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SJV Census Cluster Project: Overall Strategy

2018: Research, Building the Knowledge Base, Support Capacity Building (CB) re: Issues & Strategies

2019: Report Publication/Dissemination, Advocacy, Strategic Engagement, Grantmaking, Ongoing CB, Planning & Early Outreach

2020: Advocacy, Strategic Outreach, Ongoing Capacity Building & Strategic Engagement

Post Census: What if it is a failed census?
Update re: SJVHF Census Cluster Project

- $886,000 raised to date + Region 6 CA state outreach grant = $2.6 million
- Three research publications and executive summaries; more coming
- 10 SJVHF census advocacy grants: Feb. 1, 2019 start date ($15,000/one year)
- Community partner brainstorming, coordination, sharing, problem solving
- Dissemination/outreach re: SJV census research & implications
- Amicus Curiae: Nat’l Immigration Law Center + funder/community partners
- Vision: Strengthened regional action & advocacy network
  
  Research informed * More strategic advocacy & outreach grants * Enhanced partnerships (high touch/grassroots; formal & informal networks & leaders)

- Expected impacts: → increased civic engagement via accurate and complete Census 2020 for benefit of local communities and state
The San Joaquin Valley is home to 4.2 million people

- Accounts for 11% of California’s population
- Minority-majority region with a population larger than the City of Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Miami, San Francisco
- Mainly Latino, also many Asian-origin immigrants
- More than 1 of 4 heads of household are foreign-born
- More than 1 out of 5 heads of household are 2nd generation immigrants (US-born, foreign-born parents)
- Survey and focus group research on immigrants and their social networks to:
  - assess the impact of adding the citizenship question (CQ) to Census 2020
  - Examine willingness to respond during various stages of the census process
  - identify barriers to and opportunities for increasing Census 2020 participation
- Generated insights on concerns and perspectives
~600 Surveys conducted with San Joaquin Valley Immigrants and Their Social Networks

Survey Respondents

Latinos (95% Mexican origin, 5% Central American)
- 37% undocumented
- 27% legal residents
- 11% naturalized
- 25% 2nd generation

Other (72% Southeast Asian, 14% Filipino or Punjabi Sikh, 7% Arab or Sub-Saharan African, 7% other)
- 7% refugee or undocumented
- 10% legal residents
- 45% naturalized citizens
- 39% 2nd generation

www.shfcenter.org/sjvhealthfund
7 Focus Groups held with San Joaquin Valley Immigrants and Their Social Networks

4 Latino Focus Groups
- Indigenous community (Madera)
- U.S.-born Latino youth with immigrant parents (Fresno)
- Latino DACA recipients (Tulare County)
- Latino Head Start parents (Stanislaus, Merced and Madera Counties)

3 Focus Groups with other Immigrants
- Sikh (Kern County)
- Syrian refugees (Fresno)
- Hmong (Stanislaus and Merced Counties)

www.shfcenter.org/svjhealthfund
Face-to-Face Interviews:
8 Counties - 39 Communities – 150+ Venues
### Latinos: Dramatic Reduction in Willingness to Respond if the CQ is added

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness To Respond</th>
<th>Without the CQ</th>
<th>With the CQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Latino respondents</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented (N=147)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Residents (N=108)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized Citizens (N=44)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-born Citizens-2(^{nd}) gen (N=97)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness To Respond</td>
<td>Without the CQ</td>
<td>With the CQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born: Naturalized (N=75)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born: Legal Permanent Residents (N=16)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born: Refugee or Undocumented (N=11)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-born Citizens-2nd gen (N=64)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latinos--strongly opposed to proxy interviews*  

“NONE OF MY BUSINESS!”

### 19% Willingness to respond without CQ

“I think it's an issue of privacy. I don't think I have the right to give people’s information away. Maybe if I ask them first.”

“I would not give it, why should it be my job to answer? It's not my obligation.”

“No, because I do not know who the neighbors are. I will tell the person to go to the house [himself].”

### 8% Willingness to respond with CQ

“I do not want to do any harm by giving that personal information.”

“I will not give the information, I do not want to get people in trouble. It’s very private. The government should not ask it.”

*Proxy interviews are key component of NRFU process: 24% of NRFU interviews in Census 2010 and 27% in 2018 NRFU testing*
Other immigrants—also very opposed to proxy interviews*

**“NOT MY PLACE TO DO THAT!”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to respond</th>
<th>44%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without CQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to respond</th>
<th>26%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with CQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “You see how awkward and ugly that is. That's an invasion of privacy.” |
| “I take offense to this question. It’s too intrusive. I know my neighbors, but I’m not giving their information.” |
| “In Islam, it's called ‘Ghraib’. It means something like a spy. In Islam, I can't talk about my neighbor.” |
| “No! Do people do that? It's not my place...I would give the form to my neighbors, but I won't talk about them.” |

| “Some of my neighbors are not from Laos and I don't want to jeopardize my neighbors. So, I can't answer this question.” |
| “I believe the citizenship question should be asked and answered directly from my neighbor, not me.” |
| “It depends. I would answer only if I know that my neighbors are US citizens.” |

*Proxy interviews accounted for 24% of NRFU interviews in Census 2010 and 27% in 2018 NRFU testing.
Enumerating Complex HHs: Multiple Family Units Living Under the Same Roof or at the Same Address

- More than 1 out of 5 Latino HH’s are complex or compounds. For other immigrant HH’s, more than 1 out of 3. “Extra” people in these HHs likely not to be included in HH roster.

- Living arrangements often violate housing codes. “Extra” individuals, in many cases, undocumented. They will be left off the HH roster—especially if the CQ is on the census.

- Follow-up will not detect the “extra” family members in complex HH’s. Families in hidden housing units will not get an invitation to respond, a form, a reminder, or enumerator visit.
Mail Delivery of Census Materials Is a Major Concern: Procedural Advocacy + Messaging Needed

- 28% of immigrant HH’s lack standard mail delivery
- **PO Box only:** 13% of Latinos, 1% of Others
- **Shared mailbox:** 12% of Latinos, 29% of others
- **No mail delivery or other** (e.g. friend’s house): 3% Latinos, 2% of others
- **Spanish-English mailing limited** to census tracts with >20% non-English HH’s
- Need to expand update-leave (U/L) enumeration in areas with complex and hidden HH’s and PO box use
- Need to assure nearby user-friendly questionnaire assistance centers (QACs)
- Messaging to landlords to focus specifically on safety/confidentiality of including others living at same place
- Messaging to persuade sub-families or “extra” persons to take initiative to respond via NID—online or phone
- Support for languages that Census Bureau left out: Hmong, Khmer, Punjabi, Mixtec, Triqui, Zapotec
- More bilingual Spanish-language mailing
Internet Access Is a Barrier to San Joaquin Valley Immigrant Household Response—Especially for Latinos

- Those most willing to respond (older legal residents and naturalized citizens) have least access to the Internet
- Because so many only access the Internet by smart phone, interface needs to be extremely user-friendly for HH’s with limited digital literacy (ID entry currently very difficult on smartphone!)
- QACs need to offer online access and also strong campaigns to encourage immigrants to make use of them
- ”Mobile QAC’s”—teams of local youth, young adults, trusted neighbors with tablets offering assistance with online self-response
Widespread perception that the citizenship question is divisive, racist and bad social policy—especially among 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation Latinos. Not a major concern among Asians.

- Why are people being segregated into different groups?
- Among the naturalized citizens and legal residents, some definitely want to be counted and will respond, but still object to inclusion of the citizenship question.
- Some won’t respond to census in protest and/or solidarity with the undocumented

**Profound suspicion of the intent behind the citizenship question—particularly from Latinos**

- If the census is meant to count the population, why ask personal information and, especially, why add the citizenship question?
- Assumption that question is about immigration status and will harm people
- Some plan to skip the CQ or report only on some household members (among both Latinos and Southeast Asians)

**Distrust in federal government leads to distrust in Census Bureau assurances about confidentiality—especially among Latinos**

- If you’re rich you can afford a fine or you can find a loophole to stay out of jail
- Disbelief in confidentiality isn’t absolute, but how information could be used is of grave concern
- Weighing of risks vs. benefits

**Personal information belongs to individuals and their families**
“Get Out the Count” – High Levels of Communication Skills Will Be Crucial

- Potential willingness to participate so as to reap community benefits is offset by disbelief in government assurances of confidentiality. Local “trusted voices” are needed—but training and communication flexibility will be crucial.

- Census Bureau is working hard to get a large enough pool of potential hires in 2020. But more attention is needed to communication skills. Flexible communication for “refusal conversion”. Community navigators will be essential.

- Higher-than-expected non-response among immigrants (likely even if the CQ is removed from the form) requires waivers to allow hiring non-citizen enumerators.

- Enumerator training and supervision needs to be enhanced in order to allow enumerators to persuade reluctant respondents. Following a rigid script will not work.

- Mobile QAC’s (teams of local residents with laptops or tablets to help HH’s with online response) can make a major contribution in reducing NRFU workload by persuading indifferent and reluctant HH’s to respond.
Increased Motivation Won’t Help Much Unless Barriers To Response Are Overcome

- Census Bureau collaboration with community-based organizations in Summer 2019 in-field address canvassing will help add hidden housing units not on the address list. Also—an opportunity for early promotion of census participation.

- Expansion of U/L to areas with city-style addresses in NRFU will help those living complex HH’s, those in hidden housing, and those with only PO boxes to respond.

- Dramatic increase in NRFU workload and more $ needed if CQ is added. Also “smart targeting” to low-income tracts with concentrations of immigrants and ultra-low self-response. Adequate workforce needed but quality of communication with HH’s must be maintained. Community navigators....

- More extensive mailing of bilingual materials (no significant cost impact) and improved language support for languages not currently included will help (at QAC’s and phone).

- Getting more QAC’s is critical. They require local language/culturally competent staff. Community-based organizations’ efforts crucial and will require philanthropy support.
“Get-Out-The-Count” Messaging

- **March-June 2019**: Prepare to effectively promote census participation with Plan A—Restoring Trust if CQ is banned and Plan B—Building Enthusiasm in Face of Adversity

- **August-December 2019**: Initiate promotion of census participation with strategy configured to respond to SCOTUS decision re: CQ

- **March 2019-August 2020**: Targeted promotion of Census participation to hard-to-count diverse sub-populations based on market segmentation analysis – not just race/ethnicity. Emphasis on local/friendly/trustable community QAC’s, mobile QAC’s.

- **April-August 2020**: Phased Census promotion keyed to sequence of NRFU activities—beyond self-response to emphasize response to enumerators, attention to reminders, and inclusion of “extra” family members on HH roster
Thank You!
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Ellen Braff-Guajardo  ebraff-guajardo@sierrahealth.org
Cindy Quezada  cindy.cviic@gmail.com
Ed Kissam  edkissam@me.com

SJV Census reports can be found at  
shfcenter.org/San-Joaquin-Valley-Census-Research-Project