

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES  
(*Survey Methodology* - #2006-9)

**Cognitive Testing of Translations  
of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages**

Yuling Pan  
Marjorie Hinsdale\*  
Alisú Schoua-Glusberg\*\*  
Hyunjoo Park\*

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

RTI International\*  
Research Support Services\*\*

Report Issued: December 12, 2006

*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. Contract No. 50-YABS-2-66053 TO 8 RTI Project Number 0209182.008

# Cognitive Testing of Translations of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages

Final Research Report

Contract No. 50-YABS-2-66053 TO 8  
RTI Project Number 0209182.008  
Deliverable 4

Authors:

Yuling Pan, U.S. Census Bureau  
Marjorie Hinsdale, RTI International  
Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Research Support Services  
Hyunjoo Park, RTI International

Prepared for

U.S. Census Bureau  
Department of Commerce  
Washington, DC 20233

Prepared by

RTI International  
Survey Research Division  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

September 25, 2006



# Table of Contents

---

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Participant Recruitment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in English</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5. Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Spanish</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>6. Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Chinese</b>	<b>499</b>
<b>7. Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Korean</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>8. Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Russian</b>	<b>944</b>
<b>9. Summary and Recommendations for Future Research</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>115</b>

## List of Tables

---

2-1 Number of Interviews and ACS Materials Tested by Round	8
3-1 English Recruiting Targets	11
3-2 Spanish Recruiting Targets	13
3-3 Chinese Recruiting Targets	14
3-4 Korean Recruiting Targets	16
3-5 Russian Recruiting Targets	19
4-1 Demographic Characteristics of English-Speaking Participants	20
5-1 Demographic Characteristics of Spanish-Speaking Participants	34
6-1 Demographic Characteristics of Chinese-Speaking Participants	50
7-1 Demographic Characteristics of Korean-Speaking Participants	73
8-1 Demographic Characteristics of Russian-Speaking Participants	95

## **Appendices**

---

- Appendix 1 – ACS Introductory Letter  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 2 – ACS Thank You Letter (Round 1 and Round 2)  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 3 – ACS Informational Brochure  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 4 – ACS Q&A Brochure  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 5 – Round 1 Protocol Guide #1  
(English only)
- Appendix 6 – Round 1 Protocol Guide #2  
(English only)
- Appendix 7 – Round 2 Protocol Guide #1  
(English only)
- Appendix 8 – Round 2 Protocol Guide #2  
(English only)
- Appendix 9 – Agenda for Cognitive Interview Training Session
  
- Appendix 10 – Informed Consent Forms  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 11 – Recruitment Plan
  
- Appendix 12 – Recruiting Screener  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In an effort to ensure high-quality data from linguistically isolated populations included in the American Community Survey (ACS) sample, the ACS language team at the Census Bureau took the initiative to develop translations of ACS supporting documents into five languages: Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian, and Vietnamese. This task order, the Cognitive Testing of Translations of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages, was designed to evaluate these translated materials in four of the aforementioned languages to determine 1) whether these materials meet the Census Bureau Pretesting Standard (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003) and the Census Bureau Guideline for Translation (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004); 2) whether respondents who see the translated documents have a similar understanding of the intended communication as the English-speaking respondents; 3) what types of informed-consent messages are conceptually difficult to translate effectively; and 4) what could be done to overcome this difficulty. The languages tested for this task include: Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Russian, as well as English, for comparative purposes.

The specific documents selected for inclusion in the cognitive interviews include the ACS Introductory Letter, Thank You Letter, Informational Brochure, and the Question and Answer Brochure. These documents were selected because they are critical in the procedures used by ACS interviewers to explain the purpose of the study, how the data are used, privacy and confidentiality assurances, and the mandatory nature of the survey. As a result, the quality of the data and the response rates for the ACS rely to a large extent on the quality and effectiveness of the translations of these documents into the targeted languages.

This task order was designed to include an expert panel review of the translated materials, development of protocols, recruiting appropriate participants, cognitive testing, analysis, and reporting recommendations for changes to the translated ACS survey letters and informational brochures. An important byproduct of this research is the investigation of best practices for conducting cognitive interviews in languages other than English and Spanish. Documentation on techniques and probes that proved to be culturally appropriate and fruitful for each language will expand on the existing experience with techniques for English and Spanish, and will benefit the field of cognitive interviewing.

This report documents all aspects of this research, from recruitment through protocol development to results of qualitative research conducted by RTI International and Research Support Services under the direction of the U.S. Census Bureau. The specific research activities are listed below:

- Organizing a panel of experts to conduct the initial committee review of the translated documents
- Preparing a recruitment plan, including consent forms and incentive receipts
- Preparing and testing interview protocols
- Translating interview protocols, consent forms, and incentive receipts into target languages
- Recruiting participants

- Conducting the cognitive interviews in English as well as the targeted languages
- Reviewing findings after the cognitive interviews were completed, and offering alternative translations as needed
- Conducting two rounds of cognitive interviews, including debriefings and revisions to protocols after completion of the first round
- Preparing the interim research reports, interview summaries, and this final research report

**Materials to be tested in cognitive interviews.** The four ACS CAPI documents included in this research were divided into two sets, with two documents in each set. To reduce the burden on the respondents, only one set of documents was tested in each cognitive interview; however, all four documents were tested in both cognitive interview rounds. The first set of materials for each round included the Introductory Letter and the Informational Brochure. The second set of materials for each round included the Thank You Letter and the ACS Q&A Brochure. Descriptions of each document are provided below.

- **Introductory Letter, ACS-16(L).** A one-page letter handed to respondents as a standard part of the ACS CAPI interview. It is similar in content to the letter included in the ACS mailing package and it explains the ACS, confidentiality, etc. (See Appendix 1.)
- **Thank you Letter, ACS-26(L).** A brief letter thanking the respondent for participating in the ACS. (See Appendix 2.)
- **Informational Brochure, ACS-50(HU).** A multi-colored trifold brochure with basic information about the ACS, including regional office (RO) phone numbers. This brochure is used regularly by CAPI interviewers to encourage response. (See Appendix 3.)
- **ACS Q&A Brochure, ADDC/05.** Frequently asked questions in a booklet format. It explains in a clear format answers to major questions about the survey, its uses, privacy, confidentiality, the mandatory nature of the survey, etc. This brochure is used to provide more detailed information about the survey. (See Appendix 4.)

**Schedule.** Cognitive interviews were completed in two distinct rounds. The first round of interviews took place in February and March, 2006. Following an interim meeting to discuss the findings from the first round, the second round of interviews began in April and was completed in June, 2006.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

The goal of the Cognitive Testing of Translations of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages task order was to conduct 112 cognitive interviews in the targeted languages specified by the U.S. Census Bureau based on ACS and Census 2000 data. Three sites were selected for the interviews: Washington, DC (and surrounding communities), Chicago, IL (and surrounding communities), and Raleigh, NC. Sites were selected specifically because they are close to the research teams geographically, which helped control overall costs, and these sites have sufficient concentrations of Hispanic, Chinese, Korean, and Russian populations to represent the target language groups.

This chapter outlines the protocol followed by the researchers in order to accomplish this goal. Because all steps in the protocol required extensive knowledge of the targeted languages, the first step was to organize a panel of experts for each language group.

**Panel of Language Experts.** The qualifications and experience considered in assembling the language teams included: native-speaker language competence, education and work experience in the target culture, and knowledge of and experience with translation work. Preference was also given to individuals who had community or survey translation experience. Each language team was comprised of one lead language expert and two other language experts. A total of 15 language experts were identified and engaged in the research from start to completion of the last round of cognitive interviews and reporting. Five of the positions were filled by staff from RTI, Research Support Services (RSS), and the Census Bureau. The remaining ten experts were hired by RTI and RSS as consultants for this research. All language experts completed the security clearance application before processing any Title 13 data.

The language experts are listed below with their language team affiliations.

### **Spanish Team**

- Dr. Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Spanish Language Lead from RSS
- Ms. Rosanna Quiroz, Spanish Language Expert from RTI
- Ms. Yolanda Fowler, Spanish Language Expert from RSS
- Ms. Olivia Yañez, Spanish Language Expert from RSS
- Mr. Manuel Borobia, Spanish Language Expert from RSS (Participated in committee translation only)

### **Chinese Team**

- Dr. Yuling Pan, Chinese Language Lead, U.S. Census Bureau
- Dr. Sylvia Wen-ying Chou, Chinese Language Expert consultant to RTI
- Dr. Mei Kong, Chinese Language Expert consultant to RTI
- Ms. Yu Yuan, Chinese Language Expert from RTI (recruiting and transcriptions)

### **Korean Team**

- Ms. Hyunjoo Park, Korean Language Lead from RTI
- Ms. Natalie Kee, Korean Language Expert consultant to RTI
- Ms. Jiyong Son, Korean Language Expert consultant to RTI

### **Russian Team**

- Ms. Evguenia Haps, Russian Language Lead consultant to RSS
- Ms. Olga Bezzubov, Russian Language Expert consultant to RSS
- Ms. Sophia Kholodenko, Russian Language Expert consultant to RSS.
- Dr. Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Russian Language team member (RSS)

Once the language teams were formed, the members of the panel of experts began by reviewing the translated ACS materials. Because all the ACS CAPI documents had been translated previously (through another Census Bureau contract), the only step left for this task was to review the documents and determine if there were any modifications required before the documents were used for the cognitive interviews. Each language expert reviewed the documents individually and made recommendations for revisions. The language lead reviewed the recommendations and submitted a list of modifications that included corrections to errors in typing, omission, or meaning. Any other revisions that were suggested were included as issues to be reviewed during the cognitive interviewing. For example, the panel members also identified potentially problematic language that should be included in the cognitive interview to determine if the translation was effective and accurate.

The cognitive interview protocols were translated to the target languages using a committee approach. (This is described in detail later in this section.) In addition to participating in committee reviews of the translations, the panel members also participated in the conduct of the cognitive interviews, preparation of interview summaries, review of the cognitive findings and identification of alternative wording of translations. They also made changes to translated materials after Round 1, and made contributions to the interim and final reports and recommendations.

**Development of cognitive interview protocols and forms.** Scripted cognitive interview protocols were developed in English and reviewed by staff at the U.S. Census Bureau, including members of the ACS language team. (See Appendices 5-8, English versions of Protocols for Rounds 1 and 2.)

The cognitive interview protocol documented the administration details, consent forms, and materials required for the cognitive interviewing, including a list of standard probes and special instructions to be used, and a guide for the interviewers to follow during interviews and reporting. The protocol was designed to test the translated materials to ensure that they met the Census Bureau's translation requirements for reliability, fluency, and appropriateness. Because the protocol included scripted instructions to be read to the respondent, it also served as a guide for the administration of consent forms and to confirm the point in time when the tape recording was to begin.



The protocol was designed to uniformly facilitate the two rounds of cognitive interviews in English as well as the four targeted languages. Each of the four ACS documents was assessed by having respondents go through two readings. Respondents were first asked to read an entire document silently. They were then asked to read specified segments aloud in the second reading. Scripted cognitive interview probes were developed to determine general impression and comprehension after the initial reading. Following the second reading, probes focused on the reaction to the information and message as well as understanding of specific terms and phrases. For round 2 interviews, a debriefing section was added to the interview protocol, in which respondents were asked to evaluate alternative wordings of translation developed by the expert panel after their review of the ACS CAPI translated materials and review of the findings from the first round of cognitive interviews.

The English interview protocols were tested and timed before they were submitted to the language teams for translation. As part of the protocol guide development, language teams contemplated the impact of the statements included in the ACS materials and the possible impact of such statements for each targeted ethnic/cultural population. If any specific issues needed to be addressed for that language, additional protocol guide questions were added.

Once finalized, all documentation was submitted to RTI's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. The Census Bureau obtained the appropriate clearance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for this work.

**Translation Methodology for the Cognitive Interview Protocols.** As mentioned before, the ACS CAPI materials were translated through another Census Bureau contract. The translation task for this contract was to translate the cognitive interview protocols and interview materials including the consent form and respondent incentive receipt. To translate the cognitive interview protocols into each of the four target languages, a committee approach was followed. The four language teams were engaged in committee review of the translated materials before the testing began, and then engaged in translating the cognitive interview protocols and forms.

Team or committee approaches to translation have been used since the 1960s (Nida 1964), and more recently in the translation of data collection instruments (Brislin, 1976; Schoua-Glusberg, 1993; Guillemin, Bombardier and Beaton, 1993; Acquadro, Jambon, Ellis and Marquis, 1996). In recent years, survey researchers' and survey translators' dissatisfaction with traditional translation and assessment methods (such as back translation) has led to the wider adoption of team approaches. The U.S. Census Bureau Expert Panel on Translation and the Translation Task Force for the European Social Survey have indicated that back translation is not a satisfactory approach. Recently issued Census Bureau Guidelines for Survey Translation recommend following a team or committee approach (Pan and de la Puente, 2005).

The specific type of team or committee approach we used for the translation of the cognitive interview protocol was the Modified Committee Approach. For each language, a team of three language experts worked simultaneously and independently, each translating one third of the protocol. In addition to translating the cognitive interview protocols, the language teams also translated the interview consent forms and incentive receipts into the target languages. After they completed their translations, a meeting was held to review the

translated items, one by one, as a group. Each translator contributed to the discussion with the aim of improving and refining the first translation, making sure that it reflected the intent of the English original and flowed well in the target language. This “reconciliation” meeting was chaired in each case by Dr. Schoua-Glusberg, who has twenty years of experience acting as a referee in translation team discussions. Team discussions were generally held in English, and each member had to articulate the reasons for suggesting changes or improvements to the original translation.

The strength of the committee approach lies in the fact that consensus among bilinguals produces more accurate text than the subjective opinion of a single translator. Additionally, by striving for consensus, problems of personal idiosyncrasies, culture, and uneven skill in either language are overcome. The group process in the reconciliation meeting is somewhat akin to a brainstorming session in which the team looks together for alternative translations and selects by consensus.

**Cognitive Interview Training.** After finalizing the cognitive testing protocols with the Census Bureau, a comprehensive cognitive interviewing training session was held with all of the language team members. The language experts trained to be cognitive interviewers were also experienced social scientists with graduate degrees. Some of them worked with the Census Bureau before on language-related projects. The training session was held at RTI’s office in Washington, DC on January 21, 2006.

This training session consisted of both methodological and substantive issues and provided the basic context on the specific cognitive interviewing methodologies to be used in this research. The following topics were covered in sequence during the one-day training. (See Appendix 9):

- Welcome and introductions
- Background of ACS and the specific task order
- General cognitive interviewing training
- Administering culturally appropriate probes
- Review of protocol guide #1
- Review of protocol guide #2
- Demonstration of probing
- Break-out into groups for practice with mock interviews and language-specific discussions
- Final gathering/questions and answers

The training was designed to outline the research goals and objectives, to review the correct administration of the prepared probes as documented in the protocol guides, as well as to cover the specific language/culture wording and translations to the target languages. An important part of the training for the language experts involved negotiating appropriate questions and probes for each language and culture. Team members with direct experience conducting cognitive interviews specifically targeted toward translation issues were critical members of each language team. Throughout the training, discussions of specific questions and probes were raised as language experts contemplated possible difficulties or concerns that respondents might raise or have. As possible, solutions were discussed during the training;

however, some issues were tabled for later discussion and resolution among the language teams.

During the language team break-out sessions, each team member practiced administering the protocol guides in both English and the targeted language. Teams also had an opportunity to discuss the impact of culturally-driven perceptions of surveys and topics in the ACS CAPI materials for their particular ethnic/cultural population. This was a critical step in the process and had to be completed by the language teams individually because presenting the messages in culturally appropriate ways facilitated the communication of the intended message in different languages.

Following the one-day training, the language teams reviewed and finalized the translated protocols and then kept in contact (via conference call) as needed to review or confirm plans for final modifications to the materials.

**Conducting the cognitive interviews.** Cognitive testing of the English versions of the ACS materials was undertaken in order to help determine if problems found in the translated versions were simply problems already present in the original English version.

Because in-depth cognitive testing of the ACS materials was a cognitively-demanding task for respondents, the four documents were divided into two sets, with two documents in each set. Only one set of documents was tested in each cognitive interview. The interviews were conducted in two rounds for each language, with 12 interviews in each round for the target languages and 8 interviews in each round for English. In each round, half of these interviews were done with each set of materials (see *Table 2-1*).

**Table 2-1 Number of Interviews and ACS Materials Tested by Round**

Cognitive Interview Round 1	Cognitive Interview Round 2
Materials Set 1: Introductory Letter, ACS-16(L) Informational Brochure, ACS-50(HU) Number Cognitive Interviews: 4 English Interviews 6 Spanish Interviews 7 Russian Interviews <sup>1</sup> 6 Korean Interviews 6 Chinese Interviews	Materials Set 1: Introductory Letter, ACS-16(L) Informational Brochure, ACS-50(HU) Number Cognitive Interviews: 4 English Interviews 5 Spanish Interviews <sup>2</sup> 6 Russian Interviews 6 Korean Interviews 6 Chinese Interviews
Materials Set 2: Thank You Letter, ACS-26(L) Q & A Brochure, ACS Q&A Number Cognitive Interviews: 4 English Interviews 6 Spanish Interviews 6 Russian Interviews 6 Korean Interviews 6 Chinese Interviews	Materials Set 2: Thank You Letter, ACS-26(L) Q & A Brochure, ACS Q&A Number Cognitive Interviews: 4 English Interviews 7 Spanish Interviews <sup>3</sup> 6 Russian Interviews 6 Korean Interviews 6 Chinese Interviews

Prior to beginning the interview, each participant was assigned to one of the protocols. The protocol began by providing the participant with an explanation of the research and having the participant review and sign the informed consent document. (See Appendix 10 for Consent Forms.) If the participant agreed, the interviewer tape recorded the interview. As described previously, the interview protocols involved both silent reading and the reading aloud of specified statements in the ACS letters and statements. Interviewers observed the participants while they read, noting any specific signs of difficulty, confusion, hesitation, or annoyance. Interviewers asked probing questions to determine the cause of any observed or spoken confusion or concern on the part of the participants. For some sections, interviewers followed scripted probes to discuss meanings of specific statements or terms. Sometimes, the protocol guide inquired about specific meanings or alternative wordings that would have been more effective.

Following the discussion, the interviewer closed out the interview and provided the incentive payment to the participant.

**Reviewing findings.** After all first round cognitive interviews were completed and documented in summary reports, the language teams met to reassess the language used for problematic statements in the letters and brochures. They developed alternative translations,

<sup>1</sup> See Section 8, Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Russian, for explanation of additional Russian participant in Round 1.

<sup>2</sup> See Section 5, Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Spanish, for explanation of deviation from planned number of participants using protocol guide 1 for Round 2.

<sup>3</sup> See Section 5, Recommendations for Modifications to ACS CAPI Materials in Spanish, for explanation of deviation from planned number of participants using protocol guide 2 for Round 2.

as needed, to be included in the second round of interviewing. In order to try to meet the targeted one-hour time period for the interview, the teams reviewed the probing questions in the interview protocol that elicited universally consistent responses among round 1 participants and determined which of those questions could be deleted for round 2 interviews. The language teams also drafted additional debriefing questions appropriate to the target language to test the alternative translations. All the proposed alternative translations were tested in the second round of interviews. Thus, in addition to testing the same materials as in round 1 interviews, round 2 interviews also tested the suggested changes by presenting to the round 2 interview respondents a showcard comparing the original translations with the alternative translations, and by asking for their assessment of the two versions of translations.

After the completion of two rounds of interviews, the language teams met one more time to review the results and to make recommendations to improve the translations in the target languages. Sections 5-8 contain detailed discussion on the recommendations for modifications to ACS CAPI translations in each language.

**Reporting results.** Interview summary reports for each interview were prepared and delivered to the Census Bureau on a flow basis. An Interim Report for each language, which included recruiting and interview outcomes as well as aggregate data of all summaries for that language, were submitted at the end of Round 1 interviewing. These interim reports also included a discussion of any problematic wording or concepts in the materials found in the course of the cognitive interviews, as well as suggestions for debriefing questions for round 2 interviews. An Interim Meeting was held in April 2006 at the Census Bureau offices in Suitland, MD. Representatives from RTI, RSS, and the Census Bureau presented the findings from Round 1 as well as recommendations for modifications to Round 2 protocol guides. In addition to Census Bureau staff from the Statistical Research Division, there were members of the ACS team present at the meeting.

### **3. PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT**

Participant recruitment for target language interviews was carried out under the responsibility and direction of RTI International, Research Support Services, and the Census Bureau as specified in the language-specific sections described in this section. For each target language, the recruitment process followed the same general process for screening participants. All recruitment information was maintained in a consistent manner for each language group, and all team members followed the security protocol developed to protect potential participants. In order to reach the targeted number of participants, however, each team utilized a cadre of recruiting techniques in order to determine what was most effective for the targeted demographics. This section details both the consistently applied as well as the unique protocols for recruiting each language group.

**Recruiting Targets.** As an initial step in the planning process, a Staffing and Recruiting Plan (see Appendix 11) was developed and approved by the Census Bureau. This plan outlined the recruiting targets for specific demographics for each language population. These target numbers were based on the demographics of respondents to the 2004 ACS. Specific targets by language group are identified in the language-specific sections below. As part of the Staffing and Recruiting Plan, a screening form was developed in English and translated into each of the target languages. Appendix 12 provides documentation of the screening questions used to determine eligibility for each language groups. The screening questions for the English group were slightly modified, since language was not an issue for the cognitive interview recruiting.

Once an interview candidate expressed interest in participating in the cognitive interview, one of the language experts used the scripted questions to complete the screening form in that target language. The eligibility criteria embedded in the screening questions allowed us to target a mix of age groups and various education levels. In addition to the demographic requirements, participants were screened for language dominance so that they would resemble as closely as possible the ACS CAPI respondents who request materials in the target languages. Candidates for cognitive interviews were screened for language competency and only those who spoke and read the target language as a native speaker and could read or speak English less than well were eligible for the cognitive recruiting.

All procedures were developed in accordance with U.S. Census Bureau's Policy Office and Legal Office working plan for the implementation of this task order. All language teams utilized a paper document to record recruiting information. This document was designed to track basic demographics of the respondents asked during the screening interview. Each respondent was given an ID number, which was then used in the interview summaries for identification purposes.

#### **3.1 Recruiting of English Respondents**

Recruiting of the English cognitive interview participants was conducted by the Census Bureau for the interviews in the Washington DC Metro area and by RSS in Chicago. The Census Bureau recruiter used typical methods for recruitment, such as posting flyers and inviting respondents to identify others who may be eligible and willing to participate. The Census Bureau recruiting targeted Northern Virginia and the Washington DC area. RSS

recruited in Chicago by posting flyers in a social service organization, in a non-profit job center, and in a township general assistance office.

While no specific recruiting guidelines were specified in the Statement of Work or the proposal, we developed recruiting targets based on 2004 ACS demographic statistics from the Census Bureau’s Website and from feedback from the ACS language team. Special effort was made to recruit lower education participants to be sure that they understood the meaning of the materials. Also, a higher proportion of African Americans was recruited in order to ensure that there were more than only the targeted 12 percent from the ACS data. Table 3-1 displays the recruiting targets for the English language group for each round of interviews.

**Table 3-1. English Recruiting Targets, Both Interview Rounds Based on 2004 ACS Data**

Target Characteristics		2004 ACS CAPI Data		Recruiting Targets		Actual Numbers	
		%	target #	min #	max #	Screened <sup>4</sup>	Recruits
<b>Education</b>	less than HS graduate	16%	3	2	4	>2	2
	HS graduate, less than college	57%	9	8	10	>10	10
	college graduate	27%	4	4	6	>4	4
<b>Race</b>	White	77%	12	8	12	>4	4
	African American	12%	2	2	6	>11	11
	Other	11%	2	2	6	>1	1
<b>Gender</b>	Male	49%	8	6	10	>6	6
	Female	51%	8	6	10	>10	10
<b>Age</b>	18 – 24	9%	1	2	4	0	0
	25 – 34	14%	2	2	4	>3	3
	35 – 44	15%	2	2	4	>5	5
	45 – 54	14%	2	2	4	>5	5
	55 – 64	10%	2	2	4	>3	3
	65 or older	12%	2	2	4	0	0
<b>Total number participants</b>				16	16	>16	16

### 3.2 Recruiting for Spanish Respondents

Recruiting for Spanish interviews began immediately after interviewer training on January 21 and continued through June 19. Recruiting efforts were carried out in three geographically distinct areas with large Hispanic populations within the metropolitan Chicago area and in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Recruiting was done in a variety of ways: posting flyers in community agencies and organizations, networking through personal contacts, and soliciting help from a community-based organization that serves Latin American immigrants in Chicago.

Following the general guidelines in our Recruiting Plan, we attempted to recruit Spanish-speaking subjects born in Latin America, oversampling people with less than a high school education, and those who came to live in the United States between 1990 and 2000. These were the demographics of the majority of the ACS participants who indicated Spanish

<sup>4</sup> Detailed demographics on all screened participants are not available, as recruiting for Washington DC area interviews was handled by a Census recruiter working on several projects.

was their dominant (or only) language. A variety of age groups was to be included, with most subjects under 55. We attempted to reflect the diverse origins of these immigrants by including Mexicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans, although we aimed to have the greatest number of recruits be Mexican to match the ACS data.

As mentioned previously, participants were screened for language dominance to be consistent with actual ACS respondents who had requested materials in Spanish. There was one exception: because of an incorrect instruction in the Spanish screener, one participant who spoke and read English well was screened in and interviewed. The mistake was discovered after the conclusion of the Round 1 interviews and the Spanish screener was corrected.

For the second round of interviews we concentrated on including primarily Mexican respondents in order to meet the target number for that group, making sure that a large proportion had not completed education beyond high school. As recruiting proceeded, all language experts commented on the difficulties they were facing in finding interested potential participants. We believe these difficulties were attributable to the concerns many undocumented Latin American immigrants were having amidst the public debate on immigration reform and reports of raids and deportations.

Table 3-2 table displays the recruiting targets for the Spanish-language group in each round of interviews.



**Table 3-2. Spanish Recruiting Targets, Both Interview Rounds Based on 2004 ACS Data**

Target Characteristics		2004 ACS CAPI Data		Recruiting Targets		Actual Numbers	
		%	target #	min #	max #	screened	recruits
<b>Education</b>	less than HS graduate	90%	22	20	22	22	18
	HS graduate, less than college	7%	2	1	2	13	6
	college graduate	3%	1	1	2	5	0
<b>Year of Entry</b> Came to live in the U.S.	since 2000	30%	7	6	8	22	13
	between 1990 and 1999	39%	9	8	10	10	4
	between 1980 and 1989	19%	5	4	6	7	6
	before 1980	12%	3	2	4	1	1
<b>Gender</b>	Male		0	8	16	19	12
	Female		0	8	16	21	12
<b>Age</b>	18 – 24	17%	4	4	6	9	6
	25 – 34	32%	8	6	8	14	5
	35 – 44	23%	5	4	6	10	8
	45 – 54	14%	3	2	4	4	2
	55 – 64	8%	2	1	2	2	2
	65 or older	7%	2	1	2	1	1
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>	Mexican	69%	17	16	18	29	18
	Guatemalan	4%	1	1	2	4	2
	Honduran	2%	1	1	2	1	1
	Salvadoran	6%	1	1	2	1	1
	Puerto Rican	4%	1	1	2	0	0
	Cuban	4%	1	1	2	0	0
	Other	10%	2	2	4	5	2
<b>Total number participants</b>				24	24	40	24

### 3.3 Recruiting for Chinese Respondents

The Chinese team recruited monolingual Chinese-speakers in the Greater Washington D.C. Metro area through diverse methods, including posting ads in three local Chinese newspapers<sup>5</sup>; making calls and sending electronic posters to a community service center and four Chinese schools; distributing information and flyers in two Chinese grocery stores, three Chinese churches and other Chinese community organizations in person; posting ads through three Chinese internet web-communities; and word-of-mouth. In addition, we recruited a snowball sample by asking respondents to recommend their acquaintances at the completion of each interview.

We followed the general guidelines in the narrative in our Recruiting Plan: “Chinese-speaking subjects’ characteristics suggest the need to include high school and college graduates as well as people who have not graduated from high school. People who came to the United States between 1980 and 2000 should be over sampled relative to other years of

<sup>5</sup> 《美洲時報》，《美華商報》，《大紀元時報》

entry. The population over 55 should be included. Recruiting will target the following dialects: Cantonese, Mandarin, and Fukanese.” We attempted to recruit Chinese-speaking respondents who were speakers of major Chinese dialects and were from different parts of China.

The following table displays the recruiting targets for this language group for each round of interviews.

**Table 3-3. Chinese Recruiting Targets, Both Interview Rounds Based on 2004 ACS Data**

Target Characteristics		2004 ACS CAPI Data		Recruiting Targets		Actual Numbers	
		%	target #	min #	max #	screened	Recruited
<b>Education</b>	less than HS graduate	77%	18	18	20	28	16
	HS graduate, less than college	8%	2	2	4	9	4
	College graduate	15%	4	2	4	104	4
<b>Year of Entry</b>	since 2000	20%	5	4	6	69	8
	between 1990 and 1999	39%	9	8	10	46	12
	between 1980 and 1989	28%	7	6	8	19	4
	before 1980	14%	3	2	4	7	0
<b>Gender</b>	Male			8	16	42	9
	Female			8	16	99	15
<b>Age</b>	18 – 24	4%	1	1	2	26	1
	25 – 34	13%	3	2	4	41	0
	35 – 44	22%	5	4	6	11	5
	45 – 54	25%	6	6	8	17	5
	55 – 64	13%	3	2	4	23	8
	65 or older	23%	6	4	6	23	5
<b>Dialect preference</b>	Mandarin	n/a	n/a	8	16	120	20
	Cantonese	n/a	n/a	8	16	21	4
<b>Total number participants</b>				24	24	141	24

While we found respondents who represented most of our desired demographic characteristics, we encountered problems recruiting all of the 24 persons to strictly fill the remaining quota. For the first round of interviews, we had difficulty finding Chinese immigrants who had come to the U.S. before 1989 but spoke very limited English. We also had difficulty finding young monolingual Chinese speakers between age 18 and 34. Based on the objective of this research, we re-prioritized the demographic requirements and determined that the low education level is the most hard-to-get but important characteristic. We then modified the restrictions and recruited people with less than high school education regardless of their other characteristics for the last two remaining interviews.

Given the challenges encountered in the first round of recruitment, we focused our recruiting efforts for the second round of interviews particularly on two characteristics: year of entry and age. We looked for respondents who had entered the country before 1989 and who were under 34 years of age because these were the two demographic characteristics

underrepresented in the first round. We again encountered recruitment difficulties in the second round; we were able to recruit only three monolingual Chinese speakers who met one or the other criterion. The recruiting difficulties are probably an indication that Chinese immigrants who have lived in the U.S. for more than 16 years tend to speak English fairly well. They also indicate that young Chinese immigrants living in the U.S., regardless of their year of entry, are likely to have good English skills. In order to meet the recruiting targets as closely as possible, we then recruited candidates who had entered the U.S. in relatively early years (between 1990 and 1999) or who were relatively young (between 35 and 44 years of age).

Among the recruitment methods we attempted, Chinese newspapers and the word-of-mouth approach turned out to be most effective in reaching Chinese speakers and found 46 persons who met the basic criterion (Chinese monolingual). Based on their other characteristics such as education level, age, gender and year of entry, we recruited a total of 24 persons for the cognitive interviews. These 24 participants had a wide range of demographic characteristics, varied by age, education level, year of entry and dialect preference. This final group of respondents reflects a representative mix of these characteristics.

### **3.4 Recruiting for Korean Respondents**

The Korean team recruited monolingual Korean respondents in three regions: the Washington DC Metro area, the Chicago Metro area and Madison, WI. For recruiting, we spent a total of 10 weeks (From February 8 to April, 20, 2006). Most of the active recruiting activities, such as placing an advertisement in Korean businesses and visiting community centers, were completed in the first three weeks for the Round 1 interviews. For the second round, less active activities such as asking for additional help from the community centers over the telephone or answering incoming calls generated by the earlier advertisements were all that was required because we already had a large number of eligible respondents from which to select candidates.

We used diverse methods for recruitment, such as local daily newspaper advertisement (Joongang USA DC/MD/VA beginning February 10, 2006 and Joongang USA Chicago Metro beginning February 13, 2006), Internet advertisements through the Korean Internet Community, posting flyers at sites that Koreans usually visit, and asking for help from Korean community leaders. Snowball recruiting (word of mouth) through the actual respondents was done as well at the conclusion of each interview.

The Korean team followed the guidelines outlined in the Recruiting Plan: “Korean-speaking subjects show the highest education levels and for that reason we should be certain to recruit people with high school and college degrees in addition to people without a high school degree. The year of entry data and age data parallel the Chinese patterns and suggest similar recruiting efforts. Immigrants since 1980 are over-represented in this group relative to the other groups as are people over 55.”

Table 3-4 displays the recruiting targets for the Korean language group for each round of interviews. These targets were based on ACS CAPI interviews conducted in 2004 and include all people (age 15 and older) who reported speaking a language other than English at home and also reported that they speak English less than “well.”

**Table 3-4. Korean Recruiting Targets, Both Interview Rounds Based on 2004 ACS Data**

Target Characteristics		2004 ACS CAPI Data		Recruiting Targets		Actual Numbers	
		%	target #	min #	max #	screened	recruits
<b>Education</b>	less than High School graduate	55%	13	12	14	7	4
	HS graduate, less than college	9%	2	2	4	53	9
	College graduate	36%	9	8	10	138	11
<b>Year of Entry*</b>	since 2000	16%	4	2	4	112	7
	between 1990 and 1999	45%	11	10	12	52	8
	between 1980 and 1989	27%	7	6	8	22	5
	before 1980	12%	3	2	4	11	4
<b>Gender</b>	Male		12	8	16	72	9
	Female		12	8	16	126	15
<b>Age</b>	18 – 24	2%	1	0	2	20	1
	25 – 34	13%	3	2	4	56	3
	35 – 44	20%	5	4	6	47	5
	45 – 54	26%	6	6	8	33	5
	55 – 64	18%	4	4	6	24	4
	65 or older	21%	5	4	6	18	6
<b>Total number participants</b>			24	24	24	198	24

\* Sum of year of entry is 197 because one respondent was born in the U.S. and the year-of-entry question was skipped for this case.

The Korean team screened a total of 198 calls (Washington DC: 95 calls, Chicago: 67 calls, Wisconsin: 36 calls) and found 95 persons who met the selection criterion (monolingual Korean). More than half of them were college graduates (69%) and recent immigrants (57%). They were more likely to be women (64%).

Although the total number of eligible respondents seemed to be sufficient, we encountered difficulties in meeting the recruitment targets because many of the qualified respondents were highly educated, recent immigrants. For persons with hard-to-get characteristics (i.e., less than high school education), we had to recruit them without regard to their other characteristics, which caused other demographic characteristics to be over or under the recruitment targets.

Identifying people with less than high school education turned out to be the biggest challenge to recruitment. Because Koreans think highly of education culturally, those who have low education levels may not want to admit this to strangers. In an effort to overcome the challenge of identifying low education participants, the Korean team solicited assistance from Korean community leaders (church pastors, community center staffs). While these leaders were willing to help, they also expressed having difficulty because educational achievement is a sensitive issue for this group. Also a challenge was finding people who came to the U.S. between 1980 and 1989. The absolute number of respondent candidates in this group itself was small (only four total). Moreover, three out of the four candidates had the same education level (high school graduate), so we could not recruit them all and still meet the target quotas for other demographics. In the interest of maintaining the schedule, the

Korean team received permission to adjust the education target quota as needed. We assume that the high number of household members with less than high school education found by the ACS is due to the ACS data including demographics on 15 to 17-year-olds in the household. We suspect that by age 18, significantly more Korean speakers have at least a high school education.

### **3.5 Recruiting for Russian Respondents**

Recruiting for Russian interviews began immediately after interviewer training on January 21 and continued through March 20 for Round 1. Recruiting efforts were carried out in three geographically distinct areas within the metropolitan Chicago area that included neighborhoods with concentrations of Russian immigrants.

Recruiting was done in a variety of ways: through posting flyers in ethnic grocery stores, in a senior building where large numbers of tenants are Russian immigrants, networking through personal contacts, and soliciting help from an agency that assists refugees with relocation in the Chicago area.

The Russian team followed the general guidelines in the narrative in our Recruiting Plan: “Recruiting of Russian-speakers should over sample high school and college graduates and people who moved to the United States between 1990 and 2004. People over the age of 55 should also be over sampled.” Initially, we did not notice a discrepancy between that statement and the breakdown by education attained in the table of 2004 ACS CAPI respondents who spoke English less than well and spoke Russian at home. In this table, 47% had completed less than high school, 15% were high school graduates but not college graduates, and 38% were college graduates.

Upon discovery of this discrepancy, we began to actively look for Russian immigrants with less than a high school education. The cognitive interviewers explained that high school was mandatory in Russia and that it would be virtually impossible to find people with less education. Young immigrants (ages 15-17) who left Russia before completing high school could potentially be eligible; however, this group learns English fast, and in any case we were not interviewing minors. One of the interviewers who also worked as Court Interpreter in Chicago remembered that on occasion she has had to interpret for Russian speakers from very closed religious or ethnic groups where she thought some of the women may not have completed high school. Following that lead, we contacted an agency that helps refugees settle in Chicago and identified a group of ethnic Turks born in the Soviet Union (e.g., Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan) who were forced to leave around 1989 when ethnic wars began there. In 1989, these families moved to Russia where they've experienced social and bureaucratic persecution, which denied them proper documents, which in turn denied or limited their education. However, we were concerned that such a closed group may not speak enough Russian to do a cognitive interview (they speak Turkish among themselves). We screened three persons from this group and found one who had not completed high school and who seemed to speak Russian adequately. He was interviewed (our 13<sup>th</sup> case) but the interviewer found in the course of the interview that while his Russian skills were superior to his English skills, his command of Russian was not close to that of a native Russian speaker.

The fact that Russian-speaking non-high-school graduates had been counted in the ACS puzzled us. After consulting encyclopedias and a Russian demographer that works in

Moscow, we were convinced that high school (10 or 11 grades at different points in time) was indeed compulsory and that there are very few exceptions, much less so among émigrés. We conclude that the ACS CAPI respondents in that category were either 1) under age 18 (least likely option, as they would have to be very recent arrivals to not speak English at that age), or 2) adults classified as having less than high school because they had not completed 12 grades of education. This may reflect a problem with the education level categories on the ACS when used with people educated outside the U.S.

For the second round of interviews we concentrated on including primarily respondents over age 55 because the ACS data indicated that was the predominant age group of non-English-speakers. We also attempted to recruit participants who had not completed education beyond high school. Recruiting took advantage of contacts made during Round 1 recruiting and proceeded faster and more smoothly as the adjusted recruiting guidelines were shared with the team for this phase, thus allowing them to look specifically for the types of persons of interest. Table 3-5 displays the recruiting targets for this language group for each round of interviews for Russian respondents.

**Table 3-5. Russian Recruiting Targets, Both Interview Rounds Based on 2004 ACS Data**

Target Characteristics		2004 ACS CAPI Data		Recruiting Targets		Actual Numbers	
		%	target #	min #	max #	screened	recruits
<b>Education</b>	less than HS graduate	47	11	10	12	1	1
	HS graduate/less than College	15	4	2	4	19	12
	College graduate	38	9	8	10	19	12
<b>Year of Entry</b>	since 2000	28	7	6	8	15	9
	between 1990 and 1999	58	14	14	16	23	15
	between 1980 and 1989	7	2	1	2	0	0
	before 1980	7	2	1	2	1	1
<b>Gender</b>	Male			8	16	16	11
	Female			8	16	23	14
<b>Age</b>	18 – 24	3	1	1	2	0	0
	25 – 34	7	2	1	2	2	1
	35 – 44	13	3	2	4	6	4
	45 – 54	15	4	2	4	3	3
	55 – 64	15	4	2	4	6	3
	65 or older	47	11	10	12	22	14
<b>Total number participants</b>				24	24	39	25

Across the two rounds, between February 15 and May 7, we completed screeners with 39 eligible individuals. Approximately another 10 were determined to be ineligible because they spoke English well, but due to a miscommunication they were turned away without completing screeners. Of the 39 eligible individuals, 25 that most closely met the desired combination of requirements were chosen for the cognitive interviews. As the table above shows, the 25 participants have a range of demographic characteristics including: age, education level, year of entry and national origin,<sup>6</sup> and the recruiting has reflected a representative mix of these characteristics.

<sup>6</sup> All respondents were born in the former USSR, but in a variety of republics.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ACS CAPI MATERIALS IN ENGLISH

### 4.1 Respondents' Characteristics

While there were no particular difficulties in recruiting the targeted demographics, we did interview a larger proportion of African-American respondents than initially intended. Based on characteristics such as education level, race, gender, and age, we recruited the 16 persons for the cognitive interviews. Detailed demographic profiles of the eight participants are summarized in Table 4-1 below.

**Table 4-1 Demographics Characteristics of English-Speaking Participants**

ID	Gender	Age	Education	Race/ Ethnicity	Region
W1	Female	30s	HS graduate	White	DC Metro
W2	Female	50s	College graduate	Black	DC Metro
W3	Male	40s	Some college	White	DC Metro
1	Male	35-44	Some college	Black	Chicago Metro
2	Male	55-64	Some college	Asian	Chicago Metro
3	Female	35-44	HS graduate	Black	Chicago Metro
4	Female	55-64	HS graduate	White	Chicago Metro
5	Female	45-54	Less than HS (8 <sup>th</sup> )	Black	Chicago Metro
W4	Female	30s	HS graduate	Black	DC Metro
W5	Male	30s	College graduate	White	DC Metro
6	Female	45-54	Some college	Black	Chicago Metro
7	Female	45-54	HS graduate	Black	Chicago Metro
8	Female	45-54	Some college	Black	Chicago Metro
9	Male	35-44	College graduate	Black	Chicago Metro
10	Female	45-54	Less than HS	Black	Chicago Metro
11	Male	35-44	College graduate	Black	Chicago Metro

### 4.2 Summary of findings from the two rounds of cognitive interviews

Following informed consent procedures, the protocols were followed in each case. Of the sixteen interviews conducted in this Phase, five were done in the DC Metro area and 11 in Chicago. Eight used Protocol 1 which tested the ACS Introductory Letter and the Brochure, and eight used Protocol 2 which tested the Questions & Answers booklet and the Thank You



Letter. All interviews were audio taped after obtaining respondents' consent to do so. The average time was 1.25 hours for the interviews completed in Chicago. The average time was one hour for the interviews completed in DC Metro area.

The following general issues were identified in Round 1 interviews:

- Participants read the materials intently, without making comments or making facial expressions worth of note. The only observations made by the interviewers were about words that participants had difficulty reading, stumbled upon or simply misread.
- Lower education respondents generally had a more difficult time understanding some of the concepts or vocabulary in the documents.
- Some problems in comprehension stemmed from respondents' lack of frame of reference they could use to make sense of what they were reading. For instance, if a reader is not familiar with the long form of the decennial census, any reference to the long form will be less than clear or revealing. Or, for persons not aware of what the U.S. Code is, the references to the Code can be intimidating.
- Some respondents displayed confusion between the cognitive interviews and the ACS survey. The content of the Consent Form in particular seemed to be associated in participants' minds with participating in the ACS itself. And, because the Consent Form explains the voluntary nature of the cognitive interview, it may have put participants in a frame of mind to read the materials that did not let them process the statements about the mandatory nature of the survey.
- Because respondents were unclear and sometimes wondered what questions might be asked, we recommended adding a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure. The new paragraph which was successfully tested in Round 2 is:

“The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.”

- The emphasis on the potential uses of the data that is pervasive throughout the materials misled participants into thinking that the ACS is a survey that asks for participants opinions about the needs for services and programs in their communities.
- Respondents found confidentiality statements generally clear and reassuring. However, the mandatory nature of the survey was intimidating, and in particular the references to the U.S. Code and Title 13, which alarmed a number of respondents.
- Respondents generally had a positive response to the materials. They found them interesting and appealing in design and layout.

Eight interviews were conducted for Round 2: two in the Washington DC area and six in the Chicago area. The interviews were conducted between April 3 and June 21, 2006.

After the discussion of the interim report at the Census Bureau interim meeting, the decision was made to keep the Round 1 protocol unmodified, with the two exceptions described below.

#### **4.3 Modification of Round 2 interview protocol guides**

The two changes made to the Round 1 protocol in preparation for the Round 2 interviews were:

- Reduce the questions and probes for evaluating the three versions of the confidentiality message to free up some time to test the new message on what questions are asked in the ACS, and
- Test a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure.

#### **4.4 Issues identified in each document in both rounds of interviews**

##### **Introductory Letter**

Generally, the respondents liked the letter. They got the impression the ACS is about finding out what services and programs each community needs. That encouraged them to participate because they felt they would be helping their community. A couple of participants thought it was specifically addressed to low-income or troubled neighborhoods, another one that it would target communities with high numbers of immigrants.

The Introductory Letter contains the following key messages: request for survey participation, survey sponsor, survey purpose, data uses, mandatory nature of the ACS, response burden, confidentiality, administrative records use, and other sample surveys. Of these messages, some were well received and had a positive or neutral impact on the respondents; some caused confusion or did not have a positive impact; and some failed to come across.

##### *Messages clearly understood*

Respondents appeared to understand that the Introductory Letter was intended to ask for their participation in a survey. Other messages that were well understood included the burden estimate of 30 minutes to complete the ACS, the confidentiality and the data uses messages.

The confidentiality message was understood in the sense that the letter tells participants that the information they provide will be kept confidential. Respondents defined the term confidential as meaning “private” or “between you and me.” However, a few

respondents were mistrustful of the degree to which confidentiality would be protected: one respondent felt that answers are only confidential “if there is no problem” (no “red flag” in the responses). If there is something “to check on” then the data may not be confidential.

The message on data uses was well received and clearly understood. Respondents were very positive about the potential benefits to their communities of funds allocation as a result of the survey. This would encourage them to participate in the survey.

Finally, regarding the message about the fact that ACS respondents may be asked to participate in other surveys, participants were not alarmed or concerned about what this may involve.

*Messages not understood as intended or otherwise problematic*

Not all realized that the ACS is conducted by the Census Bureau. (#4: “It says the American Community Survey. I’m assuming they are a company that can help the community. They are conducting the survey. The Census Bureau is, in conjunction with some community, conducting the survey. Hopefully they are a big company that can address the community needs, a big company like a government agency.”)

The message on survey purpose did not come across clearly for most participants, as they understood the purpose of the survey and the uses of the data to be one and the same thing. That is, they thought that the ACS was to elicit opinion and feedback from people about their community or community services or the needs for the community so that the government would know where to allocate funds to fill those needs.

The message on the mandatory nature of the ACS was understood but not well received, for the most part. Respondents indicated that the language in the letter was strong and demanding rather than polite and encouraging participation. The language about being “required by law” was perceived as “a scare factor” and too forceful. One respondent was not sure if or how people would be required to answer every question. However, in this context we don’t know for sure if the objection from respondents would prevent them from participating in the ACS or not because the purpose of cognitive interviewing is to find out how respondents interpret the materials. It cannot be determined with certainty in the cognitive interviewing context if respondents’ interpretation of the mandatory message will encourage or discourage them from participating in the survey.<sup>7</sup>

References to Title 13 and its sections were unsettling, as participants did not know what they meant or what the U.S. Code is. Some felt those sections of the letter were not written clearly enough that the average American could understand them. The detailed references were not perceived as reassuring as intended (in the sense that knowing the source the respondent can try to find out the contents of the sections) but rather as intimidating and off-putting: #5 - “Then when they have the Chapter 13 and the section 9. I have no idea what that means, so if I have no idea what that means, I’m not going to be too quick to even

---

<sup>7</sup> A Census Bureau study (2003, 2004) found that the mandatory message in ACS materials in the field test increased response rates. It indicates that the mandatory nature of the survey does not appear to be an issue.

do anything with it. You're talking about this but you're not explaining it, so I'm not even interested in it." Some participants specifically asked for information on how and where to access additional details about Title 13.

Respondents lacked a general understanding about what specific questions the ACS would cover. Some expressed curiosity as to what information they would be asked to provide. They wanted more details about the survey.

The respondents vaguely understood "statistical" to mean something related to a "count" or to "numbers." Several mentioned the word "statistical" as one of the words they or other people would have trouble understanding. The limitations on the use of the data for statistical purposes only was a concept that was generally missed by this group or only vaguely defined as "just for the Census Bureau's purposes only."

The message on combining the ACS data with data respondents may have given other agencies brought up concerns that the Census Bureau might compare other administrative data about the individual respondent and catch him/her in an untrue report. There was concern that the government already had the answers to the questions. What type of data might be combined seemed to refer in respondents' minds to surveys the respondents may have done for other agencies.

#### *Problems with specific wording*

In addition to the word statistical and the references to the U.S. Code discussed above, the other problem word in the letter was "tribal." Most respondents were unclear about the meaning of term "tribal" in "tribal government":

#5: [What does it mean where it says "tribal governments" here?] All areas in the government. [Have you heard of tribal governments before?] No. [What do you imagine these tribal governments to be?] Tribal is a group, like Internal Revenue. Just the different governments... the Post Office.

#3: [When it says tribal governments, what do you think they're talking about?] When I think of tribal, I think of outside the U.S. Like Africa. [Do you know of any tribal governments in the U.S.?] No.

#### **Informational Brochure**

Respondents generally liked that the brochure was a little clearer than the letter and not as threatening. One was particularly encouraged by the explanation of how participants benefit from the survey. They understood the message in the brochure to be that the purpose of the ACS is to help the communities, in particular low-income communities, or subgroups in the population, like children or the elderly. They felt participation is equated with helping the community. On the other hand, several respondents commented that the brochure seems to be targeting the Hispanic communities and no other ethnicities mentioned. One person did not see why he should answer, because he was not Hispanic.

While respondents demonstrated an understanding of the data uses and survey objectives, some also expressed distrust that the needed changes would take place (general distrust of government).

Respondents felt that the Title 13, U.S. Code was better covered in the brochure, particularly regarding confidentiality. It tells about this law, the Census Bureau, and their oath. One respondent thought that he would be compensated if the government breaks the law and discloses any data about him. Still, several respondents felt that they would like additional information regarding confidentiality and Title 13. They wanted to know more about the legal requirements and how much of their unique personal information they would be asked to share.

Regarding the mandatory nature of the survey, some respondents still felt intimidated by the message:

#2 - “Where it says ‘Do I have to answer the questions...?’ It’s like mandatory. To me it does not bother me, but when people see that, they think, oh, the government means law, and law means jail. A lot of people are not too favorable of the law enforcement agencies these days. Brothers and sisters see this about the law and...”

One respondent felt that people would want to answer because the federal government might withhold benefits to the individual—such as access to student loans—if he/she did not participate in the ACS.

With regard to the layout of the brochure, most thought it was fine, although there were some negative reactions to the depiction of the flag as a political tool. Respondents liked that the brochure had contact information, both phone and web, in case someone wanted more information.

## **Q&A Brochure**

In general, respondents felt the brochure was clear, easy to read and helpful in explaining the purpose of the American Community Survey, which they had not heard of before. However, one respondent was suspicious because this community survey did not seem related to the census (counting people).

Most respondents were not able to explain to someone else how the data collected from the American Community Survey will be used. Several were confused about the term “decennial.” However, most picked up on the fact that it means 10 years. It was a term they had not heard before (with the exception of the respondent who is a programmer at the Census Bureau).

Among the messages or issues that worried or bother respondents, some were:

- Several respondents were concerned that only Hispanics were mentioned but no other ethnic/racial groups.
- Most respondents did not have a clear idea of the meaning of “Title 13, United States Code, Section 9.” They had never heard of the U.S. Code, and generally were surprised that the survey would be mandatory.
- There was not a good understanding of the term “summarized into profiles” for all respondents.
- The words “demographic” and “statistical” were not well understood: #1 – “You are asking me about demographic. Demographic is where people live. They are cluster, or whatever.”

Regarding the layout and design of the brochure, most found it attractive. Some respondents noted that the text is in a small font that may be difficult to read. A couple of respondents thought the brochure should have the colors of the American flag, not just red.

### **Thank You Letter**

Respondents understood that the point of the letter is to thank participants in the ACS. Respondents indicated that they would appreciate the “Thank You” phrase. (Some specifically commented that they liked the large font.) It made them feel important. One indicated that she liked the idea that it is going to represent various households, various income levels in the country. That means various communities are going to be represented in the survey.

Some felt the letter should be more personalized, such as with a person’s name, title, and address at the top. The director’s title at the top was not associated with the specific name at the bottom. Two respondents thought something was missing in the letter: one mentioned a seal from the Department of Commerce, and one mentioned there was no date. One respondent noted that he liked the mention of the website, but was not clear about the physical address; it should be more specific than U.S. Census Bureau, Washington DC.

Generally speaking, respondents understood well all messages in the letter: the reassurance of confidentiality, the concept of summarized information, the restatement of the uses of the data by different levels of government, and the provision of the Census website where respondents can find more information on the ACS. Most respondents felt that there was value in completing the survey—the materials successfully conveyed that message.

In this piece, again, respondents were not clear on the term “tribal government.”

## **Confidentiality Statements**

Round 1 respondents did not see a significant difference in the three showcards. Two respondents preferred version 2, one preferred version 3, one preferred a combination of 2 and 3, but when pressed, selected version 2.

Round 2 respondents thought the versions were trying to say the same thing, but they did observe differences among the three versions. Some felt the short version (1) was all that was needed, while others felt that the added detail in version 3 was more compelling. Three respondents preferred version 1, two preferred version 2, and three preferred version 3.

## **Survey Overview Statements**

The addition of a sentence explaining what questions the ACS includes was tested. This was particularly well received in the version in which this was added to a short paragraph. When tested as an addition to a long paragraph, respondents felt it was unnecessary and too much information.

Choice of words to include in the statement is important. One respondent seriously objected to the use of the word “demographic.” She was particularly articulate in explaining the feeling and reaction of participants when they are confronted with materials that include long, difficult words:

I'm gonna tell the truth. I done stop reading version 2. Demographical housing? What the hell is they talking about? Version 1 breaks it down more simpler. You got a lot of parents' kids reading them this information. ... So if they don't understand, the parents definitely don't understand. ... Children is reading this to their parents even in English; if they ain't understanding it... the children just reading it... If my kid come to me and say “the American Community Survey includes questions about basic demographical” I'm like: “What is you talking about?” I sit there acting like I'm understanding but I ain't.

## **4.5 Proposed Changes Based on Two Rounds of Cognitive Interviews**

This list of recommendations originates in both the English cognitive interviews and the discussions among the language experts in all four non-English languages.

### Mention of the Decennial Census and its Relationship to the ACS

- Issue: A large number of respondents showed major confusion over the mention of the 2010 Decennial Census and the ACS in the beginning section of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure. They could not figure out the relationship between the two. This confusion led a number of respondents to think that the ACS is done in

conjunction with the Census, every ten years. References to the long form only add confusion because many of the less educated respondents have never heard of the long form.

- Proposed solution: Consider starting the brochures with the proposed statement. This statement was tested in the second round of interviews and was well received.

<b>Original statement</b>	<b>Proposed statement</b>
<p><i>Informational Brochure</i></p> <p>“The American Community Survey is part of the 2010 Decennial Census Program.”</p>	<p>“The U.S. Census Bureau conducts a population census once every 10 years to count the population in the country. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts surveys on a variety of topics. This brochure provides information about one of those surveys, The American Community Survey.”</p>
<p><i>Q&amp;A Brochure</i> <i>Under the question of “What is the American Community Survey?”</i></p> <p>“It is new survey the U.S. Census Bureau developed as part of the 2010 Decennial Census Program.”</p>	<p>“The U.S. Census Bureau conducts a population census once every 10 years to count the population in the country. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts surveys on a variety of topics. This brochure provides information about one of those surveys, The American Community Survey.”</p>

If we need to link the ACS with the 2010 Decennial Census program in a way that is understandable to most respondents, additional language will be needed to explain the relationship between the ACS and the 2010 Decennial Census. The additional language will need to be pretested.

Questions covered in the ACS

- Issue: The references to what kinds of questions are covered in the ACS are not registering with the respondents. As a result, respondents have no idea about the nature and content of the ACS and wonder what the questions will be about. Most think they will be asked about the needs of their community; they do not expect personal questions about their own household. The message tested that included an explicit list of topics of questions covered in the ACS was very well received by respondents in the second round of interviews.
- Proposed solution: We recommend adding a sentence in the beginning of the second paragraph in the Introductory Letter, and adding a question and answer bullet in both brochures to cover this.



<b>Documents to add the statement</b>	<b>Proposed statement</b>
<i>Introductory Letter (At the beginning of the second paragraph)</i>	“The ACS asks questions about your household, including housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, and so on.”
<i>Informational Brochure Q&amp;A Brochure</i>	“The ACS asks questions about your household, including housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, and so on.”

Confusing Survey Purpose With Uses of the Data

- Issue: The emphasis on the potential uses of the data that is pervasive throughout the materials creates a good feeling among respondents, that the government is interested in their communities. By the same token, that strong emphasis misled participants into thinking that the ACS is done to see how to best allocate millions of dollars in the respondents’ specific communities. This turned, in their minds, participation into a sort of quid pro quo: I answer the survey, the government will give money to my community. While this is likely to have a positive effect on response rates, it may be negative in the long run as participants become disillusioned if they do not see the effects of their participation.
- Proposed solution: The Census Bureau may want to consider carefully the language used in the description of the uses of the data to diminish the impression the respondents are getting. Alternative wording on this message will need to be pretested.

Mandatory Nature of the Survey

- Issue: this message is not clearly understood, particularly by non-English speakers. While most English-speaking respondents understood the message, some were incredulous that the survey could be mandatory and that interfered with their processing of the information. Others, particularly non-English speakers, felt the language about the mandatory nature is too strong. Some respondents confused the cognitive interview with the ACS and insisted that the ACS was voluntary because that was what they read in the consent form for the cognitive interview.
- Proposed solution: The mandatory nature of the survey clearly needs to be spelled out in the materials, even if it makes some respondents uncomfortable. We don’t recommend changing the English wording without pretesting it because the field test showed that the statement greatly increased the response rate (Griffin et al., 2003, 2004). However,

changes should be made for other languages to make the statement clearer and culturally appropriate. The most culturally appropriate wording was proposed by each language experts' team.

- Issue: The detailed references to Title 13 were not seen as reassuring, but rather as threats. Hardly anyone knew about the U.S. Code., both U.S.-born English speakers and immigrants alike.
- Proposed solution: In any document where there is detailed citation of the U.S. Code, the word “Title 13” should be kept in the text, but the detailed citation (e.g., “sections 141, 193, and 221”) could be reduced and put in a footnote that includes a website reference where people can look for the contents of Title 13, since that was a concern among participants.

<b>Original phrase</b>	<b>Proposed phrase</b>
Title 13, United States Code, Section 141, 193, and 221	Title 13, United States Code*  *Footnote: Title 13, United States Code, Section 141, 193, and 221 (include the website here)

Thank You Letter Format

- Issue: the letter starts with an indication that it comes from the Director of the Census Bureau. However, respondents had trouble associating that message with Mr. Kincannon’s signature at the bottom. They were not sure who he was. The mocked-up versions tested in Round 2 where that initial message was removed and Mr. Kincannon’s name was followed by his title was clear and removed the concerns.
- Proposed solution: change the letter to reflect the format tested in Round 2.

Reference to Hispanic Origin

- Issue: A couple of the English-language respondents, both African-American, interpreted the mention of Hispanic origin in the Informational Brochure and Q&A Brochure as indicating the ACS is interested primarily in Hispanics. This was a turnoff and led them to feel excluded. For Asian respondents, they felt that Hispanics have a more prominent position in the United States than they do, and commented that the ACS is targeting at the Spanish-speaking population.
- Proposed solution: remove reference to Hispanic origin and replace it with “ethnic origin.”

Original phrase	Proposed phrase
<p><i>Q&amp;A Brochure</i></p> <p>“Information about race, Hispanic origin, and language spoken at home...”</p> <p>“Why doesn’t the ACS ask one question about race and another question about Hispanic origin?”</p>	<p>“Information about race, <i>ethnic origin</i>, and language spoken at home...”</p> <p>“Why doesn’t the ACS ask one question about race and another question about <i>ethnic origin</i>?”</p>
<p><i>Informational Brochure</i></p> <p>“The ACS brings you data every year about education, children... race and Hispanic origin ...”</p>	<p>“The ACS brings you data every year about education, children... race and <i>ethnic origin</i> ...”</p>

Combining Administrative Records

- Issue: in English and non-English languages, respondents were often thrown off by this statement in the Introductory Letter. Some objected that they had not given information to any other agencies. Others thought the Census Bureau would share their ACS responses with other agencies. Others only read this as the possibility of survey data given to other agencies being shared with Census, not of any other kind of data. In summary, this message is not getting across clearly.
- Proposed solution: Soften the message to indicate that their survey data may be combined with other data they “may” have given to other federal agencies.

Original text	Proposed text
<p>We may combine your survey data with data that you gave to other federal agencies. Any combined information would be given the same protections as your survey information.</p>	<p>We may combine your survey data with data that you <i>may have provided</i> to other federal agencies. Any combined information <i>is given</i> the same protections as your survey information.</p>

Terminology Issues

- A number of terms were not understood by the English-speaking respondents interviewed. These are: statistical purposes, demographic, profiles, and decennial. Any way to avoid them and still convey the intended message, even if in less than full detail, will help participants be more comfortable with the materials.

- “Tribal government” was not understood in context but “Indian tribal government” would be clear to all. We recommend changing the term “tribal government” to “Indian tribal government” for non-English languages.

## **5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ACS CAPI MATERIALS IN SPANISH**

All interviews in Round 1 were conducted between March 10 and March 28, 2006. Following informed consent procedures, the protocols were followed in each case. All interviews in Round 2 were conducted between May 16 and June 21, 2006. All interviews were audiotaped after obtaining respondents' consent to do so, with the exception of respondent #3 in round 1.<sup>8</sup> The interviews lasted from one hour to one hour and 30 minutes for Round 1 interviews, and from one hour and 30 minutes to one hour and 45 minutes for Round 2 interviews.

### **5.1 Respondents' Characteristics**

Across the two rounds, between January 31 and June 21, 2006, we completed screeners with 40 individuals, 9 of which were ineligible due to their command of English. As Table 5-1 shows, the 24 participants ranged in demographics in terms of age, education level, year of entry and national origin, and the recruiting has reflected a representative mix of these characteristics.

Overall, the respondents interviewed fulfilled the recruiting goals, particularly the distributions by gender, age and national origin. In terms of year of entry, recent immigrants (arrivals since 2000) were found in larger numbers than expected, not an unexpected outcome when recruiting specifically for immigrants with limited or no English skills. Although we were able to meet the combined target of high school graduates and below, our attempts to focus on the lower education populations ended with no college graduates being interviewed. Again, fewer college graduate immigrants from Latin America have no or only very basic English skills.

---

<sup>8</sup> Respondent #3 was unwilling to be recorded. He had never spoken into a tape recorder and was concerned that he "might get into trouble" by doing so, that his words might be thrown back at him in some unspecified way.

**Table 5-1 Demographics Characteristics of Spanish-Speaking Participants**

ID	Gender	Age	Education	Year of Entry	Country of origin
#1	F	18-24	Less than HS	1990-99	Mexico
#2	F	55-64	Less than HS	1980-89	Guatemala
#3	M	45-54	Less than HS	1980-89	Mexico
#Y1	F	35-44	Less than HS	1980-89	Guatemala
#Y2	F	18-24	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#Y3	M	18-24	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#OY3	F	18-24	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#OY2	M	25-34	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#R1	F	35-44	HS Graduate	2000+	Colombia
#R2	M	25-44	HS Graduate	1990-99	Colombia
#R3	M	25-34	HS Graduate	2000+	El Salvador
#R4	F	25-34	Less than HS	2000+	Honduras
#Y1 (2)	F	35-44	Less than HS	1980-89	Mexico
#Y2 (2)	F	35-44	Less than HS	1980-89	Mexico
#Y3 (2)	M	35-44	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#OY-B	M	65+	Less than HS	Pre-1980	Mexico
#OY-C	F	55-64	Less than HS	1990-99	Mexico
#OY-D	M	18-24	Less than HS	1990-99	Mexico
#OY-E	F	35-44	HS Graduate	2000+	Mexico
#R1 (2)	M	35-44	HS Graduate	2000+	Mexico
#R2 (2)	M	18-24	HS Graduate	2000+	Mexico
#R3 (2)	M	25-34	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico
#R4 (2)	F	35-44	Less than HS	1980-89	Mexico
#ASG1	M	45-54	Less than HS	2000+	Mexico

## 5.2 Summary of findings from the two rounds of cognitive interviews

Twelve interviews were to be conducted in each round of the interviews. In Round 1, six used Protocol 1, which tested the ACS Introductory Letter and the Brochure, and six were done with Protocol 2, which tested the Questions & Answers booklet and the Thank You Letter. In Round 2, however, there were 5 done with Protocol 1 and 7 with Protocol 2. Interviews were conducted in a variety of locations, ranging from participants' homes, fast food restaurants, and offices.

The following general issues were identified in Round 1 interviews:

- The Spanish translation was generally found to be working well. Overall, the level of vocabulary was understandable to all, including Spanish-speakers of different national origins and individuals with very low education.
- Participants read the materials intently, without making comments or making facial expressions worthy of note. The only observations made by the interviewers were about words that participants had difficulty reading, stumbled upon or simply misread.

- Most confusion detected among participants appeared to be related to the presentation of information in the materials rather than to translation choices.
- Except for a few words that were unfamiliar to participants, the remaining issues that lead them to understand specific messages in ways other than intended would not be easily solved. They would require a rather substantial redesign of the English materials.
- “Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense,” the Spanish translation of “American Community Survey” presented problems for some of the Spanish-speakers interviewed. In all likelihood, we would have discovered additional problems had we probed specifically for people’s reactions to the name of the survey. As it was, the objections were volunteered. Participants felt that the term “Estadounidense” (American) excluded them as immigrants and that even naturalized immigrants from Latin America would not think of themselves as “Estadounidense,” and would first think the term just covered the U.S. born.
- Some respondents displayed confusion between the cognitive interviews and the ACS survey. The content of the Consent Form in particular seemed to be associated in participants’ minds with participating in the ACS itself. And, because the Consent Form explains the voluntary nature of the cognitive interview, it may have put participants in a frame of mind to read the materials that did not let them process the statements about the mandatory nature of the survey. Alerting the cognitive interviewers of this problem to further stress the difference between both types of data collection was helpful in minimizing this problem in Round 2.
- The emphasis on the potential uses of the data that is pervasive throughout the materials misled participants into thinking that the ACS is a survey that asks for participants’ opinions about the needs for services and programs in their communities. Only those who were interviewed with Protocol 1 realized what the questions would focus on once they got to the first back panel in the brochure (where the picture of a pencil appears and topics for questions are listed).
- Respondents generally liked the design and layout of the brochures. They enjoyed the graphics and felt positive overall about the amount and presentation of information.

After the first round of cognitive interviews, the Chicago-based Spanish language team met on March 28, 2006 to review the issues identified in the interviews and discuss recommendations for revisions to improve the translated materials. To address the issues identified in Round 1, the Spanish team recommended a list of revisions along the following lines:

- Test alternative wording for a number of translated terms that had created respondent confusion;

- Test a new translated version of the survey name designed to reduce the feeling of exclusion respondents experienced when the term “Americans” was used;
- Add a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure. The new paragraph is:

“The ACS includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.”

### **5.3 Modification of Round 2 interview protocol guides**

In order to test our proposed changes in Round 2 interviews, we added debriefing questions at the end of interview to elicit respondents’ reactions to the proposed changes. Due to the time constraints for the cognitive interviews, we modified the two interview protocol guides by deleting some questions from the original protocols. We deleted questions that sounded repetitive in the interview and questions that did not elicit much information in Round 1 interviews. We also developed new probing questions to test these proposed changes for Round 2 interviews.

We tested alternative wording using a showcard to ask respondents to compare the original and revised versions and to ask them which they preferred and why. While the next section describes the major issues identified in the documents across both testing rounds, the detailed recommendations on wording changes appear in point 5 below.

### **5.4 Issues identified in each document in both rounds of interviews**

#### **Introductory Letter**

The Introductory Letter contains the following key messages: request for survey participation, survey sponsor, survey purpose, data uses, mandatory nature of the ACS, response burden, confidentiality, administrative records use, and other sample surveys. Of these messages, some were well received and had a positive or neutral impact on the respondents; some caused confusion or did not have a positive impact, and some failed to come across.

Generally the respondents liked the letter. They got the impression the ACS is about finding out what services and programs each community needs. That encouraged them to participate because they felt they would be helping their community. A couple of participants thought it was specifically addressed to Hispanics. Not all realized that the ACS is conducted by the Census Bureau. One person mentioned that “Dear Resident” seems to exclude Hispanics who are not in this country legally.



*Messages clearly understood*

Spanish-speaking respondents appeared to understand that the Introductory Letter was intended to ask for their participation in a survey.

The burden message was understood, although some respondents may have confused the estimated time to complete the ACS with the time to do the cognitive interview. With regular ACS respondents this should not be an issue, however, since they will not be confused with the cognitive interviews.

The confidentiality message was understood in the sense that the letter tells participants that the information they provide will be kept confidential. Respondents defined the term confidential as meaning “that they cannot give my information to anybody,” “that the Census Bureau cannot publish it,” etc.

The message on data uses was well received and clearly understood. Respondents were very positive about the potential benefits to their communities of funds allocation as a result of the survey. This would encourage them to participate in the survey.

*Messages not understood as intended or otherwise problematic*

Several respondents were not sure who conducts the ACS. Some thought it is the Census Bureau but were not positive.

The message on survey purpose did not come across clearly for most participants, as they understood the purpose of the survey and the uses of the data to be one and the same thing. That is, they thought that the ACS was to elicit opinion and feedback from people about their community or community services or the needs for the community so that the government would know where to allocate funds to fill those needs.

Statistical Purpose: about half of the respondents understood “statistical” to mean something related to a “count,” “numbers,” “projections for future years,” “quantities, totals about the survey.” Several said they did not understand what “propósitos estadísticos” means. In that context, the limitations on the use of the data for statistical purposes only was a concept that was generally missed by this language group.

The message that the survey is mandatory did not get across clearly. In Round 1 there were hints that this may have been caused by the dissonance between the voluntary nature of the cognitive interview and the mandatory statement in this paragraph. Two respondents said they did not understand the sentence. Even one person who clearly defined what “required by law” means, believed it was in error because the survey is voluntary. Across rounds respondents expressed concern with the reference to the “códigos” (codes) and “título” (title) which they did not know what they are. Both in the mandatory and confidentiality messages, references to Title 13 and its sections were unsettling as participants did not know what they meant or what the U.S. Code is.

The message on combining the ACS data with data respondents may have given other agencies was fairly well understood in terms of the protection that would be afforded to the combined data. However, what data might be combined did not appear to be clear. One person thought this referred to combining data across respondents. Others thought it referred to any surveys the respondent may have done for other agencies. The message produced concern in one of the respondents, however, who thought survey information might be shared with the IRS or the immigration authorities.

Finally, regarding the message about the fact that ACS respondents may be asked to participate in other surveys, Spanish-speaking participants were rather unclear as to what this may involve. While they did not appear concerned that they may be asked to participate in other surveys, five participants did not understand what they may be asked to participate in. One thought they may have to do the ACS more than once. However, the assurances of the protection that would be afforded to the combined data did come across well.

*Problems with specific wording*

- 1) The word “tribales” presented problems. Respondents were unfamiliar with the term and could not even guess its meaning correctly. Some read it as “tribunales” (= tribunals or courts), others as “triviales” (= trivial in English).
- 2) Two respondents had stumbled over the word “recopila” and did not know what it meant.
- 3) Four respondents defined “crítica” as related to criticizing rather than meaning something of critical importance.
- 4) The word “afectar” was interpreted as negative rather than neutral.

**Informational Brochure**

According to the participants, the brochure was easy to read. However, several had a difficult time explaining the messages it covers. As with the letter, the uses of the data was the one message that respondents “took home.” They understood the message in the brochure to be that the purpose of the ACS is to help the communities, in particular low-income communities, or subgroups in the population, like children or the elderly. They felt participation is equated with helping the community.

Under the heading of “**What is the American Community Survey?**” most respondents did not know the meaning of the word “Decenal.” While some realized it meant every so many years but did not know how many, others knew that “decena” means a group of ten things but could not figure how that applied to the Census Program.

Under the heading of “**Do I have to Answer the Questions on the American Community Survey?**” the response in Spanish begins with the affirmative “Sí” (Yes). However, several participants read this as the conditional “Si” (If) which carries no accent

mark. By doing so, the meaning of the printed response was distorted from saying “Yes, your response to this survey is required...” to saying “If your response to this survey is required...”<sup>9</sup> Another R said that “if the law requires it, you are supposed to answer the questions,” again reflecting this view of the conditional statement. (This same issue appeared in Protocol 2 discussed later in this report.) A few others understood the survey to be mandatory. Only one respondent indicated the reason why she would participate is that the survey is mandatory. Alternative wording tested in Round 2 shed more light on this issue: the verb “require” (in its perfectly adequate Spanish translation) was not understood as meaning mandatory (see Recommendations section in this report).

The group of Round 1 respondents had no problems with comprehension in the center panel under “**How will my participation help me and my community?**” They seemed to understand well the uses of the data described there. In Round 2, however, perhaps due to having more respondents with very low education, the group generally had more difficulty articulating their understanding of this section.

Under the heading “**Is the Information I Provide Confidential?**” the general message about protection from disclosure was clearly understood. In Round 1, several respondents were thinking about the confidentiality of their own responses to the cognitive interview. However, this did not seem to be an issue in Round 2. In any case, respondents had never heard of Title 13 or even the U.S. Code. One respondent defined it as “the official Constitution.” Others knew the word code but in different contexts (e.g. coded password). Some expressed concern about the title and section numbers as something intimidating that they did not understand.

Respondents had more difficulty stating what “propósitos de estadística” means than in the letter (where it appears in slightly different way as “propósitos estadísticos”). Some gave vague answers. One thought “estadística” is a derivative from “estado” (the State). Regarding how participants are selected for the ACS, respondents understood that the ACS uses random sampling although they did not specifically mention that addresses—rather than individuals—are randomly selected.

Respondents were generally positive about the design and layout of all sections of the brochure.

### **Q&A Brochure:**

Respondents generally liked the brochure. They found it informative and relatively easy to read. However, some of the lower education respondents commented that it was a bit dense and should be re-read carefully for full comprehension. The section on transportation seemed to be somewhat harder to comprehend for a few.

---

<sup>9</sup> This is a problem observed and documented in earlier years by the author of this report when testing the brochure for the Puerto Rican Community Survey for the Census Bureau.

In the first Q&A section, some respondents understood the Census Bureau intends to do the ACS annually instead of every ten years, while others did not mention this. The survey purpose was more clearly conveyed in this document: participants spoke of the need to get more timely information. Most respondents spoke of it relating to gathering information rather than solving problems.

Under the heading **“How are the answers that I provide to the ACS used?”** again, the uses of the data were generally clear to all. Respondents did not understand what was meant by summarized “profiles.”

In this document the confidentiality message was clear to most. However, three respondents read the “Sí” as a conditional “Si.” This led them to imagine exceptions to the confidentiality protection, such as breaking confidentiality in cases where a serious crime is committed. Other problems in the delivery of this message were:

- 1) References to Title 13 were a problem for respondents. They realized it was a reference to some law but they did not know what the law was.
- 2) References to “la ley” (the law) seemed potentially intimidating to some respondents. “La ley” is sometimes used in Spanish as a way to refer to “the authorities.” Using the plural “las leyes” we would avoid such ambiguity.

Regarding the mandatory nature of the survey, this message was clear to about half of the respondents. Again, part of the confusion came from the voluntary nature of the cognitive interview (and the statements in that regard in the consent form) which was only exacerbated by some respondents reading the “Sí” as conditional. Again, respondents were puzzled and somewhat intimidated by the numbers of the specific sections under Title 13.

As for the layout and design of the brochure, respondents generally liked it, and liked the amount of information provided, as well as the graphics. Two, however, did not find the color and pictures very appealing.

#### *Problems with specific wording*

The terms that at least several respondents had difficulty understanding were:

1. summarized into profiles (“se resumen en perfiles”)
2. demographic (“demográfica”)
3. decennial (“decenal”)
4. collect (“recopilar”)

## Thank You Letter:

Eight of the 13 respondents mentioned that the point of the letter is to thank participants in the ACS. Only one respondent mentioned the letter was not addressed to anyone.

In Round 1, respondents were not clear that Mr. Kincannon is the Director of the Census Bureau. They suggested we place his title under his name. This was tested in Round 2 and was very well received by all.

The presence of the Department of Commerce letterhead AND the Census Bureau logo at the bottom of the page was confusing to some respondents. Perhaps only one of the two should be used.

Generally speaking, respondents understood well all messages in the letter: the reassurance of confidentiality, the concept of summarized information, the restatement of the uses of the data by different levels of government, and the provision of the Census website where respondents can find more information on the ACS.

The specific terminology that caused difficulties in this letter were the words “tribales” and the verb “afectar” (understood by some respondents as always implying a negative effect.)

## Comparing Confidentiality Statements

In Round 1, the following three versions of the confidentiality statement (from the Introductory Letter, from the Q&A Brochure, and from the Informational Brochure) were tested to elicit perceived differences and preferences in the message delivery.

**VERSION #1**      (*Introductory Letter*)

---

*I want to emphasize that any information you give our representative will be kept confidential. By law, the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your household (Title 13, Section 9).*

**VERSION #2**      (*Informational Brochure*)

---

**Is the Information I Provide Confidential?**

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law (Title 13, United States Code, Section 9). This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subjected to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household.*

**VERSION #3** (Q&A Brochure)

Are my survey answers confidential?

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law under Title 13, United States Code, Section 9. This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.*

All versions were perceived to basically transmit the same message. However, nine of the 12 respondents expressed a preference for Version 2. They liked the fact that it specifies penalties for Census Bureau staff that violates the protection of confidential data. Respondents indicated they felt better protected.

Because of the strong findings in Round 1, and in the interest of shortening the length of the protocol to allow for additions in Round 2 to test alternative wordings, this section was not repeated in Round 2.

## 5.5 Proposed Changes Based on Two Rounds of Cognitive Interviews

Based on the findings from the first round of interviews, we drafted a list of proposed changes to be tested in the second round of interviews. Findings from the second round of interviews indicated which of our proposed changes were warranted and which—after additional interviews—were not deemed necessary.

The Spanish language experts' team from Illinois and North Carolina met on July 5 for another session to finalize the proposed changes. We reviewed the testing data for all the proposed changes from the second round interviews.

The list that follows is a table containing final recommendations for changes, starting with terms to be changed throughout all four documents, and followed by specific changes for each document. The table contains the current translation, the proposed change, the English back translation of the Spanish translation to give the reader an idea of what the Spanish translation says, and notes stating the reason for changes.

**LIST OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES**

***Throughout the ACS materials: Global change for all the materials***

All materials should be reviewed for consistency in the way the same terms are translated. Currently they are not always consistent.

<b>Current translation</b>	<b>Proposed Translation</b>
Name of the survey:  Encuesta sobre la Comunidad Estadounidense  Survey about the American Community	  Encuesta sobre las Comunidades en los Estados Unidos  Survey about the Communities in the United Status
<b>Note:</b> The current translation of the survey name gives respondents the impression that it the ACS is only for U.S. citizens or not for immigrants, regardless of current status.	
...recopilar  To collect	... obtener  To obtain
<b>Note:</b> Some respondents did not know the word “recopilar,” but understood well the proposed alternative.	
... afectan  Affect	...concernen  Concern, have an impact on
<b>Note:</b> To a number of respondents the verb “afectar” always has a negative connotation, that is one cannot be positively affected. Hence this was cause for alarm, and should be avoided.	
Título 13, Código de Estados Unidos  Title 13, U.S. Code	Título 13 del Código de Leyes de los Estados Unidos  Title 13, U.S. Code of Laws
<b>Note:</b> Respondents were not familiar with the U.S. Code and only knew the word “code” in other contexts. The tested alternative was preferred because it indicated respondents what kind of code the documents refer to.	
Propósitos estadísticos or Propósitos de estadística  Statistical purposes	
<b>Note:</b> Because many respondents that need Spanish materials have lower levels of education and do not understand what this means, we recommend using the concepts sparingly, possibly paraphrasing, and generally avoiding delivering messages of crucial importance that hinge on respondents understanding what this concept means.	

## Recommended Changes by Document

### Introductory Letter

<b>Para-graph</b>	<b><u>Current Translation</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Translation</u></b>
1	Estimado Residente  Dear Resident	Estimado Señor o Señora  Dear Sir/Madam
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation suggested to some respondents that undocumented immigrants are not included in the ACS.</p>		
2		<p>La encuesta incluye preguntas sobre las características básicas de la población, sobre vivienda, educación, raza, grupo étnico, idioma, estatus de veterano, empleo, transporte al trabajo, ingresos y demás.</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. Because respondents were unclear and sometimes wondered what questions might be asked, we recommend adding a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS, at the beginning of the second paragraph. This new paragraph was successfully tested in Round 2 and respondents felt the information provided was necessary.</p>		
2	...información actual y crítica...  Up-to date and critical information	...información actual y de mucha importancia...  Up-to-date and very important information
<p><b>Note:</b> lower education respondents are not familiar with the intended meaning of the word “crítica” and only associate it with criticism.</p>		
2	Gobiernos tribales  Tribal governments	Gobiernos de las tribus de indios  Governments of Indian tribes
<p><b>Note:</b> Respondents were not familiar with the word “tribales,” but the tested alternative was understood by all.</p>		
3	La ley de los Estados Unidos requiere que usted responda a esta encuesta.  U.S. law requires that you respond to this survey.	Todas las personas cuyos domicilios resultan seleccionados están obligadas por una ley a responder a esta encuesta.  All the people whose addresses are selected will be required by law to respond to this survey.
<p><b>Note:</b> the original version was not being understood correctly as far as the mandatory nature of the survey. The tested version was clearly understood.</p>		



4	<p>En conformidad con la ley, la Oficina del Censo no puede publicar ni divulgarle a nadie ninguna información que lo identifique personalmente a usted o a su familia.</p> <p>In conformity with the law, the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your family.</p>	<p>La ley estipula que la Oficina del Censo no puede publicar ni divulgarle a nadie ninguna información que lo identifique personalmente a usted o a su hogar.</p> <p>The law stipulates that the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your household.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> the original translation was interpreted by some respondents as indicating limitations in the confidentiality protection (as though “in conformity with the law” meant something like “to the extent allowed by law”). Also, the proposed translation preserves more closely the meaning of “household” in the English original.</p>		
5	Si tiene acceso a la Internet	Si tiene acceso a Internet
<p><b>Note:</b> because in different Spanish-speaking countries the Internet is identified with a different gender and therefore preceded by a different article, we tested it without the article and it was well received.</p>		

Introductory Brochure

<u>Column /Paragraph</u>	<u>Current Translation</u>	<u>Proposed Translation</u>
1/1	<p>Programa del Censo Decenal del 2010</p> <p>2010 Decennial Census Program</p>	<p>Programa del Censo del Año 2010</p> <p>2010 Census Program</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> if possible, we recommend excluding the word “decenal” which respondents did not understand.</p>		
1/last	<p>Sí, la ley requiere que responda a esta encuesta.</p> <p>Yes, U.S. law requires that you respond to this survey.</p>	<p>Así es. Si su domicilio resulta seleccionado, usted está obligado por ley a responder a esta encuesta.</p> <p>That is right. If your address happens to be selected, you are required by law to respond to this survey.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> As stated earlier, the original Sí was consistently misread as conditional. The proposed version was tested and clearly understood as saying that the survey is mandatory.</p>		
3	<p>Sí. En conformidad con la ley, sus respuestas son confidenciales.</p> <p>Yes. In conformity with the law, your answers are confidential.</p>	<p>Así es. La ley especifica que sus respuestas son confidenciales.</p> <p>That is right. The law specifies that your answers are confidential.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> As stated earlier, the original Sí was consistently misread as conditional</p>		
3	Esta ley requiere que cada empleado	Esta ley requiere que cada empleado

	<p>de la Oficina del Censo—incluyendo al director y a cada representante de la Oficina del Censo—preste juramento y quede sujeto a pena de encarcelamiento, multa o ambos si divulga CUALQUIER información que pudiera identificarlo a usted o a miembros de su hogar.</p> <p>This law requires that every Census Bureau employee – including the Director and every Census Bureau representative – take an oath and be subject to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household.</p>	<p>de la Oficina del Censo—incluyendo al director y a cada representante de la Oficina del Censo—preste juramento. Si alguna de esas personas divulga CUALQUIER información que pudiera identificarlo a usted o a miembros de su hogar está sujeta a condena de encarcelamiento, multa o ambos.</p> <p>This law requires that every Census Bureau employee – including the Director and every Census Bureau representative – take an oath. If any of these persons discloses ANY information that could identify you or members of your household, they are subject to a jail term, a fine, or both.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> the very long original sentence was hard to follow for lower literacy respondents. Therefore we tested a version in which we broke it down into two sentences. This made it clear and also removed confusion as to who exactly might be subject to jailing or fines.</p>		
3		<p>La encuesta incluye preguntas sobre las características básicas de la población, sobre vivienda, educación, raza, grupo étnico, idioma, estatus de veterano, empleo, transporte al trabajo, ingresos y demás.</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement as a final question/answer in the internal right side panel following the question on confidentiality, to inform respondents on the type of questions asked in the ACS. Even though this brochure includes such information on the pack panel (next to the drawing of a pencil), respondents consistently missed it. In Round 2, this wording was tested and was very well received by respondents who felt the information provided was necessary.</p>		

**Q&A Brochure**

<b>Page#/ Column</b>	<b><u>Current Translation</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Translation</u></b>
1/1	<p>La encuesta proveerá información económica, social, demográfica y de vivienda...</p> <p>The survey will provide economic, social, demographic and housing information...</p>	<p>La encuesta proveerá información económica, social, de población y de vivienda...</p> <p>The survey will provide economic, social, population and housing information...</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> to avoid the word “demographic,” which was not understood by respondents, we recommend replacing it with “population.”</p>		
2/1		<p>La encuesta incluye preguntas sobre las características básicas de la población, sobre vivienda, educación, raza, grupo étnico, idioma, estatus de veterano, empleo, transporte al trabajo, ingresos y demás.</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement as a question/answer right before the question on uses of the data. In Round 2, this wording was tested and was very well received by respondents who felt the information it provided was necessary.</p>		
4/2	<p>Sí. En conformidad con la ley, sus respuestas son confidenciales.</p> <p>Yes. In conformity with the law, your answers are confidential.</p>	<p>Así es. La ley especifica que sus respuestas son confidenciales.</p> <p>That is right. The law specifies that your answers are confidential.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> As stated earlier, the original “Sí” was consistently misread as conditional</p>		
5/1	<p>Sí, la ley requiere que usted conteste las preguntas de esta encuesta.</p> <p>Yes, U.S. law requires that you respond to the questions in this survey.</p>	<p>Así es. Si su domicilio resulta seleccionado, usted está obligado por ley a responder a esta encuesta.</p> <p>That is right. If your address happens to be selected, you are required by law to respond to the questions in this survey.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> As stated earlier, the original “Sí” was consistently misread as conditional. The proposed version was tested and clearly understood as saying that the survey is mandatory.</p>		
3/1	<p>Las respuestas se resumen en perfiles utilizados para evaluar las</p>	<p>Las respuestas se resumen de maneras que permiten evaluar las necesidades...</p>

necesidades...	
The answers are summarized into profiles used to evaluate the needs...	The answers are summarized in ways that permit to evaluate the needs...
<b>Note:</b> Because “summarized into profiles” was terminologically and conceptually hard to understand for respondents, we tested the alternative version, which was understood. Clearly, profiles and ways do not mean the same, and perhaps the overall concept is still difficult to grasp, but at least there are no longer words that intimidate the respondents and make them wonder what they are being told.	

**Thank You Letter**

No specific changes are recommended beyond the general ones that apply to all documents.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ACS CAPI MATERIALS IN CHINESE**

All interviews in Round 1 were conducted between March 2, 2006 and March 21, 2006. Following informed consent procedures, the protocols were followed in each case. All interviews in Round 2 were conducted between April 24, 2006 and May 19, 2006. All interviews were audiotaped after obtaining respondents' consent to do so. The interviews lasted from 50 minutes to one hour and 15 minutes for Round 1 interviews, and from one hour and 15 minutes to two hours for Round 2 interviews.

### **6.1 Respondents' characteristics**

As mentioned in section 3.3, we screened 141 individuals and found 46 persons who met the basic criterion (Chinese monolingual). Based on other characteristics such as education level, age, gender and year of entry, we recruited 24 Chinese-speaking respondents for the cognitive interviews. As Table 6-1 shows, the 24 participants have a wide range of demographic characteristics, varied by age, education level, year of entry to the United States, and dialect preference.

**Table 6-1 Demographics Characteristics of Chinese-Speaking Participants**

ID	Gender	Age	Education	Year of Entry	Dialect Preference
1	Female	45-54	Less than HS graduate	Since 2000	Mandarin
2	Female	55-64	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Mandarin
3	Male	65+	HS graduate	1980-1989	Cantonese
4	Female	65+	College graduate	1980-1989	Mandarin
5	Male	45-54	Less than HS graduate	Since 2000	Shandong Dialect
7	Female	55-64	College graduate	1990-1999	Fukanese
8	Female	45-54	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Mandarin
10	Female	45-54	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Shanghai Dialect
11	Male	35-44	Less than HS graduate	Since 2000	Mandarin
12	Female	55-64	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Mandarin
13	Male	65+	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Cantonese
23	Female	35-44	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Mandarin
18	Male	65+	Less than HS	Since 2000	Mandarin
28	Female	55-64	Less than HS	1980-1989	Mandarin
29	Female	35-44	Less than HS	Since 2000	Cantonese
33	Male	45-54	Less than HS	1980-1989	Fukanese
39	Male	65+	College graduate	1990-1999	Shanghai Dialect
44	Female	35-44	HS graduate	Since 2000	Mandarin
14	Female	18-24	College grad	Since 2000	Mandarin
40	Male	35-44	HS graduate	1990-1999	Cantonese
24	Female	55-64	HS graduate	1990-1999	Shanghai Dialect
37	Male	55-64	Less than HS	Since 2000	Mandarin
42	Male	55-64	Less than HS	1990-1999	Mandarin
16	Female	55-64	Less than HS	1990-1999	Mandarin

## 6.2 General issues identified in the first round of interviews

From Round 1 interviews, we found that there are mainly two barriers for Chinese respondents to fully understand the translated materials. One has to do with the quality of the translation, and the other has to do with the lack of survey knowledge. This section documents the general issues identified in Round 1 interviews.

- The Chinese translation was generally found to be hard to comprehend. It uses high level vocabulary and long, complex sentence structures. Some parts of the translated materials do not read naturally in the Chinese language. In some instances, the translation follows the English syntax or sentence ordering. This created confusion for Chinese respondents. We noticed that in general, those with higher degree of comprehension actually found the language more challenging than those with limited understanding of the content. The latter group (mostly respondents with a lower education level) claimed that the text was easy to understand, but they only understood individual words instead of the messages being conveyed. We believe this happened because 1) they didn't know that they

misunderstood the materials; and 2) they didn't want to admit that they had difficulty processing the materials. As previous studies show (Pan, 2004; Pan et al., 2005), many Chinese-speaking respondents tend to perceive the cognitive interview as a test. They want to give the right answer to each question.

- In general, the more educated respondents found the language problematic and wording too complicated and “political”-sounding. They commented that the translation sounds awkward, condensed, and complex. Some of them mentioned that the Chinese text sounds like a piece of translation from the English text and doesn't read smoothly in Chinese.
- We identified some mistranslated or ambiguous terms that cause confusion for comprehension of the informed consent messages [e.g., “计划” (plan) “信息” (information), “家庭” (family)]. We also identified some long complex sentences that can be re-structured to help ease the comprehension. We then worked out a list of proposed changes to be tested in Round 2 interviews.
- The translated term of “美国社区调查” for the American Community Survey is often mistaken as “美国社会调查” (American Social Investigation). There is only one word different between the translated term for the ACS and the term “American Social Investigation” in Chinese. The current translated term of “调查” has two meanings. One is “investigation,” and the other is “survey.” It is a little misleading in this context. It gives the impression that it's asking for open-ended personal feedback. We recommend that the term ACS be translated into “美国社区问卷调查” (American Community Questionnaire Survey) in order to avoid the connection with the Chinese social investigation.
- Many respondents at times did not distinguish between the cognitive interview and the ACS. This applied in particular to the topic of mandatory nature of the survey. Respondents read in the consent form for the cognitive interview that their participation was voluntary and that they could decline to answer any questions. When they read about the mandatory nature of the ACS, they still thought they could decline to participate.
- Respondents showed major confusion over the mention of the 2010 decennial census and the ACS in the beginning section of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure. They couldn't figure out the relationship between the two. This led some of the respondents to think that the ACS takes place every ten years. Some of them thought that the ACS is a census.
- There is a lack of mention of what kinds of questions are covered in the ACS. As a result, respondents have no idea about the nature and content of the ACS. It will be very helpful if these materials include a list of topics (general questions) covered in the ACS survey.

- The emphasis on the potential uses of the data that is pervasive throughout the materials misled participants into thinking that the ACS is a survey that asks for participants' opinions about the needs for services and programs in their communities. Most respondents volunteered information on their community needs.
- Most respondents have positive reaction to the mention of the potential uses of the ACS data. They reported that this part and the legitimacy of the ACS (conducted by the Census Bureau, the federal government) would encourage them to participate in the ACS.
- On the topic of confidentiality, respondents understood the basic concept, but many of them thought that their opinions and feedback about the community needs, rather than their personal information, would be protected. They didn't seem to appreciate the detailed information about the legal requirement of confidentiality (particularly in the Introductory Letter). They found the text too serious, scary, and intimidating. It may, as a result, discourage people from participating.
- Respondents generally liked the design, color, and layout of the two brochures, but felt that the front cover of the Q&A Brochure was too plain and the font size in the two brochures was too small. Many respondents, particularly older respondents, found it hard to read the text with such small font. We recommend adding some words on the front cover to provide background information about the ACS and using a larger font size for the two brochures.

### **6.3 Modification of Round 2 interview protocol guides**

After the first round of cognitive interviews, the Chinese team met to review the issues identified in the interviews and discuss recommendations for revision to improve the translation.

To address the issues identified in Round 1, the Chinese team recommended a list of revisions along the following lines:

- Re-structure long complex sentences to make the translation read more naturally in the Chinese language;
- Correct mistranslated or ambiguous terms to reflect the intended messages in the original English documents;
- Test a new translated term for the survey name “美国社区问卷调查” (American Community Questionnaire Survey);
- Add a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure. The new paragraph is:



“The ACS includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.”

- Replace the existing introductory paragraph in the beginning of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure by a new statement to clarify the relationship between the 2010 decennial census and the ACS. The new statement reads:

“The U.S. Census Bureau conducts a census every 10 years in order to survey the U.S. population. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts surveys about a variety of topics. This brochure introduces to you one of the surveys, namely, The American Community Survey.”

In order to test our proposed changes in Round 2 interviews, we added debriefing questions at the end of the interviews to elicit respondents’ reaction to the proposed changes. Due to the time constraints for the cognitive interviews, we modified the two interview protocol guides by deleting some questions from the original protocols. We deleted questions that sounded repetitive in the interview and questions that did not elicit much information in Round 1 interviews. We also developed new probing questions to test these proposed changes for Round 2 interviews.

For changes that involved individual words/expressions, we developed probes that asked for the respondent’s interpretation of the original word and the proposed word. For changes that involved re-structuring of the entire sentence or change in the syntax, we gave the respondents a showcard to compare the two versions and asked them which one they found easier to understand and which they preferred and why.

We also dropped the read-aloud parts not only because it did not show the respondents’ hardship to understand the material, but also because they tended to read the paragraphs again to answer the questions although they had read them just a minute ago. We also simplified comparison of confidentiality versions because respondents thought the basic message of three different versions were the same.

#### **6.4 Issues identified in each document in both rounds of interviews**

The discussion of issues identified in each ACS CAPI document centers around the key messages covered in these materials. These key messages include request for survey participation, survey sponsor, survey purpose, data uses, mandatory nature of the ACS, response burden, confidentiality, administrative records use, and other sample surveys. In the section that follows, a detailed discussion of how these messages were understood and interpreted is included in the sub-section of the Introductory Letter, because the Introductory Letter covers all of these messages, while the other three ACS CAPI documents convey some (and not all) of the messages.

##### **Introductory Letter**

Of the above-mentioned key messages conveyed in the Introductory Letter, some were well received and had a positive impact on the respondents; some caused confusion or did not have a positive impact, and some failed to come across.

*Messages that were well received*

The messages that were well received by the Chinese respondents include survey sponsor, data uses, and response burden. All respondents understood that the ACS was conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. And they all commented that the data collected from the ACS would be used by all levels of the governments to improve services for the community. They understood that the survey takes about 30 minutes of their time to complete. These messages had a positive impact on the respondents. When asked what in the letter might encourage their participation in the ACS, they mentioned the facts that the ACS was conducted by the federal government and that the data would be used to benefit their communities.

*Messages that caused confusion*

The message on survey purpose caused some confusion among many respondents (10 out of 12). They thought that the ACS was to elicit opinion and feedback from people about their community or community services or the needs for the community. Many of them commented that they were not able to participate in the ACS because they didn't have the information about their community. This confusion occurred partly because the current translated term for the "American Community Survey" is too close to the term of "social investigation" in Chinese, and partly because respondents did not have any clue on what types of questions were being asked in the ACS.

The term "tribal government" presented a problem for some respondents. They thought it was about some Chinese ethnic groups. A few suggested that it should be "local government," or "county government," as it was unclear what it meant to them.

*Messages that caused different reactions*

Most respondents understood the literal meaning of the mandatory nature message and the confidentiality message. That is, the law requires that they answer the ACS questions and that their answers are protected by law. However, the message on the mandatory nature of the ACS didn't register well with respondents. They seemed to have some understanding that the law requires them to answer the survey, but they used a generic term "you" to talk about someone who must answer the survey, instead of themselves.

In general, it was well understood that the respondents' answers are protected. Interestingly, many of the Chinese respondents thought that "freedom of speech" is what protects confidentiality. The emphasis on law caused two types of reactions: one was fear of

the law, the other was distrust of the law. Several respondents thought it was too much, and that there was no need to keep stressing the subject. Here is a quote from one respondent:

R#13, male, 60+, HS, year of entry: 2000

“You should tell the general public the basic idea. If you put too much information here, such as ‘law, title so and so,’ it is too intimidating. People will be scared by it.”

Another reaction is the distrust in law. Respondents understood the meaning of the sentence, but they didn’t believe what they read. Here is a quote from another respondent:

R#1, female, 40+, less than HS, year of entry: 2000

“For people who are newcomers, they may not believe in U.S. laws. There are differences between China and the U.S. in terms of laws. In China, they (the government) say they will keep (the information) confidential, but they don’t really do it.”

These reactions reflect the cultural background of respondents. We believe this has to do with the two different types of expectations people have towards the way a society is governed. In the U.S., most people see the society as being governed by law, whereas in Chinese society, people regard a great part of the society as being governed by human relations, where people acknowledge that there are given laws on the one hand, but on the other hand, they don’t necessarily operate by the law, but by other socially accepted mechanisms (such as human relationships, behavior norms, etc.). This explains why stress on law doesn’t help much with Chinese respondents. On the contrary, it might cause fear and doubt.

Most respondents had the general understanding of the phrase “statistical purposes” in the confidentiality statement; the problem is how they interpret it in this context. Most respondents understood that the survey result is used merely as statistics (“for calculating numbers”), as reference, or for summing up individuals’ responses into some kind of statistical data. There is some misinterpretation detected. A few respondents had the impression that people’s data can be unreliable or simply wrong, so we need statistics to rule out “bad” answers.

#### *Messages that failed to come across*

In the message on administrative records use, the two sentences are long and complex. Most respondents focused on only one aspect of this message, either on data combination, or confidentiality. Only one respondent saw the connection between the two. Some respondents failed to understand it all together. We recommend revising these two sentences.

In the message on other sample surveys, we detected major confusion. The respondents could not figure out who participated in the ACS, what the other Census Bureau surveys were, and what was the relation between those who participated in the ACS and in other Census Bureau surveys. This confusion was caused by two factors. One is that the

current translation uses a long and complex sentence to convey the message. The other factor is that respondents had no survey knowledge or experience. They lacked the necessary background knowledge to interpret this message. To address the first factor, we recommend changing this sentence to make it more understandable. But correcting the translation alone may not necessarily address the second factor.

Another interesting finding from the cognitive interviews is about the message that requests participation in the ACS. This message is stated in the first paragraph in the Introductory Letter. This first paragraph states the reason for contacting the household and the main purpose of the letter (request for participation). Many respondents simply missed the main point of the Introductory Letter. That is, the purpose of the letter is to invite participation. Only one (out of 12) respondents saw it as requesting participation in the ACS. We added one probing question in round 2 interviews to ask what the respondent thought the main purpose of the letter was. They all reported it was about community services.

After analyzing the respondents' comments and reactions to this paragraph, we concluded that the failure to understand this message was not because the language or the translation were not clear to respondents, but because the presentation style in the letter caused some problems. First, the introductory paragraph starts with a request for cooperation from residents to participate in the ACS, but doesn't give any explanation or definition of the ACS or surveys in general. It is presupposed in the letter that the reader has the knowledge of what a survey is and how a survey works, i.e., that there is a set of questions being asked either by a person or in a survey form, and that individuals need to answer these questions and complete the form. According to previous studies on Chinese and Korean immigrants, many of them lack survey knowledge or experience. Since many Chinese respondents do not have any prior knowledge of a survey, they had no clue what was being asked from them in the letter.

Second, the letter-writing style used in English may cause confusion to speakers of other languages. For English language and most Western languages, the preferred letter-writing style is to state the main message first, followed by background or detailed information. For Asian languages, the preferred letter writing style is to attend to the politeness aspect of communication and to establish common ground first. The main message will come towards the end of letter after necessary background information is provided. This difference in writing style leads the westerner to focus on the opening stages of the writing as the most crucial, while the Asian reader will tend to look for crucial points to occur somewhat later. This is exactly what happened in our project. We found that the Chinese respondents all missed the message in the first paragraph asking for help from respondents. None of them mentioned that the letter was to invite participation. They interpreted that the letter was mainly to introduce a survey on community needs, and they all detached themselves from the participation part after reading the letter.

This issue may not be easily addressed in this translation effort because it involves restructuring or tailoring the letter to fit the communicative style of the target language. We raised this issue here for future research and consideration when conducting translations. As illustrated by the current research, in order to adequately convey key survey messages contained in survey supporting documents, it is insufficient to merely translate each sentence as closely as possible. This standard translation strategy lacks the ability to account for

perceptions that are driven by a respondent's cultural background and written language conventions when confronting written materials. Without taking into account these aspects of comprehension/interpretation, survey messages are misconstrued, or missed altogether.

### **Informational Brochure:**

The main messages in the Informational Brochure did not present a major problem. All respondents understood the messages on data uses and confidentiality. Many of them liked the message on how data is used for community improvement. Some respondents felt encouraged to participate in the ACS, as it relates to community services. Many respondents found the brochure to be clear and helpful in providing information regarding the ACS.

The confidentiality message was well understood. Respondents commented on the specific consequences for violating the law (Title 13). None of them had heard of Title 13, but they understood it to mean a law title. They were surprised to read about the specific consequences of jail term and fine. Two respondents thought that it was too serious and too intimidating.

About the mandatory nature of the survey, half respondents (6) thought the ACS was mandatory, and the other half thought they should participate out of their willingness to comply with the government, but not mandatory.

The first paragraph under the first topic "What is the American Community Survey" caused major confusion. None of the respondents got the idea of the relationship between the decennial census and the ACS. Quite a few respondents were confused about the frequency of the ACS, thinking it happens every 10 years. Many of them thought that the ACS was a census, counting population. We recommended using a different version to introduce the ACS. The new version was tested in the second round of interviews, and 8 out of 12 respondents liked the new version, and 4 out of 12 thought the new version was too long.

The second paragraph under the same topic talks about sampling. Not many respondents understood it. We suggest revising the two long sentences to make them simpler.

The first paragraph under the topic of "How will my participation help me and my community?" was found to be hard to comprehend. It contains long and complex sentence structure. Respondents just had a vague idea that it was about funds. We recommend revising this long sentence.

### **Q&A Brochure**

The Q&A Brochure is the most challenging document among the four ACS materials. In terms of language and translation, the Q&A Brochure uses many high-level words and complicated sentence structures. The translation doesn't sound natural in Chinese. Many respondents quickly pointed out that many sentences read awkward, fragmented, or

incoherent. Respondents found it difficult to go through the document. After reading it, they just got a vague idea of the information presented in the document. We recommend many changes regarding the sentence structure and wording to improve the translation.

On the topic of the ACS and survey sponsor, many respondents were confusing the ACS with the Decennial Census when reading this part of the brochure. Similarly to their reaction to the Information Brochure, none of the respondents got the idea of the relationship between the decennial census and the ACS. Quite a few respondents were confused about the frequency of the ACS, thinking it happens every 10 years. Many of them thought that the ACS was a census, counting population. We recommended using a different version to introduce the ACS. The new version was tested in the second round of interviews. Ten out of 12 respondents liked the new version. They commented that the new statement was clearer and better, the language in the statement was more concise, and it better explained the purpose of the census, the ACS, and the brochure.

They also mentioned, after reading the brochure, that they had no idea what questions were being asked in the ACS, and how the ACS collected the information on topics listed in the brochure (such as income, age, veterans' status, income and housing). In the second round of interviews, we added a new statement explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS as the first bullet point under the first topic of "What is the ACS?" All respondents in round 2 interviews affirmed the necessity of this statement. They commented that adding the new statement would be helpful and provide them with a better understanding of the ACS.

On the topic of data uses, most respondents had some vague understanding (i.e., government collects information, conducts statistical analysis). We do think that this section in the English original is too vague and general, and hard to understand. It would be helpful to spell out how the data is used in more plain and specific terms.

Most respondents had a good understanding regarding the confidentiality message, but some confused it with the cognitive interview itself and talked about how their responses in this cognitive interview will be protected and kept confidential.

Regarding the mandatory nature of the survey, most respondents still didn't understand it. They said that, in theory, participation is required by law, but in practice, one doesn't have to answer (especially if there's nothing much to say). Interestingly, respondents reported their willingness to participate in the ACS not because it is required by law, but because of their willingness to obey the governmental authority. Many respondents either said they "should" answer the question, or that the brochure said that it's required by law, but they may not participate, depending on personal arrangements at the time. This interpretation of legal requirement is similar to the reaction of the confidentiality message. That is, Chinese-speaking respondents do not necessarily believe in what the law says.

There are some issues concerning the layout and the design of the Q&A Brochure. One respondent reacted strongly against the white background (signaling something sad). Many respondents commented that the cover is too blank and can include more pictures or words. Another common complaint is that the font is too small and the layout too crowded.

## **Thank You Letter**

In the first round of interviews, many respondents missed the point that that letter was to express appreciation for participation (in spite of the two big words, “Thank you!”). Two out of six respondents in the 1<sup>st</sup> round interviews thought the letter was asking for participation. In the second round of interviews, half (three out of six) of the respondents got the main point that the letter was thanking people for participating in the ACS. We believe this misunderstanding was caused by the letter-writing style—the same reason discussed in the section regarding the Introductory Letter.

The confidentiality message was clear for everyone. Respondents also had a general understanding of data uses, but their understanding was vague, and sometimes incorrect. The sentence on data uses is long and doesn’t sound natural. We recommended making changes in terms of sentence structure and the wording of “summarized information” and “program” in the translation. Respondents all reported that they saw the value of the survey, and showed their willingness to participate in the survey to obey the governmental authority.

Regarding the sender of letter, in the first round of interviews, some respondents couldn’t tell who the sender of the letter was. They could identify the name of the sender, but not the title of the director of the U.S. Census Bureau. In the second round of interviews, the title of the director was cut and pasted under the name of the director. Then, all six respondents in round 2 understood that the letter was sent by the Director of the U.S. Census Bureau.

There were some issues concerning the format of the letter. Quite a few respondents suggested that we should include an addressee/title (such as “Dear Resident,” as seen in the Introductory Letter). Some respondents mentioned that they saw too much blank space on the upper right-hand corner. Some respondents suggested that to adhere with Chinese letter-writing style, we should have indentation at the beginning of each paragraph.

## **Comparison of Three Confidentiality Statements**

All three versions on confidentiality listed below were perceived to convey basically the same message. Seven of the 12 respondents in Round 1 and nine of the 12 respondents in Round 2 expressed a preference for Version 3 because it is clear and easy to understand, concise and to the point without unnecessary information. Its general tone is milder than the tone used in Version 2.

Seven of the 24 respondents in the two rounds of interviews expressed a preference for Version 2 because it clearly states the consequence for violating the law of confidentiality.

**VERSION #1** (Introductory Letter)

*I want to emphasize that any information you give our representative will be kept confidential. By law, the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your household (Title 13, Section 9).*

**VERSION #2** (Informational Brochure)

Is the Information I Provide Confidential?

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law (Title 13, United States Code, Section 9). This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subjected to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household*

**VERSION #3** (Q&A Brochure)

Are my survey answers confidential?

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law under Title 13, United States Code, Section 9. This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.*

## 6.5 Proposed changes based on two rounds of cognitive interviews

Based on findings from the first round of interviews, we drafted a list of proposed changes to be tested in the second round of interviews. Findings from the second round of interviews confirmed that all our proposed changes were well received by respondents, except for a couple of changes that still needed some small modifications.

The Chinese team met for another session of discussion to finalize the proposed changes. We finalized all the proposed changes tested in round 2 interviews. In addition, we drafted new proposed changes based on the findings from round 2 interviews and our expert panel discussion. These new proposed changes target at simplifying the structure of long and complicated sentences that are found in the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure.



The list that follows is a table containing final recommendations for changes, starting with individual terms to be changed throughout all four documents, and followed by specific changes for each document. The table contains the current translation, the proposed change, the English back translation of the Chinese translation to give the reader an idea of what the Chinese translation says, and notes stating the reason for changes.

## LIST OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES

### *Throughout the ACS materials: Global change for all the materials*

Current translation	Proposed Translation
“美国社区调查” The American Community Investigation	“美国社区问卷调查” The American Community Questionnaire Survey
<b>Note:</b> The current translation of the survey name gives respondents an impression that it is a social investigation.	
人口普查局的服务代表 Census Bureau service representative	人口普查局的普查员 Census Bureau’s census staff/workers
<b>Note:</b> The current translation uses the term “service representative” for Census Bureau representative. It caused some negative reaction. As “service representative” sounds like they also provide other services.	
家庭 (family)	住户 (household)
<b>Note:</b> The current translated term for household is “family,” which refers to family members only. The recommended term of “住户” is closer to the English original of “household” which refers to people who are not necessarily part of the family but living in the same house.	
计划 (plan)	项目 (program)
<b>Note:</b> The current translation uses the term “计划” (plan) to translate the word “program,” which caused major confusion for respondents. The correct term for “program” should be “项目.”	
信息 (information)	资料 (information)
<p><b>Notes:</b> The current translation uses the term “信息” (<i>xingxi</i>) for translation of words such as “data” and “information” (both public and personal). We recommend using 资料 “<i>ziliao</i>” for personal information. These two terms (信息 “<i>xingxi</i>” and 资料 “<i>ziliao</i>”) are synonyms and the context is important as the two terms have slightly different meanings/connnotations. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 信息 “<i>xingxi</i>”: general survey information (can be summarized, or taken from individuals); “This survey information”; (e.g., means of transportation to work) can be made public. We recommend using 信息 “<i>xingxi</i>” for information or data related to the public domain, such as survey information, or summarized data.</li> <li>• 资料 “<i>ziliao</i>”: information related to individuals; personal information that</li> </ul>	

<p>can be traced back to the individuals (e.g., names, address); identifiable information [note: another meaning: public records that can be looked up, e.g. data one can look up on the internet or in the library.] We recommend using 资料 “ziliao” for personal information.</p>	
工作交通 (commute to work)	上下班交通 (commute to work)
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation is not a Chinese phrase. It is made up based on the English wording. It caused major confusion for respondents.</p>	
年长者 (senior citizen, elderly)	老年人 (senior citizen, elderly)
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation is not commonly used in this context in the simplified Chinese.</p>	

**Introductory Letter**

Para-graph#	Current translation	Proposed Translation
2		<p>“美国社区问卷调查” 所问的问题包括基本人口特征、住房、教育程度、种族、族裔、语言、退伍军人状况、工作状况、上下班交通、收入，等等。</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommended adding this statement at the beginning of the second paragraph to explain the types of questions asked in the ACS.</p>	
2	<p>“美国社区调查” 会搜集至关重要的新信息，这些信息将用于满足全美社区的需求。</p> <p>The “American Community Survey” collects crucial new information that will be used to meet the needs of all American communities.</p>	<p>“美国社区问卷调查” 提供反应现状的重要信息，这些信息将用于满足全美社区的需求。</p> <p>The “American Community Survey” provides information that reflects the current situation. This information will be used to meet the needs of all American communities.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation mistranslated the words of “produce” and “up-to-date.”</p>	
2	<p>例如，本项调查的结果将被用于确定哪些地方需要设立新学校、医院和消防站。</p> <p>For example, the results of this survey will be used to determine</p>	<p>例如，本项调查的结果可以帮助确定哪里需要建立新学校、医院和消防站。</p> <p>For example, the results of this survey can help determine where there is a need for building new schools, hospitals, and fire</p>

	which places need building new schools, hospitals, and fire departments.	departments.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation uses complex and passive voice structure, which is difficult for respondents to comprehend.	
3	美国法律规定您必须填写调查问卷。 The U.S. law requires you to fill out the survey questionnaire.	根据美国法律规定，您必须填写调查问卷。  According to the U.S. law, you must fill out the survey questionnaire.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation doesn't sound natural in Chinese. Many respondents missed the word "you" in this sentence.	
3	我们估计填写本调查问卷约需 30 分钟时间。  We estimate that filling out this survey questionnaire approximately needs 30 minutes.	您填写本调查问卷的时间， 大约为 30 分钟。  The time you would spend on filling out this survey questionnaire is approximately 30 minutes.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation uses a long sentence.	
3	人口普查局以随机方式将您的住址（并非您个人）选作抽样的一部分。 The Census Bureau randomly selected your address (not yourself) as part of the sample.	您的住址（而非您个人）是人口普查局以随机抽样的方式选中的。 Your address (not yourself) was selected randomly by the Census Bureau.
	<b>Note:</b> The phrase "as part of the sample" caused trouble in understanding.	
4	我们可能会将您的调查问卷资料与您向其他联邦机构提供的资料综合在一起。  We may take your survey questionnaire information and the information you provided to other federal agencies to combine together.	您在这次问卷调查中提供的资料，以及您向其他联邦机构提供的资料，我们可能会综合在一起。 (as to) The information you provide in this survey questionnaire, along with information you provided to other federal agencies, we may combine together.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is long and doesn't sound natural in Chinese.	
4	我们会像对待您的调查问卷信息一样为任何综合信息提供保护。	对您调查中提供的信息，我们会像对待其它综合信息一样，进行保护。 Towards the information/data you

	We will, like the way treating your survey questionnaire information, provide protection for any combined data.	provided in the survey, we will, like treating other summarized data, provide protection.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is long and complex. It reads awkward in Chinese.	
4	此外，我们可能要求部分填写“美国社区调查”问卷的家庭参加人口普查局的其他调查。  In addition, we may require part of the families that filled out the “American Community Survey” questionnaire to participate in Census Bureau’s other surveys	在参加这次“美国社区问卷调查”的住户之中，我们可能会要求其中的一部分参加人口普查局的其他调查。 Among households participating in this “American Community Survey,” we may ask some of them to participate in Census Bureau’s other surveys.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is long and complex. It doesn’t sound natural in Chinese.	
5	如果您有上网能力，……，请查看我们的网站： If you have the ability to go on the internet, please look up our website.	如果您能上网，……，请查看我们的网站： If you can go on the internet... please look up our website.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation contains the unnecessary word of “the ability to.” It makes the text more complex.	

**Informational Brochure**

Column #	Current translation	Proposed Translation
1 Left inside	“美国社区调查”是2010年十年一次人口普查计划的一部分。这是一项每年提供有关美国社会经济和住宅特点信息的调查。 The American Community Survey is part of the 2010 decennial census plan. This is a survey that annually provides information on American social economic and housing characteristics.	美国人口普查局每十年进行一次人口普查，以统计美国人口。除此之外，美国人口普查局还定期进行各种专题的问卷调查。这个小册子向您介绍这些问卷调查其中之一：“美国社区问卷调查”。 The U.S. Census Bureau conducts census once every 10 years in order to survey the U.S. population. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts questionnaire surveys on a variety of topics. This brochure introduces to you one of the questionnaire surveys, namely, The American Community Questionnaire Survey.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation doesn’t give a clear explanation of the relationship between the decennial census and the ACS. It caused major confusion for respondents. The problem exists with the English original. We recommend a new version of text to explain the decennial census and the ACS.	
1 left inside 2 <sup>nd</sup>	地址 (address)	住户 (household)

paragraph		
	<p><b>Note:</b> We propose to change all 地址 “address” to 住户 “household” within this paragraph in the brochure because the word “address” doesn’t go with the verb “to participate,” “to receive,” or “to visit” in this paragraph.</p>	
1 left inside 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	<p>只有少量以随机方式选出的地址作为抽样参加“美国社区调查”，这些地址代表所在社区的其他地址。 Only a small number of addresses selected by means of random sampling as a sample to participate in the American Community Survey. These addresses represent other addresses in their local community.</p>	<p>参加“美国社区问卷调查”的住户是以随机抽样的方式选出的。虽然数量很小，但是，这些住户代表了所在地区的其他住户。 The households participating in the American Community Survey are selected by means of random sampling. Although small in number, these addresses represent other households in the area.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation caused major confusion as to who participated in the survey. First, the translated sentence is awkward. Second, the word “address” caused a major problem because the word “address” and the verb “to participate” do not go with each other in the Chinese language. We recommend using the word “household” instead of “address” in this paragraph, and changing the translated term 地址 “address” to 住户 “household.” The sentence is re-structured to ease comprehension.</p>	
1 left inside 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	<p>抽样地址会收到一份调查问卷，填写后寄回。</p>	<p>被选中的住户会收到一份调查问卷，填写后寄回。 The household being selected will receive a survey questionnaire, which they fill out and mail back.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> We propose to change all 地址 “address” to 住户 “household” within this paragraph in the brochure because the word “address” doesn’t go with the verb “to participate,” “to receive,” “to fill out,” or “to visit” in this paragraph. In changing the word 地址 “address” to 住户 “household,” this sentence needs restructuring at the beginning.</p>	
2 Middle inside 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	<p>数亿美元的政府和商业费用将根据各个地区的社会、经济和住宅信息在不同的州、社区和人群之间进行分配。 Billions of U.S. dollars of government and business costs will be, based on social, economic and housing information, distributed among different states, communities, and people groups.</p>	<p>各州、社区和人群组所分配到的政府及商业资金，是根据所搜集到的该地区的有关信息决定的，这些信息包括社会、经济和住宅方面的数据。 The government and business funds distributed to each state, community, and population group are based on the collected information relevant to that area. The information includes social, economic, and housing data.</p>

	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is incorrect in using the term “cost.” The sentence is long and complex.
--	---

**Q&A Brochure**

Page #/ Column#	Current translation	Proposed Translation
p.1/c.1	<p>这是美国人口普查局设计的一份新调查问卷，此问卷是“2010年每十年一次人口普查计划”的一部分。</p> <p>This is new questionnaire survey designed by the U.S. Census Bureau. This questionnaire is part of the “2010 Decennial Census Plan.”</p>	<p>美国人口普查局每十年进行一次人口普查，以统计美国人口。除此之外，美国人口普查局还定期进行各种专题的问卷调查。这个小册子将向您解释这些问卷调查其中之一，即“美国社区问卷调查”的有关问题。</p> <p>The U.S. Census Bureau conducts a census once every 10 years in order to survey the U.S. population. In addition, the Census also regularly conducts surveys on a variety of topics. This brochure explains to you questions regarding one of the questionnaire surveys, namely, The American Community Questionnaire Survey.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation doesn’t give a clear explanation of the relationship between the decennial census and the ACS. It caused major confusion for respondents. The problem exists with the English original. We recommend a new version of text to explain the decennial census and the ACS.</p>	
p.1/c.1		<p>“美国社区问卷调查”所问的问题包括基本人口特征、住房、教育程度、种族、族裔、语言、退伍军人状况、工作状况、上下班交通、收入，等等。</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic population characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement as the first bullet point after the first paragraph to explain the types of questions asked in the ACS.</p>	
p.1/c.1	<p>“美国社区调查”将每年向本国的社区提供至关重要的经济、社会、人口普查和住宅信息，而不是每十年提供一次此类信息。</p> <p>The American Community Survey will annually provide critical economic, social, demographic and housing information to this country’s communities, instead of providing this type of information once every ten years.</p>	<p>“美国社区问卷调查”将每年，而不是每十年一次，向各社区提供至关重要的经济、社会、人口普查和住宅信息。</p> <p>The American Community Questionnaire Survey annually, instead of once every 10 years, provides critical economic, social, demographic and housing information to each community.</p>

	<b>Note:</b> The “instead of” phrase is at the end of the sentence in the current translation. Respondents were confused about the two time frames (annually and once every 10 years).	
p.1/c.1	<p>此类信息在帮助州政府和地方社区作出有关学校、道路、年长者中心和其他物品与服务规划方面起到至关重要的作用。</p> <p>This type of information, in helping the state government and local communities to make plans concerning schools, roads, senior citizen centers and other goods and services, play a critical role.</p>	<p>在帮助州政府和地方社区做出有关学校、道路、老年人中心和其他物资与服务规划方面，此类信息具有至关重要的作用。</p> <p>In helping the state government and local communities to make plans concerning schools, roads, senior citizen centers and other goods and services, this type of information play a critical role.</p>
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation uses a very long sentence. The subject phrase is too far from the main verb. Respondents got lost in the middle of the sentence. The translated term for “senior citizens” is not the common wording for “senior citizens” in simplified Chinese. The translated term for “goods” needs to be changed too.	
p.2/ c.2	<p>联邦计划根据有关年龄的信息分配儿童、工作年龄成年人或年长者的资金或服务。</p> <p>The federal (government) plans to, based on the age-related information, distribute children, working-age adults or senior citizens’ funds or services.</p>	<p>联邦项目会根据有关年龄的信息，来分配用于儿童、适合工作年龄的成年人和老年人的资金和服务。</p> <p>Federal programs will, based on age-related information, distribute funds and services for children, adults with age appropriate for working, and the elderly.</p>
	<b>Note:</b> Mistranslation of the term “programs” in the current translation, which caused major confusion. The wording in the sentence gives the impression that the government will distribute children and working-age adults. We recommend modifying the phrase “working-age” to “age appropriate for working.”	
p.2/ c.2	<p>退伍军人状况信息主要被美国退伍军人事务部用于衡量退伍军人的需求和评估有关教育、就业和健康护理问题的退伍军人计划。</p> <p>Veteran status information is used primarily by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to measure the needs of veterans and to evaluate veterans’ plans concerning education, employment, and health care issues.</p>	<p>美国退伍军人事务部根据退伍军人状况信息，衡量退伍军人的需求和评估有关退伍军人教育、就业和健康护理问题的项目。</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, based the information of veteran status, measures the needs of veterans and evaluates veterans’ programs concerning education, employment, and health care issues.</p>
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation closely follows the English sentence structure, which makes it very difficult to read in Chinese. The translated term of “program” is incorrect.	



p.3/ c.1	<p>对收入和住宅问题回答被总结成概况，美国住宅与城市开发部用于评估年长者、残障人士和低收入住宅拥有人的住宅协助需求。</p> <p>Concerning the answers to income and housing questions summarized into summary, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development uses to evaluate the needs for housing assistance for the elderly, handicapped, and low-income homeowners.</p>	<p>美国住宅与城市开发部根据对收入和住宅问题回答的综合信息，评估老年人、残障人士和低收入住宅拥有人的住宅协助需求。</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, based on the summarized information from answers to income and housing questions, evaluates the needs for housing assistance for the elderly, handicapped, and low-income homeowners.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation closely follows the English sentence structure, which is ungrammatical in Chinese and makes it very difficult to read.</p>		
p.3/ c.1	<p>有关种族、西班牙裔/拉丁美洲裔及在家使用语言的信息将被用于确定《选举权法案》规定的双语选举要求以及监管《民权法案》规定的平等就业机会。</p> <p>Information about race, Hispanic origin, and language spoken at home is used to determine bilingual requirements stipulated in the Voting Rights Act and the monitoring of equal employment opportunities stipulated in the Civil Rights Act.</p>	<p>有关种族、西班牙裔/拉丁美洲裔及在家使用语言的信息将被用于确定《选举权法案》所规定的双语选举要求，也将被用于监督《民权法案》所规定的平等就业机会。</p> <p>Information about race, Hispanic origin, and language spoken at home is used to determine bilingual requirements stipulated in the Voting Rights Act, and is also used to monitor equal employment opportunities stipulated in the Civil Rights Act.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation is too long and hard to process.</p>		
p.3/ c.2	<p>联邦机构、州政府和社区认为，他们没有掌握更好地理解社区问题、对社区需求做出回应以及分配计划和资源所需的最新信息。</p> <p>Federal agencies, state governments, and communities think that they do not grasp better understanding for community problems, responses to community needs and distribution plans and resources needed information.</p>	<p>联邦机构、州政府和社区认为，他们没有得到所需要的最新信息，来更好地理解社区问题，对社区需求做出回应，以及分配项目和资源。</p> <p>Federal agencies, state governments, and communities think that they do not have the information that they need to better understand community problems, to respond to community needs, and to allocate programs and resources.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The current translation is too long, complex, and cumbersome. The translated term for “program” is incorrect.</p>		
p.4/c.2	<p>该法律规定，人口普查局仅限将个人提供的信息用于统计目的，不得发表或发布可识别任何个人身份的信息。</p>	<p>该法律规定，对于个人所提供的信息，人口普查局仅限用于统计目的，不得发表或泄露可识别任何个人身份的资料。</p>

	The law requires that the U.S. Census can only use information provided by individuals for statistical purposes and cannot publish or issue any information that would identify any individual.	The law requires that, as to/towards information provided by individuals, the U.S. Census can only use them for statistical purposes and cannot publish or release any information that would identify any individual.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation closely follows the English sentence structure, which makes it very difficult to read in Chinese. The translated term of “release” is incorrect.	
p.5/c. 1	法律（《美国法典》第 13 篇第 141、193 和 221 节）规定您必须回答该调查问卷中的问题。 The law (Title 13, U.S. Code, Sections 141, 193, 221) stipulates that you must answer the questions in the survey questionnaire.	根据法律（《美国法典》第 13 篇第 141、193 和 221 节）规定，您必须回答该调查问卷中的问题。  According to what is stipulated in the law (Title 13, U.S. Code, Sections 141, 193, 221), you must answer the questions in the survey questionnaire.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation doesn't sound natural in Chinese.	

**Thank You Letter**

Para-graph #	Current translation	Proposed Translation
1	<p>法律规定，你提供的所有信息将得到保密。本项调查的成功取决于您和被选择参加本项调查的其他家庭的合作。</p> <p>The law stipulates that the information you provide will be kept confidential. The success of this survey is based on the cooperation of you and other families that are selected for this survey.</p>	<p>根据法律规定，你提供的所有信息将得到保密。本项调查的成功取决于您和被选中的其他住户所提供的合作。</p> <p>According to the law, the information you provide will be kept confidential. The success of this survey is based on the cooperation provided by you and other selected (for the survey) households.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> The first sentence of this statement needs a phrase of “according to” to make it sound natural in Chinese. The second sentence caused confusion as to who is cooperating with whom. We recommend adding a phrase “所提供的” (provided by) to avoid this confusion.</p>	
2	<p>联邦、州、地方和部落政府将使用本项调查的总结信息做出决定，并制定计划。这些计划将影响您和您所在社区的保健、教育和交通服务。</p> <p>Federal, state, local, and tribal governments use the summarized information from this survey to make decisions and make plans. These plans will affect you and the health care, education, and transportation services in your community.</p>	<p>联邦、州、地方和部落政府将使用本项调查的综合信息做出决定，并建立服务项目。这些服务项目将影响您和您所在社区的保健、教育和交通服务。</p> <p>Federal, state, local, and tribal governments use the summarized information from this survey to make decisions and establish programs. These programs will affect you and the health care, education, and transportation services in your community.</p>
	<p><b>Note:</b> The term “program” is mistranslated as “plan” in the current translation, which caused some confusion. We recommend changing it to “项目” to avoid confusion. “总结信息” as in “summarized information” should be changed to “综合信息.”</p>	

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ACS CAPI MATERIALS IN KOREAN**

The first round of Korean interviews were conducted between March 9 and March 18, 2006. The interviews lasted from 60 minutes to one hour and 40 minutes. The average time was 95 minutes. The breakdown of the 2<sup>nd</sup> round cognitive interviews was the same as the 1<sup>st</sup> round and the interviews were conducted between April 27 and May 14, 2006. The 2<sup>nd</sup> round interviews lasted from 55 minutes to one hour and 40 minutes<sup>10</sup> and the average time was 72 minutes.

Unlike the other language teams, the Korean team pre-identified problematic sentences in the Korean translation prior to round 1 cognitive interviews and tested the revised translation in round 1 cognitive interviews. So in addition to reviewing the translated materials for round 1 interviews, the Korean respondents were also asked to react to the revised sentences prepared by the Korean team at the end of the interview. After round 1 interviews, the Korean team identified additional problematic parts and tested these at round 2 interviews. Because the majority of the revised translation was tested in round 1 interviews, the average interview time was significantly reduced for round 2 interviews.

Following informed consent procedures, the protocols were followed in each case. Of the 12 interviews conducted in each phase, six used Protocol 1 which tested the ACS Introductory Letter and the Brochure, and six used Protocol 2 which tested the Questions & Answers booklet and the Thank You Letter. Twenty-three interviews were audio-taped after obtaining respondents' consent to do so.

### **7.1 Respondents' characteristics**

As referred back to section 3.4, we screened 198 respondents and found 95 persons who met the basic criterion (Korean monolingual). Based on their other characteristics such as education level, age, gender and year of entry, we recruited 24 Korean-speaking respondents for the cognitive interviews. As Table 7-1 shows, the 24 participants have a wide range in demographics of age, education level and year of entry, and the recruiting has reflected a representative mix of these characteristics.

---

<sup>10</sup> Only this interview took a very long time in round 2, since the respondent refused recording.

**Table 7-1 Demographics Characteristics of Korean-Speaking Participants**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Year of Entry</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Protocol used</b>
M6	Female	25-34	HS graduate	Since 2000	Madison, WI	1
D17	Female	35-44	College graduate	1990-1999	DC Metro	1
D22	Female	65+	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	DC Metro	1
C61	Female	55-64	College graduate	1980-1989	Chicago Metro	1
C21	Male	65+	HS graduate	1979 or before	Chicago Metro	1
C36	Male	65+	HS graduate	1979 or before	Chicago Metro	1
M5	Female	25-34	HS graduate	1990-1999	Madison, WI	2
M13	Female	35-44	College graduate	Since 2000	Madison, WI	2
D19	Male	35-44	College graduate	Since 2000	DC Metro	2
C43	Female	45-54	College graduate	1990-1999	Chicago Metro	2
C4	Female	45-54	HS graduate	1980-1989	Chicago Metro	2
D48	Female	55-64	Less than HS graduate	1980-1989	DC Metro	2
C53	Female	45-54	College graduate	1970-1979	Chicago Metro	2
C52	Male	35-44	College graduate	1990-1999	Chicago Metro	1
C67	Male	65+	Less than HS graduate	Since 2000	Chicago Metro	1
C48	Female	55-64	College graduate	1970-1979	Chicago Metro	2
M29	Female	65+	Less than HS graduate	1990-1999	Madison, WI	2
M3	Female	18-24	HS graduate	Since 2000	Madison, WI	1
M33	Male	35-44	College graduate	Since 2000	Madison, WI	2
C30	Male	65+	HS graduate	1980-1989	Chicago Metro	2
D94	Male	55-64	College graduate	1990-1999	DC Metro	1
D82	Female	45-54	HS graduate	1980-1989	DC Metro	1
D30	Female	45-54	HS graduate	1990-1999	DC Metro	1
D16	Male	25-34	College graduate	Since 2000	DC Metro	2

## **7.2 General issues identified in the first round of interviews**

From Round 1 interviews, we found that there are mainly two barriers for Korean respondents to fully understand the translated materials, as with Chinese respondents. One has to do with the quality of the translation, and the other has to do with the lack of survey knowledge. This section documents the general issues identified in Round 1 interviews.

The translated material did not have obvious errors in Korean language and culture, delivering the basic message as intended. However, there were parts where many respondents felt uncomfortable. In addition, some expressions and words were identified unnatural or difficult, and many of the participants found them to be unclear.

- The Korean translation uses high level vocabulary and long sentence structures. Some parts of the translated materials do not read naturally in the Korean language. In some instances, the translation follows the English syntax ordering and this created confusion for Korean respondents. Those with higher level of education and understanding of the contents found the materials more challenging and pointed out more problematic parts than those with a lower level of comprehension. The latter group (mostly elderly respondent with a lower level of education) claimed that the material was easy to read, but they actually showed difficulty to comprehend the intended messages. This is not only because of translation, but also because of their lack of knowledge about surveys.
- The most dominant issues were the strong tone and direct expression in the translated material. Most respondents felt that the tone of the material was strong in Korean culture. Especially, the parts describing “mandatory characteristics of the ACS” aroused negative feelings. This was because the direct way of communication is unfamiliar to them. It could be interpreted as rudeness in Korean language and culture. Inclusion of the legal statement to explain the mandatory nature of the ACS was another contributing factor, because the word “법(law)” seemed to be associated with negative feelings, unnecessarily reminding respondents of legal enforcement and deportation.
- It was mentioned that seeing a mention to the sender in the beginning of the Thank You Letter looked strange because the sender’s name should be at the end of the letter in Korean culture. This was found to be true in the other ethnic groups.
- There were also parts which seemed to be unclear in Korean cultural understanding, such as tribal government (부족정부). For them, the word “tribe” always comes with “Indian.” Thus, reading these words (tribal government) alone made respondents wonder what they meant in the context.

- In the translated material, there were a lot of terms translated incompletely. Some words were written as they sound (phonetic translation) in Korean, without a translation of the meaning. Many respondents said that these half-English words bothered them and that they did not have a clear understanding of their meaning.
- Some respondents wondered whether only Koreans are eligible of the ACS. Also, some respondents thought that only U.S. citizens, not illegal immigrants or permanent residents qualified to participate in the ACS. Some respondents pointed this misunderstanding was due to spacing. Currently, U.S. Census Bureau is translated into 미국인구조사국 without any spacing between letters. That is, they were confused because “미국인,” a part of the current translation, means “American people.” It is suspected that this confusion is related to the survey title as well.
- We found respondents’ confusion over the mention of the 2010 decennial census and the ACS in the beginning section of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure. Some respondents said “인구조사 (population survey)” or “센서스(decennial census, borrowed English term)” instead of “ACS.” It was not clear whether they did differentiate the Census from the ACS, or if they used these terms only because they were more familiar to them, or if they were simply confused about the two.
- There is a lack of mention of what kinds of questions are covered in the ACS. As a result, many respondents wondered what kinds of questions would be specifically asked in the ACS.
- Most respondents understood what confidentiality meant and liked to see that their information would be protected. However, many of them thought that the word “비밀 (secret)” looked too unnecessarily serious, and the word made them suspect that participation was risky. These respondents reported an uncomfortable feeling with “법 (law),” because adult Koreans might be reminded of abuse stories which happened under the name of law and secret during the period of tyranny and military government in past Korea. These reactions also reflect the cultural background of respondents. In Korean society, people regard a great part of the society as being ruled by human relations, where people acknowledge that there are given laws on the one hand, but on the other hand, they don’t necessarily operate by the law, but by other socially accepted mechanism. This explains why stress on law doesn’t help much with Korean respondents. On the contrary, it might cause fear and doubt.
- An interesting finding beyond the translated materials, was that “Korean-translated government material” itself was a pushing factor to encourage the respondents’ participation. They believed this clearly showed the U.S.

government's concern for Koreans, and they were more likely to participate in the ACS based on that impression. Several participants wondered who would contact them (Is s/he Korean? Does s/he speak Korean?) in the text describing previous or future contact and it was an important factor for their participation decision as well.

- Despite this encouraging factor, some respondents were disappointed by the appearance of the material, such as paragraph alignment, typos, line change, spacing, font size and font choice and inconsistent editing throughout the material. Especially, paragraph alignment bothered some respondents much. Korean texts are almost always written with “justified alignment” paragraph format rather than “left-aligned,” which is the current format. Even if these look very minor, respondents used these errors as indicators of the Census Bureau's efforts and importance of the ACS. Regardless of their ages, almost all respondents said the font size was too small.

### **7.3 Modification of Round 2 interview protocol guides**

Differently from the other language teams, the Korean team prepared revised sentences for pre-identified problematic sentences prior to the 1st round interviews, and asked the respondents' understanding and preference to the revised sentences at the end of the 1st round. This action was taken from the belief that respondents might not answer the “better sentences” in open-ended questions, but they could easily choose better sentences among the alternatives provided.

After the first round of cognitive interviews, the Korean team reviewed the issues identified in the interviews and discussed recommendations for revision to improve translation. To address these issues, the Korean team recommended a list of revisions along the following lines:

- Re-structure long complex sentences to make the translation read more naturally in the Korean language;
- Correct mistranslated or incompletely translated terms to reflect the intended message in the original English documents;
- Test the new translated term for the survey name “Survey of Communities in the U.S. (미국의 지역사회에 대한 조사)”;
- Add a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the types of questions asked in the ACS to the Introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure. The new paragraph is:



*“The ACS includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.”*

- Replace the existing introductory paragraph in the beginning of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure by a new statement to clarify the relationship between the 2010 decennial census and the ACS. The new statement reads:

*“The U.S. Census Bureau conducts census every 10 years in order to survey the U.S. population. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts surveys about a variety of topics. This brochure introduces to you one of the surveys, namely, The American Community Survey.”*

- Revise mandatory characteristics of the ACS as polite as possible while keeping the meaning of original sentences.
- Put the sender at the end of the letter instead of beginning in the thank you Letter.

In order to test our proposed changes in round 2 interviews, we added debriefing and probing questions at the end of the interviews to elicit respondents’ reaction to the proposed changes. For changes that involved re-structuring of the entire sentence or changing the syntax, we gave the respondents a showcard to compare the different versions, and asked them which one they found easier to understand, and which they preferred and why.

To accommodate the additional questions under the time constraints for cognitive interviews, we modified two interview protocol guides by deleting a number of questions which overlapped or produced consistent answers from the original protocol guides. We also dropped the read-aloud parts not only because it did not show the respondents’ hardship to understand the material but also because they tended to read the paragraphs again to answer the questions although they had read them just a minute ago. We also simplified comparison of confidentiality versions because respondents thought the basic message of three different versions were the same.

#### **7.4 Issues identified in each document in both rounds of interviews**

The discussion of issues identified in each ACS document centers around the key messages: request for survey participation, survey sponsor, survey purpose, data uses, mandatory nature of the ACS, response burden, confidentiality, administrative records use, and other sample surveys. In the section to follow, a detailed discussion of how these messages were understood and interpreted is included in the Introductory Letter, because the Introductory Letter covers all of these messages, while the other three ACS documents convey some of the messages.

A new survey title (Survey of Communities in the U.S.- 미국의 지역사회에 대한 조사) to address the problem that some respondents excluded themselves from the eligible respondents' pool turned out to be equally misleading. This new title did not properly capture the ACS target population: Seven out of twelve respondents preferred the original title. Four respondents preferred the new title because the new title seemed to refer to the national level, whereas the original title seemed to refer to the regional level. To deliver the intended message, respondents said that the material should specifically state that those who reside in the U.S. are eligible to participate in the ACS—regardless of their citizenship and national origin—rather than change the survey title.

## **Introductory Letter**

### *Messages clearly understood*

The messages that were well received by the Korean respondents are survey sponsor, purpose of survey, respondent burden and other sample survey future participation.

All respondents understood that the ACS was conducted by the federal government (or Census Bureau) and they recognized this by referring to the Census logo and the letterhead. They all commented that the data collected from the ACS would be used to improve services for the communities in diverse ways, and that they would benefit from this. This encouraged Korean respondents to participate in the ACS. They understood that the survey would take about 30 minutes to complete. Most of respondents understood that the data would be used only for statistical purposes and would not be used for any other purposes. Most respondents, excluding the elderly respondents with a lower level of education, understood they could be asked to participate in other surveys in the future.

### *Messages not understood as intended or otherwise problematic*

The confidentiality message was understood in the sense that the information participants provide to the ACS will be kept confidential. Respondents defined the term confidential as meaning “that they cannot give my information to anybody,” “that the Census Bureau cannot publish it,” and so on. They have never heard of Title 13 but they guessed it had something to do with privacy. While respondents were glad to find the protection of their privacy, some respondents felt that the mention of law was simultaneously scary. They thought the information that they provided to the ACS would not be sensitive at all so the specific inclusion of law (title 13) made them even suspect some risk to participating in the ACS. This reflects the cultural background—the view how the society is ruled—described earlier in 7.2.

The message that the survey is mandatory did not deliver the intended message, either. Korean respondents understood that what this sentence meant “Respondents should respond to this though they do not think this would involve any fine or social obligation.” They felt uncomfortable to see this direct expression with mention of the law. They thought that this direct translation was rude and should be written more politely.

Many respondents did not understand the message of administrative records use and this translation confused respondents much. The sentence reads “귀하의 조사 데이터를 귀하께서 다른 연방정부 기관에 제공하신 데이터와 결합할 수는 있습니다 (We may combine your survey data with data that you gave to other federal agencies). The translation itself is correct, but this sentence started on the assumption that respondents have participated in surveys sponsored by the other federal agencies before. However, the chance is very slim, since they are monolingual Koreans and most government surveys are not conducted in Korean. Thus, by adding some more words to clarify that this is only applied to those who have participated in the other federal surveys, their confusion could be cleared.

Another interesting finding from the cognitive interviews is that many respondents, especially elderly respondents, simply missed the main point of the letter. This message is stated in the first paragraph in the Introductory Letter, which states the reason for contacting the household and the main purpose of the letter—to request participation in the ACS. However, many respondents thought that this letter was about the government’s effort to help the community, or that it was an introduction of the ACS.

This is caused not by the translation but by different presentation styles in the letter and communication style in Korean culture. In Korean letter-writing style, a letter usually begins with greeting, introduction of the sender (if he/she is a stranger), introduction of the letter—all of which warm up and lead to the main content, followed by good-bye and sender’s signature. In Korean culture, where politeness and interpersonal relationship are emphasized, readers expect to see the main idea towards the end, after the comfortable atmosphere and the common ground are established. Thus, those who are accustomed to this style can easily miss the earlier messages. Besides, many Korean respondents were not familiar with the ACS or with surveys in general. The Introductory Letter requests participation in the ACS without giving any explanation of the ACS itself or surveys in general. These two factors made it difficult for respondents to grasp the intended message, especially for elderly respondents, who were very accustomed to the Korean communication style.

The direct translation of “Thank you in advance for your help” (여러분의 협조에 미리 감사드립니다) was pointed to be inappropriate many times. In this sentence, the author thanks at the present for the future event. It looks very strange to see a gap in time in the same sentence. Thus, we recommend using a more indirect translation to avoid this problem, such as “여러분의 참여를 다시 한번 부탁드립니다. 감사합니다. (I ask the favor of your cooperation once again. Thank you).”

Some respondents thought that the current font “gothic” was too visually hard and was not suitable for a letter, and recommended using 명조(Myoungjo) or 바탕(Batang), which are often used in the long text format, and convey a softer tone.

## **Informational Brochure**

In the part that describes the Decennial Census at the beginning of the brochure, the current text was long and only gave the redundant impression that the census repeats every ten years. Moreover, this introduction tended to confuse respondents, who could not distinguish between the Decennial Census and the ACS. Thus, it is necessary to revise this sentence.

There were many respondents who wondered what kinds of questions would be specifically asked in the ACS at the first round, because all the materials described only the supplementary information of ACS such as the benefits of the survey and confidentiality, without showing the specific questions. In the second round, all respondents liked the additional statement: “The survey includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.” This statement was added in the Introductory Letter as well, and the reaction to the additional sentence was the same positive one.

As mentioned earlier in 7.2, many respondents seemed confused about two different surveys: the Decennial Census and the ACS. They referred to the “Census” instead of the ACS. In the second round interviews, we found that the newly added statement to clarify the relationship between the 2010 Decennial Census and the ACS was not preferred over the original translation. Four respondents liked the new version because they did not like the original introduction with redundant detailed information which was already included in the material. Five respondents liked the original version because the new introduction included irrelevant information. The rest of the respondents wanted to mix the content of the two versions, but their opinions were not unified. Based on these opinions, the Korean team came up with the new introduction by combining two versions to accommodate these issues. That is, “미국 인구조사국에서는 전국의 인구를 파악하기 위한 인구주택(센서스)조사를 실시하고 있습니다. 그러나 이는 10 년에 한 번씩만 실시되어 최신 정보를 얻기가 어려웠습니다. 이러한 단점을 보완하기 위해, 인구조사국은 최근 이 사업의 일부로 미국 지역사회 조사를 매년 실시하여, 사회, 경제 및 주택 특성에 관한 시의 적절한 정보를 파악하고자 합니다.” (The U.S. Census Bureau conducts the U.S. Census to understand the national population in the country. However, because it is conducted every 10 years, it was hard to have up-to-date information. To complete this shortcoming, the U.S. Census Bureau recently conducts the American Community Survey annually as a part of this project and expects to have timely information about society, economics and housing characteristics.) This text can be also used in the Q&A Brochure to help respondents to understand the ACS better.

One sentence stating the confidentiality of survey data was very long and complex, and caused difficulty in comprehension. Thus, it is necessary to write the sentence concisely to help comprehension. It is advised to use “law” and “secret” more carefully, since their use

caused a backfire effect, arousing respondents' concerns. As pointed out in the other documents, many respondents understood the confidentiality and mandatory nature of the ACS. However, they thought that the direct request of survey participation with a mention of the law was awkward, and that the detailed description of the consequences of violating Title 13 was inappropriate.

In addition, some respondents felt that the expression “조사 설문서가 표본 주소로 전달되면 이를 작성하여 우편으로 보내야 합니다 (A survey questionnaire is delivered to a sample address to complete and mail back)” was not appropriate, since it looked like a commandment rather than a request, and should be written politely.

### **Q&A Brochure**

The Q&A Brochure is the most challenging document among the four ACS materials. This was caused by the combination of the factors as follows: First, the amount of information provided in the brochure is voluminous for those without proper knowledge of the ACS and surveys in general. In addition, the Q&A Brochure uses many high-level words and complicated sentence structure. The strong tone in the translation about the mandatory nature of the ACS and the direct mention of the consequences of breaking the law (in regard to confidentiality) present the same problem as in the Introductory Letter.

As with the Informational Brochure, the part describing the Decennial Census at the beginning of Q&A Brochure also gave the impression of redundancy, and caused confusion among respondents. A new introduction to clarify the relationship between the Decennial Census and the ACS is necessary.

Throughout the material, there were several incompletely translated words such as data (데이터), title(타이틀), section(섹션), table(테이블), Senior center(시니어센터). They were written as they sound in Korean, without a translation of the meaning. Many respondents said that these half-English words bothered them and that they did not have a clear understanding of their meanings. These words seemed to be chosen by a third party translator partly because it was hard to find the exact counterparts in Korean. It is true that many Koreans can understand the meaning of these words, since these words are often used in Korean as “borrowed words.” However, four monolingual Korean respondents who participated in this cognitive interview had a hard time guessing what those words meant. Taking into account that those respondents are the target population which needs these translated materials, we should find appropriate words or coin the words to the extent that they keep the original meaning. Writing the currently half-English translated word in the parenthesis additionally would help to keep the original meaning for those who are familiar with these words.

For parts explaining who needs to fill out the questionnaire, careful respondents pointed out the confusion due to the unclear sentence. According to the original English material, those who stayed at the current address for two months were instructed to fill out a portion of the survey. However, in the current translation, it is not clear whether they should fill out the entire questionnaire or a part of the questionnaire. This is because of the misunderstanding of the word “이상 (something or more).” This word is based on the Chinese word “以上 (something or more) and very often used in Korean but many people do not have clear understanding about inclusion point. Thus, it is recommended to re-write this sentence more clearly.

Several respondents said that the inconsistent formatting bothered them. That is, there are two “그렇습니다(yes)” in the Q&A Brochure, but one is in bold letters and the other is not.

### **Thank You Letter**

The Thank You Letter was the most easily understood document among the four ACS documents. The letter was found to be written in easy words. However, there were two things often mentioned as culturally inappropriate in the text.

First, the placement of “the sender” in the beginning of the letter looked strange because the sender’s name should be at the end of the letter in Korean culture. Though there was one respondent who liked a bigger font saying 감사합니다(Thank you), the rest of the respondents thought it was strange to see the outstanding letter size in the content. Besides, some respondents stated that it would look more official if the date when the letter was written were included at the end of the letter if possible.

Second, the direct translation of “your participation is greatly appreciated” (귀하의 참여는 매우 소중합니다) was pointed out repeatedly to be inappropriate. Respondents thought that the current expression could be used in the logo or advertisement to grasp the attention of the viewers, but seeing this feature in a formal letter looked very strange to them. The reason is that the passive voice is not often used in Korean. Thus, using an active sentence such as “귀하의 적극적인 참여와 관심에 진심으로 감사드립니다 (We truthfully appreciate your active participation and interest)” would be more natural. This is also the same sentence used in the recent 2005 Korean Census Thank You Letter.

Some respondents thought that the current font “gothic” was too visually hard and was not suitable for a letter. They recommended using 명조(Myoungjo) or 바탕(Batang), which are often used in the long text format to convey a softer tone in communication.

## Comparison of Three Confidentiality Statements

All three versions on confidentiality listed below were perceived to convey basically the same message. Since the respondents did not see significant difference among the three confidentiality statement versions, we simply asked their preferences at the second round of cognitive interviews.

At the first round interviews, the confidentiality showcard version #2 was most preferred (7 out of 12) because it gave the most detailed information. But in the second round, version #1, #2 and #3 were equally preferred by 4 respondents. Those who preferred version #3 liked the proper length of the sentences, and those who preferred version #1 liked the simplicity of the text. In total, the confidentiality card version #2 was the most preferred, but it seems risky to generalize this result due to the small sample size.

**VERSION #1**      *(Introductory Letter)*

I want to emphasize that any information you give our representative will be kept confidential. By law, the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your household (Title 13, Section 9).

**VERSION #2**      *(Informational Brochure)*

Is the Information I Provide Confidential?

Yes. Your answers are confidential by law (Title 13, United States Code, Section 9). This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subjected to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household.

**VERSION #3**      *(Q&A Brochure)*

Are my survey answers confidential?

Yes. Your answers are confidential by law under Title 13, United States Code, Section 9. This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.

### 7.5 Proposed changes based on two rounds of cognitive interviews

The findings from the two rounds of cognitive interviews confirmed that all our proposed changes were well received by respondents except, for a couple of changes that still needed some small modifications.

The Korean team met for another discussion to finalize the proposed changes and review our interview process. The list that follows is a table containing final recommendations for changes, starting with individual terms to be changed throughout all four documents, and followed by specific changes for each document. The table contains the current translation, the proposed change, the English back translation of the Korean translation to give the reader an idea of what the Korean translation says, and notes stating the reason for the changes.

**Throughout the ACS materials:**

Current translation	Suggested Translation
가구(household)	가정(Family)
<p><b>Note:</b>The current word “가구(household)” is unfamiliar to many of the respondents, so they preferred “가정(family)” in the context. Even though there is a subtle difference in the meanings of two words, these two words are used interchangeably in Korean.</p>	
미국인구조사국(The U.S. Census Bureau)	미국 인구조사국(U.S. Census Bureau)
<p><b>Note:</b> Because there was no space between letters, some respondents had difficulty reading, and mistook that the ACS is only for Americans (Koreans excluded). We recommend adding some space.</p>	
미합중국 법전 타이틀 13 섹션 9(title 13, section 9)	미 연방법 13 장 9 항(title 13, section 9)
<p><b>Note:</b> The current words are not translated and written as they sound in Korean. Many respondents did not understand the concept. We recommend using Korean legal terminology for better understanding. It is not the exact concept because difference in legal systems, but it presents an equivalent concept.</p>	
부족정부(tribal government)	인디언 부족정부(Indian tribal government)
<p><b>Note:</b> We recommend adding “Indian” (인디언) in front of “tribal government” for clarification. Several participants suggested it would be easier to understand, since these words always come together.</p>	
데이터(data)	자료(data)
<p><b>Note:</b> The current word is not translated but written as it sounds in Korean. We recommend translating it into Korean.</p>	
웹사이트(website), www.census.gov	인터넷(internet), http://www.census.gov
<p><b>Note:</b> The current word is not translated but written as it sounds in Korean. Internet is used instead because there is no corresponding Korean word, but “internet (인터넷)” is very commonly used. To look more official, inclusion of <a href="http://">http://</a> in front of web address is recommended.</p>	
<p><b>Note:</b> Use justified alignment, separate lines carefully (i.e. do not separate one word between lines), space appropriately between words to eliminate misleading impression</p>	



**Note:** Enlarge the font size, reduce empty background

**Lead Letter**

Para-graph	Current translation	Suggested Translation
1	인구조사국 직원이 설문서 작성을 도와드리기 위해 전화를 드릴 것입니다 (A Census Bureau representative will call you to help you complete the survey)	인구조사국 직원이 설문서 작성을 도와드리기 위해 연락을 드릴 것입니다 (A Census Bureau staff will contact you to help you complete the survey)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is not correct (contact is translated into “call”). We recommend correcting it.	
2	미국 지역사회 조사에서 수집된 중대한 최신 정보는 미 전국에 있는 지역 사회들이 필요한 것들을 충족시키는데 사용되고 있습니다 (The ACS produces critical up-to-date information that is used to meet the needs of communities across the United States)	미국 지역사회 조사는 기본적인 인구통계, 주거, 교육, 인종, 민족, 언어, 퇴역군인정보, 취업, 통근, 소득 등에 대한 질문을 포함합니다. 미국 지역사회 조사에서 수집된 중대한 최신 정보는 미 전국에 있는 지역 사회들이 필요한 것들을 충족시키는데 사용되고 있습니다. (The American Community Survey includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on. The ACS produces critical up-to-date information that is used to meet the needs of communities across the United States.)
	<b>Note:</b> This first statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement at the beginning of the second paragraph to explain the types of questions asked in the ACS.	
2	여러분과 여러분의 이웃에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 비상사태에 대비한 계획을(plan for emergency situations that might affect you and your neighbors)	홍수, 화재 및 기타 자연재해와 같은 여러분과 여러분의 이웃에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 비상사태에 대비한 계획을(plan for emergency situations that might affect you and your neighbors such as flood, fire and other natural disasters)
	<b>Note:</b> More examples are added for clear comprehension of “emergency.” These examples are already used in the Brochure.	
3	조사표본 무작위 선택결과(as a result of survey sample random selection)	무작위 표본추출 결과(as result of random sample selection)
	<b>Note:</b> Both translations are almost the same and they equally confuse the respondents, but the suggested translation is a boilerplate text so it sounds more familiar to respondents.	

3	미국 법에 따라 귀하는 이 조사에 응답해야 합니다(You are required by U.S. law to respond to this survey).	귀하의 조사 참여는 미국 법에 의거한 것으로, 조사에 응해 주시기를 부탁드립니다.(Your survey participation conforms to the U.S. law and we ask you a favor to respond to this survey.
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation arouses some negative feeling because of tone. We recommend translating it more politely.	
3	본 조사는 30 분 정도 소요될 것으로 추정됩니다( We estimate this survey will take about 30 minutes of your time)	본 조사는 30 분 정도 소요될 것으로 예상됩니다. We anticipate this survey will take about 30 minutes of your time.
	<b>Note:</b> estimate(추정) is an unnecessarily difficult word and it is used often in the scientific investigation. We recommend replacing it with easy word.	
4	귀하께서 저희 직원에게 제공하시는 일체의 정보는 비밀로 처리된다는 것을 강조드리고 싶습니다(I want to emphasize that any information you provide our staff will be kept as secret)	귀하께서 저희 직원에게 제공하시는 응답은 엄격히 안심하시고 조사에 응해주실 것을 부탁드립니다(Any answer you provide our staff will be strictly protected so I ask you to respond to this survey with relief)
	<b>Note:</b> To address respondents' uncomfortable feeling about the word “비밀(secret), it is rewritten avoiding that word.	
4	귀하의 조사 데이터를 귀하께서 다른 연방정부 기관에 제공하신 데이터와 결합할 수는 있습니다. 결합된 정보도 본 조사 정보와 마찬가지로 보호를 받습니다(We may combine your survey data with data that you gave to other federal agencies. Any combined information would be given the same protections as your survey information.)	귀하가 이전에 다른 연방정부기관 조사에 참여하신 적이 있으실 경우, 귀하의 응답은 이전에 제공하신 정보와 함께 사용될 수도 있습니다. 그러나 이 역시 동일한 법적인 보호를 받습니다(If you participated in other federal agency surveys before, your answers may be used with the previously provided information together. However, this will be under the same legal protection.)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation aroused suspicion and difficulty in comprehension. We recommend paraphrasing the whole sentence for better understanding, by excluding those who are not applied to this case.	
4	조사에 응답하시는 일부 가구들에게 다른 인구 조사국 조사에 참여하시도록 요청을 드릴 수도 있습니다(Some households that respond to the American Community Survey may be asked to participate in other Census Bureau surveys)	조사에 응답하시는 일부 가구들은 인구조사국의 다른 조사에 참여하시도록 요청을 받을 수도 있습니다(Some households that respond to ACS may receive the request to participate in other Census Bureau surveys)
	<b>Note:</b> The translated sentence is in passive form. We recommend re-writing it in active form for better comprehension.	
6	여러분의 협조에 미리 감사드립니다	여러분의 참여를 다시 한번

	(Thank you in advance for your help)	부탁드립니다. 감사합니다. (I ask a favor of your cooperation once again. Thank you).”
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is unnatural because of the time difference in the same sentence. The suggested translation is a more indirect translation, but delivers the intended message.	

**Informational Brochure**

Para-graph	Current translation	Suggested Translation
Left inside #1	<p>미국지역사회 조사는 2010 년 10 년 주기 인구조사 프로젝트의 일환으로 새로 개발한 시행됩니다 (The American Community Survey is part of the 2010 Decennial Census Program.)</p> <p>본 조사는 매년 미국의 사회, 경제, 및 주택 특성에 관한 정보를 제공하게 됩니다(It is a survey that provides information each year about the social, economic, and housing characteristics of the United States.)</p> <p>종전에는 미국인구조사국이 10 년마다 한번씩 10 년 주기 인구조사를 실시한 때에만 이 정보가 제공되었습니다(Previously, this information was available only once every 10 years when the U.S. Census Bureau conducted the Decennial Census)</p>	<p>미국 인구조사국에서는 전국의 인구를 파악하기 위한 인구주택(센서스)조사를 실시하고 있습니다(The U.S. Census Bureau conducts the U.S. Census to understand the national population in the country) 그러나 이는 10 년에 한 번씩만 실시되어 최신 정보를 얻기가 어려웠습니다(However, because it is conducted every 10 years, it was hard to have up-to-date information)</p> <p>이러한 단점을 보완하기 위해, 인구조사국은 최근 이 사업의 일부로 미국 지역사회 조사를 매년 실시하여, 사회, 경제 및 주택 특성에 관한 시의 적절한 정보를 파악하고자 합니다. (To complete this shortcoming, the U.S. Census Bureau recently conducts the American Community Survey annually as a part of this project and expects to have timely information about society, economics and housing characteristics)</p>
	<b>Note:</b> The current text gave an impression of redundancy, repeating “every 10 years.” We recommend rewriting the sentence in order to reduce unnecessary redundancy. To address confusion between the ACS and the Census, new introductory text is rewritten based on the feedback from respondents, with the purpose of connecting yet distinguishing the ACS and the Census.	
Left inside #2	<p>조사 설문서가 표본 주소로 전달되면 이를 작성하여 우편으로 보내야 합니다 (A survey questionnaire is delivered to a sample address to complete and mail back)</p>	<p>조사 설문서가 표본 주소로 전달되면 이를 작성하여 우편으로 보내주시면 고맙겠습니다(A survey questionnaire is delivered to a sample address. We would appreciate if you complete and mail it back)</p>
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation looks like a commandment rather than a request. WE	

	recommend rewriting the text to deliver the message more politely.	
Left inside #2	가구에 대한 연락을 시도합니다 (the Census Bureau attempts to contact the household)	해당가정에 연락을 드립니다(The Census Bureau contacts the household)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation looks unnatural because the word “시도(attempt)” is often used in a risky situation (e.g., a break-in is attempted.) We recommend deleting 시도.	
Left inside #3	본 질문서에 대한 귀하의 응답은 미국 법에 의해 요구됩니다- 미국 법전 타이틀 13 섹션 141, 193 및 221(your response to this survey is required by law -Title 13, United States Code, Sections 141, 193, and 221).	귀하의 조사 참여는 미국 법에 의거한 것으로, 조사에 응해 주시기를 부탁드립니다-미 연방법 13 장 141 항 193 항 221 항(Your survey participation conforms to the U.S. law and we ask you a favor to respond to this survey- Title 13, United States Code, Sections 141, 193, and 221) 미국에 거주하시는 분들은 시민권 여부, 체류상태, 출신국가에 관계없이 모두 이 조사에 참여하셔야 합니다 (Those who reside in the U.S. should participate in this survey regardless of their citizenship, immigration status and national origin)
	<b>Note:</b> The current words (title, section) are not translated, but written as they sound in Korean. Many participants did not understand the concepts. We recommend using Korean legal terminology. It is not the exact concept because of the difference in legal systems, but it presents an equivalent concept. <b>Note:</b> The current translation was directly written in a strong tone; we recommend rewriting it to accommodate cultural characteristics. <b>Note:</b> The last sentence was added to clarify who are eligible to participate in this survey because some respondents through only U.S. citizens were eligible.	
Middle Inside #1	수십억 불(Billions of government and business dollars)	수십억 달러(Billions of government and business dollars)
	<b>Note:</b> Dollar(불) is translated into 불, which is an out-dated Korean word and not used often in these days any more.	
Right Inside #1	귀하의 답변은 법에 따라 비밀로 처리됩니다(Your answers will be treated as secret by law) 이 법은 국장과 그 외 모든 인구조사국 조사원을 비롯한 인구조사국의 전 직원들이 선서를 해야 하며 귀하나 귀 가족의 신분을 드러낼 수 있는 일체의 정보를 공개할 경우 징역이나 벌금 또는 두가지 처벌을 모두 받을 수	귀하의 응답은 법에 의거하여 엄격히 보호됩니다(Your answers will be strictly protected according to law) 이 법에 의해, 국장과 조사원을 포함한 모든 인구조사국 직원은 조사정보 보호를 선서합니다. 또 직원이 귀하나 귀 가족의 신상정보를 공개할 경우 징역이나 벌금 또는 두 가지 처벌을 모두 받게 됩니다 (Based on this law,

	있도록 규정하고 있습니다.( This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subject to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household)	every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath about personal information protection. And those who release any personal identifying information of you or your household will be subject to a jail term, a fine or both)
	<b>Note:</b> The use of the word “비밀(secret)” conveys an uneasy feeling to Korean respondents. We recommend rewriting the sentence to reduce that negative feeling. <b>Note:</b> The sentence is very long and complex and caused difficulty in comprehension. We recommend rewriting it more concisely.	
Cover Middle #1	다음 웹사이트를 방문하시도록 권장합니다(we encourage you to visit our Web site at: <a href="http://www.census.gov/acs/www/">www.census.gov/acs/www/</a> )	인터넷에서 다음 주소를 방문하십시오(Please visit the following address: <a href="http://www.census.gov/acs.www">http://www.census.gov/acs.www</a> )
	<b>Note:</b> The current word “웹사이트(website)” is not translated but written as it sounds in Korean. 인터넷(Internet) is used instead because there is no corresponding Korean word but “internet(인터넷)” is very commonly used. The sentence is shortened more naturally.	
Cover Middle #2	또한 다음 주소로 우편에 의해 저희에게 연락하실 수도 있습니다(You may also contact us by mail at the following address)	또한 다음 주소를 이용, 우편으로 저희에게 연락하실 수도 있습니다(You may also contact us by mail at the following address)
	<b>Note:</b> We recommend changing 우편에 의해(by mail) to 우편으로(by/with mail) for shorter/natural expression.	

### Q&A Brochure

Page & Paragraph	Current translation	Suggested Translation
Throughout the material	데이터(data), 타이틀(title), 섹션(section), 테이블(table), 시니어센터(senior center), 퀵테이블(Quick table), 프로젝트(project), 시스템(system), 프로파일(profile), 이슈(Issue)	자료(data), 장(title), 항(section), 표(table), 노인복지회관(Senior center), 간략정리표(Quick table), 사업(project), 체계(system), 간단한 개요(profile), 문제(issue)
	<b>Note:</b> These words were not translated so translation suggestions for these words are listed.	
p1. left#1	미국지역사회 조사는 미국 인구조사국에서 2010년 10년 주기 인구조사 프로그램의 일환으로 새로 개발한 조사입니다(It is a new survey that the U.S. Census Bureau developed	미국 인구조사국에서는 전국의 인구를 파악하기 위한 인구주택(센서스)조사를 실시하고 있습니다(The U.S. Census Bureau conducts the U.S. Census to understand

	as part of the 2010 Decennial Census Program)	the national population in the country) 그러나 이는 10 년에 한 번씩만 실시되어 최신 정보를 얻기가 어려웠습니다(However, because it is conducted every 10 years, it was hard to have up-to-date information) 이러한 단점을 보완하기 위해, 인구조사국은 최근 이 사업의 일부로 미국 지역사회 조사를 매년 실시하여, 사회, 경제 및 주택 특성에 관한 시의 적절한 정보를 파악하고자 합니다. (To complete this shortcoming, the U.S. Census Bureau recently conducts the American Community Survey annually as a part of this project and expects to have timely information about society, economics and housing characteristics) 이 조사는 기본적인 인구통계, 주거, 교육, 인종, 민족, 언어, 퇴역군인정보, 취업, 통근, 소득 등에 대한 질문을 포함합니다(The survey includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on)
	<b>Note:</b> To address the confusion between the ACS and the Census, new introductory text is rewritten based on the feedback from respondents to connect yet distinguish the ACS and the Census. <b>Note:</b> The last sentence was added to explain the types of questions asked in the ACS.	
p1. left#2	시니어 시티즌 센터과(senior citizen center and )	시니어 시티즌 센터와(senior citizen center and)
	<b>Note:</b> typo(과), it should be “ 와”	
p2. left 2nd bullet	프로그램을 입안하는데 사용합니다(design programs)	프로그램을 만드는데 사용합니다(design/make programs)
	<b>Note:</b> Design(입안) is a difficult word so it is translated into more easier sentence.	
p2. right 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence	초보자 그저 데이터를 보고자 하는 사람 (Beginners who may just want to look at the data)	그저 자료가 궁금한일반인(General people who may be just curious about the data)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is correct but directly translated, so it doesn't fit the context. 초보자(beginner) is often used to call those who just started something but may improve in some fields later. In the current text, such meaning would be	

	inappropriate. We recommend using 일반인(General people). The order is changed again to fit Korean language.	
p2. left last	이 질문들은 근본적으로 10년 주기 인구조사의 일환으로 물었던 질문들과 동일합니다(This questions are essentially the same questions that have been asked as part of the decennial census)	이 질문들은 기본적으로 10년에 한번씩 실시되는 인구조사(센서스)의 일부 질문들과 동일합니다. (This questions are essentially the same questions that have been asked as part of the census)
	<b>Note:</b> We recommend paraphrasing Decennial (10년 주기) better understanding.	
p3. left 2nd bullet	투표권법에 따른 이중언어 선거요건과 민권법에 따른 평등 고용 기회를 감시하는 것을 결정하기 위해 사용됩니다(used to determine bilingual election requirements under the Voting Rights Act and the monitoring of equal employment opportunities under the CMI Right Act)	민권법에 보장된 고용평등을 감독하고, 투표권법에 따른 이중언어요건을 결정하기 위해 사용됩니다 (used to determine bilingual election requirements under the Voting Rights Act and the monitoring of equal employment opportunities under the CMI Right Act)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is not accurate and causes problem in comprehension. We recommend rewriting the text to clarify how the information is used.	
p4. left 3rd bullet	출퇴근 시간의 교통체증을 줄이도록 최대 교통량 처리 계획을 세우고, 주차 계획을 세우며, 합승 프로그램 및 자유 시간 근무제와 같은 전략을 개발하기 위해(to plan for peak volumes of traffic in order to reduce traffic congestion, plan for parking, and develop strategies, such as carpooling programs and flexible work schedules)	출퇴근시간의 정체를 줄이기 위한 최대허용교통량을 계획하고, 주차계획을 세우며, 카풀이나 탄력근무제와 같은 전략을 개발하기 위해(to plan for peak volumes of traffic in order to reduce traffic congestion, plan for parking, and develop strategies, such as carpooling programs and flexible work schedules)
	<b>Note:</b> The current sentence is quite long. We recommend shortening a little for better understanding (flow change). Also, we recommend changing 합승(carpool) to 카풀(carpool, borrowed English word) because 카(carpool) is widely used and 합승 tends to be used for only taxi sharing.	
p4. left 3rd bullet	미래의 도로 이용자수를 예측함으로써(by projecting future number of people using road)	미래의 도로 교통량을 미리 예상해 봄으로써(by predicting future ridership)
	<b>Note:</b> projecting(예측) is an unnecessarily difficult word and often used in a more academic/scientific context so 예상(predicting) is used, which has the same meaning and easier to understand. Also, 도로이용자수(number of people using road) is changed to 도로교통량(road traffic) to better fit the context.	
p4. right 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	귀하의 답변은 미합중국 법전 타이틀 13 섹션 9에 따라 법적으로 비밀로 취급됩니다(Your answers will be treated as secret by law under title 13,	귀하의 응답은 미 연방법 13장 9항에 따라 엄격히 보호됩니다(Your answer will be strictly protected by law under title 13, U.S. code section 9)

	U.S. code section 9)	
	<b>Note:</b> The sentence is re-written to avoid the use of word 비밀(secret) which conveys a negative feeling to Korean respondents.	
p4. right 1st	개인을 식별하는 정보를 발표하거나 공개할 수 없다고 규정하고 있습니다.(this law specifies ~ cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual)	개인을 구별하는 정보를 발표하거나 공개할 수 없다고 구체적으로 밝히고 있습니다. (this law specifies ~ cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual)
	<b>Note:</b> identify(식별) was a little difficult word for understanding and “specify” was also translated into 규정(regulate), which is not correct either. We recommend rewriting the text using easier words to understand.	
p4. right 2nd	경찰이나 다른 법률기관이 조사에 대한 나의 답변내용을 볼 수 있는가?(Can the police or any regulatory agency see my answers to the survey?)	경찰이나 이민국 등 다른 규제/단속기관이 나의 답변을 볼 수 있는가? (Can the police or any regulatory agency such as immigration office see my answers to the survey?)
	<b>Note:</b> We recommend adding the name of additional agencies (immigration office) for better understanding.	
p5. left 2nd	본 질문서에 대한 귀하의 응답은 미국 법에 의해 요구됩니다. 동일한 법이 여러분이 제공하시는 정보의 기밀성을 보호합니다(The same law protects the confidentiality of the information that you provide)	귀하의 조사 참여는 미국 법에 의거한 것입니다(Your survey participation conforms to the U.S. law) 동일한 법이 귀하가 제공하시는 정보를 엄격히 보호합니다(The same law strictly protects the information that you provide) 미국에 거주하시는 분들은 시민권 여부, 체류상태, 출신국가에 관계없이 모두 이 조사에 참여하셔야 합니다 (Those who reside in the U.S. should participate in this survey regardless of their citizenship, immigration status and national origin)
	<b>Note:</b> The current translation is direct and the tone is strong. We recommend rewriting the text in a softer tone. 기밀성(confidentiality) is an unnecessarily huge word and it is rarely used in common documents. <b>Note:</b> The last sentence was added to clarify who are eligible to participate in this survey because some respondents thought that only U.S. citizens were eligible.	
p5. right 2nd	2 개월 이상 이 주소에 거주하는 경우, 전체 설문서를 작성해야 합니다. 거주 기간이 2 개월 이하인 경우라도, 지시사항에 따라 설문서의 일부를 작성해야 합니다(If you are staying at the address for 2 months or more, you must complete the entire	2 개월 넘게 해당 주소에 거주해 왔다면, 전체 설문지를 작성해야 합니다. 거주 기간이 2 개월 혹은 그보다 짧은 경우에도, 지시 사항에 따라 설문지의 일부를 작성해야 합니다. (If you are staying at the address for



	survey. If you are staying for 2 months or less, you must still complete a portion of the survey)	more than 2 months, you must complete the entire survey. If you are staying for 2 months or less, you must still complete a portion of the survey)
	<b>Note:</b> This current translation is incorrect; people who stay at the current address for 2 months will be confused according to this translation. We recommend rewriting the text more clearly.	

**Thank-you Letter**

Para-graph	Current translation	Suggested Translation
1	미국인구조사국장 드림(From the Director)	Move this(미국인구조사국장 드림) at the end (below the signature)
	<b>Note:</b> The position of this text in the current translation is not conventional in Korean-letter writing. We recommend changing the position of the text.	
4	귀하의 참여는 매우 소중합니다(Your participation is greatly appreciated)	귀하의 적극적인 참여와 관심에 진심으로 감사드립니다(We truthfully appreciate for your active participation and interest)
	<b>Note:</b> The current expression is unnatural. We recommend revising it to deliver the intended message more politely, according to Korean custom.	

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ACS CAPI MATERIALS IN RUSSIAN**

All interviews in Round 1 were conducted between February 23, 2006 and March 26, 2006. Following informed consent procedures, the protocols were followed in each case. All interviews in Round 2 were conducted between May 6 and May 24, 2006. All interviews were audiotaped after obtaining respondents' consent to do so. The interviews lasted from one hour to one hour and 30 minutes for Round 1 interviews, and from one hour and 30 minutes to two hours for Round 2 interviews. Round 1 interviews were conducted by three cognitive interviewers from RSS: Olga Bezzubova, Jenya Haps and Sophia Kholodenko. In Round 2 Ms. Haps did not participate due to her absence from the country during the data collection period.

### **8.1 Respondents' Characteristics**

Across the two rounds, between February 15 and May 7, we completed screeners with 39 eligible individuals. Approximately another 10 were determined to be ineligible because they spoke English well, but due to a miscommunication they were turned away without completing screeners. Of the 39 eligible individuals, 25 that most closely met the desired combination of requirements were recruited for the cognitive interviews. As Table 8-1 shows, the 25 participants have a wide range in demographics of age, education level, year of entry and national origin,<sup>11</sup> and the recruiting has reflected a representative mix of these characteristics.

---

<sup>11</sup> All respondents were born in the former USSR, but in a variety of republics.

**Table 8-1 Demographics Characteristics of Russian-Speaking Participants**

ID	Gender	Age	Education	Year of Entry	Country of origin
1	F	55-64	HS graduate	2000+	USSR (Russia)
4	F	45-54	College graduate	Pre-1980	USSR (Ukraine)
5	F	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
7	M	55-64	College graduate	2000+	USSR (Uzbekistan)
8	M	35-44	College graduate	2000+	USSR (Russia)
10	M	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
11	M	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
13	F	35-44	College graduate	2000+	USSR (Uzbekistan)
14	F	45-54	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
15	F	35-44	College graduate	2000+	USSR (Tajikistan)
16	M	35-44	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Belarus)
18	F	45-54	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Unspecified)
19	M	25-34	Less than HS	2000+	USSR (Uzbekistan – Ethnic Turk)
3 (O3)	F	65+	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
23 (O22)	M	65+	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
37 (O36)	M	65+	HS graduate	2000+	USSR (Ukraine)
32 (O31)	F	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
31 (O30)	M	65+	HS graduate	2000+	USSR (Belarus)
29 (O28)	F	65+	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)
25 (O24)	F	65+	College graduate	2000+	USSR (Ukraine)
30 (O29)	M	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Belarus)
33 (O32)	F	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Belarus)
36 (O35)	F	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Russia)
27 (O26)	M	55-64	College graduate	1990-99	USSR (Russia)
35 (O34)	F	65+	HS graduate	1990-99	USSR (Ukraine)

## 8.2 Summary of findings from the two rounds of cognitive interviews

Twelve interviews were to be conducted in each round of interviews, six with Protocol 1, which tested the ACS Introductory Letter and the Brochure, and six with Protocol 2, which tested the Questions & Answers booklet and the Thank You Letter. However, altogether twenty-five interviews were conducted in both rounds. One additional Round 1 interview was done with Protocol 1 after realizing that none of the 12 prior respondents had less than a high school education<sup>12</sup>. Interviews were conducted in participants' homes, in a community room in the participant's apartment building, in bookstores, in the library and in coffee shops.

The following general issues were identified in Round 1 interviews:

<sup>12</sup> See recruiting discussion below.

- The Russian translation was generally found to be adequate. Overall, the level of vocabulary is understandable to the respondents.
- There were relatively few words that were problematic to participants. However, there was inconsistent translation of the same term across materials or even within a same piece, which lead to confusion. These issues can easily be solved. Remaining issues that lead them to understand specific messages in ways other than intended cannot be easily solved. They would require a rather substantial redesign of the materials.
- Any confusion detected among participants appears to be related to the presentation of material or mixing up the cognitive interview and the ACS, rather than to translation choices. Respondents displayed confusion between the cognitive interviews and the ACS survey. The content of the Consent Form in particular seemed to be associated in participants' minds with participating in the ACS itself.
- The rhetorical style of the brochures may be somewhat different from standard government materials the respondents were familiar with in the Soviet Union. Some respondents felt there were too many explanations that made the brochures sound repetitive and wordy.
- The Russian translation of "American Community Survey" presented problems for some of the Russian speakers interviewed. There were no specific probes for this translation, but some objections were volunteered. Participants felt that by calling it "Анкетирование **американцев** (Americans) по месту жительства" the survey excluded them as immigrants. In all the materials, the explanation in parentheses of what the ACS is (or the alternative name provided there)—Исследования американских сообществ (Research on the American Community)—only introduced confusion, particularly because of the word сообществ which respondents had difficulty with.
- Participants seemed confused between the ACS data uses and the gathering of their opinions in the cognitive interviews. Putting both notions together, several thought they were being asked for their opinions on community needs.
- Respondents showed major confusion over the mention of the 2010 decennial census and the ACS in the beginning section of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure. They couldn't figure the relationship between the two. The language experts' team felt much confusion would be avoided by calling the Census, the ACS and the cognitive interviews with different terms consistently.
- Participants' confusion between the Census and the ACS may have to do with the fact that the Census Bureau conducts both, and that respondents are not familiar with surveys (other than the Decennial Census) done by the Census Bureau. This may be alleviated by adding a statement at the top of both brochures explaining that the United States Census Bureau conducts the U.S. Census to count the

population in the country every ten years, that it also conducts surveys on different topics on a regular basis, and that the brochure provides information (or answers questions for the Q&A) about one of those surveys: the American Community Survey.

- There is a lack of mention of what kinds of questions are covered in the ACS. As a result, respondents have no idea about the nature and content of the ACS. It will be very helpful if these materials include a list of topics (general questions) covered in the ACS survey.
- Most respondents reacted positively to the mention of the potential uses of the ACS data. They reported that this part and the legitimacy of the ACS (conducted by the Census Bureau, the federal government) would encourage them to participate in the ACS.
- On the topic of confidentiality, respondents understood the basic concept and did not appear threatened by it, or by the mention of the pertinent sections of the U.S. Code.
- Respondents generally liked the design, color, and layout of the two brochures. However, the font size was universally considered too small. Because Russian takes up more space than English, the font in the brochures had to be smaller in order to have all the text fit. Given that the consumers of these materials tend to be older immigrants, the font size is a particularly important issue for this language version. The language experts' team suggested the use of a font with serifs might improve readability.

After the first round of cognitive interviews, the Russian language team met on April 2, 2006 to review the issues identified in the interviews and discuss recommendations for revisions to improve the translated materials. To address the issues identified in Round 1, the Russian team recommended a list of revisions along the following lines:

- Test alternative wording for a number of translated terms that had created respondent confusion;
- Correct any mistranslated terms to reflect the intended messages in the original English documents;
- Test the a new translated version of the survey name designed to reduce the feeling of exclusion respondents experienced when the term “Americans” was used;
- Add a new paragraph explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS to the introductory Letter and the Q&A Brochure. The new paragraph is:

“The ACS includes questions about basic demographics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.”

- Replace the existing introductory paragraph in the beginning of the Informational Brochure and the Q&A Brochure with a new statement to clarify the relationship between the 2010 decennial census and the ACS. The new statement reads:

“The U.S. Census Bureau conducts census every 10 years in order to survey the U.S. population. In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau also regularly conducts surveys about a variety of topics. This brochure introduces to you one of the surveys, namely, The American Community Survey.”

### **8.3 Modification of Round 2 interview protocol guides**

In order to test our proposed changes in Round 2 interviews, we added debriefing questions at the end of interview to elicit respondents’ reactions to the proposed changes. Due to the time constraints for the cognitive interviews, we modified the two interview protocol guides by deleting some questions from the original protocols. We deleted questions that sounded repetitive in the interview and questions that did not elicit much information in Round 1 interviews. We also developed new probing questions to test these proposed changes for Round 2 interviews.

We tested alternative wording always in context. To do so, we gave the respondents a showcard to compare the original and revised versions and asked them which they preferred and why. While the next section describes the major issues identified in the documents across both testing rounds, the detailed recommendations on wording changes appear in point 5 below.

### **8.4 Issues identified in each document in both rounds of interviews**

#### **Introductory Letter**

The introductory Letter contains the following key messages: request for survey participation, survey sponsor, survey purpose, data uses, mandatory nature of the ACS, response burden, confidentiality, administrative records use, and other sample surveys. Of these messages, the majority was well received and had a positive or neutral impact on the respondents; some caused confusion or did not have a positive impact, and some failed to come across.

#### *Messages clearly understood*

Russian respondents, generally speaking, understood well that the Introductory Letter was intended to ask for their participation in a survey. The vast majority understood that it was a government-sponsored survey, whether or not they realized precisely that it is carried out by the Census Bureau.

The burden message was understood as stating how long it would take respondents to participate. The confidentiality message was also clearly understood. Respondents defined the term confidential as meaning “secret,” “private,” “not to be disclosed,” “nobody will

disclose it,” “they will not tell anything to anybody about me.” In that context, the limitations on the use of the data for statistical purposes only was a concept that was generally understood: that the data can only be combined and put into summarized reports.

The message on the mandatory nature of the ACS was widely understood and it was generally accepted that participation needs to be required because the population’s input is necessary. (The exception was one respondent who strongly objected to the word “обязан” which indicates that the survey must be done; he did not think people can be forced to complete a survey.)

Finally, the message about the fact that ACS respondents may be asked to participate in other surveys, Russian-speaking participants generally understood this message fairly well. They did not appear concerned that they may be asked to participate in other surveys.

*Messages not understood as intended or otherwise problematic*

The message on survey purpose did not come across clearly for most participants, as they understood the purpose of the survey and the uses of the data to be one and the same thing. That is, they thought that the ACS was to elicit opinion and feedback from people about their community or community services or the needs of the community, so that the government would know where to allocate funds to fill those needs. All respondents commented that the data collected from the ACS would be used by all levels of the government to improve services for the community. These messages had a positive impact on the respondents. When asked what in the letter might encourage their participation in the ACS, they mentioned the fact that the ACS is conducted by the government and that the data will be used to benefit their communities.

In the message on the mandatory nature of the ACS, the references to Title 13, however, were not well received. Respondents were not familiar with the U.S. Code, wondered what Title 13 might state, and generally were uneasy at the citation of a law. Some had concerns that giving incorrect information may also be penalized. In terms of the terminology employed, it should be mentioned that references to a code of law in Russian would typically state the word “law.” Hence, some respondents felt the translation of U.S. Code was not complete and should have read Кодекс Законов США instead of Кодекс США. The word used for Title 13, “Титул 13”, is associated in Russian with nobility, military rank or book titles, but not usually with a law.

The message on the possibility of combining data given to other agencies with ACS data at the individual level raised some issues. In Round 1, about half of the respondents understood this message well, but others had different reactions: a) puzzled about what other data about them other agencies may have, b) thinking that data from other surveys could be combined, c) worrying about needing to be perfectly consistent when giving data to agencies. In Round 2, we tested this message adding the word “possibly” (возможно) to the phrase “...we may combine your survey data with data you gave...” to soften the statement and give a way out to those who otherwise got agitated or puzzled because they thought they had not given data to any other agencies. The message regarding the confidentiality of any combined information was well understood and received.

In the burden message it was not entirely clear if respondents thought completing the Census, the ACS or the cognitive interview would take 30 minutes.

Editorial comments from the language experts' team:

- In the third paragraph, there should be a comma in the second line after США.
- In the third paragraph, there should be a period at the end of the paragraph.
- Since the letter is addressed to respondents in plural, the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun should not be capitalized anywhere (same for its possessive forms).
- In the sentence thanking respondents in advance, the word *ваши* is unnecessary and should be deleted.
- The job title of Mr. Kincannon should be consistently stated in Russian across letters.

### **Informational Brochure**

The brochure was considered easy to read by all. They felt reassured by the information contained in it and felt that the amount of information was sufficient. The first paragraph in which the survey is introduced in the context of the 2010 Decennial Census Program was confusing to respondents. Six participants thought that the "анкетирование" (the term used for "survey" in the Russian name of the ACS) is what happens every ten years, thus displaying confusion between the ACS and the Decennial Census.

The message about the mandatory nature of the survey, presented under the heading of "**Do I have to Answer the Questions on the American Community Survey?**" was clearly understood, i.e. that the survey is mandatory by law. Three of them, however, expressed their discomfort/worry with the mandatory nature and felt threatened by the statement. One participant thought that only legal residents and citizens are covered by that law, which would exclude some immigrants.

The message of uses of the data that appears in the center panel under "**How will my participation help me and my community?**" was well understood and appreciated, as had been the case in the letter.

Under the heading "**Is the Information I Provide Confidential,**" the general message about protection from disclosure was clearly understood, although respondents had never heard of the U.S. Code or Title 13. "Title" was understood as a specific article in the law, since respondents are not familiar with this type of Title. The penalties for information disclosure were hard to understand as stated "subject to a jail term or a fine, or a jail term and a fine", but the version tested Round 2 in which the second part of the statement was replaced with "or both" worked well.

Generally, all respondents were positive about the design and layout of all sections of the brochure. However, the piggy bank picture elicited very negative comments from three participants. They liked the flag. The picture in the inside of the brochure, right side panel,



should have the legend appear in Russian, whether it says “Совершенно секретно” or “Конфиденциальный.”

Only about half of the respondents remembered that the sample for the ACS consists of randomly selected addresses.

### **Q&A Brochure:**

Respondents found this brochure very clear and thorough. This was the document where the font size was most problematic for respondents, given the amount of information presented in a compact format.

They generally understood well how the ACS data will be used (although they evidenced confusion between the Decennial Census and the ACS, not all were sure of the relationship between the two, of how often the ACS is done, and even one respondent who thought the ACS is the program to prepare the population for the 2010 Census). As was the case with the short brochure, given the consistent findings about these confused readings of the brochure introduction, we drafted and tested a different version of an introduction of the ACS. The new version was tested in the second round of interviews. Respondents generally liked the new version. They found it clearer and better, the language in the statement was more concise, and it better explained the purpose of the census, the ACS, and the brochure.

Respondents remembered that the data will be used to make decisions on allocation of funds to programs and services in the communities. This is the one document where Russian-speaking respondents were most able to distinguish between the purpose of the survey and the uses of the data. They more clearly understood that the survey collects data, and that the data are then used in social and government programs.

The reassuring intent of the confidentiality message was conveyed well to the respondents. Also, they were able to define “statistical purposes,” although a few used somewhat circular references. In this context, the word “идентифицировать” (to identify) was difficult for several. Also, the translation for individual persons (“индивидуальными лицами”) was found to be somewhat awkward, as it sounds in Russian more like “individual individuals” (an alternative was tested in Round 2 and is recommended later in this report).

The mandatory nature of the survey was clear to all. However, references to Title 13 were a problem in this brochure as well. Respondents believed it was a reference to some part of a law, but they did not know what it was exactly or what it covered.

They also mentioned, after reading the brochure, that they had no idea what questions were being asked in the ACS, and how the ACS collected the information on topics listed in the brochure (such as income, age, veterans’ status, income and housing). In the second round of interviews, we added a new statement explaining the types of questions asked in the ACS as the first bullet point under the first topic of “What is the ACS?” All respondents in round 2 interviews affirmed the necessity of this statement. They commented that adding the new statement would be helpful and provide them with a better understanding of the ACS.

Regarding the design and layout of the brochure, respondents again commented on the small print that made it hard to read. The pictures were not considered to be very clear. One respondent indicated that a brochure written in Russian should also include some pictures of white respondents, not just minorities. A concern was expressed that there is no indication on the brochure that calling one of the Census numbers the caller will reach a Russian speaker. The same is true for email addresses.

Additional recommendations from the language expert team pertaining to areas of the brochure that were not tested: 1) The names of the FactFinder tables should not be translated. They can be described as they are, putting in parentheses at the end of each description the name in English. 2) Read by some in error, the reference to any regulatory agency (page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> column) as “регулятивное ведомство” was not understood.

### **Thank You Letter**

Across rounds, all but one of the respondents understood the point of the letter to be to thank participants in the ACS.

Respondents were somewhat confused by the Department of Commerce letterhead in addition to the CENSUS BUREAU logo at the bottom. Some felt too many organizations were named. Most knew the letter came from the Director of the CENSUS BUREAU, although some objected to his title being placed near the top of the letter. They suggested we place his title under his name. In Round 2, a mocked up version of the letter with the title under his name was tested, and all respondents were happy with that version.

Otherwise, there were some individual isolated concerns such as someone objecting to the letterhead appearing in English, one person who noticed it was not addressed to anyone (she suggested adding “дорогой участник анкетирования”—Dear survey participant), one person who wished the letter was addressed to a specific person, and a respondent who objected to the placement of THANK YOU.

Generally speaking, respondents understood well all messages in the letter: the purpose to thank them, the reassurance of confidentiality, the concept of summarized information, the restatement of the uses of the data by different levels of government, and the provision of the Census website where respondents can find more information on the ACS.

There are two typos on this letter: 1) after “sincerely yours” (“искренне Ваш”) there should be a comma, not a period; and 2) after Вами in the first paragraph, there should be a space, not a dash.

### **Comparing Confidentiality Statements**

The following three versions of the confidentiality statement (from the introductory Letter, from the Q&A Brochure, and from the informational Brochure) were tested to elicit perceived differences and preferences in the message delivery.

**VERSION #1** (Introductory Letter)

*I want to emphasize that any information you give our representative will be kept confidential. By law, the Census Bureau cannot publish or release to anyone any information that would identify you or your household (Title 13, Section 9).*

**VERSION #2** (Informational Brochure)

*Is the Information I Provide Confidential?*

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law (Title 13, United States Code, Section 9). This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subjected to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household.*

**VERSION #3** (Q&A Brochure)

*Are my survey answers confidential?*

*Yes. Your answers are confidential by law under Title 13, United States Code, Section 9. This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.*

All three were perceived to transmit very similar messages. However, six respondents preferred Version 1 over Versions 2 and 3 (3 endorsements each). Some felt Version 3 contained a threat. Others liked 2 because it included a more detailed explanation. Those who preferred Version 1 liked it because it was short and clear.

Another respondent noticed that the words used to translate the reference to the law were not consistent. This person questioned why Versions #3 and #2 give different names for the U.S. Code: «Свод законов США» in #3 and «Кодекс Соединенных Штатов» in #2. Here, as in every reference to the U.S. Code in the materials, we propose to keep a combination of the two: Кодекс законов США.

## 8.5 Proposed Changes Based on Two Rounds of Cognitive Interviews

Based on the findings from the first round of interviews, we drafted a list of proposed changes to be tested in the second round of interviews. Findings from the second round of

interviews indicated which of our proposed changes were warranted and which—after additional interviews—were not deemed necessary.

The Russian language experts’ team met at RSS on June 24 for another session to finalize the proposed changes. We reviewed the testing data for all the proposed changes from the second round interviews. In addition, we drafted a few new proposed changes based on the findings from round 2 interviews and our expert panel discussion.

The list that follows is a table containing final recommendations for changes, starting with terms to be changed throughout all four documents, and followed by specific changes for each document. The table contains the current translation, the proposed change, the English back translation of the Russian translation to give the reader an idea of what the Russian translation says, and notes stating the reason for changes.

### **LIST OF RECOMMENDED CHANGES**

#### ***Throughout the ACS materials: Global change for all the materials***

All materials should be reviewed for consistency in the way participants are addressed. Materials that address a single respondent should have the pronoun Вы (and all its forms including possessive pronouns) capitalized, while materials that address the respondents in plural (as the introductory Letter does) should not have them capitalized.

<b>Current translation</b>	<b>Proposed Translation</b>
Name of the survey:  Анкетирование американцев по месту жительства (Исследование американских сообществ).  Survey of Americans by place of residence (Research on American Communities)	Анкетирование населения США по месту жительства (“American Community Survey” – “ACS”).  Survey of the USA population by place of residence (“American Community Survey – ACS”)
<b>Note:</b> The current translation of the survey name gives respondents the impression that the ACS is only for U.S. citizens and not for immigrants, regardless of current status.	
References to random sampling:  По принципу произвольного отбора  By any selection principles	По принципу случайного отбора  By random selection principles
<b>Note:</b> Although word by word the current translation is correct, the standard phrase used to refer to random sampling is the one in the proposed translation.	
Да. Ваши ответы являются конфиденциальными в соответствии с	Да. Ваши ответы являются конфиденциальными в соответствии с

законом. Смотри Титул 13 Свода Законов США, раздел 9.	законом (Кодекс законов США: Title 13, Section 9).
Yes. Your responses are confidential by law. See Title 13, U.S. Code, Section 9.	Yes. Your responses are confidential by law (U.S. Code of Law: “Title 13, Section 9.”)
<p><b>Note:</b> The use of the word “Титул” created confusion. Respondents associated the word with books or with nobility. We offer no simple solution. Perhaps it could be kept in English so that respondents who want further information know the right words to look for it. The word Смотри (“see”) should not be necessary when there is no place for the respondent to look for the information in the document they are reading. The ACS may want to consider removing references to specific sections of the Title; not knowing what they state, respondents felt intimidated by the section numbers. Alternatively, although it is not exactly accurate, Title 13 could be referred to as Part 13 of the U.S. Code, in which case it would be translated as часть 13.</p>	
...десятилетней переписи	...переписи, проводящейся раз в десять лет
Ten-year long Census	Census taking place every ten years
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation contained a mistake: десятилетний is something that lasts ten years, rather than something that occurs every ten years.</p>	
сайт	Интернет
website	Internet
<p><b>Note:</b> The term “site” is not as widely known as “Internet”, particularly by older immigrants who tend to be the users of the ACS CAPI Russian materials.</p>	

In addition to the more global changes indicated above, the following are suggested changes for three of the documents. No further recommendations for the Thank You Letter than those in the aforementioned comments.

### Recommended Changes by Document

#### Introductory Letter

Para-graph#	<b>Current Translation</b>	<b>Proposed Translation</b>
2		<p>Это анкетирование включает в себя вопросы об основных демографических показателях, жилье, образовании, расовой принадлежности, этническом происхождении, языке, статусе ветерана, занятости, поездках на работу, доходах и т.д.</p>

		The ACS includes questions about basic demographic characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommended adding this statement at the beginning of the second paragraph to explain the types of questions asked in the ACS. In Round 2, this addition was tested and was very well received by respondents who felt the information provided was necessary.</p>		
4	<p>В соответствии с законом, Бюро переписи населения не имеет права публиковать или раскрывать кому-либо какую-либо информацию, по которой можно идентифицировать Вас или Ваше домохозяйство.</p> <p>In conformity with the law, the Census Bureau does not have the right to publish or reveal to anyone any information that could identify you or your household.</p>	<p>В соответствии с законом, Бюро переписи населения не имеет права публиковать или разглашать какую-либо информацию, по которой можно определить, кто Вы, где Вы живете и кто еще проживает по этому адресу.</p> <p>In conformity with the law, the Census Bureau does not have the right to publish or release to anyone any information that could indicate who you are, where you live and who else lives at your address.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation contains some words that, although correct Russian terms, sounded odd to respondents, possibly because they are survey jargon. That was the case with <b>домохозяйство</b> and with <b>идентифицировать</b>. Even if not always practical, wherever possible these words should be avoided.</p>		

Informational Brochure

<b>Panel/ Paragraph</b>	<b><u>Current Translation</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Translation</u></b>
Inside, 3 <sup>rd</sup> panel		<p>Это анкетирование включает в себя вопросы об основных демографических показателях, жилье, образовании, расовой принадлежности, этническом происхождении, языке, статусе ветерана, занятости, поездках на работу, доходах и т.д.</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic demographic characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status,</p>

		employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement as a final question/answer in the internal right side panel following the question on confidentiality, to inform respondents on the type of questions asked in the ACS. Even though this brochure includes such information on the pack panel (next to the drawing of a pencil), respondents consistently missed it. In Round 2, this wording was tested and was very well received by respondents who felt the information provided was necessary.</p>		
Inside, 3 <sup>rd</sup> panel	<p>За разглашение любой информации, по которой можно идентифицировать Вас или Ваше домохозяйство, им грозит тюремное заключение или штраф, или тюремное заключение и штраф.</p> <p>For disclosing any information which could identify you or your household, he is subject to imprisonment or fine, or imprisonment, or fine.</p>	<p>За разглашение любой информации, по которой можно определить, кто Вы, где Вы живете и кто еще проживает в этому адресу, им грозит тюремное заключение или штраф, или и то и другое.</p> <p>For disclosing any information which could indicate who you are, where you live and who else lives at your address, he is subject to imprisonment or fine, or both.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation was unnecessarily wordy in that it stated that violations of confidentiality could result “in imprisonment or fine, or imprisonment and fine.” The proposed translation is tighter in that it says “imprisonment or fine, or both.”</p>		

Questions & Answers Brochure

<b>Page/ Column/ Paragraph</b>	<b><u>Current Translation</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Translation</u></b>
Page 1, Col. 1, Parag. 2	<p>Сообщества США сообщают нам, что Анкетирование по месту жительства помогает им принимать на местном уровне правильные решения на основе получаемой информации и являются важными для их будущего развития.</p> <p>U.S. communities tell us that the American Community Survey helps them make informed decisions and is a key to their future.</p>	<p>Местные организация общественность сообщает нам, что анкетирование ACS помогает принимать правильные решения на местном уровне и является важным для будущего развития регионов.</p> <p>Local organizations tell us that the ACS helps them make the right decisions locally and is important for future development of the communities.</p>

<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation is a literal rendition of “U.S. communities” but participants found it very unclear. It did not reflect the local aspect of “community,” but rather “community” as in “international community.” The proposed translation changes the subject to местная общественность (i.e. local organizations) which respects the spirit of the meaning of the original, and uses a term more related to the local level and familiar to everyone.</p>		
<p>Page 2, Col. 1</p>		<p>Это анкетирование включает в себя вопросы об основных демографических показателях, жилье, образовании, расовой принадлежности, этническом происхождении, языке, статусе ветерана, занятости, поездках на работу, доходах и т.д.</p> <p>The ACS includes questions about basic demographic characteristics, housing, education, race, ethnicity, language, veteran status, employment, commuting to work, income, and so on.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> This statement is not in the English version or the current translation. We recommend adding this statement as a question/answer right before the question on uses of the data. In Round 2, this wording was tested and was very well received by respondents who felt the information it provided was necessary.</p>		
<p>Page 2, Col. 2, Parag. 3</p>	<p>Информация о возрасте используется в федеральных программах для включения финансовых средств и услуг, предназначенных для детей, взрослого работоспособного населения и для пожилых американцев.</p> <p>Information about age is used in federal programs to target funds or services to children, working-age adults and for aged Americans.</p>	<p>Информация о возрасте используется в федеральных программах для распределения финансовых средств и услуг, предназначенных для детей, взрослого работоспособного населения и для лиц пожилого возраста.</p> <p>Information about age is used in federal programs to distribute funds or services allocated to children, the population of working-age adults and for people of advanced age.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation did not properly convey the sense about the “distribution” of funds. Also the new translation again avoids using the term “Americans.”</p>		
<p>Page 3, Col. 1, Parag. 1</p>	<p>Ответы на вопросы о доходах и жилье необходимы для подготовки кратких профилей, которые использует Министерство жилищного строительства и</p>	<p>Ответы на вопросы о доходах и жилье необходимы для подготовки кратких характеристик, которые используются Министерством жилищного строительства и</p>



	<p>городского развития США для ...</p> <p>Responses to questions about income and housing are summarized into profiles that are used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to ...</p>	<p>городского развития США для оценки потребностей в жилье.</p> <p>Responses to questions about income and housing summarized into characteristics that are used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to ...</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The term профилей (“profiley” for profiles) was not understood by participants. While it is not a synonym, the tested term характеристик (i.e. characteristics) was understood well and gave readers a general understanding of the intended meaning.</p>		
<p>Page 3, Col. 1, Parag. 2</p>	<p>Информация о расе, латиноамериканском происхождении и языке, на котором общаются дома, используется для выработки правил, требующих использования двух языков при проведении выборов в соответствии с Законом о праве голоса и для наблюдения за обеспечением равноправия при приеме на работу в соответствии с Законом о гражданских правах.</p> <p>Information about race, Hispanic origin and language which is used at home, is used for determining bilingual election requirements in conformity with the law on the right to vote and to monitor equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act.</p>	<p>Информация о расе, латиноамериканском происхождении и языке, на котором общаются дома, используется для выработки правил, требующих употребления двух языков при проведении выборов согласно Закону о праве на участие в голосовании и для наблюдения за обеспечением равноправия при приеме на работу согласно Закону о гражданских правах.</p> <p>Information about race, Hispanic origin and language which is used at home, is used for determining bilingual election requirements in conformity with the Voting Rights Act and to monitor equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation translates the name of the Voting Rights Act as the Right to Speak up or to Voice your Opinions (i.e. freedom of speech). While the right to vote (права голоса) is a common expression in Russian to refer to one of the basic rights citizens have, the language team was concerned that it may not be the right way to refer to the U.S. Voting Rights Act, which has a different history and purpose. The proposed version tries to address that subtlety. In addition, it is a bit shorter and participants found it clearer.</p>		
<p>Page 4, Col. 1, Parag. 3</p>	<p>...программы ... для скаутов...</p> <p>...programs... for Scouts..</p>	<p>...программы ... для молодец...</p> <p>...programs... for youth...</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> Unacculturated Russian speakers in America are usually not familiar with the concept of “scouts.” We recommend substituting with a reference to programs for youth.</p>		
<p>Page 4,</p>	<p>Данный закон предусматривает, что</p>	<p>Данный закон предусматривает,</p>

<p>Col. 2, Parag. 2</p>	<p>Бюро переписи населения может использовать предоставляемую индивидуальными лицами информацию только в целях статистики и не может публиковать или предоставлять данные, с помощью которых можно идентифицировать какое-либо физическое лицо.</p> <p>This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individual individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.</p>	<p>что Бюро переписи населения может использовать информацию, предоставленную частными лицами, только в целях статистики и не может публиковать или предоставлять кому-либо данные, с помощью которых можно идентифицировать какое-либо физическое лицо.</p> <p>This law specifies that the Census Bureau can use the information provided by individual individuals for statistical purposes only and cannot publish or release information that would identify any individual.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> In the original translation, the term индивидуальными лицами was considered redundant. As one respondent put it, a Person is always an Individual. Intending to preserve the original meaning, the alternative tested and now recommended was частными лицами.</p>		
<p>Page 5, Col. 2, Parag. 2</p>	<p>Представитель Бюро переписи населения может помочь Вам в этом деле.</p> <p>A Census Bureau representative can assist you in this matter.</p>	<p>При необходимости представитель Бюро переписи населения поможет Вам в этом.</p> <p>If necessary, a Census Bureau representative will assist you with this.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The original translation indicated that the Census Bureau representative will help participants complete their form. The proposed translation indicates that s/he can provide help if necessary.</p>		

## **9. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Throughout the completion of the Cognitive Testing of Translations of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages task order, the teams identified a number of aspects of the project that went well, and a number that could be improved for future rounds of cognitive interview testing of translated materials. This section identifies both, as well as future areas of related research.

Overall, the research efforts did meet the desired goals set out at the beginning of the contract, which were to evaluate the translated materials in four languages (Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Russian) as well as English. Through the cognitive interviews, we evaluated the materials to ensure that they met the Census Bureau Pretesting Standard (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003) and the Census Bureau Guideline for Translation (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). We also determined to what extent the respondents understood the intended communication in the same manner as the English-speaking respondents. Finally, we identified informed consent messages that were conceptually difficult to translate effectively and made recommendations for modifications.

### **9.1 Lessons learned**

Overall, we found that the team approach to translating the protocols worked very well for the tasks completed. Also, the expert panel approach to conducting the cognitive interviews and making recommendations was effective. As part of the original plan, we allowed the language teams to have some variation in the wording of recommendations in order to better match the intended messages in English. This adaptive approach to translating turned out to be critical to the success of the project as the cognitive interview results demonstrate.

**Training.** While the training provided for this research was sufficient for the successful execution of the activities, we found that we needed to expand and continue training beyond the originally planned single-day training session. After the initial training, which was scheduled to take place before recruiting, each language team also scheduled a language-specific follow-up training session to allow for additional practice using the interview materials. Additional documentation was provided to all teams to ensure consistent execution of the cognitive interviews. For future research that involves language experts who may not have extensive experience recruiting and interviewing, we recommend dividing the training into two sessions: project overview and recruiting followed by cognitive interviewing training a few weeks later. New interviewers would benefit from hearing more examples of effective probes for cognitive interviewing. Sufficient time must be devoted to the practice of mock interviews in the target language.

**Recruitment.** We found that recruitment targets for the specific demographics identified in the 2004 ACS data were not always feasible given schedule and cost constraints. Further review of the age groups included in the ACS data as well as the education ranking would be of benefit before future rounds of interviews targeting these demographics. As

documented in the language-specific recruiting reports, there was reason to believe that the exclusion of 15- to 17-year-olds for this task order may have been part of the reason for not identifying a the targeted number of individuals with less than high school education. Also, for Russian participants, the challenge could be related to the number of years identified as high school.

As documented in the recruiting sections, the second round of recruiting was significantly less challenging because there were many participants from the initial round that were still willing to participate. The second round of recruiting was afforded the luxury of only targeting the difficult-to-identify demographics as a result. We also learned about the most effective recruiting techniques for these specific populations.

**Conduct of cognitive interviews.** Despite efforts after training to clarify the difference between being asked to participate in the ACS and participating in the cognitive interview, some respondents remained confused on this point. As a result of this confusion, the language teams suspect that some of the responses to our questions about the meaning of informed consent statements may have been affected. For example, some respondents remembered that the interview was voluntary, so they insisted that the ACS was also voluntary despite what seemed to be very clear statements (they were asked to read about the mandatory nature of the ACS). We recommend additional explanation for respondents that may clarify without leading the respondent to a specific answer to a question.

Another confounding issue was that many respondents were completely unfamiliar with any of the Census programs and as such, were not able to fully grasp some of the specific concepts of the 2010 Census programs and the ACS that were being tested during the cognitive interview. To ameliorate this difficulty, we recommend adding time up front to educate the respondents about the ACS survey before asking specific questions in the cognitive interview. This would provide more background for the study and facilitate the conceptualization of the circumstances under which the study would take place.

## **9.2 Future Research**

The following are possible topics for future research related to the ACS:

- Further investigation of alternative wording for lengthy or complex sentences would help ensure better and consistent understanding of intended messages. Each language team was forced to select the most critical passages to test with the two rounds of cognitive interviews, but there were other messages that could also be unclear to future ACS respondents.
- Additional research that targets a better understanding of which ACS materials are most useful for these linguistically isolated populations.
- Development and testing of on-line Question and Answer documents that may be adapted for spoken languages if available to ACS telephone interviewers.
- Research into effective communication protocols used with translation services in order to better understand how to facilitate two-way communication with Census Bureau methodologists and translators in order to improve the cognitive equivalence of the intended messages. Need to better understand

how constraints of matching English in both sentence structure and format can impact the cultural sensitivity of the messages.

- An investigation of how these non-English speakers are motivated to complete the ACS forms and how they actually complete the forms. For example, do they complete the forms themselves or do they have an English-speaking family member or friend complete the forms for them?
- Additional information regarding what these non-English-speaking populations understand about how the ACS data are used. Many respondents seemed to understand that specific reporting of community needs would bring about specific change as a result of their participation. While this probably increases response rates, the impact in the long run is not known.
- An investigation that will provide insight on reasons for response/non-response to the ACS.
- Obviously, inclusion of other languages such as Vietnamese, would be worthwhile of future research.

In addition to these topics related to the ACS, future research should also be conducted in the following two areas. One area is methodological research that will help refine and tailor the cognitive interview method to non-English-speaking populations. Cognitive interviewing in non-English languages presents new challenges in terms of methodology and application of widely used cognitive interview techniques. The Census Bureau has conducted exploratory research on conducting cognitive interviews in Spanish (Goerman, 2005) and in Chinese (Pan, 2004). More systematic research is needed in terms of conducting cognitive interviews as well as providing cognitive interview training in non-English languages.

The other area for future research concerns the methodology for translating survey supporting materials. In order to understand how best to convey survey letter messages to respondents in languages other than English, we recommend that future research explore and identify linguistic elements (communicative strategies) that might run counter to the communicative style commonly asserted in documents written in English. Researchers must also understand more about cultural assumptions affecting respondents' perceptions about various topics covered in the survey letter.

Once the communicative strategies and culturally-driven perceptions of surveys and survey letter topics are identified for particular ethnic/cultural populations, researchers must provide systematic guidance to translators in tailoring survey letter messages. Cultural variations in the presentation of the messages should be allowed to ensure they convey the intended message in different languages.

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 – ACS Introductory Letter  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 2 – ACS Thank You Letter (Round 1 and Round 2)  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 3 – ACS Informational Brochure  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 4 – ACS Q&A Brochure  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 5 – Round 1 Protocol Guide #1  
(English only)
- Appendix 6 – Round 1 Protocol Guide #2  
(English only)
- Appendix 7 – Round 2 Protocol Guide #1  
(English only)
- Appendix 8 – Round 2 Protocol Guide #2  
(English only)
- Appendix 9 – Agenda for Cognitive Interview Training Session
  
- Appendix 10 – Informed Consent Forms  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)
- Appendix 11 – Recruitment Plan
  
- Appendix 12 – Recruiting Screener  
(English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian)

## References Cited

- Acquadro, C., Jambon, B., Ellis, D., and Marquis, P. 1996, "Language and Translation Issues," in B. Spilker (eds.), *Quality Life and Pharmacoeconomics in Clinical Trials*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven.
- Brislin, R. 1976, "Introduction," in R. Brislin (eds.), *Translation: Applications and Research*, New York: Gardner.
- Goerman, P. 2005. "An Examination of Pretesting Methods for Multicultural, Multilingual Surveys." Paper presented at the Third International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation. Madrid, Spain. March 10-12.
- Guillemin, F., Bombardier, C. and Beaton, D. 1993, "Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Health-Related Quality of Life Measures: Literature Review and Proposed Guidelines," *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 46: 1417–1432.
- Nida, E. A. 1964, *Toward a science of translating*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Pan, Y. 2004. "Cognitive Interviews in Languages Other Than English: Methodological and Research Issues" In *The 2004 American Statistical Association Proceedings of the Joint Statistical Meetings*.
- Pan, Y., Craig, B., and Scollon, S. 2005. "Results from Chinese Cognitive Interviews on the Census 2000 Long Form: Language, Literacy, and Cultural Issues." In *Statistical Research Division's Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2005-09)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Pan, Y., and de la Puente, M. 2005. "Census Bureau Guideline for the Translation of Data Collection Instruments and Supporting Materials: Documentation on how the Guideline Was Developed." *Statistical Research Division's Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2005-06)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov/srd/www/byname.html#panyuling>.
- Schoua-Glusberg, A. 1992, Report on the Translation of the Questionnaire for the National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study, Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2003. "Meeting 21<sup>st</sup> Century Demographic Data Needs – Implementing the American Community Survey: Report 3: Testing the Use of Voluntary Methods." Retrieved on August 8, 2006. <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/Report03.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2003. "Meeting 21<sup>st</sup> Century Demographic Data Needs – Implementing the American Community Survey: Report 11: Testing Voluntary Methods – Additional Result." Retrieved on August 8, 2006. <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/Report11.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2004. "Census Bureau Guideline: Language Translation of Data Collection Instruments and Supporting Materials". Issued April 5, 2004.