

ATTACHMENT D:
COGNITIVE TESTING REPORT

Table of Contents

Survey of Artists Participating in International Exchanges: Web Survey Instrument Cognitive Testing Report.....	3
Purpose.....	3
Sample.....	3
Description of Data Collection Process	3
Part 1: Modifications to the Web Survey Instrument	5
Modifications Based on General Comments on the Survey	5
Modifications Based on Comments on Specific Survey Questions and Items.....	5
Part 2: Revised Web Survey Instrument.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix: Detailed Respondent Comments.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 1. Cognitive Testing Respondent Sample.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 2. General Comments on the Web Survey.....	5
Table 3. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Descriptive Information	5
Table 4. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Opportunities.....	6
Table 5. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Network.....	7
Table 6. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Skills and Learning	7
Table 7. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Reputation as an Artist.....	8
Table 8. Specific Comments and Revisions to Creativity	9
Table 9. Specific Comments and Revisions to Overall Survey	9

Survey of Artists Participating in International Exchanges: Web Survey Instrument Cognitive Testing Report

Purpose

From November 20, 2019, to November 27, 2019, 2M Research (2M) performed cognitive testing of the survey of artists who participated in the USAI International (USAI) program with nine respondents. The purpose of the cognitive testing was to detect issues with the clarity and readability of the items in the web survey, as well as to estimate the average time to complete the survey. This report summarizes the comments of the nine grantees and the suggested revisions to the survey based on the comments. The report includes the summarized respondent comments and associated suggested revisions.

Sample

To identify cognitive testing respondents, the Arts Endowment provided 2M with a list of grantees with considerations for diversity in terms of the following criteria:

- First-time or repeat awardee
- Artistic discipline as defined by the USAI program (i.e., dance, music, opera/music theatre, theatre, folklife/traditional arts, and multidisciplinary)
- Festival location (country)
- Representation from race/ethnicity groups: White – Non-Hispanic, Black/African American – Non-Hispanic, Hispanic/Latino, no single race or ethnicity, and other – Non-Hispanic (Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Native American/Pacific Islander)
- Artists from rural or smaller city context

Using these guiding criteria, 2M intended to collect cognitive testing data from a diverse sample of grantees to gain input from a variety of perspectives. These criteria were used to purposefully sample diverse grantees to help to identify any gaps in the survey responses or other areas for improvement and will help to ensure the revised survey is appropriate for a range of respondents.¹

Description of Data Collection Process

2M programmed the draft web survey by using the survey software Qualtrics. To recruit participants, 2M selected 20 past participants of the USAI program as potential respondents for the cognitive testing, based on the sampling criteria. Then, the Arts Endowment sent an initial invitation email inviting the artists to participate in testing the survey. If needed, 2M followed up with a reminder email to encourage participation.

For the artists who indicated interest in testing the survey, we first scheduled a 30-minute telephone interview with each respondent. Then, we sent each respondent a unique link to take

¹ Upon request, additional details on the sample characteristics may be provided.

the survey in Qualtrics and asked the respondents to write notes as they took the survey to record any issues with comprehension, clarity, and usefulness, as well as other thoughts. In addition to respondent notes, 2M assessed the amount of time the respondents spent on the entire survey.

2M conducted the interview by telephone to review the completed survey and respondents' notes and to discuss any issues that arose with specific questions during the survey. The interview also included general questions about the clarity of the survey questions and interpretation of the phrasing. 2M emailed a PDF version of the completed survey to the respondents prior to the cognitive interview so that respondents were able to re-read specific survey questions and their responses, as needed. 2M asked respondents to elaborate on specific items (i.e., questions, format, or responses) they found unclear so that 2M could compare respondents' perceptions to the intent of the questions and discuss any suggestions for improved clarity.

Modifications to the Web Survey Instrument

The cognitive testing respondents generally agreed the survey posed relevant, clear, and important questions to measure the impact of the USAI program on artists’ careers. Respondents felt that the survey could be clarified in terms of the causal relationship between the program and outcomes (e.g., number of bookings, changes in artistic practice). Respondent comments are summarized below and will be used to revise the updated web survey.

Modifications Based on General Comments on the Survey

Table 2 summarizes the general comments on the web survey instrument 2M received from the nine cognitive testing participants.

Table 1. General Comments on the Web Survey

Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most respondents felt the survey was an appropriate length. ▪ Average time spent on the survey was approximately 3 to 13 minutes, with an average of 6 minutes. ▪ All respondents felt positive about the survey overall and felt it was capturing salient information about the program’s impacts on artists’ careers. ▪ All respondents agreed that the survey is very relevant and easily understood.

Modifications Based on Comments on Specific Survey Questions and Items

The web survey is organized into one descriptive information section on the grantee and five constructs measuring professional outcomes artists experience as a result of the USAI program. The following tables summarize the comments and proposed revisions to the descriptive information section (Table 2), the respective construct questions, and the overall survey (Table 8). The constructs include Professional Opportunities (Table 3), Professional Networking (Table 4), Professional Skills and Learning (Table 5), Reputation as an Artist (Table 6), and Creativity (Table 7).

Table 2. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Descriptive Information

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One respondent considered himself an artist who was sponsored through the USAI program to travel; however, he did not identify as a performing artist. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise QA-1 to include technical directors, producers, or any artist.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One respondent answered “yes” to QA-2; however, the respondent also received a newer grant through the USAI program. It was difficult for the respondent to answer the survey thinking about the older grant that occurred several years ago. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This issue is specific to the survey testing because we are drawing on older grants to cognitively test and pilot test the survey. In the pilot test, ensure that the survey corresponds to the most recent USAI experience from 2014 to 2018 and

	exclude 2019 USAI grantees to avoid this issue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many respondents felt that artists would have differing answers to survey questions based on the status of their career (i.e., younger artist versus established artist). One respondent suggested including a self-selection question for artists to indicate their career status. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No revisions suggested. The current descriptive information is sufficient to support the Arts Endowment’s analysis plan.

Table 3. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Opportunities

Comments ²	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Q1-1, many respondents believed the word “invitation” to mean written communication about an upcoming booking. Some respondents did not believe there was a significant difference between invitation and booking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Q1-1 due to respondents’ similar understanding of invitation and booking. To focus on the outcomes of the program, the question series will solely inquire about the bookings rather than more general interest.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Q1-2, most respondents understood “following this USAI-sponsored project” to mean afterward rather than resulting from. Respondents did not understand “USAI-sponsored project” to include the larger experience of meeting other presenters and artists or witnessing their work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise Q1-2 (Q1-1 in revised survey) wording to specify bookings resulting from the USAI-sponsored experience. Revise Q1-2a (Q1-1a in revised survey) to specify bookings resulting from USAI-sponsored experience.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Q1-2a, most respondents preferred to enter an estimate for the number of bookings they secured. Respondents felt this was easier to tally because the bookings resulted in easily trackable performances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Q1-2b, all respondents agreed the open text box is the preferred and an easier format to enter country names. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.

² Comments are organized by the numbering in the tested version of the web survey. Part 2 includes the revised and renumbered version of the web survey.

Table 4. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Network

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2-1 and Q2-2, respondents understood “new professional contact” to primarily mean other presenters, people who witnessed their work, or booking agents. Respondents suggested additional clarification of who to include in this group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “new professional contacts may include industry contacts such as booking agents, managers, festival contacts or liaisons, or other artists or presenters who may provide an opportunity for new artistic projects in the future” to Q2-1 and Q2-2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2-2, one respondent suggested adding an open text box to indicate what type of contacts were made and why relationships were/were not maintained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No revisions suggested to ensure survey brevity and low respondent burden.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2-2a, many respondents felt a range would be easier to answer with versus using an open text box for number of professional contacts maintained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise Q2-2a to present numeric ranges.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2-2b, some respondents felt that an additional option should be available to indicate collaborations that have not yet been completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise Q2-2b to remove the word “finished” to include projects which may be in process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q2-3, respondents believed “interact” to mean engaging the Embassy in matters related or unrelated to the performance, such as contacting the Embassy when artists lost visas or passports, casually meeting with someone from the Embassy, or inviting Embassy contacts to the performance. Several respondents indicated Embassies are typically invited to performances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “Interactions may include contacting the Embassy to invite individuals to attend performances or other performance-related communications. May also include the Embassy contacting artists regarding their performances.” to Q2-3 to specify formal interactions related to artwork or performance.

Table 5. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Professional Skills and Learning

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One respondent suggested adding an open-ended question for respondents to describe how they learned about travel logistics, as indicated under Q3-1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No revisions suggested to ensure survey brevity and low respondent burden.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respondents did not understand “after your USAI experience” to have a direct relationship to the respondent’s USAI experience and requested clarification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise Q3-1 to indicate relationship (i.e., resulting from the USAI experience) similar to Q3-2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One respondent believed “understanding” was too broad and suggested Q3-1 be rephrased similar to Q3-2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise Q3-1 for consistency with Q3-2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some respondents indicated that some artists may be unable to answer Q3-1 and Q3-2 based on their role in their organization. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “non-applicable” to response options in Q3-1 and Q3-2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q3-2, one respondent understood strategies for engaging international audiences to include non-performance strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise Q3-2 language to specify artistic performance strategies.

Table 6. Specific Comments and Revisions to the Reputation as an Artist

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q4-1, respondents had robust discussions on the appropriateness of the term “reputation,” and some determined the term was judgmental or may elicit negative connotations. Despite this, respondents generally believed it was an appropriate term that encompassed behavioral and artistic merit and integrity, while “image,” “profile,” and “visibility” did not. Respondents recommended against “image” and “profile.” Respondents indicated that the broader definition of “reputation” may be more applicable to established artists, whereas “visibility” is more specific and may be important to younger artists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “visibility” to Q4-1 to increase inclusivity of statement.”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q4-1, one respondent believed not all artists have a reputation as international artists, despite USAI funding. This respondent suggested adding a “non-applicable” option. Similarly, one respondent was unsure whether all artists participate in social media as noted in Q4-2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “non-applicable” response option to Q4-1 for artists who do not believe they have an international reputation and in Q4-2 for artists who do not have a social media presence.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q4-1, some respondents felt that it would be difficult to track a change in the number of social media followers before and after a specific performance or festival. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add “non-applicable” response option in Q4-1 for artists who do not track social media following.
---	--

Table 7. Specific Comments and Revisions to Creativity

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q5-1 and Q5-2, respondents discussed the impact of the cumulative experience on their artwork and artistic process. Respondents reported difficulty answering questions specifically about their project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise “USAI-sponsored project” to “USAI-sponsored experience” to reflect the experiential aspect of program in Q5-1 and Q5-2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Q5-2, one respondent believed “diverse” would confuse other respondents and connote unintended meaning. This respondent suggested replacing with “innovative.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No revision suggested. Respondents generally believed “diverse” ideas was a clear term, and “innovative” is already noted in the question.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One respondent suggested adding a question asking artists whether the program did/did not impact artists’ work, prior to asking the specific ways in which their work changed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add new question: “I benefitted creatively in other ways as a result of the USAI-sponsored experience.”

Table 8. Specific Comments and Revisions to Overall Survey

Comments	Suggested Revisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respondents asked for more open-ended questions, particularly at the close of the survey, to be able to reflect on their experiences in their own words. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add optional open-ended question at the end of the survey with word limit to restrict respondent burden.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some respondents thought artists would be hesitant to indicate “disagree” or “strongly disagree” on Likert-type questions. Respondents felt those responses would indicate they had a negative experience or that they were ungrateful for the experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To ensure brevity of the survey, assurances will be presented on the survey introduction only. Add language to the introduction ensuring the confidentiality of survey responses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Respondents understood “USAI-sponsored project” to mean only the performance, not the experience of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace all references to “USAI-sponsored project” with “USAI-

meeting and observing other artists and their work.	sponsored experience” to encompass the entire festival experience.
---	--

