

Isolation/Fear Factor as Reason for Not Having Service

Table 6.8

The table opposite shows the four items that go into the isolation/fear factor and the percentages saying each is a reason for not having phone service as well as the percentages saying each is a big part of the reason.

Also shown is a NET unduplicated count of the percentages saying either of the two items having to do with calling the phone company is a reason and the percentages saying either of these is a big part of the reason they do not have phone service.

Highlights

Discomfort about calling the phone company and/or worry that name/address would be reported to the government account for only a relatively small part of the total reasons why non-customers don't have phone service: 21% mention either of these items as a reason and only 11% say either of these is a big part of the reason. However, this varies a great deal by ethnic group -- see below.

By company: GTE non-customers are more likely to cite discomfort/worry about calling the phone company (not comfortable / fear having name/address reported to the government) than are Pacific Bell non-customers.

By ethnicity/race: While NLD Hispanics, Blacks and Whites rarely cite discomfort about calling the phone company as a big part of the reason why they do not have phone service, 19% of the LD Hispanics do so. What is also noteworthy is that if one has such concerns, there is a high probability that it will be perceived as a big part of the reason -- for example, 23% of LD Hispanics cite discomfort in calling the phone company as a reason and 19% cite it as a big part of the reason.

If "worry name/address would be reported to the government" is included with the more general discomfort about calling the phone company, then 32% of LD Hispanics appear to have some concerns about calling the phone company (for either of these reasons) and 23% say one or the other of these is a big part of the reason they don't have service.

Summary of Reasons for Not Having Phone Service

	<u>Non-customers</u>							
	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>				
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
<i>% Is a reason —</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Cost	69	72	69	69	73	64	70	68
Call control	44	50	43	51	54	45	31	39
No need	43	36	44	41	32	56	37	51
Fear/worry	21	28	20	25	32	14	18	15
Average number	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.7
<i>% “BIG” reason —</i>	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
Cost	56	58	56	57	59	55	56	56
Call control	35	36	35	43	49	34	25	26
No need	27	19	28	24	19	32	22	40
Fear/worry	11	17	11	16	23	5	7	4
Base	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)

Summary of Reasons for Not Having Phone Service

Table 6.9

The table opposite summarizes the NET unduplicated counts of non-customers mentioning any of the items within each of the four main groups of reasons and the percentages citing any of them as a big part of the reason.

Highlights

Looking at the percentages who see each as a big part of the reason for not having phone service, one sees the following:

More than half (56%) cite cost as the big reason (installation, deposit and, less so, monthly service).

About one-third (35%) cite call control factors.

Slightly more than one-quarter (27%) cite no need as the big reason.

Fear/worry (about calling the phone company and/or being reported to governmental agencies) is cited by about one in ten (11%) as the big reason (by 23% of LD Hispanics). Specifically, fear of being reported to the government is cited as a reason by 15% of LD Hispanics and as a big part of the reason by 10% of LD Hispanics. (See Table 6.8.)

By company: The relative importance of these factors is about the same for both companies.

By ethnicity/race: Cost is the main concern of all groups. Call control is more important to Hispanics than Blacks or Whites, (especially LD Hispanics). No need is more likely to be a factor for Whites and NLD Hispanics than LD Hispanics or Blacks. Fear/worry is most likely to be a factor among LD Hispanics -- much less so among other groups.

Part Two: Awareness of, Reactions to and Interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS)

Introduction

The second half of the interview with non-customers was devoted to measuring awareness of Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS), describing the service to non-customers and getting their reactions to it.

This section of the report is divided into two chapters:

- Chapter 7: Looks at awareness of Universal Lifeline Telephone Service among non-customers and the matched set of customers. It also compares awareness of ULTS with awareness of Custom Calling Services.
- Chapter 8: Looks at reactions to ULTS, and specifically, perceived ability to meet the qualifications, reactions to various cost elements and interest in having it. It also examines interest in a restricted toll call service.

Chapter 7.0 Awareness of Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS)

Examines:

Whether ever heard of ULTS

Ability to describe it correctly among those aware

Awareness of Custom Calling Services

It compares awareness of ULTS among non-customers and the matched customers.

Awareness of "Universal Lifeline Telephone Service" (Name)

	<u>Non-Customers</u>							
	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>				
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>Heard of something called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service?</i>								
Yes, heard of it	<u>54</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>55</u>
Can describe correctly (a)	40	39	40	38	40	35	47	39
Close to correct (b)	4	1	4	-	-	-	6	12
Incorrect (c)	3	1	3	1	1	2	6	3
Don't know/not reported	7	4	7	8	9	7	10	2
Not heard of it	46	55	46	52	50	56	32	45
Base	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)
<i>% of those aware who can volunteer —</i>								
Correct description	74	87	73	79	80	80	69	71
Close to correct (cum)	81	89	80	79	80	80	78	93

(a) Mostly "for low income people" plus some "lower rates"

(b) "Limited calls", for "older persons"

(c) "emergency", "handicapped", "other"

* Less than 0.5%

Source: Q.101, 102(NC)

Awareness of "Universal Lifeline Telephone Service" (Name)

Table 7.1

Non-customers were asked if they had ever heard of something called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service. Those who said they had were then asked to describe, open-ended, what they think it is and who they think it is for.

Responses are shown opposite.

Highlights

Slightly more than half (54%) of the non-customers say they have heard of a service called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service. The large majority of those aware could volunteer the correct description, i.e. that it is for low income persons and/or that it is a lower rate service. A few more offer a description that suggests they may know what it is, i.e. that it is a limited call service and/or for older persons.

Thus, 40% are aware of the name and can volunteer (correctly) what it is.

46% have never heard of the name, Universal Lifeline Telephone Service.

By company: Pacific Bell non-customers are more aware of the name than GTE non-customers (55% vs. 45%), but fewer of those aware could correctly describe it so that the percentage aware AND able to describe correctly is about the same for both companies: 40% and 39% respectively.

By ethnicity/race: Black non-customers have higher awareness of the name (68%) than Whites (55%), and considerably higher than LD Hispanics (50%) or NLD Hispanics (44%). However, Blacks and Whites are somewhat less able to come up with the correct description than Hispanics with the result that the percentage aware and able to describe correctly is more nearly the same across the groups: 47% Black, 40% LD Hispanic, 39% White and 35% NLD Hispanic.

Awareness of ULTS Among Matched Customers

	<u>Matched Customers</u>							
	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>				
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>Heard of something called</i>								
<i>Universal Lifeline Telephone Service?</i>								
Yes, heard of it	<u>69</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>64</u>
Say have it now	47	41	47	43	41	46	52	51
Don't say have it	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>
Can describe correctly (a)	14	17	14	17	24	7	13	7
Close to correct (b)	1	1	1	*	*	-	4	-
Incorrect (c)	3	1	3	2	1	4	4	3
Don't know/not reported	5	4	5	5	6	4	6	3
Net: Say have/correct	61	58	61	60	65	53	65	58
Not heard of it	32	37	31	33	28	40	21	36
Base	(566)	(287)	(279)	(347)	(201)	(146)	(112)	(98)

% of those aware but DO NOT SAY HAVE IT who can volunteer —

Correct description	64	74	64	71	77	47	48	58
Close to correct (cum)	68	78	68	71	77	47	63	58

(a) Mostly "for low income people" plus some "lower rates"

(b) "Limited calls", for "older persons"

(c) "emergency", "handicapped", "other"

* Less than 0.5%

Source: Q.101, 102, 103(C)

Awareness of ULTS among Matched Customers

Table 7.2

Matched customers were asked the same question as customers.

Responses are shown opposite.

Highlights

69% of the matched customers have heard of a service called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service: within this group, 47% claim to have it and 22% do not, but are aware of it. Most of the DON'T HAVE, BUT AWAREs can describe it correctly; as a result, 61% of the matched customers are aware of this service by name and can correctly describe it (as compared to 40% for non-customers).

By company: Awareness of ULTS among matched customers is the same for both companies. (Differences are not statistically significant.)

By ethnicity/race: Among matched customers, awareness of the name ranges from a high of 79% among Blacks to 60% among NLD Hispanics.

Awareness of ULTS: Non-Customers vs. Matched Customers

	<u>Total</u>			<u>GTE</u>			<u>PB</u>			
	<u>Customers</u>			<u>Customers</u>			<u>Customers</u>			
	<u>Non-Cust</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Don't Have</u>	<u>Non-Cust</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Don't Have</u>	<u>Non-Cust</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Don't Have</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<i>Heard of ULTS —</i>										
Yes, heard of it	<u>54</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>42</u>	
Say have it now	-	47	-	-	41	-	-	47	-	
Don't say have it	<u>54</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>42</u>	
Can describe correctly (a)	40	14	25	39	17	29	40	14	25	
Close to correct (b)	4	1	2	1	1	1	4	1	2	
Incorrect (c)	3	3	5	1	1	1	3	3	5	
Don't know/not reported	7	5	10	4	4	6	7	5	10	
Net: Say have/correct	40	61	25	39	58	29	40	61	25	
Not heard of it	46	32	59	55	37	63	46	31	59	
Base	(571)	(566)	(285)	(288)	(287)	(159)	(283)	(279)	(126)	
<i>% Aware but don't say have it who can volunteer —</i>										
Correct description	74	64	61	87	74	78	73	64	60	
Close to correct (cum)	81	68	66	89	78	81	80	68	64	

(a) Mostly "for low income people" plus some "lower rates"

(b) "Limited calls", for "older persons"

(c) "emergency", "handicapped", "other"

Source: Q.101, 102, 103(NC)(C)

Awareness of ULTS: Non-Customers vs. Matched Customers

Table 7.3

The table opposite shows awareness of ULTS among non-customers and matched customers.

Highlights

Among all groups, matched customers have higher awareness of ULTS than non-customers. However, among those aware of the name, non-customers tend to be better able to say what it is than customers.

NOTE: Caution is urged in comparing awareness of ULTS among customers and non-customers:

The fact that customers have higher awareness does NOT indicate that it is this higher awareness that CAUSED them to get phone service because the causal relationship is not clear, i.e. one cannot assume that it is higher awareness among customers that caused them to get ULTS. They could be more aware because they have contacted the phone company and have phone service.

Probe for Awareness of Special Service for Lower Income People

	<u>Matched Customers</u>							
	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>				
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Heard of ULTS	<u>69</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>64</u>
Say have it	47	41	47	43	41	46	52	51
Don't say have it	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>12</u>
Can describe correctly	14	17	14	17	24	7	13	7
Cannot describe correctly	8	6	8	7	7	8	14	5
Have not heard of	32	37	31	33	28	40	21	36
Total: Say have or can describe	61	58	61	60	65	53	65	58
Not aware or can't describe ULTS	<u>40</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>42</u>
Aware "low income service"	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>
Say have it	5	5	5	6	10	1	4	3
Don't say have it	7	8	7	6	6	7	7	10
Base	(566)	(287)	(279)	(347)	(201)	(146)	(112)	(98)
 <i>% of those NOT AWARE of ULTS who are —</i>								
Aware "low income service"	30	31	30	30	46	17	31	31

Source: Q.101, 102, 103, 104(C)

Field Research Corporation

Probe for Awareness of Special Service for Lower Income People

Table 7.4

Customers who had not heard of ULTS (or had heard of it but could not volunteer the correct description) were asked this follow-up question:

"Are you aware that the phone company offers a special type of phone service for lower income people?"

Due to an error in the SKIP instructions printed on the questionnaire, non-customers were not asked this follow up probe. As a result, while we have awareness of ULTS (name) among non-customers, we do not have awareness of the more generic concept of a special service for lower income people among non-customers. We can, however, examine the extent to which the above probe INCREASED awareness of this type of service among *customers*. We can then use this measurement to provide an improved estimate of what awareness might have been had non-customers been asked the question. The analysis assumes that the increase among non-customers could be less than among customers, but, logically, it could not be more.

Highlights

Among *customers*: When customers who are not aware of ULTS or are aware, but cannot correctly describe it (40% of all customers) are asked if they are aware the phone company offers a special service for lower income persons, 30% say they are (30% of 40% = 12%). Thus, the probe adds another 12% to awareness among customers. This brings total awareness of this type of service to 73% among customers: 47% have it, 14% don't have it but are aware and can correctly describe it and another 12% are aware of a low income service. The large majority of those not aware of the name are also not aware there is a low income service.

These data from customers suggest that the MOST the probe could have done among non-customers would have been to increase awareness of a ULTS type service by 30% of those not aware of the name. Applying this logic, one can provide an improved estimate of what the highest awareness among non-customers would have been if the probe had been asked. This is done on the following page.

Awareness of ULTS, Low Income Service and CCS (Summary)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>					
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Non-customers									
Aware ULTS and can correctly describe it	40	39	40	38	40	35	47	39	
*Aware ULTS <u>or</u> a low income service (adjusted)	58	58	58	57	68	46	63	58	
Aware CCS	76	71	76	75	80	68	84	71	
Base	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)	
Matched customers									
Aware ULTS and can correctly describe it	61	58	61	60	65	53	65	58	
Aware ULTS <u>or</u> a low income service	73	71	73	72	81	61	76	71	
Aware CCS	84	82	85	87	89	85	88	77	
Base	(566)	(287)	(279)	(347)	(201)	(146)	(112)	(98)	
Customers with "Say Have ULTS" removed									
Aware ULTS and can correctly describe it	25	29	25	30	42	13	30	12	
Aware ULTS <u>or</u> a low income service	43	46	43	46	60	27	46	36	
Aware CCS	86	78	87	88	88	89	86	85	
Base	(285)	(159)	(126)	(189)	(103)	(86)	(44)	(48)	

*Adjusted by formula — see text on previous page

Source: Q 101 102 103 50(NG) 34(C)

Awareness of ULTS, Low Income Service and CCS (Summary)

Table 7.5

Highlights

The table opposite shows the percentage of non-customers aware of ULTS and able to correctly describe it (40%). On the next line, it shows the "adjusted awareness" of this type of service by applying what the probe did to awareness among customers to non-customers.

As shown there, awareness of this type of service among non-customers if the probe had been used would almost undoubtedly be more than the 40% (aware ULTS and describe correctly) but it would NOT be higher than 58% (the adjusted figure).

Non-customers were also asked if they had ever heard of Custom Calling Services like Call Waiting. (See next page.) As shown opposite, 76% of the non-customers say they have heard of these. Thus, awareness of Custom Calling Services among non-customers is higher than the highest estimate of awareness of ULTS if non-customers had been asked the probe.

It is also important to note that non-customers as a group are almost as aware of Custom Calling Services as are customers: 76% vs. 84%. This finding suggests that, had the probe been included, awareness of ULTS among non-customers would probably be closer to the 58% (more like customers) than to the 40%.

NOTE: The failure to ask the probe was due to a clerical oversight in the final proofing of the questionnaire; Field Research very much regrets the error and has tried, in this analysis, to provide the best estimate of awareness of the generic service using the data available.

Awareness of Custom Calling Services

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>					
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Non-customers									
Have heard of CCS	<u>76</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>71</u>	
Aware cost extra/are optional (a)	91	90	91	87	84	93	94	97	
Not aware of this (a)	9	10	9	13	16	7	6	3	
Have not heard of CCS	25	29	24	25	20	32	16	29	
Base	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)	
Matched customers									
Have heard of CCS	<u>84</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>77</u>	
Aware cost extra/are optional (a)	91	88	91	90	88	92	89	97	
Not aware of this (a)	9	12	9	10	12	8	11	3	
Have not heard of CCS	16	18	15	13	11	15	12	23	
Base	(566)	(287)	(279)	(347)	(201)	(146)	(112)	(98)	

(a) Based on those aware

Source: Q.50, 51(NC), Q.34, 36(C)

Field Research Corporation

Awareness of Custom Calling Services

Table 7.6

The table opposite shows awareness of Custom Calling Services and, among those who are aware, whether they are aware that they cost extra and are optional.

Highlights

Awareness of Custom Calling Services is high among non-customers (76%) as well as among matched customers (84%).

Most of those aware of Custom Calling Services know that they are optional and that one pays extra for them. About one in ten non-customers is not aware of this -- about the same as for matched customers.

By company: Awareness is equally high for both companies.

By ethnicity/race: Black and LD Hispanic non-customers are more aware of Custom Calling Services than are White or NLD Hispanic non-customers: 84% and 80% vs. 71% and 68% respectively. While the large majority of non-customers aware of CCS know that they are optional and cost extra, LD Hispanics are less aware of this than others (16% not aware).

Chapter 8.0 Reactions to, Interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS)

Examines:

Perception of ability to qualify for ULTS (after reading qualifications)

Attempts to get ULTS (among those who qualify)

Reasons have not tried to get it

Reactions to various elements of ULTS service

Installation charge

Deposit requirement

Reactions to costs of calls

What think monthly bill would be for ULTS

Ability to limit calling within 12 miles

Affordability of ULTS service

Interest in having ULTS

Interest in a call control service

Universal Lifeline Telephone Service

(WORK)

In order to qualify for this service, you need to meet these requirements:

- Have a maximum annual income of \$15,300 for a one or two person household or \$17,900 for a three person household. Add \$3,600 for each additional person. For example...

If your household has:	Your annual household income, before tax is no more than:
1 or 2 persons	\$15,300
3 persons	\$17,900
4 persons	\$21,500
5 persons	\$25,100
6 persons	\$28,700
7 persons	\$32,300
Each additional person	\$3,600

- Your family cannot have another residential telephone number at the same time, that is, you can only have one Universal Lifeline Service per family.
- You cannot be claimed as a dependent on another person's income tax return.

If you do qualify, you must fill out a form each year certifying that you still meet these requirements.

Introduction

Before being shown a description of ULTS, non-customers were given a card that described the qualifications for ULTS service, were asked to read it and then to say whether they would qualify for it or not. Only those who said they thought they would qualify were shown the description of the service and asked their reactions to it.

The text of the card is shown (reduced) opposite.

Perceptions of Ability to Qualify for ULTS

	Non-customers							
	Total	GTE	PB	Hispanic				
				Tot	LD	NLD	Black	White
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Based on reported household income/size, % who —</i>								
Would qualify	77	80	76	75	80	67	83	76
Would not	11	7	11	8	9	6	12	17
Can't determine	13	12	13	17	11	27	6	7
<i>After reading qualifications, % who say they —</i>								
Would qualify	78	78	78	74	78	70	85	82
Would not	12	13	12	17	14	20	5	9
Not sure	10	9	10	9	8	10	10	9
Net: Total qualify (a)	83	85	83	84	89	76	87	80
Base	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)

(a) For the most part, the algorithm (income/# dependents) was used to qualify households. 13% of non-customers did not answer the income question. 54% of these non-customers (7% of 13%) said they thought they would qualify when shown the qualifications. These are included in this measure of "total qualify"

Source: Q.108, Table 109(NC)

Qualify for ULTS: Non-Customers vs. Matched Customers

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>			<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
				<u>Tot</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
(1) Meet qualifications based on reported household income and dependents (a)								
Customers	68	73	68	73	86	53	72	53
Non-customers	77	80	76	75	80	67	83	76
(2) Say "would qualify" after reading qualifications								
Customers —								
Have ULTS (b)	52	45	52	49	51	46	56	54
Don't have (b)	<u>48</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>46</u>
Would qualify	20	23	20	23	26	18	19	15
Total have or would qualify	72	68	72	72	77	64	75	69
Non-customers	78	78	78	74	78	70	85	82
Base (customers)	(566)	(287)	(279)	(347)	(201)	(146)	(112)	(98)
Base (non-customers)	(571)	(288)	(283)	(347)	(205)	(142)	(115)	(94)

(a) No further analysis shown here to examine non-customers and customers who did not answer the income question

(b) Based on respondent testimony

Source: Q.108(NC), Q.102, 106, 110(C) plus Q.924-926(NC)(C)

Field Research Corporation

Perceptions of Ability to Qualify for ULTS

Table 8.1

At the end of the interview, non-customers were asked their household income and the number of persons dependent on that income. These data were used to determine the percentage of non-customers who meet the qualifications for ULTS. Results are shown at the top of the table opposite.

Earlier in the interview, non-customers were shown the qualifications and asked if they would qualify for it or not. Responses are shown at the middle of the table opposite.

The "total qualify" shown at the bottom of the table is calculated by taking the 77% who would qualify based on the income/# of dependents algorithm used by the phone companies plus the portion of the 13% who did not answer the income question that said they "would qualify" after they read the qualifications earlier in the interview.

Highlights

The large majority of non-customers felt they would qualify for ULTS after reading the qualifications: 78%. Another 10% were not sure if they would qualify or not, leaving just 12% who said they would not qualify.

The percentage who would qualify using stated household income and number of persons dependent on that income is about the same as when non-customers read the qualifications and decided themselves if they would qualify or not.

The total "would qualify" for ULTS using both measures is 83%. (See bottom of table opposite.)

By company: In both companies, the large percentage of their non-customers would qualify for ULTS.

By ethnicity/race: There are some differences to be observed between Hispanics, Blacks and Whites on this measure. Specifically, 17% of the Hispanics reading the qualifications said they would not qualify as compared with only 9% of Whites and 5% of Blacks. It is difficult to compare this with the results obtained when one uses stated household income and number of dependents because of higher not reporteds among Hispanics, especially NLD Hispanics.

Bottom line: While most Hispanic non-customers feel they would qualify for ULTS, they are less likely to think they qualify than are Black and White non-customers (after reading the qualifications).

Qualify for ULTS: Non-Customers vs. Matched Customers

Table 8.2

The table opposite compares non-customers who say they would qualify for ULTS with matched customers (bottom half of table opposite). It makes the same comparison as the previous table using reported household income and number of dependents as the basis for determining eligibility (top half of table opposite).

Highlights

The large majorities of non-customers as well as matched customers qualify for ULTS using either of the two measures.

Looking at the bottom half of the table, Hispanic customers are no more likely to qualify for ULTS than Hispanic non-customers. Among Whites and Blacks, non-customers are more likely to qualify for ULTS than matched customers.

Attempts to Get ULTS among Those Aware

	Non-customers							Matched Customers (a)			
	Total	GTE	PB	Hispanic			BlackWhite	Total	GTE	PB	
				Tot	LD	NLD					
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Have tried to get ULTS	48	48	49	38	36	42	57	64	18	10	19
Have not	49	53	48	59	64	50	40	37	82	90	81
Not reported	3	-	3	3	-	9	3	-	-	-	-
Base	(260)	(121)	(139)	(149)	(95)	(54)	(64)	(42)	(128)	(73)	(55)

Among those who have tried to get, reasons don't have it (read list) —

Had outstanding balance	40	46	40	36	27	50	45	40	-	-	-
Decided I didn't want it	9	10	9	2	-	4	1	27	11	27	10
Did not meet qualifications	9	12	8	10	9	10	11	5	77	27	80
Got it, but discontinued	21	16	21	22	26	16	30	12	-	-	-
Have no phone	10	11	10	20	32	1	7	-	-	-	-
Other reasons	11	7	12	11	6	19	7	16	11	31	10
Base	(125)	(57)	(68)	(58)	(33)	(25)	(39)	(25)	(17)	(7)	(10)

(a) Excludes 25 respondents who say they have it

Source: Q 104, 105(MC), Q 105, 107(C)