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Conceptual framework of survey cooperation (Groves and Couper, 1998)

- Social environment
- Survey design
- Household(er)
- Interviewer
- Householder-interviewer interaction
- Decision to cooperate or refuse

Out of researcher control

Under researcher control
Previous Studies

- Goyder (1986) Survey on surveys
- Loosvelt and Storms (2008)
- OECD: measuring trust in official statistics
- Baily, Rofique and Humphrey (2010)
- Lorenc et al. (2011)
The 2010 Census Social Marketing Campaign

- Paid ads, earned media, Partnership Program
- 452 ads
  - television, radio, print, out-of-home, digital
- 28 total languages
- $362 million on paid advertising
- 267,000 partners with 1,000 partnership specialists and 3,000 assistants
Research Questions

– What were the public’s mindsets prior to the 2010 Census?
– Are these mindsets predictive of Census participation?
– Was the 2010 Census social marketing campaign successful in changing the external climate?
– Did the public mindsets change as a result?
Pre-Census Mindsets

- Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators Survey (CBAMS) conducted in 2008
- Assessed Census awareness, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, privacy concerns, and media consumption
- Multi-mode survey 39% response rate (RR3)
Measuring the survey climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mindset</th>
<th>Core descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Edge</td>
<td>committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nodders</td>
<td>impressionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical 5TH</td>
<td>resistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacquainted</td>
<td>peripheral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These mindsets used to develop and target messages for 2010 Census communications campaign (see Bates et al., 2009).
Monitoring the climate over the 2010 Census campaign

- Census Integrated Communication Program Evaluation survey (CICPE)
- 3-wave survey: before, during, after 2010 Census
- Included a panel component (n=1,568)
- Replicated the 5 mindsets using reduced set of questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 Survey</th>
<th>Pre-Census 2010 Survey (W1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Edge</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nodders</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical Fifth</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacquainted</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shift in the mindsets over the campaign: panel cases

Wave 1:
- Unacquainted: 8%
- Head Nodders: 35%
- Leading Edge: 22%
- Cynical 5th: 23%
- Insulated: 12%

Wave 2:
- Unacquainted: 2%
- Head Nodders: 35%
- Leading Edge: 31%
- Cynical 5th: 14%
- Insulated: 18%

Wave 3:
- Unacquainted: 0%
- Head Nodders: 36%
- Leading Edge: 39%
- Cynical 5th: 12%
- Insulated: 13%
Movement of “Unacquainted” Mindset (7% of the population): W1-W3

Prior to Campaign (W1) 100%

After Campaign (W3) 51% 5% 34% 10%

- Unacquainted
- Head Nodders
- Leading Edge
- Cynical 5th
- Insulated
Movement of “Head Nodders” Mindset (41% of the population): W1-W3

Prior to Campaign (W1)

- 100%

After Campaign (W3)

- 28%
- 50%
- 6%
- 16%

Legend:
- Unacquainted
- Head Nodders
- Leading Edge
- Cynical 5th
- Insulated
Movement of “Leading Edge” Mindset 
(27% of population): W1-W3

Prior to Campaign (W1)  100%

After Campaign (W3)  31%  53%  13%  3%

- Unacquainted
- Head Nodders
- Leading Edge
- Cynical 5th
- Insulated
Movement of “Cynical 5th” Mindset (20% of population): W1-W3

Prior to Campaign (W1): 100%

After Campaign (W3): 45% Unacquainted, 37% Unacquainted, 15% Head Nodders, 3% Leading Edge, 1% Cynical 5th, 3% Insulated
Movement of “Insulated” Mindset
(6% of population): W1-W3

Prior to Campaign (W1):
- 100% Insulated

After Campaign (W3):
- 40% Head Nodders
- 5% Unacquainted
- 8% Leading Edge
- 47% Insulated
## Mindsets and Census Response Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W1 mindset</th>
<th>W1 intent to mail (% ‘def. will’)</th>
<th>% actually mailed Census form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading edge</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nodders</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical 5th</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacquainted</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Predicting Census participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W1 Mindset</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>odds ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>odds ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nodders</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical Fifth</td>
<td>0.474***</td>
<td>0.449***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated</td>
<td>0.460**</td>
<td>0.492*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacquainted</td>
<td>0.209***</td>
<td>0.223**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading Edge (omitted category)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience Segmentation Clusters:</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Around Avg. (homeowner skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.374*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Around Avg. (renter skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Disadvantaged (owner skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.303***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Disadvantaged (renter skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.127***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Enclave (owner skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.323***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Enclave (renter skew)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.409*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unattached Mobiles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantaged Homeowners (omitted category)</strong></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2,671  
Model 1 R-sq=.05  
Model 2 R-sq=.111
Summary

- External environment matters
- Survey “climate” should be assessed
- Determining mindsets is one way to assess
- Found evidence that 2010 Census social marketing campaign moved some mindsets
- Mindsets were predictive of Census cooperation
Looking forward

- Are there others ways we can change the survey climate (besides a campaign)?
- Should we continuously monitor the climate? What is best way? *Loosveldt and Storms, 2008; deLeeuw, 2010; Childs and Earp papers 2012*
- Can mindsets help us understand other aspects of surveys e.g. informed consent to use admin. records? Predict mode of response?
- Can correlates of mindsets be found in auxiliary data/paradata?