Affordability Survey 2010

Volume 3

Mail Survey of Households without Landline Service

(This page intentionally left blank)

Table of Contents

Introduction Mail Survey of Households without Landline Service..... v

Specific Research Objectives..... v

Executive Summary of Findings..... v

Noncustomer Mail Survey Design..... vii

Sample Design..... vii

Methodology, Data Collection, and Data Entry..... viii

Chapter One Characteristics of Households without Landline Service in the CHCF-B Areas..... 1

Chapter Two Use of Phone Services by Noncustomers.....19

Chapter Three Noncustomers' Perceptions of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service.....103

Chapter Four Noncustomers' Knowledge of LifeLine Telephone Services.....111

Chapter Five Comparison of Noncustomers Residing in Post January 1, 2009 California High Cost Fund (CHCF)-B Eligible Areas Compared to Formerly Eligible Areas.....135

(This page intentionally left blank)

Mail Survey of Households without Landline Service

Specific Research Objectives

The main survey objectives are:

1. To provide data on perceived telephone service affordability in high cost areas
2. To identify factors that affect perceptions of telephone service as difficult to afford
3. To understand the reasons why noncustomers do not have landline telephone service, and
4. To measure penetration, awareness and knowledge of, interest in, and beliefs about the California LifeLine Telephone Program (LifeLine).

Other surveys conducted simultaneously are described in volumes 1 (statewide survey) and 2 (CHCF-B customer survey) of this report.

Executive Summary of Findings

The current, post-2009 California High Cost Fund-B (CHCF-B) area is mostly rural with a population that is less wealthy than the rest of the state (sections 1.6 and 1.3). Although these non-landline customers are mostly non-Latino white, which is consistent with the racial demographics of the area, they are also more likely to be African American, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Native American, and less likely to be Latino, than the general population (1.1).

For most respondents, being without traditional landline telephone service is not a recent phenomenon. A large majority of respondents, particularly among African Americans and Latinos, have either never had traditional telephone service in their household, or have been without traditional telephone service for one year or more (2.1 and 2.9). Respondents under the age of 30 are also more likely than others never to have had traditional telephone service. Rates of discontinuation of landline service within the past year are highest among respondents 40 years of age and older, respondents with household incomes under $34,000, and LifeLine eligible respondents.

The reason most commonly cited for not having traditional telephone service is having other phone service (2.2). Among respondents who have discontinued their phone service, nearly three-quarters of respondents cite this reason, suggesting that the combined expense of

maintaining a landline plus other phone service is a strong driver behind a decision to discontinue service (2.3). Other commonly agreed upon reasons focused on expenses that were largely out of the respondent's control, such as long distance rates, the rates charged for extra services, the basic monthly service rate, and government taxes and surcharges. Reasons that focused on telephone users' behavior, such as how long one talked on the phone, or how others use one's phone, were the least often given reasons.

Throughout this report and its corresponding tables, the word "access" is used to represent use of or subscription to a service, product or feature. To interpret whether respondents' data refers to merely having access to a service, product or feature, or their response refers to actual subscription to a service, product or feature, please refer to the "Source" question located beneath each table which corresponds to Section Findings. The numerical designation at the bottom of each table (i.e. Q5) indicates the survey question from which the related data was gathered; the associated surveys and questions are located in Technical Appendix A, beginning on page 170. A very large majority (95%) of respondents has access or subscribes to other telephone services (2.4). Differences in access to other means of voice communication are primarily by income (2.9d). Nearly all respondents reporting that they do not have access to other means of voice communication lived in households with annual incomes below $24,000. This population is mostly rural, older, and not working; these findings are in keeping with parallel findings among customers described in Volume 2 (see chapter two).

Most respondents think that consumers must meet at least one general requirement to get basic phone service (3.1). Good credit rating, a job, and a certain income level are the three most commonly agreed upon requirements. A majority of respondents have heard of LifeLine (4.1). A majority of respondents also claim to be familiar with LifeLine's benefits (4.2). However, fewer are motivated to have traditional telephone service even if they know their household qualifies for LifeLine service (4.4).

In 2009, CHCF-B areas were limited to those discussed above (post-2009). As explained in the methodology section, this survey was also delivered to noncustomers in areas that were previously covered under CHCF-B (pre-2009). Post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are mostly rural, while pre-2009 respondents are predominantly urban. It is thus not surprising that the post-2009 area respondents are more non-Latino white, older, poorer, and have higher rates of LifeLine eligibility, while pre-2009 area respondents are more ethnically diverse, slightly younger, and are more likely to be in the workforce (5.1 through 5.6).

Pre- and post-2009 respondents do not differ much in their use of or access to other services (5.7 through 5.11). Overall, both pre- and post-2009 respondents have very high rates of access to other non-landline telecommunication services in their household. Very high rates of access to a cellular or mobile phone among both groups account largely for such high rates of access to non-landline services (5.9). Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area have slightly higher access to broadband or high speed Internet (5.10), and generally higher access to digital phone service (5.11), than do respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area, probably because of the demographic differences between areas and the far larger percentage of those in pre-2009 areas who live in urban locations.

We do not know from this data if pre-2009 CHCF-B noncustomers are paying more for phone service and/or discontinuing their phone service features compared to the post-2009 CHCF-B *customer* population. We do know that the percent actually living without phone service is similar to that predicted by the "high risk" analysis in Volume 2 (see chapter 6), even though the pre-2009 CHCF-B area is better tied to telecommunications networks.

Noncustomer Mail Survey Design

Sample Design

PRI purchased a U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Delivery Sequence File (DSF) sample of all known residential addresses for pre-2009 and current CHCF-B areas. The DSF is a computerized file that contains all delivery-point addresses serviced by the USPS, with the exception of general delivery. UPS provided the DSF sample with associated telephone numbers, where available; all records with telephone numbers were then removed from the sample. PRI further compared the remaining addresses in the sample against telephone company data to identify households without basic landline telephone service. From that group of households, PRI drew a random sample of 6,000 addresses to be surveyed by mail. Each survey was assigned a unique identifier for response rate and sample tracking. To increase response rate, PRI mailed nonresponding households a second questionnaire with a follow up cover letter two weeks after the initial mailing. PRI offered a $20 Visa check card as an incentive to complete and return the mail survey.

To increase the number of returned surveys from current CHCF-B areas, PRI drew and mailed questionnaires to a second sample of 6,000 addresses in May. PRI received 1,090 eligible completed questionnaires from the total sample within the time frame allowed: 324 from current CHCF-B areas and 766 from pre-2009 CHCF-B areas. The response rate was 9.5 percent.

Methodology

PRI designed, printed, mailed, and received returns from a self-administered English questionnaire on light cardstock to landline noncustomers between March 24 and June 14, 2010. To facilitate participant response, the questionnaire was designed to be folded as a postage paid mailer pre-addressed to San Francisco State University. PRI mailed the questionnaire with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, the respondent's rights and risks in participating in the survey (informed consent), and information on who to contact with questions about the survey. PRI included contact numbers for households to request a survey in Spanish, Chinese, or Vietnamese.

Data Collection and Data Entry

PRI collected, edited, coded, and entered all mail survey responses into a WinCATI database. WinCATI allowed us to track survey progress and to improve data quality by limiting the range of responses for each question.

Chapter One

Characteristics of Households without Landline Service in the CHCF-B Area

This chapter describes the demographic characteristics of the sample of respondents who reside in current CHCF-B areas.[1] The tables that follow illustrate an area that is mostly rural with a population that is less wealthy than the rest of the state. Although respondents are mostly non-Latino white, which is consistent with the racial demographics of the area, respondents are also more likely to be African American, Asian or Pacific Islander, and Native American, and less likely to be Latino, than for the general population.

[1] A comparison of respondents who live in the current CHCF-B area with those who live in the area formerly included in the CHCF-B area will be presented in Chapter 5.

1.1 Race/Ethnicity

Findings

- A majority of survey respondents is non-Latino white (69 percent).
- Although Latinos comprise the second largest racial/ethnic group among survey respondents (7 percent), they are represented at nearly half the rate of the program area's general population (13 percent). Whether the low rate of Latino participation is due to survey bias or to lower non-customer rates among Latinos is unclear.
- African Americans (4 percent), Asian or Pacific Islanders (7 percent), and especially Native Americans (12 percent) participated in the survey at rates higher than those for the program area's general population. Again, whether the difference is due to survey bias or higher non-customer rates among those populations is unclear.

Table 1.1 Race/Ethnicity of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Compared to Census Data

Race/Ethnicity	*CHCF-B Respondents*		*Decennial Census*
	Frequency	%	%
White	253	69	79
African American	13	4	2
Latino	26	7	13
Asian or Pacific Islander	21	7	1
American Indian	43	12	2
Other	10	3	3
Total	322	100	100
Base	(322)[2]		

Sources: 2000 Decennial Census, Q17

[2] Base refers to the number of respondents who offered a valid response to the question. Responses of "do not know" or refusals to answer are not included in the base; they are considered invalid or "missing" cases.

1.2 Age

Findings

- Respondents are fairly evenly distributed among age groups. Nearly two in five respondents are between the ages of 40 and 59 (39 percent). Respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 are represented at a rate similar to that of respondents 60 years and older (20 percent and 21 percent, respectively).

Table 1.2 Age of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
18 to 29 years of age	73	20
30 to 39 years	74	20
40 to 59 years	141	39
60 years and older	76	21
Total	364	100

Base (364)

Source: Q15

1.3 Gross Annual Household Income

Findings

- A majority of respondents are from low income households.[3] Over half of respondents have an annual household income of $50,000 or less (55 percent), which is approximately 80 percent of the state median household income of $61,017 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008).

- The household income distribution is similar to that of landline customers in the area (see Volume 2, Chapter 1.3).

[3] The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines low income as at or below 80 percent of area median income.

Table 1.3 Gross Annual Household Income of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
$24,000 or less	92	28
$24,001 - $34,000	38	12
$34,001 - $39,800	23	7
$39,801 – $50,000	34	10
$50,001 - $75,000	55	17
Over $75,000	87	26
Total	329	100

Base (329)

Source: Q18

1.4 Employment

Findings

- A majority of respondents is employed (56 percent), 10 percent is unemployed, and one-third is not in the workforce (34 percent).
- The rate of unemployment among non-landline customers (10 percent) is lower than that for landline customers in the area (16 percent; see Volume 2, Chapter 1.3).

Table 1.4 Employment Status of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Employed	197	56
Unemployed	35	10
Not in workforce	121	34
Total	353	100

Base (353)

Source: Q19

1.5 LifeLine Income Eligibility

Findings

- Based on household income and household size, nearly one quarter of respondents may be eligible for LifeLine service (24 percent).

Table 1.5 LifeLine Income Eligibility of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
No	282	76
Yes	87	24
Total	369	100

Base (369)

Sources: Q16 and Q18

1.6 Current Service Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes the urban/rural composition of noncustomers in CHCF-B areas.

Findings

- Survey respondents are mostly rural. Nearly three out of every four respondents live in a rural area (74 percent).

Table 1.6a Location (Urban or Rural) of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Urban	97	26
Rural	272	74
Total	369	100

Base (369)

Source: 2000 Decennial Census

1.6b Current Service Location (Urban or Rural) by Race/Ethnicity

By Race/Ethnicity

- Service location varies somewhat by race/ethnicity.
- A large majority of non-Latino white (72 percent), Latino (73 percent), and Native American (74 percent) respondents live in rural areas.
- A great majority of Asian Pacific Islander respondents live in rural areas (95 percent).
- African American respondents are more urbanized than other races and ethnicities, with nearly half living in urban areas (46 percent).

Table 1.6b Location (Urban or Rural) of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Race/Ethnicity

Service Location	*Race/Ethnicity*					
	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Other*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Urban	28	46	27	5	26	20
Rural	72	54	73	95	74	80
Base	(253)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(43)	(10)

Sources: 2000 Decennial Census and Q17

1.6c Current Service Location (Urban or Rural) by Age

By Age

- Service location varies by age, with the younger respondents more urbanized than the older ones.
- A large majority of respondents ages 40 years and older live in rural areas (88 percent).
- On average, almost half of respondents between the ages of 18 and 39 live in urban areas (46 percent).

Table 1.6c Location (Urban or Rural) of CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Age

Service Location	Age of Respondent			
	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*
	%	%	%	%
Urban	53	39	14	11
Rural	47	61	86	90
Base	(73)	(74)	(141)	(76)

Sources: 2000 Decennial Census and Q15

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter Two

Use of Phone Services by Noncustomers

This chapter describes characteristics of phone use by respondents who reside in the current CHCF-B area but do not currently have landline service (i.e. noncustomers).

For most respondents, being without traditional telephone service is not a recent phenomenon. A large majority of respondents, particularly among African Americans and Latinos, have either never had traditional telephone service at their household, or have been without traditional telephone service for one year or more. Respondents under the age of 30 are also more likely than others never to have had traditional telephone service, although their shorter household histories probably account in part for this, in addition to their likelihood of using alternative telephone services. Rates of discontinuation of landline service within the past year are highest among respondents 40 years of age and older, respondents with household incomes under $34,000, and LifeLine eligible respondents.

The reason most commonly cited for not having traditional telephone service is having other phone service. Among respondents who have discontinued their phone service, nearly three-quarters of respondents cite this reason, suggesting that the combined expense of maintaining a landline plus other phone service is a strong driver behind a decision to discontinue service. Having other phone service is also more commonly cited by those who are urban, young, non-Latino white, in the workforce, and living in higher income households. Other commonly agreed upon reasons focused on expenses that were largely out of the respondent's control, such as long distance rates, the rates charged for extra services, the basic monthly service rate, and government taxes and surcharges. Reasons that focused on consumer action, such as how long one talked on the phone, or how others use one's phone, were the least often given reasons.

A very large majority of respondents have access to other telephone services. Differences in access to other means of telecommunication are primarily by income. Nearly all respondents reporting not to have access to other means of telecommunication lived in households with annual incomes below $24,000. This population is mostly rural, older, and not working.

Access to cellular or mobile phone service is notably high; 95 percent of respondents report having current access to cellular phone service in their household. Respondents without cellular service tend to be Asian or Pacific Islander, ages 60 years and older, have household incomes of $24,000 or less, and are LifeLine eligible. Only 1 percent of respondents indicate that they do not use or need a phone, which suggests that telephone service is regarded as a necessity among those who do not have landlines.

With respect to other telecommunication services, a majority of respondents have broadband or high speed internet access (70 percent). However, the penetration rate of digital phone service (24 percent) among respondents is considerably lower than that of cellular or mobile

phones, perhaps because cellular phones have an advantage of portability. Those without broadband access tend to be rural, Asian and Pacific Islander, American Indian, older, poorer, LifeLine eligible, and unemployed. Those with digital telephone access tend to be urban, African American, and have higher household incomes.

(This page intentionally left blank)

2.1 Prior History of Traditional Phone Service

The following describes respondents' prior history of traditional phone service.

Findings

- A very large majority of respondents had either never had traditional telephone service or had been without traditional telephone service for one year or more (88 percent).
- A majority of respondents had discontinued their telephone service more than one year ago (52 percent).
- More than one third of respondents had never had telephone service at their current residence (36 percent).

Table 2.1 Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Never	99	36
More than one year ago	143	52
Within the last year	31	12
Total	273	100

Base (273)

Source: Q2

2.2 Reasons for Not Considering Traditional Phone Service at this Household

The following describes the reasons for not having considered telephone service, among those respondents who had never had telephone service at their residence.

Findings

- Among those who had never had telephone service at their residence, having other phone service was the most commonly cited reason (48 percent).
- Roughly one in six respondents thought long distance calling was too expensive (16 percent). Some specifically cited the scale of rural distances, which makes calls to one's neighbor or the nearest town qualify for long distance tolls.

Table 2.2 Reasons for Not Having Considered Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Who Had Never Had Phone Service

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Have other phone service	48	52	100
Long distance calling is too expensive	16	84	100
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	4	96	100
Can't control how others might use my phone	3	97	100
Extra services are too expensive	8	92	100
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	13	87	100
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	13	87	100
Other	21	79	100

Base (160)

Source: Q3

2.3 Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household

The following describes the reasons for having discontinued telephone service, among those respondents who had once had telephone service at their residence.

Findings

- Among those who had discontinued telephone service at their residence, a majority reported having some other phone service (73 percent). This reason was most commonly agreed upon among respondents. This finding suggests that the combined expense of maintaining a landline plus other phone service is a strong driver behind a decision to discontinue service.

- With the exception of the "have other phone service" reason, the more commonly agreed upon reasons focused on expenses that were largely out of the respondent's control, such as long distance rates, the rates charged for extra services, the basic monthly service rate, and government taxes and surcharges. Reasons that focused on consumer action, such as how long one talked on the phone, or how others use one's phone, were the least agreed upon reasons.

- The expense of long distance calling was a commonly cited reason, with more than one-third of respondents in agreement (38 percent). Again, the scale of rural distances was cited by some as a factor.

- More than two in five persons thought that the monthly charge for local service was too expensive; this was the second most commonly cited reason. In comparison, it was the fourth most commonly cited reason among those who had never had telephone service.

- Generally, respondents who discontinued their telephone service had higher rates of concurrence with a list of possible reasons than respondents who have never had telephone service. A possible reason for this is that a decision to disconnect one's service requires an active driver; those respondents may have had specific reasons for deciding to disconnect. A decision not to connect service at all may be made more passively. Another possible reason is that the reasons given may have been biased toward reasons of discontinuance rather than non-initiation of service. For example, without having seen a monthly billing statement, a respondent who had never connected one's landline service may not be aware of the actual costs of maintaining a landline.

Table 2.3 Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Who Had Previously Had Phone Service

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Have other phone service	73	27	100
Long distance calling is too expensive	38	62	100
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	13	87	100
Can't control how others might use my phone	9	91	100
Extra services are too expensive	22	78	100
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	42	58	100
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	37	63	100
Other	29	71	100
Base	(255)		

Source: Q4

2.4 Access to Other Services

The following describes respondents' use of or access to other telecommunication services.

Findings

- A vast majority reported having cellular, digital or VoIP telephone service (95 percent).
- Other telephone services to which respondents had access were a phone at work (33 percent); a friend, neighbor, or relative's phone (23 percent); and a public pay phone (11 percent).
- Only 1 percent of respondents indicated that they did not use or need a phone. This suggests that telephone service is regarded as a necessity among those who do not have landlines.

Table 2.4 Use of or Access to Other Services among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	95	5	100
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	23	77	100
A public pay phone	11	89	100
A phone at work	33	67	100
Pre-paid phone cards	10	90	100
Do not use or need phone	1	99	100
Other	2	98	100

Base (367)

Source: Q5

2.5 Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service

The following describes respondents' current access to cellular or mobile phone, broadband internet and/or digital phone services.

Findings

- Similar to the finding reported in section 2.4, a vast majority reported having cellular or mobile phone service (95 percent).

Table 2.5 Current Access to a Cellular or Mobile Phone among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Yes	350	95
No	17	5
Total	367	100

Base (367)

Source: Q11

2.6 Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet

The following describes respondents' current access to cellular or mobile phone, broadband internet and/or digital phone services.

Findings

- Broadband or high speed internet is commonly accessed among respondents, with more than two-thirds reportedly having such (70 percent).

Table 2.6 Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet Connection among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Yes	255	70
No	108	30
Total	363	100

Base (363)

Source: Q12

2.7 Current Access to Digital Phone Services

The following describes respondents' current access to cellular or mobile phone, broadband internet and/or digital phone services.

Findings

- The penetration rate of digital phone is considerably lower than that for cellular or mobile phones. Nearly one quarter of respondents has access to digital phone service such as VoIP, a service which requires broadband internet access (24 percent).

Table 2.7 Current Access to Digital Phone Service such as a VoIP Phone among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Yes	85	24
No	276	76
Total	361	100

Base (361)

Source: Q13

2.8 Current Access to Other Means of Telecommunication

The following describes respondents' current access to other means of telecommunication, including cellular or mobile phone, broadband internet and/or digital phone services.

Findings

- A vast majority of respondents have current access to non-landline means of telecommunications (97 percent), including cellular or digital phone service, or broadband internet. Thus, despite not having landlines, a vast majority of respondents continue to telecommunicate by other means.

Table 2.8 Current Access to Other Telecommunication Services among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Frequency	%
Yes	354	97
No	11	3
Total	365	100

Base (365)

Sources: Q11, Q12 and Q13

2.9a Prior History of Traditional Phone Service by Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes respondents' prior history of traditional phone service by location.

Urban/Rural

- Among urban and rural respondents, a greater percentage of urban respondents (44 percent) than rural respondents (33 percent) reported never having had traditional telephone service, perhaps reflecting in part greater access to alternative telephone services as well as better cellular phone reception in urban areas.

Table 2.9a Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Location (Urban or Rural)

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Never	44	33	36
More than one year ago	48	54	53
Within the last year	8	13	11
Total	100	100	100
Base	(77)	(196)	(273)

Sources: Q2 and 2000 Decennial Census

2.9b Prior History of Traditional Phone Service by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity

- A majority of respondents across races and ethnicities had either never had phone service or had discontinued their phone service more than one year ago. African American and Latino respondents had the highest rates of such longer term discontinuation, at 100 and 95 percents, respectively.

- Fewer respondents had discontinued their phone service within the past year. Nearly one in five Asians or Pacific Islanders had discontinued one's phone service within the past year (19 percent), which rate was higher than for other races and ethnicities.

Table 2.9b Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	37	40	40	38	28	36
More than one year ago	52	60	55	43	58	53
Within the last year	12	0	5	19	14	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(190)	(10)	(20)	(16)	(29)	(265)

Sources: Q2 and Q17

2.9c Prior History of Traditional Phone Service by Age

Age

- More than two-thirds of respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 had never had traditional phone service (69 percent). Although younger persons are generally more likely to use alternative telephone services, they are also more likely to have had shorter household histories.

- On the other hand, respondents 40 years and older were three times more likely to have discontinued their traditional telephone service within the past year. An average of 16 percent of respondents 40 years and older have discontinued their service within the past year, compared with an average of 5 percent of respondents under 40 years of age.

Table 2.9c Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Age

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Never	69	39	24	24	37
More than one year ago	26	57	59	61	52
Within the last year	5	4	17	15	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(58)	(56)	(100)	(54)	(268)

Sources: Q2 and Q15

2.9d Prior History of Traditional Phone Service by Gross Annual Household Income

Household Income

- On average, lower income respondents reported at twice the rate than higher income respondents that they had discontinued their telephone service within the past year. An average of 18 percent of respondents with household incomes of $34,000 or less had discontinued their telephone service within the past year, compared with an average of 9 percent of respondents with household incomes of $50,000 or more. Possible reasons for lower income respondents having higher rates of more recent discontinuation may be greater likelihoods of changes in housing or household economics.

Table 2.9d Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Gross Annual Household Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001 - $34,000*	*$34,001 - $39,800*	*$39,801 - $50,000*	*$50,000 - $75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	37	37	35	44	35	28	35
More than one year ago	46	44	55	44	54	66	53
Within the last year	17	19	10	11	11	6	12
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(65)	(27)	(20)	(27)	(46)	(65)	(250)

Sources: Q2 and Q18

2.9e Prior History of Traditional Phone Service by Eligibility for LifeLine Service

LifeLine Eligibility

- LifeLine income eligible respondents were slightly more likely to have discontinued their telephone service within the past year (16 percent) than ineligible respondents (10 percent). As household income is one of two factors used in determining LifeLine income eligibility (the other factor being household size), this finding is likely related to the higher average rate of recent discontinuation among lower income respondents. Eligibility for LifeLine services for other reasons was not determined.

Table 2.9e Prior History of Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Eligible	*Ineligible*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Never	36	36	36
More than one year ago	48	54	53
Within the last year	16	10	11
Total	100	100	100
Base	(64)	(209)	(273)

Sources: Q2, Q16 and Q18

2.10a Reasons for not Considering Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes the reasons for not having considered telephone service, among those respondents who had never had telephone service at their residence by location.

Urban/Rural

- Urban respondents are more likely not to have traditional phone service because of access to other to other telephone service. Three out of five urban respondents reported having other phone service (60 percent), compared to two out of five rural respondents (41 percent).

- Urban and rural respondents cite at similar rates the expense of long distance calling (18 and 14 percents, respectively), despite the fact that rural distances make many area calls qualify for long distance tolls.

Table 2.10a Reasons for Not Having Considered Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Who Have Never Had Phone Service by Location (Urban or Rural)

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Have other phone service	60	41	48
Long distance calling is too expensive	18	14	16
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	4	4	4
Can't control how others might use my phone	6	2	3
Extra services are too expensive	12	5	8
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	14	13	13
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	10	14	13
Other	8	26	21
Base	(49)	(111)	(160)

Sources: Q3 and 2000 Decennial Census

2.10b Reasons for Not Considering Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity

- Non-Latino whites are more likely than others to agree that having other phone service was a reason for not having considered traditional phone service. More than half of non-Latino white respondents cited this reason (54 percent), compared to two-fifths of African Americans (43 percent), Asian or Pacific Islanders (43 percent), and Latinos (40 percent).

- Among factors for not having considered telephone service, Latinos cited the expense of long distance calling at a greater rate (50 percent) than other races and ethnicities, perhaps owing to a likelihood of dialing internationally.

Table 2.10b Reasons for Not Having Considered Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Who Have Never Had Phone Service by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have other phone service	54	43	40	43	29	48
Long distance calling is too expensive	10	29	50	14	24	15
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	3	14	10	0	6	4
Can't control how others might use my phone	2	14	20	0	0	3
Extra services are too expensive	6	29	0	0	18	8
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	12	29	20	0	12	13
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	14	0	20	0	12	13
Other	21	0	30	29	12	20
Base	(110)	(7)	(10)	(7)	(17)	(151)

Sources: Q3 and Q17

2.10c Reasons for not considering Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Age

Age

- A majority of respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 cited having other phone service as a factor for not having considered telephone service (72 percent). These younger respondents also cited the expense of other services at rates higher than other age groups.
- Respondents under the age of 40 cited the expense of long distance calling at nearly three times the rate of older respondents.

Table 2.10c Reasons for Not Having Considered Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents Who Had Never Had Phone Service by Age

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Have other phone service	72	43	41	15	48
Long distance calling is too expensive	25	20	7	8	16
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	9	3	0	0	4
Can't control how others might use my phone	6	6	0	0	3
Extra services are too expensive	13	6	4	4	8
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	15	14	13	8	13
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	17	11	13	8	13
Other	9	20	26	35	21
Base	(53)	(35)	(46)	(26)	(160)

Sources: Q3 and Q15

2.11a Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes the reasons for having discontinued telephone service, among those respondents who had once had telephone service at their residence by household location.

Urban/Rural

- Among both urban and rural respondents, "[having] other phone service" was the most commonly agreed upon reason for having discontinued their landline service. Although both urban and rural respondents agreed at high rates, urban respondents agreed at a higher rate than rural respondents (83 percent compared to 70 percent, respectively).

Table 2.11a Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Location (Urban or Rural)

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Have other phone service	83	70	73
Long distance calling is too expensive	35	38	38
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	14	12	13
Can't control how others might use my phone	11	9	9
Extra services are too expensive	19	23	22
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	40	42	42
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	30	38	37
Other	26	30	32
Base	(57)	(198)	(255)

Sources: Q4 and 2000 Decennial Census

2.11b Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity

- Among respondents from most races and ethnicities, "[having] other phone service" was the most commonly agreed upon reason for having discontinued their landline service. However, among Asian and Pacific Islander respondents, the expenses of long distance calling and of the monthly local service charge were the most commonly agreed upon reasons.

Table 2.11b Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have other phone service	76	67	73	60	67	73
Long distance calling is too expensive	35	44	40	73	31	38
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	10	11	20	27	14	13
Can't control how others might use my phone	6	11	13	27	14	9
Extra services are too expensive	20	11	33	20	31	22
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	38	44	53	67	49	42
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	32	22	33	60	54	37
Other	27	11	27	27	46	32
Base	(173)	(9)	(15)	(15)	(35)	(254)

Sources: Q4 and Q17

2.11c Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Gross Annual Household Income

Household Income

- On average, respondents with higher household incomes agreed at higher rates that "[having] other phone service" was a reason for having discontinued their landline service.
- A greater percentage of respondents with household incomes between $34,001 and $50,000 agreed that the monthly local service charge was expensive (average 46 percent), than did those with household incomes less than $34,000 (average 37 percent), perhaps because those with lower incomes had monthly rates controlled by the LifeLine program.

Table 2.11c Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Gross Annual Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Have other phone service	63	71	50	75	89	82	73
Long distance calling is too expensive	45	29	29	60	41	31	39
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	15	4	14	15	19	9	13
Can't control how others might use my phone	20	7	7	15	5	3	10
Extra services are too expensive	28	14	43	15	19	19	22
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	48	25	57	35	57	37	43
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	43	29	43	40	43	34	38
Other	31	25	21	40	24	26	32
Base	(65)	(28)	(14)	(20)	(37)	(65)	(229)

Sources: Q4 and Q18

2.11d Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Employment

Employment

- Unemployed respondents were in general more likely than others to agree with the reasons given for having disconnected their telephone service, perhaps because many of the listed reasons related to expense (e.g. "long distance calling is too expensive", "extra services are too expensive").

- Respondents who were not in the workforce were less likely than employed and unemployed respondents to agree that "[having] other phone service" was a reason for having discontinued their landline service. Eighty percent of employed and unemployed respondents agreed, compared to only 63 percent of respondents not in the workforce.

Table 2.11d Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by Employment

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Have other phone service	80	80	63	74
Long distance calling is too expensive	36	50	39	38
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	12	25	10	12
Can't control how others might use my phone	9	5	12	10
Extra services are too expensive	18	25	28	22
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	38	45	47	42
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	34	40	42	37
Other	29	25	26	32
Base	(136)	(20)	(91)	(247)

Sources: Q4 and Q19

2.11e Reasons for Discontinuing Traditional Phone Service at this Household by Income Eligibility for LifeLine Services

LifeLine Income Eligibility

- Respondents who appear eligible for LifeLine service based on household size and income were less likely than ineligible respondents to have discontinued their telephone service because they had other phone service, and more likely than ineligible respondents to have discontinued their telephone service for all other reasons, particularly expense. Nearly two-thirds of LifeLine eligible respondents agreed that they had discontinued their telephone service because they had other phone service (66 percent), compared with three-quarters of ineligible respondents (75 percent). On the other hand, one-half of LifeLine eligible respondents agreed that the monthly charge was too expensive (51 percent) compared with two-fifths of ineligible respondents (39 percent).

Table 2.11e Reasons for Having Discontinued Traditional Phone Service among CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents by LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Eligible	*Ineligible*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Have other phone service	66	75	73
Long distance calling is too expensive	43	36	38
Talking on the phone too much makes the bill too expensive	16	11	13
Can't control how others might use my phone	18	7	9
Extra services are too expensive	30	20	22
Monthly charge for local service is too expensive	51	39	42
Fees, taxes, and surcharges are too expensive	41	35	37
Other	26	30	32
Base	(61)	(194)	(255)

Sources: Q4, Q1 and Q18

2.12a Access to Other Services by Race/Ethnicity

The following describes respondents' use of or access to other telecommunication services by selected demographics.

Race/Ethnicity

- Asian and Pacific Islander respondents had the lowest rate of cellular or mobile phone access (81 percent), while access among respondents of other races and ethnicities ranged from 91 to 100 percent.
- Only a very small percentage of American Indians (5 percent) and Latinos (4 percent) reported not needing or using a phone.

Table 2.12a Access to Other Services by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	96	100	96	81	91	95
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	24	15	12	33	23	23
A public pay phone	13	8	8	14	7	11
A phone at work	34	31	35	19	37	33
Pre-paid phone cards	9	8	8	14	16	10
Do not use or need phone	0	0	4	0	5	1
Other	2	8	0	5	2	2
Base	(252)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(43)	(355)

Sources: Q5 and Q17

2.12b Access to Other Services by Age

Age

- In general, respondents 60 years and older report the lowest rates of access to other services when compared with younger respondents. Only 90 percent of respondents 60 years and older report having access to cellular, digital, or VoIP phone, compared with at least 95 to 99 percent of younger respondents. Respondents 60 years and older also have the lowest rates of access to a friend, neighbor's, or relative's phone at 13 percent, compared with 32 percent of respondents between the ages of 18 and 29; access to a public pay phone at 4 percent, compared with 19 percent of respondents between the ages of 18 and 29; and a phone at work at 13 percent, compared with 47 percent of respondents between the ages of 30 to 39 years. This suggests that respondents 60 years and older are more vulnerable than others in their access to other telecommunication services.

Table 2.12b Access to Other Services by Age

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	99	95	96	90	95
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	32	27	21	13	23
A public pay phone	19	16	9	4	11
A phone at work	45	47	29	13	33
Pre-paid phone cards	7	14	9	11	10
Do not use or need phone	0	0	1	4	1
Other	1	1	0	8	2
Base	(73)	(74)	(140)	(76)	(363)

Sources: Q5 and Q15

2.12c Access to Other Services by Gross Annual Income

Income

- Consistent with other findings, respondents with lower annual household incomes have access to cellular, digital, or VoIP phones at rates up to 10 percentage points lower than respondents with higher annual household incomes. Respondents with annual household income of $34,000 or less have access to cellular, digital, or VoIP phones at an average rate of 91 percent, compared with respondents with annual household incomes over $75,000, 100 percent of whom have access.

Table 2.12c Access to Other Services by Gross Annual Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	91	90	100	97	97	100	96
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	27	21	17	18	22	23	22
A public pay phone	12	11	9	15	7	12	11
A phone at work	17	24	13	38	44	51	33
Pre-paid phone cards	10	16	4	9	9	12	10
Do not use or need phone	0	3	9	0	0	0	1
Other	4	5	0	6	0	0	2
Base	(90)	(38)	(23)	(34)	(55)	(87)	(327)

Sources: Q5 and Q18

2.12d Access to Other Services by Employment Status

Employment

- Not surprisingly, employed respondents have greater access to a phone at work (48 percent) than respondents who are unemployed (14 percent) or not in the workforce (14 percent).
- Unemployed respondents have higher rates of access to a friend, neighbor's, or relative's phone (43 percent), a public pay phone (26 percent), and pre-paid phone cards (23 percent) than others.

Table 2.12d Access to Other Services by Employment Status

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	98	89	92	95
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	21	43	21	23
A public pay phone	9	26	11	11
A phone at work	48	14	14	33
Pre-paid phone cards	9	23	10	11
Do not use or need phone	0	0	4	1
Other	1	3	4	2
Base	(197)	(35)	(119)	(351)

Sources: Q5 and Q19

2.13a Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Race/Ethnicity

The following describes respondents' current access to cellular or mobile phone service by selected demographics.

Race/Ethnicity

- Asian and Pacific Islander respondents had the lowest rate of cellular or mobile phone access (81 percent), while access among respondents of other races and ethnicities ranged from 93 to 100 percent.

Table 2.13a Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	97	100	96	81	93	95
No	3	0	4	19	7	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(251)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(43)	(354)

Sources: Q11 and Q17

2.13b Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Age

Age

- Access to cellular or mobile phone service was high among all age groups, with respondents aged 60 years and older having the lowest rate of access at 90 percent.

Table 2.13b Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Age

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	99	97	96	90	96
No	1	3	4	10	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(73)	(74)	(139)	(76)	(362)

Sources: Q11 and Q15

2.13c Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Gross Annual Income

Income

- Respondents with incomes of $24,000 or less report much lower rate of access to cellular or mobile phone service (87 percent) than others, suggesting that the barrier to access of such service is primarily economic.

Table 2.13c Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Gross Annual Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	87	97	100	100	98	100	96
No	13	3	0	0	2	0	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(91)	(38)	(23)	(34)	(55)	(86)	(327)

Sources: Q11 and Q18

2.13d Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by Income Eligibility for LifeLine Services

LifeLine Eligibility

- As household income play a large role in defining LifeLine eligibility, that LifeLine eligible respondents have lower rates of access to cellular or mobile phone service is not surprising.

Table 2.13d Current Access to Cellular or Mobile Phone Service by LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Eligible	*Ineligible*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Yes	86	98	95
No	14	2	5
Total	100	100	100
Base	(86)	(281)	(367)

Sources: Q11, Q16 and Q18

2.14a Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes respondents' current access to broadband or high speed Internet service by selected demographics.

Urban/Rural

- Urban respondents have broadband access at a considerably higher rate than rural respondents (83 percent compared to 65 percent, respectively).

Table 2.14a Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Location (Urban or Rural)

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Yes	83	65	70
No	17	35	30
Total	100	100	100
Base	(96)	(267)	(363)

Sources: Q12 and 2000 Decennial Census

2.14b Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity

- Among racial and ethnic groups, Asian Pacific Islanders and American Indians have the lowest rates of access to broadband (57 and 52 percent, respectively).

Table 2.14b Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	73	85	77	57	52	71
No	27	15	23	43	48	29
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(250)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(40)	(350)

Sources: Q12 and Q17

2.14c Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Age

Age

- Broadband access also declines as respondent age increases. As older respondents were also more rural, this finding may reflect a division of access by age, or an urban/rural division of access.

Table 2.14c Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Age

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	84	74	65	62	70
No	16	26	35	38	30
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(73)	(74)	(137)	(74)	(358)

Sources: Q12 and Q15

2.14d Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Gross Annual Household Income

Household Income

- Broadband access also generally decreased as respondent household income decreased. A great majority of respondents with household incomes over $75,000 had broadband access (95 percent), compared to slightly more than half of respondents with household incomes of $34,000 or less (55 percent, or 69 of 125 respondents by combining income categories). Broadband access is lowest among respondents with household incomes of $24,000 or less, among whom less than half have access (47 percent).

Table 2.14d Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Gross Annual Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	47	76	70	62	78	95	72
No	53	24	30	38	22	5	28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(88)	(37)	(23)	(34)	(55)	(86)	(323)

Sources: Q12 and Q18

2.14e Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Employment Status

Employment

- Unemployed respondents were also less likely to have broadband access, with slightly more than half reporting yes (51 percent), compared to nearly three quarters of employed respondents (74 percent) and over two thirds of respondents not in the workforce (69 percent).

Table 2.14e Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by Employment

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Yes	74	51	69	70
No	26	49	31	30
Total	100	100	100	100
Base	(195)	(35)	(118)	(348)

Sources: Q12 and Q19

2.14f Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by LifeLine Income Eligibility

LifeLine Income Eligibility

- LifeLine eligible respondents were much less likely to have broadband access, with slightly more than half reporting yes (52 percent), compared to three quarters of ineligible respondents (76 percent).

Table 2.14f Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet by LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Eligible	*Ineligible*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Yes	52	76	70
No	48	24	30
Total	100	100	100
Base	(83)	(280)	(363)

Sources: Q12, Q16 and Q18

2.15a Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes respondents' current access to digital phone service by selected demographics.

Urban/Rural

- Urban respondents are more likely than rural respondents to have digital phone service (34 percent compared to 20 percent, respectively), perhaps because urban locations offer greater access to services than rural locations.

Table 2.15a Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Location (Urban or Rural)

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Yes	34	20	24
No	66	80	76
Total	100	100	100
Base	(96)	(265)	(361)

Sources: Q13 and 2000 Decennial Census

2.15b Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity

- African American respondents (39 percent) have the highest rates of digital phone service among all races and ethnicities. Possible explanations include the greater likelihood of African American respondents living in urban locations and therefore having greater access to services, or that the sample is skewed toward African Americans with higher incomes and/or higher educations.

Table 2.15b Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Race/Ethnicity

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	24	39	27	24	17	24
No	76	61	73	76	83	76
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(246)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(42)	(348)

Sources: Q13 and Q17

2.15c Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Gross Annual Household Income

Household Income

- Access to digital phone service was highest among respondents with household incomes over $75,000, among whom nearly one-half have digital phone service (45 percent), and lowest among respondents with household incomes less than $24,000 (9 percent).

Table 2.15c Current Access to Digital Phone Services by Gross Annual Household Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	9	24	17	20	24	45	24
No	91	76	83	79	76	55	76
Total	100	100	100	99	100	100	100
Base	(90)	(37)	(23)	(34)	(54)	(85)	(323)

Sources: Q13 and Q18

2.15d Current Access to Digital Phone Services by LifeLine Income Eligibility

LifeLine Income Eligibility

- LifeLine eligible respondents were much less likely to have access to digital phone service (11 percent) than ineligible respondents (28 percent). This is consistent with the earlier finding that LifeLine eligible respondents have a much lower rate of broadband access.

Table 2.15d Current Access to Digital Phone Services by LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Eligible	*Ineligible*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Yes	11	28	24
No	89	72	76
Total	100	100	100
Base	(85)	(276)	(361)

Sources: Q13, Q16 and Q18

2.16 Current Access to Other Means of Telecommunication by Gross Annual Household Income

The following describes respondents' current access to other means of telecommunication, including cellular or mobile phone, broadband internet and/or digital phone services by selected demographics.

Household Income

- Differences in access are primarily by income. Nearly all respondents reporting not to have access to other means of telecommunication lived in households with annual incomes below $24,000. This population is mostly rural, older, and not working.

Table 2.16 Current Access to Other Means of Telecommunication by Gross Annual Household Income

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	92	100	100	100	98	100	98
No	8	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base	(89)	(38)	(23)	(34)	(55)	(86)	(325)

Sources: Q11, Q12, Q13 and Q18

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter Three

Noncustomers' Perceptions of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

This chapter describes respondents' knowledge of whether or not consumers must meet certain requirements in order to subscribe to residential landline telephone service. Most respondents thought that consumers must meet at least one general requirement, with a good credit rating, a job, and a certain income level being the three most commonly agreed upon requirements. Older respondents, those with lower incomes, and those not working agreed with a higher average number of requirements than others.

3.1 Respondents' Perceptions of the Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

PRI asked respondents whether they thought that telephone subscribers had to meet certain requirements, ranging from household income level to U.S. citizenship.

Findings

- Among those who answered the question, respondents thought telephone subscribers had to meet an average of 2.1 requirements. Half of respondents thought that subscribers had to meet 1 requirement (50 percent), while nearly one quarter thought that subscribers had to meet 2 (23 percent). Responses ranged from 1 requirement to all 7 requirements (Table 3.1b).
- Having a good credit rating (44 percent), having a job (39 percent), and having a certain income level (38 percent) were the most commonly agreed upon requirements (see asterisk in Table 3.1a).
- Unfortunately, "None of the above" was not among the response options provided to respondents, so the percentage of respondents who did not think that telephone service had such subscription requirements is unknown. As a proxy, we may look at the percentages of respondents who marked "Don't know" (37 percent, see asterisk below Table 3.1a) or who did not mark any options at all (13 percent).

Table 3.1a Respondents' Perceptions of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

Perceived Requirements for Traditional Phone Service	*Yes* %	*No* %	*Total* %
Have a certain income level	38	62	100
Have a good credit rating	44	56	100
Have a bank account	22	78	100
Have a California driver's license	18	82	100
Have a Social Security card	27	73	100
Be a U.S. Citizen	18	82	100
Have a job	39	61	100
Base	(181)*		

Source: Q6

* Base does not include respondents who answered "Don't know" (n=138) or who did not mark any options at all (n=49).

Table 3.1b Number of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

Number of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service	*Frequency*	%
One	92	50
Two	41	23
Three	22	12
Four	12	7
Five	3	2
Six	7	4
Seven	4	2
Total	181	100
Mean	2.1	

Base (181)

Source: Q6

(This page intentionally left blank)

3.2 Requirements for Phone Service by Respondent Characteristics

Race/Ethnicity

- African American and Asian or Pacific Islander respondents thought telephone subscribers had to meet the highest average number of requirements, at 2.4.

Age

- In general, the average number of requirements thought to be had from telephone subscribers increased as age increased. Respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 agreed with an average of 1.8 requirements, while respondents 60 years and older agreed with an average of 2.4 requirements.

Income

- In general, the average number of requirements thought to be had from telephone subscribers increased as income decreased. Respondents with annual household incomes between $24,001 and $34,000 agreed with an average of 2.5 requirements, while respondents with annual household incomes over $75,000 agreed with an average of 1.6 requirements.

Employment

- Respondents who were not working thought that telephone subscribers needed a higher average number of requirements than did employed respondents. Unemployed respondents agreed with an average of 2.5 requirements, and respondents not in the workforce agreed with an average of 2.3 requirements, compared with employed respondents, who agreed with an average of 1.8 requirements.

Table 3.2 Number of Requirements for Traditional Phone Service by Respondent Characteristics

Urban/Rural	*Mean*
Urban	2.2
Rural	2.0
Base	(181)

Race/Ethnicity	*Mean*
White	2.0
African American	2.4
Latino	1.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.4
American Indian	2.0
Other	3.3
Base	(179)

Age	*Mean*
18 to 29 years	1.8
30 to 39 years	1.9
40 to 59 years	2.1
60 years and older	2.4
Base	(180)

Income	*Mean*
$24,000 or less	2.2
$24,001 to $34,000	2.5
$34,001 to $39,800	1.7
$39,801 to $50,000	2.0
$50,001 to $75,000	1.8
Over $75,000	1.6
Base	(167)

Employment	*Mean*
Employed	1.8
Unemployed	2.5
Not in workforce	2.3
Base	(177)

Sources: Q6, Q15, Q17, Q18, Q19 and 2000 Decennial Census

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter Four

Noncustomers' Knowledge of Lifeline Telephone Services

This chapter describes respondents' knowledge of the California LifeLine Telephone Program (LifeLine). A majority of respondents have heard of LifeLine. Familiarity with LifeLine is highest among rural, Asian/Pacific Islander, and older respondents. A majority of respondent also claimed to be familiar with LifeLine's benefits. However, fewer were motivated to have traditional telephone service even if they knew their household qualified for LifeLine service. Motivation varied by race/ethnicity, income, employment, and LifeLine eligibility.

4.1a Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Services

PRI asked respondents whether they had heard of LifeLine service, for low-income customers.

Findings

- More than half of respondents have heard of LifeLine services (58 percent).

Table 4.1a Percentage of Noncustomers Who Have Heard of LifeLine Service

Heard of LifeLine Service?	*Frequency*	%
Yes	207	58

Base (357)

Source: Q7

4.1b Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Services by Location (Urban or Rural), Race/Ethnicity, and Age

Urban/Rural

- Rural respondents were much more familiar with LifeLine services than were urban respondents. Nearly two-thirds of rural respondents had heard of LifeLine services (65 percent), compared to nearly two-fifths of urban respondents (39 percent).

Race/Ethnicity

- Among racial and ethnic groups, Asian or Pacific Islander respondents were the most familiar with LifeLine services (67 percent) and Latinos were the least familiar (46 percent).

Age

- Familiarity with LifeLine service increased with age. More than three-quarters of respondents 60 years and older had heard of LifeLine services (77 percent), compared to slightly more than one-quarter of respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 (27 percent).

Table 4.1b Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Services by Location, (Urban or Rural) Race/Ethnicity, and Age

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
	%	%	%
Urban/Rural	39	65	58
Base	(97)	(260)	(357)

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Other*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Race/Ethnicity	57	62	46	67	58	80	58
Base	(244)	(13)	(26)	(21)	(40)	(10)	(354)

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Age	27	48	71	77	58
Base	(73)	(73)	(136)	(70)	(352)

Sources: Q7, Q15, Q17 and 2000 Decennial Census

4.1c Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Services by Employment and LifeLine Income Eligibility

Employment

- Respondents who were not in the workforce were most familiar with LifeLine service (61 percent), perhaps in part because those not in the workforce includes persons such as SSI and Medi-Cal recipients and persons with disabilities, who are automatically qualified for LifeLine services.

- Just over half of persons in the workforce, including those employed and unemployed, were familiar with LifeLine service (56 and 53 percent, respectively).

LifeLine Eligibility

- Nearly two-thirds of respondents, who appear LifeLine eligible based on household size and annual household income, were familiar with the service (63 percent).

Table 4.1c Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Services by Employment Status and LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Employment	56	53	61	57
Base	(195)	(32)	(116)	(343)

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
LifeLine Eligible	63	56	58
Base	(82)	(275)	(357)

Sources: Q7, Q16, Q18 and Q19

4.2a Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits

PRI asked respondents who had heard of LifeLine whether they knew what its benefits were.

Findings

- More than half of respondents who had heard of LifeLine services also responded that they knew what its benefits were (57 percent). Respondents were not, however, asked to identify these benefits.

Table 4.2a Percentage of Noncustomers Who Have Heard of LifeLine who also Claim Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits

	Frequency	%
Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits	122	57

Base (207)

Source: Q8

4.2b Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits by Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Gross Annual Household Income

Race/Ethnicity

- Among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, more than two-thirds of Asian or Pacific Islander respondents reported to know what its benefits were (71 percent).

Age

- Although general familiarity with LifeLine was higher among older respondents, among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, reported knowledge of its benefits was slightly higher among younger respondents than older respondents. Nearly two-thirds of respondents younger than 40 claimed knowledge of its benefits, compared to just over half of respondents 40 and over.

Income

- Among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, those with the lowest incomes had the lowest rate of knowledge of LifeLine benefits. Only two-fifths of respondents with annual households incomes of $24,000 or less claimed knowledge of LifeLine benefits (39 percent), compared with nearly two-thirds to three-quarters of respondents with higher annual household incomes.

Table 4.2b Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits by Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Gross Annual Household Income

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Other*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Race/Ethnicity	56	50	55	71	60	50	57
Base	(146)	(8)	(11)	(14)	(25)	(8)	(212)

	18 to 29 years	*30 to 39 years*	*40 to 59 years*	*60 years and older*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%
Age	65	67	56	52	58
	(20)	(36)	(98)	(58)	(212)

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Income	39	65	77	75	64	62	58
Base	(61)	(20)	(13)	(20)	(33)	(47)	(194)

Sources: Q8, Q15, Q17 and Q18

4.2c Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits by Employment and LifeLine Income Eligibility

Employment

- Although general familiarity with LifeLine was higher among respondents who were not in the workforce, among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, reported knowledge of its benefits was lowest among those not in the workforce compared with those in the workforce. Just over one-half of respondents not in the workforce (52 percent), and slightly more unemployed respondents (55 percent) claimed knowledge of LifeLine benefits, compared to nearly two-thirds of employed respondents (63 percent).

LifeLine Eligible

- Among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, only one-half of respondents who appear LifeLine eligible based on household size and annual household income, reported knowledge of LifeLine benefits (49 percent).

Table 4.2c Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits by Employment and LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Employment	63	55	52	58
Base	(107)	(20)	(75)	(202)

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
LifeLine Eligible	49	60	57
Base	(57)	(157)	(214)

Sources: Q8, Q16, Q18 and Q19

4.3a Knowledge of Whether Noncustomer Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits

Respondents who had heard of LifeLine were asked if they knew whether or not their household qualified for the program.

Findings

- More than two in five respondents who had heard of LifeLine services thought their household qualified for benefits (44 percent).
- More than one third of respondents who had heard of LifeLine services did not know if their household qualified for benefits (36 percent).
- One in five respondents who had heard of LifeLine services thought their household did not qualify for benefits (20 percent).

Table 4.3a Percentage of Noncustomers Who Have Heard of LifeLine Disaggregated by Claim to Know Whether Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits

Know Whether Current Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits?	*Frequency*	%
Yes, do know	92	44
Don't know	76	36

Base (211)

Percentage of Noncustomers Who Have Heard of LifeLine who also Claim to Know Whether Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits

Among Those Who Believe They Know Their Household's LifeLine Eligibility	*Frequency*	%
Believe Household Qualifies for LifeLine	74	80
Believe Household Does Not Qualify	18	20

Base (92)

Source: Q9

4.3b Claims Knowledge of Whether Noncustomer Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits by Location (Urban or Rural) and Gross Annual Household Income

Urban/Rural

- Among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, half of urban respondents thought their households qualified (51 percent), while rural respondents were divided between thinking their households qualified (42 percent) and not knowing (38 percent).

Income

- Among respondents who had heard of LifeLine, respondents with higher annual household incomes thought that their households qualified for LifeLine benefits at higher rates than did respondents with lower household incomes. More than half of respondents with annual household incomes of $50,000 and above thought that they qualified for LifeLine service. This finding appears incongruous, as such respondents are unlikely to qualify based on their household incomes. Poorly worded response options may have confused respondents about the intended meaning of the responses and may thus account for the discrepancy.[4]

[4] In response to the question, "If you have heard of LifeLine, do you know whether or not you qualify?" respondents were given the options of "Yes", "No", and "Don't know". Selecting "Yes" could indicate either, "Yes, I know whether or not I qualify," or "Yes, I qualify."

Table 4.3b Knowledge of Whether Noncustomer Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits by Location (Urban or Rural) and Gross Annual Household Income

	Urban	*Rural*	*Total*
Urban/Rural	%	%	%
Yes	51	42	44
Don't know	27	38	36
Base*	(37)	(174)	(211)

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
Income	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	37	37	31	42	56	57	45
Don't know	42	42	46	26	28	24	34
Base	(60)	(19)	(13)	(19)	(32)	(46)	(189)

Sources: Q9, Q18 and 2000 Decennial Census

4.4a Motivation to Have Traditional Telephone Service if Noncustomer Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits

Respondents who had heard of LifeLine were asked if qualification for LifeLine benefits would motivate them to have traditional telephone service in their households.

- Telephone rate discounts are not an overwhelming motivating factor to subscribe to landline service. Only one third of respondents who had heard of LifeLine services would be motivated to subscribe to traditional telephone service if they knew they qualified for LifeLine benefits (34 percent).

Table 4.4a Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Noncustomer Household Qualified

	Frequency	%
Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Household Qualified	53	34

Base (157)

Source: Q10

4.4b Motivation to Have Traditional Telephone Service if Noncustomer Household Qualified, by Race/Ethnicity and Gross Annual Household Income

Race/Ethnicity

- If qualified for LifeLine benefits, African American (63 percent) and Asian or Pacific Islander respondents (58 percent) reported greater motivation to have traditional telephone service than did respondents of other races and ethnicities.

Income

- Lower income respondents reported having greater motivation than others to have traditional telephone service. One-half of respondents with household incomes of $24,000 or less agreed they would be motivated, as did 46 percent of respondents with household incomes between $39,081 and $50,000.

Table 4.4b Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Noncustomer Household Qualified by Race/Ethnicity and Gross Annual Household Income

	White	*African American*	*Latino*	*Asian or Pacific Islander*	*American Indian*	*Other*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Race/Ethnicity	29	63	25	58	40	0	34
Base	(104)	(8)	(8)	(12)	(20)	(3)	(155)

	$24,000 or less	*$24,001-$34,000*	*$34,001-$39,800*	*$39,801-$50,000*	*$50,000-$75,000*	*Over $75,000*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Income	50	25	36	46	29	18	34
Base	(44)	(16)	(11)	(13)	(28)	(33)	(145)

Sources: Q10, Q17 and Q18

4.4c Motivation to Have Traditional Telephone Service if Household Qualified by Employment and LifeLine Income Eligibility

Employment

- Just over half of unemployed respondents reported that qualification for LifeLine benefits would motivate them to have traditional telephone service (53 percent).

LifeLine Eligible

- LifeLine eligible respondents were 50 percent more likely to be motivated to have traditional telephone service than others. Forty-five percent of LifeLine eligible respondents reported that qualification for LifeLine benefits would motivate them to have traditional telephone service, compared with 30 percent of non-eligible respondents.

Table 4.4c Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Household Qualified by Employment and LifeLine Income Eligibility

	Employed	*Unemployed*	*Not in Workforce*	*Total*
	%	%	%	%
Employment	32	53	33	35
Base	(82)	(15)	(51)	(148)

	Yes	*No*	*Total*
	%	%	%
LifeLine Eligible	45	30	34
Base	(40)	(117)	(157)

Sources: Q10, Q16, Q18 and Q19

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter Five

Comparison of Noncustomers Residing in Post January 1, 2009 California High Cost Fund (CHCF)-B Eligible Areas Compared to Formerly Eligible Areas

This chapter compares noncustomer respondents residing in 2009 CHCF-B fund eligible areas ("post-2009 CHCF-B areas") with those respondents living in formerly (but not currently) eligible areas ("pre-2009 CHCF-B areas"). Comparisons are made by demographics, access to other forms of voice communication, and knowledge of telephone and LifeLine services.

Location is the primary difference between post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B area respondents. Post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are mostly rural, while pre-2009 respondents are predominantly urban. It is thus not surprising that the post-2009 area respondents are more non-Latino white, older, report lower average annual household income, and have higher rates of LifeLine eligibility, while pre-2009 area respondents are more ethnically diverse, slightly younger, and are more likely to be in the workforce.

Pre- and post-2009 respondents do not differ much in their use of or access to other services. The only notable difference is in respondents' use of or access to a phone at work, for which a lower rate of employment among post-2009 respondents may partially account.

Overall, both pre- and post-2009 respondents have very high rates of access to other non-landline telecommunication services in their respective households. Very high rates of access to a cellular or mobile phone among both groups account largely for such high rates of access to non-landline services. Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area have slightly higher access to broadband or high speed Internet, and generally higher access to digital phone service, than do respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B areas, probably because of the demographic differences between areas and the far larger percentage of those in pre-2009 areas who live in urban locations.

When asked about requirements for traditional phone service, respondents in both areas did not differ greatly in their beliefs.

With respect to LifeLine eligibility, respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area are more likely to have heard of the program. However, among those who have heard of LifeLine, both post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents claim knowledge of its benefits at similar rates. Also, despite the fact that respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area appear more likely than post-2009 CHCF-B respondents to believe that their households qualify for Lifeline benefits, pre- and post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are similarly motivated, or unmotivated, to have traditional phone service if their households qualify for Lifeline benefits.

5.1 Current Service Location (Urban or Rural)

The following describes the rural/urban composition of noncustomers in the post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B areas.

Findings

- The post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B areas are very different. Survey respondents in the post-2009 areas are mostly rural; nearly three out of every four respondents live in a rural area (74 percent). In comparison, respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B areas are predominantly urban (95 percent).

Table 5.1 Current Service Location (Urban or Rural) of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Urban	97	26	728	95
Rural	272	74	41	5
Total	369	100	769	100
Base	(369)		(769)	

Source: 2000 Decennial Census

5.2 Race/Ethnicity

The following describes the racial/ethnic composition of noncustomers in the post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B areas.

Findings

- The post-2009 CHCF-B area is more non-Hispanic white than the pre-2009 area. More than two-thirds of the post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are non-Hispanic white (69 percent), compared to just over half of the pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents (51 percent).
- Latinos respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area (16 percent) are represented at more than twice the rate than in the post-2009 CHCF-B area (7 percent).
- Nearly one-quarter of respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area reported to be Native American Indian (23 percent), almost twice the rate of respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area (12 percent).

Table 5.2 Race/Ethnicity of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*		*Decennial Census*
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*	*%*
White	253	69	389	51	79
African American	13	4	42	6	2
Latino	26	7	123	16	13
Asian or Pacific Islander	21	6	17	2	1
American Indian	43	12	177	23	2
Other	10	2	12	2	3
Total	366	100	760	100	100
Base	(366)		(760)		

Source: 2000 Decennial Census, Q17

5.3 Age

The following describes the age composition of noncustomers in the post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B areas.

Findings

- In both post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B areas, respondents are fairly evenly distributed among age groups.
- Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B areas are slightly younger than respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area, which is consistent with the more urban location of the pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents.

Table 5.3 Age of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
18 to 29 years of age	73	20	183	24
30 to 39 years	74	20	192	25
40 to 59 years	141	39	286	38
60 years and older	76	21	95	13
Total	364	100	756	100
Base	(364)		(756)	

Source: Q15

5.4 Gross Annual Household Income

Findings

- Respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area generally report lower annual household income than respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area. Forty percent of post-2009 CHCF-B respondents have annual household incomes of $34,000 or less, compared with 32 percent of pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents.

- One-quarter of post-2009 CHCF-B respondents have annual household incomes over $75,000 (26 percent), compared with one-third of pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents.

Table 5.4 Gross Annual Household Income of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
$24,000 or less	92	28	139	20
$24,001 - $34,000	38	12	86	12
$34,001 - $39,800	23	7	33	5
$39,801 - $50,000	34	10	74	11
$50,001 - $75,000	55	17	129	19
Over $75,000	87	26	232	33
Total	329	100	693	100
Base	(329)		(693)	

Source: Q18

5.5 Employment

Findings

- Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B areas are more likely to be employed than respondents in the post-2009 area (61 percent compared to 56 percent, respectively).
- Post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are less likely to be in the workforce (34 percent) than respondents in the pre-2009 area (28 percent).

Table 5.5 Employment Status of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Employed	197	56	453	61
Unemployed	35	10	83	11
Not in workforce	121	34	212	28
Total	353	100	748	100
Base	(353)		(748)	

Source: Q19

5.6 Lifeline Service Eligibility

Findings

- Given that the post-2009 CHCF-B area respondents generally report lower annual household income than respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area, the fact that the post-2009 respondents have higher rates of Lifeline service eligibility, based on household income and household size, is not surprising. Nearly one quarter of respondents in the post-2009 area may be eligible for Lifeline service (24 percent), compared with one-sixth of respondents in the pre-2009 area (17 percent).

Table 5.6 LifeLine Service Eligibility of Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
No	282	76	639	83
Yes	87	24	130	17
Total	369	100	769	100
Base	(369)		(769)	

Sources: Q16 and Q18

5.7 Use of or Access to Other Services

Findings

- Pre- and post-2009 respondents do not differ much in their use of or access to other services. The only notable difference is in respondents' use of or access to a phone at work, reported by 42 percent of pre-2009 respondents, compared with 33 percent of post-2009 respondents. A lower rate of employment among post-2009 respondents, as noted in Table 5.5, may account in part for this difference.

Table 5.7 Use of or Access to Other Services among Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009	*Pre-2009*
	%	%
Cellular, digital, or VoIP	95	97
A friend, neighbor, or a relative's phone	23	20
A public pay phone	11	11
A phone at work	33	42
Pre-paid phone cards	10	10
Do not use or need phone	1	1
Other	2	1
Base	(367)	(760)

Source: Q5

5.8 Current Access to Any Other Telecommunication Services

Findings

- Owing to the very high penetration rate of cellular or mobile phones, both pre- and post-2009 CHCF-B respondents have very high rates of access to one or more telecommunication services other than a landline.

Table 5.8 Current Access to Any Other Telecommunication Services among Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Access to one or more other services	354	97	747	98
Base	(365)		(762)	

Sources: Q11, Q12 and Q13

5.9 Current Access to a Cellular or Mobile Phone

Findings

- Both pre- and post-2009 respondents have very high rates of access to a cellular or mobile phone, suggesting that cellular or mobile phones have very high penetration rates, especially in both urban and rural areas.

Table 5.9 Current Access to a Cellular or Mobile Phone among Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Cell access	350	95	742	97
Base	(367)		(764)	

Source: Q11

5.10 Current Access to Broadband or High Speed Internet Connection

Findings

- Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B areas have slightly higher access to broadband or high speed Internet than do respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B areas. Seventy-eight percent of pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents reported to have current access to broadband, compared with 70 percent of post-2009 CHCF-B respondents. Although the response differential is only eight percentage points, an explanatory factor may be the more urban location of pre-2009 respondents.

Table 5.10 Current Access to Broadband or High-Speed Internet Connection among Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	*%*	*Frequency*	*%*
Broadband access	255	70	583	78
Base	(363)		(750)	

Source: Q12

5.11 Current Access to Digital Phone Service Such as VoIP Phone

Findings

- Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area have higher rates of access to digital phone service such as VoIP phone. Over one-third of pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents reported having access to digital phone service (36 percent), compared with one quarter of post-2009 CHCF-B respondents (24 percent). Again, the more urban location of pre-2009 respondents may partially explain the difference.

Table 5.11 Current Access to Digital Phone Service such as VoIP Phone among Post- and Pre-2009 CHCF-B Noncustomer Respondents

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
Digital phone access	85	24	265	36
Base	(361)		(746)	

Source: Q13

5.12 Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

Findings

- In general, respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B area did not differ greatly from respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area in their beliefs in the credit requirements for traditional phone service.
- Respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area were more likely than pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents to believe that one must have a good credit rating. Forty-four percent of post-2009 respondents agreed that one must have a good credit rating, compared with 37 percent of pre-2009 respondents.
- Respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area were almost twice as likely to agree that one must be a U.S. citizen in order to have traditional phone service (18 percent), than pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents (10 percent).

Table 5.12 Requirements for Traditional Phone Service

	Post-2009	*Pre-2009*
	%	%
Have a certain income level	38	40
Have a good credit rating	44	37
Have a bank account	22	25
Have a California driver's license	18	18
Have a Social Security card	27	24
Be a U.S. Citizen	18	10
Have a job	39	42
Base	(181)	(394)

Source: Q6

5.13 Noncustomers Hearing of Lifeline Service

Findings

- Respondents in the post-2009 CHCF-B area were more likely to have heard of LifeLine service. Fifty-eight percent of post-2009 respondents have heard of LifeLine, compared with 50 percent of pre-2009 respondents.

Table 5.13 Noncustomers Hearing of LifeLine Service

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
Hearing of LifeLine service	207	58	371	50
Base	(357)		(746)	

Source: Q7

5.14 Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of Lifeline Benefits

Findings

- Among those who have heard of LifeLine service, a majority of both post- and pre-2009 CHCF-B respondents claim knowledge of its benefits.

Table 5.14 Noncustomers Claiming Knowledge of LifeLine Benefits

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
Claiming knowledge of LifeLine benefits	122	57	224	58
Base	(214)		(389)	

Source: Q8

5.15 Noncustomer Knowledge of Whether Current Household Qualified for Lifeline Benefits

Findings

- Respondents in the pre-2009 CHCF-B areas appear more likely than post-2009 CHCF-B respondents to believe that their households qualify for LifeLine benefits. More than half of pre-2009 respondents answered positively when asked whether they know if they qualify for LifeLine benefits (53 percent), compared with 44 percent of post-2009 respondents. However, as noted in Chapter 3, poor response option wording may have undermined the reliability of this finding.

Table 5.15 Noncustomer Knowledge of Whether Current Household Qualified for LifeLine Benefits

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
Yes	92	44	202	53
Don't know	76	36	93	24
Base	(211)		(381)	

Source: Q9

5.16 Noncustomer Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Household Qualified

Findings

- Despite differences in rates at which respondents believe they qualify for LifeLine benefits, pre- and post-2009 CHCF-B respondents are similarly motivated, or unmotivated, to have traditional phone service if their households qualified for LifeLine benefits. For both groups of respondents, only one-third of respondents answered the question positively.

Table 5.16 Noncustomer Motivation to Have Traditional Service if Household Qualified

	Post-2009		*Pre-2009*	
	Frequency	%	*Frequency*	%
Yes	53	34	111	36
Base	(157)		(306)	

Source: Q10