

2007 PeachCare for Kids Survey

Methods and Procedures

Between 4 and 25 April, 2007, a telephone survey of adult residents in Georgia was conducted by the Survey Research Center (SRC), under contract from subscribers to the Georgia Poll. The purpose of the study was to learn the attitudes and opinions of respondents towards several key sets of questions, and information about local and national affairs. Prior to the survey, telephone interviewers attended two three-hour training sessions that covered survey methods, standard procedures of telephone interviewing, the purpose of the survey, an in-depth explanation of the survey instrument, and a practice session. In addition, at least one supervisor was present at all times during interviewing to provide quality control.

The first step in the process of conducting this study involved the development of the survey instrument. Survey Research Center staff developed a draft questionnaire containing subscriber questions (See Appendix A) that was then formatted for programming into SRC's CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system. The questionnaire was pre-tested during the first night of data collection. The pretest procedure uncovered no problems with the interview schedule and data collection proceeded.

The design of the study called for conducting a total of 500 telephone interviews from a random-digit dialed sample of households in Georgia. The procedures utilized were intended to ensure that all adult residents in the sample had an equal chance of being selected for inclusion in the data collection. This provision of equal opportunity of selection is a necessary requirement if a probability sample is to be obtained. Bias in response is also minimized, and inferences about the general population can safely be made from the results obtained in the survey.

Assuming the sampling procedures outlined above produce random samples of the population of interest, the estimated theoretical standard error associated with the sample estimates obtained ($n=500$), when the population proportion (P) is 50 percent (i.e., a "worse case scenario"), is .0223. In addition, the theoretical standard error decreases as the proportion (P) approaches 0 or 100. Thus, if 85% of the sample provides a given response, the standard error is .0159.

The standard errors are derived from the mathematical formula:

Square Root of:

$$\frac{P * Q}{n}$$

where: P = the proportion of the population exhibiting a characteristic (i.e., approve of Ray Barnes);

Q = (1-P), the proportion not exhibiting the characteristic;

n = size of the sample.

The standard errors can be used to estimate the sampling margin of error of the estimates (i.e., the probable difference in results between interviewing the entire population of businesses, versus taking a scientific sample of the population). This margin of error extends 1.96 standard error units, giving a 95% confidence level. This means that there is a 95% probability that the results obtained from the sample fall within the same parameters as those of the entire population. The standard error is calculated according to the following formula:

$$P \pm 1.96 * (\text{standard error})$$

Thus, with a random sample size of 500 and a population proportion of 50 percent, the 95% confidence interval for the estimate would be:

$$\begin{aligned} .50 \pm 1.96 * .0223 &= .50 \pm 0.44 \\ &= 50\% \pm 4.4\% \\ &= 45.6\% \text{ to } 54.4\% \end{aligned}$$

These methods produce a sample that is representative of the population under study. Sampling error is no greater than +/- 4.4 percent, with a 95 percent level of confidence. That is, if 50 percent of the sample gave a certain response to a question, we can be 95 percent certain that between 45.6 and 54.4 percent of each population as a whole would give that same response. This expected error decreases as the sample proportion approaches 0 or 100.

In addition to sample size, the quality of a sample is determined by cooperation rate; that is, the proportion of members of the original sample who provide an interview. Table 1 details the

results of the telephone procedures. In Table 1, we see that the cooperation rate* for the study was 37.4 percent. That is, of the 1,338 eligible respondents contacted, 500 yielded complete interviews. Table 1 also shows the final disposition of each of the 4,852 numbers called in the study. Table 2 presents demographic characteristics of sampled respondents.

Once a respondent is located and cooperation obtained, quality-control procedures are set in place to ensure that high quality data are produced. Supervisors are assigned to monitor interviewers in progress; thus approximately one-fifth to one-quarter of all interviews are monitored, and any interviewer errors are eliminated. Retraining of interviewers takes place, if necessary.

All manuscripts utilizing data made available through the Survey Research Center at the University of Georgia should acknowledge that fact as well as identify the original collector of the data. The Survey Research Center urges all users of this data to adapt some adaptation of the following notice, with the parentheses indicating items to be filled in approximately or deleted by the individual user:

The data (and tabulations) utilized in this document were made available (in part) by the Survey Research Center of the University of Georgia. Neither the Survey Research Center nor the University bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretation presented here.

Table 1: Summary of Survey Effort

	N	% Category
<u>Interview</u>		
Complete	500	99.2
Partial	4	0.8
Total	504	100.0
<u>Eligible, Non-Interview</u>		
First Refusal	142	10.1
Final Refusal	692	48.8
Resp. Never Available	0	0.0
Ans. Machine, No Msg	380	26.8
Ans. Machine, Message	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>		
Dead	3	0.2
Phys/Mentally Unable	26	1.8
Language Unable	57	4.0
Misc. Unable	0	0.0
Callback, Resp Not Selected	110	7.8
Callback, Resp Selected	7	0.5
Total	1417	100.0
<u>Unknown Eligibility: Non-Interview</u>		
Unknown if Household		
Busy	50	6.5
No Answer	692	90.5
Ans. Machine	3	0.4
Technical Phone Problems	19	2.5
Unknown: No Screener	0	0.0
Unknown: Other	1	0.1
Total	765	100.0
<u>Not Eligible</u>		
Out of sample	0	0.0
Fax/Data Line	282	13.0
Non-working number	128	5.9
Disconnected number	1308	60.3
<u>Technological circumstances</u>		
Number changed	6	0.3
Cell phone	10	0.5
Call forwarding	8	0.4
<u>Not a household</u>		
Business/government/other	415	19.1
Institution	1	0.1
Group quarters	1	0.1
No eligible respondent	7	0.3
Quota filled	0	0.0
Total	2166	100.0
Cooperation Rate *		37.4

* Cooperation rate is computed using the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines for reporting results of survey. The rate computed here is AAPOR Cooperation Rate 3 (COOP3). $COOP3 = \text{Interviews} / (\text{Interviews} + \text{Partials} + \text{Refusals})$

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<u>Gender:</u>	N	% Sample	% 2000 Census
Male	172	34.8	49.2
Female	322	65.2	50.8
TOTAL	494	100.0	100.0
<u>Ethnicity:</u>			
White	344	72.1	65.1
African-American	115	24.1	28.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	0.8	2.2
Multi-Racial/Other	14	2.9	3.8
TOTAL	477	99.9	99.8
Hispanic	5	1.0	5.3
<u>Age:</u>			
18 - 24	27	5.5	13.9
25 - 44	155	31.4	44.1
45 - 64	228	46.1	28.9
65 and older	84	17.0	13.1
TOTAL	494	100.0	100.0
<u>Education:</u>			
< High School	37	7.6	22.3
High School Grad/GED	107	21.9	29.5
Some College	165	33.8	24.7
College Grad or Higher	179	36.7	23.4
TOTAL	488	100.0	99.9
<u>Income:</u>			
< \$15,000	13	3.7	16.8
\$15,000 - \$34,999	59	16.9	26.5
\$35,000 - \$49,999	44	12.6	16.0
\$50,000 - \$74,999	92	26.3	19.6
\$75,000 or more	142	40.5	21.1
TOTAL	350	100.0	100.0
MSA/non-MSA			
MSA	389	77.8	68.6
Non-MSA	111	22.2	31.4
TOTAL	500	100.0	100.0

- U.S. Census Bureau estimates

2007 PeachCare for Kids Survey

The Survey Research Center at the University of Georgia conducted the 2007 PeachCare for Kids Survey between April 4th and 25, 2007 when a telephone interview was administered to an RDD (Random Digit Dial) probability sample of 500 Georgia residents 18 years old or older. The purpose of the survey was to assess perceptions and knowledge of Georgia residents about a range of current issues facing residents of the state. Estimates based a sample of this size are subject to sampling error of +/- 4.4% at the 95 percent confidence interval. Sampling error is the probable difference in results between interviewing a sample of the population of adult Georgians versus interviewing the entire population of adults in Georgia. Sample surveys are subject to other sources of error such as non-response error and error associated with the wording of questionnaire items. The cooperation rate for the study was 37.4%.

Table 3
Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians

	n	%
<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>		
Yes	437	90.1
No	48	9.9
TOTAL	485	100.0
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>		
Very Important	374	78.7
Somewhat Important	90	18.9
Not Too Important	7	1.5
Not at all Important	4	0.8
TOTAL	475	100.0

Table 4
Preferences for Funding for PeachCare

	n	%
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:</i>		
Keep Funding at Same Level	61	13.7
Provide Enough Funding to Cover Current Members	92	20.7
Provide More Money for Program	292	65.6
TOTAL	445	100.0

Table 5

Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare

	n	%
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:</i>		
Strongly Favor	292	63.5
Somewhat Favor	102	22.2
Somewhat Oppose	39	8.5
Strongly Oppose	27	5.9
TOTAL	460	100.0
<i>Favor Expanding Program:</i>		
Strongly Favor	250	54.7
Somewhat Favor	117	25.6
Somewhat Oppose	48	10.5
Strongly Oppose	42	9.2
TOTAL	457	100.0
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:</i>		
Strongly Favor	29	6.8
Somewhat Favor	44	10.3
Somewhat Oppose	139	32.4
Strongly Oppose	217	50.6
TOTAL	429	100.0
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>		
Strongly Favor	47	11.0
Somewhat Favor	59	13.8
Somewhat Oppose	127	29.7
Strongly Oppose	195	45.6
TOTAL	428	100.0
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>		
Strongly Agree	378	81.3
Somewhat Agree	72	15.5
Somewhat Disagree	6	1.3
Strongly Disagree	9	1.9
TOTAL	465	100.0
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>		
Strongly Agree	331	71.3
Somewhat Agree	106	22.8
Somewhat Disagree	18	3.9
Strongly Disagree	9	1.9
TOTAL	464	100.0
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>		
Strongly Agree	336	73.4
Somewhat Agree	91	19.9
Somewhat Disagree	18	3.9
Strongly Disagree	13	2.8
TOTAL	458	100.0
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:</i>		
Too Much	41	10.6
Too Little	257	66.4
Amount is About Right	89	23.0
TOTAL	387	100.0

Table 6
Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Gender

	Male	Female
<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Yes	85.6	92.7
No	14.4	7.3
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>		
Important	97.5	98.1
Not Important	2.5	1.9

* $p \leq .05$

Table 7
Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
By Gender

	Male	Female
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Keep Funding at Same Level	20.5	10.3
Provide Enough Funding to Cover Current Members	19.2	21.4
Provide More Money for Program	60.3	68.3

* p ≤ .05

Table 8
Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
By Gender

	Male	Female
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Favor	79.7	88.9
Oppose	20.3	11.1
<i>Favor Expanding Program:*</i>		
Favor	78.2	85.7
Oppose	21.8	14.3
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:</i>		
Favor	77.7	81.4
Oppose	22.3	18.6
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:*</i>		
Favor	22.5	13.5
Oppose	77.5	86.5
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>		
Favor	25.2	24.5
Oppose	74.8	75.5
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>		
Agree	95.7	97.3
Disagree	4.3	2.7
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>		
Agree	92.0	95.3
Disagree	8.0	4.7
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>		
Agree	90.1	94.9
Disagree	9.9	5.1
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:*</i>		
Too Much	14.5	8.5
Too Little	58.0	71.3
Amount is About Right	27.5	20.2

* $p \leq .05$

Table 9
Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Ethnicity

	White	Non-White
<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>		
Yes	89.9	90.2
No	10.1	9.8
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>		
Important	97.6	100.0
Not Important	2.4	0.0
* p ≤ .05		

Table 10
Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
by Ethnicity

	White	Non-White
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Keep Funding at Same Level	17.0	6.2
Provide Enough Funding to Cover Current Members	21.3	19.2
Provide More Money for Program	61.7	74.6

* $p \leq .05$

Table 11
Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
By Ethnicity

	White	Non-White
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Favor	83.0	93.1
Oppose	17.0	6.9
<i>Favor Expanding Program:*</i>		
Favor	79.2	93.9
Oppose	20.8	6.1
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:*</i>		
Favor	77.1	87.7
Oppose	22.9	12.3
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:</i>		
Favor	17.4	14.6
Oppose	82.6	85.4
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>		
Favor	27.1	18.3
Oppose	72.9	81.7
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>		
Agree	96.9	98.4
Disagree	3.1	1.6
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>		
Agree	93.5	96.9
Disagree	6.5	3.1
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>		
Agree	93.8	93.5
Disagree	6.2	6.5
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:*</i>		
Too Much	11.9	6.2
Too Little	58.6	84.1
Amount is About Right	29.5	9.7

* $p \leq .05$

Table 12

**Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Age**

<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
Yes	81.5	89.5	92.3	87.5
No	18.5	10.5	7.7	12.5
 <i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>				
Important	100.0	98.6	97.3	97.2
Not Important	0.0	1.4	2.7	2.8

* $p \leq .05$

Table 13

**Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
by Age**

	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:</i>				
Keep Funding at Same Level	7.7	9.9	19.1	9.2
Provide Funding to Cover Current Members	15.4	19.7	20.6	26.2
Provide More Money for Program	76.9	70.4	60.3	64.6

* $p \leq .05$

Table 14
Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
By Age

	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:</i>				
Favor	88.9	89.0	82.4	86.8
Oppose	11.1	11.0	17.6	13.2
<i>Favor Expanding Program:</i>				
Favor	77.8	87.7	79.2	87.7
Oppose	22.2	12.3	20.8	12.3
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:</i>				
Favor	81.5	83.1	75.9	84.8
Oppose	18.5	16.9	24.1	15.2
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:*</i>				
Favor	36.0	13.7	15.7	20.3
Oppose	64.0	86.3	84.3	79.7
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>				
Favor	26.9	17.7	27.9	30.4
Oppose	73.1	82.3	72.1	69.6
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>				
Agree	92.6	98.6	96.3	95.5
Disagree	7.4	1.4	3.7	4.5
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>				
Agree	92.6	95.2	93.5	94.0
Disagree	7.4	4.8	6.5	6.0
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>				
Agree	85.2	95.2	92.4	94.0
Disagree	14.8	4.8	7.6	6.0
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:*</i>				
Too Much	8.3	9.5	12.3	9.8
Too Little	62.5	72.2	62.0	68.6
Amount is About Right	29.2	18.3	25.7	21.6

* p ≤ .05

Table 15

**Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Education**

<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>	HS Grad or Less	Some College/Tech	College Grad+
Yes	92.3	89.3	89.6
No	7.7	10.7	10.4
 <i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>			
Important	98.6	98.1	97.0
Not Important	1.4	1.9	3.0

* $p \leq .05$

Table 16

**Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
by Education**

	HS Grad or Less	Some College/Tech	College Grad+
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:*</i>			
Keep Funding at Same Level	9.1	10.8	20.5
Provide Funding to Cover Current Members	18.9	18.9	24.4
Provide More Money for Program	72.0	70.3	65.1

* $p \leq .05$

Table 17
Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
by Education

	HS Grad or Less	Some College/Tech	College Grad+
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:</i>			
Favor	89.7	87.5	80.7
Oppose	10.3	12.5	19.3
<i>Favor Expanding Program:</i>			
Favor	86.1	85.3	79.0
Oppose	13.9	14.7	21.0
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:</i>			
Favor	83.9	79.9	76.9
Oppose	16.1	20.1	23.1
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:</i>			
Favor	18.6	12.9	18.5
Oppose	81.4	87.1	81.5
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>			
Favor	26.2	23.7	24.4
Oppose	73.8	76.3	75.6
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>			
Agree	97.8	96.1	96.4
Disagree	2.2	3.9	3.6
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>			
Agree	96.4	93.5	92.8
Disagree	3.6	6.5	7.2
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>			
Agree	96.3	93.4	90.4
Disagree	3.7	6.6	9.6
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:</i>			
Too Much	8.6	10.2	12.3
Too Little	72.4	66.1	61.6
Amount is About Right	19.0	23.6	26.1

* $p \leq .05$

Table 18

Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Income

<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>	< \$20,000	\$20,000 - \$34,999	\$35,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000+
Yes	85.7	95.9	88.1	89.3
No	14.3	4.1	11.9	10.7
 <i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>				
Important	100.0	97.9	100.0	97.3
Not Important	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.7

* p ≤ .05

Table 19
Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
by Income

	< \$20,000	\$20,000 - \$34,999	\$35,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000+
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:</i>				
Keep Funding at Same Level	15.0	12.8	5.0	15.9
Provide Enough Funding to Cover Members	30.0	14.9	20.0	23.7
Provide More Money for Program	55.0	72.3	75.0	60.4
* p ≤ .05				

Table 20
Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
by Income

	< \$20,000	\$20,000 - \$34,999	\$35,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000+
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:</i>				
Favor	90.0	91.8	90.0	84.6
Oppose	10.0	8.2	10.0	15.4
<i>Favor Expanding Program:</i>				
Favor	75.0	83.0	90.5	83.8
Oppose	25.0	17.0	9.5	16.2
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:</i>				
Favor	75.0	83.7	90.5	76.5
Oppose	25.0	16.3	9.5	23.5
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:</i>				
Favor	27.8	17.8	15.0	16.2
Oppose	72.2	82.2	85.0	83.8
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>				
Favor	35.0	23.9	12.8	25.8
Oppose	65.0	76.1	87.2	74.2
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>				
Agree	95.0	93.9	100.0	97.3
Disagree	5.0	6.1	0.0	2.7
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>				
Agree	85.0	98.0	97.6	93.2
Disagree	15.0	2.0	2.4	6.8
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>				
Agree	95.2	93.6	97.6	94.5
Disagree	4.8	6.4	2.4	5.5
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:</i>				
Too Much	5.9	4.7	5.7	12.2
Too Little	76.5	81.4	71.4	58.9
Amount is About Right	17.6	14.0	22.9	28.9

* p ≤ .05

Table 21

Awareness and Importance of
PeachCare to Georgians, by Urban/Rural Status

<i>Heard of PeachCare for Kids:</i>	MSA	Non-MSA
Yes	89.6	91.8
No	10.4	8.2
 <i>PeachCare for Kids is Important:</i>		
Important	97.5	98.2
Not Important	2.5	1.8

* $p \leq .05$

Table 22
Preferences for Funding for PeachCare,
by Urban/Rural Status

	MSA	Non-MSA
<i>Funding PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Keep Funding at Same Level	15.5	7.8
Provide Enough Funding to Cover Current Members	22.2	15.5
Provide More Money for Program	62.3	76.7

* $p \leq .05$

Table 23

Attitudes of Georgians Toward PeachCare,
by Urban/Rural Status

	MSA	Non-MSA
<i>Favor Investing More in PeachCare for Kids:*</i>		
Favor	83.9	91.5
Oppose	16.1	8.5
<i>Favor Expanding Program:</i>		
Favor	81.4	88.6
Oppose	18.6	11.4
<i>Favor Parent Insurance:</i>		
Favor	80.9	78.5
Oppose	19.1	21.5
<i>Favor Cutting Back Program:</i>		
Favor	17.2	16.3
Oppose	82.8	83.7
<i>Favor Focusing on Cutting Taxes:</i>		
Favor	26.0	20.6
Oppose	74.0	79.4
<i>All Children Should Have Health Care:</i>		
Agree	95.8	100.0
Disagree	4.2	0.0
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Especially Important:</i>		
Agree	93.3	97.2
Disagree	6.7	2.8
<i>PeachCare for Kids is Smart Way to Invest in the Future:</i>		
Agree	92.4	96.2
Disagree	7.6	3.8
<i>Opinion on Amount State Government Spends on Health Care:</i>		
Too Much	11.3	8.3
Too Little	64.3	72.9
Amount is About Right	24.4	18.8

* $p \leq .05$
