

## **Public Attitudes toward Data Sharing by Federal Agencies**

Eleanor Singer, *Survey Research Center, University of Michigan*  
Stanley Presser, *University of Maryland*

As a result of a lower-than-expected mail return to the 1990 census, as well as a persistent differential undercount of minority populations, the Census Bureau is contemplating a variety of innovative procedures for the year 2000. One of these is the use of administrative records held by other government agencies in order to locate people who might otherwise be missed.

Public acceptance of data sharing among federal and state statistical agencies is necessary for effective implementation of such a procedure, but only limited information exists concerning public attitudes on this topic. The most extensive information to date comes from questions on several IRS surveys of taxpayers, from questions added to a series of Wisconsin surveys carried out in 1993-95, and from scattered other surveys reviewed by Blair (1994) for the National Academy Panel on Census Methods. From this review it is clear that the public is not well informed about what data sharing actually entails, nor about the meaning of confidentiality. It seems likely that opinions on this topic are not firmly held and are liable to change depending on information stipulated in the survey questions as well as on features of the social climate.

Partly because of this lack of information, the National Academy Panel recommended a "program of research on public views about statistical uses of administrative records in government" (Steffey and Bradburn, 1994:146). In line with this recommendation, the 1995 Joint Program in Survey Methodology (JPSM) practicum survey was devoted to examining these issues.<sup>1</sup> The survey asked questions designed to probe the public's understanding of the Census Bureau's pledge of confidentiality and their confidence in that pledge, and it also asked how they felt about the Census Bureau's obtaining some information from other government agencies in order to improve the decennial count. Reactions to arguments of efficiency were also probed. In addition, in an effort to understand responses to the data sharing questions, the survey asked a series of questions about attitudes toward government and about privacy in general.

This paper examines public attitudes toward the Census Bureau's use of other agencies' administrative records. It analyzes the relationship of demographic characteristics to these attitudes, as well as the interrelationship of trust in government, attitudes toward data sharing, and general concerns about privacy. Implications are drawn for the response of the public toward increased use of administrative records by the Census Bureau.

---

<sup>1</sup> The practicum, a two-semester course required of students pursuing the Master of Science degree in survey methodology, involves the design, conduct, and analysis of a survey for a federal statistical agency. The topic of the 1995 survey was proposed by the Census Bureau. We collaborated with the practicum students in the design and development of the survey instrument.

## Methods

The 1995 JPSM survey was administered between late February and early July to a two-stage Mitofsky-Waksberg random digit dial sample of households in the continental United States. In each household, one respondent over 18 years of age was selected at random using a Kish procedure. The response rate (interviews divided by the total sample less businesses, nonworking numbers, and numbers that were never answered after a minimum of twenty calls) was 65 percent. The nonresponse consisted of 23.4% refusals, 6.5% not-at-home, and 5.1% other (e.g., language other than English and illness). Computer-assisted telephone interviewing was conducted largely by University of Maryland Research Center interviewers, supplemented by graduate students in the JPSM practicum (who had participated in the design of the questionnaire through focus groups, cognitive interviews, and conventional pretests.) The total number of completed interviews was 1443.<sup>2</sup>

Because we suspected that questions about data sharing and about the confidentiality of census information would not be meaningful unless respondents had some idea of the kind of information involved, the interview began with the five demographic questions on the 1990 census short-form questionnaire, which asked for the respondent's name, age, race, ethnicity, and marital status. Subsequent questions about confidentiality and data sharing referred back to the content of these five questions. As a result, we hoped that responses to questions probing attitudes toward agencies' sharing of data with the Census Bureau and beliefs about the latter's safeguarding of identified data would be anchored in the specific content of the information involved.

Besides anchoring questions about data sharing in the specific information asked for on the short census form, we also took pains to acquaint respondents with the fact that the 1990 census had failed to count a significant number of people, and that the communities in which these people lived were, as a result, deprived of full political representation and economic benefits. Thus, the context for the questions on data sharing was the undercount and its consequences.

The questionnaire included several questions about this issue. First, respondents were asked whether they favored or opposed three specific agencies--the Social Security Administration (SSA), the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS)--giving the Census Bureau the name, address, age, sex, marital status, and (in the case of SSA and INS) race of persons in their files *who are missed in the census*. These three agencies were selected because they are among the most likely candidates for supplementing lists of persons enumerated in the census, and also because two of the three might be perceived as

---

<sup>2</sup> The data were weighted to correct for unequal probabilities of selection (due to households containing different numbers of adults and phone lines) and poststratified to the March 1993 Current Population Survey distributions on region, gender, race, age, and education. The weights were scaled so that the weighted N equaled the actual number of interviews.

threatening by respondents. Presentation of the three agencies was systematically rotated. Next, respondents were asked about *replacing* the census with information from the records of other government agencies. Finally, those who opposed the latter practice or said they were unsure, were asked whether they would favor it if it (a) led to reduced costs or (b) reduced the undercount. Half the sample was asked first about cost and half, about accuracy; those who continued to oppose the practice or to say they were unsure were then presented with the other argument. The wording of these questions is shown in the Appendix.

The analysis seeks to answer four questions. First, we ask how those who favor data sharing for *any* of the three agencies differ from those who favor data sharing for *none* of them. Second, we ask whether the same characteristics predict favorability toward data sharing for each of the agencies. Third, we ask how, if at all, attitudes toward data sharing in order to *eliminate* the conventional census differ from attitudes toward data sharing in order to *improve* the census count. Finally, we examine the special characteristics of those who remain opposed to data sharing even when considerations of accuracy and economy are added to reduced burden as arguments for eliminating the conventional population count.

The questionnaire included a large number of items we believed, on the basis of prior research (Blair, 1994; Singer and Schaeffer, 1995), to be related to attitudes toward other statistical agencies' sharing data with the Census Bureau. We used exploratory factor analysis to reduce this large number of potential independent variables to the following seven indexes, each consisting of variables highly correlated with each other and all related in the same direction to the dependent variables: (1) *Importance* attached to the census; (2) *Control/Efficacy*, which measures the respondent's perceived influence over government; (3) *Knowledge about the census*; (4) *Trust* in government; (5) *Distress* at disclosure of personal information; (6) *Belief* that the Census Bureau currently shares identifiable data with other agencies; and (7) *Beliefs about privacy invasion*. The exact wording of the items making up each of these indexes, as well as the alphas indicating their internal consistency, are shown in the Appendix. These indexes, or factors, were then used to predict attitudes toward data sharing, controlling simultaneously for a number of demographic characteristics.

## Results

Sharing of data with the Census Bureau is widely approved by the current sample.<sup>3</sup> Between 68 percent and 73 percent, depending on the specific agency asked about, say they would favor the agency giving the Census Bureau the name, address, age, sex, and marital status of people who are missed in the census. These numbers are similar to those found in other surveys (e.g., Blair, 1994; Singer and Schaeffer, 1995). A considerably smaller number, but still a majority (54 percent), favor the Census Bureau's getting everyone's name, address, age, sex, race, and marital

---

<sup>3</sup> This statement must be treated with caution in light of the substantial nonresponse to the survey. It is possible that people more opposed to data sharing or to the census, or more concerned about privacy, were disproportionately likely to refuse to be interviewed, thus overestimating the degree of support for data sharing.

status from the records of other government agencies in order to eliminate the filling out of census forms altogether.

Who are the people who favor data sharing, and how do they differ from others, who remain opposed to this practice? In order to answer this question, we first estimated a logistic regression equation which contrasts those willing to have one or more of the three agencies share data with the Census Bureau (85%) with those unwilling to have any of the three do so (15%), and predicts willingness to share, first from the seven attitudinal factors described above, and then from attitudes as well as demographic characteristics.<sup>4</sup> The results of this regression equation are shown in Table 1. Regression coefficients for the equation without demographic controls are shown in Column 1; regression coefficients for the equation including demographic controls are shown in Column 3. (Standard errors are shown in parentheses.)

Among the attitudinal measures, only three are significantly related to favorability toward data sharing in this multivariate context: importance attached to the census, and belief that other agencies can at present get census data, are positively related to data sharing, and distress at the possibility of disclosure of identifiable information about oneself is negatively related.

When six demographic variables (plus the dummy variable for income missing, which we regard as a proxy measure of privacy concerns) are added to the equation, two of these attitudinal variables--importance and distress--remain significant, and trust in government becomes marginally so (greater trust being associated with greater favorability). Among the demographics, nonwhite race, and (marginally) income and gender are significant, with blacks and women more likely to be opposed to data sharing and those with higher income more likely to have favorable attitudes toward it. Those who did not disclose their income in the interview were significantly less likely to favor the sharing of administrative data across federal agencies, a finding also reported in Singer and Schaeffer (1995).

The picture changes only slightly when we look at the favorability of attitudes toward data sharing by each of three specific agencies, as estimated by three logistic regression equations. These data are shown in Table 2. The same three factors that predict favorability toward data sharing for any agency also predict approval for each of the three agencies: the importance attached to the census, trust in government, and (negatively) distress at the possibility of disclosure. In addition, belief that the Census Bureau currently shares data is significant for the INS and the IRS. (Note that this relationship is positive--i.e., those who believe data are currently being shared are more likely to approve of data sharing in the future.)

---

<sup>4</sup> The dependent variable in the regression equation is a dummy variable equal to one if the respondent is willing to have one or more of the three agencies share data with the Census Bureau, and zero otherwise. The independent variables are: (1) importance attached to the census, (2) belief that other agencies can at present get census data, (3) distress at the possibility of disclosure of identifiable information about oneself, (4) trust in government, (5) nonwhite race, (6) income, (7) gender, and (8) a dummy variable for income missing.

There are small variations among the three agencies in the case of the demographic predictors. Age, income, and nonwhite race significantly predict data sharing attitudes for all three agencies, and Hispanic ethnicity is not significant for any of them. The other demographic variables are significant predictors for some agencies but not for others: The better educated are more likely to favor data sharing by the INS, and women are marginally less likely to favor data sharing by the IRS than men. The dummy variable for income missing is a significant (negative) predictor for all three agencies.

To get some sense of the amount of variance predicted by the demographics and attitudinal variables, we estimated a regression equation predicting the number of agencies for which a respondent favored data sharing. In this equation, 17% of the variance is accounted for by the attitudinal variables alone, 6% by the demographics alone, and 21% by both sets of variables. Two things are noteworthy about these findings: first, there is very little overlap among the demographics and attitudinal variables; the variance explained by each is largely independent of that explained by the other. Second, the demographic variables explain relatively little variation compared to the attitudinal variables.

So far, we have examined responses to questions about *supplementing* the census with information obtained from administrative records. We also, however, asked how respondents felt about *replacing* the conventional census with such information, thus saving everyone the trouble of filling out the census form. As noted earlier, only 54 percent of the sample initially favored this proposal, but, prompted with two additional arguments about potential improvements in accuracy and reductions in cost (and, we should note, the persistent questioning of the interviewer), an additional 26 percent shifted to the favorable position, leaving only some 15 percent unpersuaded (the rest expressed no opinion).

We look first at predictors of favoring data sharing to replace the conventional census when no additional arguments are presented, shown in Table 3. Column 1 shows the coefficients from an equation including only the attitudinal factors; column 3 shows the results of predicting favorability from the factors and the demographic controls.

When only the seven factors are included in the equation, five are significant: importance, knowledge, distress, control, and belief that data are currently being shared; the same five remain significant when the demographic variables are added to the equation. Among the demographic variables, age and (marginally) education and income are all significant. Although most of these variables are familiar from earlier analyses, this is the first time that specific knowledge about the census emerges as a predictor of attitudes toward data sharing, and the relationship is negative: those who know more are less likely to be supportive of this proposal. Control/efficacy also has a negative relationship with the dependent variable: those who feel they are in control of their lives and over personal information about themselves are less likely to approve of data sharing in order to replace the conventional census. Furthermore, the direction of the relationship with income and education has changed: the better educated, and those with higher income, are also more likely to oppose this proposal.

Whereas the existence of the undercount, and the importance of reducing it, had been carefully documented in the questionnaire, there was no corresponding buildup of arguments for eliminating the census in order to avoid the burden of completing the form. Perhaps as a result of this, support for data sharing under these circumstances is much lower than when it is described as helping to reduce the undercount; and support for the practice is located in a somewhat different subgroup of the population--in particular, among those less knowledgeable about the uses made of the census, and among those with less education and income. We suspect that this result comes about because, in the absence of detailed information about the need for replacing the census or the consequences of doing so, those who are better informed about the census, or better educated, withhold their support, perhaps because they believe the quality of the census would suffer as a result. Comments recorded by interviewers about the spontaneous objections raised by some respondents support this interpretation.

This supposition can be tested by results presented in Table 4, which shows the results of two logistic regression equations predicting hard-core opposition to the proposal that other agencies share data with the Census Bureau--that is, opposition even in the face of arguments about possible increased accuracy and reduced costs. Table 4 includes only those respondents who initially opposed data sharing to replace the census. Column 1 shows the results of an equation using only the attitudinal factors as variables as predictors of continued opposition. As can be seen, only three of the factors have a significant effect on opposition to this use of data sharing: being bothered by the possibility of disclosure of census information about oneself, beliefs about privacy invasion, and (negatively) regarding the census as important. The same three variables remain significant when the demographic variables are added to the equation (Column 3), and, in addition, control/efficacy achieves marginal significance. Thus, when two reassuring arguments--about improved accuracy and reduced cost--are introduced, enough people are persuaded so that knowledge and education no longer predict resistance to data sharing that would permit replacing the census. The hard-core opposition to this practice comes, instead, from those greatly concerned about personal privacy, as indicated by the significance of a cluster of privacy-related factors: distress, beliefs about privacy invasion, control, and the dummy variable for income missing.

### **Discussion**

So far as supplementing the census with administrative records is concerned, people who consider the census very important, and those with greater trust in government, are more favorably inclined toward this proposal, which is described as leading to the counting of people "who would otherwise be missed in the Census." On the other hand, those who would be bothered a lot by possible disclosure of personal information about them by the Census Bureau are more likely to be opposed. Belief that the Bureau currently shares identified records with other agencies is positively related to approval of a proposal to share data among agencies in the future.

Among the demographic predictors, age and income are both positively related to favoring data sharing in order to improve the count, a finding suggesting that this practice may be viewed as a

practical solution to an expensive problem. Nonwhites, on the other hand, are more likely to be opposed. Interestingly enough, neither knowledge about the uses made of census information (admittedly, measured by a weak index of knowledge) nor (with the exception of the INS) education, an indicator of more general knowledge, is significantly related to views about data sharing in order to improve the count. Those who refuse to disclose their income in the survey are, not surprisingly, also opposed to the sharing of data among administrative agencies.

Although the significance levels of one or another of these variables may change depending on the agency involved and on whether or not missing data are imputed, we have reasonable confidence in the general pattern of these results, having rerun the equations in a variety of ways.

So far as replacing the conventional census by means of data sharing is concerned, opposition appears to be located in part among those who believe the quality of the census would suffer as a result of this practice, and in part among those who are greatly concerned about personal privacy. Credible arguments about increased efficiency and improved accuracy might reduce opposition among the former group; we have no information about what, if anything, might win over the latter.

Although related general attitudes are an obvious touchstone for people to draw upon in answering questions about largely unfamiliar issues, background characteristics frequently shape such answers as well. For example, in a multivariate analysis of attitudes toward genetic testing, Singer (1993) found that general attitudinal positions accounted for 10 percent of the variance, and demographic variables for another 10 percent. By contrast, the relative unimportance of social background (age, race, sex, education, Hispanic ethnicity, and income) compared to general attitudinal predispositions in predicting answers to the data sharing questions is striking. However, comparisons across studies need to be made carefully. Nonresponse bias, in the form of self-selection on the dependent variable, may be more important in our study than in studies of other issues, because individuals who are opposed to data sharing may have been disproportionately apt to refuse to cooperate with the request for an interview.<sup>5</sup> If the connection between cooperation and data sharing attitudes was stronger for some demographic groups than for others, the survey would underestimate the association between those group characteristics and data sharing attitudes.

The particular agency--among the three asked about--did not make a great deal of difference in attitudes toward data sharing. At the same time, we believe that our findings are context-dependent, in several senses. First, the context for the question about data sharing in this study

---

<sup>5</sup> This is a possibility because the survey was conducted in a context where data sharing was a novel concept. It is possible that individuals who are opposed to data sharing may have been disproportionately apt to refuse to cooperate with the request for an interview. If the connection between cooperation and data sharing attitudes was stronger for some demographic groups than for others, the survey would underestimate the association between those group characteristics and data sharing attitudes.

was improving the accuracy of the decennial count, and the consequences of inaccuracy. If this context were changed, the findings might change, as well. Second, the context of data sharing in the current study is the five specific questions enumerated in the questionnaire. If the type of information to be shared is not specified, or if respondents come to believe that sensitive data are being shared, attitudes of favorability might change, as well. Finally, the social context for the study was the absence of a scandal involving disclosure, as well as the absence of an anti-data sharing campaign. Our findings might change, perhaps dramatically, if this social context were to change--a conclusion supported by events in several European countries (Butz, 1985).

### References

Blair, Johnny. 1994. "Ancillary Uses of Government Administrative Data on Individuals: Public Perceptions and Attitudes." College Park, University of Maryland Survey Research Center.

Butz, William P. 1985. "Data Confidentiality and Public Perceptions: The Case of the European Censuses." *American Statistical Association*, pp. 90-97.

Singer, Eleanor. 1993. "Public Attitudes toward Fetal Diagnosis and the Termination of Life." *Social Indicators Research* 28: 117-36.

Singer, Eleanor and Nora Cate Schaeffer. "Public Attitudes toward Data Sharing by Federal Agencies." 1995. Paper presented at May 1995 AAPOR Conference, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.

Singer, Eleanor, Dawn R. Von Thurn, and Esther R. Miller. 1995. "Confidentiality Assurances and Survey Response: A Review of the Experimental Literature." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59: 66-77, 1995.

Steffey, Duane and Norman Bradburn (eds.). 1994. *Counting People in the Information Age*. Washington: National Academy Press.

## Appendix

### Independent Variables

Factor 1: Census Importance ( $\alpha=.63$ )<sup>6</sup>

Factor 1 is an index consisting of the sum of answers to the following questions (answers were recoded so that a high score indicates high importance or strong agreement):

(Q 1) "Every 10 years the Census Bureau Counts the people in the United States. How important do you think it is to count the people in the United States: extremely important (32%), very important (39%), somewhat important (20%), or not too important (7%)?"

(Q 15) "Do you feel it is an invasion of your privacy for the Census Bureau to ask your age, race, sex, Hispanic origin, and marital status along with your name and address?" (4=yes [22%], 1=no [77%])

(Q 16A/B) "How important do you think it is for the Census Bureau to ask about age, race, sex, Hispanic origin, and marital status (these five questions): very important (41%), somewhat important (36%), not too important (12%), or not important at all (9%)?"

(Q 27H) "Everyone has responsibility to cooperate with the Census. Would you say you strongly agree (55%), somewhat agree (36%), somewhat disagree (5%), or strongly disagree (3%)?"

(Q 20A/B) "As I said earlier, some communities (big cities and cities with large minority populations) are more likely to be undercounted in the Census than others. As a result, undercounted communities get fewer political representatives and less money from the government than they should. Do you think this problem is very serious(36%) , somewhat serious (41%), not too serious (13%), or not serious at all (6%)?"

Factor 2: Concern about Privacy/Efficacy ( $\alpha = .68$ )

Factor 2 is an index consisting of the sum of answers to the following questions, coded so that low scores indicate strong agreement and high scores, disagreement; low scores indicate low efficacy:

(Q 27B) "People have lost all control over how personal information about them is used. Would you say you strongly agree (40%), somewhat agree (37%), somewhat disagree (14%), or

---

<sup>6</sup> Standardized item alphas used throughout. Percentages for each question do not necessarily sum to 100% because the percentages responding DK are not shown.

strongly disagree (5%)?"

(Q27D) "If privacy is to be preserved, the use of computers must be strictly regulated. Would you say you strongly agree (59%), somewhat agree (24%), somewhat disagree (7%), or strongly disagree (6%)?"

(Q27E) "The government already knows more about me than it needs to. Would you say you strongly agree (49%), somewhat agree (29%), somewhat disagree (13%), or strongly disagree (4%)?"

(Q27F) "People like me don't have any say about what the government does. Would you say you strongly agree (31%), somewhat agree (26%), somewhat disagree (25%), or strongly disagree (17%)?"

(Q27G) "I don't think public officials care much what people like me think. Would you say you strongly agree (33%), somewhat agree (31%), somewhat disagree (23%), or strongly disagree (12%)?"

Factor 3: Knowledge about Census ( $\alpha = .49$ )

Factor 3 consists of the sum of the following variables, scored 1 point for each correct answer:

(Q 10) "The Census is used in many different ways. It is used to decide how many representatives each state has in Congress. The Census is also used to decide how much money communities get from the government. Have you heard about either of these uses of the Census?" (yes, 50%)

(Q 11A/B) "In the last Census about 5 million people were not counted. Some communities (big cities and cities with large minority populations) were most likely to be undercounted than others. As a result, undercounted communities got fewer political representatives and less money from the government than they should. Have you heard about some communities (big cities and cities with large minority populations) getting fewer representatives or less money because they were undercounted?" (yes, 42%)

(Q 17) "Most households are sent a Census short form that just asks these 5 questions about each person. But other households get a longer form that also asks many other questions such as whether people work, their occupation, and the amount of money they earn. Did you know that most households got the short form but that some households were sent a long form?" (yes, 30%)

Factor 4: Trust in Government ( $\alpha = .69$ )

Factor 4 consists of the sum of answers to two questions, scored so that high scores indicate high trust:

(Q28) "How about the people running the government? Would you say you have a great deal of confidence (5%), only some confidence (63%), or hardly any confidence (31%) in the people running the government?"

(Q29) "How much do you trust the government in Washington to do what is right: just about always (3%), most of the time (20%), some of the time (57%), or almost never (19%)?"

Factor 5: Distress at Disclosure (*alpha* = .65)

Factor 5 consists of 3 questions, each scored so that high scores indicate high distress.

(Q7d) "How much would it bother you if another government agency, outside the Census Bureau, got your name and address along with your answers to the census? Would it bother you a lot (36%), some (20%), a little (10%), or not at all (29%)?"

(Q8d1) "How much would it bother you if someone outside the government got your name and address along with your answers to the census? Would it bother you a lot (58%), some (18%), a little (8%), or not at all (12%)?"

(Q24) "In general, how worried would you say you are about your personal privacy: very worried (21%), somewhat worried (36%), not very worried (25%), or not worried at all (18%)?"

Factor 6: Belief in Current Practice (*alpha* = .56)

Factor 6 consists of the sum of answers to two questions, scored so that low scores indicate belief that other agencies can get census data and intermediate scores indicate uncertainty:

(Q7) "The five questions I just asked are on the Census form along with the household's address. The person in the household who fills out the form must list the full name of everyone who lives there along with each person's age, sex, race, and marital status. Do you think other government agencies, outside the Census Bureau, can (53%) or cannot (9%) get people's names and addresses along with their answers to the Census, or are you not sure (38%)?"

(Q8) "Now I want to ask you about people outside the government. Do you think someone who is not in the government can (50%), or cannot (14%) get people's names and addresses along with their answers to the Census, or are you not sure (37%)?"

Factor 7: Beliefs about Privacy Invasion (*alpha* = .35)

Factor 7 consists of the sum of answers to 2 questions, scored one point for each positive

response:

(Q25) "Have you personally ever been the victim of what you felt was an invasion of privacy?"  
(yes, 29%)

(Q26) "Do you believe that your telephone has ever been tapped?" (yes, 9%)

### Treatment of Item Missing Data

Because of the large number of cases lost to analysis when those missing on any of the items are excluded (about a quarter of the sample), we included those missing on fewer than half the items on a given factor, assigning them a score averaged over the number of items they had answered. A similar strategy was adopted with respect to the question on income, to which 68 people (4.7%) responded Don't Know and 209 (14.5%) refused to answer. These people were assigned at random to one of the seven income categories, in such a way as to maintain the original distribution among the categories. In addition, we included a dummy variable in all of the equations indicating whether or not income had been imputed because of nonresponse.

### Dependent Variables

1. Favors any agency sharing data with Census Bureau.

This variable contrasts those responding "favor" to Q12SSA, Q12INS, or Q12ISR with those not responding "favor" to any of the three; the question was asked about the Social Security Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Internal Revenue Service, in random order:

"Now I will ask you about a proposal to fix the undercount. It involves using records from a number of government agencies to identify people who are missed in the Census. One of the agencies is the Social Security Administration. People missed by the Census who have Social Security records could then be counted. Would you favor or oppose the Social Security Administration giving the Census Bureau the name, address, age, sex, and marital status of people who are missed in the Census?"

2. Separate variables indicating whether or not the respondent favors data sharing by the SSA, the INS, and the IRS.

3. Favors data sharing to eliminate conventional census.

Those responding "favor" to Q13: "Another proposal is to do away with Census forms entirely. No one would be asked to fill out a form. Instead, the Census Bureau would count the entire population by getting information from other government agencies. Would you favor or

oppose the Census Bureau getting everyone's name, address, age, sex, race, and marital status from the records of other government agencies, so no one would have to fill out a Census form?"

4. Opposed to proposal in Q13 despite hypothetical arguments that (a) census would cost less and (Q14a) and (b) count would be more accurate (Q14b). A random half of those opposed to Q13 were first asked Q14a, the others, Q14b:

Q14a: "If counting the population by combining information from different agencies costs less than sending out census forms, would you favor or oppose the Census Bureau getting everyone's name, address, age, sex, race, and marital status from the records of other government agencies?"

Q14b: "If getting information from different agencies led to a more accurate count than sending out census forms, would you favor or oppose, etc."

Table 1  
 Predictors of Favoring Data Sharing by at Least  
 One Agency to Improve Count

Predictor	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		
	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Error)</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Error)</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Error)</u>	
Intercept	.7059	(.7601)	.35	-.0321	(.8684)	.97			
Importance	1.0328	(.1265)	.00	.9537	(.1321)	.00			
Knowledge	-.0667	(.2450)	.79	-.1211	(.2692)	.65			
Belief	-.3134	(.1343)	.02	-.2201	(.1423)	.12			
Control	-.1175	(.1475)	.43	-.2142	(.1551)	.17			
Distress	-.4767	(.1070)	.00	-.4901	(.1085)	.00			
Trust	.2158	(.1331)	.11	.2546	(.1370)	.06			
Paranoia	-.2251	(.2419)	.35	-.2227	(.2500)	.37			
Age	.0058	(.0049)	.24						
Education	.0563	(.0362)	.12						
Income	.1062	(.0560)	.06						
Income Miss	-.6243	(.1866)	.00						
Gender	-.3169	(.1684)	.06						
Nonwhite	-.4490	(.2237)	.04						
Hispanic	.2500	(.3629)	.49						
	N = 1401			N = 1391					

**Table 2**  
**Predictors of Favoring Data Sharing to**  
**Improve Count, by Agency**

Predictor	SSA			INS			IRS		
	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Error)</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Error)</u>	<u>Sig.</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>(Std. Er)</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Intercept	-1.0829	(.7184)	.13	-1.58	(.7095)	.03	-1.8862	(.6989)	.01
Importance	.8784	(.1128)	.00	.8459	(.1123)	.00	1.1340	(.1151)	.00
Knowledge	-.1581	(.2153)	.46	-.062	(.2135)	.77	-.1524	(.2074)	.46
Belief	-.1430	(.1170)	.22	-.332	(.1158)	.00	-.3758	(.1142)	.00
Control	.1110	(.1283)	.39	-.097	(.1246)	.44	-.0201	(.1227)	.87
Distress	-.4312	(.0852)	.00	-.323	(.0828)	.00	-.4091	(.0812)	.00
Trust	.2818	(.1109)	.01	.1949	(.1097)	.08	.3298	(.1078)	.00
Paranoia	-.3578	(.2060)	.08	-.096	(.2096)	.64	-.2721	(.2036)	.18
Age	.0086	(.0040)	.03	.0122	(.0039)	.00	.0130	(.0039)	.00
Education	.0024	(.0299)	.94	.0567	(.0294)	.05	-.0056	(.0289)	.84
Income	.1302	(.0455)	.00	.1077	(.0452)	.02	.1394	(.0443)	.00
Income Miss	-.4878	(.1605)	.00	-.449	(.1592)	.00	-.5180	(.1583)	.00
Gender	-.0806	(.1361)	.55	-.187	(.1347)	.16	-.2354	(.1313)	.07
Nonwhite	-.3385	(.1879)	.07	-.557	(.1803)	.00	-.4501	(.1815)	.01
Hispanic	-.0167	(.2920)	.95	-.390	(.2756)	.16	-.2608	(.2816)	.35
N =	1391			1391			1391		

**Table 3**  
**Predictors of Favoring Data Sharing to Replace Census**

Predictor	(1)		(2)	(3)		(4)
	<b>B</b>	<b>(Std. Error)</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>(Std. Error)</b>	
Intercept	1.7022	(.5501)	.00	1.1984	(.6222)	.05
Importance	.3815	(.0959)	.00	.3809	(.1003)	.00
Knowledge	-.6659	(.1703)	.00	-.5295	(.1835)	.00
Belief	-.2403	(.0977)	.01	-.2561	(.1014)	.01
Control	-.2128	(.1002)	.03	-.3068	(.1068)	.00
Distress	-.4109	(.0696)	.00	-.4073	(.0711)	.00
Trust	.0725	(.0926)	.43	.0962	(.0948)	.31
Paranoia	.0425	(.1805)	.81	.0207	(.1840)	.91
Age	.0169	(.0035)	.00			
Education	-.0448	(.0257)	.08			
Income	-.0684	(.0390)	.08			
Income Miss	-.1688	(.1476)	.25			
Gender	.0161	(.1160)	.89			
Nonwhite	-.2088	(.1651)	.21			
Hispanic	.0028	(.2585)	.99			

N= 1401

N= 1391

**Table 4**  
**Predictors of Opposing Data Sharing to Replace Census,**  
**Even If It Improves Accuracy and Reduces Cost**

Predictor	(1) <b><u>B (Std. Error)</u></b>	(2) <b><u>Sig.</u></b>	(3) <b><u>B (Std. Error)</u></b>	(4) <b><u>Sig.</u></b>
Intercept	-.5668 (.8762)	.52	.1241 (.9946)	.90
Importance	-.7735 (.1490)	.00	-.7220 (.1578)	.00
Knowledge	.1082 (.2822)	.70	.0096 (.3094)	.97
Belief	.0000 (.1535)	.99	-.0651 (.1608)	.68
Control	.1818 (.1672)	.28	.3459 (.1808)	.06
Distress	.4004 (.1210)	.00	.4329 (.1235)	.00
Trust	.0076 (.1513)	.96	-.0400 (.1559)	.80
Paranoia	.5462 (.2811)	.05	.5974 (.2900)	.04
Age	-.0094 (.0057)	.10		
Education	-.0309 (.0434)	.48		
Income	-.0709 (.0630)	.26		
Income Missing	.4286 (.2344)	.07		
Gender	.1911 (.1938)	.32		
Nonwhite	-.3334 (.2866)	.25		
Hispanic	.3572 (.3995)	.37		
	N= 579		N= 572	