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Who Is Multiracial? Depends on How You Ask
A Comparison of Six Survey Methods to Capture Racial Identity

BY Eileen Patten

Overview

In 2014, as Pew Research Center prepared to conduct the first major study of the views of multiracial Americans—a group that, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, is poised to triple by 2060—we faced a fundamental and unavoidable methodological challenge: how to define and measure the concept “multiracial” in a public opinion survey context.¹

Racial identity is far from a straightforward concept, and when multiple strands of identity come together this has the potential to increase the complexity. An individual’s racial self-identity may take into account a range of factors beyond genealogy, including family ties, physical appearance, culture and how others perceive them. In other words, being multiracial is more than just a straightforward summation of the races in an individual’s family tree.²

Consider, for example, a man whose mother is Asian and whose father is white. This may seem like someone who could easily be categorized as multiracial. But if this man was raised with little or no interaction with his white relatives or had experiences that were more closely aligned with those of the Asian community, he may well select “Asian” and nothing else when describing his race. Furthermore, some adults may have relatives of different races farther back in their family tree. While some people may think to include a more distant relative of a different race when asked about their racial background, others may not, even if they are aware of their family history.

With this in mind, we set out to test six different ways of defining a population of mixed-race adults to survey, using as our primary vehicle Pew Research Center’s American Trends Panel (ATP), a probability-based, nationally representative online panel of adults in the United States. We tested these different approaches with impaneled individuals who participated in more than one Pew Research Center survey, allowing us to examine how the same individual might have changed his or her responses depending on the question asked.

¹ Throughout this report, the terms “multiracial,” “mixed race” and “multiple race” are used interchangeably. When discussing measures in which a respondent selects one or more races, “two or more races” and “more than one race” are also used.
In this report, we share the results of these six survey experiments with a focus on the ways in which the different wordings of the stem, different response options and different modes used impacted the projected size of the U.S. multiracial population. We also look at the consistency in selecting two or more races across different measures at the individual level, as well as how estimates of specific subgroups of multiracial adults—most notably white and American Indian biracial adults—vary by question type.

**Standard two-question measure.** The first measurement effort was the standard two-question race and ethnicity format included on most Pew Research Center polls. Similar to the method currently employed by the Census Bureau and many other survey researchers, it asks a respondent to select one or more races, with a separate question measuring Hispanic ethnicity. This produced our baseline estimate that 3.7% of American adults are mixed race, defined as selecting two or more races (defined as: white, black, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific

### Multiracial Share of U.S. Adults Varies Widely Across Different Measures of Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>% of Population Who Gave Two or More Races/Consider Themselves Multiracial for Each Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard two-question:</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark one or more race, Hispanic asked separately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census Alternative Question Experiment (AQE):</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark one or more race or origin, Hispanic included as response option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census AQE+parents:</strong></td>
<td>10.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races for self in AQE OR Parent(s) some other race than self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census AQE+parents/grandparents:</strong></td>
<td>16.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races for self in AQE OR Parent(s)/grandparent(s) some other race than self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point allocation:</strong></td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate 10 points in any combination to whichever racial or ethnic groups describe you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudinal:</strong></td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Do you consider yourself to be mixed race; that is belonging to more than one racial group?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These figures likely overestimate the shares of single-race adults with relatives of a different race. See discussion in the “What Are the Races of Your Parents and Grandparents?” section in Chapter 1 for an explanation.

Note: Hispanic and “Some other race” are not counted as races. “Some other race” verbatim responses were backcoded when possible into the major racial categories. For point allocation, respondents are considered multiracial if they gave at least one point to two or more races; excludes 204 respondents who did not give a valid response for the point allocation measure.

Islander; Hispanic and “some other race” are not included as races).

Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment measure. We then tested a question being considered for the 2020 decennial census, in which the Hispanic origin response option is included with the racial categories in a “mark one or more” format. Using this measure, called the Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE), we found that 4.8% of adults reported two or more races (not including Hispanic or some other race).

Census AQE measure with parents’ races. Some researchers have argued that the population with a mixed racial background is likely broader than the share of adults who report two or more races when asked to identify their own race in a “mark one or more” format. One of the ways we tested this theory was by exploring the race and ethnicity of respondents’ parents and grandparents. First, we asked those who chose only one race in the AQE measure whether either their mother or father was “some other race or origin” than the race they selected for themselves. This roughly doubled the share reporting a multiracial background to 10.8%.

Census AQE measure with parents’ and grandparents’ races. For those who said they did not have a parent of a different race, we asked whether any of their grandparents were “some other race or origin” than their own, which increased the share indicating a multiracial background to 16.6%. As discussed below, because of the way the follow-up questions were worded, we believe the share of single-race adults indicating that they have a parent or grandparent of a different race overestimates the multiracial population.

Point allocation measure. Next, we tested an experimental measure developed by University of California, Berkeley political scientist Taeku Lee in which respondents are given 10 “identity points” and asked to allocate them across different racial and ethnic categories however they see fit. For example, if they think of themselves as half white and half black, they could allocate five points to each, but if they think of themselves as mostly white, but had a black ancestor, they could allocate nine points to white and one point to black. This measure was developed to increase the share of adults reporting two or more races, and the Pew Research Center analysis finds that it does compared with the “mark one or more” approaches—some 12.7% of adults gave points to two or more races using this measure.

---

3 Using a similar method, the Census Bureau found that 2.1% of adults reported two or more races in the 2013 American Community Survey. (The Census Bureau estimates include those who gave a single race along with the “some other race” category as multiracial. The Pew Research Center estimates do not include “some other race” as a racial category.)
**Attitudinal measure.** Finally, we asked people directly, “Do you consider yourself to be mixed race; that is, belonging to more than one racial group?” Taking this approach, 12.0% of adults identified themselves as multiracial.

In the end, after assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, we decided to cast a wide net in the 2015 survey of multiracial Americans by asking people to report their own race(s) or ethnicity using the AQE measure, as well as asking a revised version of the parent and grandparent follow-ups, in which we asked the specific race(s) and ethnicity of their biological parents, grandparents and earlier ancestors in a parallel format to the AQE measure. For the Pew Research Center analysis, we considered someone to be multiracial if their background included two or more races (not including Hispanic) when their own, their parents’ and their grandparents’ races were taken into account. This resulted in our estimate that 6.9% of American adults are multiracial. (Had the races of great-grandparents and earlier ancestors been taken into account, that estimate would have risen to 13.1%.)

The remainder of this report will discuss in detail the various methods Pew Research Center tested to measure respondents’ racial backgrounds, including exact question wording, as well as an assessment of the resulting racial composition and of the challenges or concerns that each question elicits. Furthermore, because these questions were asked of the same individuals in different interviews, we are also able to examine whether the same individual changed his or her responses depending on the type of question asked. This report will look at the consistency in selecting two or more races at the individual level across the different methods, including among various multiracial subgroups. A more detailed breakdown of the racial composition of the adult population captured by the different measures, as well as a comparison of other demographics of the multiracial population captured by each measure, can be found in the tables in Appendix A.
Chapter 1: Estimates of Multiracial Adults and Other Racial and Ethnic Groups Across Various Question Formats

Standard Two-Question Measure

The first method used for measuring racial identity was the two-question race and ethnicity format typically used on all Pew Research Center surveys. It is similar to the two-question format presently used in U.S. Census Bureau surveys and by many other government and research organizations.

In this format, respondents are first asked, “Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban?” Then, they are asked to select as many as apply from a list including white, black or African American, and Asian or Asian American, or to specify some other race. Up to four responses are recorded and respondents who volunteer that they are “mixed race” or “biracial” are probed to provide their specific races.

This question was included on a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) random-digit dial (RDD) telephone survey of more than 10,000 adults conducted in English and Spanish Jan. 23-March 16, 2014. This survey was used to recruit panelists for Pew Research Center’s American Trends Panel (ATP), a probability-based, nationally representative online panel of adults in the United States.

Using the two-question approach, 3.7% of adults selected two or more races, regardless of whether or not they were of Hispanic origin. In addition, two-thirds (65.8%) said they were white only and not Hispanic, 11.8% were non-Hispanic black, and 2.6% non-Hispanic Asian. Some 13.3% said they were Hispanic alone or in combination with another race or races, including 0.4% who selected Hispanic and two or more races.

---

4 The Census Bureau introduced the option to choose more than one race in 2000. Prior to that, only one race selection was permitted.

5 Analysis of the different race questions will report figures for Hispanics alone or in combination with another race or races; while this group is not mutually exclusive from the two or more races category, it is useful because when most survey organizations (including the Census Bureau) report numbers for Hispanics, they include all Hispanics regardless of their racial background.
This type of format is commonly used by survey researchers because it follows current Office of Management and Budget definitions of race and ethnicity used by the Census Bureau, in which Hispanic is considered an ethnicity and not a race. One of the major challenges with this format is that many Americans do not separate their race from their ethnic origin in the same way that some researchers often do, and this is particularly true among Hispanics.

In fact, a 2015 survey found that 67% of Hispanic adults consider being Hispanic part of their racial background or both their racial and ethnic backgrounds. This leaves many Hispanics perplexed as to how to answer this two-question format where Hispanic is not included among the racial response categories.

This is a challenge that the Census Bureau has also acknowledged. Their researchers found that some 37% of Latinos in the 2010 census reported their race as “some other race” instead of providing one of the given racial categories, and many wrote in responses such as “Mexican,” “Hispanic” or “Latin American.”6 This is also the case on Pew Research Center surveys of Latinos. In the 2014 National Survey of Latinos, 25% of Latinos volunteered their race as “Hispanic” or

---

6 See Humes, Jones and Ramirez (2011) and Tafoya (2004).
“Latino” instead of one of the standard racial classification groups, and 12% said they didn’t know how to answer or refused to answer.  

In preparation for the 2020 census, the Census Bureau has been testing alternative versions of their race and ethnicity measures, in large part to decrease the incidence of “some other race” reporting and low response rates for the race question among Hispanics. Instead of asking separate questions to measure Hispanic origin and race, the proposed single question allows people to select more than one category—and includes “Hispanic” as an option among the listed races and origins. A report released by the Census Bureau in early 2013 indicated that this new format did not reduce the estimates of Hispanics or minority race groups in the population even as it lowered item nonresponse. Furthermore, they concluded that the resulting data were more accurate and reliable, and better reflected the self-identity of respondents.

Based on this research, the next method we tested to measure the race and ethnicity of respondents was a version of the proposed new census item, combining race and Hispanic origin into one question.

Though our research has shown that many consider their Hispanic origin to be a race, for the purposes of this report we will continue to use the current Census Bureau standards which consider race and ethnicity separately, and therefore Hispanics who also select one race would not be considered to be multiracial in our analysis.

**Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment Measure**

The question derived from the Census Bureau’s Alternative Questionnaire Experiment (AQE) measure is similar to the standard two-question measure, but instead of asking a separate question to capture Hispanic origin, it asks a single question that allows people to select more than one race or origin and includes “Hispanic” as one of the options.

This question was included on Wave 5 of the American Trends Panel (conducted in English and Spanish July 7-Aug. 4, 2014), which included a mode experiment that randomly assigned the panel’s Web respondents to either their usual Web mode or a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) mode. The panel’s mail respondents (those who do not use the internet or who did not provide an email address) were assigned to CATI as well.

---


8 The bureau is also looking into several other modifications to the race question that are not discussed at length here and were not included in our tests, including whether to include a new “Middle East and North Africa” race category and whether to collect specific origins for all races (currently, this information is only collected for Hispanics, American Indian or Alaska Natives, Asians and Pacific Islanders).
For Web respondents, the question read, “What is your race or origin? Mark one or more boxes,” and response categories were listed along with examples for each, such as “German, Irish, English, Italian, Lebanese, Egyptian and so on” for the “white” response option.

The phone respondents were read: “I’m going to read you a list of categories. Which of the following describes your race or origin? You can select as many as apply.” A random half sample of the phone respondents were read the entire list of response options in the question wording box below (without the examples) and the other half were read an abridged version that is more similar to the list used in the standard two-question measure—white, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, Black or African American, Asian or Asian American, or some other race or origin.9

Altogether, 4.8% of adults selected two or more races using the AQE measure, regardless of whether or not they are Hispanic—slightly higher than the 3.7% share that did so using the standard two-question format. While this measure increases the reporting of two or more races, it does not significantly alter reporting of the other major races and ethnicities compared with the standard format. Two-thirds of adults were non-Hispanic white, 11.8% non-Hispanic black, and 2.8% non-Hispanic Asian. Some 12.9% said they were Hispanic alone or in combination with another race or races, including 0.9% who said they were Hispanic and two or more races.

---

9 To keep question wording as close as possible to the standard two-question measure, the question with the short list of response options asked respondents about their race (not “race or origin”), but the Hispanic option was still included as “Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin.”
Question wording: Census Alternative Question Experiment

**Phone with long list:** I’m going to read you a list of categories. Which of the following describes your race or origin? You can select as many as apply. White, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, Black or African American, Asian or Asian American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or some other race or origin. [RECORD UP TO FOUR IN ORDER MENTIONED BUT DO NOT PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL] [IF RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS MIXED/BIRACIAL, PROBE ONCE: What race or races is that?]  

**Phone with short list:** I’m going to read you a list of categories. Which of the following describes your race? You can select as many as apply. White, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, Black or African American, Asian or Asian American, or some other race or origin. [RECORD UP TO FOUR IN ORDER MENTIONED BUT DO NOT PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL] [IF RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS MIXED/BIRACIAL, PROBE ONCE: What race or races is that?]  

**Web:** What is your race or origin? Mark one or more boxes.  
1. **White**  
   Examples: German, Irish, English, Italian, Lebanese, Egyptian, and so on  
2. **Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin**  
   Examples: Mexican or Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Salvadoran, Colombian, and so on  
3. **Black or African American**  
   Examples: African American, Jamaican, Haitian, Nigerian, Ethiopian, Somali, and so on  
4. **Asian or Asian-American**  
   Examples: Chinese, Filipino, Asian Indian, Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese, and so on  
5. **American Indian or Alaska Native**  
   Examples: Navajo Nation, Blackfeet Tribe, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Mayan, Doyon, Native Village of Barrow Inupiat Traditional Government, and so on  
6. **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander**  
   Examples: Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro, Tongan, Fijian, Marshallese, and so on  
7. **Some other race or origin** List race(s) and/or origin(s)  

**Follow-up Questions: Parent or Grandparent of a Different Race or Origin?**  
ASK IF ONLY ONE OPTION 1-6* IS SELECTED IN AQE:  
Was either your mother or father some other race or origin than [ANSWER IN AQE]?  
1. Yes  
2. No  

IF NO TO PREVIOUS QUESTION:  
Were any of your grandparents some other race or origin than [ANSWER IN AQE]?  
1. Yes  
2. No  

* Respondents who selected only Hispanic for the AQE received the follow-up questions about their parents and grandparents but are not included in the analysis for this report because we are not counting someone who is Hispanic and a single race as multiracial.
Some of the difference between the multiracial estimates for the AQE and the standard measure may have been due to differences in mode (AQE measure in a mixed-mode survey vs. standard measure in a phone survey) and response options (long list vs. short list). Some 5.2% of respondents who answered the AQE via the Web mode reported two or more races, significantly higher than the 3.7% who gave two or more races using the standard measure. By contrast, 4.5% of respondents who answered the AQE via phone reported two or more races, not significantly higher than the share for the standard two-question phone measure. However, this finding hides variation among the phone respondents based on the list of response options read to them. Among phone respondents who were read the short list of response categories, the share reporting two or more races—3.6%—is nearly identical to the share that did so for the standard race question, which included a similar list of response options. Among phone respondents who were read the full list of response options, the share selecting two or more races—5.4%—looks more similar to the share for Web respondents, who also saw the full list of races.

This suggests that the difference in the share reporting two or more races between the standard and AQE measures we tested isn’t due to including “Hispanic” in the race question, but rather due to providing most of the respondents with a more extensive list of race categories. If this is the case, it is possible that a version of the standard two-question measure with more extensive response categories would also register higher levels of adults reporting two or more races.

An increase in the share of people saying that they are American Indian in addition to one other race accounted for 79% of the difference between the long- and short-response option versions of the phone questions.10 “American Indian or Alaska Native” was one of the response options read for the longer list of responses, but not for the abridged version.

All in all, though the share of adults indicating a multiple-race background was about 30% higher in the AQE than in the standard race question, this method is still a very similar “mark one or more” type of race question. It differs only in the placement of Hispanic origin and, in this case, response options. However, some researchers have argued that the share of people who have a multiracial background is likely higher than the share that reports two or more races when asked

---

10 Throughout this report, references to “American Indians” include Alaska Natives.
to identify their own race by selecting one or more categories from a list. Therefore, we tested several other measures to see if they would capture a broader population of mixed-race adults.

**What Are the Races of Your Parents and Grandparents?**

The first approach we took to explore the possibility of capturing a broader multiracial population was asking about the racial backgrounds of respondents’ parents and grandparents.

Along with the AQE measure, we tested a follow-up question that asked single-race respondents if either of their parents was a different race or origin than the one they reported for themselves. Those who said “no” were then asked if any of their grandparents were some other race or origin than their own.

Altogether, we found that 6% of adults chose one race for themselves but said they had a parent who was a different race or origin, which roughly doubled the multiracial estimate, from 4.8% based only on the respondents’ own races to 10.8% when the respondents’ parents were taken into account. And when extended to include single-race adults with grandparents of a different race or origin, the share of the population that could be considered multiracial rose by another 6 percentage points, to 16.6%.

However, these questions may overstate the share of single-race adults who have a parent or grandparent of a different race and, as a result, the multiracial population generated by incorporating these measures. Because the question was worded “Was either your mother or father (or any of your grandparents, in the subsequent question) some other race or origin than [insert respondent’s AQE race selection],” there was room for interpretation as to what was meant by race or origin.
Since these questions asked about a different race or origin, some respondents may have been thinking about their ethnic or even national origin in their responses. This may have been the case particularly among respondents with a Hispanic parent or grandparent, since “Hispanic” was explicitly listed when they were asked about their own race or origin in the AQE. But it could also have affected those who were thinking of a relative of Irish or Jewish or Middle Eastern origin, for example. Or a Chinese respondent who self-identified as “Asian” may have been thinking of a Japanese relative, who, while of a different national origin, would also be considered “Asian.”

It is also important to note that respondents who selected only one race for the AQE were not asked the follow-up questions about their parents or grandparents if they also selected “Hispanic” or “some other race.” Altogether, 89 respondents, or about 3% of all single-race respondents, fell in this category.

With this in mind, in order to more accurately find those who identify themselves as only one race but who may have had a parent, grandparent or earlier ancestors of a different race, the 2015 Pew Research Center survey of multiracial Americans asked all respondents to describe their parents’, grandparents’ and earlier ancestors’ races using the same Census AQE question they were given when asked to classify their own race.11 Using this refined method, we found that 2.9% of adults who chose only one race or no races12 for themselves could be considered to have two or more races in their background because of their parents’ races, and another 2.6% could be considered to have two or more races in their background because of their grandparents’ races. Altogether, using this method, the multiracial share of the adult population based on races reported for themselves, their parents and their grandparents was estimated to be 6.9% of the U.S. adult population.

---

11 For full question wording, see http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/06/11/appendix-a-survey-methodology-2/
12 Because of the way this question was revised, respondents who gave no races or a Hispanic origin only but selected multiple races for their parents or grandparents could also be counted as having two or more races. In the original, because Hispanic respondents were asked if they had relatives who were “some other race or origin than Hispanic” it was not possible to determine whether these respondents had multiple races in their backgrounds. Furthermore, this revision allowed us to analyze the parents and grandparents of respondents who gave a single race in addition to Hispanic or “some other race.”
Point Allocation Measure

Another method we tested as a potential way to capture a broader concept of race and ethnicity is called the point allocation measure. This is an experimental measure developed by Berkeley political scientist Taeku Lee in which respondents are given 10 “identity points” and asked to allocate them across different racial and ethnic categories they consider to be part of their background. This allows for a more nuanced reporting of secondary races or ethnicities, wherein a respondent can assign different weight to different categories by allocating a different number of points to each.

In his work, Lee argues that the share of respondents reporting more than one race will be greater using this measure than with a typical “mark one or more” measure. In the latter, each category is given equal importance, so someone who feels mostly of one race but has a less salient secondary race might not mark their secondary race. However, Lee hypothesizes that by allowing the allocation of points to different races, this same respondent may then acknowledge this secondary racial identity by, for example, allocating nine points to his or her primary race and a single point to a secondary race.\(^\text{13}\)

The point allocation exercise was included in wave 7 of the American Trends Panel (conducted in English and Spanish Sept. 9-Oct. 3, 2014), which was conducted almost entirely on the Web, with the remainder completing mail-in questionnaires.

Using this measure, 12.7% of respondents reported a multiracial background, defined as allocating at least one point to two or more racial groups. An additional 61.2% of respondents reported that they were non-Hispanic white only, 7.0% reported that they were non-Hispanic black only and

---

\(^{13}\) Lee tested this hypothesis in a 2003 survey of Californian adults and found that 26% identified as multiracial. By comparison, just 5% of Californian adults identified as two or more races on the 2000 census.
3.4% said they were non-Hispanic Asian only. Some 13.3% said they were Hispanic, alone or in combination with another race or races, including 2.3% who selected Hispanic and two or more races.¹⁴

The point-allocation approach increases the share of adults reporting two or more races, but decreases the share of adults reporting that their racial and ethnic background is non-Hispanic whites or non-Hispanic black compared with the standard two-question format (see Appendix A, Table A1).

Question wording: Point Allocation Measure
In thinking about their background, people often will describe which racial or ethnic groups best describe them. Imagine if we used a 10 point system where points are allocated to whichever racial or ethnic groups we think accurately describe a person.

For example, if you think of someone as half-white and half-Asian, you might allocate 5 points to each. Or if you think of someone as mostly black but with some Hispanic heritage, you might allocate 8 or 9 points for African American and 1 or 2 points for Latino.

Now think of your own background in racial and ethnic terms. How would you describe your race and ethnicity using this 10-point system?

[PROGRAMMING NOTE, FOR PARTICIPANTS WITH JAVASCRIPT ENABLED, KEEP A RUNNING TOTAL AT THE BOTTOM OF ALLOCATED POINTS]

__ White
__ Black or African American
__ Asian or Asian American
__ Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
__ Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native
__ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
__ Other
10 TOTAL POINTS

Soft prompt: The total is [more/less] than 10 points. Please change your answers to total 10, or press next to skip.

¹⁴ “Other” responses were not counted toward one’s racial composition, so a respondent who splits points between a single response category such as white and “other” would be counted as just white. However, “other” responses were backcoded into the standard racial categories when possible (for example, “Mexican” into “Hispanic”).
But the point allocation measure faced some major challenges. In particular, this question was difficult to implement and seems to have caused confusion among some respondents. Altogether, about one-in-ten respondents either did not give a valid response to the item or skipped it altogether. Among the 343 panelists who received mail-in surveys, half did not give a valid response, including 138 respondents who checked boxes instead of inserting numbers as instructed. The share giving non-valid responses or refusals on the Web was much lower (4%), likely because the Web version included a running total showing the points used and a prompt that informed respondents if their responses did not add to 10 before they moved onto the next question. Despite these aids, some 2% of Web respondents still entered numbers that did not add up to 10. In the analysis for this report, the 204 Web and mail respondents who gave non-valid responses are excluded.¹⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer to point allocation</th>
<th>Web Unweighted N</th>
<th>Mail Unweighted N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct total (10 pts)</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total didn’t add to 10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked boxes instead of inserting numbers (mail only)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused (left all boxes blank)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹⁵ We did not test this format on the phone. However, one can imagine that the added challenge of requiring mental math could make this task difficult for many phone respondents. Taeku Lee conducted this experiment over the phone in California and found that one-in-six respondents did not provide a valid response.
Attitudinal Measure: Are You Multiracial?

Finally, we asked an attitudinal question to directly capture the share of adults who say they consider themselves to be mixed race—that is, belonging to more than one racial group.

This question was asked on wave 7 of the American Trends Panel, along with the point allocation measure. A random half of respondents were asked if they considered themselves to be multiracial before they were asked to allocate points to different races, and the other half were asked this question after the point allocation measure.

Overall, 12.0% of adults said they are mixed race, including very similar shares of those who were asked the attitudinal question first (11.7%) and of those who were asked this question second (12.3%). But our analysis shows that to consider oneself “mixed race” is not necessarily equivalent to selecting more than one race when given a list of possible races. And the extent to which responses to the attitudinal question were consistent with the selection of two or more races varied depending on the question used to identify a respondent’s race.

A majority of adults who gave two or more races for themselves using the standard two-question format or the Census AQE format said they consider themselves mixed race—71% of each group said this. Still, about a quarter of these multiracial adults did not
consider themselves mixed race.

Those who chose only one race for themselves in the AQE measure but indicated that they had a parent or a grandparent of a different race or origin were among the least likely to say they consider themselves mixed race. Just 27% of single-race adults who said at least one parent was a different race or origin and 15% with a grandparent with a different background than their own said they considered themselves multiracial.

Among those who gave at least one point to two or more races using the point allocation approach, some 46% said they consider themselves mixed race, while 54% said they do not think of themselves this way.

On the other side, some adults who selected only one race or origin say they consider themselves mixed race when asked the attitudinal question. Looking at the Census AQE measure for example, adults who say they are only Hispanic (22%) or only black (15%) are more likely to say they consider themselves mixed race than adults who are only white (4%). This finding for Hispanics is consistent with findings in the 2014 Pew Research Survey of Latinos, which shows that many Hispanics consider themselves mixed race, indigenous or Afro-Latino, even if this isn’t reflected in the races they select for themselves in a standard race question.

Ultimately, the inconsistency between selecting more than one race on a race question and identifying as mixed race informed our decision to use the attitudinal question as a dependent variable to measure the salience of a respondent’s multiracial identity in our survey of multiracial adults, rather than as a way to define our multiracial population.
Chapter 2: The Consistency of Reporting Two or More Races Across Race-Selection Measures

Looking only at the three questions that asked respondents to identify their race or races—standard two-question, Census AQE and point allocation—we find that many adults who select two or more races using one approach do not offer consistent responses using the other measures. Overall, 14% of adults select two or more races on at least one of the three measures. Only 2% consistently selected two or more races using all three of the approaches that asked respondents to identify their race or races.

The Venn diagram below details the overlap and disconnect in multiple-race responses among all adults who selected two or more races on at least one of the measures. Just 16% of these adults would be considered multiracial using all three measures. A majority (60%) could only be described as multiracial using the point allocation approach, while less than 5% each would fit the definition using only the Census AQE measure or only the standard two-question measure, reflecting the greater overlap between these two approaches.

### 14% of Adults Give Two or More Races for Themselves in at Least One Race-Selection Question

Number of measures in which panelist identified two or more races for themselves among standard two-question, AQE and point allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fits at least one definition</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only one</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only two</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes 142 respondents who did not give a valid response for the point allocation measure.

To be sure, differences in mode—in addition to question type—may be playing a role. The standard race measure was asked over the phone, point allocation over the Web and Census AQE through a mix of Web and phone modes. However, eliminating mode differences does not eliminate the unique cases within each question. For example, if analysis is limited to only respondents who answered both the point allocation and Census AQE measures via the Web, the overlapping share is similar to the overlap when the total sample is analyzed (29% and 26%, respectively).

**Little Consistency in Reporting of Multiple Races Across Three Race-Selection Questions**

Among adults who gave two or more races for at least one of the three measures shown below, only 16% would qualify as multiracial on all three measures. The point allocation measure captures a unique set of multiracial respondents; six-in-ten select two or more races for only this measure and neither of the other measures.

- **Point allocation measure**: 92%
- **Standard two-question and Point allocation measures**: 60%
- **All 3 measures**: 16%
- **Standard two-question and Census AQE measures**: 3.3%
- **Census AQE measure**: 31%
- **Census AQE and Point allocation measures**: 11%
- **Standard two-question measure**: 26%

Note: Overlaps of the circles are approximate. Excludes 142 respondents who did not give a valid response for the point allocation measure. Sample size for adults who are multiple-race for any of the three questions is 289.

Our tests of different approaches to asking respondents to identify their race or races show that the share of adults who report an American Indian background is particularly susceptible to question-wording effects. For example, in the standard two-question approach, which doesn’t specifically list “American Indian” as an option, 1.5% of all adults said they were white and volunteered that they were also American Indian, while slightly more (2.5%) marked white and American Indian in the AQE. Using the point allocation approach, however, 6.3% assigned at least one point to white and American Indian. Similarly, more adults said they were black and American Indian in the point allocation measure (1.5%) than in the other two approaches (0.3% in each).

The share of all adults who report three or more races is also considerably higher using the point allocation approach than using the standard or AQE approaches. Less than 1% of respondents select three or more races when asked the standard race question (0.4%) or the AQE (0.7%). By comparison, 2.3% allocate points to three or more races using the point allocation measure.
## Appendix A: Additional Tables

### Table A1. Detailed Race Responses, by Question Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Standard two-question</th>
<th>Census AQE</th>
<th>Point allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White only</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black only</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian only</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native only</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic only</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ races</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race only</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-HISPANIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White only</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black only</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian only</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native only</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ races</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race only</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISPANIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White only</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black only</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian only</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native only</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic only</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ races</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race only</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted sample size: 10,013

Note: The symbol "---" indicates that no respondents selected that response. Figures may not add to totals due to rounding. Respondents are considered mixed race only if they gave at least two of the following race responses: white, black, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; “some other race” and “Hispanic/Latino” responses are not counted as races. Standard two-question: The total Hispanic share of 13.3% is based on those who either volunteered their race as Hispanic or said they were Hispanic in a separate question. Non-Hispanics include 0.6% who responded “Don’t know” or left the Hispanic origin question blank. Point allocation: 204 out of 3,151 total respondents entered responses that did not add up to 10 or entered check marks instead of numbers into the spaces given (mail version only). These respondents are excluded from the analysis in this table.

Table A2. Selected Characteristics, by Question Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard two-question</th>
<th>Census AQE</th>
<th>Point allocation</th>
<th>Attitudinal</th>
<th>General population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(among 25+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/Two-year degree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or more</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 or more</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-74,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban-rural classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unweighted sample size</strong></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>10,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents are considered multiracial only if they gave at least two of the following race responses: white, black, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; “some other race” and “Hispanic/Latino” responses are not counted as races.

Appendix B: About the Data

The data in this report are based on three independent survey administrations based on the same randomly selected, nationally representative group of respondents. The first is Pew Research Center’s largest survey on domestic politics to date: the 2014 Political Polarization and Typology Survey, a telephone survey of just over 10,000 Americans. A subset of these respondents has been impaneled into the American Trends Panel. Follow-up surveys have been conducted with them, and this report includes data from two of these follow-up surveys (the first by Web and telephone, the second by Web and mail). The main telephone survey and the panel surveys are described separately, in further detail, in the section that follows.

For the majority of this analysis, the samples we looked at included the same respondents or a highly overlapping group of respondents. We accounted for this overlap in all tests of statistical significance. As a result of the overlaps among the samples, the margin of sampling error reported in this methodological statement should not be used to assess the significance of differences between the various measures of racial identification tested here.

Overview of Telephone Survey Methodology

The telephone survey was conducted January 23-March 16, 2014 among a randomly selected national sample of 10,013 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia (5,010 respondents were interviewed on a landline, and 5,003 were interviewed on a cellphone, including 2,649 who had no landline telephone). The survey was conducted under the direction of Abt SRBI. A combination of landline and cellphone random digit dial samples were used; both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish. Respondents in the landline sample were selected by randomly asking for the youngest adult male or female who was at home at the time of the call. Interviews in the cell sample were conducted with the person who answered the phone, if that person was an adult 18 years of age or older. For detailed information about our survey methodology, see http://people-press.org/methodology/.

Data collection was divided equally into three phases (A, B, and C) with independent samples, non-overlapping interview dates and separate weighting. The questionnaire for each phase contained a core set of measures of political attitudes and values, political engagement and demographic characteristics, along with a set of unique questions about issues, lifestyle, media use and other topics. Additionally, most respondents to the survey were invited to join the newly created Pew Research Center’s American Trends Panel, described below.
The combined landline and cellphone sample is weighted using an iterative technique that matches gender, age, education, race, Hispanic origin and nativity and region to parameters from the 2012 Census Bureau’s American Community Survey and population density to parameters from the 2010 U.S. Census. The sample is also weighted to match current patterns of telephone status (landline only, cellphone only or both landline and cellphone), based on extrapolations from the January-June 2013 National Health Interview Survey. The weighting procedure accounts for the fact that respondents with both landline and cellphones have a greater probability of being included in the combined sample and adjusts for household size among respondents with a landline phone. Sampling errors and statistical tests of significance take into account the effect of weighting.

The following table shows the unweighted sample size and the error attributable to sampling that would be expected at the 95% level of confidence:

| Total sample for all three phases | Unweighted sample size | Plus or minus ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>1.1 percentage points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample sizes and sampling errors for subgroups are available upon request.

In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.


**The American Trends Panel Surveys (ATP)**

The American Trends Panel (ATP) is created by the Pew Research Center and managed by Abt SRBI. The Abt SRBI panel team included Chintan Turakhia, Charles DiSogra, Courtney Kennedy, Nick Bortoni, Marci Schalk, Robert Magaw, Emily Martinez, Allison Ackermann and Sandra Hernandez.

The ATP is a nationally representative panel of randomly selected U.S. adults living in households. Respondents who self-identify as internet users and who provided an email address participate in the panel via monthly self-administered Web surveys, and those who do not use the internet, do not have an email address, or refuse to provide their email address participate via the mail.
Data in this report are drawn from the fifth and the seventh waves of the panel conducted in 2014. For analysis comparing the same respondents’ answers across multiple questions, the data from these two waves and the initial telephone survey were merged. A separate weight was created for analysis based on the subset of respondents who answered both wave 5 and wave 7 of the ATP (N=2,721).

The fifth wave of the panel was conducted July 7-August 4, 2014 among 3,351 respondents. This wave featured a mode experiment in which web panelists were randomly assigned to either Web or telephone (CATI) mode, resulting in 1,509 experimental web mode completes, 1,494 experimental telephone mode completes and 348 non-experimental phone mode completes (resulting in 1,842 total phone mode completes). The margin of sampling error for the full sample of 3,351 respondents is plus or minus 2.2 percentage points; the margins of sampling error for the web sample and the phone sample are plus or minus 3.3 percentage points and plus or minus 3.0 percentage points, respectively. The seventh wave of the panel was conducted September 9-October 3, 2014 among 3,154 respondents (2,811 by Web and 343 by mail). The margin of sampling error for the full sample of 3,154 respondents is plus or minus 2.7 percentage points.

All current members of the American Trends Panel were originally recruited from the 2014 telephone survey discussed in the last section of this methodology. At the end of that survey, respondents were invited to join the panel. The invitation was extended to all respondents who use the internet (from any location) and a random subsample of respondents who do not use the internet. Of the 10,013 adults interviewed, 9,809 were invited to take part in the panel. A total of 5,338 agreed to participate and provided either a mailing address or an email address to which a welcome packet, a monetary incentive and future survey invitations could be sent. Panelists also receive a small monetary incentive after participating in each wave of the survey.

The ATP data were weighted in a multi-step process that begins with a base weight incorporating the respondents’ original survey selection probability and the fact that some panelists were subsampled for invitation to the panel. Next, an adjustment was made for the fact that the propensity to join the panel and remain an active panelist varied across different groups in the sample. The final step in the weighting uses an iterative technique that matches gender, age, education, race, Hispanic origin and region to parameters from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2013 American Community Survey. Population density is weighted to match the 2010 U.S. decennial

---

16 When data collection for the 2014 Political Polarization and Typology Survey began, non-internet users were subsampled at a rate of 25%, but a decision was made shortly thereafter to invite all non-internet users to join. In total, 83% of non-internet users were invited to join the panel.
census. Telephone service is weighted to estimates of telephone coverage for 2014 that were projected from the January-June 2013 National Health Interview Survey. It also adjusts for party affiliation using an average of the three most recent Pew Research Center general public telephone surveys and for internet use using as a parameter a measure from the 2014 Survey of Political Polarization. Sampling errors and statistical tests of significance take into account the effect of weighting. The Hispanic sample in the American Trends Panel is predominantly native born and English speaking.

The following table shows the field periods, unweighted sample sizes and response rates for each wave. The cumulative response rate takes account of the response rate for the 2014 Survey of Political Polarization (10.6%) and attrition from panel members who were removed at their request or for inactivity.

## Wave Sample Sizes and Response Rates

*Sample sizes and response rates for waves 5 and 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Field period</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
<th>Total phone-mode sample</th>
<th>Web-mode sample size</th>
<th>Phone response rate</th>
<th>Web response rate</th>
<th>Cumulative response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 5</td>
<td>July 7-Aug. 4, 2014</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>1,842*</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field period</td>
<td>Total sample size</td>
<td>Mail-mode sample size</td>
<td>Web-mode sample size</td>
<td>Mail response rate</td>
<td>Web response rate</td>
<td>Cumulative response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 9-Oct. 3, 2014</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wave 5 included a mode of interview experiment where Web panelists were randomly assigned to complete the survey via the Web (experimental Web) or the phone (experimental phone, n=1,494); mail panelists were interviewed via phone (non-experimental phone, n=348).

Source: Pew Research Center ATP Waves 5 and 7
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