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THE NIELSEN AUDIO DIARY SURVEY

Overview

- Seven-day radio listening diary (about 225 local markets)
- Persons 12 years old and older
- Addresses and phone numbers matched, where possible
- Screener for cell phone status and telephone number.
- About 73 Hispanic controlled markets
- Append characteristics from a marketing database
THE SEVEN DAY RADIO DAIRY
One for Each Person (12+) in the Household
HISPANIC INDICATOR

2012 Test

- Compared prediction to known results
- Agreements
- False positives
- False negatives – two types
- Unknown and unlinked
HISPANIC INDICATOR APPENDING

2012 Test

n = 6,723 Households

DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS

- AGREEMENT: 57%
- FALSE POSITIVE: 20%
- FALSE NEGATIVE: 14%
- UNKNOWN/UNLINKED: 8%

Nearly 60% Agreement (Accuracy)
WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HISPANIC SURNAME HOUSEHOLDS AND OTHER HISPANIC HOUSEHOLDS?
## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TYPES OF HOUSEHOLDS

Respondents in Each Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERSONS PER HH</th>
<th>HISPANICS</th>
<th>PREFER SPANISH</th>
<th>PERCENT 18-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC -Y</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC-N</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN/UNLINKED</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2012 Respondents
## CENSUS TRACT DATA – HISPANIC HH


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERCENT HISPANIC</th>
<th>HISPANIC PERCENT 45+</th>
<th>HISPANIC PERCENT RENTER</th>
<th>HISPANIC LINGUISTIC ISOLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC -Y</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC-N</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN/UNLINKED</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: 2010 Census, 2007-2011 American Community Survey
STRATIFICATION OF APPENDED DATA

Action after test

- Five strata
- Unknown/unlinked an important strata
- Hispanic “Yes” households receive bilingual materials
- Unknown/unlinked in Hispanic neighborhoods receive bilingual materials
CAN LARGER SAMPLES PINPOINT GEOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES?
SAMPLE IS DISTRIBUTED LIKE THE POPULATION
Hispanic “No” Neighborhoods are Less Hispanic than “Yes’ Neighborhoods

Source: 2010 Census
HISPANIC MEDIAN AGE (ADULTS 18+)

Block Group Data

No Pattern in Adult Age

Source: 2010 Census
AVERAGE HISPANIC MEDIAN INCOME

Block Group Data

Unknown/Unlinked has Lower Income

Source: 2008-2010 Five Year ACS
LINGUISTICALLY ISOLATED HOUSEHOLDS

Block Group Data

Hispanic “No” Are Less Isolated

Source: 2008-2010 Five Year ACS
GEOGRAPHIC SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION

Discussion

- Can’t distinguish groups geographically
- Not enough differences to create different procedures
- Unknown/Unlinked are similar to Hispanics “Yes”
- Unknown/Unlinked in lower income neighborhoods than “Yes”
- Continue to stratify Unknown/Unlinked as well as “Yes”