

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

Hyunjoo Park, RTI International¹
Virginia Wake Yelei, U.S. Census Bureau

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 to meet the growing need to include 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.

In this paper, we will report findings from cognitive interview projects in Asian languages undertaken at the U.S. Census Bureau in 2006 and 2008. In these projects, we tested survey materials that were translated into Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese, to evaluate how participants of the three language groups reacted to and perceived the translated messages. The focus of this paper is to illustrate issues in conveying intended meanings in translated messages and compare how similar and/or different the issues are across the three language groups. 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 unique findings 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 what ACS meant as 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

¹ RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute

INTRODUCTION

The Asian populations in the U.S. have grown faster rates than the U.S. population as a whole. According to the release of the American Community Survey 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 to meet the growing need to include Hispanic populations because of their increasing size. 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 or different as respondents to surveys and pretests such as cognitive interviews.

This paper presents the findings from cognitive interview projects in Asian languages undertaken by the U.S. Census Bureau, which took a rigorous approach to conduct pretests of translated survey supporting materials. We illustrate issues in conveying intended meanings in translated messages and compared how similar and/or different the issues are across the three language groups: Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese Americans. Our discussion focuses on cultural factors and 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. However, each language group has its unique reactions, too. Recommendations and future research are also discussed.

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 main messages used in the translated American Community Survey (ACS) supporting materials². The specific documents selected for inclusion in the cognitive interviews included the ACS Introductory Letter, Thank You Letter, Q&A Brochure, and Informational Brochure. These materials were designed to explain the purpose of the survey, how the data are used, privacy and confidentiality assurances, and the mandatory nature of the survey. The quality of the data and the response rates for the ACS rely to a large extent on the quality and effectiveness of the translations of these documents into the target languages. To finish each cognitive interview within one hour or so, we used two sets of supporting materials (which is a

combination of either 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 Metro Area, Chicago, IL Metro Area, Madison, WI, and Raleigh, NC. These locations were decided strategically because they were close to the research teams geographically, which helped control overall costs, and 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 utilized a combination of methods such as newspaper advertisement, direct contact to 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 as shown in the Appendix.

We reviewed 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 see how similar or different their reactions are from each other. These key messages appear more than once throughout the materials.

We selected the probing questions to ask the respondents' understanding of these key messages and reviewed the respondents' answer to these questions. Our review is based on the interview summary reports which detail the probing questions and the respondents' answers to them. Each report was prepared by the interviewer who conducted the cognitive interviews. Although summary reports may reflect each interviewer's interpretation of the respondent's answers, they included many actual quotes and conversations that were close to the actual interview. Our sample does not represent any of these language groups.

The list of questions/key messages included in our review is summarized in Table1.

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 housing³.</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 neighbors.</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>

FINDINGS

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

³ This sentence was newly added to the materials which were used for the Vietnamese cognitive interviews.

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 that how they understood the ACS. For example, they said this was about 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 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 or experience of surveys. The general structure of an Asian requesting act is routinely organized as a bottom-up approach. For example, their preferred requesting style is to attend to the politeness aspect of communication and to establish common ground first. The main message will come towards the end of letter after necessary background information is provided. In contrast, the preferred letter-writing style in English for requesting 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. That is, our Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents interpreted that the letter was mainly to introduce a survey on community needs, and they all missed the participation request in the message and 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. It is presupposed in the letter that the reader has the knowledge of what a survey is and how a survey works, i.e., that there is a set of questions being asked either by a person or in a survey form, and that individuals need to answer these questions and complete the form. Our Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents who did not have prior knowledge of survey had no clue about what was being asked in the letter. This lack of survey knowledge puts the respondents into a different frame of mind set, which refers to how cultural knowledge and expectations about people, objects, events, settings, and ways to interact influence language use in terms of language comprehension.(Tannen and Wallat 1993).

These issues may not be easily addressed in this translation effort because it involves restructuring or tailoring the letter to fit the communicative style of the target languages. We raised this issue here for future research and consideration when conducting translations or constructing survey materials in languages other than English.

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 population. A third of Korean respondents did not understand what the ACS was exactly and more than half of the Chinese and the Vietnamese respondents were confused about the definition of the ACS. Their confusion seems to be based on different reasons.

The Korean respondents seemed more familiar with the concept of a survey than the Chinese and the 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 articulate what ACS was quite accurately. The aspect that confused Korean respondents was the lack of description about what the kinds of questions asked in the ACS. Actually, in the materials used for the cognitive interview, no specific examples of questions to be asked in the ACS were included. Thus, respondents often thought that the ACS was the survey only to count people in the nation.

Compared to the Korean respondents, Chinese and the Vietnamese respondents had more difficulty understanding the purpose of the ACS. Their misunderstanding seems to be based two things: 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 one word different between the translated term for the ACS and the term “American Social Investigation” in Chinese. The current translated term of “调查” has two meanings. One is “investigation,” and the other is “survey.” 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 other hand, some of the Vietnamese respondents thought that the ACS was a social welfare or public service program due to both their lack of knowledge and experience on surveys. The Vietnamese translated term of “Khảo sát cộng đồng Mỹ” for the American Community Survey is a direct translation and contains high level vocabulary. Thus, many Vietnamese people with a lower level of education may not understand the ACS due to this choice of words. Also, the current translation of “ăn phòng Kiểm tra Dân số Hoa Kỳ (The U.S. Census Bureau)” is back translated to “U.S. Office of Examining Population” in Vietnamese. Thus, it carries an unnecessary connotation which may make people think of investigating people or surveillance.

Interestingly, several Vietnamese respondents reported that they did not understand the meaning the statement “Only a sample of addresses is selected”. This confusion was due to the word “địa chỉ (address)” and their lack of understanding of the survey. Vietnam has only relatively recently adopted an “address” system. When they need to discuss to a house in a particular location, they referred to it as someone’s house or described the appearance of the house with specific features. Since Vietnam started using “addresses” very recently, the Vietnamese respondents were not entirely familiar with the concept of home address, which made it difficult for them to comprehend this concept.

3) Survey Purpose

Example ACS questions were not included on the material used in the 2006 projects which were used for the Chinese and Korean cognitive interviews. Because all materials described supplementary information of ACS, such as the benefits of the survey and confidentiality, without showing the specific questions, many respondents asked what

kinds of questions they would be specifically 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” in the 2008 project 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 the information about their communities. This confusion occurred partly because the current translated term for the “American Community Survey” is too close to the term of “social investigation” in Chinese. It also seems to be partly because respondents did not have any clue on what types of questions were being asked in the ACS.

Vietnamese respondents did not show better understanding about the survey purpose although they were able to read examples of the questions asked in the ACS on the material compared to other groups. They did not clearly understand how the data collected through the ACS was 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 governments to improve communities in many areas.

The reasons that our Chinese, Korean, and Korean respondents could not articulate the purpose of ACS and the benefit seem to be rooted on their lack of understanding of a survey and a poor translation as explained earlier. Their lack of social experience in their home countries where individuals' self-reports in surveys are part of the decision-making process for making government policies maybe another factor.

In the texts used to describe the ACS purpose, a 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 it was unclear what it meant to them. Some Chinese respondents thought it would be some Chinese ethnic groups. The concept of tribes exists in China and Vietnam. However, it is the concept of taking the tribes into a serious consideration in a national or community decision-making process that is missing in these three (including Korean) 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 to the role of the Native Americans in the U.S. history.

4) Mandatory nature

The ACS designed to replace the long form of decennial Census and participation is mandatory. However, half of the Chinese respondents and half of the Vietnamese respondents did not understand the mandatory characteristic of the ACS. Commonly, they understood this meant a law that required people to follow/obey something but it was unclear to them what to follow or obey from the given texts. Some of them thought that the text describing mandatory nature of the ACS meant that people should answer the survey honestly or accurately. A couple of Vietnamese respondents confused the confidentiality statement with the texts about mandatory nature of the ACS. They interpreted that this meant that the information they have reported to the ACS will be kept secret under the law. This seems due to the poor translation, which did not specify what's required by law. Even for those who understood the literal meaning of the text describing mandatory nature of the ACS, they did not feel that they must answer the survey from the brochure.

The Korean respondents understood the meaning of mandatory nature relatively well. However, there were a couple of respondents who thought that they had an option not to participate in the ACS on their will. In addition, the Korean respondents showed somewhat different reactions to the texts describing mandatory nature of the ACS. Including those who understood the mandatory nature of the ACS well, Korean respondents 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 ask a favor or make a request indirectly. For example, "Your survey participation conforms to the U.S. law and we ask you a favor to respond to this survey" is socially 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 may affect their participation decision in the ACS.

Interestingly, Korean respondents raised the question about who should participate in the ACS from the sentence describing 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. However, the Chinese and the Vietnamese respondents did not have similar reactions to the mandatory nature messages. Rather, they tended to exclude non-U.S. citizen Chinese and Vietnamese' participation in the ACS from their inferences to the translated survey title "美国社区调查" and "Khảo sát cộng đồng Mỹ", which made them think of social investigation as written earlier.

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 heard of "Title 13" but they understood that it would be something related to protect their information.

Although most of the respondents were glad to find the detailed description of how to protect respondents' information, the emphasis on law caused two types of reactions: one was fear of the law and the other was distrust of the law. Roughly, a third of Asian respondents thought it was too much, and that there was no need to keep stressing the subject. They thought the information that they provided to the ACS would not be sensitive at all so the specific inclusion of law (Title 13) made them more suspicious of some implicit risks to participation in the ACS. For example, one Korean respondent mentioned abuse stories which happened with the Korean central intelligence agency under the name of laws during the period of tyranny and military government in Korea in the past. Although this confidentiality statement was written to relieve the respondents' concern, this statement may make some respondents suspect that there might be something bad behind the survey. Another reaction is the distrust in law. Respondents understood the meaning of the sentence, but they didn't believe what they read. Here is a quote from a Chinese respondent: "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. We believe this has to do with the two different types of expectations people have towards the way a society is governed. In the U.S., most people see the society as being governed by law, whereas in Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese society, people regard a great part of the society as being governed by human relations, where people acknowledge that there are given laws on the one hand, but on the other hand, they don't necessarily operate by the law, but by other socially accepted mechanisms (such as human relationships, behavior norms, etc.).

The distrust of law and government may also relate to the different relations (and thus the understanding of) between law and government. The Western conceptions of rule of law tend to emphasize the ways in which law limits the powers of the government and increases individual autonomy and freedom; while the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese tend to associate law as enhancing the power of the government. This explains why emphasis on the law doesn't help much with these Asian respondents. On the contrary, it might cause fear and doubt.

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 the three Asian language groups showed similar reactions to key messages of the ACS in general. However, each language group has its unique reactions, too.

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. They mistook ACS for social investigation/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 	Similar; Korean respondents were uncomfortable with direct request
Confidentiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similar cultural-historical experience 	Very similar; Respondents showed distrust/fear of law

For survey participation request message, message about mandatory nature of the survey, and confidentiality, our Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese respondents shared the 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 message about mandatory nature of the ACS, they did not understand the message or just literally understood the message and thought they had an option not to participate in the ACS. For confidentiality message, many of them did not believe the fact that their data would be actually protected, or they did not feel necessity to protect the data.

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 upfront in the letter. Their cultural and historical backgrounds under tyranny or communism made them scared by law or not trust laws and this resulted in misinterpreting the mandatory nature of the ACS and confidentiality message.

We also found some unique findings across these groups. For example, Korean respondents understood ACS as a survey relatively well compared to the Chinese and Vietnamese respondents. This is partly because the concept of a survey is more popular in Korea and the translation of survey in Chinese and Vietnamese carried additional meaning such as "social investigation". In addition, Korean respondents were uncomfortable to see the direct statements to describe mandatory characteristics of the ACS. In the Korean culture that emphasizes the explicit use of politeness, this direct

request can be interpreted as “rude”. The fact of the Korean emphasis on using indirectness as a preference in this particular statement is a social convention, too. Without a thorough research in the Chinese and Vietnamese historical conventions, we don’t really know the reason. The difference among the three Asian groups may be the result of the different social systems in these countries since World War II. That is, the Chinese and Vietnamese conventions might be distorted by the communist control over many years. On the other hand, the directness of a governmental message is consistent with the Confucius doctrine that the superior can be direct to the inferior in a socially hierarchical society .

Also, Vietnamese respondents had difficulty understanding the meaning of texts “Only a sample of addresses is selected” because of unfamiliarity with the concept of “address” which was adopted recently in Vietnam.

From our research, we found that the Asian populations are not exactly the same in their reactions to the key messages. They shared a few common things 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 to deal with unique issues that each language group has. Our research contributes to a line of research to identify different issues of surveys across cultures and address the issues more appropriately, which helps to improve the quality of survey eventually.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

We found that these monolingual respondents’ exposure to the U.S. society and U.S. mainstream cultures are quite limited and thus they tend to interpret terms and social phenomenon using their cultural baggage from their home countries. Thus, it is important to consider their different cultural backgrounds when we include them in survey 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 kinds. We made efforts to maximize its diversity, however, the readers should be cautious when reviewing the findings of this paper. The results throughout this paper are for the most part 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 were not exactly identical, although they are comparable to some extent. Thus, it was impossible to conduct a one-to-one comparison analysis. Further research based on the transcripts will give us more abundant information compared to the research based on interview summary reports. It will be also 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, we identified the reasons to cause these different reactions of the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese respondents mainly through expert panel, who participated in our cognitive interview projects (They are native speakers in each language and have academic and professional experience in the U.S. and in the target country). Since we are the first to review these, there is not much previous research with solid evidence to support our arguments.

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
- 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.
- 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.
- Schoua-Glusberg, A. (1992). Report on the Translation of the Questionnaire for the National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study, Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- 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, and Cynthia Wallat. (1993) "Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Example from a medical examination/interview." In D. Tannen (ed.) *Framing in discourse*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp: 57-76.

Appendix. Respondent Characteristics with Recruiting Targets

		Chinese			Korean			Vietnamese ⁴		
		Target		actual #	Target		actual #	Target		actual #
		2004 ACS	range		2004 ACS	range		2006 ACS	range	
Education	less than HS graduate	77%	18-20	16	55%	12-14	4	80-90%	16-20	18
	HS graduate, less than college	8%	2-4	4	9%	2-4	9	<10%	0-4	4
	College graduate	15%	2-4	4	36%	8-10	11	<10%	0-4	2
Year of Entry	since 2000	20%	4-6	8	16%	2-4	7	Min.	0-2	1
	1990s	39%	8-10	12	45%	10-12	8	Nearly all	20-24	8
	1980s	28%	6-8	4	27%	6-8	5			4
	before 1980	14%	2-4	0	12%	2-4	4			1
Gender	Male	n/a	8-16	9	n/a	8-16	9	n/a	8-16	11
	Female	n/a	8-16	15	n/a	8-16	15	n/a	8-16	13
Age	18 – 24	4%	1-2	1	2%	0-2	1	20-30%	6-8	2
	25 – 34	13%	2-4	0	13%	2-4	3	30-40%		6
	35 – 44	22%	4-6	5	20%	4-6	5	30-40%	8-10	3
	45 – 54	25%	6-8	5	26%	6-8	5	30-40%		5
	55 – 64	13%	2-4	8	18%	4-6	4	30-40%	8-10	4
	65 or older	23%	4-6	5	21%	4-6	6	30-40%		4
Dialect preference	Mandarin	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Cantonese	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total				24			24			24

⁴ The target for the Vietnamese was different from Chinese and Korean in several ways: The Vietnamese target statistics are based on the 2006 ACS, while Korean and Chinese group recruitment target statistics were based on 2004 ACS. The Vietnamese target demographics quota was set relatively roughly compared to the Chinese and Korean target because of long recruitment time taken from the previous project with Korean and Chinese monolingual respondents. The Vietnamese group's year of entry category was changed to "Living in U.S. 1 year ago" and "Not living in U.S. 1 year ago" for the same reason.