

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(*Survey Methodology* #2012-05)

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

Kristine Ajrouch¹
Yuling Pan
Stephen Lubkemann

¹Eastern Michigan University

Center for Survey Measurement
Research and Methodology Directorate
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20233

Report Issued: August 10, 2012

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

June 15, 2012

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

Kristine Ajrouch¹, Yuling Pan,² and Stephen Lubkemann²

¹ Eastern Michigan University, ² Center for Survey Measurement

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

i *Helping You Make Informed Decisions*

Abstract

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

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

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

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	COMMUNITY BACKGROUND: ARABIC-SPEAKERS IN THE US	5
3.	METHODS	7
3.1.	Description of Fieldwork	7
3.2.	Analysis	10
4.	FINDINGS	11
4.1.	Enumerator-Respondent Interactions	11
4.1.1.	Cultural and Social Factors Affecting Access and Rapport	11
4.1.2.	Linguistic factors Affecting Enumerator/Respondent Interactions	18
4.2.	Interpretation	20
4.3.	Perceptions of Census	26
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
5.1.	Forseeable Trends within the Arab-American Community over Next 10 Years	30
5.2.	Specific Recommendations for 2020 Decennial Census Language Assistance Programs	31
5.2.1.	Language materials	31
5.2.2.	Hiring and training bilingual enumerators	32
5.2.3.	Partnership program	33
6.	REFERENCES	34

1. Introduction

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

Yet, as of the time of the 2010 decennial census the Census Bureau still lacked an adequate understanding of how linguistic isolation influenced the census data collection process amongst non-English-speaking households, such as the Nonresponse Followup interviews. Since many such households seemed unlikely to respond to the English mailout and mailback census questionnaires, it remained likely that the data they would provide would be obtained through face-to-face interviews. Consequently, a comparative study was designed to ethnographically observe Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) interviews amongst eight different communities of language to identify what, if any, social and linguistic factors were affecting the reliability and validity of the NRFU data collected from linguistically-isolated households.

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

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

Following a brief overview of the history and community of Arabic speakers in the U.S., this report describes the specific methods employed in this field study of NRFU respondents from members of this community resident in a Midwestern state. This is followed by a discussion of our findings and recommendations for improving future NRFU coverage amongst Arabic-speakers.

2. Community Background: Arabic-speakers in the US

Documented immigration from Arabic-speaking countries¹ to the U.S. began at the turn of the 20th century (Gaultieri, 2001; Orfalea, 1988; Naff, 1985). Early immigration came primarily from Greater Syria (present-day Lebanon and Syria), with later waves originating from more diverse origins including Egypt, Iraq, Yemen, and Palestine.

Most of those who have researched and written on Arab immigration described at least two separate waves, although some have identified a third wave. Numbers reflecting the amount of immigrants in each wave are difficult to discern. For example, “prior to 1914, Arabs entering the U.S. were lumped together with other Ottoman Empire subjects and record-keeping by the immigration suffered from the language barrier, immigrants often falsified information on the basis of what they thought officials wanted to hear, untold numbers entered undetected from Canadian and Mexican borders, and many entered by relatives’ passports” (Zogby, 1990:40). Zogby also cited problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) records in later years. According to the INS “106,000 immigrants came to the U.S. between 1950-1970 from Lebanon and Jordan alone (the only figures reported and excluding nations like Iraq, Egypt, and Syria, let alone Palestinians entering on Israeli passports)” (Zogby, 1990:39).

Other methods of accounting for the number of Arabs in America have included counting church and mosque membership, memberships in clubs, and estimates from community leaders. In a report made by a local social service agency in Dearborn, Michigan, it was shown that there were more Arab-American children enrolled in public schools than the total Arab population reported in the 1980 census (Zogby, 1990).

The first wave of Arab emigration to the United States commenced during the early 1900’s (Orfalea, 1988; Naff, 1985). The majority were of the Christian faith, originating from the Levant, or modern-day Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Israel (Palestine). Orfalea lists numbers who entered the U.S. from Syria, which he obtained from *International Migration Statistics*, Vol. 1, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1925. From 1899-1932, immigrants deriving from Syria totaled 106,391. These first immigrants traveled across the Atlantic Ocean in search for a better life to a country whose streets were rumored to be paved with gold--where money could be picked off of trees. Most were illiterate, yet strived to adapt to the American way of life (Orfalea, 1988). By 1924, Arab emigration halted due to laws decreed by the United States government--the passage of the National Origins Act.

The second wave of Arab emigration began with the Immigration Act of 1965, and represented a markedly different group of immigrants. Numbers obtained from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service show that 310,171 Arabs entered the U.S. from 1948-1985 (Orfalea, 1988). They were more educated, more financially adept, and left their home countries due to political disputes and all-out warfare (Orfalea, 1988; Suleiman, 1999; Zogby, 1990). In addition, 60% of these Arab immigrants were Muslim. Whereas the first wave embraced American mores, the second wave waited much longer before settling in. Orfalea (1988) states, that

¹ These countries include members of the Arab League of Nations: Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen.

although these first and second wave immigrants attended the same churches and mosques, they did not socialize with one another much.

The demographic composition of Arabic-speakers was changed again as a result of the Israeli-Arab war in 1967, followed by other wars in 1972 and then 1982. It is these wars, Orfalea argued, that ignited a third wave of Arab immigration. This “third wave” was three times larger than the previous wave due to loosened immigration laws and warfare in the region. Continuing instabilities in the Middle East ever since have been a factor in the near constant stream of Arabic-speaking immigrants that have arrived since 1967. For instance, Iraqi immigration has increased markedly since 1990 due to the succession of wars (Sirkeci, 2005).

In Michigan, the current estimated population of Arab Americans numbers around 490,000². According to the 2008 American Community Survey 1-year estimates, half of the community in Michigan identified as having either Lebanese or Iraqi/Chaldean heritage. These groups were well represented in greater Detroit along with sizable numbers of Yemeni and Palestinian Americans, with a specific ghettoization of newer immigrants in specific sites within the Detroit area that signified class and cultural distinctions between new and older immigrants (Abraham & Shryock, 2000).

The Arab-American community was represented in all 64 of Michigan’s counties counted in the 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-year estimates, with more than 45% of the state's Arab population residing in Wayne county³. The Detroit/Dearborn area had the largest and most discernible Arab American community in the United States. Roughly one third of the city of Dearborn traced their ancestry back to an Arab-speaking country (de la Cruz & Brittingham, 2003). More than 43% of immigrant Arab-Americans living in the metro Detroit area arrived to the U.S. after 1990 (Ajrouch & Jamal, 2007).

Distinctions between national origin groups in metro-Detroit remain noticeable--and to some extent affect geographic distribution. Though there were attempts to build bridges, especially in the face of threats from non-Arab sources, there nevertheless exists a hierarchy of sorts. The Lebanese/Syrians represented the earliest immigrating national origin groups (Naff, 1983), and indeed comprised the largest proportion of Arab-Americans in the metro-Detroit area⁴ (Ajrouch & Jamal, 2007). Historically, the Lebanese and Yemeni populations preferred to live amongst their own national origin group in the metro-Detroit area (S. Abraham, 1983). Thus, as the Yemeni population moved into the “south end” of Dearborn in the 1960s and 1970s, the Lebanese moved out and developed a presence in east Dearborn (N. Abraham, 1983).

Meanwhile, Iraqis (predominantly Chaldeans) have maintained a presence in metro Detroit since the early 1900s, living in Oak Park, Detroit, and then later the northern suburbs (Southfield, Oak Park, Birmingham, Bloomfield Hills, Farmington, Farmington Hills), far from the epicenter of Dearborn (Sengstock, 2005). After the first Gulf War in the 1990s, Iraqi refugees (these though

² See: http://www.aaiusa.org/index_ee.php/pages/state-profiles-detailed#MI.

³ See: http://www.aaiusa.org/index_ee.php/pages/state-profiles-detailed#MI.

⁴ See also: http://www.aaiusa.org/index_ee.php/pages/state-profiles-detailed#MI.

being predominantly Muslim) began arriving in Dearborn. At the same time, many Lebanese moved west to Dearborn Heights. Lebanese who remain in east Dearborn often refused to rent homes to these new Iraqi arrivals. However, these Iraqis found Yemenis in the south end more willing to accept them as neighbors (Walbridge & Aziz, 2000). Walbridge and Aziz relay that Lebanese were loathe to rent to recent Iraqis refugees because they often had 20 people living in the same household and damage to the house was common (recent immigrants are accustomed to stone and cement walls, not those made of drywall). Somewhat ironically, these very same negative traits had been attributed to Lebanese immigrants a generation ago. The Lebanese tendency to distance themselves from other national origins and more recent Arabic-speaking immigrants may have also reflected a desire to avoid the negative forms of identification and stigma they themselves had often experienced during their early years in the U.S. (Walbridge & Aziz, 2000).

Within this context, some community organizations have emerged as pan-Arab (e.g., Arab American Chamber of Commerce, Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee). However, a majority of organizations have tend to form based on national origin (Lebanese American Club; Yemen Benevolent Association), or sometimes even been organized around more narrow and parochial forms of identity--such as village origin (Bint Jbail Club). In short, the Arab-American community in the Michigan area exhibits important forms of social and cultural heterogeneity.

3. Methods

3.1. Description of Fieldwork

We used observation as well as a technique known as expansive probing (Nichols & Childs, 2009) to better understand the Census experience among households whose primary or sole language was Arabic. This involved 1) accompanying Census Enumerators to observe the enumeration process, 2) conducting a brief qualitative interview with the Non-Response Follow-Up (NRFU) household following the Enumerator Questionnaire, and finally 3) interviewing the enumerators about their experiences.

These activities were carried out by three research team members trained and supervised by an expert knowledgeable in both the subject matter of immigrant history of Arab Americans and ethnographic interview methods. All three of our research team members (RAs) were bilingual in Arabic and English. All were fluent in colloquial, and modern standard (the type used in news broadcasts) Arabic. The three RAs represented three national origins (and thus three forms of colloquial dialect): Palestinian, Iraqi, and Lebanese. The three RAs also contributed to developing the debriefing questions, translating and back-translating, and developing hypotheses about what issues would emerge in the field.

In May and June 2010, these three RAs observed the 2010 Decennial Census operation known as Non-Response Follow-Up (NRFU) interviews in Michigan. The areas in which we conducted fieldwork were selected because they had been identified as home to high concentrations of people from Arab-speaking countries through an analysis based on U.S. Census 2000 data that

identified census tracts with high proportions of those who reported they did not speak English very well, and those who reported ancestry from an Arab-speaking country.

Each research team member (RA) accompanied enumerators anywhere from 4-8 days (total 16 days), and observed from 41 to 75 interviews each (a total of 166 observations) (see Table 1). Each individual RA observed at least 20 NRFU interviews conducted with households in which the respondent preferred to speak Arabic (for a total of 61 households). Each also observed up to 10 NRFU interviews with English-speaking households (for a total of 29 households), the latter providing a control group common to all studies in the larger comparative study. When a NRFU interview met the established language criteria (preference Arabic-speaking), the RAs used a previously-developed protocol (see Appendix 1) to conduct qualitative respondent debriefings. This protocol provided initial questions that were followed by emergent, expansive probes about their knowledge of the Census and about the NRFU interview experience the respondents had just completed. These debriefings were conducted with each NRFU respondent immediately following their completion of the Enumerator Questionnaire. Observations occurred until the targeted number (60) of interviews amongst Arabic-speakers had been collected.

One of the research questions of this study was the influence of the enumerator's linguistic competency and socio-cultural familiarity with communicative repertoires specific to Arabic speakers on the NRFU interview as a communicative process. Table 1 presents key characteristics of the Enumerators (E) whose NRFU interviews were observed by our research team. Our research team members assessed the language fluency of these Enumerators by observing the manner in which they spoke with and addressed NRFU respondents. All but one E were bilingual, though they varied in terms of how fluent they were (in a colloquial dialect only or in both colloquial and modern standard dialects). "Modern standard knowledge" of the Arabic language means that we verified that an enumerator could read, write and speak in formal Arabic. "Colloquial knowledge" means that we verified that any enumerator so ascribed could talk the dialect of their national origin, but could not read, write, or speak formal Arabic.

Team Member #1 accompanied two different enumerators; one was a female of Lebanese origin, fluent in both colloquial and modern standard Arabic. The other, who was not of Arab ancestry, was a white male who did not speak Arabic. Team Member #2 accompanied three enumerators, the first of which was a female of Lebanese origin, fluent in colloquial Arabic only. The second was a male of Yemeni origin, fluent in both colloquial and modern standard Arabic, while the third was a male of Yemen origin, fluent in both colloquial and modern standard Arabic. Team Member #3 accompanied three enumerators, the first of which was a female of Iraqi origin, fluent in colloquial Arabic only. The second and third were males of Lebanese origin, also fluent in colloquial Arabic only.

Table 1. Project Research Team Member (RA) and Enumerator (E) Characteristics

RA/E	E Ethnicity	E Gender	E Arabic-Speaking Fluency	# Days Observed	# Cases Observed (approx.)
RA 1					
E #1	Lebanese	Female	Lebanese dialect AND Standard Arabic	3	60
E#2	White	Male	None	1	15
RA 2					
E #1	Lebanese	Female	Lebanese dialect	1	11
E#2	Yemeni	Male	Yemeni dialect AND Standard Arabic	1	10
E#3	Yemeni	Male	Yemeni dialect AND Standard Arabic	2	20
RA 3					
E #1	Iraqi	Female	Iraqi dialect	4	30
E#2	Lebanese	Male	Lebanese (south) dialect	3	18
E#3	Lebanese	Male	Lebanese dialect	1	2
TOTAL				16	166

We held a 2-hour training session prior to going into the field. During the session, we reviewed the respondent debriefing questions (see Appendix 1) and noted that many situations would require spontaneous, emergent probes. We talked about the importance of probing, and discussed potential issues that may come up in the field. Some issues included the potential for the team member to be asked to serve as translator, and the likelihood that the team member would be asked about their own national origin and/or religious backgrounds as they talked to Arabic-speaking households.

Each team member took brief notes on all interviews conducted as well as about the respondent debriefing if one was conducted. Subsequently each team member wrote up a more extensive report for every debriefing conducted. This debriefing report needed to be specific enough so that an analyst could read the report and know what issues were most prominent for Arabic-speaking households. Seven observation/debriefings were transcribed verbatim in Arabic, and then translated into English. Two observation/debriefings carried out in English were also transcribed. Team members also interviewed each enumerator that they accompanied.

Table 2 presents the number of interviews carried out in Arabic and English organized according to the Respondent’s national origin. Lebanese, Yemeni and Iraqi immigrants comprised the most prevalent groups interviewed in Arabic. English speaking respondents were predominantly non-Arab, followed by Lebanese and Yemeni.

Table 2. Language of Interview by National Origin of Respondents

RA/E	Arabic				English				
	Lebanese	Yemeni	Iraqi	Other Arab	Lebanese	Yemeni	Iraqi	Other Arab	Non-Arab
E #1	8	5	3	2	3	1			4
E#2		1	1						2
RA #2									
E #1	5								-
E#2		3							5
E#3	7	3	1	1					5
RA #3									
E #1	10	2	6		3	4	1		-
E#2	1								-
E#3				1				1	-
TOTAL	31	15	11	4	6	5	1	1	16

3.2. Analysis

The first step of the analysis involved all the team members meeting together once all interviews were complete to compare experiences and collectively identify issues that seemed most central to the NRFU experience. Subsequent analysis by the Field PI included multiple readings of debriefing reports and transcriptions in an attempt to identify pre-determined factors such as: a) how language differences affected the interaction between the enumerator and the non-English-speaking respondent, b) which interaction effects were specifically attributable to linguistic factors as opposed to other social factors, c) the processes by which interpreters were recruited, d) the roles that interpreters played in face-to-face interviews--specifically in mediating the data collected, and e) the efficacy of standard translation vs. translation on-the-fly. The data were also carefully reviewed for factors hypothesized to influence interactions by the research team before data collection began concerning terminology, gender, national origin, ethnicity, and religion. Also analyzed were patterns detected in the English interviews (control group) to provide more context for the target language findings. Effectiveness of media campaigns and

language aid material were also factors analyzed in the debriefing interviews. A third step in analysis involved several rounds of extensive queries and consultation with the overall project PI and co-PI, as well as additional focused review of data following a one day workshop at the U.S. Census Bureau in which all of the Field Studies presented initial findings and compared provisional findings.

In observing social dynamics that affect census enumeration, our analysis focused on two broad areas: socio-cultural and linguistic factors. Analysis of socio-cultural factors uncovered the following relevant sub-themes that informed a sense of trust and facilitated the establishment of rapport: gender, national origin, and ethnicity. Analysis of linguistic factors (a number of which also involve cultural difference) uncovered matters related to the use of interpreters, dialect, conceptual equivalencies, and literacy.

4. Findings

Units identified as linguistically-isolated households ranged from a single family home to duplex, to an apartment building. One of the apartment buildings housed older residents and was subsidized, indicating low-income levels. Interview locations varied. Some remained outside (on porch, on front lawn, in front of apartment building), while others were invited inside, most often to the living room. Sometimes interviews took place in the lobby of the apartment building.

Our findings as described below are organized to address core research questions that guided this project: 1) Enumerator-Respondent Interactions; 2) Interpretation; 3) Perceptions of the Census. We describe how more narrowly linguistic and more broadly socio-cultural factors both had bearing on each of these questions in the Arabic-speaking community context.

4.1. Enumerator-Respondent Interactions

Cultural, social and linguistic factors influenced the interview process and outcome. Amongst the cultural and social factors that were observed to most influence the interview outcome were familiarity with and deployment of culturally recognizable strategies for establishing trust and rapport (through identity markers such as ethnicity and gender). The primary linguistic factors shaping the interview interactions involved matters of dialect and literacy.

4.1.1. Cultural and Social Factors Affecting Access and Rapport

Of critical importance to gaining access to the respondents targeted for the NRFU interviews was the ability to establish trust and rapport. Strategies based on ethnicity and gender surfaced as key elements that mediated interactions between the Enumerator and Respondent, influencing the interview outcome.

4.1.1.1 Ethnicity

Ethnicity was a factor that operated simultaneously at different levels—and sometimes in mutually contradictory ways at those different levels—in affecting access, rapport, and the success of NRFU interview as a communicative event. At a broader level “ethnicity” makes

reference to 1) a sense of pan-Arab cultural commonality that differentiates Arabic-speakers from other U.S. population groups. While this level of “ethnicity” provides a meaningful frame by which Arabic-speakers think of themselves and organize in certain contexts, it is certainly not the only way in which ethnic difference is organized in relation to language. At yet another level 2) specific national-origin provides another point of ethnic differentiation that often maps onto colloquial Arabic dialect. At the pan-Arab level, “ethnicity” is signaled through explicit characteristics such as (Arabic, generically speaking) language and name, but also through reference to broadly shared values that tend to cross national differences including hospitality and the centrality of family. At the lower level, ethnicity is constituted somewhat differently: often through references to national origin, but also by other factors such as hometown (village), religion, and family of origin--all of which are not necessarily co-equal with nor entirely reducible to shared nationality of origin.

We observed that the Arabic-speaking Enumerator usually achieved better access and rapport by making explicit or implicit cultural references and using communicative repertoires that signalled the most intimate form of ethnic commonality with respondents that they were capable of identifying and claiming. Thus in cases in which enumerators only recognized a pan-Arabic level of ethnic commonality with their respondents they would invoke that through specific communicative conventions and references (e.g., removing shoes when entering the home); whereas recognition of more “intimate” forms of ethnic commonality (i.e. common nationality) led them to deploy communicative strategies that were based on the signaling of that commonality (e.g., freely speaking in the local dialect). In rather stark contrast, the one Enumerator who was not of Arab-speaking national origin took a different approach, that attempted to secure access based on the signaling of authority and framing the interaction as a legal transaction. Below, we first review the various approaches practiced by the “Arab-American” enumerators, including universal pan-Arab ethnic strategies, as well as those that varied because of national origins. These are compared and contrasted to the approach practiced by the “non-Arab” enumerator.

The ability of all but one enumerator to signal and invoke Arab-speaking ancestry clearly contributed to more successful results in the NRFU face-to-face interview encounter. First, at the most general level the appearance and names of Arabic-speaking enumerators clearly resonated in a positive way with most Arabic-speaking NRFU households.

Our research team members encountered three national origin groups when observing NRFU interviews amongst Arabic-speakers, namely: Lebanese, Iraqi, and Yemeni. Of these the Yemeni posed the most significant challenges to the NRFU data collection process, and were described in the literature as a distinct group from other Arab immigrants. For instance, the mean education level for Yemeni men was lowest of any Arab immigrants--Yemen (8.7 years in 1990 and 9.7 years in 2000), compared to high school or more among Lebanese and Iraqis (Aly & Ragan, 2010).

Despite such differences, certain widely recognized forms of cultural commonality (such as the concept of “Arab hospitality”) often provided an important form of facilitating rapport. Thus for example the Arabic-speaking enumerators and research team members were regularly offered something to drink, and/or invited to stay following the interview for coffee, etc. Sometimes they were blessed by the respondent for the work they were doing, by the respondent saying: “*ya3teek*

al 3afiye” [God give you strength for the work that you do]. Occasionally, an enumerator visit was viewed by the household member as an opportunity for company, signifying that some households appeared socially isolated.

Some instances where pan-Arab ethnicity may have yielded advantages involved appearance, i.e., female enumerator wearing a headscarf established indirect rapport. Enumerators with bilingual abilities and knowledgeable about these general cultural protocols constantly capitalized on such knowledge to make their Respondents feel comfortable and in order to ensure the success of the interview. For instance, an Enumerator of Syrian/Lebanese ancestry was able to forge trust and intimacy across national origin groups by observing identity protocols that are broadly shared within most Arabic-speaking societies--such as taking shoes off before entering home:

(Field notes) -- Enumerator on the other hand took off her shoes before entering the living room where everyone was sitting. E usually follows her intuition deciding whether to take shoes off or not, usually if there is a carpet, then better to take shoes off since people might pray in those areas.

The enumerator also sometimes disclosed national-origin familiarity when national origins between the enumerator and NRFU household differed to promote trust, closeness, and hence successfully establish rapport.

(Field notes) -- respondent was having a big round platter full with rice, meat and some kind of sauce and it is suppose to be a traditional Yemeni popular dish that the enumerator recognized and used that as a way to establish rapport with the respondent. The enumerator mentioned that she tried that dish before and loved it. The respondent asked us few times to join him for lunch but we said no thank you.

A common means for establishing trust and rapport involved attempts to display connections through networks involving family or others of the same national origin as the respondent. For instance, an enumerator of Syrian/Lebanese ancestry commented on the last name of the respondent with Yemeni national origin stating she had a neighbor with that last name. The respondent inquired where, and the enumerator answered, providing the first name of her female neighbor with the last name:

E: Oh, El-J---- is our neighbor.

R: Where? What street?

E: J-----

R: Is that the white house on the corner?

E: It's a few houses down, straight, it in front of W----- St. The wife name is L-----.

In this exchange, the enumerator established that she is from the “community” and has acquaintance with a potential family member of the respondent, despite the fact that she hails from a different national origin. Though no discussion followed on whether or not the respondent knew the enumerator’s neighbor, this insertion represents an attempt by the

enumerator to claim a form of social proximity that signals to the respondent that she can be trusted.

Bilingual enumerators also tended to avail themselves of culturally-specific communicative conventions when addressing the respondent and in order to conduct the NRFU interview successfully. Thus, for example in the Arabic language, titles or phrases used to address others often facilitate closeness (Joseph, 1993), and hence build trust and rapport. Thus the use of terms that assume a close relationship in Arabic provides a means to signal trust and intimacy. Use of such communicative conventions were commonly observed by our team in interviews with older male respondents, in which the Arabic-speaking enumerators often referred to them as “my friend,” “uncle,” or “father” interchangeably. The following transcript excerpts illustrate these socio-cultural norms at work in the course of an observed interview:

An enumerator used the term “My friend” to address an older NRFU male and attempt to put him at ease. He also made references to Arabic phrases invoking religiosity as a means perhaps to facilitate trust: “You understand me? So God willing we will begin on good luck. This paper says that the information you will give me will be confidential between you, me and [Census Bureau]...[OK] my friend; what is the number of your apartment?” (Field notes)

In this same interview, the enumerator referred to the elderly respondent as “uncle,” “brother,” and “father.” Enumerators also, regardless of national origin, often used Arabic phrases to adhere to cultural norms designating respect. For instance, after reporting his age (78), the enumerator responded with a culturally appropriate phrase, “Oh, wow, may He {God} extend your age.” (Field notes)

A careful line between facilitating closeness, and hence trust and rapport, was balanced with a need to establish authority and legitimacy by the Arab-American enumerators that we observed. Female enumerators had better success in persuading the NRFU respondent to participate, but sometimes encountered a tension about who was “in charge” of the interview as a social encounter. Enumerators thus needed to establish authority and legitimacy, but at the same time not offend or threaten the respondent. For example, in one interview the enumerator stated that she can explain the information brochure to the NRFU respondent “step by step.” He took the brochure, and while smiling said, “If you would like, I can explain these steps to you!” This response conveyed that the respondent did not want to be treated as if he did not know anything. Such situations may reflect a gender dimension, where the male respondent wanted to ensure capability and control, yet such conclusions are difficult to draw from these data. Overall, bilingual enumerators were far more likely to pick up on such communicative cues and to respond in a way that reduced such tensions, but at the same time conveyed official business. This delicate interaction style that included patience along with tenacity simultaneously left the respondent comfortable with her presence and her need to ask questions as well as gave credibility to the enumeration process.

While, the bilingual enumerators that we observed were variable in their Arabic-speaking skills and in their knowledge of communicative conventions, in general they reported that more informal approaches (asking questions in less formal ways that corresponded more closely to accepted communicative conventions) allowed them to successfully gather needed information in

ways that strict adherence to the formal protocol tended to inhibit. Breaking with formality allowed these enumerators to establish rapport by adopting an approach that signified no threat, and that presented the enumeration questionnaire as a casual (as opposed to formal) encounter.

Humor within a cultural context also was used to establish rapport. In the example below, the Respondent attempted to alleviate her own anxiety by engaging with this tactic:

(Field notes)--During the transition from asking for each household member's name (and how to spell the name) to preparing the Respondent for questions about each household member's gender, Enumerator states, "This next question is strange, but I have to ask." Respondent then proceeds to tell a story about her family name, "Can I make you laugh a little?" She then relays a story about her family name, something to do with spelling it incorrectly on official papers, for her and the entire family. The Enumerator laughs with her, validating the experience as having happened, but nothing to worry about, "Yeah, don't worry. Now, K, female?"

The decision for NRFU Respondent to tell this story demonstrated the development of rapport, introduced humor to alleviate NRFU nervousness, and also communicated to the Enumerator not to worry about the concern she had in asking a strange question.

Enumerators in another area of Michigan, one an Arab-American of Yemeni descent and a member of the community he was enumerating, the other a non-Arab white male, took divergent approaches. In the latter case, perceived cultural norms were followed to establish trust, so much so that when a female team member working on the project was assigned by the local census office to accompany a male bilingual enumerator in the area, the enumerator refused because he did not want his reputation tarnished. He worked in a geographic area where he knew the residents, and did not want them to see him walking with a strange woman. Instead, one of the male team members accompanied him.

By way of contrast we observed that the non-Arab English-only speaking white male enumerator, would come upon a house and if the respondent refused, tell the respondent that s/he had to participate, i.e., the enumerator stated he would return time and again until they participated. The following field notes illustrated how the approach deployed by this enumerator made it difficult to carry out interviews amongst Arabic speakers:

Respondent's son tried to get excuses to avoid the interview himself by saying that he is only visiting, had to leave soon, and not sure if he will provide us with the right information, etc. Enumerator assured son that interview will take only 10 min and that they have to complete this interview. It was hard at times to get Son to continue with the interview.

While we observed that shared ethnicity, at both the general and more specific levels, provided information and helped secure access it should be noted, however, that having such "insider status" could also have some disadvantages. Disadvantages included a quest to uphold appearances (e.g., a Yemeni Enumerator would not accept a female research team member to

accompany him for fear his reputation would be tarnished within his community), as well as greater difficulty in enumerators asking questions that they clearly knew most Arabic-speaking NRFU respondents would deem strange, or even offensive, coming from one “Arab” to another (prime examples included questions about, race, gender, and ethnicity). Moreover, ethnic commonality--particularly at a pan-Arabic level--provided only limited privileged knowledge and status in an Arab community in which different national origins not only could correspond with different communicative conventions but could also signal quite different immigrant experiences and invoke particular forms of social tensions that also exist amongst different Arabic-speaking groups.

4.1.1.2 Gender

Female enumerators appeared to establish rapport more easily with Arabic-speaking respondents. This observation echoes the well-established understanding that gender shapes the process of data collection, and indeed filters knowledge (Denzin, 1989). It has been established that gender affects field work, including access as women sometimes are barred from men’s world, unless she is granted honorary status as a researcher, yet on the other hand are sometimes advantaged and granted access because she is viewed as harmless or invisible, and she on occasion faces sexual harassment or sexual overtures (Warren, 1988). All three research team members noted that gender not only significantly affected the interaction between NRFU respondents and enumerators but also their own interactions with both of these. An excerpt from team members’ notes highlights the issues with regard to access, when he noted his and the E’s surprise that his gender did not block access:

“The wife of the owner (Lebanese) let enumerator and I into the home. I found this odd because I was a male and this was unlike most of the other encounters that day. At the onset of the invite the enumerator asked if it was okay for the I to come in (she asked bluntly is it okay if I come in, he is a male) the NRFU laughed and looked at me jokingly and asked “Are you going to eat me?” The enumerator and I were both taken a back by her indifference to my gender (being male) and the E asked again if it was okay that I came in because I was a male. The NRFU turned to me and jokingly asked if I would eat her. After I reassured her of no such intentions she allowed us to enter her home.”

Gender also emerged as a particularly important factor that affected access to and participation in NRFU interviews, particularly among Yemenis. Summary notes from another team member illustrated how in some instances, women insisted their husband address the enumeration request:

First respondent’s wife peeked through the door, said didn’t speak English, so then enumerator switched to Arabic and mentioned that we are with the Census and that we need to collect some information about the people who live here. The woman mentioned right away that she was busy now, husband not home and not sure about the whole thing. The enumerator mentioned that we need to collect those info by law, asked if we can come back after a few minutes and hope that she has a minute for us. The respondent said okay. Went back to respondent’s house a few minutes after and that is when a man in his mid-40s answered the

door. We introduced ourselves and the reason for the visit. The respondent mentioned right away that yes they already mailed the form. The enumerator mentioned that they didn't receive and maybe wasn't sent on time and that is why we need to recollect all those info. The respondent was nice and cooperative and asked us to come in. Noticed few culture aspects that took place conducting this interview. First, Muslim female (Yemini, late 30, who didn't speak English) didn't feel comfortable talking to us or letting us inside house without her husband's approval. Second, noticed that main interview was conducted with the male respondent despite the fact that wife was there, she didn't interfere at all.

In discussing the social factors that most affected their own ethnographic experiences and observations, all three research team members highlighted the centrality of gender:

- The female team member said she never knew that in the Arab-American community women were so fearful. She discussed one instance in particular (transcribed), where a Lebanese woman said she feared her husband more than God. She would not engage in the NRFU interview until her husband returned home. Once he did return home she left them so she could finish preparing a meal, which she explained had to be ready when he arrived home or he would get angry. The team member thought there was physical abuse happening, and she asked the woman why she stayed in those conditions, but the woman's answer seemed to convey she had no other choice.
- The female team member stated the main enumerator she accompanied, a Lebanese-American young woman, was extremely cute. Her appearance facilitated a lot of cooperation. The team member said often the NRFU would either hit on her themselves (males), or want to set her up with their son (females). Her attractive appearance was thought to be a key factor that persuaded more than one NRFU to participate.
- A male research team member accompanied one female enumerator and two male enumerators. He reflected on wanting to make the female enumerator feel comfortable, that he did not have alternative motives beyond doing his job. He described wanting to keep a respectable physical distance from her. Early in the process, he had to sit close to her when they interviewed a NRFU. Afterward he apologized for sitting so close, explaining that there was nowhere else to sit. She seemed visibly relieved by the fact that he validated his action as potentially uncomfortable for her, and after that she seemed less tense. She relayed how uncomfortable she felt when during one NRFU interview, the NRFU invited her into a room, and then closed the door. She became afraid, though nothing happened. After that experience she learned to be more cautious in her interviews. He told of a specific instance when she and Ahmad came upon a male to interview, she discreetly asked Ahmad to be sure to stay close. Ahmad took this as a request for him to be a visible buffer between she and the NRFU, who apparently made her feel uncomfortable.
- The male research team member shared his experience of being invited to a Yemeni "tribal" lunch, comprised of all men. The enumerator he accompanied, the same one who

refused to have the female team member accompany him, insisted the male team member join him for the gathering.

- The male team member noticed that the enumerator asked the gender of each household member, often prefacing it with an apology for having to ask it. He perceived they were doing that to follow the letter of the enumeration questionnaire, and he told them not to do anything differently than what they normally do, as they were not being evaluated or judged. The team member could sense the discomfort and embarrassment of having to ask about gender when it was obvious what the gender was.
- The team member was, overall, very conscientious that he was a male. He felt the need to visibly display non-threatening behavior, also noting that he would not engage in eye contact, when observing or interviewing women, keeping his eyes on his notes for the most part, in order to communicate that his purpose for being there was for work, and nothing else.
- Another male team member noted that when he accompanied the female enumerator, it was quite easy to convince respondents to participate in the NRFU interview. When he accompanied the male enumerator, there were more instances when the respondent would not participate.
- Women, especially from Yemeni community, seemed afraid and fearful. Reluctant and often refused to talk to the enumerator. They told the enumerator to return when husband was home, called husband so the enumerator could talk to him on phone, or had child answer the enumeration questions. In one instance, when the husband was phoned, he came home immediately. Because he arrived so quickly, it was assumed he working down the street from his home.
- The male team member thinks he saw one woman's face when he was not suppose to because she went in the kitchen and put on the "nikab" to cover all but her eyes, again illustrating the issue of gender in the interaction, e.g., appropriate dress when interacting with a male or when a male is present.

Accounting for both ethnicity (pan-Arab/commonality and national origin/identity) and gender revealed a level of complexity in understanding cultural and social factors that mediate the interview process. Both underpinned meaningful aspects of personal identity (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000) shaping views of the field and hence affecting interactions between the Enumerator and Respondent.

4.1.2. Linguistic factors Affecting Enumerator/Respondent Interactions

4.1.2.1 Dialect

The Arab-American Enumerators varied in their language fluency and thus in both their level of comfort with translating "on-the-fly" and with coping with Arabic-speakers of other dialects. Some spoke both modern standard Arabic as well as their national origin dialect. Others spoke

only the colloquial dialect of their national origin. When modern standard Arabic was not a skill of the Arab-American Enumerator (which would have signified being educated in the Arabic language), we clearly observed that it influenced the interaction--particularly so in cases where the respondent also only spoke colloquial Arabic--but of a dialect different from that of the respondent. Thus, in one particular case that involved an enumerator with Iraqi national origins, whose speaking ability did not include modern standard Arabic, our notes suggest that the enumerator with a command of the colloquial Iraqi dialect conversed with far more confidence when the respondent spoke the Iraqi dialect.

We also noted occasions in which respondents indicated they felt more comfortable when the interview occurred in their specific Arabic dialect. Consider the following data from summary notes:

The respondent spoke Arabic only, Lebanese dialect. Iraqi enumerator spoke half in Arabic, half English. The enumerator gets nervous about her Arabic when it is not Iraqi. The respondent seemed more comfortable after the researcher team member spoke to her in Lebanese dialect.

4.1.2.2 Literacy

Literacy levels included the ability to read and write in a particular language. English literacy levels appeared low among many of the NRFU interviewees. Although in general Yemenis tend to have lower education levels than other national origin groups, for those who did not speak English fluently, literacy levels in English were uniformly low. One consistent item of data collected involved the names and birthdates/ages of those listed as living in the household. When English literacy was low, an official ID (SS card, or driver's license) was often shown in order to provide correct spelling and birthrate. Moreover, the Enumerators appeared very conscientious about getting names spelled correctly, as demonstrated in the cases recorded below:

Respondent states he will go get wife's ID to provide spelling (SS card). Enumerator confides to the researcher that NRFU probably needs the ID in order to report birth date of wife (Field notes).

In listing of household members, a Lebanese NRFU respondent states his name. The enumerator asks, "Do you know how to spell that?" NRFU: "I know but here is my ID, it is better that way."

Literacy may, of course, be a main obstacle as to why the forms were not filled out and returned in the first place. Often however, Enumerators proceeded as if NRFU Respondents had English literacy, making data collection awkward at times, and/or challenging (Note: this approach by Enumerators may have been a direct result of being observed):

Woman NRFU respondent, with poor English literacy, in the middle of trying to spell her name in English, which she cannot do very well, provided the letters in French. As she attempted to provide spelling for names, she often hesitated, and

then explained, “I am learning English little by little. My language is French. I know (my English is still not good). The researcher then attempted to console her embarrassment by acknowledging, “It’s a little hard (to learn English).”

In the same interview, the enumerator handed NRFU a list (in English), from which various answers could be chosen. She asked NRFU respondent to refer to the list as she proceeded to ask her what relationship each household member was to her, but in so doing acknowledged that NRFU did not read English, “OK, now M, what is he to you from the list? You don’t read English” to which R responded, “I mean I can, but--” E then interrupted her and asked, “Yeah, what is M to you?”

Literacy issues may also be understood by juxtaposing the Arabic and English language interviews. English language interviews provided a context for better placing observation of the Arabic-language enumeration process.⁵ English interviews were much more thorough in the sense that the enumerator asked every single question on the form, and used response cards regularly. These contrast sharply with the approach taken with Arabic-language enumeration where many questions were skipped (e.g., overwhelmingly, the E did not inquire about the racial status of each household member), and being that response cards were not available in Arabic, not used. Hence, the reliability and validity that accompany a standardized survey data collection among Arabic-language interviews are potentially compromised.

4.2. Interpretation

Bilingual enumerators frequently took it upon themselves to translate and interpret. Indeed, many of them were assigned households known to have Arabic-speaking residents. In other words, a non-Arabic-speaking enumerator would come in contact with an Arabic-speaking household, then returned to the local census office and passed the address to an enumerator who was bilingual to enumerate the census. Enumerators stated they would have “piles” of household listings assigned to them because of the language issue. Though most enumerators accompanied for this project were bilingual, their abilities varied (see Table 1), and there was no standard, translated census form from which to read.

Perhaps as a result, conceptual equivalencies emerged as the key issue of misunderstanding in the Arabic language interviews as the bilingual enumerators had to translate questions on the fly. Language aid material was not used because enumerators in many cases never received such materials. When they did receive the materials, enumerators said that people they interviewed rarely used them or could not read them. In one case, the enumerator herself could not read Arabic and so the research team members conjectured the enumerator may have felt uncomfortable presenting material to NRFU respondents because she would not be able to explain it to them should they ask questions regarding the language aid (assumption of a team member about E#1, who had not pressed the question of why she did not use the language aid material).

⁵ The English NRFU respondents were much less likely to agree to be audio-taped. For instance, one research team member did not get any of his 10 observations recorded. Another research team member forewent debriefing if the English NRFU respondent refused to be audio taped, so observed many English interviews before screening them into the study. A third team member secured about half of her English interviews to be audio-taped.

Two key issues emerged in our observation of the interpretation process: challenges in establishing conceptual equivalencies (time, middle name, race and ethnicity), and the effect of using children as interpreters.

Conceptual Equivalency: Time

Residence location on April 1 was a question that required extensive clarification for many Arabic-speaking respondents. When asked if living at residence on April 1, NRFU respondent sometimes needed to think about what the question implied, often interpreting the question as one about the length of time at which they had lived in the location in question and attempting to mentally go back to the actual date they moved into the residence. For instance, one respondent asked the enumerator to be patient as he thought about when he moved in:

- E: Were you living here on April 1?
R: No
E: April 1?
R: Extend your patience (Be patient or have patience).
E: I mean how long have you been here?
R: Have patience. I entered here in [October].
E: [October].
R: Since the tenth month.
E: [Yeah, OK]
R: Since the 9th-10th month.

One must consider how culture informed the interpretation of the question above. In this cultural context asking about one date in particular seems odd, especially if one has been living there before that date. In other words, a linear notion of time did not readily fit the cultural concept of time in Arabic-speaking cultures. The enumerator compensated for the apparent difficulty in comprehension by asking the NRFU respondent “I mean how long have you been here?” This follow-up question clarified for the NRFU respondent the intent of the question. Hence, it drew our attention to the conceptual understanding of this linguistic way of asking about dates. What was it that the NRFU respondent heard when such a question was asked, and was it interpreted as a potential threat? It may have been that stating a date in particular was not the norm for talking about and thinking about length of time. Arab culture has been labeled a polychronic culture (Hall, 1959), where time is unstructured, and thought of as being cyclical. Stating a date may have cued the NRFU respondent that there is some event, issue, or episode associated with the stated date. As a result, it may have ignited an attempt to dance around the question, or deny any association with it (until it could be identified what happened on that date). Asking a question about length of time in residence provided a sensible inquiry to the respondent, and then allowed the enumerator to infer from that an answer to the April 1 question.

Middle Name

Names in the Arabic language reflect a patrilineal system where the father is identified as the person responsible for the economic well-being and livelihood of the child (Ajrouch, 1999). As a

result, children are known by the father's first and last name. The "middle" name therefore is traditionally the father's first name, regardless whether the child is male or female. For example, a girl born into the Beydoun family named Rena, whose father's name was Samir, would be known as Rena Samir Beydoun. During the enumeration process, the concept of "middle name" was difficult to translate, and was referred to as "name of father." Interestingly, when this question was asked in the English interview, the enumerator requests only the middle initial (as opposed to an entire name). Hence, there was evidence to suggest that the translatability of the middle name concept proved an issue for the enumerator, perhaps as much as or more than the NRFU respondent.

(Field notes) --Enumerator asked, "do you have a middle name?" NRFU respondent answered, after giving first and last name, "No, this is my real name." E probed, "I mean is the name of your father on the ID? NRFU respondent responds by stating name of father, but assuring the enumerator it is not written on the ID, "The name of the father is A---, no its not there."

Ethnicity and Race

Ethnicity and race in the U.S. context involve specific socio-historical circumstances unique to the American experience. Indeed, immigrants to this country learn these categories as they acculturate and assimilate; in other words as they become American (see Ajrouch & Kusow, 2007). These categories of understanding were obviously not well understood among the Arabic-speaking NRFU respondents. In most cases, the enumerator did not probe re: race question. When a national origin was provided after the Hispanic/Latino question, race was skipped (often, though not always). Indeed, all enumerators had difficulty facilitating the question, and the NRFU respondent had difficulty placing the concepts within their categories of understanding. The bilingual enumerator would resort to asking in Arabic about "origin" as a means to ask about both race and ethnicity. Note the data below which demonstrates the difficulty of communicating the concept, and also a tendency to skip questions⁶:

⁶ Other supporting data include the following situations:

AM-18-A—Hispanic/Latino ethnicity questions not clear, and indeed after NRFU answers Lebanese, the E does not attempt to ask the race question.

AA-26-A—E does not ask the ethnicity or race question. She simply inquires as to whether they are Arab, and then explains she has to ask:

E: [ok, you guys are Arabic?] Arab?

R: Arab, yes.

E: [ok, I have to ask] (laughs)

She then goes on to ask if they live at that address, and for phone number.

AA-16-A—E does not ask the ethnicity or race question. She simply inquires as to whether they are Arab:

E: ok, for [race, we're gonna write--] Arab?

R: We are Arab.

E: Arab? [ok]

R: From Lebanon

She then goes on to ask if they have a mortgage or rent.

(Field notes) --Enumerator had to repeat Hispanic/Latino question, and then when NRFU said no, and she asks what origin they are, and he answered Yemeni, there was no attempt to ask about the legally recognized categories.

(Field notes) --Enumerator asked the Hispanic origin ethnicity question, asking them to look at the response card (which is in English, and NRFU respondent cannot read English), "It says here, look at List C. Are you from Mexican, Puerto Rican origin from your grandparents?" NRFU respondent answers, "No. No. Lebanese. The father and mother are Lebanese." Enumerator asked, "For everyone?" NRFU respondent answered, "All of us are Lebanese. My mother and father are Lebanese."

(Field notes) --For race, Enumerator asked, "What is your origin?" NRFU respondent answered, "Lebanese." There was no attempt to clarify asking about race.

In Arabic, racial classifications do not exist. The enumerator did not attempt to probe a racial answer, and it did not seem to be with NRFU respondent's categories of understanding as it related to him. The enumerator did not ask this question for each household member, perhaps sensing that the answer would be the same, given how he responded to the Hispanic origin question.

Sometimes the inquiry about ethnicity was confused with language spoken:

(Field notes) --Hispanic origin question understood as a language question...e.g., as what language do you speak, when the enumerator asked, "Now, are you Hispanic [stated in English], Latino [stated in English], Spanish [Espagne in Arabic]. NRFU respondent answered, "French." The enumerator clarified, "No, not the language you speak, for example, what's your origin?" NRFU respondent answered, "Lebanese." The enumerator tried to clarify again, "Yes, for sure you are Lebanese, but there's nothing (inaudible)?"

Interestingly, the ambivalence of racial identities felt by the enumerators sometimes emerged as s/he attempted to convey the meaning of the questions being asked. Though Arab-Americans fought to legally be considered white at the turn of the 20th century when citizenship depended on a "white" racial status (see Gualtieri, 2001), scholarly work on Arab-American identity suggests that Arab-Americans increasingly do not identify as such (Ajrouch, 2004; Samhan, 1999). The excerpt below signified how this may play out as a bilingual Arab-American enumerator attempted to explain what was meant by the questions asking for racial classification:

(Field notes) --Enumerator did not attempt to use an Arabic word to ask about racial classification. Instead she asked, "Now what do you consider yourself? White? Asian? Hawaiian, Japanese? [Enumerator laughs after this question]. NRFU respondent inquired, "What does that mean? I didn't understand." The enumerator attempted to explain using her own race and ethnicity as a reference point, "Like....uh....we're Arab, but they all consider us white. But there are

people who like to say, for example, they say they are white, but Lebanese or Iraqi, or--you know what I mean? So what do you consider yourself?" NRFU respondent answered, "Lebanese."

Above the enumerator said "they all." It is not clear whom "they" represents; is she referring to the Census? To the government? NRFU respondent's answer indicated she wanted nothing to do with the racial classification system, or still does not fully understand what it means, and so answered only with her national origin. In sum, these data highlight the ambivalence of racial identity classifications for the Arabic-speaking individual.

Using the English word "race" while conducting the interview in Arabic further testified to its unique meaning, and furthermore its conflation with ethnicity. The following excerpt demonstrates the difficulty the enumerator had to distinguish ethnicity from race:

(Field notes) --Asking the ethnicity question required using the English labels, and NRFU respondent responded with his own national origin. Note the following exchange:

E: ...Are you from the [Spanish]
R: No, no.
E: [Hispanic]
R: Lebanese
E: No
R: Lebanese
E: [No for Hispanic]. Lebanese. Do you think, when you write, when you fill out papers, do you write white or?
R: No, I'm blond.

The enumerator then had to further explain that some write "Arabic", some write "white". He then used the word "race," in English to reference what he was asking, "I mean [for race], you know, [race]. When you say origin." The NRFU respondent then responded as if he understood, "Ahhhh, origin." But then as the enumerator attempted to explain further, "Some people write white, some people write [American Indian]." The NRFU respondent responded by stating that he, "writes Arabic and English." Clearly the question was not clear. In this particular case the enumerator ultimately gave up, saying [ok, ok] and moved on to the next question.

In the case of the non-Arab white enumerator, asking about ethnicity and race involved other challenges. The team members observed that the non-Arab white enumerator did not record "other" when the NRFU respondent answered "Arab" or "Yemeni" to the race question. Instead, he marked them as "white," later explaining to us that the "Census considers Arabs to be 'white'." This data from the enumerator interview notes suggests that validity of data may be compromised when enumerators decide what the "correct" answer should be to the Census questions.

Interpreters

We identified two primary issues regarding interpreters: 1) All but one enumerator was bilingual, and so they overwhelmingly served as interpreter; 2) yet, they still relied often on children to interpret.

Reasons children were used as interpreters had more to do with the NRFU respondent than the enumerator. If a child was present, the NRFU respondent (not the enumerator) often asked the child to interpret. The NRFU respondent sometimes instructed the child to stand in for the parent to answer the Census questions. When they served as translators, they mediated not necessarily between modern standard Arabic and colloquial Arabic, but between English and colloquial Arabic. The child would be told the question in English, and s/he would then translate into colloquial Arabic for the parent. Translating occurred occasionally as well in the debriefings if the NRFU respondent did not understand the modern standard Arabic. The team member stated the question in English, and the child repeated it in colloquial Arabic to their parent. The child played many mediating roles, serving simply to translate at times, to answer a question, or to both translate and answer. For instance, the child answered questions when the parent simply did not know the answer (e.g., specific birthdates).

There was no Census form available in Arabic, and so enumerators always had to translate on the fly. Not all Arab-American enumerators were fully bilingual (see Table 1), and so they sometimes found it difficult to translate during the enumeration process. The non-Arab white enumerator did not use children, though the number of Arabic-speaking households he came upon were small compared to the other enumerators, who had been purposely assigned to such households. A reading of the transcripts, and listening of cassette recordings suggested that the interview process was much shorter, i.e., enumerators often skipped questions when the NRFU respondent did not speak English:

(Field notes) --Enumerator conducted the questions both with English and then translating in Arabic. The enumerator tended to be more informal with translation and not repeating the question for each person at times but this made it easier for the respondent to understand. Respondent identified himself right away as Yemeni. Respondent was born in Yemen. Respondent was able to speak and read English in a good level.

(Field notes) --Enumerator interpreted by asking the question in English, and then attempting to explain the question in Arabic. Enumerator had some trouble explaining questions in Arabic, but got through well for the most part.

When Enumerators translated on the fly, the interviews were shorter, and usually not every question was asked. The Enumerator “filled in” the blanks where they could instead of attempting to ask about those issues they knew would be most difficult to convey (e.g., race and ethnicity). When children were used as interpreters, the questions were revised to be simpler, but sometimes children themselves provided the answers while they interpreted. Indeed, one enumerator, who was not fully bilingual, was relieved when a child could be counted on to ask the Arabic-speaking parent the Census questions, especially if the NRFU respondent was in a

hurry (female enumerator accompanied by the male researcher), although another admitted that if and when children were recruited as an interpreter they often did not know as much (male enumerator accompanied by the male researcher), and hence made it more difficult to ask the Census questions, especially because the child often answered the questions stating that their parents did not speak English. Moreover, none of the team members reported that any enumerator ever attempted to verify any interpreter's language abilities.

In all, having children serve as interpreters introduced some inaccuracies, and occasional discomfort on the part of the NRFU respondents:

(Field notes) --Child entered the room as NRFU respondent was trying to provide birthdates of all household members. She provided the month of birth for her husband in Arabic, Kanoon, but there are two months with that same word, Kanoon al-awal, and Kanoon al-thani. She did not specify which one it was, and did not know what the English translation was. Enumerator then asked the researcher, and the researcher says he did not know. Enumerator asked again, and an 11-year old child stated, "January, 1." This child then went on to answer the rest of the questions when a month was needed. She often provided the day as well. Enumerator praised her as a "smart little girl." When Enumerator got to her name on the household list, she turned to her and said, "And you, D, how old are you?" The girl responded and then provided her complete birth date. Enumerator went on to the next child, and Interpreter answered that child's age as four. NRFU Respondent then interrupted, "three and a half year. No, in October he will be 4." Enumerator asked, "on October what?" Interpreter answered, "31, on Halloween." NRFU Respondent then interceded to let both Interpreter and Enumerator know that she would like to answer the questions, as Interpreter hesitated when asked what year, NRFU Respondent stated, "2006, she wants to answer. I want to answer." Enumerator laughed and remarked that Interpreter is a "smart girl."

4.3. Perceptions of Census

The perception of the Census was not easily garnered from the observation or interview methods employed. Overwhelmingly enumerators reported that the most challenging part of their work was convincing the reluctant NRFU Respondent to participate. Successful strategies employed by the Arab-American enumerators to convince reluctant respondents included stating the value and benefits of participating, reassuring them that there is nothing to fear, making it known that the enumerator him/herself is of Arabic-speaking origin (by greeting in Arabic and/or stating English names and words with an Arabic accent).

A highly unsuccessful strategy used only by one Arab-American enumerator (a male Enumerator accompanied by a male researcher) and by the non-Arab English-only enumerator involved informing the NRFU Respondent that participating is required. By way of contrast one female enumerator accompanied by a female researcher stated her approach was to never push the NRFU Respondent to do or provide any info that they were not comfortable giving.

Once the enumeration began and was completed, the NRFU respondents consistently stated they thought it was a good activity. During the interview process, however, questions emerged at times that suggested they harbored suspicions. The data presented below provide some insight as to how people understood and reacted to the key questions asked, especially those involving personal data such as names and birthdates.

(Field notes)-- NRFU Respondent, in the middle of trying to spell her name in English, which she cannot do very well and so she provides the letters in French, asks, "Is there something (i.e., a problem)" that has led her to come and ask the questions. The Enumerator answers, "No, no, no, every ten years they do it in this country." NRFU Respondent wants to know why, "I mean, why?" Enumerator answers that it is, "to see the nation's population, you know what I mean, to help for example." Enumerator then proceeds to collect names of all household members.

(Field notes) -- NRFU Respondent stated, as Enumerator proceeded to ask for names of all persons living in household:

R: If there is something behind this, we don't know how to speak English and we don't know how to go anywhere.

E: Ok (snickers)

R: If there's a problem—

E: [no, no, no, no, it doesn't] **spelling name aloud**

Note that both questions are asked as household members' names are asked.

Often the official reasons for carrying out the Census were understood as the need to count the population (e.g., Respondent states he knows the Census is to count the population, so we know how many people live in the country, and to show whether it is growing and by how much⁷. But

⁷ Debriefing questions suggest that the Census is viewed as a good thing, though there is some suggestion from the tone of the answer that such answers are given to signify that the respondent believes there is a right and wrong answer. There is also some attempt to answer as the respondent perceives what the observer [O] wants to hear. Note the responses via transcribed interviews:

TL-22-A—viewed positively, "It is a very good thing"

TL-19-A—Experience described as good, understood to be a means to learn population count, defined as "...good from all aspects."

AA-26-A—"good."

AM-18-A—unsure as to why he is being asked to define what the census does, but then relents to say it is a good thing.

R responds, "Who? The true goals? I am suppose to tell you the, what should be?"

O: Yes

R: With regard to the Census?

O: Meaning what do you think are the goals?

R: Good, very good, because the person becomes known. I used to live in Africa. I know that every 4-5 years they would do, this name was the Senestite (?).

At that point the E interjects to clarify it is a Census. Observer later asks about his experience with the Census in Africa, and NRFU respondent does not want to divulge any information about where he was in Africa, only that he left in 97. NRFU respondent states, "The name, of, its not important. What do you want with it? Let's stick to Lebanon."

questions sometimes arose, perhaps signifying mistrust, or fear. One way in which the NRFU Respondent and the bilingual enumerators navigated suspicion was to use culturally sanctioned means for evaluating people and situations. Inquiring about national origin and/or bridging familiarity with national origin characteristics when the Enumerator and NRFU Respondent--both of whom had ancestry to an Arab-speaking country but differed in national origin--helped to establish rapport, build trust, and position the Census activities as legitimate.

Why are we doing this and by the way where are you from? When the Enumerator was Arab American, national origin inquiries sometimes occurred, and helped put the Respondent at ease. The following data from field notes illustrate such an incident:

Respondent's wife asked, "so the government does this?" to the researcher. The researcher explained: "They do that once every ten years. They send you the form to complete but since we did not receive it we're here to complete it." At this point the Respondent asked the national origins of both Enumerator and the researcher.

The respondent above did not ask where they are from in a general sense, but asked specifically if they are Lebanese (he was Lebanese). The Enumerator reported that her mother was from Lebanon and father was Syrian. The female team member answered that she was Palestinian. The respondent asked: "from where?" and the team member reported from Bethlehem. Both Respondent and his wife commented on her origins: Respondent's wife: "Bethlehem is beautiful," Respondent: "It is Jesus' town." This positive assessment provided another step in creating familiarity and comfort with those who are there seeking to collect information on behalf of the U.S. government.

In the same interview, the NRFU Respondent, while waiting for his wife to retrieve her ID (driver's license) so as to provide correct information about name spelling, proceeded to ask Enumerator where in Syria her father comes. She reported the town, but then disclosed that he passed away 20 years before. The whole group stated together "God bless his soul." It was then established that the NRFU Respondent did not know the father, though he knew many people from Syria, no one from that town. The Enumerator responded by saying she found herself in

Census experience in Africa described as, "Normal, normal, everything was normal. In our country its normal, in African its normal, its normal."

AA-16-A—Its very good and necessary. NRFU respondent states, "Its good, but I am saying it is necessary. Every country should do a census to know its population."

TL-22-A--NRFU apologized for making them come to the house. Had he known that they would go to that trouble, he would have made sure to mail it. Identified as a way to know how many people are in the population, again identified as "a very good thing." NRFU respondent wanted to please TL, and said what he thinks she wants to hear.

AM-30-A—did not know what is purpose of census. Seems unsure about purpose, asked several times during E interview why she is being asked such questions.

AM-18-A—first time, no idea what purpose is

AM-21-A—states it is a government activity. Not sure which "ministry" (ministry is a term relevant for Lebanese government, equivalent to "department.") E interjects to clarify it is for the ministry of commerce.

AA-26-A—NRFU respondent states he thinks America uses this information.

the same situation, knowing many Syrians, but never having been to the town from which her father came. NRFU Respondent continued to inquire about her male connections by asking about her husband, where he was from and what work he did. Enumerator provided his name, corrected that he is her fiancé (not husband), and that he worked for a bakery. This response led the NRFU Respondent to ask whether he was a recent immigrant. The Enumerator reported he has been here for 8 years. NRFU Respondent's wife then proceeded to inquire whether both Enumerator and the researcher lived close by so they may visit her. She then wanted to know what would happen if the Enumerator did not come to "register" them. Enumerator answered they would come another time if no one was home.

Media and Mail

In terms of ever hearing about the Census, media sources were listed more frequently as a source of information than word-of-mouth. Approximately one-third of the English-speaking NRFU interviewees (slightly less than ½ were of Arab-speaking origin, see Table 2), had not heard of the Census before. For the other two-thirds, those who had heard of it, media (cable, newspaper, radio, mail and TV) and word of mouth (people generally, school) were their sources. Approximately half of the NRFU Arabic-speaking respondents had never heard of the Census before. For those who did hear about it, the media (TV, news, mail) accounted for about one half of their source. The other half stated hearing about it from other people (family members, co-workers) or via ethnic organizations including mosques and social service agencies.

It is important to note that even when media campaigns were effective in informing Arabic-language households about the Census, the NRFU respondents did not necessarily understand the procedure. Thus while one NRFU respondent responded that he did hear about the Census from the news, but did not understand the procedure that it needed to be filled out and returned. Reading mail was also challenging when household members lacked English literacy. It appeared that though mail was retrieved regularly, it was not always understood. Family members, neighbors, and ethnic organizations were relied upon, and aided in communicating the purpose and procedures of the Census:

(Field notes) --Difficulty in reading mail. Puts it on side for when son or daughter comes. Does not check mail every day—maybe three days a week. Did notice census in mail, but things that are not important he throws out.

(Field notes) --Interview went smooth, was recorded, Respondent answered all questions. Informant wife first wasn't very cooperative at the beginning but ended up nice and friendly. Believe that us being both Arab and Enumerator speaking Arabic helped to complete this interview. Also noticed in this case that Respondent knew what Census is all about, learned from ACCESS that they must submit those info believe to help with the Respondent's cooperation.

Arabic and English speakers varied in their reasons for not returning the Census. The English speakers overwhelmingly stated they were simply too busy and did not get to it. For example, one NRFU respondent stated that she did receive two notices to mail back the form but failed to

mail it back because she had been so busy with kids, school and other activities. The Arabic speakers, on the other hand, generally reported either that they never saw it, never received it, or most likely did not know what it was when it arrived in the mail. For example, one respondent stated as to why he did not return the form that he wasn't sure if he received the questionnaire, but he also might have thrown it away thinking that it was junk mail or misplaced it and forgot about it. A small group also claimed they had filled, and mailed it.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Forseeable Trends within the Arab-American Community over Next 10 Years

The U.S. has continued to receive immigrants steadily since the 1965 immigration laws lifted restrictions to allow those with non-European origins to enter in greater numbers. As already mentioned immigration from Arab countries increases when political unrest is high in the country of origin. Previous trends suggest that when refugees from Iraq (the first Gulf War) were relocated in the U.S., many voluntarily moved to metro-Detroit because of the existence of a vibrant Arab American community (see Walbridge, 1997). Given that the US is currently at war in the Middle East, it may be expected that migration will continue to the metro-Detroit region.

Data available from the U.S. Census Bureau, including the American Community Survey, suggest Arab Americans overall achieve socioeconomic success in the U.S. For instance, analysis of Census data by Samhan (2001) illustrated:

Arab Americans are employed in all major occupation groups, but 72% work in managerial, professional, technical, sales, or administrative jobs. As an ethnic group, they value education and have a higher-than-average percentage (36%) who hold bachelor's degrees. The propensity of Arab Americans to be business owners and professionals translates into a corresponding median income (\$39,580 in 1990) that also surpasses the national average. However, some new arrivals struggle economically, resulting in a poverty rate of some 10%.

Contrary to popular assumptions or stereotypes, the sizable majority of Arab Americans are native-born, and nearly 82% are citizens.

Given Arab Americans' long history in the U.S., they face similar challenges that other Americans will also confront over the next ten years including an aging population. Moreover, given the expected steadiness in immigration, it may be that older family members migrate as well to join their adult children.

The status of Arab-Americans in the U.S. links closely to America's relationship with Arab countries. Negative perceptions of Arabs in America have historically been linked to foreign policy initiatives in the Middle East, drawing systematic scholarly attention following the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Anthropologist Nabeel Abraham (1994) suggested that an Arab-American identity would have all but disappeared had it not been for the political unrest and the U.S. role in the Middle East region. Hence, some suggest that Arab-American as an identity is primarily

political (David, 2007). Given that immigration to the U.S. from Arab-speaking countries will likely continue due to global political events and instabilities in the Middle East region, political foundations of being Arab-American are likely to hold for the most part.

Interestingly, immigrants themselves seem more likely to identify with their national origin (e.g., Lebanese, Iraqi, etc.) than they with the pan-ethnic category of “Arab-American,” which later generations seem to more readily adopt. Individuals from the Middle East may identify themselves in multiple ways such as nationality, ethnicity, or ethno-religious labels (Bakalian & Bozorgmehr, 2009). As a result, solidarity through an Arab-American pan-ethnic affinity has historically been difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, Americans view those from the Middle East as one homogeneous group.

Though negative opinions about Arab and Middle Eastern Americans are not new, after 9/11 damaging encounters were no longer isolated and occurred in a more sweeping and patterned manner. Arab-Americans now more than ever before are asked to explain their political, religious, and personal beliefs, altering their daily lives in multiple ways. Arab immigrants hold a more precarious position in the U.S. than Arab-Americans who are citizens (Bakalian & Bozorgmehr, 2009; Detroit Arab American Study Team, 2009; Cainkar, 2009; Jamal & Naber, 2008). Legally classified as white, they straddle a world of privilege on the one hand, and discrimination on the other (generally through media portrayals, and directly especially when identifiable as having Arab origin). Whether Arab Americans ultimately gain a legally recognized racial/ethnic status (non-white) remains to be seen, and may hold ramifications for their position in U.S. society.

5.2. Specific Recommendations for 2020 Decennial Census Language Assistance Programs

Overall, methodological principles, procedures and protocols that would provide the best possible methods to overcome language and cultural barriers in data collection through face-to-face interviews among Arabic-speaking NRFU respondents include:

5.2.1. Language materials

1. Develop a fully-translated Census Enumeration Questionnaire, including response cards in modern standard Arabic.

The Arabic language team provided a translation of the Census form in modern Standard Arabic (not colloquial) during the training meeting in April. The team believed that modern standard (the type of Arabic used in newscasts), would legitimate census activities more than a colloquial version. It is suggested this translation be tested with Arab-American community leaders to ensure translation is “universally” acceptable. It is also must be recognized that Enumerators may need to use colloquial versions of the modern standard depending on literacy of the NRFU household. Nevertheless, a common translated survey will ensure more reliability and validity of data collected.

2. Develop meaningful way to ask about time, middle name, ethnicity and race in Arabic.

Develop and pilot questions that accurately ask about time, middle name, ethnicity and race using a cognitive interview approach with the dominant national origin immigrant

groups (Lebanese, Iraqi, and Yemeni). In other words, pilot these questions by having Arabic-speaking individuals think aloud as they answer the proposed question.

The questions on ethnicity and race are particularly important, given the overwhelming confusion generated by this question on both the part of the Enumerator and the NRFU respondent. There is only one ethnicity question on the Census form, that which asks: Is this person of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin? Use a translated version that carefully presents the specific question. For example, “origin” is a word translated easily into Arabic (many enumerators used it), but a carefully constructed sentence that specifically asks about Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin would ensure more reliable data. Currently, the Census asks: “What is this person’s race?” with various categories provided as responses: white, black, American Indian, multiple Asian choices, some other race. Since “race” is not a concept easily translated into Arabic, it may be useful to find a conceptual equivalent in Arabic, or simply use the English word, with a statement/explanation to the R that the English word will be used. The response categories should be translated into Arabic.

3. Consider developing training modules that demonstrate procedures for completing the Census.

Given that for many completing the Census was a first-time event, and confusion as to the proper way to respond to the mailed form emerged as a theme, the media campaign may want to develop modules that demonstrate, using people who look Arabic-speaking, how to complete the form and how to return it. Arabic-speaking immigrants may rely on satellite television, and so advertising with those outlets should be targeted and/or increased.

5.2.2. Hiring and training bilingual enumerators

4. Hire interpreters that are fully bilingual (can read and write) to accompany Enumerators, or be sure Enumerators are fully bilingual, especially women.

Women seemed more effective in facilitating trust. Being fully bilingual will be important for gathering reliable data so that questions are asked in a uniform manner. It should be noted, however, that interviewers may need to use the colloquial version (after reading the modern standard), to better communicate the questions, and especially if the R has low education.

5. (In lieu of #4) Provide training that specifically addresses the challenges posed by using children as interpreters.

Given the high occurrence of children as interpreters, training of enumerators could benefit the data collection process by thinking about aspects of the interpretation situation that may be controlled (Pan, n.d.). Following the recommendation of Pan, and in particular with the high frequency of children used as interpreters among Arabic-speaking NRFU households, two areas should be addressed: 1) training is needed for interviewers working with interpreters. As Pan illustrates, interpreters rely heavily on their memory to reconstruct the meaning of a survey question. Interpreters find it challenging to remember long sentences, and so interviewers need to know when to pause and break in the middle of a long question

so that the interpreter can accurately translate what is being said. This is especially critical given that answers to questions vary depending on how they are asked. 2) Think about developing a standardized procedure for identifying and using interpreters. Beyond knowledge of target language and culture, should the interpreter have the basic knowledge of how surveys work? If so, Census may want to consider training interpreters to accompany enumerators when fully bilingual enumerators are not available.

6. Provide training that facilitates securing legitimacy, yet promotes trust through culturally-appropriate conventions.

The Arab-American enumerators appeared to find ways that both facilitated legitimacy and promoted trust via their ethnicity (multiple levels), nevertheless including this as a formal part of training will allow for others to share their tactics and provide a “tool kit” for those not adept or experienced in this skill. The non-Arab-American Enumerator appeared to lack skills in both of these areas concerning NRFU Respondents, not just those who were Arabic-speaking. Legitimacy will be enhanced by having badges prominently visible, and (for Arabic-speaking households) speaking formal (modern standard) Arabic. Trust may be facilitated by allowing Enumerators to share their own connections to the communities/groups which they are enumerating.

5.2.3. Partnership program

7. Continue and expand work with community organizations to spread word about the census and its use.

The use of community organizations for aid and support among Arabic-speaking immigrants emerged prominently from the data. Given the disproportionate suspicion among Yemenis generally, and Yemeni women in particular, it may be especially effective to expand and work closely with Yemeni community organizations. Recruiting Yemeni women to serve as liaisons between the census and community organizations may be particularly productive. Additionally, the Census may want to consider working with community organizations where Arabic-speaking immigrants can go to the community center and receive help filling out the form. If this option goes forward, an Arabic version of the form should be available.

6. References

- Abraham, N. (1983). The Yemeni immigrant community of Detroit: Background, emigration, and, community life. Pp. 109-134 in *Arabs in the new world: Studies on Arab-American communities*, edited by S. Y. Abraham and N. Abraham. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Abraham, N. (1994). Anti-Arab racism and violence in the United States. In *The Development of Arab-American Identity*, edited by E. McCarus, 155-214. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Abraham, S. Y. (1983). Detroit's Arab-American community: A survey of diversity and commonality. Pp. 84-108 in *Arabs in the new world: Studies on Arab-American communities*, edited by S. Y. Abraham and N. Abraham. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Abraham, N. & Shyrock, A. (eds.) (2000). *Arab Detroit: From Margin to Mainstream*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press
- Ajrouch, K. J. (1999). Family and Ethnic Identity in an Arab American Community. In M. Suleiman (Ed.) *Arabs in America: Building a New Future* (pp. 129-139) Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ajrouch, K. J. (2004) Gender, Race, and Symbolic Boundaries: Contested spaces of identity among Arab-American adolescents. *Sociological Perspectives*, 47, 371-391.
- Ajrouch, K. J. & Jamal, A. (2007) Assimilating to a white identity: The case of Arab Americans. *International Migration Review*, 41(4): 860-879.
- Ajrouch, K. J. & Kusow, A. (2007). Racial and religious contexts: Situational identities among Lebanese and Somali Muslim immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(1): 72-94
- Aly, A. E. A. & Ragan, J. F., (2010). Arab immigrants in the United States: how and why do returns to education vary by country? *Journal of Population Economics*, 23(2), 519-538.
- Angrosino, M. V. & Mays de Perez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation: From method to context. Pp. 673-702 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd edition*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Bakalian, A. & Bozorgmehr, M. (2009). *Backlash 9/11: Middle Eastern and Muslim Americans Respond*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cainkar, L. (2009). *Homeland Insecurity: The Arab American and Muslim American experience after 9/11*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- David, G. (2007). The creation of "Arab American": Political activism and ethnic (Dis)unity *Critical Sociology*, 33(5), 833-862.
- De la Cruz, G. P., and A. Brittingham (2003). The Arab Population: 2000. Department of Commerce, Washington DC. Available online at www.census.gov. Retrieved August 18, 2006.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Detroit Arab American Study Team, (2009). [Citizenship and crisis: Arab Detroit after 9/11](#). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gaultieri, S. (2001). Becoming 'White': Race, Religion and the Foundations of Syrian/Lebanese Ethnicity in the United States. *Journal of American Ethnic History* 20(4):29-58.
- Hall, E. (1959). *The Silent Language*, New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Jamal, A. & Naber, N. C. (eds.) (2008). *Race and Arab Americans before and after 9/11*:

- from invisible citizens to visible subjects* New York, NY: Syracuse University Press
- Joseph, S. (1993). Gender and relationality among Arab families in Lebanon. *Feminist Studies*, 19(3):465-486.
- Naff, A. (1983). Arabs in America: a historical overview. Pp. 8-29 in *Arabs in the new world: Studies on Arab-American communities*, edited by S. Y. Abraham and N. Abraham. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Naff, A. (1985). *Becoming American: The Early Arab Immigrant Experience*, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Nichols E. & Childs, J. H. (2009). Respondent debriefings conducted by experts: A technique for questionnaire evaluation. *Field Methods*, 21(2): 115-132.
- Orfalea, G. 1988 *Before the Flames: A Quest for the History of Arab Americans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pan, Y. (n.d.). Development of Guidelines on the Use of Interpreters in Survey Interviews Washington DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Retrieved November 27, 2010 from http://www.fcs.m.gov/05papers/Pan_VIIIB.pdf
- Samhan, H. H. (1999) Not quite white: Racial classification and the Arab-American experience, in Michael W. Suleiman (ed.), *Arabs in America: Building a New Future*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 209-226.
- Samhan H. H. (2001). Who are Arab Americans? *Groliers Multimedia Encyclopedia*, Retrieved November 25, 2010 http://www.aaiusa.org/page/file/21b02cde94d4307c47_jsnmvy5dd.pdf/WhoAreArabAmericans.pdf
- Sengstock, M. C. (2005). *Chaldeans in Michigan*. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Sirkeci, Ibrahim (2005). War in Iraq: Environment of insecurity and international migration *International Migration* Vol. 43 (4): 197-214
- Suleiman, M.W. (ed.) 1999 *Arabs in America: Building a New Future*. Ed.. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Walbridge, L. S. (1997). *Without forgetting the Imam: Lebanese Shi'ism in an American community*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Walbridge, L. S. & Aziz, T. M. (2000). After Karbala: Iraqi refugees in Detroit. Pp. 321-342 in *Arab Detroit: From margin to mainstream* edited by N. Abraham and A. Shyrock. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Warren, C. A. B. 1988. *Gender issue in field research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Zogby, J. (1990). *Arab American Today: A Demographic Profile of Arab Americans*, Washington DC: Arab American Institute

Appendix 1

Debriefing Questions-English

- Q1.** Is this your first experience with the Census Bureau? Explain what your experience (elaborate) was like. **(If no)** Was there any difference between the last time and this time (i.e., written material in Arabic, translator, etc.)?
- Q2.** Describe to me the goals of the U.S. Census. Who do you think uses this information and for what purpose(s)? How does your opinion(s) (in terms of you uses the information and for what purposes) influence your participation in the U.S. Census?
- Q3.** Have you participated in a census in any other country? *(If yes)* In what country? In what year? Compare the experiences. Are there any differences?
- Q4.** Do you have any difficulties reading/understanding the mail you receive? (Can you explain those difficulties to me)
- Q5.** How often do you read/go through your mail? Who usually gets the mail in your household?
- Q6.** What were the reasons that prevented you from mailing back the Census form?
- Q7.** Have you heard anything about the Census before today (i.e., from community organizations? media)? Where from?
- Q8.** At any time, did you feel the questions were unclear? What was the cause of the confusion (not being clear)?
- Q9.** What helped you to overcome those difficulties (i.e., census printed material, interviewer, interpreter)? What suggestions would you make to improve your Census experience in the future (i.e., make it less difficult and easier to understand)?
- Q10.** Do you have any other comments regarding the Census that we did not cover in the interview?

Debriefing Questions-Arabic

Q1- هل هذه أول تجربة مع مكتب الإحصاء؟ ما رأيك بالتجربة هذه المرة؟
(إذا لا) هل كان هناك أي إختلاف بين المرة السابقة وهذه المرة (مثل إستخدام المعلومات المكتوبة بالعربية، المترجم، ألخ)؟

Q2- ما رأيك بالهدف الحقيقي وراء الإحصاء؟ صف لي أهداف الإحصاء الأمريكي.

باعتمادك من يستخدم هذه المعلومات ولأي أهداف؟

كيف هذا الرأي (هذه الأراء) تؤثر على اشتراكك بالاحصاء الأمريكي؟

Q3- هل شاركت بأي احصاء في أي بلد آخر؟
أ- بأي بلد؟ بأي سنة؟ كيف كانت تجربتك؟ قارن بين البلدين. هل هناك إختلاف بينهما؟

Q4- هل عندك (تواجه) أي صعوبات بفهم البريد الذي تستلمه؟
(هل ممكن أن تشرع لي هذه الصعوبات؟)

Q5- كم مرة تقر/تطلع على بريدك؟
من عادةً يستلم البريد في بيتك؟

Q6- ما هي الأسباب التي منعتك من عدم بعث الإحصاء في البريد؟

Q7 - هل سمعت عن الإحصاء قبل اليوم (من الجالية؟ منظمات؟ الإعلام؟)
أ- نعم-- من أين؟

Q8- هل كانت الاسئلة واضحة؟ في أي وقت، هل شعرت أن الاسئلة كانت غير واضحة؟
أ- نعم-- ما هو السبب لعدم الوضوح؟

Q9- ماذا ساعدك على تخطي هذه الصعوبات؟
(مثلاً: المعلومات المطبوعة لك من الإحصاء، المحاور؟ المترجم؟)

هل هناك أي إقتراحات تقدمها التعديل خبرتك الذاتية بالاحصاء في المستقبل -- مثلاً جعلها أقل صعبه، أسهل للفهم؟

Q10 - هل لديك أي ملاحظات ثانية عن الإحصاء التي لم نطلع عليها في هذه المقابلة؟