

Asians - are they the same? Findings from cognitive interviews with Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese Americans

Hyunjoo Park¹, Virginia Wake Yelei²

¹RTI International, 6110 Executive Blvd. #902, Rockville, MD

²U.S. Census Bureau, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC

Abstract

The Asian and Hispanic populations in the U.S. have grown at much faster rates than the U.S. population as a whole. Many government surveys have included Spanish translations in response to the increasing size of Hispanic populations. However, monolingual speakers of Asian languages are rarely included in U.S. surveys, despite their population growth. As a result, our understanding of surveys administered in Asian languages is limited.

The focus of this paper is to illustrate issues in conveying intended meanings in translated messages and to compare how similar and/or different the issues are across three Asian language groups. It also aims to explore how these issues are related to linguistic, social, and cultural factors unique to the Asian groups under observation. This study expands the previous research (Park and Pan, 2007) of the findings from Chinese and Korean cognitive interviews by adding Vietnamese cognitive interview data.

The findings show that basic challenges pertained to the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese respondents; however, there are findings unique to each group. While most participants in these language groups missed important messages presented in the testing materials, each language group showed different reactions to informed consent messages. Also, the Chinese and the Vietnamese participants showed unfamiliarity with the concept of a survey, thus exhibiting difficulty understanding messages related to a survey event. Further, some terms used in the Vietnamese translation evoked negative social association, possibly due to the participants' immigration background. These findings demonstrate the importance of taking cultural differences into account when dealing with different Asian population groups.

Key Words: cognitive interview, American Community Survey, translation, multilingual and cultural issues

1. Introduction

The Asian populations in the U.S. have grown faster rates than the U.S. population as a whole. According to American Community Survey (ACS) statistics, the Asian and Hispanic populations in the U.S. have grown at much faster rates than the U.S. population as a whole. Their annual population growth rates between 2004 and 2005 were 3.3% and 3.0% respectively, which is three times that of the total population.

Many government surveys have included Spanish translations in response to the increasing size of Hispanic populations. However, monolingual speakers of Asian languages are rarely included in U.S. surveys, despite their population growth. As a result, our understanding of surveys administered in Asian languages is limited.

Literature shows that cognitive testing is useful and informative in pretesting cross-cultural survey instruments (Goerman, 2005; Pan, 2004; Smith in Presser et al., 2004). Cognitive interviews can help uncover how cultural differences affect respondents' cognitive processing when they respond to survey questions. Through the review of cognitive interview data with monolingual Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese speakers, we examined if the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese Americans are the same as or different from respondents to surveys and cognitive interview pretests. The purpose of this paper is to examine their understanding of messages presented to respondents concerning participation in the ACS.

This paper presents the findings from cognitive interview projects in Asian languages undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2006 and 2008, which took a rigorous approach to conducting pretests of translated survey supporting materials. In these projects, we tested survey materials that were translated into Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese, to evaluate how monolingual speakers as participants of the three language groups reacted to and perceived the translated messages.

We illustrate issues in conveying intended meanings in translated messages and compare how similar and/or different the issues are across the three language groups. Our discussion focuses on cultural factors and their effect on survey responses. From our review, we found that these three groups of Asian monolingual speakers have similar reactions to the ACS key messages in general, due to shared cultural and historical development. However, each language group has its unique reactions to specific messages as well due to the linguistic, social, and cultural differences among them. Recommendations and future research are also discussed.

2. Methodology

Our research is based on cognitive interview data with monolingual Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese American respondents from two research projects conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2006 and 2008. The goal of these projects was to examine monolingual respondents' understanding of the main messages used in the translated American Community Survey supporting materials. The specific documents selected for inclusion in the cognitive interviews were the ACS Introductory Letter, Thank You Letter, Q&A Brochure, and Informational Brochure. These materials were designed to explain the purpose of the survey, the uses of the data, the assurances of privacy and confidentiality,

and the mandatory nature of the survey. In order to complete each cognitive interview within one hour or so, we used two sets of supporting materials (either a combination of Introductory Letter and Informational Brochure or a combination of Thank You Letter and Q&A Brochure).

The project team interviewed 72 monolingual adult respondents (24 interviews in each language) in different regions: Washington, DC Metropolitan Area, Chicago, IL Metropolitan Area, Madison, WI, and Raleigh, NC. These locations were chosen strategically because they were geographically close to the research teams, which helped control overall costs, and because these sites have sufficient concentrations of the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese populations to represent the target language groups.

To ensure efficient and successful recruitment of the target populations, we used bilingual recruiters who were proficient in the target languages, and we utilized a combination of methods such as newspaper advertisement, direct contact with community leaders and staff, and word of mouth.

An English cognitive interview protocol was developed to standardize the interviews. The interview protocol documented the administration details, consent forms, and materials required for the cognitive interviewing, including a list of standard probes and special instructions to be used and a guide for the cognitive interviewers to follow during interviews and reporting. Once the English interview protocol was finalized, it was translated to each language using the modified committee approach (Schoua-Glusberg, 1992). Bilingual interviewers who completed a 2-day cognitive interview training conducted the cognitive interviews in target languages. We included respondents with diverse backgrounds and most of them met the target statistics identified in the previous ACS statistics.

We compared the key messages of the materials such as the survey participation request, purpose of the study, privacy/confidentiality assurances, and the mandatory nature of the survey to compare respondents' reactions. These key messages appear more than once throughout the materials.

We designed the probing questions to elicit the respondents' understanding of these key messages and reviewed the respondents' answers to these questions. Our review is based on the interview summary prepared for each interview, which detail the probing questions and the respondents' answers to them. Each report was prepared by the interviewer who conducted the cognitive interview. Although summary reports may reflect each interviewer's interpretation of the respondent's answers, they included many actual quotes and conversations that closely approximated the actual interview. Our sample does not represent these language groups statistically and the findings should be interpreted carefully. The list of questions/key messages included in our review is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Key messages and examples of probing questions

Key Message (Texts on material)	Example of Probing Question
<p>1) Survey Participation Request</p> <p>The U.S. Census Bureau is conducting the American Community Survey. A Census Bureau representative will contact you to help you complete the survey. I would appreciate your help, because the success of this survey depends on you.</p>	<p>What did you think this letter was about?</p>
<p>2) What is ACS?</p> <p>The American Community Survey is a survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. It provides information each year about the social, economic, and housing characteristics of the United States. Previously, this information was available only when the U.S. Census Bureau conducted a population census every 10 years. Only a small sample of addresses is randomly selected to participate in the American Community Survey and they represent other addresses in the community.</p> <p>The American Community Survey will ask you questions about your household's characteristics, including such topics as education, employment, and housing¹.</p>	<p>What do you think the American Community Survey is about?</p>
<p>3) Survey Purpose</p> <p>The ACS produces critical, up-to-date information that is used to meet the needs of communities across the United States. For example, results from this survey are used to decide where new schools, hospitals, and fire stations are needed. Survey data are used by federal, state, local, and tribal governments to make decisions and to develop programs that will provide health care, education, and transportation services that affect you and your community. This survey information helps communities plan for emergency situations that might affect you and your neighbours.</p>	<p>What do you think they meant by this paragraph?</p>
<p>4) Mandatory Nature</p> <p>You are required by U.S. law to respond to this survey (Title 13, United States Code, Sections 141, 193, and 221).</p>	<p>What do you think they meant by this statement?</p>
<p>5) Privacy/Confidentiality</p> <p>Your answers are confidential by law (Title 13, United States Code, Section 9). This law requires that every Census Bureau employee—including the Director and every Census Bureau representative—take an oath and be subjected to a jail term, a fine, or both if he or she discloses ANY information that could identify you or your household.</p>	<p>What do you think they meant by this paragraph?</p>

¹ This sentence was newly added to the materials which were used for the Vietnamese cognitive interviews.

3. Findings

3.1 Survey participation request message

Most respondents from the three Asian language groups missed the main point of the introductory letter. This message begins in the first paragraph in the letter, which states the reason for contacting the household and the main purpose of the letter—to request participation in the ACS. However, more than two-thirds of our respondents tended not to focus on the first paragraph. When asked what the letter was about, they mainly answered about how they understood the ACS. For example, they said this was a survey to count people in the country. They also tended to report the data use of the ACS, such as the benefits which could be gained through data collected by the ACS.

Such a mismatch between the intended message and the actual responses from the Asian respondents is largely caused by a different communication style in Asian culture and the respondents' lack of knowledge of or experience with surveys. The general structure of an Asian requesting act is routinely organized as a bottom-up approach. This approach attends to the politeness aspect of communication; it establishes common ground first and then presents the main message towards the end of letter after necessary background information is provided (Kirkpatrick, 1991; Pan et al., 2006; Scollon & Wong-Scollon, 1991; Zhang 1995a; Zhang, 1995b). In contrast, the preferred style for writing a request letter in English is to state the main message first, followed by the background or detailed supporting information. This difference in communication style brings the readers of English to focus on the opening stages of the written material as the most crucial, while the Asian readers will tend to look for the crucial points to occur somewhat later. The findings from our project reflect this phenomenon as pointed out by Pan et al. (2006). That is, our Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents interpreted that the purpose of the letter was mainly to introduce a survey on community needs, and they all missed the participation request in the message, thus detaching themselves from the participation part after reading the letter.

Secondly, the first paragraph starts with a request for cooperation from people to participate in the ACS, but it doesn't give any explanations or definitions of the ACS or surveys in general. The letter presupposes that the reader has the knowledge of what a survey is and how a survey works, i.e., that there is a set of questions being asked either by a person or on a survey form, and that individuals need to answer these questions and/or complete the form. Our Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents who did not have prior knowledge of surveys had no clue about what was being asked in the letter. This lack of survey knowledge puts the respondents into a different mind set, due to the ways in which cultural knowledge and expectations about people, objects, events, settings, and ways to interact influence language comprehension and interpretations (Goffman, 1974; Hymes, 1974; Tannen, 1993).

The combination of the lack of basic knowledge of surveys and different communication styles results in the failure of the three groups to interpret the message of survey participation as a request. These two aspects pose a challenge to researchers in building basic survey knowledge in a culturally and linguistically appropriate way in order to deliver the intended messages.

3.2 What is the ACS?

On the topic of the ACS and survey sponsor, many respondents were confusing the ACS with the decennial census when they read this part of the material. Many of them thought that the ACS was a census, counting the population. One third of Korean respondents did not understand exactly what the ACS was and more than half of the Chinese and Vietnamese respondents were confused about the definition of the ACS, though seemingly for different reasons.

The Korean respondents seemed more familiar with the concept of a survey than the Chinese and Vietnamese respondents. A few Korean respondents, including older respondents (aged 65+), mentioned during the interviews that surveys were popular and common in Korea. In particular, highly educated Korean respondents could accurately articulate what ACS was. The aspect that confused Korean respondents was the lack of description about what kinds of questions would be posed in the ACS. Actually, in the materials used for the cognitive interview, no specific examples of questions in the ACS questionnaire were included. This led respondents to think that the ACS was a survey intended only to count people in the nation.

Compared to the Korean respondents, Chinese and Vietnamese respondents had more difficulty understanding the purpose of the ACS. Their misunderstanding seemed to be rooted in two sources: unfamiliarity with the concept of a survey and an incomplete translation of the materials. For example, some Chinese respondents thought the ACS was a social investigation. The Chinese translated term of “美国社区调查” for the American Community Survey is often mistaken as “美国社会调查 (American Social Investigation)”. There is only a one word difference in Chinese (社区 [community] and 社会 [society]) between the translated title of the ACS and the phrase “American Social Investigation”. The Chinese word “调查” has several meanings, which could be “investigation,” “research,” or “survey” depending on the context. As most Chinese are more familiar with social investigations than surveys in their home country, the use of this translation is a little misleading in this context because it gives the impression that ACS is asking for open-ended personal feedbacks on the societal level.

In a similar way, some of the Vietnamese respondents thought that the ACS was a social welfare or public service program due to their lack of knowledge of and experience with surveys. The Vietnamese title for the American Community Survey, “Khảo sát cộng đồng Mỹ,” is a direct translation and contains high level vocabulary. Thus, many Vietnamese people with a lower level of education did not understand the ACS. Also, the current translation of “ăn phòng Kiểm tra Dân số Hoa Kỳ (The U.S. Census Bureau)” means “U.S. Office of Examining Population” in Vietnamese. Thus, it carries a connotation which may make people think of investigating people or surveillance.

Interestingly, several Vietnamese respondents reported that they did not understand the meaning of the statement “Only a sample of addresses is selected.” This confusion was due to the use of the word “địa chỉ (address)” and their lack of understanding of a survey. Vietnam has only relatively recently adopted an “address” system. When they need to talk about a house in a particular location, they refer to it as someone’s house or describe the appearance of the house with specific features. Vietnamese respondents failed to

connect the sample addresses with the ACS as a mail-out survey due to this combination of a relatively new concept of “address” and their lack of life experience with surveys.

3.3 Survey Purpose

The message about survey purpose was revised for the Vietnamese project based on the findings of the earlier project with the Chinese and Korean cognitive interviews. Specifically, example ACS questions were not included in the material used for the Chinese and Korean cognitive interviews in the 2006 projects. All materials described supplementary information about the ACS, such as the benefits of the survey and confidentiality, without showing the specific questions. As a result, many respondents asked what kinds of questions they would be asked in the ACS. Based on this feedback, we added a new sentence “The American Community Survey will ask you questions about your household’s characteristics, including such topics as education, employment, and housing” when we conducted the Vietnamese cognitive interviews.

Most Chinese and Korean respondents understood that the ACS survey data would be used to help communities in general, but they did not have a clear understanding of how it could help. Some of the Chinese respondents thought that the purpose of the ACS was to elicit opinion and feedback from people about their community services or the needs of communities. Many commented that they were not able to participate in the ACS because they didn’t have information about their communities. This confusion occurred partly, as noted previously, because the current translated term for “American Community Survey” is too close to the Chinese phrase for “social investigation.” It also seems to be partly because respondents did not have any clue as to what types of questions would be asked in the ACS.

Vietnamese respondents did not show better understanding about the survey purpose than the other groups despite being given more specific information about the questions to be asked in the ACS in the material. They did not clearly understand how the data collected through the ACS were connected with the local community’s development. Despite this lack of understanding, the Vietnamese respondents understood the benefit of the ACS in general. They commented that the data collected from the ACS would be used by all levels of the government to improve communities in many areas.

As we have mentioned before, the reasons that our Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents could not articulate the purpose or benefits of the ACS seem to be rooted in poor translation and their lack of understanding of surveys. Further, the disconnect between their responses to ACS and the survey purpose shows that they did not have the social experience in their home countries of individuals’ responses to surveys becoming part of the government’s policy-making process.

This was also shown in their difficulty in understanding the text used to describe the ACS purpose, where the term “tribal government” was used as below:

Survey data are used by federal, state, local, and tribal governments to make decisions and to develop programs that will provide health care, education, and transportation services that affect you and your community.

The term “tribal government” presented a problem for some respondents across all three language groups. A few suggested that it should be “local government” or “county

government,” as they were unclear on the meaning of the term. Some Chinese respondents thought the term could refer to some Chinese ethnic groups. Although the concept of tribes exists in China and Vietnam, the idea of taking the tribes into a serious consideration in a national or community decision-making process is unfamiliar in these three cultures and societies. This indicates that the respondents of these three Asian language groups do not have social experience concerning the functions of tribes in governmental decisions, nor were they familiar with the role of Native Americans in U.S. history.

3.4 Mandatory nature

The ACS is designed to replace the long form in the decennial census and participation in the ACS is mandatory. However, half of the Chinese respondents and half of the Vietnamese respondents did not understand the implication of the mandatory nature of the ACS. In general, they understood this meant that a law required people follow/obey but it was unclear to them from the given texts what to follow or obey. Some of them thought that the text describing the mandatory nature of the ACS meant that people should answer the survey honestly or accurately. A couple of the Vietnamese respondents confused the confidentiality statement with the text about mandatory nature of the ACS. They interpreted this to mean that the information they report in the ACS will be kept secret under the law. Even for those who understood the literal meaning of the text describing the mandatory nature of the ACS, they did not feel, after reading the message in the brochure, that they had to respond to the survey.

The Korean respondents understood the meaning of mandatory nature relatively well. However, there were still a couple of respondents who thought that they could choose to not participate in the ACS. In addition, the Korean respondents showed somewhat different reactions to the text describing the mandatory nature of the ACS. Even those who understood the mandatory nature of the ACS well felt uncomfortable when reading the direct expression of “you are required by U.S. law to respond to this survey.” In the Korean culture, where politeness and interpersonal relationship are emphasized, they rarely use such a direct request. Rather, they would ask a favor or make a request indirectly. A more indirect request, such as, “Your survey participation conforms to the U.S. law and we ask you the favor of responding to this survey” is much more preferable and acceptable. The Korean respondents, who are accustomed to the Korean expression of politeness, thought that the translated mandatory nature message was rude and should be written more politely. This indicates that a direct request may affect their participation decision in the ACS.

Interestingly, Korean respondents raised a question about who should participate in the ACS from the translated text describing the mandatory nature of the ACS. They commented that only U.S. citizens, excluding permanent residents or undocumented persons, should participate in the ACS, since the participation is required by U.S. law., The Chinese and the Vietnamese respondents, however, did not have similar reactions to the mandatory nature messages. Rather, they excluded non-U.S. citizens from participation in the ACS, due to their inferences about the translated survey titles in their respective languages. This made them think of social investigation or social welfare. Since they interpreted ACS as a social program, they might think that only U.S. Citizens were eligible to participate.

3.5 Confidentiality

In general, it was well understood by all three Asian language groups that respondents' answers are protected. They interpreted confidentiality as meaning that "that the Bureau cannot give the respondent's information to anybody," "that the Bureau cannot publish it", and so on. None of them had heard of "Title 13" but they understood that it would be something related to protecting their information.

Although most of the respondents were glad to see the detailed description of how to protect respondents' information, the emphasis on the law caused two types of reactions: fear of the law and distrust of the law. Roughly one third of Asian respondents thought the message put too much emphasis on the law, and that there was no need to keep stressing the subject. They thought the information that they provided in the ACS would not be sensitive at all so the specific inclusion of law (Title 13) made them more fearful of some unknown risks of participating in the survey. For example, one Korean respondent mentioned stories about past abuses committed in the name of laws by the Korean central intelligence agency during the period of tyranny and military government. Although this confidentiality statement was written to relieve the respondents' concerns, it may make some respondents suspect that there might be something bad behind the survey. Additionally, some respondents understood the meaning of the sentence, but they didn't believe what they read because of their mistrust of the law. This is shown in a response from one of the Chinese respondents: "For people who are newcomers, they may not believe in U.S. laws. There are differences between China and the U.S. in terms of laws. In China, they (the government) say they will keep (the information) confidential, but they don't really do it."

These reactions reflect the cultural background of the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese respondents. As pointed out by Pan et al. (2006), in these cultures, society is viewed as largely governed by human relations in contrast to the view held by the people in the U.S.—that society is governed by laws. Therefore, people in those countries hold interpersonal relationships and social norms as more crucial social mechanisms than the law to govern the society (p. 59). Further, the distrust of law and government may also relate to the different relations between law and government. Western conceptions of rule of law emphasize the ways in which law limits the power of the government and increases individual autonomy and freedom, while the Asian concept tends to associate law as enhancing the power of the government (Tamahana, 2004). This may explain why emphasis on the law could cause fear and distrust rather than comfort or encouragement for these Asian respondents.

4. Summary

We have examined the cognitive interview data with the monolingual Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents for the 5 key message of the ACS: survey participation request, what is ACS, survey purpose, mandatory nature of the ACS, and confidentiality of the data. From our review, we found that, in general, the three Asian language groups showed similar reactions to key messages of the ACS. However, each language group has its unique reactions, too. Table 2 summarizes these three groups' responses to the key messages and the socio-cultural factors that may account for these responses:

Table 2: Summary of findings

Messages	Socio-Cultural Factors	Reactions
Survey participation Request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shared cultural and literary traditions 	Very similar; missed the main point of the message
What is ACS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar social experience between the Chinese and Vietnamese respondents ▪ Different social experience with Korean respondents 	Better understanding by Korean respondents compared to Chinese and Vietnamese respondents. The latter groups mistook ACS for social investigation or welfare program.
Survey Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar historical and social experience in home countries 	Similar; misunderstanding of connection between the survey data and community development
Mandatory nature of the ACS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar cultural-historical experience ▪ Different politeness rules and language structures 	Similar; Korean respondents were uncomfortable with direct request
Confidentiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar cultural-historical experience 	Very similar; respondents showed distrust or fear of law

For the messages about survey participation, the mandatory nature of the survey, and confidentiality, our Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese respondents shared common reactions. In the survey participation request message, they missed the main point of the message, which was to encourage people’s participation in the ACS. For the message about the mandatory nature of the ACS, they did not understand the message or understood it literally and thought they had the option not to participate in the ACS. For the confidentiality message, many of them did not believe the fact that their data would actually be protected, or they did not feel that such protection would be necessary.

These similar reactions seem to be based on their common cultural and historical backgrounds, and their lack of survey knowledge. That is, their preferred communication style of placing the important message at the very end caused them to miss the important message written up front in the letter. Their cultural and historical backgrounds under tyranny or communism made them scared or distrustful of laws, and this resulted in misinterpretation of the mandatory nature of the ACS and of the confidentiality message.

We also found some unique findings across these groups. For example, Korean respondents understood the ACS as a survey relatively well compared to the Chinese and Vietnamese respondents. This is partly because the concept of a survey is more developed in Korea and the translation of survey in Chinese and Vietnamese carried additional meanings such as “social investigation.” However, Korean respondents were

uncomfortable with the direct statements to describe the mandatory nature of the ACS. In the Korean culture, which emphasizes the explicit use of politeness, a direct request such as this can be interpreted as rude. While this finding may reflect the Korean cultural expectation and perception that a government statement should be constructed towards a relatively higher end of politeness, the different responses from the Chinese (who did not find the translated Chinese message to be rude or offensive) and Korean groups are inconsistent with previous empirical research (Rue & Zhang, 2008) which found that Korean and Chinese share a similar degree of politeness when power status is concerned. Thus, there could be a linguistic factor involved in the Korean text of the statement of mandatory participation through translation. That is, Korean politeness involves extensive use of a linguistic means called an “honorific system” that employs various linguistic elements in its internal language structure (Rue & Zhang, 2008, p. 293) that is not shared with English. A relatively direct translation from English would very likely fail to include this system, thus sending a much stronger tone of imposition than the original language (English) and other two languages (Chinese and Vietnamese). This finding may be directly related to language form and its social meaning in translation.

A different social and linguistic background also contributed to Vietnamese respondents’ difficulty understanding the meaning of the text “Only a sample of addresses is selected” because of their unfamiliarity with the concept of “address,” which was adopted only recently in Vietnam.

From our research, we found that the Asian populations did not have exact the same reactions to the key messages. They shared a few common reactions due to their similar social, cultural, and historical experience. However, each language group also has their unique reactions. Often times, Asian populations have been grouped into one type of respondents and they have been treated the same in surveys and pretests of surveys. However, this one-for-all type of treatment may not be effective in dealing with unique issues that each language group has. Our research contributes to a line of research that seeks to identify different issues related to surveys across cultures and address those issues more appropriately, which will help to improve the quality of surveys.

We found that these monolingual respondents’ exposure to U.S. society and U.S. mainstream culture is quite limited, and thus they tend to interpret terms and social phenomena using their cultural baggage from their home countries. It is therefore important to consider their different cultural backgrounds when we include them in survey research.

5. Limitations and Future Research

Although this research has shown interesting findings for the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese cognitive interviews, it has several limitations. First, the sample of respondents that was recruited for this research does not reflect a statistically representative sample of any kind. We made efforts to maximize its diversity; however, readers should be cautious when reviewing the findings of this paper. The results throughout this paper are qualitative.

Secondly, our review was based on the interview summary reports, rather than interview transcripts. In addition, the materials and protocols used in the cognitive interviews, though comparable to some extent, were not identical. Thus, it was impossible to conduct

a one-to-one comparison. Further research based on the transcripts will give us more abundant information compared to the research based on interview summary reports. It will also be interesting to conduct future research with additional Asian languages to see if the common findings from this research will be the same in other languages.

Lastly, our discussion of the linguistic and socio-cultural factors accounting for the observed responses of these Asian groups is largely based on our analysis of the interpretations of the projects' language expert panel. As cognitive interviewing in Asian languages is still a new development in pretesting research, additional research needs to be conducted to further verify our arguments.

Disclaimer and Acknowledgements

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in process. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau. The authors wish to thank Terry DeMaio, Yuling Pan, and Stephanie Sheffield for reviewing this paper.

References

- Goerman, Patricia (2005). An Examination of Pretesting Methods for Multicultural, Multilingual Surveys: The Use of Cognitive Interviews to Test Spanish Instruments. Presented at the 3rd International Workshop of Comparative Survey Design and Implementation. Madrid, Spain
- Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hinsdale, M., Schoua-Glusberg, A., Saleska, E., and Park, H. (2008). Cognitive Testing of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages. Prepared for U.S. Census Bureau. *Project Number: 0209182.011*.
- Hymes, Dell (1974). *Ways of speaking. Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. ed. by Richard Bauman & Joel Sherzer, 433-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (1991). Information sequencing in Mandarin in letters of request. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 33, (2), 183-203.
- Pan, Yuling (2004). Cognitive Interviews in Languages Other Than English: Methodological and Research Issues, Presented at the 2004 AAPOR Conference in Phoenix, AZ.
- Pan, Y., Hinsdale, M., Schoua-Glusberg, A. and Park, H. (2006). Cognitive Testing of ACS CAPI Materials in Multiple Languages. *Statistical Research Division Research Report Series (Survey Methodology #2006-09)*, Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Pan, Y., Landreth, A., Hinsdale-Shouse, M.A., Park, H., & Schoua-Glusberg, A.. (2007). Methodology for Cognitive Testing of Translations in Multiple Languages. Presented

- at American Association for Public Opinion Research's 62nd Annual Conference, Anaheim, CA.
- Park, H., & Pan, Y. (2007). Cognitive interviewing with Asian populations: Findings from Chinese and Korean interviews. Presented at the AAPOR's 62nd annual conference, Anaheim, CA.
- Rue, Yong-Ju and Zhang, Grace. (2008). *Request Strategies: A comparative study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schoua-Glusberg, A. (1992). *Report on the Translation of the Questionnaire for the National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Scollon, R. and Wong-Scollon, S. (1991). Topic confusion in English-Asian discourse. *World Englishes*, 9, 113-123.
- Smith, Tom (2004). *Developing and Evaluating Cross-National Survey Instruments, in Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*. Edited by Stan Presser, Jennifer Rothgeb, Mick Couper, Judith Lessler, Elizabeth Martin, Jean Martin, and Eleanor Singer. New York: Wiley.
- Tannen, Deborah (1993). *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tamahana, Brian Z. (2004). *On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhang, Yanyin. (1995a). Strategies in Chinese requesting. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as a native and target language* (pp. 23-68). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Zhang, Yanyin. (1995b). Indirectness in Chinese requesting. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as a native and target language* (pp. 69-118). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.