Summary of ULTS Subscribers vs. Qualified, Non-Subscribers

	All Customers %	ULTS Subscribers %	Qualify ULTS don't have %	
Are ULTS qualified	24	71	100	Table 440
Can't determine if qualified	10	13	-	Table 440
Don't qualify	67	16	-	Table 440
Household income $15,300 or less	20	57	58	Q.924
Recent immigrants (in U.S. 5 yrs or less)	3	9	2	Q.908
Average # persons at this address	3	3	3	Q.909
Any persons under 18	42	52	49	Q.910
2 plus families at this address	5	9	4	Q.911
Any unrelated member w/o phone service	3	6	3	Table 69
High school or more education	85	69	72	Q.920
Respondent employed	63	49	43	Q.921
(Retired)	16	17	25	Q.921
Mean age	44	41	47	Q.919
Married	57	40	47	Q.914
Never married	21	29	18	Q.914
Person with disability	5	7	9	Q.912
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(326)	

Summary of ULTS Subscribers vs. Qualified, Non-Subscribers

Table 3.2

The table opposite summarizes the characteristics of ULTS subscribers and customers who qualify for ULTS but do not have it.

Highlights

ULTS subscribers as compared to a group of customers who qualify for ULTS but do not have it are VERY SIMILAR with respect to income, household size, education, and average age.

ULTS subscribers are MORE LIKELY than qualified non-subscribers to be recent immigrants (9% vs. 2%), to have two or more families living at the address (9% vs. 4%) and to have one or more unrelated persons at the address who do not, themselves, have access to the household telephone service (6% vs. 3%).

In sum, there are not many differences between ULTS subscribers and those who would qualify but don't have it on these variables.

Summary of ULTS Subscribers vs. Qualified, Non-Subscribers

		All Customers	ULTS Subscribers	Qualify ULTS don't have	
		%	%	%	
Rent		44	74	55	Q.916
Live in house		66	45	59	Q.915
Live in apt./flat		24	44	25	Q.915
Lived at address less than 1 year		15	25	15	Q.906a
Moved 3 plus times in past 5 years		15	21	11	Q.906b
Have CCS (a)		44	47	46	Table 71
Have Call Bonus (any type) (a)		7	6	6	Table 71
TBR (a) —	Mean $	33	23	33	Table 71
	Median $	23	14	24	Table 71
MTS Usage (a) —	Mean $	12	9	10	Table 71
	Median $	4	2	4	Table 71
Basic service (b) —	Mean $	16	10	20	Q.111
	Median $	13	6	14	Q.111
Extra cost for calls (b) —	Mean $	34	30	33	Q.111
	Median $	20	16	24	Q.111
	Base	(2623)	(1297)	(326)	

(a) company records (b) respondent testimony

Field Research Corporation

Summary of ULTS Subscribers vs. Qualified, Non-Subscribers

Table 3.3

Highlights

Non-subscribers who qualify for ULTS, as compared to ULTS subscribers, are LESS LIKELY to be renters, MORE LIKELY to live in a house, LESS LIKELY to live in a multiple dwelling unit and are LESS mobile.

They are AS LIKELY to have Custom Calling Services and/or a Call Bonus type plan (customer records).

Those who qualify for ULTS but do not have it, as compared to those who do have it, show slightly higher MTS charges, say they pay more for basic service (which they do, by definition) and report a higher median cost of calls (respondent testimony).

Where Born, Length of Residence in U.S.

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Born outside U.S.	21	21	22	38	35	38	31	39	28
Lived in U.S. —									
2 yrs or less	1	*	1	2	*	2	1	-	1
3-5 yrs	3	2	3	7	5	7	1	3	1
6-9 yrs	3	2	3	9	7	9	4	7	2
10 or more yrs	15	15	15	19	22	19	25	29	24
Born in U.S.	78	79	78	62	65	62	69	61	72
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.997, 998(C) * Less than 0.5%

The following tables (Table 3.4 - Table 3.14) provide a descriptive profile of each company's ULTS subscribers.

Chapter 4 begins on page 59.

Household Size and Composition

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Number this address —									
One (single adult)	19	18	19	24	26	24	24	21	25
Two	30	30	30	20	19	20	24	24	24
Three	17	17	17	16	17	16	10	12	9
Four	18	16	18	16	13	16	18	19	17
5 or more	17	17	16	25	25	25	26	24	26
Mean	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Composition —									
Adults only	58	55	58	48	48	48	51	46	52
Children (1 or more)	42	45	42	52	52	52	49	54	48
Teen	18	19	17	21	25	20	22	25	21
Child 6-12	22	22	21	26	27	26	26	28	25
Child under 6	19	20	19	29	24	29	25	31	22
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.908, 910(C)

Household Size and Composition (cont'd)

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Number of families									
One-person HH	19	18	19	24	26	24	24	21	25
One	75	75	75	68	66	68	73	73	73
Two or more	5	5	6	9	7	9	4	6	3
Have person with disability	5	5	5	7	9	7	9	8	9
Mobility	2	2	2	4	6	3	1	2	1
Other	3	3	3	4	4	4	8	7	8
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.911, 912, 913(C)

Presence of Others in Household Who Don't Have Phone Service

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Have any in household not allowed to use phone	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	3	1
Related to respondent	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
Not related	1	*	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Have 1 or more other families who —									
Don't have phone service	1	1	*	2	1	2	*	1	-
Who share (my) service	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1
Net: Have anyone not allowed to use or doesn't have own service (a)	3	3	3	6	6	6	3	5	2
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

(a) I.e. there is a "NON-CUSTOMER" within the CUSTOMER household. Includes those who share the service.

Source: Q.1001–1005 * Less than 0.5%

Field Research Corporation

Education and Employment Status

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Education (a)									
Less than HS	14	13	14	31	31	30	28	31	27
High school	24	24	24	29	30	29	34	30	36
Some college	34	33	34	28	26	28	28	29	28
College completed	28	29	27	13	12	13	10	10	10
Employment status (a)									
Employed full-time	51	53	51	35	31	36	29	32	27
Employed part-time	11	10	12	14	12	14	14	16	13
Temporarily unempl.	7	6	7	12	12	12	15	13	15
Homemaker full-time	9	9	9	12	15	12	10	13	8
Student	2	2	2	3	2	3	4	2	4
Retired	16	18	15	17	23	16	25	21	26
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

(a) of respondent Source: Q.920, 921(C)

Age and Marital Status

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Age									
Under 21	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	2
21-29	17	14	17	28	21	29	16	25	13
30-39	24	25	24	26	26	26	22	23	22
40-59	35	32	36	21	22	20	32	26	34
60 or older	19	24	18	20	25	19	28	22	30
Mean	44	46	44	41	45	41	47	43	48
Marital status									
Married	57	60	56	40	41	40	47	51	46
Never married	21	18	22	29	22	29	18	25	16
Sep/Div/Widowed	21	20	21	30	36	30	34	23	38
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.914, 919(C)

Residence Characteristics

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Tenure									
Rent	44	36	46	74	62	76	55	52	56
Own	55	63	53	25	37	24	45	47	44
Type of dwelling									
Apt/Flat	24	19	25	44	38	45	25	28	24
House	66	67	65	45	48	44	59	53	61
Other	10	13	10	11	14	11	16	20	15
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.915, 916(C)

Residence Characteristics (cont'd)

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Length of Residence									
Less than 6 mos	9	8	10	15	9	15	10	14	9
6 mos to 1 yr	6	4	6	10	8	10	5	6	5
1-3 yrs	28	29	28	36	36	36	23	28	20
4 or more yrs	57	58	56	39	47	38	62	53	66
In last 5 yrs, moved —									
None	49	51	49	33	38	32	53	44	57
Once	21	23	21	26	28	26	22	25	21
Twice	14	14	14	19	18	19	12	17	10
3 or more times	15	13	16	21	15	22	11	14	10
Not reported	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.908(C)

CCS Penetration

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Respondent Testimony									
Have CCS	45	45	45	45	43	45	47	50	45
Customer Records									
Have CCS	44	43	44	47	45	47	46	45	47
Call Waiting	43	43	43	46	45	46	46	45	46
Speed Calling	6	26	1	5	29	2	8	28	1
Call Forwarding	8	26	3	6	29	3	11	28	5
3-Way Calling	10	26	6	10	29	7	14	28	9
Call Return	4	-	5	6	-	7	4	-	5
(No other accounts for more than 1%)									
Have Call Bonus (any)	7	-	9	6	-	6	6	-	9
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.35, Table 71

Amount Pay for Basic Service and Extra Calls (Respondent Testimony)

	Qualify ULTS but don't have			Have ULTS			Non-ULTS		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Pay for Basic Service —									
Under $10	22	14	25	41	36	42	17	11	18
$10-19	20	30	17	12	16	11	30	34	29
$20-49	20	20	20	7	9	6	21	22	20
$50 or more	3	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	1
Mean $	20	18	21	10	12	10	17	19	16
Median $	14	15	12	6	9	5	15	15	14
Don't know	35	34	35	40	38	40	32	31	32
Pay for extra calls —									
Under $10	17	7	20	14	14	14	12	6	14
$10-19	6	10	4	11	9	11	13	13	13
$20-49	27	24	28	14	16	14	23	23	23
$50 or more	9	11	9	10	10	10	14	19	12
Mean $	33	36	32	30	29	30	35	41	33
Median $	24	28	21	16	18	15	22	29	20
Don't know	42	48	39	52	51	52	38	40	38
Base	(326)	(198)	(128)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(1326)	(747)	(579)

Source: Q.111

Field Research Corporation

Amounts Pay for Telephone Service

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB	Total	GTE	PB
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Respondent Testimony									
Basic service									
Mean $	16	18	15	10	12	10	20	18	21
Median $	13	15	13	6	9	5	14	15	12
Extra cost for calls									
Mean $	34	40	33	30	29	30	33	36	32
Median $	20	29	20	16	18	15	24	28	21
Customer Records									
Total billed revenue									
Mean $	33	45	30	23	33	22	33	39	30
Median $	23	27	22	14	18	13	24	23	24
MTS usage									
Mean $	12	17	10	9	13	8	10	14	9
Median $	4	8	3	2	5	2	4	5	3
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.111, Table 71

Chapter 4.0 Perceived Affordability of Telephone Service

Examines the following, first among total customers and the major ethnic/racial groups studied, then among ULTS subscribers and, finally, among those who qualify for ULTS but do not have it:

Perceived affordability of telephone service

Size of monthly telephone bill among each group

Monthly bill by perceived affordability

Perceived affordability by type of service

Things that make service hard to afford

Perceived Affordability of Phone Service

	Total	GTE	PB	White	Hisp	Black	Asian Tot	Asian Chin	Asian Kor	Asian Viet	Low inc senior
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Phone service is —											
Very easy for me to afford	62	56	63	65	54	58	74	72	60	91	63
Somewhat easy	27	30	26	26	28	27	17	19	27	5	21
Somewhat difficult	9	11	8	8	12	11	6	6	11	1	12
Very difficult	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	3	2	*	2
Difficult	10	13	10	8	14	15	8	9	13	1	14
Less than very easy to afford	37	43	35	35	42	41	25	28	40	6	35
Have had financial difficulty paying	12	14	11	9	19	20	8	1	22	1	8
Very often	2	3	1	1	2	4	1	-	2	*	2
Somewhat often	4	5	4	3	5	8	2	1	4	*	3
Not too often	6	6	6	5	12	8	6	*	16	1	4
Not had difficulty	25	29	24	25	23	21	17	27	18	5	26
Very easy to afford	62	56	63	65	54	58	74	72	60	91	63
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)

* Less than 0.5% Source: Q.37, 38, 40(C)

Field Research Corporation

Perceived Affordability of Telephone Service

Table 4.1

Customers were asked, *"Is telephone service...very easy for you to afford, somewhat easy for you to afford, somewhat difficult for you to afford or very difficult for you to afford?"*.

Responses are shown opposite.

Highlights

Most customers (89%) say telephone service is easy rather than difficult for them to afford: 62% very easy and another 27% somewhat easy.

One in ten (10%) finds it difficult to afford.

In another question, 12% say they have had financial difficulty paying their telephone bill -- the large majority (87%) have not.

In all, 6% have financial difficulty paying their telephone bill at least somewhat often.

By company: Both companies' customers generally find telephone service easy to afford; GTE has fewer saying it is "very easy" than Pacific Bell (56% vs. 63%) and more who say it is "difficult" (13% vs. 10%).

By ethnicity/race: Vietnamese are the most likely to find it "very easy" to afford (91%), followed by Chinese (72%), Whites (65%), Koreans (60%) and Blacks (58%) and last, Hispanics (54%). Conversely, Hispanic and Black customers are more likely than others to find it difficult to afford: 14% and 15% respectively vs. 9% for Chinese, 8% for Whites and just 1% for Vietnamese.

Low Income Seniors: Most low income seniors say it is at least somewhat easy for them to afford telephone service (84%). 14% find it difficult and 8% have had financial difficulty paying their bill.

Perceived Affordability of Phone Service

	Hispanic		Asian		Chinese		Korean		Vietnamese	
	LD	NLD	LD	NLD	LD	NLD	LD	NLD	LD	NLD
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Phone service is —										
Very easy for me to afford	52	57	74	74	69	76	60	71	93	58
Somewhat easy	27	29	16	19	19	19	27	18	4	25
Somewhat difficult	12	11	6	6	8	5	11	12	*	17
Very difficult	4	2	2	1	4	1	2	-	*	-
Difficult	15	13	8	7	12	5	13	12	1	17
Less than very easy to afford	42	42	24	26	31	24	40	29	5	42
Have had financial difficulty paying	20	18	9	3	2	1	23	-	*	25
Very often	2	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	8
Somewhat often	4	5	2	1	1	1	4	-	*	-
Not too often	14	10	7	1	1	-	17	-	-	17
Not had difficulty	22	24	15	23	30	24	17	24	4	17
Very easy to afford	52	57	74	74	69	76	60	71	93	58
Base	(444)	(322)	(771)	(160)	(186)	(131)	(289)	(17)	(296)	(12)

* Less than 0.5% Source: Q.37, 38, 40(C)

Perceived Affordability of Phone Service

Table 4.2

Highlights

By language dependency:

Hispanics: LD Hispanic customers find phone service as affordable as NLD Hispanic customers.

Chinese: LD customers find phone service somewhat less affordable, on average, than NLD Chinese customers: 12% vs. 5% say phone service is difficult to afford.

Because most Korean and Vietnamese customers chose to be interviewed in their native language (and therefore are classified as language dependent), it is not possible to examine language dependency as a variable within these two groups: bases for non-language dependent are too small to provide reliable data.

Perceived Affordability of Phone Service

	All Customers			ULTS Subscribers			Qualify ULTS don't have		
	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %	Total %	GTE %	PB %
Phone service is —									
Very easy for me to afford	62	56	63	54	49	55	56	40	62
Somewhat easy	27	30	26	29	31	28	25	36	21
Somewhat difficult	9	11	8	12	16	12	14	18	12
Very difficult	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	4	2
Difficult	10	13	10	15	19	14	17	22	15
Less than very easy to afford	37	43	35	43	50	43	42	57	36
Have had financial difficulty paying	12	14	11	21	20	21	19	28	16
Very often	2	3	1	3	3	3	6	8	5
Somewhat often	4	5	4	7	6	7	5	6	4
Not too often	6	6	6	11	11	11	9	13	8
Not had difficulty	25	29	24	22	30	21	23	30	20
Very easy to afford	62	56	63	54	49	55	56	40	62
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1297)	(550)	(747)	(326)	(198)	(128)

Source: Q.37, 38, 40(C)

Perceived Affordability of Telephone Service

Table 4.3

Highlights

ULTS subscribers do not find telephone service quite as easy to afford as customers in total (54% vs. 62% "very easy"). While relatively few find it difficult to afford (15%) a total of 21% of ULTS subscribers have had difficulty paying their telephone bill (10% often).

By company: Just as GTE's total customers tend to rate the affordability of phone service somewhat lower than Pacific Bell's, so too do its ULTS subscribers and its ULTS Qualified/Don't Have customers.

ULTS Subscribers vs. Qualify/Don't Haves: Those who have ULTS do not find telephone service any more affordable than those who qualify for it but don't have it.

Amount of Monthly Telephone Bill and Perceived Affordability

	Total	GTE	PB	White	Hisp	Black	Asian Tot	Asian Chin	Asian Kor	Asian Viet	Low inc senior
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very easy to afford	62	56	63	65	54	58	74	72	60	91	63
Somewhat easy	27	30	26	26	28	27	17	19	27	5	21
Difficult	10	13	10	8	14	15	8	9	13	1	14
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)
% receive 1 bill	90	86	91	90	88	93	87	87	91	83	90
Mean $	62	68	60	56	76	70	77	87	93	49	34
Median $	45	50	44	44	50	49	49	54	78	30	24
Base	(2326)	(1123)	(1203)	(1136)	(672)	(339)	(808)	(277)	(277)	(254)	(386)
% receive 2 bills	8	12	7	8	10	5	11	11	9	13	7
LD: Mean $	45	45	46	37	67	35	53	62	65	37	28
LD: Median $	30	25	35	28	45	14	29	38	38	18	15
GTE/PB: Mean $	40	47	36	41	40	45	37	37	54	25	25
GTE/PB: Median $	27	35	22	26	29	49	23	26	45	19	16
Base	(240)	(139)	(101)	(111)	(82)	(27)	(101)	(36)	(26)	(39)	(28)

Source: Q.37; 8, 10, 11, 12

Amount of Monthly Telephone Bill and Perceived Affordability

Table 4.4A

The table opposite shows what customers think they are paying for their telephone service: For those who receive just one bill, the total monthly amount of that bill is shown. For those who receive two bills, long distance charges and local telephone company charges are both shown. Means and medians are shown to facilitate the discussion; the percentage distribution of replies can be found in the detailed statistical tabulations delivered under separate cover.

Highlights

Looking at those who say they receive just one bill (90% of the customers):

The average total monthly bill is $62; the median is $45 (i.e. half think they pay less than $45 and half think they pay more than $45).

By company: GTE customers cite higher monthly bills than do Pacific Bell customers (they also tend to be slightly less likely to think service is affordable).

By ethnicity/race: In general, there is some correlation between perceived affordability and what customers think they are paying, but it is not consistent across all groups. For example, at the extremes: Vietnamese customers find it easiest to afford and also cite the lowest bills. Koreans cite higher than average bills and find it less easy to afford than others, but Chinese also cite high bills but do not find it more difficult to afford than others. Hispanics and Blacks cite higher than average bills and have a more difficult time affording phone service than most others.

Low Income Seniors: Low income seniors cite the lowest bills of the groups shown. This group, however, is similar to customers in total with respect to how affordable they view phone service.

In sum, the total monthly bill varies by ethnicity/race with Whites and Vietnamese citing lower bills than Hispanics, Blacks, Chinese or Koreans.