente confidencial. Una vez que demuestra lo contrario, pues si esto demuestra que es para el uso del censo en lo futuro van a tener confianza.*
         There is a concern [the census] isn't confidential, this [current census interview] will be proof if this is really confidential. Once you show the opposite, well, if this [interview] shows that it's [only] for census [purposes] then they'll trust [the process] in the future.

We would also like to reiterate, that even though the monolingual Spanish respondents reported distrust and fear in the true agenda of the Census Bureau, it did not stop them from participating. The common personality trait of this ethnic group to comply with respectable people and being *bien educado* "well mannered" (as discussed in section 4.1), along with the Census Bureau media campaign and effective communicative strategies of the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators, led to the participation of almost all monolingual Spanish respondents.

4.3.   Awareness of the Census

One thing that clearly did not negatively affect access was the highly successful media campaign that generated almost universal awareness of the census within this community. All but one monolingual Spanish respondent knew that the census was being carried out.

One measure that was used to gauge the respondents' awareness of the use of the census information was asking them what they thought the census information was used for. Most responded to the open-ended question with the responses already seen in this report. This open-ended question was followed by the statements, listed below, of some of the purposes of the census information. The respondents were asked if they agreed with the statements but were also told that not all the statements were true:

(22)   The census is used:
- to decide how much money communities will get from the government
- to decide how many representatives each state will have in Congress
- to count both citizens and non-citizens
- to determine property taxes
- to help the police and FBI keep track of people who break the law
- to help businesses and governments plan for the future
- to locate people living in the country illegally

Of the monolingual Spanish respondents, 96.8% had familiarity with the uses of the U.S. Census with mid-level accuracy. That is, they were able to correctly identify three or four of the seven previously-listed statements as being either true or false. We believe that this is due to the fact that 95.2% of Spanish-speaking respondents had seen Spanish-language cable advertisements about the census. It would be uncommon to find a Hispanic household that did not subscribe to these networks, even in low-income households. Cable was identified 80.9% of the time along with other sources of census information meaning that a majority of respondents had heard about census through multiple sources. Table 2 includes a summary of these sources in rank order of the times they were identified.

Table 2. *Media sources of Census information identified by respondents*

Media source	% of respondents
Spanish-language cable	95.2
Spanish-language radio	47.6
Spanish-language community programs	28.6
Public school programs	27
Spanish-language newspaper	27

Spanish-language community contacts	23.8
Internet	4.8

Ultimately the census media campaign appeared to have been highly effective with the Hispanic communities in both rural and urban areas of Illinois, where we made our observations. One apparent reason for this is that Hispanic communities have been part of this state, and the U.S., for many decades; as a result Hispanic community center contacts, Spanish-language radio, and public schools, sometimes working together, ran effective information programs about the census. Two monolingual Spanish respondents commented:

(23)   *Pienso que hicieron muy bien de informar a las escuelas porque sí. Dieron hojas a los papás y tuvieron como un grupo de información para que vinieran diferentes personas del barrio. Y yo pienso que hicieron que era para el bien de ellos.*
I think the schools did a good job of informing us [about the census]. They gave [informational] sheets to parents and offered informational groups so that different people from the community could come in. And I think they did what was best for them [the community members].

(24)   *Yo pienso que ahorita lo manejaron bien porque en la televisión decían algunas de esas preocupaciones, decían que eran a lo mejor mal interpretado por nosotros.*
I think that they handled the situation well this time because they said on TV that some of these concerns [regarding the uses of the census information], they said we were wrongly interpreting [the use of the census].

Whichever the media campaign, messages that are effective for this population are those that clarify issues related to mistrust and fear. Clarity in the purposes of the use of data collected by the Census Bureau, specifically explaining that it is not used to enforce immigration laws, as well as clarity in who sees the information in the census, such as immigration offices, are important.

4.4.   Reasons for not Filling out the Written Census Questionnaire
Of the monolingual Spanish respondents that had remembered receiving the mail-in version of the census questionnaire (87%), the reasons listed in Table 3 were given for not mailing it in.

Table 3. *Reasons given by respondents for not filling out the census questionnaire.*

%	Reason
38.2	Did not understand it because it was in English. Examples from transcripts below: *Todo está en inglés y algunas son confusas. La del 'residente,' no se sabe si es de mi estatus aquí.* Everything is in English and some are confusing. The 'resident' question, I don't know if it's asking about my status here [in the U.S.]. *Venía en inglés y no lo entendía.* It was in English and I didn't understand it. *Lo único que yo tuve problema fue la parte donde viene "qué raza." Eso fue lo que me*

	detuvo porque pensé que no entendí, porque decía tres diferentes razas, blanco, negro y asiático y eso fue lo que me detuvo. The only thing I had a problem with was the part about race. This is what stopped me because I thought I didn't understand, because it gave three different races, White, Black and Asian and that's what made me stop.
30.9	<u>Filled out the form and mailed it in</u>.
14.5	<u>Were too busy to fill in the form</u>. *Estoy muy ocupado, estoy siempre trabajando y no tengo tiempo.* I'm very busy, I'm always working and I don't have time. *Lo rellené pero no tuve tiempo para enviarlo.* I filled it out but didn't have time to mail it in. *Estaba ocupado.* I was busy.
10.9	<u>Filled out the form but forgot to mail in or misplaced the form</u>.
7.3	<u>Waited to fill out the form because they were advised by community contacts and other media sources to wait for an enumerator to stop by their house because the enumerator would help the respondent fill out the form during a NRFU interview</u>. *En inglés, no lo llené y esperaba su visita, sabía que venían por la publicidad en español que nos decía que nos venían a ayudar.* In English, I didn't fill it out and I was waiting for your visit, I knew you'd be coming because the Spanish commercials said that you'd come and help.
5.5	<u>Were afraid to fill it out incorrectly or due to immigration reasons</u>. *Lo recibí dos veces, por miedo.* I received it twice, [I didn't mail it in] out of fear. *¿Para qué? No tiene caso. Cuando hemos pedido ayuda no nos ayuda. No tienes derecho, eres ilegal, pues para que te cuentas, ¿no?* What for? It doesn't matter. When we've asked for help, they don't help us. You don't have any rights, you're illegal, well, why do you matter, right?

4.5. Experience with a Census Process

Of the monolingual Spanish respondents, 62.1% had experience with the census process in Mexico. According to these respondents they understood the purpose of the census in Mexico to be largely similar to that of the US, i.e. to acquire an accurate count of the population. Excerpts from the interviews are included in (25)-(28). The responses are in response to the question: "Have you had any experience with the census in your country of origin? If, so please describe your experience."

(25)   *Son las mismas preguntas, estaba esperándoles para ayudarnos.*
      They're the same questions, I was waiting for you to help us [fill out the form.]

(26)   *Es parecido.*

It is similar.

(27) *Igual como ustedes, nos hacían preguntas, era corto.*
      It's the same as yours [in the U.S.], they would ask us questions, it was short.

(28) *En México, es igual, se cuenta igual. De que nos tomen en cuenta.*
      In Mexico, it's the same, they count us [in] the same [way]. So they take us into account.

One significant difference between the Mexican census and that of the U.S. is that the Mexican census is not mailed to the population and the interviews are always face-to-face. "*Nunca viene por correo, te pregunta la edad, nombre y parentesco.* [It never comes by mail, they ask for your age, name and familial relationships.]" This may lead to a conclusion that some members of this population understood the census as something that should be done face-to-face and therefore believed that even though the form was mailed they should wait for a census interviewer. (Refer to the example from the transcript listed above "*... no lo llené y esperaba su visita, sabía que venían por la publicidad en español que nos decía que nos venían a ayudar.* [I didn't fill it out and I was waiting for your visit, I knew you'd be coming because the Spanish commercials said that you'd come and help.]") But this was not the case. The 7.3% of the respondents that waited for a NRFU interviewer did so only because the census media campaign in the U.S. (on cable, community contacts, etc.) advised them that this was a viable source of help if they had difficulty filling out the written form.

Other differences and similarities are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. *Similarities between U.S. and Mexico census process*

	U.S.	**Mexico**
Locus for counting	Household	Household
Mode of enumeration	Self-enumeration	Face-to-face
Situational context of census taking	Census form, census taker (stranger)	Census taker (stranger)

For 43% of the monolingual Spanish respondents, the NRFU interview was the first survey in which they had participated. This inexperience did not negatively affect the NRFU interview, but this may explain why they did not fill in the written form. Their institutional illiteracy in filling out documents may have been a factor.

The cultural background of recent immigrant monolingual Spanish respondents may provide no frame of reference for filling in the written form or even interpreting concepts such as "confidentiality," "residence," or tenure at their household. It has been shown in previous research on census non-response patterns (Elias-Olivares & Farr, 1991) that:

> literacy *per se* is not the barrier…; that is, there was no general lack of knowledge of the Spanish or English writing systems (alphabets). Rather, the problem seems to be traceable to a lack of experience with this kind, or use, of literacy. Such institutional literacy…perhaps in an effort to include as much information as possible in limited space,

there is much print, some of which is quite small (p. 40).

Common conventions used in survey forms, such as parenthetical instructions and instructions for skip patterns, may be difficult to understand and, as concluded by Kissam, Herrera, and Nakamoto (1993), this may contribute to Hispanic respondents' perception that completing a census form is burdensome. This may explain the underlying reason why 38.2% of respondents stated that they did not fill out the document; why 7.3% preferred to wait for help in filling out the form during a NRFU interview; and why 5.5% were afraid to fill it out incorrectly.

4.6.   The Conduct of the Interview

4.6.1. Fidelity to the interview script

Most English-Spanish bilingual enumerators reworded standard Spanish lexicon found in the questionnaire to a regional variant of Spanish most commonly used by Spanish speakers of the U.S. The examples are all synonyms in Spanish: "to rent" – *rentar* instead of *alquilar*; "owner" – *dueño* instead of *propietario*; "mobile home" – *traila* instead of *casa móvil*; "people" – *gente* instead of *personas*; and "renter" – *rentero* instead of *inquilino*. *Rentar* (to rent), *rentero* (renter) and *traila* (mobile home) are common lexical loanwords in the Spanish dialect found in the U.S. where the variant is borrowed from English and incorporated into Spanish with the original pronunciation and almost similar orthographic representation: *rentar* (to rent) is based on the English word "to rent" and *traila* (mobile home) comes from the first word of "trailer park." The words used by the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators in the rewording are common synonyms, less prescriptive lexicon more common with U.S. Spanish speakers. This phenomenon of the presence of less-academic Spanish words was also evidenced by McKay et al. (1996) when they concluded that there exists elitism on the part of the translators that "discourages the inclusion of less formal terms that would be more familiar to respondents" (p. 99).

Other examples of reworded phrases that reflected a less-formal style are included below:

(29)   Original - *¿Es (nombre) de sexo masculino o femenino?*
                          is   (name)   of   sex   masculine or feminine
                       "Is (name) male or female?"

         Reformulated - *¿Es (nombre) hombre o mujer?*
                             is (name)   man   or woman
                          "Is (name) a man or a woman?"

(30)   Original - *¿Cuál   era la   edad de (nombre) el primero de abril de 2010?*
                        which   was the age of (name)   the first   of April of 2010
                       "What was (name's) age on April first, 2010?"

         Reformulated - *¿ Cuántos años   tenía (nombre) el primero de abril de este año?*
                              how many years   had   (name)   the   first   of April of   this year

"How old was (name) on April first of this year?"

(31)   Original - *¿Cuál   es la fecha de nacimiento de (Nombre)?*
                  which is the date of birth   of (name)
                  "What is (name's) date of birth?"

         Reformulated - *¿Cuándo nació   (nombre)?*
                   when born   (name)
                   "When was (name) born?"

(32)   Original
   ¿Cuál   es   su   número de teléfono   y   el mejor momento para llamar?
   which   is your[formal] number of telephone and the best   moment to   call
   "What is your phone number and the best time to call?"

         Reformulated - *¿Cuál   es   su   número de teléfono?*
                   which is your[formal] number of telephone
                   "What is your phone number?"

                   ¿Es mejor llamar en la mañana,   tarde   o noche?
                    is better   to call in the morning, afternoon, or night
                    "Is it better to call in the morning, afternoon or evening?"

(33)   Original - *¿Es esta casa … propiedad libre y   sin   deuda…?*
                   is this house… property   free and without debt
                   "Is this house… a free and clear property?"

         Reformulated - *¿Es esta   casa libre,   sin   préstamos?*
                    is this house free, without   loans
                    Is this house free of loans?

The original formal questions were almost always restated using a more informal structure. We must note, however, that these reformulations did not occur for the benefit of the monolingual Spanish respondent. Rather it occurred due to the time limit that the English-Spanish bilingual enumerator had to ask the questions. Within the short time limit, the bilingual enumerators asked the questions off script, using the reformulated informally-structured question to aid their ability to mirror speaking patterns normally found in a conversation, leading to greater communicative success. In a survey where the questions come quickly one after the other it is understandable that the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators used more informal structures readily available to them. This strategy has been noted by McKay et al. (1996) where they stated that "[i]nterviewers found the literal translations difficult to read aloud, which made it difficult for the respondents to understand the questions. The literal translation lacked the flow found in the normal speaking patterns of the languages; the translated text felt and sounded awkward" (p. 102). The monolingual Spanish respondents equally understood the original questions in the few instances in which the enumerator did not reformulate (usually because it was the first interview of the day and he/she still had to warm up to asking questions).

The other off-script addition that we observed being typically made by the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators was either fronting or backing the telephone number question with a statement explaining why they were asking for this information (see discussion in Section 4.6.2). This voluntary addition acknowledged the mistrust that was known to exist in the Hispanic neighborhoods for anything government-related, especially with possible immigration-related issues.

We must remind the reader that although fear of census officials, and governmental officials in general, is typical among this population, these fears were "not found to be a contributing factor in the undercount of the undocumented [Hispanic] population" (Rodriguez & Hagan, 1991, p. 8). Rather, respondents were more fearful of the apartment or mobile home park's manager having access to their information. As was also noted by Bracken (1992) among the Latino population in New Orleans: "The authorities feared or avoided by some were not related to the government but instead were the managers of the apartment complex. Some households were able to conceal family members or guests who abused the limit on the number of occupants placed on the apartments" (p. 6). A phone number is a direct link that the government or building manager could have to a respondent, and if the respondent is undocumented or in violation of resident occupancy in a household, the distrust that the information will be kept confidential grows stronger. The additional explanation summarized why the phone number was asked (e.g., the enumerator's boss may call the respondent to verify if the enumerator was doing his/her work) and successfully displaced the purpose from checking up on the respondent to checking up on the enumerator, lowering the respondents' doubt about the use of the census information.

The monolingual English enumerators also attempted to deploy this strategy when asking this question of monolingual Spanish respondents. This was done by emphasizing that this was for "me only" (the monolingual English enumerator would emphatically point to herself) so my (pointing to self again) boss (a word most monolingual Spanish speakers know) knows she (pointing to self) did her job (word most Spanish speakers in the U.S. know). If the monolingual Spanish speaker did not understand the gesturing act, we can not be sure, but only in two instances did the monolingual Spanish respondent not provide his/her phone number to the monolingual English enumerator, a result that was actually more favorable than the four refusals we observed with the English-Spanish bilingual enumerator.

4.6.2. Communicative conventions during the interview.
The communicative conventions previously discussed for ensuring access to this population and in persuading hesitant respondents to participate in the NRFU interview were dress code of the enumerators and supplicant demeanor rather than authoritative approaches in the initial contact. Although this supplicant manner ensured access to the household, once the respondent agreed to participate, the ensuing NRFU interview form of questioning was direct. In a typical conversation among acquaintances in informal situations there are no time limits and a more indirect manner is used as opposed to the typical northern U.S. direct strategy. Conditional tenses (*podría* – "could I") and/or the past subjunctive mood (*quisiera* – "I would like to") are frequently employed among Mexican Spanish speakers as a way to denote indirectness. The English-Spanish bilingual enumerators used these verbal tenses. However, the monolingual English enumerators that used the Spanish Job Aid that did not contain these verbal tenses were

as successful in completing their interviews. In fact we actually observed that the more direct forms of questioning that broke with communicative convention actually sped up the census enumeration in interviews conducted with time-pressed Spanish monolingual respondents. In such cases, it allowed monolingual Spanish respondents to provide short, direct responses that answered the questions.

Normal conversation patterns in monolingual Spanish communities follow an inductive pattern for topic introduction where background information is followed by the main point with much hedging. But because of the time constraint to complete the NRFU interview, which the enumerators noted from the respondents who seemed pressed for time, both bilingual and English monolingual enumerators followed a more deductive protocol, with the notable exception of the phone number and gender (see discussion in Section 4.9.3.) questions. In these two questions the communicative convention was to give the reasons first and then ask the question. Example (34) shows the response of an English-Spanish bilingual enumerator asking the phone number question to a monolingual Spanish respondent and (35) a monolingual English enumerator asking the phone number question to a monolingual Spanish respondent, with use of gesturing and word emphasis.

(34)   English-Spanish bilingual enumerator
         Ahora, para la próxima pregunta, necesitan su número de teléfono para ver si vine aquí a hablar con usted. ¿Me podría dar su número de teléfono?
         Now, for the next question, they [census] need your phone number to see if I came here and spoke with you. Could you give me your phone number?

(35)   Monolingual English enumerator
         You see my boss wants to know if I am doing my job. So they need your phone number. Phone number? So my boss can make sure I came here and talked to you. Do you have a phone number to put here [pointing to census form]?

Other conventions of communicative interaction used by the three monolingual English and 15 English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were: smiling, politely restating the purpose of the census (if applicable), not showing impatience when clarifying respondents' statements of relationships of household members, and *never* stating that it was the law that they were obliged to answer. These strategies positively affected the interview, no monolingual Spanish respondent refused to answer any question (except for the two instances in which respondents refused to provide their telephone numbers). As we observed, both monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators tended to acknowledge the respondents' distrust when this arose, that they were busy, and that it was acceptable not to know all the household birthdates readily. Using the subject/verb combination of "we need" instead of "you should," positioned both monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators in one of needing help and giving power to the respondent.

In order to successfully maintain interaction throughout the course of the interview, monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators employed various non-verbal strategies. They smiled, remained calm, stated the purpose of their visit and how important it was, emphasized that it would take only about ten minutes, and assured the respondents that all

responses were confidential. Some enumerators positioned themselves next to the respondent, shoulder to shoulder to show the respondent what they were writing. The respondent could then read what the enumerator was writing and verify spelling. The request for help in spelling placed the respondent in a dominant position making him/her more engaged in the process. This strategy was especially effective for the monolingual Spanish respondents in lowering any initial discomfort they had at the onset of the interview. However, the monolingual Spanish respondents would have continued with the interview even without these strategies. We point out these observations as a note for future interviews in the interest of making the interview process more comfortable for the respondents. We must highlight that our observations were based on 15 bilingual enumerators and only three monolingual English enumerators. The latter shared a similar set of communicative conventions with the bilingual enumerators because of their familiarity with the population in other contexts of interaction.

We observed, and the enumerators agreed, that the following actions led to successful completion of interviews: acknowledging that the respondents were busy, thanking them for their time, moving quickly from one question to the next, and using subordinate/submissive body language (looking attentively at the respondent, smiling with the mouth, lower the head down but with the chin still pointing forward and hunching the shoulders a bit, eyes widened). As for non-verbal cues, there were universal cues not only attributable to the Hispanic culture. Monolingual Spanish respondents who were hesitant to participate at first would not open the door completely. Confused respondents (both monolingual English and monolingual Spanish) would look at the enumerator, look at the question and back again at the enumerator, shake the head, or shrug the shoulders. The monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators noticed and reacted accordingly to these moves of confusion and clarified any doubts.

To summarize: negotiating access and obtaining information through the deployment of communicative conventions that stressed indirectness and informality (kind facial expressions and smiling, and showing understanding by listening to what respondents had to say even if not directly related to the census), proved effective for enumerators in cases in which monolingual Spanish respondents had time to chat with the enumerator. This indirect method led them to feel comfortable sharing the information with the enumerator. However, obtaining information directly was also effective with monolingual Spanish respondents, and perhaps more so with those who seemed pressed for time. By stating directly the purpose of the visit, its importance to their community, and what it means that their information is kept confidential, the enumerator underscored not only that we valued their time but also recognized that we had only a small window of time to get that point across. The strategy that proved most effective in convincing hesitant monolingual Spanish respondents that did not have time to be interviewed was a politely persistent enumerator that convinced the respondent that just answering the questions then would avoid numerous future phone calls and visits. Within this community this strategy was effective regardless of the linguistic competency of the enumerator.

4.6.3. Code-switching between languages
During the 63 interviews code-switching occurred minimally. We observed one case in which an English-Spanish bilingual respondent code-switched from Spanish to English toward the middle of the interview when he did not understand the questions regarding the people who lived in the household on April 1. The complete switch to English may be explained by the fact that this

particular respondent was younger (in his 20s), was born in the U.S. of Mexican heritage, and was educated in the U.S. He may have had institutional literacy and experience with these types of questionnaires in English. Or it could be that because he was younger, with most of his education occurring in English, that his proficiency level in Spanish was not adequate to understand the questions in Spanish and he may have been familiar with the terminology in English dealing with people in a household on a particular date as well as mortgage or loan questions. This phenomenon has been noted by Kissam, Herrera and Nakamoto (1993) among Hispanics completing the U.S. Census form in that the comprehension of the Spanish translation required a respondent reading level higher than that required for the English version.

We also noticed that one monolingual English enumerator code-switched the few words or phrases she knew from English to Spanish ("wife" – *esposa*, "age" – *años*, "how old are you?" – cuántos anos [sic] tienes). Her mispronunciation of the word *años* – "age" as *anos* – (meaning "anuses" in Spanish) was the source of frequent humor amongst monolingual Spanish respondents.

Few other monolingual respondents code-switched from predominantly Spanish, peppering their answers with the few words in English throughout the interview. This happened with both the monolingual English enumerator as well as the bilingual. The code-switched words in English were usually numbers, months, family relations (wife, son, daughter, husband, etc.), the personal pronoun "me" when asked who the owner of the household was, and other high-frequency governmental-type English words. As noted in the introduction, although many adult members of Mexican immigrant families have limited literacy skills it does not hinder their involvement in new experiences in the U.S., ones that they would not have necessarily had in Mexico. Because of this phenomenon, they borrow and adopt words from English in order to fill gaps in their native language, such as "las taxas" phonologically derived from "taxes" (instead of Spanish *los impuestos*) and "real estate" (instead of *bienes raíces*) (Elias-Olivares & Farr, 1991).

We note a dual situation that monolingual Spanish respondents may find themselves in. On the one hand the perception they feel that non-Hispanics have of them and on the other, the perception of established, long-time, Hispanics. Bracken (1992) noted that a cultural factor influencing the undercount among Latino immigrants is the perception that they are not yet part of American culture. Many maintain strong social and cultural ties with their home communities that may inhibit the development of new ones in the United States. As noted earlier, established immigrant groups critique recent immigrant groups for not acquiring the English language faster, and in a sense, side-stepping acculturation to the U.S. culture. We hypothesize that since this type of code-switching happened with both the bilingual enumerators and monolingual English enumerators, it may be an example of attempting to show some knowledge of English as a good-faith act to indicate willingness to be part of the American culture.

We highly suggest that monolingual English enumerators not code-switch from English to Spanish even if it is to show some knowledge of the language and observe the discourse function of respecting the dominant language of the respondent. The show of respect may have led the enumerator to believe that it would lead to a better relationship to carry out an effective interview, but this was not always the case.

4.7.   Use of Interpreters

In the cases in which there were English-Spanish bilingual enumerators, no interpreters were recruited. With the English monolingual enumerators, interpreters were recruited in six instances. The following types of interpreters were recruited: children of the monolingual Spanish respondent recruited by the respondent; an English-Spanish bilingual neighbor; an English-Spanish bilingual enumerator recruited by the monolingual English enumerator; and an English-Spanish bilingual ethnographer conducting the research. In all cases, the general principle underlying interpreter recruitment strategy was the first bilingual Spanish person at hand.

In the case of the English-Spanish bilingual child interpreters, two were recruited into the response process at the start when the questions/statements made by the enumerator became difficult for the monolingual Spanish parents to deal with. In particular, the statement made by the enumerator explaining the reason for the visit, the amount of time it would take and the two sentences dealing with confidentiality. In these two cases we observed that the English-Spanish bilingual children's presence positively affected the interview by helping the parent understand the questions. In one case it speeded up the interview, allowing the monolingual Spanish father to return to work.

The bilingual neighbor was also recruited into the response process when the questions became difficult for the monolingual Spanish respondent to deal with in his limited English. In this case the neighbor's presence positively affected the interview by helping the respondent understand the questions. The communication breakdown in this situation occurred from the start when the respondent tried to understand the purpose of the enumerator's visit to his household.

The bilingual enumerator-interpreter was recruited by the monolingual English enumerator who had difficulty communicating with two monolingual Spanish respondents and had been previously unable to complete the NRFU visit. The two enumerators had met during the census training sessions and when the monolingual English enumerator saw the bilingual enumerator, who happened to be conducting NRFU interviews in the same neighborhood, the monolingual English enumerator asked the bilingual enumerator to accompany her to the several houses where the previous NRFU interview could not be completed due to communication breakdown. In this situation, the interpreter revisited the incomplete questions and positively affected the interview by helping the respondents understand the NRFU questions being asked of them. The communication breakdown in these two situations occurred with the questions dealing with: unit used as vacation or seasonal home; people staying in unit on April 1; ownership of home; and race.

In the case of the bilingual ethnographer, the monolingual English enumerator recruited her once during the interview because there were no other bilinguals close at hand and the NRFU interview had reached a point where it was going to end due to communication breakdown. The communication breakdown also occurred with the questions dealing with: unit used as vacation or seasonal home; people staying in unit on April 1; ownership of home; and origin/race questions. The ethnographer helped interpret to complete the NRFU visit and then informed the monolingual English enumerator to not request interpretation help from her for any subsequent interviews in order to not interfere with the data collection process.

In the cases where an interpreter was recruited by the monolingual English enumerator, she felt comfortable with the recruitment and the interpreter. Although the monolingual English enumerator did not verify the linguistic ability or competence of the interpreter she recruited due to the fact that she could not speak Spanish it may have been implicitly verified since the responses that the interpreter gave were appropriate answers for the questions asked and because she knew that the interpreters she recruited were both hired by the Census Bureau to work with the Hispanic population due to their language skills.

In the instances where the bilingual enumerator and bilingual ethnographer interpreted, the Spanish Job Aid was used (see discussion in section 4.8).

In the cases where an interpreter (neighbor or child) was recruited by the monolingual Spanish respondents, the interpreters' competency may have been implicitly verified by the respondents' personal knowledge of their child or neighbor's language proficiency. The monolingual Spanish respondents expressed gratitude for the bilingual interpreters they recruited since it allowed them to understand the questions, answer correctly, and finish quickly. This sentiment is evidenced below when the monolingual respondents were asked: Do you think the interpreter helped you today?

(36)   *Sí, si no, no hubiera entendido.*
         Yes, if not, I wouldn't have understood.

(37)   *Sí, entendí todo.*
         Yes, I understood everything.

(38)   *Sí, aclarándose más bien todo lo del censo y lo relacionado al censo.*
         Yes, she explained everything about the census better.

The six interpreters' translations of the census questions were on the fly and accurate. Any added information was a repeat using different lexicon or rephrasing, as described in previous sections. For example, the *rentar* "to rent" was used after reading *alquilar*; *dueño* in addition to *propietario* "owner"; and *traila* "mobile home" in addition to *casa móvil*. The original translations may have been difficult to read aloud, which may have made it difficult for the respondents to understand the questions. Using a literal translation may feel and sound awkward to the interpreter as well as to the respondent. So these on-the-fly interpretations may have helped the respondents understand the questions and successfully complete the NRFU interview.

In no case did the respondent express confusion over the translation, with the exception of those questions whose content was confusing (see discussion on Race and Tenure at Household in section 4.9.2).

4.8.   Spanish Job Aid and (Il)literacy
We observed that the three monolingual English enumerators as well as the 15 English-Spanish bilingual enumerators extensively used the Spanish Job Aid. Only one monolingual English enumerator did not use the Spanish Job Aid until her English-Spanish bilingual enumerator colleague mentioned that using the Spanish Job Aid would simplify her interview process with

monolingual Spanish respondents. She agreed and proceeded to use it for the remainder of her interviews. The monolingual English enumerator stated that there were so many papers that she needed to keep track of, that she forgot that the Spanish Job Aid was even in her packet.

The Spanish Job Aid was useful for all enumerators though for somewhat different reasons. It provided ready-made language for the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators who often read directly from the Spanish Job Aid, while in the case of the monolingual English enumerators who read the question in English it provided a ready-made translation that they could point to at the same time. The literate monolingual Spanish respondents read the lists as directed by the enumerators and had no trouble with the target language of the Spanish Job Aid. However it provided little assistance to the English-only enumerator in those cases in which respondents were illiterate. In such cases an interpreter had to be found, or else the interview simply ended (2 cases).

We highlight the issue of literacy because our research team observed that in one-third of the cases in which monolingual Spanish respondents were given the Spanish Job Aid it was unclear whether or not they were able to read them. At no time during any of the interviews was the communicative competency in English or Spanish assessed, to avoid humiliating the monolingual English or monolingual Spanish respondent. It was therefore difficult to directly or precisely measure literacy level, especially during the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators' interviews since the enumerators asked the question and orally listed possible responses even though the monolingual Spanish respondents had the Spanish Job Aid in their hands and seemed to look at the sheet. A stronger indication of the extent of lack of literacy could be gleaned from those cases in which the monolingual English enumerators asked monolingual Spanish respondents to point to an answer on the Spanish Job Aid. In four of these cases (50% of the total observed with this enumerator) the monolingual Spanish respondents directly stated that they could not read.[6] Clearly, monolingual Spanish respondent illiteracy presents a problem if a monolingual English enumerator cannot find an interpreter.

4.9. Issues with Specific Census Questions

4.9.1. Race.
The most typical instances of miscommunication that we observed occurred when monolingual Spanish respondents were asked the question regarding their race. Examples are seen in a monolingual Spanish respondents' answer to English-Spanish bilingual ethnographers' question if there were any parts where they felt confused.

(39)   *Sí, solamente en lo que de la raza, ahí que si era blanca o si era mexicana. Ese en general, las preguntas fueron claras pero la pregunta de la raza no.*
       Yes, only the one about race, there, if I am White or if I am Mexican. In general the questions were clear but not the race question.

(40)   *La pregunta seis, era la, dejé en blanco, no supe cuál raza era yo.*

---

[6] At this point the interview would have ended since the questions were difficult for the monolingual English enumerator to reword in simpler English. Accordingly the English-Spanish bilingual ethnographer was recruited by the enumerator and interpreted.

Question six, that one, I left it blank, I didn't know what race [to categorize myself].

(41)   *Que no tenga hispanos, soy mexicano, soy de piel moreno.*
         They didn't list Hispanics, I am Mexican, I have brown skin.

(42)   *Pues sí, porque no sé que raza era.*
         Well, yes, because I didn't know my race.

Both the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators directed respondents to the Spanish Job Aid and asked them to choose a race. The race list included in the Spanish Job Aid was helpful to a certain degree. Although the majority of the monolingual Spanish respondents were literate they did not know which race to choose because they did not consider themselves one of the races listed on the Spanish Job Aid (White, Black, or Asian). The list also provided some nationalities, such as Filipino, Japanese, and Korean, so many monolingual Spanish respondents answered "Mexican."

Some monolingual Spanish respondents first thought that "race" referred to their skin color which caused confusion since many Hispanics from Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras do not consider themselves Black or White, so many answered Hispanic, Mexican-American, *moreno* "brown," or *indio* "indigenous," while some decided to mark "Other." We also noted that several monolingual Spanish respondent mothers with children born in the U.S. listed their children as "White" and those who were born elsewhere were classified as "Other" or "Mexican." Because there is no claimed link to ancestry, Latin Americans tend to view race as "fluid, so it is possible to achieve whiteness, with its attendant prestige, over time" (Paredes, 2005, p. 60). This supports the researched notion of "pigmentocracy" coined by Paredes where:

> …the whiter one's skin and the more European looking one is, the greater is one's claim to honor and privilege. This pigmentocracy has reinforced the concept of *blanqueamiento* or "whitening" and is still pervasive in Latin America (p. 153).

The problematic nature of the term "race" on the census form has been thoroughly documented (Amaro & Zambrana, 2000; Grieco & Cassidy, 2001; Prewitt, 2005; Schmidley & Cresce, n.d.). This in part stems from a fact concluded by Bates, Martin, DeMaio, & Puente (2006) that:

> …the current classifications represent a set of categories which probably is not congruent with race classifications used by a growing segment of the U.S. population (Hispanics). The mixture of race and national origin categories confuses some persons about the intent of the race question, and some persons do not find a category with which to identify (p. 6).

In Spanish, the term "race" – *raza* refers to animal breeds. Among the English-Spanish bilingual population of the U.S., *raza* has gained a new definition and includes that of Mexican-American ethnic origin. For monolingual Spanish speakers who are recent immigrants to the U.S., the term *raza* will be only that of the original terminology and not include the new. Most monolingual Spanish respondents took the cue from the Spanish Job Aid to answer the question but two monolingual Spanish respondents took slight at the question. One felt that the issue of race was

to make Mexicans "white" by not including the term "Mexican" on the list, and as a consequence de-Mexicanize them. Another stated angrily to an English-Spanish bilingual enumerator: *¡Qué! ¿Soy un perro?* – "What, am I a dog?"

Both the monolingual English and English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were faced with this challenge and they both encouraged the respondents to look through the list and choose what they thought was appropriate. The monolingual English enumerators tended to point to the "Other" response to let the monolingual Spanish respondents know that it was acceptable to use a label not listed. However, the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators were able to understand the monolingual Spanish respondents' confusion and write down classifications not included on the Spanish Job Aid (see above, such as *moreno* or *indio*).

4.9.2. Tenure at household
Another confusing question was whether the monolingual Spanish respondents lived at the household on April 1st. It was difficult for them to understand why we wanted to know if they lived there just on that one day, and this may be evidence of a different cultural norm. We hypothesize that asking a monolingual Spanish respondent if they were living in the house on a specific day is incongruent with their notion that living in a household is long-term rather than, say, in a motel that is short-term. The strategy used by the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators was to re-word the question to the two versions listed below:

(43)　　*¿Cuándo　　se mudó　　　　　　　a　este　hogar?*
　　　　　when　　　moved[3rd pers sing - formal]　to　this household
　　　　　"When did you move here?"

(44)　　*¿Cuánto　　tiempo　lleva　　　　　　　viviendo　aquí?*
　　　　　how much　time　　spend [3rd pers sing - formal]　living　here
　　　　　 "How long have you been living here?"

In both instances, the bilingual enumerators' strategy to revise the question resulted in a question about length of stay in the household, reflecting the cultural norm. The bilingual enumerators then accurately deduced the answer to the question.

The monolingual English enumerators were presented with the same issue as evidenced in (45).

(45)　　Enumerator: On April 1, was this unit vacant, or occupied by a different household? Were
　　　　　　　　　　you living here on April 1?
　　　　　Respondent: *He estado aquí desde noviembre del año pasado, noviembre.*
　　　　　　　　　　I have been living here since November of last year, November.
　　　　　Enumerator: November? 2009?
　　　　　Respondent: *Sí*, yes.
　　　　　Enumerator: How about April1? Were you living here on April 1?
　　　　　Respondent: *No, noviembre*.
　　　　　　　　　　No, November.
　　　　　Enumerator: Okay, yes.

The monolingual English enumerators did not reword the question to align with the cultural norm regarding length of residence in a household, but did reword it to include high-frequency words in English and, in some cases, also used the Spanish Job Aid. Although this exchange may have presented some difficulty for those that did not have an interpreter present, the monolingual Spanish respondents' understanding of high-frequency vocabulary in English (you, live, here, April) aided in the response, albeit a response reflecting his or her cultural norm of length of stay. The monolingual English enumerators' ability to understand the high-frequency vocabulary in Spanish (*sí* "yes" and *no* "no," as well as cognates such as *noviembre* "November") aided in being able to accurately deduce the answer to the question. It may be that the cultural norm presented in this question was one that was not presented in the monolingual English enumerator's previous experience with the community.

4.9.3 Gender
We also noted that the monolingual English and bilingual enumerators either fronted the gender question with a reason for asking such an obvious question (discussion in section 4.6.2) or frequently avoided asking the gender question to the respondent answering the questions. It may be that enumerators felt awkward or uncomfortable asking the respondents, not wanting to offend them by the question. By avoiding the uncomfortable nature of the question, the respondent may have increased respondent cooperation. This strategy has been documented as also being used among monolingual English enumerators with non-Hispanic respondents (Childs, Gerber, Carter & Beck, 2006) and therefore no notion of cultural offense can be generalized from our observations. For the members of the household that were not present and had an ambiguous name, enumerators always asked for gender.

4.10.   Enumerator Perspectives on their Training and Preparation
All enumerators found the census training process useful during which they were shown different scenarios they may encounter in the field. The training was beneficial because it helped the enumerators feel more confident in the field and it prepared them in how to persuade reluctant respondents. This is in addition to the fact that the training manuals were helpful in case the enumerators forgot something. Some enumerators would have appreciated more role-playing and more hours in the field before enumerating for the census began.

The most challenging aspects for all enumerators included the distrust on behalf of some of the respondents (both monolingual English and monolingual Spanish) as to the use of the collected information; in these cases the enumerators spent extra time convincing the respondents that all information was kept confidential. Another challenge was accessing the households due to locked gates or unsafe areas of a city, also noted as problematic among this population in another census study (Elias-Olivares & Farr, 1991). To cope with reluctant respondents, all enumerators respected the point of view of the respondents (due to the distrust of the use of the census information dealing with immigration and an undocumented status or anger with U.S. government in general), used politeness strategies, and explained to the respondents the importance of the census information for their community. Most enumerators agreed that the following actions led to successful completion of interviews: acknowledging that the respondents were busy, thanking them for their time, and moving quickly from one question to the next.

The bilingual enumerators agreed that language was not a barrier in their interaction with the respondents. The monolingual English enumerators that were aided by interpreters were appreciative of their participation in the NRFU interviews because it bypassed the occurrence of potentially failed interviews due to language barriers. The monolingual English enumerator that was not aided by interpreters (two instances) led to failed interviews, after which she actively recruited an interpreter to follow up with those households and was then able to complete the NRFU interview.

Some enumerators also noted that they had difficulty finding a place to leave the Notice of Visit since mailboxes could not be used. In one urban area of Illinois, most residences were located behind locked gates with no access to the front door. The enumerators suggested the Notice of Visit forms be made with an adhesive backing to adhere onto doors. Another issue was that LCOs were receiving many phone calls from respondents responding to the Notice of Visit. This was because the respondents were calling the phone number in the larger area of the Notice of Visit form (belonging to the LCO) and not the number in the smaller area (belonging to the enumerator). The LCO later informed the enumerators not to write the LCO phone number on the form at all so that only the enumerators' number was visible on the Notice of Visit form. The enumerators recommended making the enumerator's phone number area larger on the Notice of Visit form.

5.   Recommendations

5.1.   Enumerator Training
One issue brought up by the enumerators during the debriefing session was that they would have appreciated having more hours of in-the-field-practice as part of their training process before starting enumeration. Although both the monolingual English enumerators and the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators appreciated the English role-playing carried out during training, they felt that they would have benefited from more situations or even by shadowing a team leader for several interviews before setting out on their own. The enumerators mentioned the need for shadowing to learn strategies to deal with hostile, distant, and reluctant respondents regardless of first language. They also stated that they learned these strategies in the initial days in the field but role-playing or shadowing a leader in these situations would have made their first days on the job more productive. We endorse these measures as sound recommendations for improving enumerator performance in limited English proficiency (LEP) communities.

Another key language-related challenge that enumerators will confront in this community is that of effectively conveying that any collected information is kept confidential. Training on alternative ways to express what confidentiality means is recommended, specifically that the information will not be shared with any other branch of the government, especially that of immigration. In our observations, identity may have played a role in garnering trust among the monolingual Spanish respondents, but far more important than identity was the attitude and approach used by the enumerator. An enumerator that exudes a patient, insistent, and convincing claim that information will not be shared with immigration offices is much more effective than merely one who is Hispanic or even an enumerator who speaks Spanish. Other aspects that should be included in the content of training should be an emphasis that the enumerators' dress

code as well as deployment of communicative conventions that reflect informality and indirectness rather than authoritative approaches.

5.2. Use of Bilingual Enumerators Familiar with the Population

The LCOs effectively identified English-Spanish bilingual enumerators to carry out the 2010 U.S. Census NRFU interviews. We recommend that the English-Spanish bilingual enumerators share the same characteristics in the future, that is, be literate heritage speakers of Spanish from the community that are familiar with the communicative conventions of this population. For face-to-face interviews with non-English-speaking households, it is recommended that the enumerators be English-Spanish bilinguals and also be trained to be patiently persistent in order to raise the comfort level during the interview.

While the issues related to culturally-prescribed communicative conventions did not for the most part render NRFU interviews impossible for monolingual English enumerators working with Spanish-speaking respondents, clearly comprehension challenges did arise. This was the case even for bilingual enumerators who initially stuck strictly to the scripted questions.

A specific example is the "gender" question on the census. We recommend that to avoid any possible instance of cultural offense -- avoiding any potential discomfort about the nature of the question, and therefore increase respondent cooperation -- gender only be asked of the members of the household that are not present and/or have an ambiguous name. Or use verification rather than asking the question explicitly.

We therefore recommend that enumerators should be allowed -- in fact trained -- to be more flexible regarding the census interview script to allow for a more informal (and possibly less offensive) structure. Translations of forms sometimes lack the flow of the normal speaking patterns of the target languages, and this results in translated text that sounds awkward to respondents. In our view, allowing enumerators to re-word questions to reflect the idiosyncrasies of the target language instead of requiring them to robotically read these questions exactly as written would facilitate the enumeration process. Obviously this can only be done effectively by bilingual enumerators. By re-wording some questions the interview will also be completed more quickly; this is an important aspect to be aware of with respondents who often lack time. If there is a hesitant respondent, persistent enumerators who continually reinforce the idea that the questionnaire will not take long and that all information is confidential will find their efforts rewarded.

5.3. Interpretation

If enumerators or respondents can find any interpreter who is able to help, is better than having no interpreter present that may result in a stalled interview. These interpreters' on-the-fly interpretations typically possess a natural flow similar to that found in normal speaking patterns. While we recognize the limitation of age or language proficiency on interpreters' ability to conduct interpretation on the stop, we believe that these interpretations help the monolingual Spanish respondents understand the questions and will lead to a successfully completed NRFU interview.

### 5.4.	Language and (Unintended) Meaning in/of the Census Form

5.4.1. Race.
We recommend the "race" list on the Spanish Job Aid be revised. We suggest increasing the options for "race" to include Mexican, Guatemalan, Salvadoran, Mexican-American, etc. We do not recommend adding the term *indio* – "indigenous" since this is pejorative within the Spanish-speaking community.

A similar recommendation is one that was previously suggested by Lopez (2005) for the 2010 Census:
> First, combine the race and ethnicity questions in a format that allows respondents to select more than one option. Second, follow up the race and ethnicity item with a question encouraging respondents to specify their ancestry, nationality, ethnic origin, and/or tribal affiliation. (p. 47)

We endorse this measure as a sound recommendation for improving accurate data collection in NES communities.

5.4.2. Residence.
A related recommendation that does not deal with the NRFU interview process pertains to the census form that is mailed to the NES households. Most of these monolingual Spanish households we visited did not receive a form in Spanish and one pointed out that the words "resident" and "residence" are on the form. This may have led several monolingual Spanish respondents to incorrectly assume that the form was asking for their legal *residence* in the U.S. and out of fear of the true agenda of the census they did not complete the form. We suggest replacing the term "resident" that appears on the census envelope as well as "household residents" on the census questionnaire with *Personas que viven en este hogar* – "People living in this household." As discussed in previous sections, because of the cultural notion of being "bien educado," this term will not stop the monolingual Spanish respondent from participating in the NRFU visit, but re-wording this term on the mail-in form may decrease instances of NRFU visits to this population.

5.4.3. Strategy to avoid unintended meaning in the census form.
If we would like to take into consideration the comfort level of monolingual Spanish respondents to participate in government related activities, more education needs to focus on what the Census Bureau does *not* do. An effective way to find out possible ways to clarify the Census Bureau's purpose would be to carry out focus groups with recent immigrants, from lower-income neighborhoods, with weak English language skills.

### 5.5.	Institutional Illiteracy
We recommend first that a more efficient campaign to send Spanish versions of the U.S. Census form be sent to communities with a documented dense Hispanic population. Second, we recommend that community resources be available during census-taking time to help monolingual Spanish respondents fill in the form. We believe that these two measures will make an impact in increasing Hispanic response to census write-in forms.

6.   Ten Years from Now

Issues that we believe will arise during the next decennial census will be the following: inaccurate self-identification of race; undercount of the newer Latin American undocumented population; and effect of institutional illiteracy in completing the U.S. Census Bureau mail-in form.

As was discussed earlier, there exists a lack of cultural equivalency for "race" and "ethnicity," terms that draw on an undifferentiated concept for Hispanics. "Latinos may be divided into three racial camps. First, there are black Hispanics, who identify as Latino ethnically and as black racially…Next come white Hispanics…Then there are Latino Hispanics, who identify as Hispanic on the ethnicity question and as 'other' on the race item, most often writing in 'Latino,' 'Hispanic,' or a national origin term" (Lopez, 2005, pp. 45-46). Lopez also underscored statistics that showed that "…consistently almost half of all U.S. Latinos believe they're members of a race that's not white, black, Native American, Asian or Pacific Islander…" (p. 45). "The danger is that Latinos will be raced white in contrast to the social reality of their position" (Paredes, 2005, p. 148) leading to an inaccurate description of the Hispanic population of the U.S., disregarding the rich portrayal that exists in this population.

With the increased growth of Central American undocumented population, especially Salvadorans (Terrazas, 2010), special attention to claiming of national origin is required for accurate census taking. In the successful migratory process through Central American, Mexico and finally to the U.S., Central Americans tend to not balk as being identified as Mexican.

> Central American Spanish-speakers share some features that distinguish them from Mexicans and other Spanish speakers, but each country in the region also has distinctive vocabulary and pronunciations. In the United States, the Spanish of Central Americans changes under the influence of Mexicans…Central Americans identify with their country's lexicon, but maintaining it marks them as non-Mexican during the migratory process through Mexico to the United States, which can cause them to be returned to Central America. (Lavadenz, 2005, p. 99)

Those Central American Spanish-speakers who self-identified themselves as Mexican have a longer history in the U.S. and have a higher probability of being undocumented. This self-identification reflects their awareness of what their national origin represents. That is, "it identifies them for immigration police and it labels them as outsiders in their Mexican neighborhoods" (Lavadenz, 2005, p. 101). Ten years from now, enumerators must be aware that claiming of national origin may become unreliable if outreach programs or media do not include community education of the purpose of the census and absence of a connection between the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Immigration Offices.

Finally, as was shown with a small percentage of the participants in this study and corroborated by a study of Hispanics in Houston, Texas (Rodriguez & Hagan, 1991, p. 10) members of this population feel intimidated by the complexity of the census form. The effect of institutional illiteracy in completing the U.S. Census Bureau mail-in form among recent Hispanic immigrants may still prevail.

7. References

Amaro, H., & Zambrana, R. E. (2000). Criollo, mestizo, mulatto, LatiNegro, indigena, white, or black? The U.S. Hispanic population and multiple responses in the 2000 census. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(11), 1724-1727.

Bates, N., Martin, E. A., DeMaio, T. J., de la Puente, M. (2006). Questionnaire effects on measurements of race and Spanish origin. *Research report series – Survey methodology #2006-12*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau

Betancur, J. (1996). The settlement experience of Latinos in Chicago: Segregation, speculation, and the ecology model. *Social Forces, 74*(4), 1299-1324.

Bracken, K. (1992). Hispanics in a racially and ethnically mixed neighborhood in the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans area. Ethnographic evaluation of the 1990 decennial census report # 16. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ev92-16.pdf

Champaign County, Illinois. (n.d.). *U.S. Census Bureau, American FacfFinder*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/STTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=05000US17019&-qr_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_S1603&-ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_&-redoLog=false

Childs, J. H., Gerber, E., Carter, G., & Beck, J. (2006). Cognitive test of the 2006 NRFU: Round 2. *Study series: Survey methodology #2006-5*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.63.9601&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Cohen, J. L. (2009). Global links from the postindustrial heartland: Language, internet use, and identity development among U.S.-born Mexican high school girls. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 187-215). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duany, J. (1992). The census undercount, the underground economy and undocumented migration: The case of Dominicans in Santurce, Puerto Rico. *Ethnographic evaluation of the behavioral causes of census undercount project.* Washington, DC: Census. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ev92-17.pdf

Elias-Olivares, L., & Farr, M. (1991). Sociolinguistic analysis of Mexican-American patterns of non-response to census questionnaires. *Ethnographic exploratory research, report #16*. Washington, DC: Center for Survey Methods Research, Bureau of the Census. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ex91-16.pdf

Farr, M., & Domínguez Barajas, E. (2009). Latinos and diversity in a global city: Language and identity at home, school, church, and work. In M. Farr (Ed.), *Latino language and literacy in ethnolinguistic Chicago* (pp. 1-26). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Farr, M., & Guerra, J. (1995). Literacy in the community: A study of *mexicano* families in Chicago. *Discourse Processes Special Issue, Literacy Among Latinos, 19*(1), 7-19.

Gonzales, M. G. (2009). *Mexicanos: A history of Mexicans in the US* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Grieco, E. M., & Cassidy, R. C. (2001). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: Census 2000 brief.* Washington, DC: Economics and Statistics Administration, Census Bureau

Guisepi, R. A. (n.d.). Hispanic Americans: The story of Hispanics in the Americas. Retrieved from http://history-world.org/hispanics.htm

Katz, M. B., Stern M. J., & Fader, J. J. (2007). The Mexican immigration debate: The view from history. *Social Science History, 31*(2), 157-189.

Kissam, E., Herrera, E., & Nakamoto, J. M. (1993). *Hispanic response to census enumeration forms and procedures.* Report submitted to the Census Bureau. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

Knight, G. P., Bernal, M. E., Garza, C. A., & Cota, M. K. (1993). A social-cognitive model of ethnic behavior. In M. E. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 213-234). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Knight, G. P., Cota, M. K, & Bernal, M. E. (1993). Socialization of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic preferences among Mexican-American children: The mediating role of ethnic identity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15,* 291-309.

Lavadenz, M. (2005). *Como hablar en silencio* (like speaking in silence): Issues of language, culture, and identity of Central Americans in Los Angeles. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 93-110). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Life Cycles. (n.d.). Older age as a life stage: The importance of elders, the family, economic factors, elder abuse. Retrieved from http://www.jrank.org/cultures/pages/4093/Life-Cycles.html#ixzz1PwAGF67u

López, I. H. (2005). Race on the 2010 Census: Hispanic & the shrinking White majority. *Daedalus*, 42-52. Retrieved from http://www.law.berkeley.edu/php-programs/faculty/facultyPubsPDF.php?facID=301&pubID=20

Lopez, M. H., & Dockterman, D. (2011). U.S. Hispanic Country of origin counts for nation: Top 30 metropolitan areas. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/142.pdf

McKay, R. B., Breslow, M. J., Sangster, R. L, Gabbard, S. M., Reynolds, R. W., Nakamoto, J. M., & Tarnai, J. (1996). Translating survey questionnaires: Lessons learned. *New Directions for Evaluations, 70*, 93-104.

Paredes, P. P. (2005). Latinos and the census: Responding to the race question. *The George Washington Law Review*, *74*, 146-163.

Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. (2011). *Unauthorized immigrant population: National and state trends, 2010*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=133

Prewitt, K. (2005). Racial classification in America: Where do we go from here? *Daedalus*, 5-17.

Rodriguez, N. P., & Hagan, J. S. (1991). Investigating census coverage and content among the undocumented: ethnographic study of Latin tenants in Houston, Texas. *Ethnographic evaluation of the 1990 decennial census report #3*. Washington, DC: Census Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/ev91-3.pdf

Schmidley, D., & Cresce, A. (n.d.). Tracking Hispanic ethnicity: Evaluation of current population survey data quality for the question on Hispanic origin, 1971 to 2004. U.S. Census Bureau, Working Paper #80. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0080/twps0080.html

Terrazas, A. (2010). US in focus: Salvadoran immigrants in the United States. Retrieved from Migration Information System website: http://www.migrationinformation.org/usfocus/display.cfm?ID=765#20

Wilson, F. D., Rebhun, U., & Rivas, S. (2011). Population change and changing educational attainment of ethnic groups in the United States, 1980–2000. *Population Research and Policy Review, 30*, 1-21. doi: 10.1007/s11113-011-9204-7

Appendix A – Respondent Debriefing Questions (English)

Introduction: Hello, I'm (Name) from the U.S. Census Bureau and I'm here to evaluate your experience with the interview you just had. I'll be asking several questions based on your personal experience and I would like to let you know that there are no correct or incorrect answers. Your answers will help the Census create a more effective experience for the next Census. Do you mind if I ask you several questions? It shouldn't take longer than 10 minutes.

We would like to make this process of filling out the Census easier and clearer in the future and your recommendations would be very helpful.
1. Do you remember receiving the Census form in the mail several months ago?
No – skip to question 2.
Yes – What was your reason for not filling it out?

We'd like to know if you have heard about the Census.
2. Have you heard about the Census this year?
No – skip to question 3.
Yes – How did you hear about the Census?

(*check which items they mention*)

___ television	___ community programs	___ internet
___ cable	___ school programs	___ other sources
___ newspaper	___ Census advertising	_____
___ community contacts	___ radio	

3. The next series of questions deals with your experience with being interviewed for a previous Census.
a. Have you had any experience being interviewed for the US Census in the past?
No – go to question 4.
Yes – Was there a difference between the last time and this time?

4. Did you know that the Census is a governmental related activity?
No – Did you think it was for something else?
        No – Go to question 5.
        Yes – What did you think it was for? Why? Based on what information?
Yes – Did knowing that it is government related affect your desire to participate in the Census in any way? Elaborate.

5. We would like to know what you think the information that is collected from the Census is used for. If people think that the information is used for certain purposes and the Census does not have anything to do with those, we need to learn ways to better communicate the purpose of the Census.

Why do you think the Census is used?
Give the respondent time to add their opinion. Use the list below if the respondent needs a
prompt, let them know that not all the statements are true.
Census is used...
- *To decide how much money communities will get from the government.*
- *To decide how many representatives each state will have in Congress.*
- *To count both citizens and non-citizens?*
- *To determine property taxes?*
- *To help the police and FBI keep track of people who break the law*
- *To help businesses and governments plan for the future*
- *To locate people living in the country illegally.*

6. We think that there's a possibility that there are incorrect assumptions by the people about the use of the Census, and that these assumptions may cause some concern about filling out the Census or answer the enumerator's questions.

Did you have any concerns? *Use the list below if the respondent needs a prompt.*
No – Skip to 8.
Yes – What were your concerns?

- *The Census is an invasion of privacy.*
- *I was concerned that the information I provided might be misused.*
- *My answers to the Census could be used against me.*
- *Answering and sending back the Census matters for my family and community.*
- *I just don't see that it matters much if I personally fill out the Census form or not.*
- *It takes too long to fill out the Census information and I don't have time.*

7. Did these concerns affect the responses you gave today?
No – Go to question 8.
Yes – Describe how they affected your responses.

8. We would like to alleviate these concerns in the future but need your advice. What can we do to calm these concerns in the future?

9. Were there any points at which you felt confused about the census questions or process?
No – end interview.
Yes – Explain. What was the source of that confusion?

10. What helped you to overcome those difficulties? If they weren't overcome, what would have helped?

Appendix B – Respondent Debriefing Questions (Spanish)
Respondent Debriefing Questions in Spanish

Introducción: Hola. Mi nombre es (*Nombre*) y vengo del Censo y estoy aquí para evaluar su experiencia con la entrevista que acaba de hacer. Le haré varias preguntas basadas en su experiencia y me gustaría que supiera que no hay una respuesta que considero buena o mala. Sus respuestas ayudarán al Censo a crear una experiencia más eficaz. ¿No le molesta si le hago varias preguntas? No debería de durar más de 10 minutos.

Nos gustaría hacer el proceso de llenar los datos del Censo más simple y preciso y sus recomendaciones serán de buena ayuda.

1. ¿Se acuerda de haber recibido por correo el cuestionario del Censo hace varios meses?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 2.
   Sí – ¿Cuál fue la razón por la que no llenó el cuestionario?

2. Nos parece importante saber si ha oído hablar del Censo.
   ¿Ha oído hablar del Censo este año?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 3.
   Sí – ¿Cómo ha oído del Censo?

   (*marque las repuestas que se mencionen y note cuáles son en español*)
   ___ la televisión   ___ la publicidad del Censo
   ___ el cable   ___ la radio
   ___ el periódico   ___ el internet
   ___ contactos en la comunidad   ___ otros tipos de
   ___ programas de la comunidad   publicidad_____
   ___ programas escolares

3. Las próximas preguntas tienen que ver con su experiencia de ser entrevistado(a) por el Censo en otro momento en el pasado.
   a. ¿Ha sido entrevistado(a) por el Censo en otra situación aquí en los Estados Unidos?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 4.
   Sí – ¿Hay alguna diferencia entre la última vez y esta ocasión que ha sido entrevistado(a)?

4. *Haga esta pregunta sólo si el(la) Enumerador(a) usó los materiales en español.* ¿Le ayudaron los materiales en español para entender las preguntas y el proceso del Censo?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 4.
   Sí – Describa cómo le ayudó.

5. Las próximas preguntas no tienen que ver con su experiencia de hoy al ser entrevistado(a) sino con su experiencia en general.
   ¿Ha tenido alguna experiencia con un Censo en su país de origen?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 6.
   Sí – Describa su experiencia *note si afectó la entrevista hoy*.

6. ¿Sabía usted que el Censo es una actividad relacionada con el gobierno?
   No – ¿Pensaba que era para otra cosa?
        No – Pase a la pregunta 7.
        Sí – ¿Para qué pensaba que era? ¿Por qué? ¿En qué información se basaba?

   Sí – Sabiendo que el Censo es una actividad gubernamental, ¿afectó su deseo de participar?
Explique.

7. Nos gustaría saber lo que piensa sobre los propósitos de la información recopilada del Censo.
   Si la gente piensa que la información se usa para ciertos intereses y el Censo no tiene nada
   que ver con esto necesitamos aprender la mejor manera para comunicar el propósito
   verdadero del Censo.

   ¿Para qué cree usted que se utiliza el Censo?
   *Déle tiempo al entrevistado(a) para responder con sus propias respuestas. Use la lista abajo
   si el participante pide ejemplos/ayuda y mencione que no todas las frases son verdaderas.*
        - El Censo se usa para decidir cuánto dinero las comunidades reciben del gobierno.
        - Decidirá cuántos representantes políticos tendrá cada estado en el Congreso.
        - Para contar a toda la gente sin importar su estatus de ciudadanía.
        - Para determinar los impuestos de los terrenos.
        - Para ayudar al FBI y la policía a mantener en cuenta quiénes rompen las leyes.
        - Para ayudar a los negocios y al gobierno a planear para el futuro.
        - Para encontrar personas que viven en este país indocumentados.

8. Nosotros pensamos que hay una posibilidad de suposiciones incorrectas sobre el uso del
   Censo. Estas suposiciones pueden causar problemas al querer llenar el Censo y contestar las
   preguntas del enumerador.

   ¿Tenía usted algunas inquietudes o preocupaciones?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 10.
   Sí – ¿Cuáles eran estas preocupaciones? *Use la lista abajo si el participante pide
   ejemplos/ayuda.*
        - El censo es una invasión de mi privacidad.
        - Me preocupo que la información que se conceda pueda ser mal utilizada.
        - Mis respuestas al Censo podrían ser utilizadas en mi contra.
        - Contestar y devolver el Censo es importante para mi familia y la comunidad.
        - No veo qué importancia tiene si rellene el formulario del Censo o no.

- Se tarda demasiado tiempo para completar la información del Censo, no tengo tiempo.

9. ¿Sus preocupaciones le afectaron en cómo contestó hoy al enumerador?
   No – Pase a la pregunta 10.
   Sí – Describa cómo le afectaron.

10. Queremos calmar estas preocupaciones en el futuro pero necesitamos sus respuestas. ¿Qué podemos hacer para eliminar estas inquietudes en el futuro?

Se puede saltar la siguiente parte de la entrevista si no hay suficiente tiempo. Note la información en la observación.
11. ¿Hubo algunas partes donde se sintió confundido(a)?
    No – Pase a número 13.
    Sí – Explica. ¿Cuál fue el problema?

12. ¿Qué le ayudó a clarificar la confusión (el material en español, el/la enumerador(a), el/la intérprete)? Si no, ¿qué hubiera ayudado a resolver la confusión?

Si no hubo intérprete, termine la entrevista.
13. ¿Se sintió cómodo con el intérprete que le ayudó y cómo lo/la buscaron? Explique. En el futuro, ¿quién sería un mejor intérprete?

14. ¿Cree que el intérprete le ayudó hoy? Explique.

Appendix C - Enumerator Debriefing Questions

1. Have you had any prior experience conducting Census or survey interviews in the US?
    No – Skip to question 3.
    Yes

2. Was there any difference between the last/previous time(s) and this time? Explain.

3. How did the use of Census printed materials in Spanish facilitate or otherwise affect your conduct of the interview? Explain.

4. Did you find the enumerator training adequate and useful for your work? Explain.

5. What did you think was the most challenging aspect of your work?

6. How did you cope with reluctant Respondents? What do you think were useful strategies to deal with them?

7. Did you find it more difficult to interview Rs with languages other than English? Explain.

8. Did you find that the language was a major barrier in your interaction with Rs or were there other factors?

9. Were there any points at which the Rs felt confusion about the Census questions or process?

10. What was the source of that confusion? Do you feel that it was adequately resolved? If not what would have helped resolve it?

11. Did you use an interpreter for any of your enumerations?
    No – end the interview
    Yes – go to number 12

12. How did the recruitment and use of an interpreter affect the enumeration process?

13. *Ask these questions only if Enumerator enumerated in the past.* How did the recruitment and use of an interpreter affect the enumeration process this time as compared to previous time(s)?

14. Did you feel comfortable with the interpreter that was recruited and the process of their recruitment? Explain.

15. In what ways, if any, did you feel the interpreter facilitated or otherwise affected the interview process?

16. How did you find an interpreter and verify the interpreter's language ability in a language that they themselves didn't speak?