

TWO SIDES OF A SINGLE COIN? DIMENSIONS OF CHANGE SUGGESTED IN DIFFERENT SETTINGS

Luann Moy, U.S. General Accounting Office, Linda Stinson, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Luann Moy, USGAO, 441 G St., NW - Room 1826, Washington, DC 20548

Key words: cognitive testing, race/ethnicity

I. Introduction

The survey literature is filled with examples of both directed and non-directed probing questions, generally referred to as "cognitive interview" techniques, used successfully to study respondents' understanding of and reaction to the content of questions (e.g., De Maio and Rothgeb, 1996, Hess and Singer, 1995; Bates, 1992; and Esposito et al., 1991). Likewise, there has been much discussion about the reliability of these methods, including reviews of how and when they are used, debates over the use of "cognitive" techniques versus other pretest methods, and descriptions of specific protocols used in laboratory and on-site establishment settings (Willis, et. al., 1999, Presser and Blair, 1994, and de Maio and Rothgeb, 1996, Tucker, 1997). However, much of the discussion on the use of cognitive methods is focused on data collection at the household level and only a few authors have focused on the usefulness of this technique for establishment surveys (Goldberg, et. al., 1993).

Turning specifically to the literature of establishment surveys, the emphasis is often placed on the various protocols used to identify and gather information from knowledgeable officials. For example, Edwards and Cantor (1991) developed and described a response model for establishment surveys that treats the establishment's response as an 'information system' in which the respondent is asked to respond on behalf of the establishment.

The actual interaction between the respondent representing the establishment and the form/questionnaire requesting information from that establishment may be problematic. In many instances, the information required by the form/questionnaire is neither collected nor presented in a similar manner. This represents what Edwards and Cantor describe as the record formation phase in establishment surveys-- comparable to the cognitive encoding process for individual respondents. As they pointed out, "...the respondent must have encoded information about how to get the answer to a question. If the response is obtained from an information system, some set of steps must have occurred for the information to be in the system."

(p. 218). The authors go on to comment that respondent selection in establishment surveys is also a critical element, since establishment information tends to be highly compartmentalized and it is essential that the most knowledgeable respondent be identified and contacted.

Since establishment forms/questionnaires often request information that is retrieved from records, pretesting of the instruments is often conducted on-site at the establishment, rather than in a cognitive lab (de Maio and Rothgeb, 1996). The decision to go on-site to establishments is grounded in the belief that the information retrieval processes used by establishments can and will affect the quality of the responses. That is to say, dynamic processes such as the (a) records retrieval systems, (b) availability of colleagues for assistance, and (c) general working conditions can have as much or more influence on the quality of establishment responses than the individual who actually fills out the form/questionnaire. As pointed out by Edwards and Cantor (1991), the impact of such environmental forces (which also may be at work in regard to household surveys) are magnified for establishments surveys: "Thus, an establishment's environment may have even more effect on the survey response process than does the household respondent's environment on his or her survey responses." (p. 216)

The belief that cognitive interviews designed to pretest establishment forms/questionnaires are best done on-site at the establishment rather than in a laboratory setting has several practical implications. Since it saves travel time, it is generally less expensive and quicker to conduct pretests in the laboratory. However, if on-site interviews are more productive in identifying the information retrieval processes linking the individual respondent with records and other informed individuals within their system, then testing in the laboratory would not really be more efficient. In this paper, we examine one study where we are able to compare what we learned in the laboratory with our finding on-site at establishments, in order to reflect upon those conditions under which laboratory testing may be most useful. Using the proposed Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised guidelines

for administrative reports of aggregated race and Hispanic origin data, we examine and contrast the information gained from interviews with administrative personnel, in (1) government cognitive laboratories and (2) on-site at establishments. In this way, we hope to identify the contributions of the two sources of information.

II. Race and Ethnicity Study: Background and Study Design.

Before 1997, the OMB Statistical Directive 15 required that agencies report the number of individuals identified as:

- (a) American Indian or Alaskan Native,
- (b) Asian or Pacific Islander,
- (c) Black,
- (d) White, and
- (e) Hispanic origin or not of Hispanic origin.

The combined version included the categories:

- (a) American Indian or Alaskan Native,
- (b) Asian or Pacific Islander,
- (c) Black, not of Hispanic origin,
- (d) Hispanic, and
- (e) White, not of Hispanic origin.

In October 1997, these standards were revised, so that federal agencies should report the number of individuals identified as:

- (a) White,
- (b) Black/African American,
- (c) Asian,
- (d) American Indian or Alaska Native, and
- (e) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific

Islander,

- (f) Those indicating membership in more than one racial category, and
- (g) of Hispanic origin.

The task of developing reporting forms was a collaborative effort among committee members from the National Center for Health Statistics, the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. General Accounting Office, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Office of Minority Health, and the Department of Veteran Affairs

We initially began with a panel of experts who reviewed and made suggestions on an initial draft of a form design. From this, we constructed three aggregate reporting forms that we tested. The study design consisted of nine interviews conducted

in government cognitive laboratories with administrative personnel similar to those who would be using the reporting forms in the future. An additional series of nine interviews were conducted with similar administrative personnel located on-site at their establishments. During the course of the interviews, we asked a battery of standardized questions and conducted a debriefing session after each interview. The comments from test participants were assessed and the forms were revised accordingly.

II. Discussion of Findings

Three different forms were developed for testing (see Exhibits 1, 2, and 3). The process of developing these initial forms was a collaborative effort among the committee members, experts in questionnaire design and survey research, as well as policy and statistical analysts from the Federal Government.

Form RH-1 : This form was designed to collect every possible race combination generated from the five minimum race categories. These combinations are further classified under the column headings: "Yes, of Hispanic or Latino origin;" "No, not of Hispanic or Latino origin;" "No Hispanic or Latino origin information provided." This form represents a template for the information that could be programmed by an automated data reporting system. The categories can be easily altered depending on the specific race combinations listed.

Form RH-2: This form has two sections. The first section asks for aggregated totals for those who reported each single race, the totals reporting more than one race, and the total number of individuals for whom there is race information. The second section focuses upon the totals reporting multiple race combinations and asks the number of times each race was included in combination. As with form RH-1, these totals are further specified as "Hispanic or Latino," "non-Hispanic or Latino," or "no Hispanic or Latino information available."

Form RH-3: This form is similar to RH-2 in that it also has two sections, but it provides the opportunity to report aggregated race data crosstabulated with other variables (e.g.,

gender). The first section asks for the total number of individuals reporting each single race or a multiple race combination and this information was crosstabulated by Hispanic or Latino origin and gender. The second section records the number of times each race was mentioned in a multi-race combination and this information is likewise crosstabulated with Hispanic or Latino origin and gender.

It was these three forms that were tested through a series of interviews with respondents in the lab and in the field.

A. Lab Interviews

In total, 9 interviews were conducted in government cognitive laboratories. Participants included both Federal and private sector employees whose jobs typically involved the use of administrative forms. To test the usability of our draft reporting forms, test participants were given stacks of fictitious applications containing single and multiple race responses, as well as information about Hispanic or Latino origin. These ‘dummy records’ were used to see how participants would complete the forms using different kinds of source data. In one set of dummy records (referred to as the “Combined Form”), the Hispanic origin information was embedded along with the race information, as is typical practice among many institutions currently collecting race and ethnicity information from their constituents. Another set of dummy records (referred to as the “Separate Form”) used one question to record whether the fictitious applicant was of Hispanic origin and another question to record race. Examples of these questions from the dummy records are given in Exhibit 4.

After test participants completed their task of aggregating the information from the dummy records and recording it on either test form RH-1, 2, or 3, interviewers then probed for additional information on how participants understood and interpreted the various sections of the forms. Interviewers also asked participants to explain the meanings of the terms used and to identify any parts of the forms that were confusing, offensive or problematic in any other way.

In brief, the key findings from the laboratory interviews may be summarized as follows:

- Some respondents had difficulty grasping the concept of ‘multi-race’ reporting.
- Some participants treated “Hispanic” as a race and included it in the multi-race counts.

- Some participants were unsure how to report missing Hispanic/Latino origin information.
- Some participants were unsure how to report missing race information.
- An accompanying tally sheet could be useful for manual reporting.
- The forms needed detailed instructions with examples.
- The acronyms used in some versions were misleading and needed to be changed.
- The 3 “Hispanic information” columns on form RH-1 confused some participants.
- Section C of form Rh-2 was difficult because it requires “double-counting” of individuals.
- The layout of form RH-2 permitted users to identify miscalculations quickly.

While respondents, in many cases, understood what they needed to do, they still had problems with the words and categories on the forms. We began to see and understand that the participants who came into the lab were having cognitive difficulties with the forms because we were using categories and concepts (e.g., multi-racial) which did not match their own experiences. It was our first glimpse of the complex conceptual issues that lay at the heart of our own difficulties designing an aggregate reporting form.

B. On-Site Interviews

Our on-site interviews included public agencies (e.g., government agencies and jails), private not-for-profit organizations (e.g., private school), and private sector businesses. In total, we conducted 9 interviews on location at these establishments and, whenever possible, used their actual data-collection forms or computer-generated summaries of those forms to replace the dummy records used in the laboratory interviews.

For consistency, the on-site interviews were structured the same as our laboratory interviews and included the same questions. In addition, however, we were able to view the establishments’ data “processing” systems and learn details of their data collection processes. It was by going into the field and using actual establishment records that we quickly discovered the chasm between our draft forms and the source data with which these participants worked. In many cases, our test sites used 1977 OMB reporting guidelines (and included “Hispanic” as part of the listing of races. Apart from this common element, however, we discovered a

great deal of variability in the classification of race and ethnicity (see Exhibit 5 for examples). We also learned that race and ethnicity information is not always collected through self-reports. Visiting jails, we learned that the arresting officers made race and ethnicity assignments for prisoners in these particular systems, most typically on the basis of appearance. In the past, this had produced situations such as having a prisoner who spoke only Spanish and who had a Spanish surname and yet was classified simply as "Black." In another case, we learned of an administrative secretary who changed the self-reports of her clients if the information did not correspond with information she knew about the family and its history (e.g., she changed self-reports of "white" to "Hispanic" when she knew the individuals were born in Mexico, spoke Spanish and had a Spanish surname). While this information did not directly impinge upon our design and revision of the reporting forms, it did provide new insights into the quality of race and ethnicity data.

The findings from the field interviews may be summarized as follows:

- Some participants treated "Hispanic" as a race and included it in the multi-race counts.
- Some participants were unsure how to report missing Hispanic/Latino origin information.
- Some participants were unsure how to report missing race information.
- An accompanying tally sheet could be useful for manual reporting.
- The forms needed detailed instructions with examples.
- The acronyms used in some versions were misleading and needed to be changed.
- Some participants were confused by the 3 "Hispanic information" columns on form RH-1
- Section C of form Rh-2 was difficult because it requires "double-counting" of individuals.
- Some sites classify multi-race combinations as "other" and these cannot be disaggregated.
- The forms did not match very well with the participants' 'intake' forms.

Clearly the findings mirror those obtained during the lab interviews. In other words, conducting them on site at the establishments did not, in these particular cases, produce an advantage over what was obtained in the lab. By looking at the similarity in the findings between the lab and the field, we concluded that the problems with the form were

conceptual rather than procedural. That is to say, the difficulties resulted from the interaction of the respondent with the form and were not location specific or driven by establishment procedures.

Having said this, however, we did find one additional difference in the field which was a very important finding-- the forms we designed didn't match with the participant's intake forms. We could have learned this in the lab, though, if we had asked respondents to bring their forms with them. Nevertheless, going outside the lab did give us insights into the environment in which the forms would be completed, helped us estimate the length of time needed to complete the form, and the quality of the data the aggregate forms would be collecting.

IV. Comparisons of Lab and Field Findings

As mentioned, the findings from both the lab and the field were remarkably similar. While this triangulation of information was reassuring, it is necessary to reflect on the conditions that would lead to these similarities, since this may not always be the case.

- First of all, the task was conceptually simple. The forms involved only two variables, namely, race and ethnicity.
- Second, the problems were with the form design and how the individual interacted with it. Unfortunately, the forms appeared complex, with many lines and blanks for entering data, so that the respondents had to interpret the forms before they could complete them. Yet, the process of understanding how the individual interacted with the form was not dependent upon the location where the interview occurred.
- Third, since the central issues were largely cognitive and conceptual, they were not the result of information system retrieval problems. This is especially true for large establishments with many employees and state-of-the-art computer systems. For the larger establishments, it was mainly an issue of being able to convey to them how to program their existing variables; they simply needed "computer specs" rather than a form.

Thus the main difficulties were how to (1) convey to an individual the multitude of race and ethnicity categories that were being requested and (2) provide a conceptual bridge between their own racial

categories and those requested by the form. Consequently, the location for testing the form was as portable as the individual respondent with knowledge of the organization's racial categories. The work could be done in the lab or in the field. Doing the work in the field simply made it easier to collect copies of the various organizations' intake forms and racial categories (which they could have brought to the lab, if asked) and identify the appropriate person who typically would be filling out such a form.

V. Conclusions

While we were successful in uncovering many of the difficulties that respondents were having with our three draft reporting forms, we were not equally successful in discovering solutions to those problems. No simple answers or easy fixes appeared; the magic bullet never materialized. On the one hand, this may reflect the complexity of the task at hand. Designing a form that can be used during a transitional period between one set of definitions and a different set of definitions, may be an impossible task that has no solution. On the other hand, the fact that we uncovered problems without simultaneously discovering solutions may reflect the qualitative nature of the study. Since the work was largely exploratory, the study did not have a strictly defined experimental design that might have allowed us to clearly recognize causes and effects. Likewise, we lacked the systematic controls that would have allowed us to test various manipulations and generalize the results.

VI. What does this all mean?

The good news is that whatever we found in terms of respondents' difficulties with the forms appears 'real.' Where we conducted our interviews seemed to have few differences in our findings. The bad news is that despite the different settings where we tested, even with real data at hand, there were problems with the categories and the words on the form that we have not yet been able to overcome. We tried to improve the forms with better instructions and item labeling, but respondents still had difficulty with the separation of the 'Hispanic' category and the concept of multi-racial reporting.

In addition to these findings, however, we also learned more about the quality of the race data that will be reported back on our aggregate reporting forms. While we learned about the cognitive

difficulties respondents had with the form in both locations, by going outside the lab setting, we obtained more helpful insights about the way people are collecting the data.

REFERENCES

DeMaio, Theresa J., and Jennifer M. Rothgeb, "Cognitive Interviewing Techniques: In the Lab and in the Field" in Answering Questions, Seymour Sudman and Norbert Schwarz, ed., 1996.

Esposito, James, Pamela C. Campanelli, Jennifer Rothgeb, and Anee Polivka, "Determining Which Questions are Best: Methodologies for Evaluating Survey Questions", in Proceedings of the Section on Survey Methods Research, American Statistical Association, 1991, pp. 45-55

Goldenberg, Karen L., Shall Butani, and Polly A. Phipps, 'Response Analysis Surveys for Assessing Response Errors in Establishment Surveys', paper presented at the International Conference on Establishment Surveys, June 1993.

W. Sherman Edwards and David Cantor, "Toward a Response Model in Establishment Surveys", in Measurement Errors in Surveys, Paul Biemer, et. al., eds, John Wiley & Sons, 1991.

Presser, Stanley and Johnny Blair, "Survey Pretesting: Do Different Methods Produce Different Results?" in Sociological Methodology, 1994, pp. 73-104.

Tucker, Clyde, "Methodological Issues Surrounding the Application of Cognitive Psychology in Survey Research" in Bulletin de Methodologie Sociologique, June 1977.

Role of Respondent Debriefing Questions in Questionnaire Development

Wallman, Katherine, "Draft Provisional Guidance on the Implementation of the 1997 Standards for the Collection of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity", OMB, Feb. 1999.

Willis, Gordon B., and Theresa J. DeMaio and Brian Harris-Kojetin, "Is the Bandwagon Headed to the Methodological Promised Land? Evaluating the Validity of Cognitive Interviewing Techniques" in Cognition and Survey Research. Monroe G. Sirken, Douglas J. Hermann, et. al., eds, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1999.

Exhibit 1 - Form RH-1 (original)

FORM RH-1 For Use in Reporting Populations by Every Combination of Multiple Race and Hispanic Origin Responses

		Individuals who marked Yes, Hispanic Origin	Individuals who marked NO, Hispanic Origin	Individuals who did NOT provide Hispanic Origin Information
Individuals who marked <u>ONLY ONE</u> Race	1	White		
	2	Black/African American		
	3	Asian		
	4	American Indian/Alaska Native		
	5	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		
Individuals who marked <u>TWO</u> races	6	White + Black/African Am.		
	7	White + Asian		
	8	White + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	9	White + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	10	Black/African Am + Asian		
	11	Black/African Am + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	12	Black/African Am + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	13	Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	14	Asian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
Individuals who marked <u>THREE</u> races	15	Am Indian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	16	White + Black/African Am + Asian		
	17	White + Black/African Am + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	18	White + Black/African Am + Nat Hawaiian /OPI		
	19	White + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	20	White + Asian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	21	White + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	22	Black/African Am + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	23	Black/African Am + Asian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	24	Black/African Am + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
Individuals who marked <u>FOUR</u> races	25	Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat Hawaiian/OPI I		
	26	White + Black/African Am + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat		
	27	White + Black/African Am + Asian + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
	28	White + Black/African Am + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat		
	29	White + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
Individuals who marked <u>FIVE</u> races	30	Black/African Am + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat		
	31	White + Black/African Am + Asian + Am Indian/Alaska Nat + Nat Hawaiian/OPI		
Race Missing	32	Individuals who DID NOT provide race information		
Total	33	Count of total population (Sum of rows 1 through 32)		

Instructions for Completing Form on Race and Ethnicity

Race Categories and Definitions

- **White:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.
- **Black or African American (Black):** A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- **Asian:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asian, or the Indian subcontinent including Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.
- **American Indian or Alaska Native (AIAN):** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliations or community attachment.
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI):** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

Ethnicity Category and Definition

- **Hispanic or Latino:** A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

Instructions Prior to Completing This Form

Step 1 Classify individuals by the number of races reported.

- Individuals can report one race or more than one race. This form allows up to 5 race combinations to be reported for both Hispanics or Latinos and for non-Hispanic or non-Latinos.
- Items 3 through 7 include individuals who reported one race, followed by individuals who reported two races, and so forth.
- Individuals who did not report race or for whom race information is unavailable should be reported in Item 2.
- Individuals who reported race but did not report Hispanic or Latino origin (whether blank, missing, or unavailable) should be reported under the Not Hispanic/Not Latino columns for the appropriate race group.

Step 2 Classify individuals as Hispanic or Latino or Not Hispanic or Latino and report the number under the appropriate column.

- For purposes of this form, Hispanic or Latino origin is NOT a race category.
- Example 1: If an individual reported Hispanic, White, and Black, report this individual in Item 4, Line 4a under the Hispanic or Latino column.
- Example 2: If an individual reported Hispanic and no race information is available, report this individual in Item 2, Line 2a.
- Example 3: If an individual reported Asian, report this individual in Item 3, Line 3c, under the Not Hispanic/Not Latino column.

Step 3 Count subgroup entries into 1 of the 5 race groups as defined above.

- For example, if an individual reported Chinese and Japanese, count both as Asian. Report this individual in Item 3, Line 3C under the Not Hispanic or Latino column.

1. **Total population** _____
Should equal sum of Items 2-7 below).

Please enter the number of employees that represent the following race/ethnicity categories.

2. **Race information not available/not reported**
Total Hispanics for whom no race information is available _____
☞ Do not report these individuals below
- b. Total individuals for whom no race or Hispanic information is available _____
☞ Do not report these individuals below

3. **Individuals who reported ONE race**

Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Not Latino
------	---------------------	--------------------------------

- a. White _____
- b. Black _____
- c. Asian _____
- d. AIAN _____
- e. NHOPI _____

4. **Individuals who reported TWO races**

Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Not Latino
------	---------------------	--------------------------------

- a. White+Black _____
- b. White+Asian _____
- c. White+AIAN _____
- d. White+NHOPI _____
- e. Black+Asian _____
- f. Black+AIAN _____
- g. Black+NHOPI _____
- h. Asian+AIAN _____
- i. Asian+NHOPI _____
- j. AIAN+NHOPI _____

5. **Individuals who reported THREE races**

Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Not Latino
------	---------------------	--------------------------------

- a. White+Black+Asian _____
- b. White+Black+AIAN _____
- c. White+Black+NHOPI _____
- d. White+Asian+AIAN _____
- e. White+Asian+NHOPI _____
- f. White+AIAN+NHOPI _____
- g. Black+Asian+AIAN _____
- h. Black+Asian+NHOPI _____
- i. Black+AIAN+NHOPI _____
- j. Asian+AIAN+NHOPI _____

6. **Individuals who reported FOUR races**

Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Not Latino
------	---------------------	--------------------------------

- a. White+Black+Asian+AIAN _____
- b. White+Black+Asian+NHOPI _____
- c. White+Black+AIAN+NHOPI _____
- d. White+Asian+AIAN+NHOPI _____
- e. Black+Asian+AIAN+NHOPI _____

7. **Individuals who reported FIVE races**

Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Not Hispanic/ Not Latino
------	---------------------	--------------------------------

- a. White+Black+Asian+AIAN+NHOPI _____

Exhibit 2: Form RH-2A

FORM RH2A -For Use in Reporting Single and Multiple Race Responses Separately from Hispanic Origin

SECTION A AGGREGATE REPORTING OF POPULATION BY HISPANIC ORIGIN

If your records list Hispanic as a race and individuals did not select the Hispanic category, then they would be counted as “*Not Hispanic*” on line 2.

If your records include a separate question asking for “*Hispanic Origin*” and individuals omitted that question completely, they would be counted as “*No Hispanic Origin information*” on line 3.

Hispanic or NOT Hispanic Identification	1	Number of individuals who are Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish Origin	1	
	2	Number of individuals who are NOT Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish Origin	2	
	3	Number of individuals with NO Hispanic Origin information	3	
Total Population	4	ADD boxes 1 + 2 + 3 and enter sum in box 4 → →		4

SECTION B AGGREGATE REPORTING OF POPULATION BY RACE

If your records list “Hispanic” as one of the races, please do not count it as a race for the purposes of this summary report. Tally the races only as “White, Black/African American, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander.” Please do NOT include Hispanic as a race.

Example: Those who report that they are “*American Indian and Hispanic*” would be counted on line 8 with those individuals who marked “*American Indian/Alaska Native*” only. Their “*Hispanic Origin*” information would be recorded in Section A.

Single Race Count	5	Number of individuals who marked White only	5	
	6	Number of individuals who marked Black/African American only	6	
	7	Number of individuals who marked Asian only	7	
	8	Number of individuals who marked American Indian/Alaska Native only	8	
	9	Number of individuals who marked Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander only	9	
	10	ADD boxes 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 and enter sum in box 10 → →		10
Multiple Race Count	11	Number of individuals who marked MORE THAN ONE race		11
Missing Race Count	12	Number of individuals who DID NOT report race		12
Total Population	13	ADD boxes 10 + 11 + 12 and enter sum in box 13 → →		13

SECTION C AMONG INDIVIDUALS REPORTING MULTIPLE RACES. AGGREGATE REPORTING OF TIMES EACH RACE IS MARKED.

This section is for providing information about those who reported more than one race. The sum of lines 14-18 should be greater than the total population counts given in lines 4 and 13.

Example: Those who report that they are “*White, Black, and Hispanic*” would be included in this section of “those who marked more than one race.” They would be included in line 14 because they reported “*White*” and on line 15 because they also reported “*Black/African American*.”

Example: Those who report that they are “*Asian and Hispanic*” would NOT be included in this section because they only reported 1 race, “*Asian*.” Reminder: for the purposes of this form, “*Hispanic*” is not included as a race.

Count of TIMES each race was marked for individuals who marked MORE THAN ONE race	14	Number of times White was marked	14	
	15	Number of times Black/African American was marked	15	
	16	Number of times Asian was marked	16	
	17	Number of times American Indian/Alaska Native was marked	17	
	18	Number of times Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander was marked	18	

Exhibit 3a: Form RH-3A (original)

FORM RH-3A - For Use in Tabulating Aggregated Race Data

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



NOTE: For individuals who makred MORE THAN ONE RACE, also complete form RH-3B on next page

EXHIBIT 3b : Form RH-3B

FORM-3B - For Use in Tabulating Multiple Race Responses with Other Variables

AMONG INDIVIDUALS REPORTING MULTIPLE RACES, AGGREGATE REPORTING OF TIMES EACH RACE IS MARKED BY HISPANIC ORIGIN AND GENDER						
Hispanic and Gender Characteristics		Number of times White was marked	Number of times Black/African Am was marked	Number of times Asian was marked	Number of times Am Indian/Alaska Nat was marked	Number of times Nat Hawaiian/OPI was marked
Hispanic	Total					
	Male					
	Female					
Not Hispanic	Total					
	Male					
	Female					
No Hispanic Information	Total					
	Male					
	Female					

Exhibit 4: Examples of Race and Ethnicity Questions from the Dummy Records

Example 1: Combined Form

Race: Mark one or more

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 01 _ White | 04 _ American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 02 _ Black or African American | 05 _ Asian |
| 03 _ Hispanic or Latino | 06 _ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander |

Example 2: Separate Form

9. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

- 01 _ Yes
- 02 _ No

10. Race: Mark one or more

- 01 _ White
- 02 _ Black or African American
- 03 _ American Indian or Alaska Native
- 04 _ Asian
- 05 _ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

Exhibit 5: Examples of Race and Ethnicity Classifications Used by Establishments in our Field Tests

Example 1:

Select one:

- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- American Indian
- Multi Racial

Example 2:

Select one:

- Black, not Hispanic
- American Indian
- Oriental / Asian
- Hispanic
- White /Caucasian
- Other (select this for multi-racial combinations)

Example 3:

Select one:

- | | |
|----------|-------------------|
| Black | Black Hispanic |
| White | White Hispanic |
| Oriental | Oriental Hispanic |
| Indian | Indian Hispanic |
| | Unknown |