Slide 1

[MIKE]

Welcome, and thank you for joining us.
My name is Michael Bentley.
I lead the U.S. Census Bureau's
experiments and evaluation research
that we are conducting
to prepare for the 2020 Census.

[NICHOLAS]

Greetings. My name is Nicholas Jones.
I lead the U.S. Census Bureau's
research and outreach
for improving data on race and ethnicity.

Mike and I are here to introduce you
to the Census Bureau's recently completed
2015 National Content Test;
and the Race and Ethnicity Analysis Report
which was released on February 28th.

[MIKE]

We're very pleased that you've joined us
to learn about the results
of this important research.

This video provides a detailed introduction
to familiarize you
with the NCT research objectives, results, and findings.

Slide 2

[NICHOLAS]

To begin our presentation,
I will provide a brief introduction
of the NCT's key research dimensions
and share some background and context
on why we are examining these important topics.

After that, Mike will present results
for testing alternative versions of the race and ethnicity questions
to improve design and data quality.

Then, I will present results
for testing the inclusion of a distinct category
for respondents of Middle Eastern or North African heritage…

Next, Mike will discuss the results
for testing alternative versions
of question instructions and terminology.

And finally, I will bring together all of the findings
to discuss optimal designs for collecting and producing data
on race and ethnicity.

We're excited to share with you
how the findings from this research
enable the Census Bureau to provide
the most accurate and relevant race and ethnicity data possible
to the public about our changing and diversifying nation.

Slide 3

[NICHOLAS]

On February 28th, 2017
the U.S. Census Bureau
released the results from the
2015 National Content Test.

This test explored several promising ways
to improve our race and ethnicity questions
so that they better measure our nation.

Many Americans view "race" and "ethnicity"
differently than in decades past.

For many years,
we've conducted research on race and ethnicity,
and had ongoing conversations
with stakeholders across the country
to discuss our research plans.

These findings build upon our previous research,
and are instrumental in identifying ways
to improve respondents' understanding
of their options to report multiple race and ethnicity groups.
and collect more accurate data
on racial and ethnic self-identification.

To begin, I will provide a brief introduction
of the 2015 NCT's key research dimensions
along with some important background and context
as to why we are examining these key topics.

Slide 4

[NICHOLAS]

Our recent research on race and Hispanic origin
was prompted by a number of factors.

Leading up to the 2010 Census,
our research team spent time analyzing data
from recent censuses, as well as from the American Community Survey.

What they found was that, over time,
there has been a growing number of people
who do not identify with any of the
U.S. Office of Management and Budget race categories.

This means that an increasing number of respondents
have been racially classified as "Some other race."
In fact, in 2000 and in 2010, Some other race,
which was intended to be a small residual groups, was the 3rd largest race group.

This was fueled by the Hispanic population
not identifying with any OMB race categories,
who make up the overwhelming majority of those classified as SOR.

We are concerned that if no changes are made
to the way we collect data on race and ethnicity,
and the projected growth of the Hispanic population,
the Some other race population could become
the 2nd largest race group in the 2020 Census.

We know that the current race question design is problematic –
and not just for many in the Hispanic community.
Leading up to the 2010 Census, there were a number of campaigns
that race and ethnic organizations/advocates launched
to tell their own communities how to fill out the race question.

This led to developing the 2010 Census Race and Hispanic Origin
Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE).

Slide 5

[NICHOLAS]

It is important to note that the 2010 AQE research
is one of many of Census content tests

that were focused on improving
racial and ethnic data, over the past several decades.

Census content tests
are one of the main mechanisms
the Census Bureau uses to develop research questions
on the census forms,
in an effort to improve the data from decade to decade.

This graphic illustrates a history of the major race and ethnicity content tests
over the past several decades.

The Census Bureau is committed to improving the accuracy
of census results by researching approaches
that more accurately measure and reflect
how people self-identify their race and ethnicity.

The 2010 Census Race and Hispanic Origin Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE)
was fielded as the most comprehensive research effort on race and Hispanic origin
ever undertaken by the Census Bureau.

The 2010 AQE research was designed to identify strategies
for improving race and Hispanic origin reporting,
and to increase the accuracy and reliability of race and ethnicity data.

The 2015 National Content Test research builds on the extensive research
on race and ethnicity previously conducted by the Census Bureau
to examine how people in our society identify their race and ethnicity
as our society grows more diverse and complex.

This research acknowledges that a growing number of people
find the current race and ethnic categories confusing,
or wish to see their own specific group reflected on the census.

Slide 6

[NICHOLAS]

Some of our findings from
the 2010 AQE include:

• Combining race and ethnicity
into one question
did ___**not**___ reduce the proportion of Hispanics, Blacks,
American Indians and Alaska Natives, Asians,
or Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders.

• One of the most notable AQE findings was that
while the separate questions still had Some Other Race as high as 7 percent,
the combined question designs yielded a substantially reduced
Some Other Race population under <u>half</u> a percent.

And "White" dropped to levels
reflecting the "Non-Hispanic White" population
that we see in traditional separate question approaches.

Overall, when a "Hispanic" category is provided
as a response option with the combined question,
Some Other Race becomes one of the smallest response categories,
demonstrating that a combined question approach is more in-line
with how Hispanic respondents view themselves.

• Another major finding was that *the combined question
yielded lower item nonresponse rates*
than the two separate questions approach.

• The combined question *increased reporting of detailed responses* for most groups,
but decreased reporting for others.

• The combined question *better reflects self-identity*.
The reinterview study and focus group research confirmed that these reporting patterns were a
closer reflection of how people self-identify.

Slide 7

[NICHOLAS]

The AQE also included a series
of 67 focus groups with about 800 people
across the country, including Alaska, Hawaii,
and Puerto Rico.

• Across the focus groups, participants commented
that all race and ethnic groups
were **not** treated equally in the 2010 Census
and felt that all groups **should** be treated *fairly* and *equitably*.

• Finally, one common theme ***across communities***
was that many respondents **liked**
the **combined question approach**,
and felt it presented *equity* to the different categories,
as **each major group** received a *checkbox*, ***with examples***,
and a ***write-in line***, where detailed responses could be provided.

The overwhelming sentiment from the AQE focus groups
was a combined question provided fair and equitable treatment
for all groups with a combined question.

Additionally, Middle Eastern and North African participants
did not see themselves in the current race/ethnicity categories
and often recommended a separate
Middle Eastern, North African, or Arab response category.

Slide 8

[NICHOLAS]

All of this research,
dialogues with myriad stakeholders, and more
have helped us get to where we are today,
and that is what I'll discuss next.

I'll provide a quick overview of our primary vehicle
for informing content for the 2020 Census --
the 2015 National Content Test (or the NCT).

The 2015 NCT was conducted in the summer and fall of 2015,
with a Census Day of September 1st.

We employed a large, nationally representative sample
of approximately 1.2 million households, across the country,
including Puerto Rico.

The sample design for the NCT included oversampling of key population groups
such as Asians and Pacific Islanders, Middle Eastern and North African populations,
Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indian and Alaska Native populations.

We tested key census content areas for the 2020 Census.
And we connect the 2010 Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment research
to the 2015 NCT goals and objectives for improving data on race/ethnicity.

The NCT also included a reinterview operation
to further assess the accuracy
of the question alternatives.

The 2015 NCT is our primary mid-decade opportunity
to compare different content strategies
prior to the 2020 Census.

Slide 9

[NICHOLAS]

There are several main goals, or dimensions,
for the 2015 NCT
as it relates to race and ethnicity.

One dimension is **question format** –
as we continue to research the separate questions
approach and the combined question approach…

Another dimension examines the **response categories**
– by exploring how to collect and tabulate data
for respondents of Middle Eastern or North African heritage…

Additional dimensions pertain to the **wording of instructions
and to question terminology** –
through examining ways to optimize detailed reporting
and to improve respondent understanding of the options
to report multiple race and ethnic groups…

And, as an overarching dimension,
we are using **Web-based technology**
– with the Internet, smartphones, and telephone --
to enhance question designs
and optimize reporting of detailed racial and ethnic groups.

Next, Nicholas will discuss the question format dimension and preliminary results.

Slide 10

[MIKE]

Thanks Nicholas.

I'm excited to present the results of our research
on testing alternative question formats
for race and ethnicity,
to improve question design and data quality.

My presentation will illustrate
how different question format designs performed
in the NCT research.

Slide 11

[MIKE]

As Nicholas mentioned,
the NCT builds upon the successful strategies
from the 2010 AQE research
and undertakes further testing
to examine several key dimensions
for the questions on race and ethnicity.

One key dimension is **question format**,
as we continue to research the Separate Questions approach
and the combined question approach.
This dimension includes the overarching comparison
of **paper-based question designs** and **web-based question designs** –
with the advantage of **technology,** such as the Internet, including smartphones
and tablets,
to enhance question designs and optimize reporting
of detailed racial and ethnic groups.

Shown here on the screen are three examples
of question formats tested on paper in the 2015 NCT.

On the far left is the Separate Questions approach,
similar to what was used in the 2010 decennial census,
with a separate question for Hispanic origin and a separate question for race.

In the middle is the Combined Question with Write-Ins approach,
a format similar to what was also tested in the 2010 AQE,
which combines race and Hispanic origin into one question,
with distinguished write-in lines to elicit detail.

Finally, on the far right of the screen is the Combined Question
with Detailed Checkboxes approach,
which, again, combines race and Hispanic origin into one question,
with 6 detailed checkboxes and a write-in line to elicit detail.

Slide 12

[MIKE]

We begin with the race and ethnicity distribution
by question format.

One thing to point out
is that in all of our analyses
we are looking at the results
by each individual response mode –
paper, telephone, and internet.

We know from this test, and past research, and we will see the same in 2020,
that the demographics of respondents for each mode are different.

So we want to understand, for instance, if there are differences by question format,
but also if we are seeing similar differences across the different modes.

We are primarily showing the results by question format for internet respondents.

We'll note key findings from the other modes, when they are relevant.

Note that these are alone or in combination groups so they will add up to a little more than 100%
due to multiple reporting.

The blue bars are for the separate questions design,
the red bars for combined question with write-in areas,
and the green for combined question with detailed checkboxes.

The main takeaway is that

• **[CLICK]** Some Other Race frequency is lower
in the Combined question formats
than in the Separate question format

We also note, as we have seen in previous research,
such as with the 2010 Alternative Questionnaire Experiment findings…

[CLICK] that the level of White reporting
is lower in the Combined question formats,
which reflects more of what we traditionally see
as the non-Hispanic White population
in the two separate Hispanic origin and race questions.
Both of these results, again, are in-line with previous findings.

Slide 13

[MIKE]

Next, we look at the distribution
in a slightly different way,
with the non-Hispanic race distribution
in the middle,
and the Hispanic distribution
split into three categories

– Hispanic alone, Hispanic plus Some other race,
and Hispanic plus another major group.

Takeaways:

• **[CLICK]** The differences between Separate and Combined
seen here, is in part due to how Hispanic responses are edited,
but we believe they are mainly due to Hispanics
finding a category for themselves in the Combined Question.

In a combined format, many Hispanic or Latinos
just want to tell us they are Hispanic,
and not anything else.

• The non-Hispanic groups have similar levels of reporting,
regardless of question format,
particularly non-Hispanic White,
non-Hispanic Black, and so on.

Again, this is consistent with what we learned
in the 2010 Alternative Questionnaire Experiment research.

Slide 14

[MIKE]

Next, we examine,
for people who reported as Hispanic,
what was their race distribution?

So what were the main takeaways?

- **[CLICK]** First, most Hispanics
reported only a Hispanic response in the Combined question.
In fact, roughly 70% of Hispanic respondents
on the combined question just reported that they were Hispanic.

- **[CLICK]** There are large differences in Some Other Race alone
and Two or More categories.
This is due in part to differences in how Hispanic responses
need to be coded and edited,
but it's mainly due to the way Hispanics
answer the separate race question.

- For people who want to just report they are Hispanic or Latino,
many struggle with how to answer the race question.
Some are doing so in the Some Other Race write-in field,
while some will check White but also again say Hispanic in that write-in field, or in one of the
other write-in fields.

- **[CLICK]** Another key finding
is that there are no differences among the question formats
for Hispanics who identify as Black or other race categories.

This was a concern after the AQE results were released,
that for example, Afro-Latinos would not report
both Black and Hispanic at the same rate with a combined format.
As we can see, that is not the case.

Slide 15

[MIKE]

The next key metric we are looking at
for the analysis by question format
is the level of item nonresponse.

And here, I want to note
that we examined both missing and invalid responses;
invalid meaning they provided something uncodeable,
such as Human or Martian.

- Overall, nonresponse to the Combined question
is lower than nonresponse to the Separate race question

- **[CLICK]** Soft edits on the Internet instrument
do help reduce item nonresponse.
So if a response tries to skip a question online,
we prompt them once to please answer it,
but we do not force a response.
We found this to be very successful
in reducing our item nonresponse.

- **[CLICK]** However, paper questions yielded a higher
nonresponse rate for the Separate Hispanic Origin question
and the separate Race Question,
on the order of about 8 percent and 7 percent, respectively.

- Additionally, this is not shown on the slide, but among Hispanics,
27% skipped the separate race question on paper.

- This dropped to about 2% of Hispanics who skipped the separate race question online,
however that was still significantly higher than the overall level of item nonresponse for the
combined question format.

Slide 16

[MIKE]

Next, we look at the level of detailed reporting
for each major group. So, for example,
out of all people who identified as Asian,
what percentage provided detail
such as Chinese or Cambodian?

One finding from the 2010 AQE
was that the tested combined question
(similar to the NCT's Combined Question with Write-Ins)
elicited less detail for Hispanics.
That was primarily because the checkboxes were removed.

This is true here too, as you can see the red bar
is lower than the blue bar for Hispanic details.
But the new combined version with checkboxes seems to help.

• **[CLICK]** In fact, the Combined Question with Checkboxes
elicits the same or more details than the Separate questions format,
for every major group.

• Overall, Internet results are consistent with what we observed
for paper respondents and also for phone respondents.

• With one exception – the Combined with Detailed Checkboxes format,
on paper, showed lower levels of detailed reporting
for the American Indian or Alaska Native population.

We believe this a function of the detailed AIAN checkboxes
representing the broader conceptual categories of "American Indian," "Alaska Native," and
"Central or South American Indian,"
and not more specific tribes like Navajo or Blackfeet.

We're looking into this further, and also planning to take advantage
of the opportunity to test a slightly different design
for the AIAN category's collection of detailed responses in our upcoming 2017 Census Test,
which focuses on American Indian and Alaska Native populations.

Slide 17

[MIKE]

Lastly, we are now bringing in
some of the reinterview results.
We examined the level
of consistent reporting.

For those who are a given group
based on the reinterview,
how many identified in the same way
in the initial self-response phase?

Largely, the results were very similar
across the different question formats, with few differences.

This is a good thing; We want to be able
to elicit the same responses at Point A and Point B
for each of our Census data collections.

- **[CLICK]** We did see significantly lower level of consistency
for Hispanic respondents, between the Separate questions compared to the Combined with
Checkboxes format.

- Finally, you may notice that some of the bars are lower
for some of the smaller groups, such as AIAN, MENA, or NHPI.

That is in part because those groups
tend to be smaller in population size
and they also tend to be more multiracial.

So for example, someone who at one point may identify
as White and Native Hawaiian,
at another time may just want to tell us they are Native Hawaiian, and at another time may just
want to tell us they are White.

Slide 18

[MIKE]

In summary,
our preliminary findings show
that the combined question
with detailed checkboxes design
appears to elicit higher quality data
on race and ethnicity.

These findings are in line
with the results from the 2010 AQE.

Specifically, we found that the combined question
with detailed checkboxes design

- Did not change the distribution for the major race/ethnicity groups,

- Resulted in a decrease in Some Other Race reporting,

- Resulted in a lower item nonresponse rate
than in the separate questions approach,

- Produced the same or higher levels of detailed reporting,

and

- There was higher overall consistency in reporting for Hispanics.

**Next, Nicholas will discuss the second dimension
of our NCT research –
testing the inclusion of a
Middle Eastern or North African response category.**

Slide 19

[NICHOLAS]

Thank you, Mike!

This dimension of the NCT research
examines the response categories,
by exploring how to collect and tabulate data
for respondents of Middle Eastern and North African

Before we get started, I want to share a brief history
About why we tested a Middle Eastern or North African (MENA)
Category in the NCT.

Since the mid-1990s, MENA community leaders and stakeholders have urged OMB and the
Census Bureau to add a separate response category for MENA respondents.
These **grassroots efforts** have been **critical** to the testing of a MENA category.

The Census Bureau and all Federal Statistical Agencies follow the 1997 OMB standards for
classifying and tabulating data on race and ethnicity.
According to these standards, MENA responses to the question on race are classified as White. In
1997, OMB conducted a review and revision of the standards.
During this review process, a number of requests were received from the public to add a new
reporting category for "Arabs and Middle Easterners,"
but no agreement was reached on who should be included in this category.
OMB did not add a new category, but recommended that further research be conducted on how
to more accurately collect data for this population.
The AQE and the NCT were both part of this research effort.

Throughout these decades, the Census Bureau has been in continuous dialogue and consultation
with external stakeholders and MENA community leaders.
All of these conversations frame and inform our research.

Now, let's talk about **how** the MENA response category was tested in the NCT.

Slide 20

[NICHOLAS]

This graphic illustrates examples
of **two** of the many research designs we tested in the NCT.

The design on the left,
includes "Middle Eastern or North African" examples,
such as "Lebanese and Egyptian"
with the White category.

The design on the right,
places a distinct "Middle Eastern or North African" category,
or "M-E-N-A" category,
among the options for selecting one or more race or origin groups.

We order the race and ethnicity categories
based on population size,
with White listed as the initial category
as it has the largest population.

You can see here that the MENA category
falls between the American Indian or Alaska Native category
and the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander category.

We placed it here based on the estimated population size
from recent American Community Survey
ancestry data.

Slide 21

[NICHOLAS]

In preparation for the 2015 NCT,
the Census Bureau determined which groups
would be included in the MENA category
for the purposes of the 2015 NCT.

To do so, fifteen organizations
were identified that had published classifications
of the MENA region of the world.
The organizations included research centers,
universities, non-governmental organizations,
and U.S. federal agencies.

Next, after looking at these classifications,
we determined which countries were in the majority
– over 50 percent – of these classifications.

Nationalities and ethnicities
with origins in these countries
were included in the working classification.

Slide 22

[NICHOLAS]

Before we discuss the results,
let's take a look at the list of groups
that we classified as MENA for the 2015 NCT,
and the groups that were also oversampled
as they could be considered MENA,
by some respondents.

The Census Working classification of MENA
included all of the nationalities
that were in more than half of the 15 classifications we researched.

There were **19 nationalities**, shown here on the top of the slide, such as:

Algerian	Bahraini	Egyptian	Emirati
Iranian	Iraqi	**Israeli**	**Jordanian** Kuwaiti
Lebanese	Libyan	Moroccan	Omani Palestinian
Qatari Saudi Arabian	Syrian	**Tunisian**	Yemeni

We also included **11 transnational ethnic groups, general geographic terms, and pan-ethnicities** with origins tied to this region,
as part of our NCT working classification for the MENA category.
These groups are shown in the middle of the slide, such as:

Amazigh or Berber	Arab or Arabic	**Assyrian**
Bedouin	Chaldean	Copt
Druze	**Kurdish**	Syriac
Middle Eastern	**Arab** or Arabic	North African

Additionally, as part of our **oversampling for the NCT**,
we included groups that could **potentially**
be considered as MENA, by some respondents.
This included 12 additional groups shown on the slide, such as:

Afghan	Armenian	Azerbaijani	Cypriot
Djiboutian	Georgian	Mauritanian	**Somali**
South Sudanese	Sudanese	**Turkish**	Turkish Cypriot

Slide 23

[NICHOLAS]

Now let's look at some preliminary results
from the 2015 NCT.

Please note that for all the results
on the MENA category,
we are showing the results for all modes
because of the small MENA population.

This graph shows "Where MENA Responses are Reported by Presence of MENA Category."

As we get started, I want to mention a few points:

- The universe is people who reported as MENA in the initial self-response;

2) The light orange represents questionnaires that did **NOT** have a distinct MENA category and
the dark orange represents question designs that **INCLUDED** a distinct MENA category,

and
3) For the question designs that did **NOT** have a distinct MENA category,
the White category showed Lebanese and Egyptian as examples and as checkboxes (if using the
Combined Question with Detailed Checkboxes design).

For the question designs that **did INCLUDE a distinct MENA categor**y,
the examples of Lebanese and Egyptian were shown with the MENA category.

Additionally, Somali was included as an example for the Black category,
as it is one of the largest groups in the U.S. from Sub-Saharan Africa;
And Israeli was included as an example for the MENA category,
as it is one of the largest groups in the U.S. from the Middle East.

So, thinking back to the question designs that we just showed, where half of the sample included
a dedicated MENA category, and the other half did not, here are our main takeaways:

- **[CLICK]** Many people who are MENA
use the MENA category when it is available (nearly 80%)

- **[CLICK]** When no MENA category is present,
the MENA ethnicity is usually reported
in the White category (about 85%)

- We also see that there is less use of the Some Other Race category
when a MENA category is present

Slide 24

[NICHOLAS]

The next graphic shows the Self-Response
Reporting Patterns of MENA
Reinterview Population
by Presence of a MENA Category.

In this graphic,
the universe is people who reported as MENA
in the reinterview.

We note that there are too few people
in the "Missing/Invalid" category, to show those results.

The main findings here are that:

- **[CLICK]** People who identify as MENA
are not able to as easily indicate they are only MENA
when there is no distinct MENA category present. than when there is.

- **[CLICK]** Some people who identify as MENA in the reinterview
did not identify as MENA in the self-response return anywhere,
even when a distinct MENA category is provided.

This could in part be caused by this being a new category
and respondents are unfamiliar with the terminology.

It could also be caused by the small sample size of this group
and also that members of this group are more likely to be multiethnic
and may report they are MENA at one point in time
and may report, for example, that they are White or Asian at another point in time.

Slide 25

[NICHOLAS]

This graphic shows where detailed responses
that are **included** in the working classification of
MENA were reported by the presence of a MENA
category.

We are unable to show results for all of the groups in
the MENA working classification because of their
small sample sizes.

Even with our large NCT oversample,
we recognize that many of these groups
have very small populations in the United States.

The detailed groups included in this graph
are included as either detailed checkboxes or examples
in the various questionnaire designs when a MENA category was included.

[CLICK] First, we look at detailed reporting of these groups
when there was no MENA category included.

As a reminder, in questionnaire designs without a MENA category,
the White category included Lebanese and Egyptian
as examples or detailed checkboxes.

PINK indicates the response was provided in the White category.
GREEN indicates the response was provided in the Some Other Race category.
BLUE indicates the response was provided in the Black or African American category.
And **GRAY** indicates the response was provided in Another category,
such as Asian, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,
or American Indian or Alaskan Native.

**A major takeaway is that people who identify
with the detailed MENA groups in the working classification,
identify as White when no MENA category is available.**

For example, when no MENA category was available,
[CLICK] about 80% of Iranians provided this detail in the White category.
[CLICK] Similarly, over 96% of Algerians provided their detail
in the White category when no MENA category was available.

Next, **[CLICK]** on the right side of the slide,
we look at detailed reporting of the same groups

when a MENA category is included.

The ORANGE indicates the response was provided in the MENA category.

**People who identify with detailed MENA groups
in the working classification
use the MENA category when it is available.**

Looking at the same groups we did earlier…

[CLICK] When there was a MENA category,
85% of Iranians provided their detail in the MENA category.

[CLICK] We also see that over 80% of Algerians
provided their detail in the MENA category.

[CLICK – show both graphs again]

The major takeaway from this
is that groups in the MENA classification
identify as MENA using the MENA category,
when the MENA category is available.

Slide 26

[NICHOLAS]

Now let's examine how groups
NOT in the MENA working classification,
reported their detailed ethnicities
by the presence of a MENA category.

Remember that we oversampled for groups
that some people may consider to be MENA.

The detailed groups included in this graph
are groups that are not in the MENA working classification
but that were included in the MENA oversample.
These groups were recommended to us by stakeholders,
researchers, and through the Federal Register Notice comment process
as groups that should be considered for inclusion in a MENA classification.

Like in the previous graphic, we are not able to show results for all of the groups in the MENA
oversample, because of their small population size in the U.S.

[CLICK] First, we look at detailed reporting of these groups
when there was no MENA category included.
**In general, people who identify with detailed groups
in the MENA oversample identify as either White or Black.**

For example, when no MENA category is available,
[CLICK] about 90% of Armenians provided this detail in the White category.
[CLICK] We also see that about 98% of Somalis provided their detail
in the Black category when no MENA category was available.
Again, as we noted, Somali was an example for the Black category.

[CLICK] Next, on the right side of the slide, we look at detailed reporting
of the same groups when a MENA category is included.

**Overall, people who identify with groups in the oversample
do not use the MENA category when it is available.**
Let's look again at Armenian and Somali respondents.

[CLICK] For Armenian respondents, we see that about 70%
reported in the White category, while the other 30% reported in MENA
and other categories, such as Asian or Some Other Race.

[CLICK] For Somali respondents, 94% reported in the Black category
even when a MENA category is included.

Slide 27

[NICHOLAS]

In summary, our preliminary findings show
that the use of a distinct
Middle Eastern or North African category
appears to elicit higher quality data
for people who identify
as Middle Eastern or North African.

Specifically, the results show that…

- People who identify as MENA use the MENA category when it is available

- People who identify as MENA have trouble identifying as only MENA
when no category is available

- The nationalities and ethnicities in the 2015 NCT
working classification of MENA
identified as MENA when the category was available

AND

- The nationalities and ethnicities in the MENA oversample
did not identify as MENA when the category was available.

Next, Mike will discuss how we examined
alternative wording of instructions
as well as question terminology
in the NCT research.

Slide 28

[MIKE]

Thank you.

As alluded to by Nicholas,

I will be discussing the ways

that we explored

how to improve the instruction wording

and question terminology

with the 2015 NCT research.

Slide 29

[MIKE]

Regarding the instructions and terminology dimension,
this slide shows what we tested in the NCT.

For instruction wording,
we tested the traditional
instructions of
"Mark [X] one or more boxes"
against instructions to
"Mark all boxes that apply..."
without the [X]
along with noting, "…you may report more than one group."

For question terminology,
we tested the traditional
"What is your race or origin?" terminology

versus "What is your race or ethnicity?"
 versus having no conceptual terms at all,
and instead asking,
"Which categories describe you?"

Slide 30

[NICHOLAS]

Before being implemented in the field,
all Census materials and questionnaires
must be developed and tested
to make certain that messages
and communications are culturally appropriate,
accurately reflect intent, and are accessible to everyone,
including individuals who speak languages other than English.

In other words, all materials and questionnaires
go through cognitive testing and usability testing.

For the 2015 National Content Test,
the Census Bureau's Center for Survey Measurement and RTI International
conducted cognitive and usability testing
in both English and Spanish:

40 of the interviews were with Spanish-speaking respondents
to explore how they understood the translated question terminology

[CLICK]

of **ethnicity**:
"What is Person 1's race or ethnicity?"
– *¿Cuál es la **raza** o el **origen étnico** de Persona 1?*

and **categories**
"Which categories describe Person 1?"
– *¿Cuáles de estas **categorías** describen a Persona 1?*

The qualitative research found similar results in Spanish,
for both ethnicity and categories.

[CLICK] For ethnicity in Spanish,
respondents indicated that the terms ***raza*** (race) and ***origen étnico*** (ethnicity):

"had the same meaning,"
and were interpreted as one's "roots,"
"where [a person] was born," and one's "ancestry."

In the Spanish-language testing, some of the respondents
indicated that the term ***categorías*** meant:

a "hierarchal listing of options in which
ordering of the options implied ranking,"
a meaning not found in its English translation,

"a hierarchical order or ranking rather than a natural list of options,"
and, a "social status or hierarchy"

Therefore, based on this qualitative research,
we decided to move forward with the
terminology of "race" and "ethnicity."

Slide 31

[MIKE]

In addition to new instructions, we can say that
the Race/Ethnicity terminology elicits
higher quality data.

Specifically, the results show that…

‒ Only one major race/ethnicity group had a significant difference when instructions were changed from old to new with the Race/Origin terminology; all other distributions were not statistically significant

‒ The new instructions performed better for reporting multiple groups; all other distributions were not statistically significant

‒ Qualitative research findings show that Race/Ethnicity terminology was better understood than Categories terminology in Spanish

**Now I'll hand the presentation over to Nicholas
to discuss our conclusions and next steps for the research.**

Slide 32

[NICHOLAS]

Thank you Mike!

The 2015 NCT provides
the critical opportunity
to compare the success
of different question designs
to determine how they perform
in new web-based data collection methods
using the Internet, smartphone,
and telephone response options.

Following the goals of a reengineered 2020 Census,
our main focus is on testing the fully factorial components
of each dimension via web-based designs.
Each component is included in the various paths
of the web-based designs so that every scenario is tested.

We examined the results
that each of the presenters described in detail today,
to determine which design versions
performed better than others.

As the decisions
for the different research dimensions are made,
they guide us to a pointed outcome
on which question design performs best.

Slide 33

[NICHOLAS]

As described earlier in the briefing,
our main finding regarding question format
dimension demonstrated that the
Combined Question with Detailed Checkboxes
performed best.

As part of our ongoing work
with OMB and the IWG,
the Census Bureau and other agencies
will discuss the NCT results,
other data inputs,
and feedback from the public
through the federal register notice process.

Ultimately, OMB will decide
how to move forward
with guidance on question format
for race and ethnicity.

Slide 34

[NICHOLAS]

Another dimension of the NCT research
was to evaluate the testing
of a MENA category.

Half of the NCT designs
tested an design approach
without a distinct MENA category.

The other half of the designs
all tested a design approach
where a distinct MENA category
was included in the question.

The NCT research demonstrated
that including a dedicated
"Middle Eastern or North African"
response category
performed best.

Again, ultimately
be up to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
to determine if the MENA category will be a
minimum reporting category that is distinct from the White category.

Under the current OMB Standards on Race and Ethnicity,
MENA responses are aggregated to the White category.
OMB is currently conducting a review of these standards,
and it will be OMB's decision as to whether or not
MENA will become a new minimum reporting category
outside of the White category.

Slide 35

[NICHOLAS]

Another dimension of the NCT research
was to evaluate the testing
of old instructions and new instructions.

Half of the NCT designs
tested a design approach
<u>with old instructions</u>
to ***Mark one or more boxes***.

The other half of the designs
employed **<u>new instructions</u>**
to ***Mark all boxes that apply***
and ***Note, more than one group may be selected***.

Based on the NCT research,
we have determined that the
new instructions to "Select all boxes that apply"
and *Note, more than one group may be selected*.
performed best.

Slide 36

[NICHOLAS]

The final dimension of the NCT research
evaluated the analytical questions
for the dimension regarding
the use of different terminology
to collect data on race and ethnicity.

We examined which format performed best
(race/origin vs. race/ethnicity
vs. no terms at all – categories).

The terminology approach with "Race/Ethnicity"
and the use of question approaches
where no terms were employed ("categories")
both performed as well as the Race/Origin question terminology.

But a decision needed to be made about which terminology
should be employed for future data collections.

NCT cognitive and usability research indicated
that the use of "categories"
in data collections conducted in Spanish
caused some confusion among Spanish-speaking respondents,
who thought "categories"
presented a more hierarchical ordering of groups
rather than a list of options.

Therefore, based on both NCT statistical research
and cognitive research, we have determined that the
terminology of **Race/Ethnicity** performed best for the
combined question terminology, in both English
and Spanish data collections.

Slide 37

[NICHOLAS]
Finally, we will discuss what we learned from this research
about the optimal elements for race/ethnicity data…
What this slide depicts is a new image
of how all of these elements come together in one design.

[CLICK] The combined question with detailed
checkboxes design supported the research objectives of increasing reporting
within the current standard OMB categories,
decreasing item nonresponse, improving accuracy and reliability,
and achieving similar or higher levels of detailed reporting for all major groups.
The results of this research indicate that the optimal question format
is a combined question with detailed checkboxes design.

[CLICK] The results of this research indicate that it is optimal to use a dedicated
"Middle Eastern or North African" response category. Under the current
OMB Standards on Race and Ethnicity, MENA responses are aggregated
to the White category. OMB is currently conducting a review of these standards,
and it will ultimately be OMB's decision as to whether or not MENA
will become a new minimum reporting category that is distinct from the White category.

[CLICK] The results of this research indicate that it is optimal to use the new instructions
to "Mark all that apply" (instruction wording for paper data collections)
and to "Select all that apply" (instruction wording for Internet data collections).
These new instructions performed as well, or in some instances better than,
the old instructions to "Mark [X] one or more boxes"
(instruction wording for paper data collections)
or to "Select one or more boxes" (instruction wording for Internet data collections)
for the reporting of multiple race/ethnicity groups.
In addition, the new instructions yielded similar
or higher consistency in the reporting of major race/ethnicity groups.

[CLICK] The results of this research, in conjunction with previous qualitative research,
indicate that it is optimal to use the Race/Ethnicity terminology for the combined question.
The terminology approach with "Race/Ethnicity" and the use of question approaches
where no terms were employed ("categories") both performed as well as the Race/Origin
question terminology. But a decision needed to be made about which terminology
should be employed for future data collections. NCT cognitive and usability research
indicated that the use of "categories" in data collections conducted in Spanish
 caused some confusion among Spanish-speaking respondents who thought
"categories" presented a more hierarchical ordering of groups rather than a list of options.

we use the instruction to "*Mark all boxes that apply*,"

and we use the terminology "*race or ethnicity*" for the question stem.

You can see all of these elements in the question design.

Slide 38

[MIKE]

Thank you Nicholas!

Finally, let's discuss next steps.

Slide 39

[MIKE]
We have released the final results
from the 2015 NCT research on race and ethnicity
on our Census Bureau website.

**We encourage you to read the report
and to learn more about the findings.**

To access the report,
please visit: www.census.gov/2020census

Then, select the 2020 Census Memorandum Series link

And open the report, which is titled,
2015 National Content Test
Race and Ethnicity Analysis Report.

Slide 40

[NICHOLAS]

This extensive 2015 NCT research study has successfully built upon years of empirical research, coupled with collaboration, outreach, and engagement with organizations like those you see here.

Feedback, questions, and encouragement from stakeholders and the public
has enabled this research to reach the point where it is today.

Collectively, this research and engagement
will help ensure that the 2020 Census is in the best position
to collect and produce the highest quality statistics about our nation's diverse population.

As we move forward, we will continue to meet with stakeholders
about this important research,
and discuss the results with them
to receive feedback as we develop plans
for the 2020 Census content on race and ethnicity.

We would like to engage with you too!
Please share your thoughts and feedback with us.

As part of our ongoing work with
the U.S. Office of Management and Budget
and the Federal Interagency Working Group,
the Census Bureau and other agencies
will be in dialogues with OMB about the NCT results,
other data inputs, and feedback from the public
through the federal register notice process
to discuss and develop solutions to recommend to OMB.

Ultimately, OMB will decide how to move forward
with guidance on question format for race and ethnicity.

Final question wording on the 2020 Census content
must be submitted to Congress by April 2018.

This research, collaboration, outreach, and engagement
will help ensure that the 2020 Census
provides the highest-quality statistics
about our nation's diverse population.

We encourage you to stay involved
and let us know what you think about this important research.

Slide 41

[MIKE]

If you have any questions,
or if your organization
would like to become involved
and talk with us about the research findings,
please contact our Public Information Office
on 301.763.3030

or via email at pio@census.gov

Thank you for joining us today!

We hope this presentation has helped to
introduce you with the results
of the 2015 NCT research on race and ethnicity.

Thank you for your interest in the 2015 NCT research.