

STUDY SERIES  
(*Survey Methodology* #2005-03)

**Report on the Cognitive Testing of the Space Saving  
Features, Roster Questions, and Revised  
Instructions for the 2005 National Census Test**

Jennifer Hunter and Manuel de la Puente<sup>1</sup>

Statistical Research Division  
U.S. Census Bureau  
Washington, DC 20233

*Report Issued: 03-22-05*

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors would like to thank Betsy Martin for her comments on a previous draft of this memo. She assisted in some of our recommendations - particularly for Q1, Q2, Q3, and the final coverage question.

## Abstract

In preparation for the 2005 National Census Test, cognitive testing of proposed changes on the decennial census short form was conducted. The changes that were tested were designed to address four characteristics of the form, including: (1) Space saving features such as layout modifications and shorter instructions; (2) Revised roster questions, the inclusion of three household level questions and one individual level question to replace residence rules instructions; (3) Revised instructions for the Hispanic origin item and the race item; and (4) revised instructions for Person 1. A total of 14 cognitive interviews were conducted in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area to better understand the impact of these changes on how respondents interpret and respond to the revised questions.

Our findings showed that of the space saving design features tested in the date of birth and age questions, the question on gender, and the question on relationship of household members to Person 1 did not have a negative effect on respondent behavior. We identified some problems with the three household-level roster questions and changes in the wording were recommended. Our findings also showed that the intent of the person-level coverage question (i.e., the question to identify where the person stayed on census day) was not clear to respondents. Therefore, we recommended that this question be replaced with a coverage question from another panel in the 2005 National Census Test. Respondents did not have difficulty with the revised instructions in the race question. Regarding the Hispanic origin question, we suggested minor formatting changes and further cognitive testing to ensure that the revised instruction is not offensive to persons of Hispanic origin. We also tested revised instructions to Person 1. Our findings indicated that modification in fonts and some changes in wording are needed. We recommended that these changes be subjected to further cognitive testing. Finally, our findings also indicated that the “continue note” instructions at the bottom of the first page should be repeated for persons 2-6. We recommended this change, if there is room on the form.

## **Report on the Cognitive Testing of the Space Saving Features, Roster Questions, and Revised Instructions for the 2005 National Census Test**

In preparation for the 2005 National Census Test, cognitive testing of proposed changes on the decennial census short form was conducted. The changes that were tested were designed to address four features of the form. These features and associated changes were as follows:

(1) *Space saving design features*: (a) simplify and shorten the question about sex by eliminating the "Mark one box" instruction and placing the response boxes on the same line as the question; (b) revise the layout of the name boxes by placing the label adjacent to rather than beneath the boxes for last name, first name and MI; (c) shorten and revise the instruction about who to list as Person 1; (d) shorten the instruction associated with the race question ("Mark one or more boxes"); (e) simplify and shorten the age and date of birth questions by replacing a compound question "What is Person 1's age and what is person 1's date of birth?" with "Print Person 1's age and date of birth"; (f) revise and shorten the relationship question by eliminating the write in line and the "If not related to person 1" spanner that preceded the non-related categories; and (g) revise some navigational features (e.g., using triangles instead of arrows) of the questionnaire to facilitate flow through the questionnaire.

(2) *Revised roster questions*: (a) Replace residence rules instructions with three questions designed to determine how many people live in the housing unit and have no other place where they live, how many people live in the housing unit and have another place to live, and how many people live in the housing unit temporarily because they have no other place to live; and (b) include a question for each person enumerated on the form to determine location and type of residence during Census Day.

(3) *Revised instruction to answer both race and Hispanic origin questions*. The standard note ("Please answer BOTH Questions 9 and 10") that precedes the control version of the race and Hispanic origin items is replaced with a stronger instruction intended to improve item completeness and reduce reporting of Hispanic origins in the race item, ("Please answer BOTH Question 9 about Hispanic origin and Question 10 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.") The wording of the instruction is a modified version of an instruction tested in 2003, which had mixed effects. It only appears for Person 1, due to space limitations.

(4) *Revised instruction about who to list as Person 1*. Cognitive interviews show substantial confusion about for whom respondents are to provide information. A revised instruction is intended to clarify that respondents should include themselves, and to clarify who is listed as Person 1.

The form that was tested is attached in Appendix A.

## 2. Methodology

Between January 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005, staff from the Statistical Research Division conducted 14 cognitive interviews. Respondents were targeted for recruiting based on the changes made to the census form. We recruited complex households (a household with at least 3 adults, at least one who is unrelated), parents of college students living in college dorms, households whose members have more than one residence (excluding college students), and "regular" households (i.e., man and woman related by marriage and related children). The composition of interviewed respondents according to these characteristics is listed below<sup>2</sup>.

# of Complex Households	4
# of Households with College Students	4
# of Households with people with multiple addresses	4
# of "Regular" Households	6

The demographic characteristics of the recruited households were of secondary importance. The majority of the interviews were conducted with male respondents (9 males, 5 females), and the majority were conducted with non-Hispanic White respondents (7 Non-Hispanic Whites, 6 African Americans, 1 Hispanic White). Ages of respondents ranged from 20 to 52 years of age. The education level of respondents in this study weighed heavily towards the college educated. Three respondents had a high school or less education, four had some college, four were college graduates and three had graduate degrees. Interviews were conducted at the SRD cognitive laboratory and at places more convenient for respondents.

The interviews were conducted using concurrent think-aloud and retrospective debriefing methods. Respondents were asked to read aloud as they completed the self-administered form and to verbalize their thoughts as they read the questions and formulated their answers. At intervals following the completion of the first page and the entire form, interviewers probed respondents' answers to elicit information about how they interpreted terms and concepts. At the end of the interview, respondents were debriefed and given a series of vignettes. The first set of vignettes dealt with the roster questions and the person count boxes. Respondents were given 7 situations where there was more than one place a person could have been counted and were asked where the person should have been counted, based on the questions asked on the form. In the second series of vignettes, respondents were given 3 situations and were asked to choose who would be listed as Person 1 on the form. The goal of these vignettes was to gain more knowledge of how the questions and instructions associated with these questions were understood. In the final set of vignettes, respondents were given 6 short vignettes describing household roster situations and asked how to report the relationship for one of the persons in the vignette. The

---

<sup>2</sup>Some households fit into more than one of these categories.

goal of this set of vignettes was to observe respondents navigating the new layout of the relationship categories.

### 3. Results

Results are presented in the order of the goals outlined in the introduction followed by a few additional observations. We begin the results for each question by reminding the reader of the goal, then we show the layout of the question on the tested form, present findings from the cognitive test, and offer recommendations where applicable. If the sponsor has made a decision about our recommendation that we are aware of, that is included as well.

#### 3.1 Space Saving Design Features

---

##### 3.1.1 Sex

Goal: Simplify and shorten the question about sex by eliminating the "Mark one box" instruction and placing the response boxes on the same line as the question.

What is Person 1's sex?     Male         Female

We did not experience any problems with this question. No one ever skipped it during the cognitive test.

##### Recommendation

- No change.

##### 3.1.2 Print Name for Persons 2 and above

Goal: revise the layout of the name boxes by placing the label adjacent to rather than beneath the boxes for last name, first name and MI.

##### 1. Print name of Person 2

Last Name

First Name  MI

We experienced no problems with the exception of the person who forgot to list himself (see Section 3.4.1). Middle initial was skipped more often for household members after Person 1. We do not have sufficient evidence to say whether or not this is due to format. The format is different between Person 1 and Persons 2 and later, but it could also be due to the fact that in most cases, the respondent listed him or herself as Person 1. It is possible that there is less middle initial reporting in proxy cases no matter the format.

It is interesting to note that no respondents in this test misreported first name in last name box.

This is an improvement, as other recent cognitive tests have shown this problem with the control format.

**Recommendation**

- No change.

**3.1.3 Age/Date of Birth**

Goal: Simplify and shorten the age and date of birth questions by replacing a compound question with an imperative statement.

**Print Person 1's age and date of birth.** *Print numbers in boxes.*

Age in years on January 3, 2005

Month of birth   Day   Year of Birth

We experienced very few problems with this question. Respondents usually only skipped pieces of this question when they did not have the information (e.g., in the case of roommates). We did not have any cases where respondents thought they did not have to fill out all of the boxes. We did, however, have one respondent who did not report age and date of birth for any household members because he was concerned about identity theft. In this case, he understood what we wanted him to report, he simply objected to reporting the data.

“Age in years” did not provide additional information to respondents. It meant the same thing to them as “Age.” We had a hypothetical question of how you would report a baby under the age of 1. Most said they would put “months” next to the boxes or “5mo” in the boxes. “Age in years” did not help them.

Some respondents attended to the date in the age question, but some did not. A few respondents mis-reported age by reporting current age instead age as of census day.

**Recommendation**

- Eliminate the phrase “in years” to draw more attention to the date.

**Decision**

- Recommendation accepted.

**3.1.4 Relationship**

Goal: Revise and shorten the relationship question by eliminating the write in line and the “If not related to person 1” spanner that preceded the non-related categories.

**How is this person related to Person 1? Mark X ONE box.**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Husband or wife            | <input type="checkbox"/> Son-in-law or daughter-in-law |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological son or daughter | <input type="checkbox"/> Other relative                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted son or daughter    | <input type="checkbox"/> Roomer or boarder             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stepson or stepdaughter    | <input type="checkbox"/> Housemate or roommate         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brother or sister          | <input type="checkbox"/> Unmarried partner             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Father or mother           | <input type="checkbox"/> Foster child or foster adult  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grandchild                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other nonrelative             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parent-in-law              |  |

Respondents did not experience any problems with this question, neither during the interview, nor during the vignettes when they were asked to identify people that fit into the non-relative categories.

The debriefing did reveal that respondents differ in which categories they describe as non-related. For example, respondents disagreed as to whether or not unmarried partners and foster children were relatives. Some thought they were, and others thought they were not.

**Recommendation**

- No change.

**3.1.5 Navigational Features**

Goal: Revise some navigational features (e.g., using triangles instead of arrows) of the questionnaire to facilitate flow through the questionnaire.

Respondents did not comment on the navigational features, and we did not see any evidence of assistance or hindrance to form navigation. This aspect of the cognitive test was inconclusive.

**Recommendation**

- No change.

**3.2 Revised Roster Questions**

---

Goals: (a) Replace residence rules instructions with three questions designed to determine how many people live in the housing unit and have no other place where they live, how many people live in the housing unit and have another place to live, and how many people live in the housing unit temporarily because they have no other place to live; and (b) include a question for each person enumerated on the form to determine location and type of residence during Census Day.

### 3.2.1 Initial Person Count

**1. Including yourself, how many people live here and have no other place they live?**

*Don't forget to include babies.*

Number of people =

**2. Besides those counted in Question 1, how many other people have more than one place they live, but sleep here more often than anywhere else? Enter "0" if none.**

Number of people =

**3. Besides those counted in Question 1 or 2, how many other people were staying here temporarily on January 3, 2005 and had no other place where they live? Enter "0" if none.**

Number of people =

#### Understanding of Questions 1, 2 and 3

People tended to read Question 1 and answer it prior to reading Question 2. This caused some people to need to change their answer after reading Question 2. Upon the first read, people interpreted Question 1 as a more simple "who lives here?" After reading Questions 2 and 3, more people understood the distinction being made.

There is a strong connotation in Question 1 associated with the word "live." There were cases where a person who does not sleep at the house most of the time, but is considered to "live" there was included in this question. This happened in a few real cases, and was prominent in the vignettes.

Question 2 was understood differently by different people. Some people understood it exactly as it was intended. Several others, however, understood it more generally to mean anyone who has two places to live (regardless of where they stay more nights). Another person thought it meant only short term stays.

Respondents had a little more difficulty understanding Q3 than the other two. Some respondents could not tell the difference between Q2 and Q3. Some thought both referred to people who were temporarily staying here. Some respondents did not notice the "had no other place where they live." This could (but did not in our interviews) lead to the inclusion of visitors in Question 3.

The reference date for Q1 and Q2 is understood differently by different people. Most thought it meant "now" - whenever the interview was being conducted. A few thought it was for the past year, and a few others thought it was for 2005 (because it was marked 2005 Census Test). One respondent mentioned the need for a time period for this question. It did not apply to him, but he



thought it was confusing without a time reference.

A couple of respondents voiced that they did not feel that Q2 and Q3 were what the census “really wants.” This comment deals with the perceived validity of the questions. Respondents tend to answer questions as they interpret the need for information. For this reason, if respondents think we really are not interested in the people that questions 2 and 3 talk about, they may be inclined not to answer those questions as they are asked even if there is someone in the household that fits into those categories.

### **Performance of Questions 1, 2 and 3**

The good news is that we had no cases where people were counted twice on the same form and all people that were counted in these boxes were listed inside the form, with the exception of one respondent who forgot to list himself inside the form (more information on him in Section 3.4.1).

We are, however, concerned that this format may lead to duplicates outside the household. In the vignettes, respondents indicated that a person should be counted in Q1 where they are permanent residents (or where their family is), and should be counted in Q2 where they sleep most of the time. Our concern is that by making Q2 very clear and distinct from Q1, we may be increasing our chances of counting the commuter worker at the place she sleeps most of the time, but also increasing the chances of duplicating that person.

### **Mis-enumerations**

There were 4 interviews during which mistakes were made concerning the coverage questions. They are described below:

1. We had one college student who sleeps most of the time at college enumerated in Q1. The respondent did not realize at all that the college student should not have been counted until the debriefing. This college student was not identified in the Coverage 2 question, either, because she was not at college on January 3.
2. Another respondent reported her two college students in Q2 although they do not sleep there more often than at college. She was trying to fit them in on the form, and they fit best there with a generalized interpretation of Q2 that included anyone who has multiple places to live. (These two respondents actually voiced a desire to have instructions for how to enumerate college students.)
3. One commuter worker mis-enumerated himself in Q1. He has a place in Boston, but “lives” with his daughter in DC while working. He listed himself as having no other place to stay (at the DC address). The other address did not ever come up on the form (i.e., he was at the DC address on the night of January 3).
4. A respondent left himself off the form. It is not clear what prompted this mistake. See Section 3.4.1 for further discussion.

### **Navigational Problems**

Two respondents had to change their answer to Q1 after reading Q2 - this may cause a processing problem.

## Recommendations

- Careful assessment of the data from the field test should be planned. There is potential for an increase in duplicates.
- The sponsor should consider ways to eliminate the noted problems. Below are some suggestions that may help, but please note the risk involved with fielding a recommendation that has not been pretested. That should be weighted against the potential benefit.
  - Q1 - Consider using “live and sleep here.” *Sleeping* seems very salient to people. *Living* is more subjective.
  - Q2 - Consider underlining “sleep here more often than anywhere else.” This piece is critical and often overlooked or not attended to.
  - Q3 - Consider reordering the phrases to make them more consistent with the previous two questions:  
Besides those counted in Question 1 or 2, how many other people had no other place where they live and were staying here temporarily on January 3, 2005?  
OR Consider underlining “had no other place where they live?”

## Decision

- The residence rules group decided it was necessary to add a reference date to Questions 1 and 2. They crafted an introductory sentence to this question series that tells respondents of the need to count people as of census day.

### 3.2.2 Coverage 2

#### On the night of January 3, 2005, where did Person 1 stay?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> At this address  | <input type="checkbox"/> In military barracks                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> At another house, apartment or mobile home                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> In a nursing home or mental hospital    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In a college residence hall or dormitory                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> In a jail, prison or detention facility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In some other type of group housing - <i>Please specify type of place.</i> |  |

#### Understanding of this Question

The biggest problem with this question is that the intent is not clear to respondents. About half of our respondents thought that we really meant “most of the time” rather than that specific night - so they answered accordingly. Some thought we did mean that very specific night, but even when respondents thought that, they generally did not recall the specific date. Rather, they thought about the few weeks preceding the interview (or the few days after New Years).

Many respondents started reading down the left column and did not read past “at another house, apartment or mobile home.” This means they did not even see the group quarters (GQ) options.

Respondents who did this simply answered whether or not the household members were at home or at someone else's house that night. They may not have even considered the possibility that a household member may have been in jail that night.

It is the authors' understanding that we are interested in where the person stayed on census day for the GQs listed, but we are really interested in where the person stays most of the time for the distinction between "at this address" and "at another house, apartment, or mobile home." The latter distinction seems almost coincidental to ask as of a specific night. A commuter worker could happen to be home that night, or a child could happen to be staying at a friend's house that night.

### **Performance of this Question**

This question did not identify any of the college students. That was likely due to the fact that census day for the cognitive test was January 3, while most college students were still home on holiday. However, depending on when census day falls, college students may or may not be at college on any given night.

We had three commuter workers in this test. Two of these stayed most of the time at the household we interviewed (i.e., it was their work address). One of them was identified as staying at the other place (i.e., where his family lives) on January 3 with this question; the other was not. The one commuter worker who stayed away from the address where we interviewed most of the time was correctly not listed on the form at the household we interviewed.

We did not have anyone report a GQ stay, although there were a couple of cases of "At another house, apartment or mobile home" and one case of "other" who reported being at "work" - he works night shift. Interestingly, there was another respondent who also worked night shift who marked "at this address" because he thought that was what the census was interested in knowing, not that he was at work that night. Again, two respondents in similar situations interpreted this question to mean different things. One interpreted it very literally and the other answered what he thought we meant.

### **Recommendation**

- A complete revision of this question should be considered. People are not answering it as intended. The question seems to have two intents - one is where the person stayed most of the time and the other is whether they stayed in a GQ that night.

### **Decision**

Use a coverage question off another panel instead of this one.

## **3.3 Race and Hispanic origin questions**

Goals: (a) The standard note that precedes the control version of the race and Hispanic origin

items is replaced with a stronger instruction intended to improve item completeness and reduce reporting of Hispanic origins in the race item; and (b) shorten the instruction associated with the race question.

### 3.3.1 Note prior to Hispanic Origin and Race

**◆NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 9 about Hispanic origin and Question 10 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.**

The limitation to our testing of this note is that we only interviewed one Hispanic respondent, two respondents who had children of Hispanic decent, and a roommate of someone of Hispanic decent.

The note did not cause any respondents in this study to respond differently than they would have otherwise. Some respondents did not understand the exact purpose of the note. Two respondents (one Hispanic and one non-Hispanic) thought “Hispanic origins are not races” could mean that you had to be more specific than just “Hispanic” - that you needed to specify country of origin.

Some respondents thought “Hispanic origins are not races” could be offensive.

#### **Recommendation**

- Consider putting the note that Hispanic origins are not races closer to race item.
- Conduct additional cognitive testing to ensure that the note is not offensive to Hispanics.
- Careful assessment of the Hispanic and Race questions from the field data should be planned. Comparisons with the control form is needed in order to assess item completeness to the extent that Hispanic origins are reported in the Race question.

### 3.3.2 Hispanic Origin

#### **Is Person 1 of Spanish, Hispanic or Latino origin?**

The only problem that respondents in this test experienced for this question was one respondent who has children of mixed Hispanic decent. The respondent (the children’s father) was Puerto Rican and his wife was Dominican. He was unsure how to answer this question for his children. He felt that he should only mark one choice for them, and ultimately decided to use his country of origin rather than his wife’s.

#### **Recommendation**

- No change.

### 3.3.3 Race

**What is Person 1's race?** *Mark X one or more boxes.*

Most respondents in this study saw the note that they could pick more than one race. However, none of our respondents expressed the desire to pick more than one. Several respondents did indicate that they thought a person “should” pick only one race.

#### **Recommendation**

- No change.

### **3.4 Revised instruction about who to list as Person 1**

---

Goals: (a) Cognitive interviews show substantial confusion about for whom respondents are to provide information. A revised instruction is intended to clarify that respondents should include themselves, and to clarify who is listed as Person 1; and (b) shorten and revise the instruction about who to list as Person 1.

#### **3.4.1 Identifying Person 1**

Next, answer questions about everyone, including yourself, whom you counted in Questions 1, 2, and 3.

**Print the name** of a person who lives here and in whose name this house or apartment is owned or rented. *If that person does not live here, print the name of any adult living here. This is Person 1.*

Person 1's

Last Name

First Name

Middle Initial (MI)

#### **Formatting of this Question**

Not all people read the first sentence (Next, answer questions. . . ). The use of different fonts may impact how a person chooses to read (or not read) parts of this question. “Print the name” is in bold. This draws the attention, and indicates that it is the most important part of the question. The next two sentences: “If that person does not live here, print the name of any adult living here. This is person 1.” are in italics. This may indicate to the respondent that they do not have to read this part of the instruction.

The placement of middle initial worked very well here. Respondents attended to it.

### **Understanding of this Question**

Some respondents seemed to stumble through the instructions; most often stumbling on the conjunction (i.e., “and”) between “who lives here” and “in whose name this house. . .” It took them a minute to comprehend the instruction.

A couple of people did not realize that they would be asked to list the other people’s names inside. They either did not read the first sentence, or had forgotten it by the time they finished all of the instructions for Q6. In these cases, they indicated concern that they had to report only on one household member.

### **Performance of this Question**

Only one person was confused about who to list as Person 1. He put his daughter as Person 1, correctly. About half way through the first person column, he changed his mind and thought he should have put himself first. He crossed her name out and wrote his.

One respondent left himself off the form entirely. He had read the “including yourself” instruction, but since he was not the owner of the house, he, correctly, did not put himself down as Person 1. When he got inside the form, he forgot to list himself. He said that the inside pages asked for “Person 2” and “Person 3” - and he thought of reporting other people, but not himself.

### **Recommendations**

- The sponsor should reconsider use of font in this series. Perhaps the entire second sentence should be bolded, and the last two should be normal font.
- Other, simpler ways of asking for owner or renter’s name should be considered, but, again, use caution in changing text without the opportunity to pretest. Here is an idea for a revision:  
“Print the name of a renter or owner who lives here. If a renter or owner does not live here, print the name of any adult who does live here.”
- Consider placing the idea of listing others inside the form after the instruction about who to choose as Person 1 - see forms H and I that Don Dillman is testing.

### **Decision**

The sponsor will continue revisions and further cognitive testing of this question.

### **3.4.2 Continue note**

◆**If more people were counted in Questions 1, 2, or 3, continue with Person 2 inside.**

This note appeared at the bottom of the first page, at the end of the data collection for Person 1. It did not cause problems for anyone. About half the respondents read it, the other half just continued on their own. Respondents did understand that it meant for them to continue listing all

the people they had enumerated in the first three questions.

At the bottom of the Person 2 column, a couple of respondents seemed to need a cue to go to the top of the next column. They made it on their own, but they hesitated.

#### **Recommendation**

- Consider instructions at the bottom of the columns for Persons 2-6 if there is space.

### **3.5 Other observations**

---

#### **3.5.1 Tenure**

The tenure question used in this cognitive test had ellipses rather than a dash at the end of the question stem. This seemed to result in less re-reads of the question by respondents as compared to previous cognitive tests. This format should be explored further.

#### **3.5.2 Other response issues**

Respondents went back and forth between using check marks and Xs to respond. They tended to use X when the question specifically told them to (e.g., the Race question instructs respondents to “*Mark X one or more boxes.*”). Otherwise respondents tended to use check marks. If this causes a problem for processing, the sponsor should consider global instructions, or another way of letting the respondent know the appropriate way to mark each question.

A couple of respondents wondered why “January 3” was the date we used in the questionnaire. We doubt that April 1 would be any more salient of a date to them. The sponsor should consider explaining somewhere on the form that we count people as of April 1. This could go in the cover letter.

Appendix A:  
Form used for Cognitive  
Testing



## 2005 National Census Test

Use this section to complete information for the rest of the people who live or stay at this place.  
We may call for additional information about them.

**Person 7** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

**Person 8** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

**Person 9** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

**Person 10** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

**Person 11** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

**Person 12** Last Name First Name MI

Sex  Male  Female Age (on January 1, 2005) Date of Birth Month Day Year Related to Person 1?  Yes  No

Thank you for completing your official 2005 National Census Test form.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

A. JIC1 B. JIC2 C. JIC3 D. JIC4

If your enclosed postage-paid envelope is missing, please mail your completed to:  
U.S. Census Bureau  
National Processing Center  
P.O. Box 5500  
Jeffersonville, IN 47199-5500

If you need help completing this form, call 1-877-221-9436 between 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., 7 days a week. The telephone call is free.

TDD — Telephone display device for the hearing impaired. Call 1-800-786-9448 between 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., 7 days a week. The telephone call is free.

¿NECESITA AYUDA? Si usted necesita ayuda para completar este cuestionario llame al 1-800-845-8243 entre las 8:00 a.m. y las 9:00 p.m., 7 días a la semana. La llamada telefónica es gratis y recibirá ayuda en español.

The Census Bureau estimates that, for the average household, this form will take about 10 minutes to complete, including the time for reviewing the instructions and answers. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this burden, to: Paperwork Reduction Project 0607-0725, U.S. Census Bureau, 4700 Silver Hill Road, Stop 1500, Washington, DC 20233-1500. You may e-mail comments to Paperwork@census.gov; use "Paperwork Project 0607-0725" as subject.

Respondents are not required to respond to any information collection unless it displays a valid approval number from the Office of Management and Budget.



Start here

1. Including yourself, how many people live here and have no other place they live? Don't forget to include babies.

Number of people =

2. Besides those counted in Question 1, how many other people have more than one place they live, but sleep here more often than anywhere else? Enter "0" if none.

Number of people =

3. Besides those counted in Question 1 or 2, how many other people were staying here temporarily on January 3, 2005 and had no other place where they live? Enter "0" if none.

Number of people =

4. Is this house, apartment or mobile home... Mark  ONE box.

- Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan?
- Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage or loan)?
- Rented for cash rent?
- Occupied without payment of cash rent?

5. What is your telephone number? We may call if we don't understand an answer.

Area Code + Number

- -

6. Next, answer questions about everyone, including yourself, whom you counted in Questions 1, 2, and 3.

Print the name of a person who lives here and in whose name this house or apartment is owned or rented. If that person does not live here, print the name of any adult. This is Person 1.

Person 1's

Last Name

First Name

Middle initial (MI)

OMB No. 0607-0725: Approval Expires 8/31/2007

Form DC-2G (12-17-2004)

U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

7. What is Person 1's sex?  Male  Female

8. Print Person 1's age and date of birth. Print numbers in boxes.

Age in years on January 3, 2005

Month of Birth Day Year of Birth

NOTE: Please answer BOTH Question 9 about Hispanic origin and Question 10 about race. For this census, Hispanic origins are not races.

9. Is Person 1 of Spanish, Hispanic or Latino origin?

- No, not of Spanish, Hispanic or Latino origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Spanish, Hispanic or Latino origin — Print origin, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran and so on.

10. What is Person 1's race? Mark  one or more boxes.

- White
- Black, African Am., or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native — Print name of enrolled or principal tribe.
- Asian Indian
- Chinese
- Filipino
- Other Asian — Print race, for example, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani, Cambodian and so on.
- Japanese
- Korean
- Vietnamese
- Native Hawaiian
- Guamanian or Chamorro
- Samoan
- Other Pacific Islander — Print race, for example, Fijian, Tongan and so on.

Some other race — Print race

11. On the night of January 3, 2005, where did Person 1 stay?

- At this address
- At another house, apartment or mobile home
- In a college residence hall or dormitory
- In some other type of group housing — Please specify type of place.
- In military barracks
- In a nursing home or mental hospital
- In a jail, prison or detention facility

If more people were counted in Questions 1, 2, or 3, continue with Person 2 inside.

