

Author Full Name : Lyman Stone**Received Date :** 03/27/2023 12:59 PM**Comments Received :**

This comment proposes to explore elimination of the Ancestry question in PRCS/ACS. This is extremely ill-advised, for multiple reasons. First, although the new Census data collection for race requires specification of additional detail, there is as of yet zero study of whether the responses given in that section are even qualitatively similar to responses about "Ancestry." Census Bureau staff are proposing a substantial data deletion without any evidence to show the lost data can be replaced. Second, it is exceedingly unlikely these questions collect similar data, as can be seen in one well-attested example, Puerto Rican ancestry. In the United States, fully 5% of people who provide EITHER Puerto Rican ancestry OR Puerto Rican Hispanic detailed ethnicity report ONLY Puerto Rican ancestry but NO Puerto Rican Hispanic detailed ethnicity. This is not an error: it's perfectly possible for a person to have Puerto Rican ancestry but not identify as "Puerto Rican Hispanic" if for example they are a Black person with long ancestry in Puerto Rican, or indigenous, or white, etc. The insistence by the Census Bureau that "ancestry" is merely a subset of "race or ethnicity" is nonsensical, theoretically ill-founded, and reflects a deep lack of care by the staff proposing this change for any of the emergent research on racial, ethnic, and ancestral ID. In particular, this choice would lead to ancestries with multiple possible racial self-identifications (especially multiracial or non-Arab Middle Eastern) being misclassified and erased. Third, Census Bureau has not yet released or committed to releasing high granular data from the write-in section on race, nor released data on the procedures used to conform write-in answers to higher-level classifications. Until Census Bureau does this, it is impossible to make an objective assessment of this proposal. Fourth, ancestry classifications as they currently stand are useful for administering programs especially related to refugee diasporas, who are not always easily classified by "race" (e.g. Assyrian or Yazidi from Iraq). Many clear ancestry communities would stridently object to being described as a kind of race. Fifth, it is not clear if the 2020 racial classification question will be used again in 2030; it could be changed. In the interest of generating data which is useful to researchers and administrators, it is important to create meaningful comparison in data across timespans, which requires that at least some questions be stable across time. The ancestry question, if held stable and unchanged, provides a useful check and comparison to shifting racial-question definitions, enabling administrators more tools to observe how shifting question formats may alter individual self-definition. In sum, removing this question would be an egregious mistake.