

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 045 - FOLDER -003

[02/17/1999] [2]

Appendix B

Procedural Implementation of the New Standards for Data on Race and Ethnicity -- Phase I Report

An interagency committee was established to develop guidelines that will assist Federal agencies in their implementation of the Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity issued on October 30, 1997. The procedural implementation guidelines address three areas: (1) wording and format of questions that ask for self-reported race and Hispanic or Latino origin; (2) wording and format of instructions and forms that collect aggregate race and Hispanic or Latino origin data; and (3) instructions and training procedures for field interviewers and administrative personnel who will be using these questions and forms.

Members of the committee represent the Departments of Health and Human Services, Commerce, Education, Labor, and Veterans Affairs, and the General Accounting Office. An OMB Clearance Package was approved in March 1998 which authorized the pretesting of different questions and forms. This report describes the study objectives of the three areas, the research design, and the progress to date for Phase I. A second phase will focus on additional issues not resolved in Phase I.

1. Development and Testing of Self-Reported Race and Hispanic or Latino Origin Questions

A goal of this research is to provide guidance on the wording and format of self-reported race and Hispanic or Latino origin questions used in a variety of data collection efforts. Following are three of the most significant changes to the ways in which race and Hispanic or Latino origin questions are to be asked by Federal agencies.

- Self-report or self-identification using two separate questions is the preferred method for collecting data on race and ethnicity. When race and ethnicity are collected separately,

ethnicity shall be collected first.

- Respondents shall be offered the option of selecting one or more racial designations.
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander is to be treated as a distinct category from Asian.

The committee's primary objective is to develop and test a series of questions that agencies can use to guide the design of future data collection instruments. To design the test questions, the committee reviewed current survey practice, prior research on measuring race and ethnicity, and the survey literature on questionnaire design. This led to the identification of three factors which influenced the general design, format, and wording of race and ethnicity test questions. First, questions needed to be as similar as possible to those that were subjected to extensive testing prior to the issuance of the revised standards. In particular, questions used in previous research from the Current Population Survey, the National Content Survey, and the Race and Ethnic Targeted Test (see Federal Register Notice July 1997 for discussion of the results of those tests) were considered. Second, questions needed to be tested in both face-to-face interviews as well as telephone interviews.¹ And third, both short and long versions of questions needed to be developed--short in that the question should seek to collect the minimum information specified in the revised standards and long in that the question should collect subgroup information.

The minimum level of detail for race questions is the five revised categories--American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. Long versions of the race question provide for reporting of subgroups such as Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, and so forth. For Hispanic or Latino origin questions, the minimum level of detail is a *Yes* or *No* response indicating Hispanic or Latino origin background. Long versions of the question provide for reporting of subgroups such as Puerto Rican, Cuban,

¹Mode can also include whether the question administration is done using a computer, at this time, there is no plan for testing computer-administered instruments.

and so forth.

At this time, there are no plans to assess comparability of responses across modes; that is, the final report will offer guidelines on ways to ask a question when using a particular mode rather than provide an analysis of the effects of response distributions when using a particular mode. It will be incumbent upon individual agencies to make final determinations on the exact wording and format of questions and the potential measurement error that may be associated with a given design should be assessed.

1.1 Research Design

Qualitative research using cognitive pretesting methods are being used to test race and Hispanic or Latino origin questions. The research plan includes two phases. Phase I is still in progress; most of it has been completed and took place during 1998 in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Eventually, Phase I will include approximately 50 laboratory interviews conducted face-to-face or by telephone. Phase II will be similar in scope to Phase I, will begin in 1999, and will be conducted in selected geographic sites outside of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

Phase I does not include tests of self-administered race and ethnicity questions since the Census Bureau has already conducted considerable research in preparation for Census 2000. The Census Bureau conducted cognitive research as well as large scale field interviews as part of the Census Bureau's National Content Survey, Race and Ethnicity Targeted Test, and Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal test. Therefore, the self-administered format options contained in Section 1.3.2 of this report are based mostly on the research accomplished by the Census Bureau.

Phase I cognitive testing is conducted as part of a 10-20 minute survey which asks general household information (such as who lives in the household, the age, gender, education level, marital status, and income level of household members) followed by Hispanic or Latino origin and race questions. After the survey is completed, the subject is debriefed by a cognitive

interviewer to discuss the meaning of the words and phrases in the race and Hispanic or Latino origin questions. Attachment A contains the instrument used for testing.

It is important to remember that only a few questions have been selected for testing; other variations of ethnicity and race questions could certainly have been tested and may, in fact, work just as well or better in a particular survey. For example, all of the Hispanic or Latino origin test questions include the word *Spanish* in the question; that is, the test question asks *Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?* rather than *Are you Hispanic or Latino?* It is relevant, then, to note that the options on the following pages reflect what worked well among the different questions tested, not what is the best way to ask a race or Hispanic or Latino origin question. Phase I test results and the examples presented should not imply limitations or constraints to other question designs that comply with the revised standards.

The research design for Phase I has been modified over the past six months and currently has six experimental conditions. Two conditions test the questions by telephone and four conditions test the questions face-to-face. Optimally, each test condition will include at least 8 subjects, 1 whose parents are both American Indian or Alaska Native, 1 whose parents are both Asian, 1 whose parents are both Black or African American, 1 whose parents are both Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 1 whose parents are both White, 1 whose parents are both Hispanic or Latino (regardless of race), and 2 whose parents are different races (regardless of the particular race combinations).² Participants are recruited mostly by newspaper advertisements and flyers. Some additional recruitment efforts may be directed at community centers or other organizations in order to reach individuals who are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native, and individuals who are more than one race. Subjects are paid \$25 for one hour, and interviews are audio-taped or video-taped, depending on the interview site. Attachment C shows the progress to date by test condition.

²Participants are not asked to report their race or ethnicity during the telephone screening interview. Rather, they are asked to report the race and ethnicity of their mother and their father, along with a few other demographic questions about each of their parents. The reported race of their parents are used to assign subjects to a particular test condition. Also, it is compared with the race(s) individuals report themselves to be in order to provide further information on the process of self-identification of race and Hispanic or Latino origin.

1.2 Results

Thirty-two cognitive interviews (25 face-to-face and 7 telephone) have been completed. Generally, subjects were able to provide answers to both long and short versions of race and Hispanic or Latino origin questions. As expected, subjects who were interviewed face-to-face seemed to use and rely on the flashcards to select a response. Subjects interviewed by telephone had a bit more difficulty answering the race questions since they had to listen to a relatively long list of response options.

1.2.1 Testing Hispanic or Latino Origin Questions

Two subjects answered “*Yes*” to the Hispanic or Latino origin question and 30 answered “*No*.”

During debriefings, all subjects were asked their impressions of the other Hispanic or Latino test questions and were shown various versions of the Hispanic or Latino flashcard. Subjects were generally familiar with Hispanic or Latino origin questions, regardless of the particular test condition. As found in previous research, subjects define Hispanic and Latino differently but they are comfortable with both terms used in the same question. Since the test questions also included the term Spanish (which is allowed by the revised standards), subjects were asked their opinion about including the word Spanish; most stated they thought that the word Spanish was important to include. Subjects commonly defined Hispanic as indicating geographic location or Spanish origin, Spanish as indicating European origin or coming from the country of Spain, and Latino as a cultural concept associated with Latin American cooking, dress, and language.

Face-to-face interviews: All of the 25 subjects interviewed face-to-face seemed to find the Hispanic or Latino origin flashcards useful. Two flashcard versions were tested; Flashcard 7A and Flashcard 7B each list the detailed Hispanic or Latino origin subgroups but in different ways.

When shown both flashcards, subjects preferred Flashcard 7A which lists the subgroups under the main category “Yes, Spanish, Hispanic, Latino.”

Flashcard 7A
No Not Spanish, Hispanic, Latino

Yes Spanish, Hispanic, Latino
Includes Mexican, Mexican American,
Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or
other Spanish, Hispanic, Latino

Flashcard 7B
No Not Spanish, Hispanic, Latino

Yes Spanish, Hispanic, Latino
Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
Puerto Rican
Cuban
Other Spanish, Hispanic, Latino

Telephone interviews: For the 7 subjects interviewed by telephone, 4 were asked a short

Short *Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?*

Hispanic or Latino question and 3 were asked a long version, both shown below.

Long *Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?*

If Yes and no further information is provided, ask

Which one of the following are you? Are you Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or of another Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group?

Regardless of version, all of the telephone subjects were able to answer the first part of the question without difficulty. The second part of the long version has not been tested with enough Hispanic or Latino subjects, since one needs to answer “Yes” to the first part in order to test the second part. However, interviewers expressed concern that the long version may present some response problems since respondents will have to recall six possible categories without use of a flashcard or other visual aid.

1.2.2 Testing Race Questions

Among the 32 subjects interviewed, 13 reported their race as Black, 3 reported Asian, 2 reported Native Hawaiian, 4 reported more than one race, and 10 reported White, of which 2 also reported Hispanic or Latino origin. No American Indians or Alaska Natives were interviewed in Phase I.

Two of the 4 subjects who reported more than one race for themselves reported their parents as both being the same race. These two subjects based their multiple race reports on the backgrounds of grandparents or great-grandparents which is consistent with prior research. Of the four subjects who reported more than one race, three reported combinations of Native

Hawaiian, White, and either Japanese and/or Chinese.³ The fourth subject to report more than one race replied *White and Asian*.

Face-to-face interviews: Subjects who were interviewed face-to-face heard the question read and were handed a flashcard containing the response options. Several subjects indicated initial surprise at not seeing a Hispanic or Latino category or its equivalent. For example, one subject said *“Given the choices here, I don’t see what I should put down. I guess I have to say White, but that’s not right.”* When asked the meaning of certain race terms, some subjects referred to geographic origin, some mentioned facial or skin color characteristics, and others mentioned a particular culture or heritage.

Among the three flashcards tested, subjects preferred Flashcard 9 or Flashcard 10 (see below). In one case, a Filipino subject responded differently depending on the flashcard used. She was first shown a long version (Flashcard 10) and responded *“Filipino, I guess under Asian.”* In the debriefing, she was then shown a short version (Flashcard 9) and again was asked her race. She responded *“Other Pacific Islander because the Philippines are a Pacific Island. So I guess*

Flashcard 9

White
Black or African American
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

my answer would be different depending on the list used.”

³Several subjects were specially recruited through a Native Hawaiian source which accounts for the frequency of Native Hawaiian responses.

Flashcard 10	
White	
Black or African American	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian	
	Asian Indian Japanese
	Chinese Korean
	Filipino Vietnamese
	Other Asian
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	
	Native Hawaiian
	Guamanian or Chamorro
	Samoan
	Other Pacific Islander

Telephone interviews: Subjects interviewed by telephone were only asked a short version of the race question as shown below.

Short *I'm going to read a list of racial categories. Please select one or more to best describe your race. Are you White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander?*

There was some indication that hearing a list with alternative terms representing one category (i.e., *Black or African American* is one category, not two) may result in confusion. Specifically, two subjects thought the interviewer asked them to choose between *Black or African American* and commented that they did not like having to make a choice. This problem can be addressed through interviewer training that teaches the interviewer to pause longer after saying each category term or phrase; that is, if the interviewer is reading a list of "...*White, Black or African American, Asian, ...*" she/he should pause between the words *White* and *Black*, not pause between *Black* or *African American*, and pause again between *African American* and *Asian*. This should help the telephone respondent hear that *Black or African American* is one choice, not two. There was some evidence that the instruction to "...*select one or more...*" was misunderstood on the telephone to mean that the subject had to select more than one race. Interviewers will need to be trained to perceive and correct for this.

1.2.3 Concepts of Race and Ethnicity

As has been noted elsewhere in the literature, respondents often do not make clear distinctions between the terms used in describing race, ethnicity, nationality, and ancestry. In the cognitive interviews, understanding of the intent of a race or Hispanic origin question was shared but individual differences in the interpretation and meaning of terms used was found, as was confusion regarding the separation of Hispanic or Latino origin from race. The following examples from the cognitive interviews illustrate these findings.

- *It means ethnic background. Not the country. I think people tend to cross quickly between using the terms race and country. When I say "Yes, I am Hawaiian" I mean that in my bloodstream I have Hawaii. My blood inheritance.*
- *Race I guess means the color somebody is. Or, their cultural heritage.*
- *The word race means the biological heritage from which you descend.*
- *Race means the culture that someone is from.*
- *The way I think of race, I think of it as a negative, probably because of what we've read about in the 60's--race riots, etc. It always seems to have a negative connotation. I prefer to use ethnicity.*
- *I answer differently sometimes, depending on what's beneficial to my family or me.*
- *Sometimes you see Hispanic as a choice for race. If Hispanic had been offered as a race then I would have chosen that.*
- *The race question is difficult because it doesn't have enough categories, it's too restrictive. With only five categories, there are two that are too specific--American Indian and Native Hawaiian--and there's a list of countries for the Asians. It doesn't specify anything about Central or South American descent. Everybody comes from different backgrounds; even White Americans can probably check off Irish, etc.*

1.3 Guidelines for the Design of Race and Ethnicity Questions

As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, the Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity issued on October 30, 1997 set forth principles that should be followed when collecting race and ethnicity data for Federal reporting purposes. These principles and the guidelines below should serve to assist in the design and format of race and ethnicity questions contained in Federal data collection instruments. In addition, there is a rich literature on questionnaire design and data collection methods as well as the measurement of race and ethnicity. Readers are strongly encouraged to consult the literature and are referred to a suggested reference list contained at the end of this chapter. By no means comprehensive, this list should provide at least a starting point for those seeking further guidance. Following the guidelines below are examples of questions to illustrate specific formats and wording depending on

the mode of data collection.

Guideline 1: Communicate clearly an instruction that allows multiple responses to the race question. The revised standards are clear that the format and wording used in a race question must communicate to the respondent an instruction that multiple responses are acceptable. Based on research findings, the recommended forms for this instruction are *Mark one or more* or *Select one or more*. The committee supports these recommendations but recognizes that other possible instructions may be preferred, especially when integrating a race question within an existing data collection instrument. For example, some mail instruments do not word questions in a personal way; that is, rather than *What is your age?* an instrument may simply have *Age* with a line for an entry. Taking this case further, if one has an item simply worded as *Race* with a line for an entry, then an instruction must be included to communicate that multiple race responses are acceptable. Variations could include *Race - enter one or more*. Regardless of exact wording, the instruction must be evident to the respondent.

Guideline 2: Consider using an instruction to answer both the Hispanic or Latino question and the race question. This has particular relevance for mail surveys or questionnaires that are self-administered since there is no interviewer interaction. An instruction such as the following may improve potential item non-response, especially among Hispanic respondents.

NOTE: Please answer BOTH Questions 1 and 2 (Hispanic or Latino and Race)⁴

Guideline 3: For data collection efforts requiring detailed Hispanic or Latino origin or race information, consider options to collect further information through write-in entries or follow-up questions asked by the interviewer. Write-in entries or follow-up questions would be most commonly used for 'other' responses such as Other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino, Other Pacific Islander, or Other Asian. Also, write-in or follow-up information may be desired to obtain the name of the enrolled or principles tribe for American Indian or Alaska Native responses.

⁴Modified version as shown in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal forms

Questions shown in section 1.3.2 includes examples for write-in responses.

Guideline 4: Take mode carefully into account when designing questions and instructions. This guideline may seem obvious but it is often the case that surveys are conducted using a mixed mode (i.e., the initial interview attempt may be personal visit but a telephone interview is permissible). Since the questions should be designed with the mode in mind, there may need to be different versions of questions, depending on the mode of administration. Below is a brief discussion of some additional issues to consider depending on mode.

For surveys conducted face-to-face by an interviewer, use of a flashcard is very helpful to the respondent. The wording of the question has to incorporate the instruction to look at the flashcard. Further, the design of the flashcard is important; it should clearly and neatly contain all available response categories. Similarly, the design, layout, and visual appearance of a self-administered questionnaire is very important and should be carefully considered.

For telephone surveys, questions generally are shorter with fewer response categories. This presents a problem with questions that need to collect detailed information (see Guideline 3 discussed above). One solution may be to allow a follow-up question similar to the example shown in Section 1.3.4 that was tested to collect detailed Hispanic or Latino information. Using the race question as another example, if the respondent is read, *Please select one or more to best describe your race. Are you White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander?* and responds *I am Asian*, a follow-up question such as *Which one of the following are you? Are you Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or from another Asian group?* could be asked.

Guideline 5: Provide definitions to the minimum race categories when possible. This guideline is particularly relevant when the short version (only the five minimum categories) of a race question is used. Individual interpretation of the five categories could lead to response error, especially for respondents unsure of the definitions of Asian and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander. For self-administered forms, providing the definition of the category should be considered if space

and formatting limitations can be overcome. For interviewer-administered questions, the definitions should be readily available to the interviewer (usually in a manual that provides question-by-question specifications) to assist the respondent if needed.

Guideline 6: Adhere to the specific terminology as stated in the October 30, 1997 revised standards. The revised standards address the words and terms to use, and also indicates other terms that can be considered. For example, the name of the Black category should be Black or African American and additional terms such as Haitian or Negro can be used if desired. In another example, American Indian should be used and Native American should not be substituted for American Indian. Reviewing the terms specified in the revised standards is strongly encouraged before designing questions on race and Hispanic or Latino origin.

1.3.2 Examples of Hispanic or Latino Origin and Race Test Questions --

①

Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--

Self-Administration⁵

⁵Questions 2 and 5 are similar to the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal Long Form. Question 3 and 6 are similar to the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal Short Form. Write-in entries are presented in these questions since they will appear on Census 2000 Forms.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino <i>Print group</i> Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? Mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the "NO" box if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.
<input type="checkbox"/> No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Puerto Rican <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Cuban

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino <i>Print group</i> Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? Mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the "NO" box if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.
<input type="checkbox"/> No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Puerto Rican <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am, Chicano <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Cuban

4

What is your race? Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

5

What is your race? Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native — *Print name of enrolled*



	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian	Print race	Print race
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Filipino	<input type="checkbox"/> Samoan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Japanese	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander —	

⑥

What is your race? Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.

White

Black or African American



<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native - Print name of enrolled or principal tribe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian Indian <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese <input type="checkbox"/> Korean <input type="checkbox"/> Guamanian or Chamorro <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese <input type="checkbox"/> Samoan <input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian — <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pacific Islander —

**1.3.3 Examples of Hispanic or Latino Origin and Race Test Questions -
Face-to Face Administration**

- ⑦ Interviewer hands respondent Flashcard 7 and asks
Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

FLASHCARD 7

No Not Spanish, Hispanic, Latino

Yes Spanish, Hispanic, Latino
Includes Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish, Hispanic,
Latino

- ⑧ Interview hands respondent Flashcard 7 (above) and asks

Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

If “Yes”, and respondent does not state detailed background, ask

Which one of these groups are you?

If respondent hesitates or does not answer, ask

Are you Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban or of another Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group?

NOTE: For Question 7, the objective is for interviewer to record Yes or No only. For Question 8, the objective is for interviewer to record detailed Hispanic or Latino background for all respondents who answer Yes, of Hispanic or Latino origin.

- ⑨ Interviewer hands respondent Flashcard 9 and says

FLASHCARD 9

White
Black or African American
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Please select one or more of the following categories to best describe your race.

- ⑩ Interviewer hands respondent Flashcard 10 and says

FLASHCARD 10

White
Black or African American
American Indian or Alaska Native
Asian
 Asian Indian Japanese
 Chinese Korean
 Filipino Vietnamese
 Other Asian
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 Native Hawaiian
 Guamanian or Chamorro
 Samoan
 Other Pacific Islander

Please select one or more of the following categories to best describe your race.

**1.3.4 Examples of Hispanic or Latino Origin and Race Test Questions -
Telephone Administration**

⑪ **Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?**

⑫ **Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?**

If "Yes", ask

Which one of the following are you? Are you Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or of another Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group?

⑬ **I'm going to read a list of racial categories. Please select one or more to best describe your race. Are you White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander?**

1.4 Continuing Research on Self-Reported Race and Ethnicity Questions

Phase I will be completed by April 1, 1999. Phase II research will begin in Spring 1999 and conclude by July 31, 1999. Phase II will follow the same research design as Phase I but will be expanded geographically and will focus on testing with individuals who are Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and individuals with multiple racial heritage. In addition to research conducted by the committee, other studies could be initiated by agencies or interested groups. The committee expects to continue the review and modification of these guidelines as implementation occurs, feedback from agencies is received, and new research findings become available.

2. Development and Testing of Aggregate Reporting Forms

A second goal of this research is to provide guidance on the design of reporting forms that will be used by administrative personnel to aggregate race and Hispanic or Latino origin data for a given population (e.g., reporting race and ethnicity for a school population, a jail population,

etc). Implementing the revised standards will cause some fundamental changes to the ways in which race and Hispanic or Latino origin data have previously been aggregated and reported.

In the past, agencies were required to report, at a minimum, the number of individuals who marked one of the four race categories, as well as the number of individuals who reported either Hispanic or Latino origin or not of Hispanic or Latino origin. A standard or prototype reporting form was not provided to Federal agencies. Rather, agencies developed their own forms depending on the characteristics of a given program and the data collection effort.

The October 30, 1997 revised standards specify that, at a minimum, the number of individuals who marked one of the five race categories and the number who marked more than one race category are to be reported and that the race of those indicating Hispanic or Latino origin be reported if available. In many cases, greater detail about the combinations of specific multiple race responses will be needed. The following are some of the decisions issued in the revised standards that impact the design of aggregate reporting forms.

- When self-identification is not feasible or appropriate, a combined question can be used and should include a separate Hispanic or Latino category co-equal with the other categories.
- When the combined format is used, an attempt should be made to record ethnicity and race but the option to indicate only one category (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, with no race designation) is acceptable.
- When data are collected in a combined format and data on multiple responses are collapsed, the total number of respondents reporting 'Hispanic or Latino and one or more races' and the total number of respondents reporting 'more than one race' (regardless of ethnicity) shall be provided.
- When data on race and ethnicity are collected separately, provision shall be made to

report the number of respondents in each racial category who are Hispanic or Latino.

- In addition to providing the number of people who marked one of the five racial categories, data producers are strongly encouraged to provide the detailed distributions of multiple responses. At a minimum, the total number of respondents reporting 'more than one race' shall be made available.

The committee's goal is to test different forms in order to offer guidelines to Federal agencies. These guidelines should serve as a reference tool for agencies as they develop their own version of aggregate reporting forms based on agency data needs and program characteristics.

2.1 Research Design

The development of test forms has been a collaborative effort among the committee members, experts in questionnaire design and survey research, and policy and statistical analysts from the federal government who have been involved in the revision of standards for race and ethnicity data. In developing test forms, a decision was made to only use the minimum race categories specified in the revised standards. Thus, the forms only aggregate the numbers of American Indians or Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks or African Americans, Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders, and Whites and do not aggregate subgroups such as Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, and so forth. However, any form could easily be extended in order to capture other subgroup data, and it is expected that agencies will develop forms that meet their specific data needs.

Phase I is still in progress. Twenty cognitive interviews, 10 in cognitive laboratories and 10 on-site at establishments and agencies, are planned for this phase of the research. To test the forms, the subjects need to be familiar with reporting aggregate data for a given population (e.g., total numbers of students by demographic characteristics) but not necessarily familiar with the revised standards. For Phase I, participants are recruited mostly through committee contacts with representatives in various Federal, state and local agencies as well as those in the private sector.

Three different forms have been developed for testing purposes. The committee recognized from the outset that many organizations collect and maintain data at the individual level that includes Hispanic or Latino co-equal with other race categories. However, the design of the forms was an attempt to see how subjects would approach the task of aggregating separate Hispanic or Latino counts with the expectation that in the future, agencies will gradually modify the ways in which individual race and Hispanic or Latino origin data are collected. A brief description of each form follows.

- Form RH-1 is designed to collect the specific reports of race and record these by the Hispanic or Latino origin responses. There are 31 reporting lines representing every combination of both single and multiple race responses for the five minimum race categories. Total numbers for each race group are then entered under one of three Hispanic or Latino origin status columns: Yes, of Hispanic or Latino origin; No, not of Hispanic or Latino origin; No Hispanic or Latino origin information provided. This form conceptualizes what an automated data collection format would include. It can easily be expanded or reduced depending on the specific race combinations listed.
- Form RH-2 has two parts. First, it asks for the aggregate number of individuals who reported each single race, the number of individuals who reported more than one race, and the number of individuals for whom race information is missing. Second, for records of individuals who reported more than one race, the form then asks for a count of the number of times each race was included in a multiple race response. These numbers are reported in one of three columns: Hispanic or Latinos, non-Hispanic or Latinos, or separate Hispanic or Latino origin question but with no answer given.
- Form RH-3 has two parts and is similar conceptually to RH-2. However, it is designed to report aggregated race data crosstabulated with other variables. RH-3A asks for the aggregate number of individuals who reported each single race and the aggregate number of individuals who reported more than one race crosstabulated by Hispanic or Latino origin and gender. RH-3B is completed only for records reporting more than one race. The number of times each race was indicated is then crosstabulated by Hispanic or Latino origin and gender.

2.2 Results

Expert panel: A panel comprised of questionnaire design specialists and experts well-versed in aggregate reporting by establishments was convened in July 1998 to discuss draft forms for testing. Results indicated that the test forms were too complicated and should be redesigned so

that they would be easy to complete with little or no instructions. There were many reformatting suggestions, such as trying to follow the step-by-step narrative approach used by Internal Revenue Service tax forms that guide a respondent in calculating and entering a numeric report. Also, several of the experts thought that a reporting form should be developed that allowed for the aggregation of Hispanic or Latino origin individuals co-equal with individuals reporting race information; this suggestion was based on the knowledge that current practice among many institutions is to collect individual race and ethnicity data using a combined format.

The feedback from the expert panel led to three significant changes in the test forms. First, one form was redesigned to allow for the aggregate reporting of every combination of multiple race responses (among the five minimum race categories). A second form was redesigned to capture single race responses, the total count of multiple race responses, and the number of times a racial group was reported within multiple race combinations. Using Asian reports as an example, the second form was designed to aggregate the total number of students who reported only Asian and the total number of students who reported Asian plus one or more other races. Third, a form was redesigned to provide a template for crosstabulating race reports with other demographic data.

Cognitive interviews: Fourteen interviews have been accomplished thus far, 7 in cognitive laboratories and 7 on-site. Of the 14 respondents interviewed, 5 were Federal government personnel, 6 worked in private industry, 2 worked in local correctional facilities, and 1 worked in a school. For the laboratory testing, subjects were given 'dummy' records of applications that contained multiple race responses as well as combined Hispanic or Latino origin and race questions. Dummy records were used in order to see how subjects would complete the forms based on different kinds of source data. Examples of the questions used in the dummy records are below followed by the results of testing each of the three forms. For testing conducted on-site, actual agency records were used. Attachment B contains the general interview protocol. Attachment D shows the progress to date by test condition.

Example 1 - Combined format used on dummy records	
Race: Mark one or more	
01 <input type="checkbox"/> White	04 <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native
02 <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	05 <input type="checkbox"/> Asian
03 <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino	06 <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

Example 2 - Two question format used on dummy records	
9. Are you	10. Race: Mark one or more
Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?	01 <input type="checkbox"/> White
01 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	02 <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American
02 <input type="checkbox"/> No	03 <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native
	04 <input type="checkbox"/> Asian
	05 <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

2.2.1 Form RH-1

This form has been tested with four subjects. There were no appreciable differences between the laboratory and on-site interviews other than the fact that the agency data used on-site was substantially different than the data elements for Form RH-1. While Form RH-1 is the easiest of the three forms to complete, the subjects demonstrated some difficulty grasping the concept of multiple race responses and said the form appeared complex when they first looked at it. Several subjects stated that a separate set of instructions on how to complete the form is needed. One subject reviewed the form and did not think it provided all the needed reporting categories because Hispanic was not listed as a race. Even though the subject noticed that there was an individual column for Hispanic individuals to be reported, he was confused because Hispanic was not listed among the rows with the other race groups.

Once subjects began to complete the form, they were able to adapt to its format and report numbers accurately in the correct rows. However, entering the correct number in the appropriate Hispanic column remained a problem. One subject stated *“Everything was pretty straightforward and I really didn’t have any difficulty filling out my employees...but why are there three Hispanic columns? Why is the focus there? It seems sort of arbitrary.”* In particular, subjects seemed to have the most difficulty knowing where to report Hispanic individuals with no race information.

RH-1 form and instructions will be revised prior to further testing. The revised form will only have two Hispanic columns (Yes, of Hispanic or Latino origin; No, not of Hispanic or Latino origin) because subjects had a lot of difficulty discriminating between the column *Individuals who marked NO, Hispanic origin* and the column *Individuals who did not provide Hispanic origin information*.⁶ The revised RH-1 will also attempt to make clearer where to record individuals for whom no race information is available. Last, an improved set of instructions will be developed and tested. Following is a sample of part of the form that was tested followed

⁶ RH-1 as well as RH-2 and RH-3 used Hispanic origin rather than Hispanic or Latino origin. This was an oversight that will be corrected in future testing.

by the test instructions.

FORM RH-1

		Individuals who marked YES, Hispanic Origin	Individuals who marked NO, Hispanic Origin	Individuals who did NOT provide Hispanic Origin information
Individuals who marked ONLY ONE race	1 White			
	2 Black/African American			
	3 Asian			
	4 American Indian/Alaska Native			
	5 Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander			
Individuals who marked TWO races	6			
	7 White + Asian			
	8 White + Am Indian/Alaska Nat.			
	9 White + Nat Hawaiian/OPI			
	10 Black/African Am + Asian			
	11 Black/African Am + Am Indian/Alaska Nat.			
	12 Black/African Am + Nat Hawaiian/OPI			
	13 Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat.			
14 Asian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI				
Race missing	32 Individuals who DID NOT provide race information			
Total	33 Sum of rows 1 through 32			

NOTE: Form RH-1 contains rows 15-31 which are rows for individuals who marked three, four, and five race groups. For space reasons, only the first third of the form is shown above.

RH-1 INSTRUCTIONS

When completing this form, please note:

1. We are requesting separate counts for individuals who mark only one race and for those who mark more than one race-- one race, two races, three races, etc.
2. For the purposes of this form, 'Hispanic' is an ethnic group and is not a race
3. If you are entering information for individuals of Hispanic origin for whom no race data are available, please enter these individuals in your count on Line 32, 'Individuals who DID NOT provide race information' and Column (1) 'Individuals who marked YES, Hispanic origin'.
4. If you do not have any racial/ethnic information for individuals, or the information your organization has does not fit a racial/ethnic category, then please enter these individuals in your count in Row 32 'Individuals who DID NOT provide race information' and Column (3) 'Individuals who did not provide Hispanic Origin information'.

Form RH-2 has been tested with eight subjects and has undergone several revisions. As found in Form RH-1, participants interviewed on-site as well as the laboratory subjects using a combined race/ethnicity dummy record were the most confused because the test form separates counts of Hispanics from counts of race groups which is not currently done at their agency or organization. With one exception, the subjects interviewed both in the laboratory and on-site were not experienced in manually aggregating data from individual source documents. Rather, they were familiar working with data already aggregated and contained in automated files, most of which include Hispanic as one of the race/ethnicity reporting categories. For example, one subject stated *"The only one I got confused and stumped on wasunder the multi-race count...It was hard for me not to treat Hispanic as a race category. I guess I've been trained and indoctrinated."* A second subject said *"It's basically asking how Hispanics were separated into groups of races. I think the part that confuses me is that our Hispanics do not view themselves as another race. And so that is kind of what threw me off... it's asking for Hispanics who had marked 'White,' but they don't. They would have checked Hispanic."*

Whether in the laboratory or on-site, all subjects were confused at first by the second half of the form which requires the reporting of the number of times a race was marked among the multiple race responses. Below is a modified portion of the form that asks for these counts. As indicated in the RH-1 discussion, Form RH-2 will be revised prior to further testing.

FORM RH-2 REPORTING MULTIPLE RACES

Count of TIMES each race was marked for	<i>Hispanics</i>	<i>NON Hispanics</i>	<i>Separate Hispanic Origin Question with no answer given</i>
Number of times WHITE was marked			
Number of times BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN was marked			
Number of times ASIAN was marked			
Number of times AMERICAN INDIAN/ ALASKA NATIVE was marked			
Number of times NATIVE HAWAIIAN / OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER was marked			

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

2.2.3 Form RH-3

Two interviews were completed with Form RH-3. Neither subject completed the form accurately or seemed to understand its intent. This form allows for race information to be crosstabulated by other demographic information. The top portion of the form is shown below.

The two subjects interviewed only had experience working with automated data and therefore, had no experience or knowledge of the tasks involved in manually aggregating responses. One subject, a Federal government EEO officer, stated that Hispanic is considered a race and she demonstrated difficulty in not knowing where to report Hispanic individuals as well as what to do for Hispanic or Latino individuals who also mark one race (*Should I count this as a multiple race count?*). The other subject did not understand the form at all and was only familiar with producing aggregate reports from automated data systems. Form RH-3 needs some additional testing before revisions can be made.

FORM RH-3A AGGREGATE REPORTING OF POPULATION BY RACE, HISPANIC ORIGIN AND GENDER									
Hispanic and Gender Characteristics		Individuals Who Marked Only ONE Race					Individuals Who Marked MORE THAN ONE Race	Individuals Who Did NOT Report Race	Total Pop
		White	Black/ African American	Asian	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander			
Total Population									
Hispanic	Male								
	Female								
	Total								
Not Hispanic	Male								
	Female								
	Total								
No Hispanic Information	Male								
	Female								
	Total								

2.3 Methodological Problems

Based on the laboratory interviews, on-site visits, and discussions with many state and local government personnel and personnel working in private industry, several methodological problems regarding the development and testing of aggregate reporting forms were identified.

Differences between the format of the individual (source) data and the format of the aggregate form: One of the problems in trying to test a prototype form that would assist agencies in developing aggregate reporting methods is that the format of the individual data varies across programs, agencies, and organizations. To develop an aggregate reporting form, general questionnaire design principles would call for using the same or similar categories as those used for the individual data. For example, if the individual data uses a combined race/ethnicity question in which Hispanic or Latino is one of the response options, then one would expect to design an aggregate form that follows the source data convention. Through interviews and

discussions with a variety of data reporters, members of the committee found that a combined race/ethnicity question has been used often and that a variety of terms and words are used to represent a race category. Thus, subjects have difficulty complying with the testing task because they are essentially being asked to reformat and redefine their data in order to complete the test form.

Regardless of whether an agency is using a combined question or whether an agency is using the terms set forth in the revised standards, the point here is that data reporters expect an aggregate form to be similar conceptually to individual records. Since the test forms were developed independent of what the individual records contain, the test forms were perceived as unsuitable for reporting agency race and ethnicity data.

To illustrate this problem, at one corrections center, the racial identification is made by the arresting officer and includes the categories: (1) Black, (2) White, (3) Oriental, (4) Indian, (5) Black Hispanic, (6) White Hispanic, (7) Oriental Hispanic, (8) Indian Hispanic, and (9) unknown. The information is made by observation, and it is unclear to what extent Hispanic information is assessed accurately. At a different corrections center in the same state, race and ethnicity data are automated and keyed using two separate fields as follows: (B) Black, (A) Asian/Pacific Islander/Oriental, (I) American Indian/Alaska Native, (C) Caucasian, and (U) Unknown; in a separate field either (H) Hispanic is entered or the field is left blank. The data are obtained from a police officer who records it on an intake form which is then keyed at the time of entrance to the facility. The database at this facility allows for missing/unknown race information which the subject said accounts for roughly 10% of the facility population. Neither one of these subjects worked easily with the test form because it was so different from their agency's individual source data and aggregate reports they have completed in the past.

Difficulties in performing a complicated manual task. A second testing problem was that only one subject was familiar with manual aggregating and reporting of race and ethnicity data. One of the committee's underlying assumptions was that if manual reporting forms were developed and tested, they could then easily be adapted to automated reporters. While this may be true,

the testing process itself was strained because the individuals interviewed had considerable difficulty applying their data reporting process to manual completion of the test forms. Improving the instructions will partially reduce this problem but redesigning the forms is necessary too.

Visual appearance of the forms: The committee recognized that the forms look complicated. While it was thought that draft forms would suffice for testing purposes, the importance of the appearance and layout of the forms were underestimated. Prior to further testing, the forms will be redesigned to look more professional and reduce the initial perception of complexity.

Mix of laboratory and on-site tests: Conducting both laboratory and on-site visits is methodologically much more complicated than had been foreseen. Simply put, testing in the laboratory using dummy records is not similar enough to a like task at an agency level. This is because the laboratory subjects actually performed the task of categorizing and manually aggregating data in order to fill out the test form. On-site, however, the data the subjects worked with for testing were already aggregated and therefore, the task was substantially different and subjects could not simply disaggregate the data as needed to fill out the form. This problem can be partially remedied by developing different protocols for laboratory and on-site tests as well as ensuring that the interview is conducted with a staff member who has access to the individual source data.

2.4 Guidelines for Aggregate Reporting of Race and Ethnicity Data

As referred to previously, the Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity issued on October 30, 1997 set forth principles that should be followed when aggregating race and ethnicity data for Federal reporting purposes. The committee tested three different reporting forms with the hopes of providing guidelines to agencies for the development of new reporting forms. None of the three forms as tested are recommended for use. However, results of the fourteen interviews suggest that minor revisions and improved formatting of Form RH-1 may work for agencies that collect each multiple race

combination reported. The Phase II revision of Form RH-1, along with improved instructions, may also serve to help develop computer specifications for those who will be developing automated reporting systems.

For agencies that need a total number of multiple race responses followed by the number of times each race was reported, the concepts underlying Forms RH-2 and RH-3 will provide the data needed and may be worth pursuing. However, the current forms need substantial revision and, more importantly, considerable attention still needs to be paid to developing instructions that are easy to understand and will lead to accurate completion of the forms. A remaining problem that can only be overcome in time is the need for agencies to change the way individual data are collected. Redesign of the forms will not address the disconnect between the format of the individual data and the format of aggregate forms that meet the revised standards. A few general guidelines, though, can be offered at this point and should be considered by agencies as they move forward with implementing the revised standards.

Guideline 1: If possible, allow for the reporting of every combination of multiple race responses.

A system that collects every multiple race combination along with Hispanic or Latino origin information will allow the maximum flexibility for an agency in further reporting and analysis. It would be expected that only automated systems could achieve this, unless the population sizes for a given agency or organization are small enough to allow manual record keeping and tabulations. Most of interviews thus far confirmed that for agencies that automate individual records, new combinations of multiple races could be incorporated into their current systems.⁷ Practically, though, modifying a reporting system to accept numerous combinations of race and ethnicity reports has several difficulties, most notably (1) the burden associated with reporting at least 62⁸ unique combinations of race and Hispanic or Latino origin crossed by other variables and (2) the issue of data suppression due to confidentiality and privacy concerns.

Guideline 2: Professionally design the form and include clear instructions.

Taking care to professionally design a reporting form may seem obvious but the need for this is heightened when the form is complex and appears difficult to complete. Many future respondents reporting race and ethnicity data will be working with new terms and concepts and therefore, may be more prone to error if instructions are not clear and completion of forms are not self-evident. In particular, instructions must address what the reporter should do if the individual data has been collected using a combined format.

Guideline 3: Provide definitions that assist in understanding the concepts of single race reports and multiple race reports as well as the distinction between ethnicity and race. These definitions might be able to be integrated into the instructions accompanying the form or on the

⁷Contacts at establishments have stated that the costs of modifying their current automated systems may be high and that accommodating a reporting change would require a decision at senior management levels.

⁸The figure of 62 is based upon the possible combinations of 5 race categories and 2 ethnicity categories (Yes or No regarding Hispanic or Latino origin). The figure could be substantially higher if subgroups (e.g., Japanese, Samoan, Cuban, Puerto Rican, etc.) are used when collecting race and ethnicity data as well as combinations that account for missing race data and missing Hispanic or Latino origin data.

form itself. Another option is to develop an information sheet that explains these and other relevant definitions.

Guideline 4: Explain how the respondent should treat different kinds of missing data. One clear problem that emerged in the cognitive testing was that respondents were unsure how to handle missing data. Missing data can take a variety of forms (i.e, Hispanic is reported but race data is missing; race is reported but Hispanic information is missing) and each type should be addressed to avoid reporting errors.

2.5 Continuing Research on Aggregate Reporting of Race and Ethnicity

Phase I will be completed by April 1, 1999. Phase II will begin in the Spring 1999 and be completed by July 31, 1999. Its research design is currently being revised and may include further testing and refinement of forms and instructions. It may also include a more focused effort to conduct on-site visits with various agencies to better understand the reporting problems posed by aggregate reporting of race and ethnicity data. It is relevant to note that many of the problems identified in this research are not new and have been known and documented in the past. Phase II will concentrate on developing guidelines that will inform the reporting process, improve data quality, and assist data reporters in aggregating data containing multiple race responses.

3.0 Field Instructions and Training Procedures

Work to develop interview instructions and interviewer training procedures will begin in the Spring of 1999 and conclude on July 31, 1999. Different training modules and interviewer instructions depending on the mode of administration and the type of data collection will be developed and hopefully tested by organizations involved in data collection operations.

Work on field instruction and training will, in all likelihood, not address new issues or problems.

For example, some household interviewers have for years been using flashcards for race

questions and are experienced in helping a respondent understand response categories and so forth. However, since the revised standards do encompass several distinct changes, it seems timely to address in a more systematic way issues in the fielding of the questions, and ways that interviewers can be trained to improve data quality. Specific procedures on how to ask the questions and, in some cases, how to instruct the respondent to use the flashcard will be developed as well as suggested interviewer probes, definitions, and statements that can be used to answer respondent questions. It is known from past surveys that at a minimum, guidance should be provided regarding the following:

- What should the interviewer say if the response is multiracial, biracial, or some other term or phrase without a specific race combination mentioned?
- What should the interviewer say if the response is Hispanic, Latino, or some other term indicating Hispanic or Latino origin?
- What are the general probes and/or definitions that interviewers should use for responses such as American, Swedish, Jewish, and so forth?
- What is the interviewer response to a refusal or a response of “other?”

Some Suggested References and Helpful Readings

Aday, L. (1989). Designing and conducting health surveys: A comprehensive guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bates, N., de la Puente, M., DeMaio, T. J., & Martin, E. A. (1994). Research on race and ethnicity: Results from questionnaire design tests. Proceedings of the Annual Research Conference, (pp. 107-136). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Belson, W.A. (1981). The design and understanding of survey questions. Aldershot, England: Gower.

Biemer, P. P., Groves, R. M., Lyberg, L. E., Mathiowetz, N. A. & Sudman, S. (Eds.). (1991). Measurement error in surveys. New York: Wiley.

Bureau of the Census (1996). Findings on questions on race and Hispanic origin tested in the 1996 National Content Survey. Population Division Working Paper No. 16.

Bureau of the Census (1997). Results of the 1996 Race and Ethnic Targeted Test. Staff in Population Division and Decennial Statistical Studies Division. Population Division Working Paper No. 18.

Cantor, D., Schechter, S. & Kerwin, J. (1996). Evaluation of changes to the race question on birth certificates. Proceedings of the Government Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 241-245.

Converse, J. M., & Presser, S. (1986). Survey questions: Handcrafting the standard questionnaire. Beverly Hills: Sage.

DeMaio, T. J. (Ed.). (1983). Approaches to developing questionnaires. Statistical Policy Working Paper No. 10. Washington, DC: Statistical Policy Office, Office of Management and Budget.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: Wiley.

Edmonston, B., Goldstein, J., & Tamayo Lott, J. (1994). Spotlight on heterogeneity: An assessment of the federal standards for race and ethnicity classification. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Evinger, S. (1995). How shall we measure our nation's diversity? Chance, Winter 1995, 7-14.

- Farley, R. (1993). Questions about race, Spanish origin and ancestry: Findings from the Census of 1990 and proposals for the Census of 2000. Testimony at hearings of the Subcommittee on Census, Statistics and Postal Personnel, House of Representatives, April 14.
- Fowler, F. J. (1993). Survey research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gerber, E., & de la Puente, M. (1996). The development and cognitive testing of race and ethnic origin questions for the Year 2000 Decennial Census. Proceedings of the Annual Research Conference, (pp. 190-232). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Groves, R. M., Biemer, P. P., Lyberg, L. E., Massey, J. T., Nicholls II, W. L. & Waksberg J. (Eds.). (1988). Telephone survey methodology. New York: Wiley.
- Groves, R. M. (1989). Survey errors and survey costs. New York: Wiley.
- Lyberg, L., Biemer, P., Collins, M., de Leeuw, E., Dippo, C., Schwarz, N. & Trewin, D. (Eds.) (1997). Survey measurement and process quality. New York: Wiley.
- Office of Management and Budget (1997). Recommendations from the Interagency Committee for the Review of the Racial and Ethnic Standards to the Office of Management and Budget concerning changes to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity. Federal Register, Vol. 62 (131), 36844-36946.
- Office of Management and Budget (1997). Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity. Federal Register, Vol. 62 (210), 58781-58790.
- Payne, S. L. (1951). The art of asking questions. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schechter, S. (In press). Revising the standards for data on race and ethnicity: Comments on the process and thoughts on future implications. Statistical Policy Working Paper: Seminar on Interagency Coordination and Cooperation. Washington, DC: Statistical Policy Office, Office of Management and Budget.
- Schwarz, N., & Sudman, S. (1996). Answering questions: Methodology for determining cognitive and communicative processes in survey research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sirken, M., Herrmann, D., Schechter, S., Schwarz, N., Tanur, J., & Tourangeau, R. (Eds.). (in press). Cognition and survey research. New York: Wiley.
- Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. (1982). Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tanur, J. M. (Ed.). (1992). Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tucker, C., McKay, R., Kojetin, B., Harrison, R., de la Puente, M., Stinson, L., & Robinson, E. (1996). Testing methods of collecting racial and ethnic information: Results of the Current Population Survey Supplement on race and ethnicity. Bureau of Labor Statistics Statistical Notes, No. 40.

Tucker, C. (in press). Revision of the classification system for race and ethnicity. Statistical Policy Working Paper: Seminar on Interagency Coordination and Cooperation. Washington, DC: Statistical Policy Office, Office of Management and Budget.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (1996). Racial and ethnic classifications used by public schools. NCES 96-092, by N. Carey and E. Farris, J. Carpenter, project officer, Washington, DC.

Date: _____

Start time: _____

Interviewer: _____

From Scott's telephone screening, subject's race is _____ and Hispanic or Latino origin status is _____

This interview is for the condition marked below:

___	CONDITION 1	Hisp Short + Race Short	Telephone interview
___	CONDITION 2	Hisp Long + Race Short	Telephone interview
___	CONDITION 3	Hisp Short + Race Short	Face-to-face (Flashcards 1 and 3)
___	CONDITION 4	Hisp Long + Race Short	Face-to-face (Flashcards 2 and 3)
___	CONDITION 5	Hisp Long + Race Long/2 banks	Face-to-face (Flashcards 2 and 4)
___	CONDITION 6	Hisp Long + Race Long/3 banks	Face-to-face (Flashcards 2 and 5)

Before we begin, do you have any questions to ask of me?
(If yes, answer as neutrally as possible. If specific to questionnaire, tell respondent we will talk about this later).

Begin Interview - Modify wording as necessary if interview is conducted on telephone.

Okay, let's begin. Pretend you are at home and I've knocked on the door/telephoned you and asked you to participate in an interview. You agree and I begin the interview.

Q1. What are the names of all persons living here (in this house/apartment)? Start with the name of a person living here who owns or rents this house/apartment.

Person 1 _____	Person 4 _____
Person 2 _____	Person 5 _____
Person 3 _____	Person 6 _____

Q2. What is *(use name)* person #2's relationship to *(use name)* person #1?
What is *(use name)* person #3's relationship to *(use name)* person #1?, etc.
Enter relationship above next to name.

Q3. What is (your/ _____'s) date of birth? Ask for all household members.

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

Q4. What is (your/ _____'s) age in years? Ask for all household members.

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

Q5. Are you (is _____) now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?
Only ask for subject and remaining adults in household.

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

PROBE: What does separated mean to you?

PROBE: Do you consider divorced and separated the same thing or different things?

Q6. What is (your/ _____'s) sex? Ask for all household members and mark M or F above in Q5.

Q7. What is the highest level of school (you/ _____) (have/has) completed or the highest degree (you/ _____) (have/has) received?

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

PROBE: Can you tell me what this question is asking?

PROBE: What does completed mean to you?

Q8. Interviewer hands respondent Hispanic/Latino Flashcard.

Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino?

Be sure to record the verbatim response. Ask the probes after getting Hispanic origin for all household members.

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

PROBE: Can you tell me what this question is asking?

PROBE: What does Spanish, Hispanic, Latino mean to you?

PROBE: Do all three words mean the same thing or do they mean something different?

PROBE: When you looked at the flashcard, what did you think your answer was suppose to be?

PROBE: What does Puerto Rican mean to you? What does Cuban mean? Etc.

Q9. Interviewer hands respondent Race Flashcard

Please select one or more of the following categories to best describe your race.

Be sure to record the verbatim response in the order that the race(s) are named. Ask the probes after getting race for all household members.

Person 1 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 6 _____

PROBE: Can you tell me what this question is asking?

PROBE: What does the word race mean to you?

PROBE: Does Black or African American mean the same thing or do they mean something different? What do they mean to you?

PROBE: Does American Indian or Alaska Native mean the same thing or do they mean something different? What do they mean to you?

PROBE: What does Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander mean to you? Do they mean the same thing or do they mean something different?

PROBE: Do you notice anything unusual or different about the flashcard? Was the card easy or hard to read?

PROBE: Show the subject the other two flashcards. Ask the subject what is the difference between each flashcard. Also ask whether the subject has a preference for one flashcard over another.

PROBE: Is there anything missing from the flashcard that you would have expected to see or were looking for?

DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

1. You told me that you are (or other person is) _____(RACE). But are there any other races in your family background that might apply to you (other person)?
2. (If yes) What are those other races?
3. When you've completed forms or interviews which asked for (your /other person's) race, have you always answered with the same race, or has your answer been different?
4. If yes, Hispanic.....have you ever reported your race as Hispanic or Latino? Do you find race questions confusing or easy to answer?
5. Were there any questions in this interview that you think some people might find difficult? If so, which ones? Why?
6. Were there any questions in this interview that you think some people might find sensitive? If so, which ones? Why?
7. Is there anything in these questions that you think we should change? What are those changes?

_____ Starting Time
_____ Interviewer

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is _____, and I work for _____. Today, we are asking for your help in testing a new form which asks for some general information about the people who work in your agency (organization, firm). We have found that the best way to design these forms is to try them out with a variety of people to see how easy or hard they are to complete.

What I would like you to do is first look at the form and tell me what you think it is asking you to do. There are no right or wrong answers but your first impression will help us understand how other people will interpret the purpose of the form. Then, I'd like you to try to fill it out without asking me to help you. After completing the form, I will ask you some questions about your answers, and you can also tell me more about what you like and don't like about the form.

Before we begin, do you have any questions to ask of me?

(If yes, answer as neutrally as possible. If specific to questionnaire, tell respondent we will talk about this later).

Okay. Here's the form. Please take a minute to look at it and then I'll ask you some questions.

1. Can you tell me in your own words what this form is asking you to do?
2. What is your general reaction to the form?
3. How easy or difficult is it to understand? Are you pretty sure you know what to do or are you confused?

Now before you try to fill it out, I have a task for you to do. After you are done with the task, you might have a better idea of how to complete the form.

NOTE: On-site establishment interviews are conducted using the organization's personnel data. Lab interviews are conducted by giving participants 100 "dummy" records.

Pretend that your school/organization gained 100 new students/employees during the year. You are responsible for reporting the race and Hispanic or Latino origin of those 100 students/employees to your boss. For example, your boss wants to know how many white were students/employees, how many black or African American students/employees, etc.

Now, I would like to let you know about some recent changes in OMB reporting requirements.

First of all, it is specified that respondents may select more than one race.

Second, the category Asian/Pacific Islander has been broken out into two categories: Asian and Native Hawaiian.

You may want to use these blank sheets as worksheets to extract the information from these records of your 100 new students/employees.

Now use these numbers to fill out the form. If you aren't sure what to do, try to guess rather than ask me a question. (make a note if you have a question) We can talk afterwards about what you are unsure of.

DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

1. Now that you have worked with the form, can you tell me in your own words what the form asked you to do?
2. 2. What question or questions does your agency ask to obtain race/ethnicity data from its students (clients)?
3. How well would this form work for report racial and ethnic data in your current data system?
4. How are your school's/company's race/ethnicity data broken out?
5. Do your records include multi-racial data? If yes, would you be able to categorize it in a way that you could complete this form?
6. How did you arrive at your numbers? Go over with me the parts of the form you completed and what you did to enter the number.
7. What does (racial group) mean to you?
8. What does the Hispanic or Latino instruction mean to you?
9. What does single race only on this form mean to you?
10. What does plus one or more other races on this form mean to you?

11. Were there any items on this form that you think some people might find difficult? If so, which ones? Why? (What makes them difficult?)
12. What about the amount of detail that this form asks for.... Do you think the form asks for enough detail? Do you think the form asks for too much detail?
13. What did you like about the form?
14. What did you dislike about the form?
15. Were there any questions that you find sensitive? If so, which ones?
16. Is there anything on this form that you think we should change? If yes, what are those changes?
17. How did you interpret the 'total population' boxes?
18. Did you have any records that you couldn't fit into one of the boxes? Where did you put people whom you couldn't fit into a category? How have you handled situations like this in the past?
19. How long would it take for you to gather the information to complete this form?
20. What did you think about the instructions? What should be changed?

21. Before today, were you aware of the Federal Government's recent revision to race and ethnicity standards and that multiple race responses are now acceptable in government surveys?

ATTACHMENT C: TESTING PLAN AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS OF JANUARY 11, 1999

SELF-REPORTED RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN QUESTIONS

Condition	Interview Mode	Hispanic Question	Race Question	Race and Ethnic Background of Subject's Mother and Father							Total
				American Indian	Asian	Black/Af. American	Native Haw/OPI	White	Hispanic ⁹	More than one race	
1	Telephone	Short	Short			2		2			4
2	Telephone	Long	Short			3					3
3	Face-to-face	Short	Short			2				1	3
4	Face-to-face	Long	Short				1	2			3
5	Face-to-face	Long	Long with two bank flashcard		1	3	1	2	1	1	9
6	Face-to-face	Long	Long with three bank flashcard		2	3		2	1	2	10
Total				0	3	13	2	8	2	4	32

⁹Both subjects who reported their parents as Hispanic reported their race as White.

ATTACHMENT D: TESTING PLAN AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS OF JANUARY 11, 1999

AGGREGATE REPORTING FORMS

Condition	Laboratory Interviews	On-site establishment interviews	Total
RH-1 Every combination	2	2	4
RH-2 Counts of population and times of multiple race responses	4	4	8
RH-3 Crosstabulated counts of population and times of multiple race responses	1	1	2
Total	7	7	14