



This document was prepared by and for Census Bureau staff to aid in future research and planning, but the Census Bureau is making the document publicly available in order to share the information with as wide an audience as possible. Questions about the document should be directed to Kevin Deardorff at (301) 763-6033 or kevin.e.deardorff@census.gov

August 6, 2012

2010 CENSUS PLANNING MEMORANDA SERIES

No. 221

MEMORANDUM FOR The Distribution List

From: Burton Reist *[signed]*
 Acting Chief, Decennial Management Division

Subject: 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Paid Advertising
 Assessment Report

Attached is the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Paid Advertising Assessment Report. The Quality Process for the 2010 Census Test Evaluations, Experiments, and Assessments was applied to the methodology development and review process. The report is sound and appropriate for completeness and accuracy.

If you have any questions about this document, please contact Mary Bucci at (301) 763-9925.

Attachment

August 1, 2012

2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Paid Advertising Assessment Report

U.S. Census Bureau standards and quality process procedures were applied throughout the creation of this report.

Final

Monica Wroblewski

Census 2010 Publicity Office



This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	v
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Scope.....	1
1.2 Intended Audience	1
2. Background	1
2.1 Census 2000.....	1
2.2 2010 Census	2
3. Methodology	4
3.1 Method	4
3.2 Questions to be Answered	5
4. Limitations.....	5
5. Results	5
5.1 Did the media buy process adversely affect the overall media buy schedule? If yes, how did it affect the overall media buy schedule?.....	5
5.2 Did the Census Bureau have a plan to monitor and verify that purchased media was run? If yes, describe.	6
5.3 Did the Census Bureau successfully meet all production schedule dates? If not, why? ..	6
5.4 What process did the Census Bureau use to inform media buy vendors of opportunities with the campaign and was it organized and well designed? How was this determined?	7
5.5 How comprehensive was the review process for creative materials? Describe.....	7
5.6 How comprehensive was the review process for media buy plans? Describe.....	8
5.7 Did copy testing thoroughly test the creative executions against all target audiences? Describe.	9
5.8 What did the Census Bureau do to adequately reach all known markets?	10
5.9 Was the paid advertising media mix appropriate? If yes, describe. How was this measured?	10
5.10 How many advertisements did the Census Bureau produce for each media vehicle?... ..	11
5.11 In what languages did the Census Bureau create advertising and how was the decision made regarding what languages to utilize?.....	11
5.12 Were there issues identified with in-language advertising? If yes, describe.	12
5.13 Did the Census Bureau have sufficient funding to support all desired advertising endeavors?.....	12
5.14 Did paid advertising successfully align with the population segments and mindsets? If yes, explain. If no, why not?.....	13
6. Related Evaluations, Experiments, And/Or Assessments	14
7. Key Lessons Learned, Conclusions, And Recommendations	14
8. Acknowledgements	15
9. References	16
Appendix: Favored Media Outlet by Audience Segment.....	17

List of Tables

Table 1: Campaign Reach and Frequency Targets	3
Table 2: Creative Copy Testing Focus Groups by Phase and Audience	9
Table 3: Final Spending by Audience/Language.....	12
Table 4: Final Spending by Media Type.....	13
Table 5: Final Spending by National/Local	13
Table 6: Final Spending by Phase.....	13

Executive Summary

Paid advertising, a component of the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program, consisted of developing media schedules for creating and placing 2010 Census advertisements using the appropriate media vehicles to reach the right people at the right time in the right way. This campaign officially launched on January 17, 2010 and continued through July 4, 2010, supporting the established goals of the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program:

1. Improve the Mail Response Rate
 - a. Develop tools and materials to educate and inform the public about the census form, census day, confidentiality of census information, and the benefits that can be derived from the data gathered.
 - b. Develop measurable strategies to maximize paid and earned media coverage of the importance of mailing back the census form.
2. Improve cooperation with enumerators
 - a. Disseminate messaging about cooperating with enumerators.
 - b. Maximize media coverage regarding cooperating with enumerators in national, local, and special interest media.
3. Improve overall accuracy and reduce the differential undercount
 - a. Establish local partnerships in hard-to-count areas and through the use of specialized products and services to educate the public and increase knowledge of the benefits of the 2010 Census with all target audiences.
 - b. Garner support from 2010 Census national and regional partners and stakeholders to serve as trusted third-party spokespeople for the 2010 Census effort by building on the campaign of “It’s In Our Hands.”
 - c. Establish and implement media activities in local and national media venues to increase media coverage and ensure integration and consistency on the messaging.

The 2010 Census paid advertising campaign was built upon a solid foundation of research to ensure that the messaging resonated with the targeted communities. It consisted of three phases: awareness, motivation, and support.

- Phase 1, the Awareness Phase (January to February 2010), aimed to build awareness and familiarity with the upcoming 2010 Census.
- Phase 2 marked the Motivation Phase (March to April 2010) where individuals were motivated to complete the census form and mail it back.
- Phase 3 was the Nonresponse Followup Phase (May to July 2010) in which the campaign supported nonresponse followup efforts to educate non-respondents about the enumerators who would be traveling door-to-door to obtain responses.

The U.S. Census Bureau executed 452 total advertisements in 28 languages in all 210 Designated Marketing Areas for 3,900 unique media outlets between television, radio, print, interactive, and outdoor media. The Census Bureau developed the advertisements in 28 total languages comprised of the 14 languages used in Census 2000 plus 14 additional languages added because of funding provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Funds

received from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act helped us to expand the campaign to its final state. The final 2010 Census paid advertising budget was 167 million dollars.

The Census 2010 Publicity Office attempted to reach every market across the United States and Puerto Rico, with emphasis towards hard-to-count populations. The messages revolved around three key points – the 2010 Census is easy, safe, and important. There were two 2010 Census taglines used: “It’s In Our Hands” and “We can’t move forward until you mail it back”.

Additionally, the Census Bureau formed the Joint Advertising Advisory Review Panel, which included representatives from each Race and Ethnic Advisory Committee, the 2010 Census Advisory Committee, and the Census Advisory Committee of Professional Associations. The Communications Directorate facilitated these meetings. The Joint Advertising Advisory Review Panel also existed during Census 2000; for both censuses, it enabled representatives to take pertinent information relating to the review of advertisements from start to finish back to their respective Advisory Committees.

The internal Census Bureau lessons learned for paid advertising include discussions of the many successes, including communication and integration. However, several shortcomings were also identified with recommendations for the 2020 Census. The major recommendations include:

- Awarding the contract earlier to commence contract work sooner.
- Build options into the contracts to allow for flexibility and uses for additional funds received.
- Build better tools to assess program effectiveness and develop metrics to measure progress.
- Accounting for industry inflation in the starting budget for paid media buys.

In conclusion, this assessment details that the Census 2010 Publicity Office, along with the primary contractor and subcontractors, effectively administered all components of 2010 Census paid advertising campaign. The Census Bureau received multiple awards, including the Media Week: Media Plan of the Year Awards, Interpublic Group MERGE Awards, and Summit International Marketing Awards. The 2020 Census paid advertising efforts should build upon the successes of the 2010 Census paid advertising campaign while taking recommendations and lessons learned into consideration, especially with regards to beginning earlier with an adequate budget from commencement.

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope

Paid Advertising, a component of the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program (ICP) was implemented by the Census 2010 Publicity Office (C2PO). This assessment will describe the various efforts paid advertising engaged in during the 2010 Census and the outputs that resulted from this work. Analyzing, interpreting, and synthesizing the effectiveness of the ICP is beyond the scope of this study.

1.2 Intended Audience

This assessment is intended for Census Bureau managers, decennial census staff, contractors working in support for the 2020 Census, and for use by other internal and external stakeholders as a reference and guide regarding the process used for managing paid advertising programmatic issues.

2. Background

2.1 Census 2000

The Census 2000 Partnership and Marketing Program (PMP) marked the first time that the U.S. Census Bureau utilized paid advertising. The advertising firm Young and Rubicam, Inc. (Y&R) was responsible for developing and delivering persuasive advertising and messaging for Census 2000. In order to segment the market, Y&R created a behavioral Likelihood Spectrum™ Model designed to predict census participation. The central organizing assumption behind the model was that participation in civic and community-minded activities could also predict Census participation. The model collapsed the population into three groups using civic-mindedness: the least likely to respond, undecided/passive, and the most likely to respond (Bates and Mulry, 2007)

During Census 2000, the Census Bureau created more than 250 television, radio, print, outdoor, and internet advertisements in 17 languages to reach 99 percent of all U.S. residents. The census message was heard or seen on average over 50 times. More than 3,000 media outlets carried over 130,000 advertisements along with over 71,000 radio spots. The Hispanic newspaper buy was the largest single media buy for a Spanish-language campaign. Value added opportunities negotiated by Y&R and its partner agencies exceeded 10.8 million dollars. Y&R also negotiated free bonus spots that doubled the number of television spots for American Indians and Alaska Natives.

Extensive research among many diverse audiences helped form the campaign's core message: "This is your future. Don't leave it blank." It was clear that the census was irrelevant or misunderstood by many. The advertising agencies needed to find a way to dispel the idea that the census was nothing more than the federal government's head count. The campaign had to

convince a skeptical public that there was something to be gained by answering the census, or something to be lost by not answering.

The message strategy was to let people know how answering the census could benefit themselves, their families, or their communities. This benefits message worked for all audiences but was more effective when adapted specifically for each audience. The Census Bureau posted all logos, taglines, and other graphic elements on the Internet so that local governments and other census partners could use them (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003).

There was no Census Bureau assessment of the effectiveness of paid advertising campaign for Census 2000. However, the Census Bureau contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) to conduct an independent evaluation of the Census 2000 PMP. The Census 2000 PMP evaluation used self-reported measures of campaign exposure to predict propensity to return a Census form and concluded that the campaign was effective in increasing public awareness of Census 2000. The evaluation also found evidence that the PMP successfully changed beliefs and motivated households to complete and return their Census form, but that evidence was somewhat weaker and less uniform (Wolter et al., 2002).

2.2 2010 Census

The Census Bureau strategically designed the ICP to build upon the Census 2000 PMP. The available evidence suggests that the Census 2000 PMP, along with other efforts aimed at improving census participation, helped reverse a three decade decline in the mail response rates (especially in traditionally hard-to-count areas) and may also have improved cooperation with Census Bureau enumerators, helping to shorten the workload and reduce the costs of Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) operations (Wolter et al., 2002).

Given the judged success of the Census 2000 PMP, paid advertising efforts served as the benchmark for the 2010 Census paid advertising program. However, the 2010 Census had unique challenges to overcome including the struggling economy and the growing distrust of the government (Vitrano, 2009).

In order to execute the paid advertising program, the Census Bureau awarded the program contract to the advertising agency, DraftFCB. DraftFCB, the primary contractor, also worked alongside a group of 14 subcontractors who specialized in various targeted audiences. DraftFCB participated in all phases of campaign planning, implementation, and execution discussed within this assessment, while directing work to and from the subcontractors, and always with Census Bureau oversight and approval.

The ICP was built upon a solid foundation of research. C2PO researched all elements of the campaign across audiences to ensure that the messaging resonated with the targeted communities. The creative executions and promotional materials were based on validated communications strategies, ensuring that the overall intended messages were clear, compelling, and persuasive, and more importantly, culturally relevant and sensitive. Additionally, audience segmentation research enabled the campaign to funnel messaging and resources to each audience

cluster relative to each cluster’s propensity to respond. All clusters were inclusive of all races and therefore are not race-specific.

The paid advertising campaign officially launched on January 17, 2010 and ran through July 4, 2010, and consisted of three phases: awareness, motivation, and support:

- Phase 1, the Awareness Phase (January – February 2010), aimed to build awareness and familiarity with the upcoming census.
- Phase 2 marked the Motivation Phase (March – April 2010) where the campaign encouraged individuals to complete the census form and mail it back.
- Phase 3 was the Nonresponse Followup Phase (April – July 2010) in which the campaign supported efforts to educate nonrespondents about the enumerators traveling door-to-door to obtain responses from households that did not participate during the mail back period.

The Census Bureau purchased media in three phases as follows:

1. Upfront Market – mostly national media buys in Summer 2009
2. Scatter Market – mostly local media buys in Fall 2009
3. Rapid Response – media buys in March, April, and June 2010

Additionally, and as shown in Table 1 below, the campaign had reach targets and frequency targets for each phase of the paid advertising campaign for both base funding and funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Reach is defined as the percentage of households exposed to the media while frequency tells how often the household will be exposed. In the end, we exceeded our goals with a reach as high as 97 percent, which is the highest achievable level given a small percentage of the population cannot be reached through any paid media. Additionally, our final frequency measures for the Awareness Phase was up to 18 times, and up to 48 times during the Motivation Phase.

Table 1: Campaign Reach and Frequency Targets

Phase	Population Reached by Media
Awareness Phase	95% (at least 10 times with base funding) 95% (at least five additional times with ARRA funding)
Motivation Phase	95% (at least 20 times with base funding) 95% (at least 11 additional times with ARRA funding)
NRFU Phase	Lowest Responding Population (at least 3 times with base funding) Lowest Responding Population (at least 2 additional times with ARRA funding)

Source: DraftFCB Projected Plan Reach/Frequency PowerPoint Presentation

The Census Bureau attempted to reach every segment of the population across the United States and Puerto Rico. However, the paid media plan was skewed towards hard-to-count populations. The advertisements covered all types of media including television, radio, print, interactive, and outdoor. Through the messaging, the team strove to connect census participation to the nation’s future and to give ownership to every individual regardless of any demographic characteristic. The 2010 Census messaging was evolved around three key points, “It’s Easy, Safe, and

Important.” “It’s In Our Hands,” and “We can’t move forward until you mail it back” were two 2010 Census taglines.

C2PO arranged for the testing and review of paid advertisements both internally at the Census Bureau and externally at multiple points during the development process. To assist in the creation of advertisements, DraftFCB and its subcontractors conducted quantitative and qualitative focus groups across audiences to ensure advertisements resonated appropriately under the oversight of Census Bureau staff. The contractors incorporated revisions as necessary.

Staff also worked closely with the Census Bureau advisory groups from 2007 through 2009, including the Census Advisory Committee of Professional Associations (CACPA), the 2010 Census Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Race and Ethnic Advisory Committee (REAC). The Joint Advisory Advertising Review Panel (JAARP), which is composed of members from each of the three committees previously listed, conducted thorough reviews of the advertisements ensuring that materials were culturally sensitive and addressed key concerns for target audiences. Staff implemented changes based upon input from advisory committees as appropriate, though some suggestions and recommendations were not feasible or easily implemented given time and budget constraints.

The Census Bureau also formed a cross-divisional advertising review team composed of staff from the Communications, Field, and Decennial Directorates to ensure all advertisements met government standards and adhered to the Census Bureau’s decennial census mission. Finally, all rough cuts and final versions of each advertisement were provided to the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate Oversight Committees, the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC), Census Bureau executive staff, and JAARP. Overall, this review process, commencing in December 2008 and running through December 2009, was collaborative and continual improvements to the advertisements occurred throughout the campaign.

3. Methodology

3.1 Method

The intent of this assessment is to appraise whether or not the Census Bureau took appropriate steps to develop and launch a successful paid advertising campaign for the 2010 Census ICP. C2PO obtained the data necessary to answer the research questions by conducting in-depth informant interviews with Census Bureau staff and contractors who worked on the paid advertising program. In addition, C2PO collected and reviewed documentation relating to the paid advertising program from the following sources:

- Requirements included in the Creative and Media task orders for both the base plan and funding received through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA);
- Media Buy plans and schedules by target audience, market, language, and media vehicle;
- Key informant interviews which allow qualitative data collection from all parties closely involved with the 2010 Census and related research efforts; and

- Archival research including e-mails, memoranda, and documentation (e.g., lessons learned reports) pertaining to the 2010 Census paid advertising campaign.

3.2 Questions to be Answered

1. Did the media buy process adversely affect the overall media buy schedule? If yes, how?
2. Did the Census Bureau have a plan to monitor and verify that purchased media was run? If yes, describe.
3. Did the Census Bureau successfully meet all production schedule dates? If not, why?
4. What process did the Census Bureau use to inform media buy vendors of opportunities with the campaign and was it organized and well designed? How was this determined?
5. How comprehensive was the review process for creative materials? Describe.
6. How comprehensive was the review process for media buy schedules? Describe.
7. Did copy testing thoroughly test the creative executions against all target audiences? Describe.
8. What did the Census Bureau do to adequately reach all known markets?
9. Was the paid advertising media mix appropriate? If yes, describe. How was this measured?
10. How many advertisements did the Census Bureau produce for each media vehicle?
11. In what languages did the Census Bureau create advertising and how was the decision made regarding what languages to utilize?
12. Were there issues identified with in-language advertising? If yes, describe.
13. Did the Census Bureau have sufficient funding to support all desired advertising endeavors?
14. Did paid advertising successfully align with the population segments and mindsets? If yes, explain. If not, why not?

4. Limitations

The effects of the 2010 Census Paid Advertising program are hard to quantify and isolate into direct, attributable participation results. Over time, many efforts have been made to make such correlations, with mixed success. Therefore, this assessment at its barest level is designed as a mechanism to express the outcomes of measurable items such as the types of paid advertising used, activities undertaken, rough inferences of impressions generated, and the amount of paid advertising produced. It is limited to this scope, and should be used as one of many tools for a truly thorough review of paid advertising.

5. Results

5.1 Did the media buy process adversely affect the overall media buy schedule? If yes, how did it affect the overall media buy schedule?

Buying national media earlier was one of the lessons learned from Census 2000 and was implemented for the 2010 Census. Earlier purchases of national media in May 2009 when networks were setting their fall schedules led to the availability of better media spots, prime placements, and financial savings.

Local media, however, was purchased in the fall of 2009, which primarily covered ethnic media. Known as the scatter market, local media buys were planned for August 2009, but they did not occur until October and November, which led to a several week delay in the delivery of the media buy schedule to the Census Bureau, originally planned for January 2010. Local ethnic buys occurred later than planned due to a combination of reasons. First, after receipt of ARRA money, we added languages and created new advertising, which also had to be copy tested. Furthermore, the media outlets were delayed in offering advertisement space for sale, which was not within the control of the Census Bureau or DraftFCB. The Census Bureau having to educate stakeholders about the media buy process and differences between purchasing national and local media was the only observable impact of media buy timing. Throughout the whole process open communications were maintained by posting the media buy schedules on the 2010 Census website.

5.2 Did the Census Bureau have a plan to monitor and verify that purchased media was run? If yes, describe.

As part of the paid advertising contract, the contractor was responsible for monitoring the paid advertising campaign and verifying that purchased media were run. All agency advertisement buyers would also randomly check advertisement runs. While this was a helpful process, it was not 100 percent reliable. The Census Bureau, though, was a diligent client and would make calls when problems arose, such as advertisements running too close together or running during unapproved programming. During the campaign, when a purchased advertisement did not run, we received a “make good” which is a spot of the same value that would run in an equal time. “Make goods” ran through June 2010.

The most reliable source of information, however, comes from the media vendors themselves. For radio and television, invoices submitted for payment were required to exactly match the buy order and be accompanied by a signed affidavit stating that the advertisements ran as ordered and reported. For print, tear sheets from each publication, showing the date of run and name of publication, were required to accompany each invoice as proof that the advertisement actually ran when ordered. For out-of-home (e.g., billboards) advertisements, we requested a picture of the placement with the date of run to be submitted with the invoices. Due to the magnitude of our out-of-home run, the Census Bureau agreed to accept a picture of the placement with a listing of all locations it was appearing at that time. Even then, however, we received pictures of each location in most instances.

5.3 Did the Census Bureau successfully meet all production schedule dates? If not, why?

At the highest level, the Census Bureau met all production schedule dates. The base plan was on schedule when we received an infusion of funds from ARRA. Therefore, we were able to create more advertisements and advertisements in additional languages, which led to additional production dates, resulting in a longer than initially planned production period. The program continued to meet the production schedule dates from the revised schedule.

5.4 What process did the Census Bureau use to inform media buy vendors of opportunities with the campaign and was it organized and well designed? How was this determined?

DraftFCB proposed a strategy with input from partner agencies to the Census Bureau, and the Communications Directorate along with the Acquisitions Division approved the approach. Together, we planned and organized a multipronged approach to inform media buy vendors of opportunities with the campaign. We released 2,500 requests for proposals outlining advertising opportunities for the 2010 Census. These eventually reached over 68,000 media properties through various distribution channels (e.g., a national network distributing to all affiliates). The Acquisitions Division website was used to provide all information for potential vendors and provided contacts for requesting additional information.

We also hosted 11 meetings for ethnic media outlets in conjunction with New America Media, which is the country's first and largest national collaboration and advocate of ethnic news organizations. These meetings occurred in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, New Orleans, and Phoenix. These meetings were contracted with and through DraftFCB to bring local ethnic media from each city and surrounding areas together to learn about the ICP and potential opportunities for advertising. However, some vendors in attendance had misperceived the event as an opportunity to actually purchase media.

DraftFCB held six small business seminars (two in New York, two in Chicago, and two in San Francisco) where representatives were given the opportunity to meet one-on-one and give statements of their capabilities. In addition, during September 2008, DraftFCB presented a half-day seminar entitled "Marketing to the Federal Government – GSA Advertising and Integrated Marketing Solutions Program." Approximately 20 small businesses attended the 2008 Small Business Conference.

Finally, DraftFCB was subsequently recognized by the American Advertising Foundation (AAF) as the winner of the 2010 "AAF Supplier Diversity Award" and most recently awarded the 2011 Interpublic Group Award for Supplier Diversity.

5.5 How comprehensive was the review process for creative materials? Describe.

The review process for creative materials was comprehensive and exhaustive. The Census Bureau established a cross-divisional creative review panel in early 2009 to review all advertisements for every group through their full evolution, from conception to final product. This panel consisted of representatives from the Decennial Management Division, Field Division, Regional Offices, C2PO, and Public Information Office.

DraftFCB incorporated changes based upon insights learned from copy testing (Phase One and Two) and focus groups (see the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Research Assessment report for more information). DraftFCB and the panel then determined which advertisements to run.

Census Bureau Executive Staff, Regional Directors, DOC, and the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate all reviewed and approved rough cuts of the advertising material at the beginning of the process and the final products in late fall 2009.

Additionally, the Census Bureau formed the JAARP, which included representatives from each REAC, the 2010 Census Advisory Committee, and the Census Advisory Committee of Professional Associations. JAARP also existed during Census 2000; for both censuses, JAARP enabled representatives to take pertinent information relating to the review of advertisements from start to finish back to their respective Advisory Committees for informational purposes, to offer an opportunity for questions, comments, and feedback relating to the advertisements, and to provide their opinions about the advertisements' potential for success. It is noteworthy to mention that DraftFCB was extremely proactive and suggested implementing JAARP. At one meeting with JAARP on April 20-21, 2009 to review creative concepts and storyboards for the campaign, JAARP issued a "vote of no confidence" in the DraftFCB team's advertising campaign. The Census Bureau immediately worked with DraftFCB to respond to this "vote of no confidence" to reclaim the support of the committee. The Census Bureau and DraftFCB developed a comprehensive response memorandum that addressed all of the concerns of JAARP. On June 30, 2009, the Census Bureau organized and DraftFCB hosted a highly successful meeting with JAARP in New York. Afterwards, as a result of the meeting, JAARP reversed their "vote of no confidence." This paved the way and set the tone for more successful meetings not only with JAARP but with all external stakeholders including REAC relating to the paid advertising campaign. The responsiveness that DraftFCB showed in mitigating this serious issue was very impressive.

Additionally, before advertisement production began, the Census Bureau identified and assembled staff throughout the agency that could function as casting reviewers. Basically, they were responsible for looking at talent selections for the advertisements and for specific groups and determining the best selection for an advertisement.

5.6 How comprehensive was the review process for media buy plans? Describe.

Cross-divisional teams and advisory committees, who met on an ongoing basis, reviewed and approved the media buy plans for each audience in a process that lasted over a year. All stakeholders, internal and external, were expected to provide comments and feedback after receiving updated materials as they became available from DraftFCB. This continuous process, from award of contract until the end of NRFU, provided an environment that fostered continual revisions of plans based upon up to date information. Ultimately, the plans and revisions were backed by DOC and Census Bureau executives as well as the U.S. Congress. Additionally, regional offices were given the opportunity to identify outlets where buys must be made in their regions before the media plans were finalized. These "essential buys" were developed much earlier and built into the media buy process as a lesson learned from the Census 2000.

5.7 Did copy testing thoroughly test the creative executions against all target audiences? Describe.

It was imperative to ensure the concepts and messages used in creative executions would resonate with each target audience. Therefore, we planned to conduct copy testing when developing creative executions by target audiences. These results were also important when there was criticism about whether a particular advertisement or concept would work for a particular audience. The Census Bureau could always rely on the research results to justify the decisions made. We successfully met our goals for copy testing, by creating and testing 192 messages in 115 focus groups that were conducted in 36 cities across the United States and Puerto Rico with 1,714 participants covering 17 different audiences as shown in Table 2 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009a and 2009b).

Table 2: Creative Copy Testing Focus Groups by Phase and Audience

Audience	Phase I		Phase II	
	Number of Groups	Number of Participants	Number of Groups	Number of Participants
Black	14	224	2	19
Diverse Mass	13	266	6	44
Hispanic	13	252	8	67
Puerto Rico	2	46	3	30
NHPI ¹	4	39	0	0
AIAN ²	8	136	0	0
Legacy	6	62	0	0
Asian	18	375	0	0
Bangladeshi	0	0	2	17
Hmong	0	0	2	19
Laotian	0	0	2	17
Thai	0	0	2	18
Pakistani	0	0	2	18
Armenian	0	0	2	18
Iranian	0	0	2	15
Greek	0	0	2	14
Portuguese-Speaking	0	0	2	18
Total	78	1400	37	314

Source: 2010 Census Communications Campaign Creative Copy Testing Phase II Final Summary Report

¹ Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander

² American Indian Alaskan Native

5.8 What did the Census Bureau do to adequately reach all known markets?

Under contract and the direction of the Census Bureau, DraftFCB developed 452 ads that appeared in all 210 Designated Marketing Areas, in approximately 3,900 unique media outlets, and in 28 different languages.

5.9 Was the paid advertising media mix appropriate? If yes, describe. How was this measured?

DraftFCB and the Census Bureau developed media buy plans based on research (specifically through Audience Segmentation and the Census Barriers, Attitudes, and Motivators Survey (CBAMS)), guided by the market knowledge of DraftFCB and subcontractors, and specific to each audience.

Audience segmentation research defined the underlying constructs behind the hard-to-count populations, developed mutually exclusive clusters of the population according to mailback propensity, and created predictive statistical models for the potential impact that the partnership and paid advertising campaigns may have on mail response among the identified population clusters. This segmentation model enabled the campaign to funnel messaging and resources to each audience cluster relative to each cluster's propensity to respond by mail. All clusters are inclusive of all races and therefore are not race-specific.

Segmentation results associated each tract in the country with one of eight audiences. These defined audiences were (Bates and Mulry, 2007):

- Advantaged Homeowners,
- All Around Average I and II,
- Single Unattached Mobiles,
- Ethnic Enclave I and II, and
- Economically Disadvantaged I and II.

For the All Around Average, Ethnic Enclave, and Economically Disadvantaged segments, the I denotes a homeowner skew, while the II denotes a renter skew (Bates and Mulry, 2007) For more information on audience segmentation, please see the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Research Assessment report.

We provided audience segmentation results to DraftFCB. They subsequently augmented the results with media consumption information obtained from Simmons, a company that conducts surveys on buying behavior and media usage. See Appendix for a picture that illustrates the media outlets favored by each segment. Furthermore, through CBAMS, we measured previous census responses, attitudes towards the census, knowledge of the purpose of the census, potential motivators and barriers to census participation, ranking of potential messages, media consumption, and demographic information. CBAMS data enhanced the cluster segmentation by providing much needed, up-to-date insight into how the target audiences feel about the Census and why they may or may not participate to help us develop appropriate messages to address these mindsets. CBAMS revealed five distinct mindsets: Leading Edge, Head Nodders,

Insulated, Unacquainted, and Cynical Fifth. While there are different cultural contexts that emerged, these mindsets exist throughout the population, regardless of race or ethnicity. For more information on CBAMS mindsets, please see U.S. Census Bureau (2009), C2PO 2010 Integrated Communications Research Memoranda Series No. 10, Messaging to America: Census Barriers, Attitudes and Motivators Survey Results.

Some of the Census Bureau's outstanding efforts were executed with the African American market. We implemented radio disc jockey tours featuring Michael Baisden, Tom Joyner, and Steve Harvey in 46 cities with high concentrations of African American populations including Los Angeles, New Orleans, Detroit, Baltimore, and the District of Columbia between March 9 and April 10, 2010. In each city, the DJs worked with regional staff to prepare for interviews, set-up, and to secure promotional materials for distribution at each event.

Additionally, for the same audience, particularly the African American male segment, we partnered with Christopher Bridges (aka Ludacris), to create webisodes and Luda Street Teams. The webisodes featured Ludacris walking through neighborhoods in Dallas, New Orleans, New York City, Washington, DC, and Atlanta, talking to various people about the benefits of being counted in the 2010 Census. Ludacris also visited the homes of several fans to discuss the 2010 Census in person. The 'Luda on the Block' street teams hit Atlanta, Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Birmingham, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Columbus, Dallas, Detroit, Hartford/New Haven, Houston, Los Angeles, Memphis, Miami/Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Milwaukee, New York City, San Francisco/Oakland, and Philadelphia in March and April, 2010. During his on air radio interviews, Ludacris mentioned the census and its importance. The street teams posted Ludacris Census posters around town and distributed informational brochures highlighting the key points of the 2010 Census, "It's easy, safe, and important."

5.10 How many advertisements did the Census Bureau produce for each media vehicle?

The total number of ads developed: 452

- Television: 62
- Radio: 97
- Print: 159
- Out-of-Home: 79
- Digital (online): 55

5.11 In what languages did the Census Bureau create advertising and how was the decision made regarding what languages to utilize?

The Census Bureau created advertising in 28 total languages.

- Base funding allowed the replication of the 14 languages used in Census 2000:
 - English, Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese for oral media, Simplified Chinese for print media), Vietnamese, Korean, Hindi, Tagalog, Russian, Polish, Arabic, Haitian Creole (French), Japanese, and Cambodian (Khmer).
- ARRA funding allowed us to add 14 languages including:

- Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani (Urdu), Bangladeshi (Bengali), Portuguese, French, Italian, German, Iranian (Farsi), Armenian, Greek, Yiddish, and Ukrainian.

5.12 Were there issues identified with in-language advertising? If yes, describe.

We were very sensitive to accurately represent our advertising in all languages and worked with advertising agencies that had expertise in developing materials in-language and in-culture. Native speakers worked on materials development, and we verified translations using an independent third party contractor, A Language Bank. As a result, we did not encounter issues with respect to in-language advertising.

5.13 Did the Census Bureau have sufficient funding to support all desired advertising endeavors?

In comparison with respect to Census 2000, the 2010 Census ICP contained many more components to fund. With this in mind, a scalable campaign was developed, meaning if the Census Bureau received additional money there would be additional communications activities that could be implemented. The original ICP contract budget started at 212 million dollars and increased to 362 million dollars with ARRA funding. For paid advertising, which had a contract start date of September 19, 2007, the final allocation was 167 million dollars. This budget enabled the Census Bureau to reach 93 percent to 97 percent of the Diverse Mass, Black, and Hispanic audiences.

Additional final budget distributions as of March 2011 are shown in the following tables:

Table 3: Final Spending by Audience/Language

Audience/Language	Spending (in millions)
Diverse Mass	\$81.6
Hispanic	32.7
Black	28.4
Asian*	14.2
AIAN	4.1
Puerto Rico	2.4
Emerging Audiences**	1.9
NHPI	1.1
Legacy Languages***	0.6
Total	\$167.0

* Includes Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Hindi, Tagalog, Japanese, Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, Pakistani (Urdu), and Bangladeshi (Bengali).

** Includes German, French, Italian, Greek, Portuguese, and Yiddish.

*** Includes Russian, Polish, Arabic, Farsi, Armenian, and Ukrainian.

Source: Communications Contract Planning Budget Rev 3/17/11

Table 4: Final Spending by Media Type

Media Type	Spending (in millions)
Television	\$81.5
Newspaper	26.0
Radio	24.8
Digital	13.8
Out-of-Home	11.1
Magazine	4.6
Events	2.9
Other*	1.4
Cinema	0.9
Total	\$167.0

* Production of media-driven content integrations

Source: Post Buy Cover rev. 3.18

Table 5: Final Spending by National/Local

Category	Spending (in millions)
National	\$88.3
Local	78.7
Total	\$167.0

Source: Post Buy Cover rev. 3.18

Table 6: Final Spending by Phase

Phase	Spending (in millions)
Awareness Phase	\$44.3
Motivation Phase	78.5
Rapid Response	31.8
Heavy-Up	1.3
Nonresponse Followup	11.1
Total	\$167.0

Source: Post Buy Cover rev. 3.18

5.14 Did paid advertising successfully align with the population segments and mindsets? If yes, explain. If no, why not?

The development of paid advertising was guided by the population segments created during audience segmentation and by the five mindsets that emerged from CBAMS to identify attitudes toward, barriers against, and motivation to participate in the 2010 Census – Leading Edge, Head Nodders, Unaware, Unacquainted, and Cynical Fifth. The combined insights from these research efforts allowed us to successfully align messaging to each audience’s unique characteristics; that is, we used all information available to develop messaging that would resonate with each group.

For example, if a particular demographic group had more concerns about confidentiality than another, then our messaging for that group emphasized confidentiality more so than for groups not as concerned about confidentiality. Additionally, the messaging was further designed in language, with respect to cultural lifestyle elements (e.g., a Hispanic advertisement featuring Hispanic people and other culturally relevant details), and placed in the media vehicle most consumed by the specific demographic group.

6. Related Evaluations, Experiments, and/or Assessments

- 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program Evaluation
- 2010 Census ICP assessment reports:
 - 2010 ICP Summary
 - Research
 - Earned Media and Public Relations
 - Rapid Response
 - 2010 Census Website
 - Portrait of America Road Tour
 - Promotional Materials
 - Census in Schools
 - National Partnership
 - Regional Partnership
 - Mail Response Rates/Take 10

7. Key Lessons Learned, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Lessons Learned

- We developed a research based paid advertising component for the ICP to educate and motivate people living in the United States to fill out and mailback their 2010 Census forms. We should continue to utilize research as a basis to paid advertising.
- Paid advertising efforts during NRFU encouraged cooperation with enumerators.
- Relationships soured when smaller local media did not get media buys. Include more regional input into local buys.

Recommendations

- The 2020 Census paid advertising efforts should build upon the successes of the 2010 Census campaign while taking recommendations and lessons learned into consideration, especially with regards to budget and timing.
- Award the contract and commence contract work sooner.
- Build requirements and options into the contracts, thus allowing for flexibility with, and uses for, additional funds received.

- Build better tools to assess program effectiveness and develop metrics to measure progress.
- Account for industry inflation in the starting budget for paid media buys.

While the 2010 Census paid advertising program was executed as planned within the scope of the final budget and on time, implementing these recommendations in the future can only improve upon our success. Research was an integral component of the ICP, and we learned that with an ever evolving political and economic climate, as well as the changing face of technology and media consumption, it is imperative to conduct ongoing research throughout the decade in support of the 2020 Census.

8. Acknowledgements

We recognize and thank those individuals who were instrumental in compiling and producing this report, specifically Tasha Boone and Kendall Johnson. In addition, the information used to answer the questions was generated by the C2PO staff and to them we are thankful. We also would like to thank everyone who provided guidance on the direction and scope of this assessment; in particular, Jennifer Kim, Benjamin Saunders, Jonathan Zapata, Brenda Holmes, and Mary Bucci, for fact checking and providing comments on a draft version of this report. Without such assistance, this report would not have been successful.

9. References

- Bates, N. and Mulry, M. (2007), "Segmenting the Population for the 2010 Census Integrated Communications Program," C2PO 2010 Census Integrated Communications Research Memoranda Series No. 1. U.S. Census Bureau, October 22, 2007, (http://2010.census.gov/partners/pdf/C2POMemoNo_1_10-24-08.pdf).
- U.S. Census Bureau (2003), "Census Marketing," U.S. Census Bureau Website, (<http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/advcampaign.html>), April 25, 2003.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2008), "2010 Census Integrated Communications Plan."
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009a), "2010 Census Communications Campaign Creative Copy Testing (Phase 1) Final Summary Report," C2PO 2010 Census Integrated Communications Research Memoranda Series, No. 13, U.S. Census Bureau, July 22, 2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2009b), "Census Communications Campaign Creative Copy Testing (Phase 2) Final Summary Report," C2PO 2010 Census Integrated Communications Research Memoranda Series, No. 16, U.S. Census Bureau, November 16, 2009.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2010), "2010 Census Integrated Communications Campaign Lessons Learned Report Developed by DraftFCB Team Census 2010," Fall 2010.
- Vitrano, Frank A. (2009), "2010 Census Detailed Operational Plan for Integrated Communications Program," U.S. Census Bureau, July 30, 2009.
- Wolter, K., Calder, B., Malthouse, E., Murphy, S., Pedlow, S., and Porras, J. (2002), Census 2000 Evaluation D.1: Partnership and Marketing Program Evaluation, National Opinion Research Center, July 17, 2002.

Appendix: Favored Media Outlet by Audience Segment

<p>Advantaged Homeowners</p> 	<p>More TV, Internet, magazines and lifestyle outdoor (mall advertising)</p>	<p>Place-based and Community Events, Outreach, Public Relations Across All</p>
<p>All Around Average I</p> 	<p>No significant mass media skews</p>	
<p>All Around Average II</p> 	<p>Slightly heavier users of most mass media including Internet</p>	
<p>Single Unattached Mobiles</p> 	<p>More Internet, radio and place-based media where young adults congregate (cinema, concerts)</p>	
<p>Ethnic Enclave I</p> 	<p>More In-culture TV/newspaper/radio, neighborhood outdoor</p>	
<p>Economically Disadvantaged I</p> 	<p>Heavier users of cable TV</p>	
<p>Ethnic Enclave II</p> 	<p>Under consume traditional mass media; more in-culture newspaper and radio, neighborhood outdoor</p>	
<p>Economically Disadvantaged II</p> 	<p>Heavier users of broadcast media</p>	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2008). "2010 Census Integrated Communications Plan."