

**Senior Statewide Legal Hotlines  
Client Outcomes Survey, 2002**



**A Survey of Clients at Senior Legal Hotlines in  
California, New Hampshire, and Maryland**

**Narrative Report written by Shoshanna Ehrlich,  
AARP Foundation**

**Technical Support for Legal Hotlines Project,  
Sponsored by the Administration on Aging  
Analysis Completed by Research Associate Lanae Davis, M.A.**

**April, 2003**

## Table of Contents

|      |  |         |
|------|--|---------|
| I.   | Introduction.....  | Page 3  |
| II.  | Methodology.....   | Page 4  |
| III. | Summary of Results.....  | Page 6  |
| IV.  | Results.....   | Page 7  |
|      | A. Demographic Data.....   | Page 8  |
|      | B. Contacting the Hotline.....   | Page 13 |
|      | C. Follow Up Actions and Outcomes.....   | Page 19 |
|      | D. Comparison of Clients/Advocates/Casetypes.....  | Page 24 |
| V.   | Comparison with Project for the Future of Equal<br>Justice Hotline Outcome Study 2002..... | Page 33 |
| VI.  | Findings and Recommendations.....  | Page 35 |
| VII. | Appendix.....  | Page 37 |

## ***I. Introduction***

The Statewide Senior Legal Hotline model was originated by AARP in 1985 as a demonstration project to provide telephone legal advice to people over aged 60. The model has spread to 23 states, Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C. The Administration on Aging has supported the start up or continuation of many of these hotlines. Others are run with a combination of legal services, IOLTA, state, and other grants or funding. The AoA also provides for technical support to the senior hotlines through the AARP Foundation Technical Support for Legal Hotlines Project. All of the hotlines provide telephone legal advice; most provide some brief services. Some of the hotlines are stand-alone while others are part of a full-service legal program.

With the exception of the Senior Legal Hotline in California, all of them serve their entire state. Because the California senior population is the largest in the nation, current funding levels only permit the California Senior Legal Hotline to serve the northern portion of the state.

Various client surveys were performed in the mid-90's and client satisfaction with the service was substantially favorable<sup>1</sup>. It was clear that hotlines were adept at serving the core function of answering legal questions and giving advice on solving legal problems. The large unanswered question was whether clients actually followed the advice and whether, by doing so, they were substantially able to improve their situation with regard to their legal problem. To research these questions, the AARP Foundation Technical Support for Legal Hotlines Project conducted a Senior Hotlines Outcomes Survey with five of the senior statewide legal hotlines in Year 2000.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See 1994 and 1992 Legal Hotlines Client Satisfaction Surveys, the results of surveys sent to clients of the Washington D.C., Florida, Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Texas statewide senior legal hotlines. The surveys were conducted by Evaluation Research Services. Available in hard copy from the National Center on Poverty Law, <http://www.povertylaw.org/hotline/hotline2A.htm>  
Clearinghouse Number: 51,857; 51,858.

<sup>2</sup> *Senior Legal Hotlines Client Outcomes Survey, 2000* <http://www.legalhotlines.org>

The results of that survey indicated that:

- 54% of respondents called to get the answer to a legal problem
- 43% of respondents were advised to take a follow-up action
- Of those advised to do so, 82% of them reported taking a follow-up measure
- 48% of those performing the follow-up measure reported complete or partial resolution of their problem when surveyed between one-two months after their call to the hotline
- 43% were still awaiting results

The results from the Year 2000 survey raised several issues that the instant survey sought to investigate:

- ◆ Whether a similar survey would substantially duplicate the initial results
- ◆ Whether the number of respondents who had obtained a resolution (favorable or unfavorable) was greater when the survey was sent after an additional month between the call and the survey mailing (between 2-3 months).
- ◆ Whether certain client or casetype characteristics impact the client's decision to take follow-up action
- ◆ Whether certain client or casetype characteristics impact the outcome

The new survey sought to collect data on two factors which had not been studied before:

- ◆ The percentage of respondents who had access to the internet
- ◆ Whether the hotline advocate type (attorney or paralegal) impacted a client's decision to take follow up action and the outcome of that action.

In 2002, the Project for the Future of Equal Justice completed an extensive study of hotline outcomes for low-income legal hotlines<sup>3</sup>. The results of that study offer important contrasts and comparisons for the delivery of legal hotline services. The overall goal of the second senior legal hotline study was to identify factors influencing client follow-up and outcomes that could be used to improve hotline design, implementation, and allocation of legal services resources.

The instant report presents the findings from the survey of Senior Legal Hotlines in three states. The report outlines the methodology used in the study, summarizes the findings, and presents the tables and analysis for each survey item and comparisons between the two senior hotline surveys where duplicate data was collected. It includes a comparison of results with the Project for the Future of Equal Justice Hotlines Outcomes Study. Finally, the Project offers observations and

---

<sup>3</sup> *Hotline Outcomes Study 2002*, <http://www.nlada.org>.

recommendations for adjustments to the legal hotline model and implications for the spectrum of legal service delivery methods suggested by the findings.

## ***II. Methodology***

The AARP Foundation Legal Hotline Technical Support for Legal Hotlines Project enlisted the participation of three senior legal hotlines: the Senior Legal Hotline at Legal Services of Northern California (serving Northern California only) the Maryland Senior Legal Hotline at the Legal Aid Bureau of Maryland (statewide), and the New Hampshire Senior Citizens Law Project Advice Line at New Hampshire Legal Assistance (statewide). These three hotlines are all affiliated with a full-service program where appropriate clients needing full-representation could be referred. The Project, with the participation of the three hotline managers and Research Associate Lanae Davis, revised the previous client survey instrument to include the desired new areas of study and made other refinements. (Appendix). A translator at the California Hotline produced the Spanish version.

The California Senior Legal Hotline and the New Hampshire Senior Advice Line sent the surveys out to every client they served (with the exception of clients who might be endangered by receipt of the survey) during the period from March 1-August 31, 2002. The surveys were sent no earlier than 60 days after the client had the consultation with the hotline advocate and the case was closed, but no later than three months after the call. The survey send-out began May 1<sup>st</sup> for clients served in March and ended in November for clients served in August. All responses were tabulated including those respondents who reported being assigned a free lawyer.

The Maryland Senior Legal Hotline asked each client on the phone whether he would be willing to participate in a survey. This accounts for the smaller number of surveys sent from Maryland but the higher rate of response. A total of 4,150 surveys were sent out by the three hotlines and 1,294 were returned to AARP Foundation. This represents an average response rate of 31% - almost exactly the same as the Year 2000 survey (30%). The surveys were anonymous and the stamped return envelope directed the survey to AARP headquarters. Project Staff sent the surveys to the Research Associate, Lanae Davis, in Denver, for statistical analysis. At first, the Researcher had some concerns about including the Maryland results, since the Maryland hotline had sent surveys only to those callers who had agreed to participate. However, after data analysis, there was no significant difference in the Maryland results, other than that the Maryland respondents were poorer than the respondents in the other two states. Accordingly, the Maryland results were included in the cross-site tabulations. All conclusions in this report apply only to clients who responded to the survey and cannot be generalized to the full hotline client population.

Several of the questions allowed clients to enter a descriptive comment in addition to selecting a fixed choice response. This was done to provide additional input to the hotlines. The Research Associate did not analyze any narrative data supplied by clients. Only client responses to close-ended questions on the survey instrument were tabulated.

The surveys were pre-coded by the hotline advocate for gender, age, number in household, and casetype. The surveys were also coded as to whether the hotline gave advice to a third party rather than directly to the client. If so, the third party received the survey. The California surveys were also coded by the advocate to indicate whether service was rendered by an attorney or paralegal. The Maryland and New Hampshire hotlines only have attorney hotline advocates so could not participate in this portion of the survey.

### **III. Summary of Results:**

#### **Client/Hotline Advocate Characteristics**

- Virtually all callers to the three senior hotlines were over 60 years of age
- 71% of respondents were women.
- 70% of respondents have incomes under \$20,000 per year.
- 32% of respondents have access to the internet. Female, older clients, and clients with incomes of less than \$12,000 per year are less likely to have internet access but internet access did not have a significant effect on whether respondents followed the advice or on the outcomes achieved.
- 87% rated the hotline advice as helpful or somewhat helpful
- The attorney/paralegal hotline advocate factor did not have a significant impact on whether the client reported taking action nor the results achieved.
- Problems labeled with the “Family” casetype were the least likely to be resolved during the survey period and respondents with the “Family” casetype were the least likely to be satisfied.
- The overwhelming majority of clients report they would call the hotline again.
- The results from the 2002 were virtually identical to the results from the 2000 senior hotline survey for those items analyzed in both studies.
- The increased length of time between hotline service and survey time in the 2002 survey resulted in a larger percentage of cases that were completely resolved than in the previous survey. There was a concomitant decrease in the percentage of respondents who were still waiting for the results of their follow-up action.

#### **Was Advice Followed**

- 45% of respondents called the hotline to get an answer to a legal question
- 43% wanted advice about how to solve a legal problem
- 45% of respondents reported being advised to take a follow-up action
- 85% of those respondents reported taking a follow up action.

#### **Results of Action**

Of those who reported taking action:

- 41% reported their problem was completely resolved
- 16% reported their problem was partially resolved
- 30% reported they were still waiting for results of action
- 12% reported their action didn't solve the problem
- Among those who are still waiting for results, 54% have been waiting between one-two months.

#### **Correlations with Casetypes**

- Callers with the Wills/Estates casetype were significantly more likely to report their problem as being completely resolved (60%)
- Callers with the Family casetype were significantly less likely to report their problem as completely resolved (21%) and more likely to be still waiting (50%) than other casetypes. Along with the “other” casetype, family casetype respondents were significantly less likely to find the advice helpful
- Casetype did not significantly affect the percentage of callers who reported taking follow up action

### ***IV. Results***

Results are presented in narrative form with the representational table immediately following. All statistically significant differences across columns are noted on the tables by the symbol: ▲. Results from the Year 2000 survey are contained in the last column of each table, where applicable.

#### **Number and Percentage of Responses from Each Hotline**

California, an exceptionally high-volume senior hotline, naturally sent out more surveys than the other participants and its clients represent a greater percentage of the total. Of the 4,150 surveys sent out during the study, 3,105 were from California. New Hampshire sent out 783 surveys, while Maryland sent out 352. AARP Foundation received a total of 1,294 responses for a response rate of 31%. Of the responses received, 856 (66%) were from California callers; 294 (23%) were from New Hampshire, and 144 (11%) were from Maryland. The size of the survey was slightly larger than the 2000 senior survey (1,043 returned). The response rate was almost identical in 2000 (30%). The average response rate was calculated from the total number of surveys sent and received. As noted above, the Maryland hotline asked each caller if they would agree to participate in the survey before sending the form.

| Hotline       | Number of Responses | Percentage of Total | Response Rate | Total Year 2000 |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| California    | 856                 | 66%                 | 27%           |                 |
| New Hampshire | 294                 | 23%                 | 38%           |                 |
| Maryland      | 144                 | 11%                 | 41%           |                 |
| Total         | 1,294               | 100.0%              | Ave.31%       | 1,043           |

## A. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The demographic statistics, as well as any conclusions we can draw from these results, represent those 31% of callers who responded to the survey and are not necessarily indicative of the demographic makeup or results of the total number of hotline clients. Results are similar across sites and parallel to the previous survey, with gender, age, and income proportions closely resembling the 2000 survey. Hotlines conducted the legal consultation in English with 99% of respondents. Only seven callers chose to speak Spanish with their hotline advocate.

### Gender:

This year, just as in the Year 2000 survey, 71% of the respondents were female and 29% were male. The percentage of male vs. female respondents ranged from 65% female in New Hampshire to 81% female in Maryland. Although this represents a significant difference in the gender distribution across the three sites, there was no significant impact on answers to survey questions. The percentage of female hotline callers is higher than the percentage of females in the older population. 59% of Americans aged 65 or over are female.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 1: Gender of Respondents: (Raw numbers are enclosed in parentheses)**

| Gender ▲ | California | New Hampshire | Maryland   | Total 2002  | Total 2000   |
|----------|------------|---------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Male     | 29% (249)  | 35%(104)      | 19% (28)   | 29% (381)   | 29% (299)    |
| Female   | 71% (607)  | 65% (190)     | 81% (116)  | 71% (913)   | 71% (722)    |
| Total    | 100% (856) | 100% (294)    | 100% (144) | 100% (1294) | 100% (1,021) |

<sup>4</sup> *A Profile of Older Americans 2000, www.aoa.gov/STATS*

**Age:**

The senior hotlines are funded to serve clients 60 and over and therefore we should not expect any clients to be in the under 60 category. Accordingly, less than 1% of the respondents were under 60. The vast majority of respondents (80%) were between 60-80 years of age. There were 552 (43%) respondents between the ages of 60-70, and 483 (37%) between the ages of 71-80. Respondents between 81-90 years of age numbered 212 (16%) and 36 people (3%) were over the age of 90. A statistical difference is noted across sites with more Maryland respondents in the 60-70 year age group than in California or New Hampshire. Respondent ages were parallel to the 2000 survey, with the percentage of clients in the 60-80 age groups virtually identical in both studies.

**Table 2: Age of Respondents**

| Age▲     | CA         | NH         | MD         | Total       | 2000 Survey |
|----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Under 60 | 1% (11)    | 0          | 0          | 1% (11)     | 8% (86)     |
| 60-70    | 41% (348)  | 45% (131)  | 51% (73)   | 43% (552)   | 43% (444)   |
| 71-80    | 39% (333)  | 33% (97)   | 37% (53)   | 37% (483)   | 36% (376)   |
| 81-90    | 16% (138)  | 20% (59)   | 10% (15)   | 16% (212)   | 11% (117)   |
| Over 90  | 3% (26)    | 2% (7)     | 2% (3)     | 3% (36)     | 1% (10)     |
| Total    | 100% (826) | 100% (294) | 100% (144) | 100% (1294) | 100% (1033) |

**Number of Persons in Household**

A majority of the seniors responding to the survey live alone (58%) and almost all the rest live with one other person (35%). Living in an extended family household is rare for the respondent population. Only 7% report living in a house with three or more people. No significant differences were noted across sites. This item was not asked in the 2000 survey.

**Table 3. Number in Household**

| Number in | CA | NH | MD | Total |
|-----------|----|----|----|-------|
|-----------|----|----|----|-------|

|               |            |            |           |             |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Household     |            |            |           |             |
| One person    | 57% (487)  | 60% (175)  | 65% (93)  | 58% (755)   |
| Two people    | 36% (308)  | 35% (102)  | 31% (45)  | 35% (455)   |
| Three or more | 7% (61)    | 6% (17)    | 4% (6)    | 7% (84)     |
| Total         | 100% (856) | 100% (294) | 100%(144) | 100% (1294) |

### **Yearly Household Income**

The senior legal hotlines generally have no income requirements for the advice and brief services. Nevertheless, a large majority of callers are from the lower income ranges. Almost 2/3 of callers had income below \$20,000 per year. Over 40% have incomes below \$12,000 per year. As would be expected, respondents in a one person household reported incomes that were much lower than respondents with two or more persons in the household. More than half of one person households reported incomes of less than \$12,000 per year. Only 8% of callers had incomes over \$40,000 per year. Maryland respondents were significantly poorer than callers from California and New Hampshire. Fully 88% of Maryland respondents had income less than \$20,000 per year. The difference in income across sites did not produce a significant impact on follow-up action taken, results obtained, or satisfaction reported. The difference in income level is most likely due to the poverty levels in Baltimore, where the Maryland hotline is based.

**Table 4. Yearly Household Income**

| Yearly Household Income ▲ | CA         | NH         | MD         | Total       | 2000 Totals |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| \$12,000 or less          | 41% (282)  | 41% (100)  | 55% (68)   | 43% (450)   | (combined)  |
| Between \$12,000-\$20,000 | 31% (212)  | 31% (77)   | 33% (40)   | 31% (329)   | 70% (677)   |
| Between \$20,000-40,000   | 21% (145)  | 18% (43)   | 9% (11)    | 19% (198)   | 22% (211)   |
| Over \$40,000             | 7% (49)    | 11% (26)   | 3% (4)     | 8% (7)      | 8% (74)     |
| Total                     | 100% (688) | 100% (246) | 100% (123) | 100% (1056) | 100% (962)  |

**Table 5. Household Income by Household size**

| <b>Household income by Household Size</b> |               |               |                      |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------------|
|   | One person HH | Two person HH | Three or more person |
|   |               |               |                      |

|                         |                  |                  |               |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|
| <b>California</b>       |                  |                  |               |
| ▲Income:                |                  |                  |               |
| • \$12,000 or less      | 53% (208)        | 19% (48)         | 54% (26)      |
| • Between 12,000-20,000 | 31% (120)        | 33% (83)         | 19% (9)       |
| • Between 20,000-40,000 | 12% (47)         | 35% (88)         | 19% (9)       |
| • Over \$40,000         | 4% (16)          | 12% (30)         | 8% (4)        |
| <b>▲New Hampshire</b>   | One person HH    | Two person HH    | Three or more |
| Income:                 |                  |                  |               |
| • \$12,000 or less      | 49% (72)         | 29% (25)         | 23% (3)       |
| • Between 12,000-20,000 | 28% (41)         | 35% (30)         | 46% (6)       |
| • Between 20,000-40,000 | 16% (23)         | 21% (18)         | 15% (2)       |
| • Over \$40,000         | 7% (10)          | 16% (14)         | 15% (2)       |
| <b>▲Maryland</b>        |                  |                  |               |
| Income:                 |                  |                  |               |
| • \$12,000 or less      | 61% (48)         | 46% (18)         | 40% (2)       |
| • Between 12,000-20,000 | 33% (26)         | 31% (12)         | 40% (2)       |
| • Between 20,000-40,000 | 5% (4)           | 18% (7)          | 0             |
| • Over \$40,000         | 1% (1)           | 5% (2)           | 20% (1)       |
| <b>▲Total</b>           | One Person House | Two-Person House | Three or more |
| Income:                 |                  |                  |               |
| • \$12,000 or less      | 53% (328)        | 24% (91)         | 47% (31)      |
| • Between 12,000-20,000 | 30% (187)        | 33% (125)        | 26% (17)      |
| • Between 20,000-40,000 | 12% (74)         | 30% (113)        | 17% (11)      |
| • Over \$40,000         | 4% (27)          | 12% (46)         | 11% (7)       |

### **Third Party Calls**

The results showed a significant difference across sites in the percentage of third party calls the hotlines handled. Third parties numbered 1/5 of New Hampshire respondents, a far greater percentage than California (8%) or Maryland (2%). No reason for this difference is evident. Whether the higher percentage of third party callers in New Hampshire is due to more third parties calling for the elderly in that state, or whether the difference is due to hotline call handling procedures in each of the hotlines, is left unanswered in this study. The results highlight the need for every hotline to have clear third-party call handling procedures in place.

**Table 6. Percentage of Third party callers responding to the survey**

|  |         |          |        |           |
|--|---------|----------|--------|-----------|
| % of respondents who were third party callers▲ | CA      | NH       | MD     | Total     |
|  | 8% (68) | 21% (61) | 2% (3) | 11% (132) |

### **Access to the Internet**

Over the last few years, legal services programs have constructed a world of legal resources for clients on the internet. An objective of this study was to gain some information about the ability of the elder client population to access the internet in order to benefit from these resources. Results showed that over 30% of respondents had access to the internet and email and almost all of that access (92%) was via home computer. There was a significant difference across sites with Maryland clients being much less likely to have access to the internet and email (16%). This can be explained by the expected correlation between internet access and income. Respondents who are female, older than 70, or have incomes less than \$12,000 per year are less likely to have internet access. Of the 2/3 of respondents without internet access, only 11% said they planned on getting it within one year.

The finding that over 1/3 of hotline survey respondents have access to the internet was very encouraging. Interestingly though, internet access was not a significant factor in whether clients followed hotline advice or the results they achieved (see Table 20 below)

**Table 7. Internet Access**

|   | <b>California<br/>(N=856)</b> | <b>New Hampshire<br/>(N=294)</b> | <b>Maryland<br/>(N=144)</b> | <b>Total<br/>(N=1294)</b> |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| % with Internet access                                    | 34% (278)                     | 37% (105)                        | 17% (23)                    | 32% (406)                 |
| Of those with Internet access, where access the internet: |                               |                                  |                             |                           |
| • Home computer   | 90% (245)                     | 96% (98)                         | 91% (21)                    | 92% (364)                 |
| • Home of friend/relative                                 | 4% (12)                       | 1% (1)                           | 9% (2)                      | 4% (15)                   |
| • Library   | 4% (11)                       | 1% (1)                           | 0                           | 3% (12)                   |
| • Community Center  | .4% (1)                       | 0                                | 0                           | .3% (1)                   |
| • Other   | .7% (2)                       | 2% (2)                           | 0                           | 1% (4)                    |
| Of those without access, % plan on getting access within  |                               |                                  |                             |                           |

|            |          |         |        |          |
|------------|----------|---------|--------|----------|
| next year▲ | 13% (64) | 8% (12) | 7% (7) | 11% (83) |
|------------|----------|---------|--------|----------|

|                             | Has Internet Access<br>(N=406) | Does not have<br>Internet Access<br>(N=847) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Sex▲                        |                                |   |
| • Male                      | 39% (156)                      | 25% (215)                                   |
| • Female                    | 62% (250)                      | 75% (632)                                   |
| Age▲                        |                                |   |
| • Under 60                  | 1% (4)                         | .8% (7)                                     |
| • 60-70                     | 50% (202)                      | 41% (343)                                   |
| • 71-80                     | 28% (115)                      | 41% (348)                                   |
| • 81-90                     | 18% (72)                       | 15% (128)                                   |
| • Over 90                   | 3% (13)                        | 3% (21)                                     |
| Yearly household income:▲   |                                |   |
| • \$12,000 or less          | 30% (97)                       | 49% (347)                                   |
| • Between \$12,000-\$20,000 | 27% (89)                       | 33% (236)                                   |
| • Between \$20,000-\$40,000 | 26% (87)                       | 15% (107)                                   |
| • Over \$40,000             | 17% (56)                       | 3% (23)                                     |

## B. METHOD USED TO CONTACT THE HOTLINE REASONS FOR CONTACT

### Initial Contact Methods

The participating senior hotlines asked to include a question on how the client got in contact with the hotline to assist them in evaluating different call intake practices at their programs, including the level of contact through email or websites. The significant numerical differences noted across sites reflect the different methods of handling incoming calls at the three sites. More than 1/3 of calls were answered by a hotline advocate who picked up the call and spoke with the client. This was the most popular intake vehicle at the California and Maryland hotlines. More than a quarter of the calls were answered by a receptionist who gave the client an appointment for a call-back from a hotline advocate. The majority of respondents in New Hampshire were served this way. A smaller number of respondents (13%) reported that their calls were picked up by a receptionist and transferred to a hotline, although almost one-fourth of

Maryland calls were handled this way. A very small percentage of total respondents (6%) left an answer on an answering machine although 17% of Maryland respondents did so.

The California hotline was the only of one the three participating hotlines that had a formal procedure for email and website intake. However, only 2% of the CA respondents made contact with the hotline this way.

**Table 8. Method Used to Contact the Hotline**

| Selected characteristics of Hotline Clients by Site                                 |                        |                              |                     |                    |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Method used to contact hotline:<br>▲  | California<br>(N=856 ) | New<br>Hampshire<br>(N=294 ) | Maryland<br>(N=144) | Total<br>(N=1294 ) |
| • Called the number and a Hotline advocate picked up call                           | 43% (348)              | 14% (40)                     | 36% (50)            | 36% (438)          |
| • Receptionist picked up call and transferred to a hotline advocate                 | 13% (103)              | 10% (29)                     | 22% (30)            | 13% (162)          |
| • Receptionist picked up call and gave an appointment for a call back from advocate | 22% (177)              | 56% (160)                    | 7% (10)             | 28% (347)          |
| • Left a message on an answering machine  | 4% (35)                | 6% (18)                      | 17% (24)            | 6% (77)            |
| • Sent an email or contacted through a website                                      | 2% (12)                | 0                            | 0                   | 1% (12)            |
| • Other   | 17% (137)              | 13% (38)                     | 17% (24)            | 16% (199)          |

**Reasons for Contacting the Hotline**

Clients were asked to select the reasons why they had called the hotline. The choices were:

- Wanted an answer to a legal questions

- Wanted advice about how to solve a legal problem
- Wanted help to solve a legal problem
- Wanted a legal document of form
- Wanted an attorney to handle a matter until it was resolved
- Other

Clients were asked to check all that applied. In keeping with the results from the 2000 survey, the vast majority of respondents wanted either an answer to a legal question (45%) or advice on how to solve a legal problem (43%). 27% wanted help to solve a legal problem, and 14% wanted a document or form. Only 16% of respondents reported calling because they wanted an attorney to handle a matter until it was resolved

There is some variation across sites with respondents in Maryland more likely to want a legal document or form or wanting an attorney to handle the matter than in the other sites.

**Table 9. Reasons for Contacting the Hotline**

| <b>Reason for Calling the Hotline by Site</b>                  |                        |                        |                        |                           |                                  |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Reason contacted the hotline:</b>                           | <b>CA<br/>(N=856 )</b> | <b>NH<br/>(N=294 )</b> | <b>MD<br/>(N=144 )</b> | <b>Total<br/>(N=1294)</b> | <b>Total<br/>2000<br/>Survey</b> |
| • Wanted an answer to a legal question                         | 45% (389)              | 46% (135)              | 40% (57)               | 45% (581)                 | 54% (558)                        |
| • Wanted advice about how to solve a legal problem             | 45% (383)              | 38% (111)              | 41% (59)               | 43% (553)                 | 35% (361)                        |
| • Wanted help to solve a legal problem▲                        | 29% (246)              | 22% (64)               | 26% (38)               | 27% (348)                 | not asked                        |
| • Wanted a legal document or form▲                             | 14% (121)              | 7% (21)                | 26% (38)               | 14% (180)                 | 8% (87)                          |
| • Wanted an attorney to handle a matter until it was resolved▲ | 14% (123)              | 14% (41)               | 31% (45)               | 16% (209)                 | 17% (181)                        |
| • Other  | 6% (52)                | 7% (21)                | 4% (6)                 | 6% (79)                   | 17% (173)                        |

### **Helpfulness of Advice**

For those respondents who reported that the hotline gave advice, an overwhelming majority (88%) found the advice helpful to some degree. 68% found it very helpful and an additional 20% found it somewhat helpful. Only 12% reported the

advice was not helpful. Although there were differences across sites in the reasons cited for the hotline call, there were no significant differences across sites with regard to the percentage of respondents who found the advice helpful. The California surveys were analyzed by attorney and paralegal categories for this factor. Respondents reported similar levels of helpfulness of advice for both hotline advocate types. The satisfaction rates for the advice were also very similar to those found in the 2000 survey.

**Table 10. Helpfulness of Advice**

| If the Hotline gave advice, was it helpful:    | CA (781)                     | NH (265)  | MD (115)                      | Total (1161) | Total 2000 (916) |
|--|------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| • Yes  | 68% (530)                    | 70% (186) | 63% (72)                      | 68% (788)    | 69% (629)        |
| • No   | 11% (87)                     | 13% (33)  | 18% (21)                      | 12% (141)    | 13% (123)        |
| • Somewhat                                     | 21% (164)                    | 17% (46)  | 19% (22)                      | 20% (232)    | 18% (164)        |
| <b><i>California</i></b>                       | <b><i>Attorney (344)</i></b> |           | <b><i>Paralegal (433)</i></b> |              |                  |
| If the Hotline gave you advice, was it helpful |                              |           |                               |              |                  |
| • Yes  | 72% (246)                    |           | 65% (282)                     |              |                  |
| • No   | 11% (37)                     |           | 11% (49)                      |              |                  |
| • Somewhat                                     | 18% (61)                     |           | 24% (102)                     |              |                  |

Those clients who reported the hotline advice was helpful or somewhat helpful were then asked how the advice helped. This question was designed to gain insight to which aspects of the service clients found most useful and were perhaps not usually considered a benefit of the telephone legal service. These include understanding of a legal situation, relief of anxiety, and understanding that a problem has no solution. Almost half (47%) checked that the advice answered the legal question. 43% noted that they understood their situation better. 29% reported having an idea of how to solve their problem, while 22% reported using it to solve their problem. Fully 37% reported some relief of anxiety after receiving the advice. Again, these results were very similar to the 2000 survey. There were no significant differences across sites.

The instant survey did not ask those clients who reported the advice was unhelpful to select the reasons why the advice did not help. The design team decided to eliminate this question because the number of respondents in the ‘unhelpful’ category was very small in the 2000 survey. Each possible reason for ‘unhelpfulness’ yielded

only a handful of responses. Therefore, the question was jettisoned to save space on the survey form which the design team limited to one page front and back.

**Table 11. Reasons Why Advice Was Helpful**

| <b>Client Assessment of Legal Advice by Site</b> |                   |                      |                 |              |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
|  | <b>California</b> | <b>New Hampshire</b> | <b>Maryland</b> | <b>Total</b> |
| If helpful/somewhat helpful, how advice helped:  |                   |                      |                 |              |
| • It answered my question                        | 45% (315)         | 49% (113)            | 50% (47)        | 47% (475)    |
| • I understand my situation better               | 44% (306)         | 42% (97)             | 40% (38)        | 43% (441)    |
| • I have an idea of how to solve my problem      | 30% (206)         | 25% (59)             | 30% (28)        | 29% (293)    |
| • Some of my anxiety was relieved                | 35% (243)         | 38% (89)             | 43% (40)        | 37% (372)    |
| • I used it to solve my problem                  | 22% (150)         | 22% (51)             | 23% (22)        | 22% (223)    |
| • I now understand my problem cannot be solved   | 5% (35)           | 6% (13)              | 3% (3)          | 5% (51)      |
| • Other  | 7% (46)           | 6% (14)              | 4% (4)          | 6% (64)      |

**Legal Matters:**

In the instant survey, the hotline advocate coded the survey with a casetype from one of 6 broad categories plus an “other” category. As a result, all 1,294 responses contained a casetype. The hotline advocate had a coding sheet which described which legal matters were to be included in each broad casetype. These are set forth below. The subject matter of hotline calls was similar across sites. However, New Hampshire respondents were more likely to have a health casetype question or problem than callers in the other states. The consumer casetype was the most frequent in California (30%) and New Hampshire (23%). In Maryland, the Wills/Estates casetype was the most frequent among respondents (26%). The Will/Estates casetype contains some high priority matters such as joint ownership and advance directives.

The casetype data is not directly comparable to that of the 2000 study because in the first study respondents were asked to self-identify which kind of legal matter they called about and only four topics plus “other” were listed. The 2000 respondents did not have “Family” or “Social Security” as a choice. In the 2000 survey, the design

team decided to identify only the four most popular categories and the Family casetype historically comprised only 7-8% of senior hotline calls while the Social Security/Public Benefits casetype comprised only 2-4%, and were not among the top four caseypes. 5 Similarly, these two casetypes comprised only 10% of responses in the 2002 survey. Respondents with the Wills/Estates category decreased somewhat from the 2000 study while surveys coded “Consumer” in 2002 showed an increase from 19% in 2000 to 27% in 2002. We cannot say whether this was due to an actual increase in consumer problems or resulted from the difference between client self-identifying or hotline coding of the subject matter, or some other factor.

**Casetype descriptions for coding by hotline advocates:**

- Wills/Estates (includes wills, powers of attorney, guardianships, trusts, joint ownership, probate, advance directives including health care)
- Consumer (includes debts, loans, credit cards, problems with products or services, bankruptcy)
- Health (includes Medicare, Medicaid, private insurance, nursing homes)
- Housing (includes landlord/tenant, real estate, mortgages, condos, utilities)
- Family (includes divorce, alimony, child support, custody, visitation of children and grandchildren)
- Social Security (includes disability, retirements, widow(ers), and SSI)
- Other matters

**Table 12. Casetypes Across Sites**

| Casetype by Site▲ | California (N=856) | New Hampshire (N=294) | Maryland (N=144) | Total (N=1294) | 2000 (N=1003) |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Wills/Estates     | 22% (184)          | 21% (61)              | 26% (37)         | 22% (282)      | 33% (332)     |
| Consumer          | 30% (255)          | 23% (68)              | 20% (29)         | 27% (352)      | 19% (190)     |
| Health            | 8% (71)            | 19% (56)              | 5% (7)           | 10% (134)      | 12% (123)     |
| Housing           | 18% (156)          | 18% (54)              | 16% (23)         | 18% (233)      | 11% (117)     |
| Family            | 8% (72)            | 4% (13)               | 11% (16)         | 8% (101)       | Not asked     |
| Social Security   | 2% (19)            | 2% (6)                | 3% (4)           | 2% (29)        | Not asked     |
| Other             | 12% (99)           | 12% (36)              | 19% (28)         | 13% (163)      | 23% (241)     |

5 See Senior Legal Hotline Annual Reports <http://www.legalhotlines.org>.

These reports contain an analysis of casetypes from 16 or more of the senior hotlines.

## C. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES

### **Recommended Actions:**

A total of 1,161 clients responded to the question “Did we suggest you take any action to solve your legal problem?” Almost half were not advised to take any follow up action. This appears to track with a similar percentage of respondents (45%) who stated

the reason for their call was to get information or advice on a legal question. Across all sites, 45% of the respondents indicated they were told to take a follow up measure while 8% of respondents did not know whether the hotline suggested follow-up action. There were no significant differences across sites for the number of respondents reporting being advised to take a follow-up action. The figures were also substantially similar to the 2000 survey.

**Table 13: Respondents Who Reported Being Advised to Take Follow-up Action.**

| Follow-up Suggested | CA         | NH         | MD         | Total       | Total 2000 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Yes                 | 45% (347)  | 46% (119)  | 42% (53)   | 45% (519)   | 43% (380)  |
| No                  | 47% (366)  | 46% (117)  | 49% (61)   | 47% (544)   | 50% (442)  |
| Don't know          | 9% (66)    | 8% (21)    | 9% (11)    | 8% (98)     | 7% (58)    |
| Total               | 100% (799) | 100% (257) | 100% (125) | 100% (1161) | 100% (880) |

### **Actions Taken:**

Although legal hotlines typically keep records of the type of service rendered and the nature of the advice given, they do not have the resources to routinely re-contact clients to determine if they followed any advice given or what outcomes clients may have achieved. Collecting an overview of follow-up information was a major goal of the earlier survey and the instant survey sought to evaluate whether the encouraging results, showing a follow-up rate of over 80% for senior hotline respondents in the 2000 survey, would hold up to re-testing. The results of the present survey show that

respondents at the senior hotlines again reported taking follow action at rates greater than 80%.

Of the 519 respondents who reported being advised to take action, 487 reported whether they had taken action or not. Of these 487, 85% (413) reporting taking the advised action. 12% did not take the action and 3% don't know. There were no significant differences across sites. Findings from 2000 were duplicated. The rate of follow-up by respondents may be higher than those for non-responding clients on the theory that those clients who fill out and send back a survey are also more likely to take follow-up action. Such a determination is beyond of the scope of this study.

**Table 14: Respondents Reporting Whether They Took Follow-up Action Upon Advice**

| Took Action | CA         | NH         | MD        | Total      | Total 2000 |
|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Yes         | 84% (272)  | 87% (97)   | 86% (44)  | 85% (413)  | 82% (294)  |
| No          | 14% (45)   | 0% (11)    | 8% (4)    | 12% (60)   | 17% (60)   |
| Don't Know  | 2% (7)     | 4% (4)     | 6% (3)    | 3% (14)    | 1% (4)     |
| Total       | 100% (324) | 100% (112) | 100% (51) | 100% (487) | 100% (358) |

**Types of Actions Taken**

The clients who reported taking a follow-up action based on advice from the hotline advocate were then asked to select what type of action they took. Clients were asked to select all responses that applied to them. Clients were given the following list of actions and could check all that applied:

- I made a phone call to try to resolve the matter
- I wrote a letter
- I contacted the agency the hotline referred me to for help
- I prepared legal papers or forms
- I asked for a court or agency hearing
- I hired an attorney
- I was assigned a free attorney
- Other

One third of respondents reported making a phone call or writing a letter. There were some statistical differences across sites as to the type of action respondents reported taking. Respondents in Maryland were more likely to ask for a court or agency hearing and be assigned a free lawyer than in California or New Hampshire. Since Maryland respondents were poorer than those in the other two states, it is possible that they were eligible for free extended services from the low-income legal aid program at

higher rates.

Again the results of the 2000 survey were substantially duplicated. In the more recent survey, however, 30% reported preparing legal papers or forms compared to 14% who reported preparing papers in the earlier survey. The increase in reported document preparation presents the intriguing question of whether the increase might be due to the expansion, in the intervening years, of the hotline advocate's ability to access documents over the internet or on their program software to assist the client quickly with their document needs. The study did not investigate this factor.

**Table 15: Client Follow-up Actions (Select all that apply-does not equal 100%)**

|  | <b>California</b> | <b>New Hampshire</b> | <b>Maryland</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Total 2000</b> |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|
| If yes, what action did you take:                      |                   |                      |                 |              |                   |
| • Made a phone call to try to resolve the matter ▲     | 35% (95)          | 22% (21)             | 32% (14)        | 32% (130)    | 38% (111)         |
| • Wrote a letter                                       | 36% (99)          | 31% (30)             | 27% (12)        | 34% (141)    | 32% (95)          |
| • Contacted the agency hotline referred me to for help | 21% (57)          | 16% (15)             | 23% (10)        | 20% (82)     | 24% (71)          |
| • Prepared legal papers or forms                       | 34% (91)          | 24% (23)             | 25% (11)        | 30% (125)    | 14% (41)          |
| • Asked for a court or agency hearing ▲                | 7% (19)           | 6% (6)               | 18% (8)         | 8% (33)      | 8% (22)           |
| • Hired an attorney                                    | 10% (26)          | 18% (17)             | 11% (5)         | 12% (48)     | 15% (45)          |
| • Was assigned a free lawyer ▲                         | 7% (19)           | 18% (17)             | 32% (14)        | 12% (50)     | 6% (17)           |
| • Other  | 9% (25)           | 12% (12)             | 0               | 9% (37)      | 16% (48)          |

**Outcomes:**

Gathering data on the status of clients' problems was one of the main objectives of the study. In the 2000 survey, 43% of respondents taking a follow-up were still waiting for the results of the action 1-2 months after the hotline call. The subsequent survey sought to determine if respondents had achieved a higher resolution rate after more time had passed between the hotline consultation(s) and the survey time. Hotlines sent the surveys out no earlier than two months after closing the case and not more than three months later.

Of the 487 respondents who answered that they had taken a follow up action, 402 reported an outcome. More than half (57%), reported a favorable outcome. That is, 41% reported their problem was completely resolved by taking the recommended

action and another 16% had achieved a partial resolution. Only 30% of the year 2002 respondents were still waiting for results compared to 43% of year 2000 clients. 12% of 2002 clients reported that the action did not resolve the problem while 9% of the year 2000 clients did so, indicating that the higher total resolution rate in the new study clustered in the favorable rather than unfavorable outcome categories.

**Table 16: Results of Client Follow-Up Actions and Wait Times**

| Outcome▲            | CA         | NH         | MD        | Total      | Total 2000 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Completely Resolved | 38% (99)   | 47% (45)   | 49% (21)  | 41% (165)  | 33% (93)   |
| Partially Resolved  | 19% (51)   | 12% (11)   | 9% (4)    | 16% (66)   | 15% (43)   |
| Still Waiting       | 27% (72)   | 34% (33)   | 37% (16)  | 30% (121)  | 43% (123)  |
| Did Not Resolve     | 16% (41)   | 7% (7)     | 5% (2)    | 12% (50)   | 9% (25)    |
| Total               | 100% (263) | 100% (105) | 100% (43) | 100% (402) | 100% (284) |

| If still waiting for results of action, how long has it been since you took action: ▲ | CA       | NH       | MD       | Total    |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| • One month or less   | 26% (18) | 29% (9)  | 63% (10) | 32% (37) |
| • Between one and two months  | 57% (40) | 65% (20) | 19% (3)  | 54% (63) |
| • Not sure  | 17% (12) | 7% (2)   | 19% (3)  | 15% (17) |

**Inaction**

Of the 487 people who reported whether they had taken an action, only 60 (12%) reported that they didn't take the follow up action. Of those, 59 gave a reason for not taking action. The most frequent reason given (35%) was that they still plan on taking the action. Cost was the second most frequent reason given (23%) for not taking action. The numbers were too small to note any meaningful differences across sites or to compare with the numbers from 2000 where only 13 people reported why they had not taking action.

**Table 17: Reason for not taking action**

|  | <b>California</b> | <b>New Hampshire</b> | <b>Maryland</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| If did not take action, reason why not:            |                   |                      |                 |              |
| • Did not understand or forgot what to do          | 0                 | 0                    | 0               | 0            |
| • Was too hard to do what Hotline advised          | 2% (1)            | 0                    | 0               | 2% (1)       |
| • Was too expensive                                | 24% (11)          | 18% (2)              | 25% (1)         | 23% (14)     |
| • Haven't taken action yet but still plan to do so | 33% (15)          | 27% (3)              | 75% (3)         | 35% (21)     |
| • Did not seem worth the effort                    | 11% (5)           | 18% (2)              | 0               | 12% (7)      |
| • Problem was resolved without taking any action   | 20% (9)           | 0                    | 25% (1)         | 17% (10)     |
| • Other  | 7% (3)            | 27% (3)              | 0               | 10% (6)      |

**Satisfaction**

1,199 of the total 1,294 respondents indicated whether they would call the hotline again. An overwhelming majority (84%) would call the legal hotline again if they had another legal questions or problem. There were no differences across sites and the figures were virtually identical to the year 2000 survey results.

**Table 18. Would you call the hotline again for another legal question or problem?**

| Would you call the Hotline again if you had another legal question or problem: | <b>CA</b>  | <b>NH</b>  | <b>MD</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>2000 Total</b> |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|
| • Yes  | 84% (662)  | 84% (232)  | 84% (111) | 84% (1005)   | 83% (812)         |
| • No   | 6% (47)    | 5% (14)    | 8% (11)   | 6% (72)      | 6% (62)           |
| • Don't know   | 10% (82)   | 11% (30)   | 8% (10)   | 10% (122)    | 10% (100)         |
| • Total  | 100% (791) | 100% (276) | 100% 132  | 100% (1199)  | 100% (974)        |

### **D. Comparison of Client/Advocate/Casetype Characteristics : Affect on Follow-Up and Outcomes**

This section of the study sought to investigate correlations between certain client, hotline advocate, and casetype characteristics and their impact on whether clients took action and the results obtained.

#### **Client Characteristics/Advocate Characteristics**

Respondents' gender, age, household income, and whether they had access to the internet was compared with whether the client was one of the 411 who reported taking action or the 60 who reported not taking action. No significant differences were noted in the group that took action vs. the group that didn't take action, with regard to any of these factors. That is, the group that took action had similar proportions of males, ages, and incomes, as the group that did not take action. About 40% of respondents in both the action and no action groups were served by an attorney while about 60% of each group had been served by a paralegal. Likewise, no significant differences were noted in the number reporting they would call the hotline again- 93% of the action group and 87% of the no action group would call again.

**Table 19. Selected Client Characteristics by whether client took action**

| <b>Selected Case/Client Characteristics by whether client took action that the Hotline suggested</b> |                                     |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Of those who responded to Question 10- did you<br>Take any action:                                   | <b>Yes, took action<br/>(N=411)</b> | <b>No, did not<br/>take action<br/>(N=60)</b> |
| Sex  |                                     |   |
| • Male   | 29% (121)                           | 35% (21)                                      |
| • Female   | 71% (290)                           | 65% (39)                                      |
| Age  |                                     |   |
| • Under 60   | 1% (4)                              | 2% (1)  |
| • 60-70  | 45% (184)                           | 37% (22)                                      |
| • 71-80  | 35% (143)                           | 45% (27)                                      |
| • 81-90  | 16% (65)                            | 15% (9)                                       |
| • Over 90  | 4% (15)                             | 2% (1)  |
| Yearly household income:   |                                     |   |
| • \$12,000 or less   | 46% (162)                           | 46% (25)                                      |
| • Between \$12,000-\$20,000  | 30% (104)                           | 30% (16)                                      |
| • Between \$20,000-\$40,000  | 16% (58)                            | 22% (12)                                      |
| • Over \$40,000  | 8% (29)                             | 2% (1)  |
| Call handled by:   | <b>Yes-took action<br/>(N= 411)</b> | <b>No- did not<br/>take action<br/>(N=60)</b> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attorney</li> <li>• Paralegal/law student</li> </ul>  | 43% (116)<br>57% (155)                         | 40% (21)<br>60% (31)  |
| Result of action taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem was completely resolved</li> <li>• Problem was partially resolved</li> <li>• Still waiting for the results of action</li> <li>• Action did not resolve problem</li> </ul>   | 41% (163)<br>17% (66)<br>30% (121)<br>13% (50) | NA  |
| Of those where an action was recommended, reason why client did not take action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not understand or forgot what to do</li> <li>• Was too hard to do what Hotline advised</li> <li>• Was too expensive</li> <li>• Haven't taken action yet but still plan to do so</li> <li>• Did not seem worth the effort</li> <li>• Problem was resolved without taking any action</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul> | Yes-took action<br><br>NA                      | No-did not<br><br>0<br>2% (1)<br>23% (14)<br>35% (21)<br>12% (7)<br><br>17% (10)<br>10% (6) |
| Would you call the Hotline again: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>  | 93% (378)<br>3% (11)<br>5% (19)                | 87% (52)<br>5% (3)<br>8% (5)  |

As noted previously, of the 406 people reporting having internet access and the 847 people reporting no access, females, older clients and clients with income less than \$12,000 per year are less likely to have internet access. However, in the analysis of whether clients with internet access had taken action and the outcomes of their actions, there were no significant differences noted between the internet and no internet groups. Over 80% of both groups reporting taking action; over half of each group reported a favorable outcome; about 30% of each group was still waiting for results, and about 15% of each group reported their problem was not resolved. About 85% of both groups would call again.

**Table 20. Internet Access Compared with Client Characteristics, Action and Outcomes**

| <b>Selected Client Characteristics and Case Outcomes by Client Access to the Internet</b>   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <b>Has Internet Access<br/>(N=406)</b>                  | <b>Does not have Internet<br/>Access (N=847)</b>          |
| Sex▲<br>• Male<br>• Female  | 39% (156)<br>62% (250)                                  | 25% (215)<br>75% (632)                                    |
| Age▲<br>Under 60<br>• 60-70<br>• 71-80<br>• 81-90<br>• Over 90  | 1% (4)<br>50% (202)<br>28% (115)<br>18% (72)<br>3% (13) | .8% (7)<br>41% (343)<br>41% (348)<br>15% (128)<br>3% (21) |
| Yearly household income▲:<br>• \$12,000 or less<br>• Between \$12,000-\$20,000<br>• Between \$20,000-\$40,000<br>• Over \$40,000  | 30% (97)<br>27% (89)<br>26% (87)<br>17% (56)            | 49% (347)<br>33% (236)<br>15% (107)<br>3% (23)            |
| Of those who answered Q 10, based on the Hotlines advice, did you take action?<br>• Yes<br>• No<br>• Don't know   | 87% (145)<br>11% (18)<br>3% (3)                         | 83% (259)<br>13% (41)<br>4% (11)                          |
| For those who took an action, result of action taken:<br>• Problem was completely resolved<br>• Problem was partially resolved<br>• Still waiting for the results of action<br>• Action did not resolve problem | 42% (64)<br>15% (23)<br>28% (43)<br>15% (23)            | 36% (106)<br>18% (52)<br>33% (95)<br>13% (39)             |
|   |   |   |
|   | <b>Has Internet</b>                                     | <b>Does Not have Internet</b>                             |
| Of those where an action  |   |   |

|   |           |           |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| was recommended, reason why client did not take action: |           |           |
| • Did not understand or forgot what to do               | 0         | 0         |
| • Was too hard to do what Hotline advised               | 0         | 2% (1)    |
| • Was too expensive                                     | 22% (4)   | 24% (10)  |
| • Haven't taken action yet but still plan to do so      | 33% (6)   | 37% (15)  |
| • Did not seem worth the effort                         | 17% (3)   | 7% (3)    |
| • Problem was resolved without taking any action        | 17% (3)   | 17% (7)   |
| • Other   | 11% (2)   | 10% (4)   |
| Would you call the Hotline again:                       |           |           |
| • Yes   | 85% (329) | 84% (658) |
| • No  | 6% (23)   | 6% (47)   |
| • Don't know  | 9% (34)   | 11% (83)  |

### **Hotline Advocate Affect on Action and Outcomes**

One of the objects of the survey was to get insight into whether advice rendered by an attorney vs. a paralegal had an effect on whether the client followed the advice and results achieved. Of the three hotlines in the study, only the California hotline uses paralegals. The CA hotline non-attorney calls were mostly handled by three experienced full-time paralegals, and two part time paralegals, one of whom is very experienced. Some volunteer paralegals with different levels of experience and two summer law students also handled some calls in the paralegal category. No significant differences were found in the responses from clients who were served by a paralegal or attorney. Both groups of clients reported taking action at the same rate (over 80%). Respondents whose matter had been handled by an attorney reported a somewhat higher complete resolution rate for their problem but the difference had no statistical significance.

**Table 21. Advocate Type Affect on Action and Outcome**

| California Advocate Type                        | Attorney<br>(Total 134) | Paralegal<br>(Total 182) |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Based in the hotline advice did you take action |                         |                          |
| • Yes   | 85% (116)               | 83% (155)                |
| • No  | 13% (18)                | 15% (27)                 |
| Result of Action Taken:                         | (Total 110)             | (Total 152)              |
| • Problem was completely resolved               | 45% (49)                | 33% (50)                 |
| • Problem was partially resolved                | 16% (17)                | 22% (34)                 |
| • Still waiting for results of action           | 23% (25)                | 31% (47)                 |
| • Action did not resolve problem                | 17% (19)                | 14% (21)                 |
| Would you call the hotline again?               | (Total 360)             | (Total 427)              |
| • Yes   | 84% (301)               | 84% (358)                |
| • No  | 6% (20)                 | 6% (27)                  |
| • Don't know                                    | 11% (39)                | 10% (42)                 |

**Client Characteristics and Outcome**

An analysis was performed seeking correlations between client gender, age, income and the results obtained. For the 400 respondents who reported their outcomes after taking action, no significant differences were noted. That is, in each of the four outcome categories (resolved, partially resolved, still waiting, unresolved) about 30% of the respondents were male, similar proportions were in each age category breakdown, close to half of the respondents in each resolution group had incomes of \$12,000 or less; a small minority in each of the resolution groups had incomes over \$40,000. The only significant difference found in this correlation was that clients who took action and ended up with no problem resolution were (understandably) less likely to call the hotline again (74%) than the other three outcome category respondents (over 90%)

**Table 22. Client Characteristics and Outcomes of Action**

| <b>Selected responses of clients by Outcome of Action Taken<br/>(in cases where an action was recommended)</b> |   |                                       |   |                                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Of those who responded that they took recommended action   | Problem was completely resolved (N=163) | Problem was partially resolved (N=66) | Still waiting for the results of action (N=121) | Action did not resolve problem (N=50) |
| Sex  |   |                                       |   |                                       |
| • Male   | 32% (51)                                | 30% (20)                              | 26% (31)  | 30% (15)                              |
| • Female   | 69%(112)                                | 70% (46)                              | 74% (90)  | 70% (35)                              |
| Of those who responded that they took recommended action   | Problem was completely resolved (N=163) | Problem was partially resolved (N=66) | Still waiting for the results of action (N=121) | Action did not resolve problem (N=50) |
| Age  |   |                                       |   |                                       |
| • Under 60   | 0                                       | 2% (2)                                | .8% (1)   | 4% (2)                                |
| • 60-70  | 45% (74)                                | 52% (34)                              | 44% (53)  | 34% (17)                              |
| • 71-80  | 33% (54)                                | 29% (19)                              | 39% (47)  | 42% (21)                              |
| • 81-90  | 17% (28)                                | 15% (10)                              | 12% (15)  | 18% (9)                               |
| • Over 90  | 4% (7)                                  | 3% (2)                                | 4% (5)  | 2% (1)                                |
| Yearly household income:   |   |                                       |   |                                       |
| • \$12,000 or less   | 42% (57)                                | 58% (32)                              | 44% (48)  | 50% (22)                              |
| • Between \$12,000-\$20,000  | 35% (47)                                | 16% (9)                               | 30% (33)  | 27% (12)                              |
| • Between \$20,000-\$40,000  | 12% (16)                                | 20% (11)                              | 18% (20)  | 18% (8)                               |
| • Over \$40,000  | 12% (16)                                | 6% (3)                                | 7% (8)  | 5% (2)                                |
| Would you call the Hotline again▲:   |   |                                       |   |                                       |
| • Yes  | 98% (159)                               | 96% (63)                              | 93% (112)                                       | 74% (36)                              |
| • No   | 1% (2)                                  | 0                                     | 3% (4)  | 8% (4)                                |
| • Don't know   | .6% (1)                                 | 5% (3)                                | 4% (5)  | 18% (9)                               |

**Casetypes and Outcomes**

An analysis was done comparing casetypes with the reason the client called, the helpfulness of advice, whether hotlines suggested follow-up action and the outcomes achieved. All respondents who indicated an outcome were included in this tabulation. Unlike the client and hotline advocate characteristics noted above, the casetype prompting the hotline call did reveal some differences with possible implications for service delivery management.

Of the 1,235 surveys where clients gave a reason for calling the hotline, callers

with the Family casetype were more likely to want an answer to a legal question than other callers. Callers with a Health/Social Security issue were more likely to want help to solve a legal problem.

Of those answering whether the advice was helpful, callers in the Wills/Estates casetype were more likely to find the advice helpful (77%) than those with the Family casetype (55%).

There was no difference among the casetypes with regard to the percentage of respondents reporting taking action. All casetypes had a “took action” rate over 80%. However, of those that took action, the Wills/Casetype had a much higher complete resolution rate (60%) than any of the other casetypes with Family having the lowest (21%). However, it is important to keep in mind that the number of total respondents with the Family casetype was only 8%. The Family casetype also had a higher proportion of respondents still waiting for results (50%) than the other casetypes. The “Other” category had the highest proportion of unresolved cases (29%).

Figures for the respondents who didn’t take action are too small to make meaningful comparisons among casetypes, and thus an analysis is not presented.

Casetype and outcome comparisons were performed for the year 2000 survey but comparison to this year’s survey is difficult because the Family casetype was not included as a category in the earlier study.<sup>6</sup> In the 2000 survey, Wills/Estates also had the highest complete resolution rate.

**Table 23. Casetypes, reasons for contact, helpful advice, actions and outcomes**

| Selected Case Characteristics and Outcomes by Case Type       |                                       |                             |  |                            |                          |                          |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | <b>Wills/<br/>Estates<br/>(N=272)</b> | <b>Consumer<br/>(N=332)</b> | <b>Health/<br/>Social<br/>Security<br/>(N=159)</b> | <b>Housing<br/>(N=220)</b> | <b>Family<br/>(N=95)</b> | <b>Other<br/>(N=157)</b> |
| Reason contacted the Hotline▲                                 |                                       |                             |  |                            |                          |                          |
| • Wanted an answer to a legal question                        | 30% (81)                              | 36% (119)                   | 28% (45)   | 40% (87)                   | 43% (41)                 | 41% (65)                 |
| • Wanted advice about how to solve a legal problem            | 14% (38)                              | 13% (42)                    | 12% (19)   | 13% (28)                   | 16% (15)                 | 13% (20)                 |
| • Wanted help to solve a legal problem                        | 32% (88)                              | 25% (84)                    | 37% (58)   | 26% (56)                   | 17% (16)                 | 29% (45)                 |
| • Wanted a legal document or form                             | 7% (20)                               | 5% (17)                     | 8% (13)  | 5% (11)                    | 11% (10)                 | 4% (6)                   |
| • Wanted an attorney to handle a matter until it was resolved | 7% (2)                                | 2% (7)                      | 0  | 5% (1)                     | 1% (1)                   | 6% (1)                   |
| • Other   | 16% (43)                              | 19% (63)                    | 15% (24)   | 17% (37)                   | 13% (12)                 | 13% (20)                 |
| Of those where the hotline provided advice, was it            | <b>Wills/<br/>Estates</b>             | <b>Consumer</b>             | <b>Health/<br/>Social</b>                          | <b>Housing</b>             | <b>Family</b>            | <b>Other</b>             |

<sup>6</sup> See *Senior Legal Hotline Outcomes Study 2000*, <http://www.legalhotlines.org>

|   |  |   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| helpful ▲:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Somewhat</li> </ul>   | 77% (191)<br>9% (21)<br>15% (36)   | 69% (219)<br>11% (35)<br>20% (62)   | <b>Security</b><br>74% (112)<br>8% (12)<br>18% (27)                      | 67% (142)<br>10% (22)<br>23% (48)   | 55% (46)<br>26% (22)<br>21% (18)                             | 53% (78)<br>20% (29)<br>28% (41)  |
| Did the Hotline suggest you take any action ▲:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>   | 46% (116)<br>48% (121)<br>6% (15)  | 54% (170)<br>35% (110)<br>11% (34)  | 43% (61)<br>50% (71)<br>8% (11)  | 40% (86)<br>51% (109)<br>9% (20)  | 39% (36)<br>56% (52)<br>5% (5)                               | 35% (50)<br>56% (81)<br>9% (13)   |
| Based on the Hotlines advice, did you take action:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>   | 84% (92)<br>13% (14)<br>4% (4)   | 86% (133)<br>12% (18)<br>3% (4)   | 88% (52)<br>9% (5)<br>3% (2)   | 84% (68)<br>15% (12)<br>1% (1)  | 88% (29)<br>12% (4)<br>0                                     | 80% (39)<br>14% (7)<br>6% (3)   |
| Of those that took an action, result of action taken ▲:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem was completely resolved</li> <li>• Problem was partially resolved</li> <li>• Still waiting for the results of action</li> <li>• Action did not resolve problem</li> </ul>   | 60% (53)<br>9% (8)<br>23% (20)<br>8% (7)   | 38% (49)<br>15% (20)<br>34% (44)<br>13% (17)                              | 44% (23)<br>14% (7)<br>33% (17)<br>10% (5)                               | 33% (22)<br>35% (23)<br>23% (15)<br>9% (6)  | 21% (6)<br>11% (3)<br>50% (14)<br>18% (5)                    | 32% (12)<br>13% (5)<br>29% (11)<br>26% (10)                             |
| If still waiting for the results of action, how long has it been:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One month or less</li> <li>• Between one and two months</li> <li>• Not sure</li> </ul>  | 28% (5)<br>67% (12)<br>6% (1)  | 32% (14)<br>50% (22)<br>18% (8)   | 19% (3)<br>56% (9)<br>25% (4)  | 50% (7)<br>36% (5)<br>14% (2)   | 43% (6)<br>50% (7)<br>7% (1)                                 | 18% (2)<br>73% (8)<br>9% (1)  |
| Of those where an action was recommended, reason why client did not take action:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not understand or forgot what to do</li> <li>• Too hard to do what was advised</li> <li>• Too expensive to do what advised</li> <li>• Have not taken the action yet but still plan to do so</li> <li>• Did not seem worth the effort</li> <li>• Problem was resolved without taking any action</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul> | <b>Wills/<br/>Estates</b><br>0<br>0<br>14% (2)<br>36% (5)<br>14% (2)<br>29% (4)<br>0 | <b>Consumer</b><br>0<br>0<br>28% (5)<br>50% (9)<br>6% (1)<br>0<br>11% (2) | <b>Health/<br/>Social</b><br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>60% (3)<br>20% (1)<br>0 | <b>Housing</b><br>0<br>8% (1)<br>50% (6)<br>25% (3)<br>8% (1)<br>8% (1)<br>8% (1) | <b>Family</b><br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>25% (1)<br>50% (2) | <b>Other</b><br>0<br>0<br>14% (1)<br>57% (4)<br>0<br>43% (3)<br>14% (1) |

|                                   |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Would you call the Hotline again: |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| • Yes                             | 85% (223) | 84% (278) | 90% (136) | 85% (183) | 76% (66)  | 78% (119) |
| • No                              | 6% (15)   | 6% (19)   | 3% (4)    | 6% (13)   | 9% (8)    | 9% (13)   |
| • Don't know                      | 9% (23)   | 10% (34)  | 7% (11)   | 9% (20)   | 15% (13)  | 14% (21)  |
| Totals 2000 Survey                | (173)     | (142)     | (75)      | (74)      | Not Asked | (138)     |
| • Completely Resolved             | 46% (79)  | 20% (29)  | 35% (26)  | 27% (20)  |           | 32% (193) |
| • Partially Resolved              | 19% (32)  | 12% (13)  | 20% (15)  | 14% (10)  |           | 16% (94)  |
| • Still Waiting                   | 24% (42)  | 48% (25)  | 33% (25)  | 34% (25)  |           | 37% (222) |
| • Action did not resolve problem  | 12% (20)  | 15% (8)   | 12% (9)   | 26% (19)  |           | 15% (93)  |

## ***V. Comparison with Project for the Future of Equal Justice Hotlines Outcome Study 2002***

The Project for Future of Equal Justice Hotlines Outcomes Assessment Study<sup>7</sup> was completed in November 2002. It involved determining client outcomes at five participating hotlines. It was a more comprehensive, well-funded scientific study than the senior hotlines studies. The senior study made the most of a miniscule budget. The PFEJ study was based on a random sampling and overcame the principal weakness of the mailed surveys where the analysis was based on clients who chose to return their survey. Another important difference between the studies is that the PFEJ study eliminated clients whose cases were sent to the full-service program or who had been assigned a free attorney. In contrast, all senior hotline clients were sent surveys and those who had been assigned a free attorney were included. The inclusion of these cases in the results was more likely to increase the number of respondents who found the hotline helpful and had a favorable outcome.

The survey methodology, definition of categories for analysis, client demographics and casetypes were also different and make it impossible to directly compare outcomes for the senior and low income hotlines. All comparisons reflect only

<sup>7</sup> Read the complete study at [www.nlada](http://www.nlada) or [www.legalhotlines.org](http://www.legalhotlines.org)

broad general impressions. Nevertheless, the PFEJ survey and the two senior hotline outcomes studies detailed in this report are almost certain to be the only cross-site research ever to be performed on these issues. It is imperative, therefore, that we come to some conclusions about hotline outcomes and use the studies as a guide to refining hotline in the future.

### **Similarities in Results**

The PFEJ survey and the senior hotlines survey results had several important similarities.

- A large majority of clients in both studies rated their hotline experience favorably, although respondents from the senior survey rated their consultation as helpful or somewhat helpful at higher rates than those in the PFEJ survey (88% vs.69%).
- A substantial minority of cases in both studies were still pending (19% for PFEJ) (30% for seniors).
- Both groups of clients perceived important benefits from the hotline service apart from the outcome of their case. These included understanding their problem or situation (over 40% in each group), having their question answered (47% of seniors), and being able to make better decisions (2/3 of PFEJ clients).
- Callers who followed the hotline advice in both studies were usually successful. Only 6% of PFEJ clients who followed the advice were unsuccessful as determined by the reviewing attorneys. Only 12% of the self-identifying senior respondents reported the action they took did not resolve the problem.
- Clients with the Family casetype had the poorest resolution rates and the highest still pending rates in both studies.

### **Differences in Results**

The most notable differences in results between the PJEJ and senior hotline surveys is that senior hotline clients report following the advice and achieving a favorable outcome at somewhat higher rates than the PJEJ clients.

- Senior clients were much more likely (45%) to report that they needed only an answer to a legal question than PFEJ clients (21%). For these clients, the hotline consultation was very likely to result in a favorable outcome since they usually got what they wanted within the context of the phone consultation. However, these cases were not counted in the senior hotline outcome results.
- 85% of the senior respondents advised to follow up reported doing so while only 39% of the PFEJ who should have taken action were judged by PFEJ to

have acted on hotline advice. 27% of PFEJ clients were judged not to have acted because of a variety of factors, including failure to understand the advice, lack of time or fear of action., while 12% of the senior respondents reported failure to take action

- PFEJ clients acted and got favorable results in 31% of reviewed cases, while 57% senior respondents reported a positive outcome. That includes the 12% of senior respondents who report being assigned a free attorney.

### **Conclusions on Comparisons**

Although it might seem possible to conclude that the senior hotlines are more successful at explaining follow-up actions, getting clients to take action, and achieving more positive outcomes than the low-income hotlines, most of the differences in findings, apart from the survey structures, can likely be explained in the different client demographics and casetypes in the two populations.

The PFEJ outcomes study was much more detailed and was done by telephone. The typical client interviewed by the PFEJ was a middle-aged, English-speaking female, single parent with at least one minor-aged child. Average income was 101% of FPL. Over 70% of clients in both studies were female. The senior callers likewise tended to be low-income but a substantial proportion was above the poverty level. Although these factors were not surveyed, the senior callers were logically much more likely to have a stable income from Social Security or SSI, access to medical care in the form of Medicare or Medicaid, a stable housing situation, no minor children to support, and are much less likely to be employed full time. They are not likely to have problems such as divorce and custody requiring immediate action. They are more likely to have the time to take those actions advised by the hotline to solve their problem.

An even greater impact on results most likely stems from the casetypes about which the two populations contact the hotline. Respondents in the senior surveys report calling for just an answer to a legal question at a much higher rate than the clients in the PFEJ study. (45% vs. 21%). As a result, the hotline model is likely to be a satisfactory method of delivering services to a higher percentage of seniors than other callers.

Equally as important was the disparity in calls about the Family casetype between the two study populations. The PFEJ found favorable hotline outcomes for the Family outcome to be lowest of all. This troublesome casetype had the lowest resolution rate and highest still pending rates in both senior and low-income surveys. However, Family cases represented only 8% of senior hotline clients vs. 39% in the PFEJ study. The Family casetype was twice as common as any other casetype at the low-income hotlines thereby causing greater impact on the low-income outcome results.

Finally, over 20% of senior hotline respondents called about the Wills/Estates casetype. This casetype seems particularly amenable to handling by a hotline with a completely resolved rate of 60% - the highest of any category. However, it is one that was not even handled by the low-income hotlines in the PFEJ study.

Consumer issues were about 20% of casetypes for both populations so

recommendations for practices in this subject area are probably the most applicable to both populations.

## ***VI. Findings and Recommendations***

This portion of the report attempts to sum up the general findings and recommendations that can be inferred from the Senior Hotline outcome surveys. A summary of specific findings from the data analyzed in the Senior Legal Hotline Outcomes Survey is contained on page 5 of this report.

With regard to respondents to the Senior Legal Hotline Outcome Survey:

- Senior hotline client demographics such as age, gender, and income did not affect respondent's decision to follow-up or the outcome achieved
- Senior Legal Hotlines were very successful at answering client questions, explaining legal rights and procedures, and generally helping survey respondents understand their situations
- Senior Legal hotline advocates, whether attorneys or experienced paralegals, were very good at giving valuable advice, which, if followed, resulted in a favorable outcome for the client
- Senior Legal hotlines were mostly successful in getting respondents to follow their advice.
- Legal hotline advice is more successful in certain casetypes, particularly Wills/Estates routinely handled by the senior hotlines

### **Recommendations**

Now that the PFEJ and Senior Hotline outcomes studies have been completed and the results analyzed and debated, it is time to apply the findings to refining the hotline model. Based on these findings, the major innovations hotlines require are findings ways to provide more brief services to clients who are not likely to successfully perform the recommended action and finding ways, within the spectrum of the legal services system, to provide more help to clients who have problems not likely to be resolved by follow-up action but for whom no full services are available.

Some steps hotlines may wish to consider:

- Developing a system for re-contacting certain clients to see if they have performed a follow-up action. These include clients whom the hotline advocate identifies, in his discretion, as likely to need assistance to achieve a successful outcome for an important problem as well as clients that have certain barriers to follow up such as those identified in the PFEJ.<sup>8</sup> Such a system would take into account a hotline's inability to follow-up with everyone as well as the fact that

---

<sup>8</sup> These include non-English speakers, clients with extremely low-income or low-level education, transportation problems and others. *PREJ Final Report at 49,65.*

some problems may be minor enough that it would not be a reasonable use of hotline resources to re-contact the client.

- Instituting a brief services unit to make phone calls, write letters, get information from agencies, assist in filling out forms, and perform other discreet and limited tasks likely to solve the client's problem.<sup>9</sup>
- Undertaking a systemic analysis of casetypes and common client scenarios within each casetype, to determine whether hotline advice and client follow-up is effective for that problem. Both the PFEJ and Senior studies have already identified family law as a casetype the hotline model has not served as successfully as others. As an additional example, one senior hotline recently made the determination that hotline clients with home repair problems were likely to have a favorable outcome when they had not paid in full, while clients who had already paid were unsuccessful in getting a good result. While such a determination is completely expected, it is not one that hotlines have generally considered in an organized fashion
- Planning strategies with funders, legal services providers, courts, law schools, and the private bar to increase service options for those types of problems for which full representation is not presently available but for which hotline advice or brief services is not likely to result in a favorable outcome.

## Appendix

### SENIOR LEGAL HOTLINE CLIENT SURVEY 2002

You recently called our legal hotline for assistance about \_\_\_\_\_.  
AARP Foundation is conducting a survey to determine how helpful the \_\_\_\_\_ Senior Hotline is. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey and return it in the reply envelope enclosed. Your response will help us improve our service. **FOR CONFIDENTIALITY, DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY.** If you still need help with a legal matter, please call our hotline at 1-800----- . Thank you for giving us your valuable help.

Office Use Only

G \_\_\_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_\_ H \_\_\_\_\_  
C \_\_\_\_\_ T \_\_\_\_\_

***Your Yearly Household Income: Please check***  
**\$12,000 or under 450 (43%)**  
**Between \$12-20,000 329 (31%)**  
**Between \$20,000-\$40,000 198 (19%)**  
**Over 40,000 79 (8%)**

#### 1. How did you get in contact with the Senior Legal Hotline?

**438 (36%) I called the number and a Hotline advocate picked up my call.**

**162 (13%) A receptionist picked up my call and transferred me to a Hotline advocate.**

<sup>9</sup> See *LHQ Spring 2002* at 9, and *LHQ Winter 2002* at 1, for descriptions of two types of brief services units at LCE in Washington D.C. and Legal Aid Society of Hawaii.

347 (28%) A receptionist picked up my call and gave me an appointment for a call-back from the advocate.

77 (6%) I left a message on an answering machine.

12 (1%) I sent an email or contacted the Hotline through a website.

199 (16%) Other:

Please describe \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you have access to the Internet? Yes 406 (32%) No 847 (68%)

3. If yes, where do you go online? (*Check one*):

Your home computer 364 (92%) Home of friend or relative 15 (4%)

Library 12 (3%) Community Center 1 (.3%) Other 4 (1%)

4. If you don't have Internet access, do you plan on getting it within the next year?

Yes 83 (11%) No 764 (89%)

5. Do you have access to email? Yes 361 (34%) No \_\_\_\_\_

If you don't have email, do you plan on getting it within the next year? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

6. Why did you contact us? (*Check all that apply*)

581 (45%) I wanted an answer to a legal question.

553 (43%) I wanted advice about how to solve a legal problem.

348 (27%) I wanted help to solve a legal problem.

180 (14%) I wanted help with a legal document or form.

209 (16%) I wanted an attorney to handle a matter until it was resolved.

79 (6%) Other: Please

explain \_\_\_\_\_

7. If we gave you legal advice, did it help? Yes 788 (68%) No 141 (12%)

Somewhat 232 (20%)

8. If the advice helped, describe how? (*Please check all that apply*)

475 (47%) It answered my question.

441 (43%) I understand my situation better.

293 (29%) I have an idea of how to solve my problem.

372 (37%) Some of my anxiety was relieved.

223 (22%) I used it to solve my problem.

51 (5%) I now understand that my problem can't be solved.

64 (6%) Other:

Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

9. Did we suggest that you take any action to solve a legal problem you had?

Yes 519 (45%)

No 544 (47%)

Don't know 98 (8%)

10. Based on our advice, did you take any action? Yes 413 (85%) No 60 (12%)

Don't know 14 (3%)

11. If yes, what did you do? (*Check all that apply*)

130 (32%) I made a phone call to try to resolve the matter.

- 141 (34%) I wrote a letter.
- 82 (20%) I contacted the agency you referred me to for help.
- 125 (30%) I prepared legal papers or forms.
- 33 (8%) I asked for a court or agency hearing.
- 48 (12%) I hired an attorney.
- 50 (12%) I was assigned a free or reduced fee lawyer.
- 37 (9%) Other:  
Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

12. If you took the action we recommended, what was the result? (*Check one*)
- 165 (41%) My problem was completely resolved.
  - 66 (16%) My problem was partially resolved.
  - 121 (30%) I am still waiting for the results of my action.
  - 50 (12%) The action didn't resolve my problem.

13. If you are still waiting for the result, how long has it been since you took the action in Question 11?
- One month or less 37 (32%)    Between one and two months 63 (54%)  
not sure 17 (15%)

14. If you did not take the action recommended by the hotline please check the reason below: (*Check all that apply*)
- 0 I did not understand or forgot what to do.
  - 1 (2%) It was too hard to do what you advised.
  - 14 (23%) It was too expensive to do what you advised.
  - 21 (35%) I haven't taken the action yet but still plan to do so.
  - 7 (12%) It didn't seem worth the effort.
  - 10 (17%) My problem was resolved without taking any action.
  - 6 (10%) Other:  
Please explain \_\_\_\_\_

15. Would you call us again if you had another legal question or problem?
- Yes 1005 (84%)                      No 72 (6%)                      don't know 122 (10%)

Please use the space below to tell us what else we could have done to help. Please also write any other comments you have about our service:

---



---



---



---



---

