

A Working Paper



A Project of the
Annie E. Casey
Foundation

Summary of Research Findings:

Awareness, Use, and Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Among Congressional Staff

Prepared by

The Population Reference Bureau

December 1, 2007

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of UPS, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and communities fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs.

KIDS COUNT, a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is a national and state-by-state effort to track the status of children in the United States. By providing policymakers and citizens with benchmarks of child well-being, KIDS COUNT seeks to enrich local, state, and national discussions concerning ways to secure better futures for all children. At the national level, the principal activity of the initiative is the publication of the annual *KIDS COUNT Data Book*, which uses the best available data to measure the educational, social, economic, and physical well-being of children. The Foundation also funds a nationwide network of state-level KIDS COUNT projects that provide a more detailed community-by-community picture of the condition of children.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

The Annie E. Casey Foundation
701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
www.aecf.org

***Summary of Research Findings:
Awareness, Use, and Perceptions of KIDS COUNT
Among Congressional Staff***

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
Survey and Methodology	4
Findings	6
I. Evaluation of KIDS COUNT	6
Awareness of KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation	6
Awareness of KIDS COUNT Data Book and Website	8
Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Data	8
Use and Impact of KIDS COUNT Data and Program	9
II. Broader Data Issues	11
Satisfaction with Current Data	11
Preferred Geographic Levels	12
Conclusions	13
Appendix 1: Partisan and Ideological Differences	14
Appendix 2: Distribution of Survey Responses	16

Tables

	Page
Table 1: Awareness of Organizations	6
Table 2: Use of Organizations	7
Table 3: Attributes of KIDS COUNT	8
Table 4: Most Important Attributes of Other Publications and Resources	9
Table 5: Uses of KIDS COUNT Data	10
Table 6: Impact of KIDS COUNT Program	10
Table 7: Satisfaction with Current Data	11
Table 8: Importance of Comparable Data Across Geographies	12
Table 9: Preferred Levels of Geography	12
Table 10: Most Important Attribute by Party	14
Table 11: Importance of Comparable Data by Party and Ideology	15

Summary of Research Findings: Awareness, Use, and Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Among Congressional Staff

Executive Summary

At the request of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Harris Interactive conducted a telephone survey of Congressional Staff members to assess their awareness, use, and perceptions of KIDS COUNT and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. KIDS COUNT is a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation that provides national and state-by-state indicators of child well-being on an annual basis through the national KIDS COUNT Data Book and website. Harris Interactive completed interviews with 151 senior staff members and aides in the spring of 2007. These interviews were balanced by party as well as by chamber and tenure to ensure the sample was broadly representative of congressional offices. Major findings from the study are summarized below¹.

I. KIDS COUNT Program

Awareness of KIDS COUNT

- Among the congressional staff surveyed, just under half (46%) are aware of KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation, while one in five are familiar with the annual KIDS COUNT Data Book and fifteen percent with the KIDS COUNT website.
- Even though staff members may be familiar with particular organizations that compile and disseminate data on children and families, they do not necessarily turn to those organizations for information. Among staff familiar with KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation, more than three-fifths (63%) say they do not use the organization *at all* to obtain information on the status and well-being of children, while only sixteen percent report using it *some* or *a lot*. Usage patterns are similar across other organizations, with only ten to thirty percent of staff reporting using them *some* or *a lot*.
- Of those staff who are aware of the Data Book or the website, more than two in five (44%) read or heard about KIDS COUNT on the Internet, while four in ten (39%) learned about it in a newsletter or other publication. One-third of these staff members became familiar with KIDS COUNT because they received the Data Book.
- Among staff who are currently aware of the KIDS COUNT Data Book or website, two-thirds were not familiar with KIDS COUNT before they began working as a legislative staff member.

¹ Data tabulations and tables for this report were furnished by Harris Interactive, Inc.

Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Data

- Congressional staff who are familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book are generally very satisfied with it. More than three-quarters of these staff think the Data Book is *clear and understandable, credible, relevant to legislators, and useful*. Almost three in four staff (72%) think the Data Book is *timely*, while three-fifths (61%) think it is *respected by people with different political views*.
- Among staff who are not familiar with the Data Book, a majority (52%) indicate that credibility is most important to them in the various publications and resources they use regularly.

Use and Impact of KIDS COUNT Data and Program

- Congressional staff who are familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book and website use the information in a variety of ways. Two-thirds (64%) use it to become *informed about children's needs*, three-fifths (58%) to *do background research on an issue*, and just over two in five (44%) when they are *writing speeches*. More than one-quarter (28%) of staff also use the information *in support of committee or council deliberations or to help craft legislation, policies or programs*.
- Congressional staff have a positive view of the impact of the KIDS COUNT program on both public policy and public awareness of the problems faced by children and families. Among staff familiar with the Data Book and website, just under half say the KIDS COUNT program has a major or moderate impact on public awareness of problems, while just over half say it has a major or moderate impact on public policy.

II. Broader Data Issues

Satisfaction with Current Data

- Although a majority of congressional staff are *very or somewhat* satisfied with the data currently available, there are some differences by geographic level. Satisfaction is highest for federal-level data (72%), followed by state-level data (66%), and then data at the congressional district level (60%).
- Only one-fifth of congressional staff reported that there was important information on children and teens they were unable to find. Of those, two-fifths could not find the information they wanted on education issues, while one-fourth could not find the information they wanted on healthcare issues.

Preferred Geographic Levels

- Having comparable data across different geographies is important to a sizeable majority of congressional staff members. More than four-fifths (85%) say it is important to have comparable measures of the status and well-being of children between states, while more than three-quarters (77%) say it is important to have comparable measures between congressional districts.
- The two levels of geography that are most important to congressional staff are congressional districts and states. More than one-third (34%) indicate they regularly need information on children at the congressional district level, while just under one-third (30%) regularly need it at the state level. Data at the *national* and *city* level are rated as *least important* by staff members.

Summary of Research Findings: Awareness, Use, and Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Among Congressional Staff

Introduction

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. The Foundation initiated the KIDS COUNT project in 1990 in an effort to track the status and well-being of children in the United States on a national and state-by-state basis. By providing policymakers and citizens with annual benchmarks of child well-being, the Foundation seeks to enrich local, state, and national discussions concerning ways to secure better futures for all children.

The KIDS COUNT project provides national and state-level indicators of children's educational, social, economic, and physical well-being through publication of the KIDS COUNT Data Book, and through a website (www.kidscount.org). While the Data Book is published annually, the information on the website is updated throughout the year as new data become available. With more than 100 measures currently available, the KIDS COUNT website also provides more indicators of children's well-being than the Data Book.

Each year, a copy of the KIDS COUNT Data Book is sent to every congressional office. In the spring of 2007, the Annie E. Casey Foundation wanted to assess the awareness, perceptions, and use of the KIDS COUNT Data Book and website by congressional staff members. The Foundation commissioned Harris Interactive to conduct a survey of congressional staff to assess their familiarity with KIDS COUNT, and their use of KIDS COUNT information for a variety of activities from writing speeches to helping craft legislation, policies, or programs. The Foundation also wanted to determine how satisfied congressional staff are with available data on children, as well as what levels of geography are most important to them. This survey is part of an on-going effort by the Foundation to assess awareness, perceptions, and use of KIDS COUNT information by a broad cross-section of target audiences, including state legislators, county officials, and business leaders. As a result, the survey instrument for this study was designed to complement the surveys used in prior evaluations, in particular, the survey of state-level legislators and their staff.

Survey and Methodology

The survey was developed through collaboration between Harris Interactive, the Population Reference Bureau, and Foundation staff. Many of the survey questions paralleled those used successfully in similar studies conducted among state legislators and staff. The survey questions were added to Harris Interactive's Congressional Omnibus which fielded in the spring of 2007. Telephone interviews were conducted with 151 senior staff members and aides, representing approximately one in four Hill offices.

These interviews were also balanced by party identification and chamber. Approximately half (51%) of the interviews were from Democrat offices, and half (49%) were from Republican offices. Also, four-fifths (80%) were from House offices while one-fifth (20%) were from Senate offices. Further, interviews were also balanced by tenure of office. Six percent of the interviews were with staff whose members were first elected prior to 1980, 11 percent with staff whose members were elected between 1980 and 1987 and 8 percent with those whose members were first elected between 1988 and 1991. Almost two in five (38%) worked for members who were first elected between 1992 and 1999, one-quarter (26%) for members first elected between 2000 and 2005, and finally, one in ten (11%) worked for members who were first elected in 2006.

By instituting balances by chamber, party, and tenure, the resulting sample for this survey is representative of congressional offices.

Findings

Detailed survey results are presented below.² These results are divided into two major sections. The first summarizes the information about KIDS COUNT, and the second summarizes the information about the broader data issues addressed by the survey.

I. Evaluation of KIDS COUNT

Awareness of KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation

Congressional staff were asked about their awareness of nine different organizations that compile and disseminate data on children and families. As shown in Table 1, awareness ranges from a high of 95 percent for the Heritage Foundation to a low of only 7 percent for Child Trends. KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation is in the lower third of awareness – 46% are aware and 54 percent are not aware of the organization.

Table 1 – Awareness of Organizations

“To begin, I will read you a list of some national organizations that compile and disseminate data on children and families. Please tell me if you are aware of these organizations.”

(Base: All Respondents)

Organization	Aware of	Not Aware of
Heritage Foundation	95%	5%
Children’s Defense Fund	82%	18%
Focus on the Family	81%	19%
The Brookings Institution Center on Children and Families	76%	24%
National Center for Children in Poverty	63%	37%
America’s Promise	50%	50%
KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation	46%	54%
Voices for America’s Children	29%	71%
Child Trends	7%	93%

Examining awareness of KIDS COUNT in more detail, the survey finds that certain groups are more likely to be aware of the organization than others. For example, Liberals are more likely to be aware of KIDS COUNT than Conservatives (72% versus 33%), as are Democrats (57%) compared to Republicans (36%). There are also regional differences, with about half (52%) of those in the South being aware of KIDS COUNT compared to just over one-third (35%) of those in the Northeast.

² Data tabulations and tables for this report were furnished by Harris Interactive, Inc.

Among staff who were aware of each organization, the survey also measured the extent to which they used these organizations to obtain information on the status and well-being of children. The results are shown in Table 2 below. While *very few* staff are aware of Child Trends, half of those who are aware use the organization to obtain information on children (but note that this is 5 out of 10 staff who report awareness of Child Trends). Conversely, while almost all staff had heard of the Heritage Foundation, just one in five (21%) report using them a lot or some of the time to obtain information on the status and well-being of children.

Table 2 – Use of Organizations

“Of these that you are aware of, please tell me how much you use each of these organizations to obtain information on the status and well-being of children Do you use this organization a lot, some, a little or not at all?” (Base: Familiar with organization)

Organization	Total Use	Use a lot/ Some	Use a little	Do not use at all
Child Trends	60%	50%	10%	40%
The Brookings Institute Center on Children and Families	39%	28%	11%	60%
Heritage Foundation	38%	21%	17%	61%
Children’s Defense Fund	39%	21%	18%	60%
Focus on the Family	33%	16%	16%	67%
KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation	36%	16%	20%	63%
National Center for Children in Poverty	31%	14%	17%	69%
America’s Promise	30%	14%	14%	70%
Voices for America’s Children	15%	9%	5%	84%

The pattern is similar for KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation. Among staff who are aware of the organization, just 16 percent use the organization a lot or sometimes while an additional 20 percent use it a little. But almost two-thirds (63%) of those who are aware of KIDS COUNT do not use the organization at all to obtain information on the status and well-being of children. There is an opportunity to expand usage of the organization within this group.

One striking similarity across all of these organizations, excluding Child Trends, is the fact that at least three in five congressional staff members do not use the organizations they are familiar with to obtain information on the status and well-being of children.

Among those who are aware of KIDS COUNT, Senate staff are more likely than House staff to use the organization a lot or some of the time to obtain information (31% versus 12%). And, while Democrats and Liberals may be more likely to be aware of KIDS COUNT than Republicans and Conservatives, among those who are aware, there is no difference in the extent to which they use the organization to obtain information.

Awareness of KIDS COUNT Data Book and Website

One in five congressional staff (19%) are familiar with the KIDS COUNT data book and slightly less (15%) are familiar with the KIDS COUNT website. Among staff who are currently aware of the KIDS COUNT Data Book or website, two-thirds (67%) were not familiar with KIDS COUNT before they began working as a legislative staff member.

Among those who are aware of either the KIDS COUNT Data book or website, more than two in five (44%) heard about the organization on the Internet, while 39 percent heard about KIDS COUNT in a newsletter or other publication. One-third (31%) of these staff members became familiar with KIDS COUNT because they received the Data Book. Other places where congressional staff report seeing or hearing something about KIDS COUNT are in the newspaper (28%), on radio or television (17%), from a legislator or legislative staffer (19% each) and from a government provider, advocacy group, or service provider (17% each).

Perceptions of KIDS COUNT Data

As shown in Table 3 below, Congressional staff who are familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book think it has many positive attributes.

Table 3 – Attributes of KIDS COUNT

“I’m going to read you a list of attributes now. Thinking about the KIDS COUNT Data Book, please tell me if these attributes apply to the Data Book a lot, somewhat, a little or not at all.”
(Base: Familiar with KIDS COUNT)

	Applies A Lot/ Somewhat	Applies A Little/ Not at all	Not Sure
Clear and Understandable	83%	6%	11%
Credible	81%	3%	17%
Relevant to Legislators	81%	3%	17%
Useful	78%	6%	17%
Timely	72%	6%	22%
Respected by people with different political views	61%	14%	25%

More than three-quarters of these staff think the Data Book is *clear and understandable*, *credible*, *relevant to legislators*, and *useful*, and almost three in four staff (72%) think the Data Book is *timely*. While three-fifths (61%) think the Data Book is *respected by people with different political views*, this share is much lower than that for most of the other attributes.

The survey also obtained additional information from staff who were not familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book or website. These congressional staff were read a brief statement describing the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the KIDS COUNT project.³ After hearing the description, staff were asked if they might be interested in using the Data Book in the future. Almost two-thirds (64%) of congressional staff who were not familiar with KIDS COUNT said they would be interested in using the Data Book or website the next time they were looking for information on children’s issues.

Staff who were not familiar with KIDS COUNT were also asked what attributes are most important to them in the publications and resources they regularly use. As shown in Table 4, more than half (52%) say that credibility is most important to them, while one in five (20%) say it is most important that publications are clear and understandable. One in ten (10%) say timeliness is the most important attribute.

Table 4 – Most Important Attributes of Other Publications and Resources

“When you think of the various publications and resources you use regularly, which one aspect is most important to you? Again, while all may be important, I am looking for the one that you consider most important.” (Base: Not familiar with KIDS COUNT)

	Total
It is credible	52%
It is clear and understandable	20%
Timeliness	10%
It is relevant to legislators	9%
It is respected by people with differing political views	8%
None of the above	1%

The responses to these questions suggest there is an opportunity to increase the use of KIDS COUNT information among congressional staff who are not already familiar with the KIDS COUNT project or the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The attribute that these staff want most is *credibility*, and Table 3 shows this is definitely something the KIDS COUNT Data Book provides.

Use and Impact of KIDS COUNT Data and Program

Congressional staff who are familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book and website use the information in a variety of ways. As Table 5 indicates, two-thirds (64%) use it to inform themselves about children’s needs, while almost six in ten (58%) use it to do background

³ The statement read before the question was: “The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. Through the KIDS COUNT project, the Foundation seeks to enrich local, state and national discussions concerning ways to secure better futures for all children, by providing policymakers and citizens with benchmarks of child well-being.”

research on an issue. Just over two in five (44%) use this information in writing speeches while just over one-third (36%) use it for checking or confirming other data sources. Congressional staff also use KIDS COUNT data to help hold government agencies accountable, to support committee or council deliberations, and to help craft legislation, policies or programs.

Table 5 – Uses of KIDS COUNT Data

“In what ways do you use the information provided by KIDS COUNT?”
(Base: Familiar with KIDS COUNT)

	Total
To inform yourself about children’s needs	64%
To do background research on an issue	58%
In writing speeches	44%
To check or confirm other data sources	36%
To help hold government agencies accountable	31%
In support of committee or council deliberations	28%
To help craft legislation, policies or programs	28%
Other	14%
Not sure	11%

(Note: Multiple responses accepted)

Congressional staff have a positive view of the impact of the KIDS COUNT program on both public policy and public awareness of the problems faced by children and families. Table 6 shows that over half (52%) of staff familiar with the Data Book and website think KIDS COUNT has had a major or moderate impact on public policy, while just under half (47%) think it has had a major or moderate impact on public awareness of the problems faced by children and families.

Table 6 – Impact of KIDS COUNT Program

“Thinking about all aspects of the KIDS COUNT program, what impact, if any, do you think KIDS COUNT has had on public awareness of problems faced by children and families/public policy? Do you think KIDS COUNT has had a major impact, a moderate impact, a minor impact, or no impact at all on public awareness of problems faced by children and families/public policy?” (Base: Familiar with KIDS COUNT)

	Public awareness of problems faced by children and families	Public policy
Major impact	11%	8%
Moderate impact	36%	44%
Minor impact	39%	31%
No impact at all	3%	-
Not sure	11%	17%

About one in three staff members say the impact of KIDS COUNT on public policy and public awareness is minor, while only three percent view it as having no impact at all. However, almost one in five staff (17%) were not sure if KIDS COUNT has had an impact on public policy, and one in ten (11%) were not sure if the program has had an impact on public awareness of the problems faced by children and families. Overall, more than four-fifths of Congressional staff who are familiar with KIDS COUNT think the program has had an impact.

II. BROADER DATA ISSUES

Satisfaction with Current Data

Although a majority of congressional staff are *very* or *somewhat* satisfied with the data currently available to track the status and well-being of children, Table 7 indicates there are some differences by geographic level. Satisfaction is highest for federal-level data (72%), followed by state-level data (66%), and then data at the congressional district level (60%). However, about one in ten staff members were not sure of their level of satisfaction with the data available at these three geographic levels.

Table 7 – Satisfaction with Current Data

“Overall, how satisfied are you with the data that are currently available to you at the [state/federal/congressional district] level for tracking the status and well-being of children – Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?”

(Base: All Respondents)

	Federal Level	State Level	District Level
Satisfied (NET)	72%	66%	60%
Very satisfied	17%	9%	13%
Somewhat satisfied	56%	58%	47%
Dissatisfied (NET)	19%	24%	30%
Somewhat dissatisfied	13%	19%	19%
Very dissatisfied	5%	5%	11%
Not sure	9%	10%	10%

Congressional staff were also asked if they had been unable to find any specific information on children and teens that was important to them. Only one-fifth (18%) reported that they had experienced this problem. Of those, two-fifths could not find the information they wanted on education issues, while one-fourth could not find the information they wanted on healthcare issues. Almost one in five also reported difficulties locating information on safety or sexuality issues.

Preferred Geographic Levels

As shown in Table 8, having access to comparable data across different geographies is important to a sizeable majority of congressional staff members.

Table 8 – Importance of Comparable Data Across Geographies

“How important is it to you to have access to comparable measures between states/between congressional districts on the status and well-being of children? Would you say it is very important, somewhat important, not that important, or not at all important?”

(Base: All Respondents)

	Total
<i>State data</i>	
Important (NET)	85%
Very Important	38%
Somewhat important	47%
Not important	14%
<i>Congress. District data</i>	
Important (NET)	77%
Very important	33%
Somewhat important	44%
Not important	22%

More than four-fifths (85%) say it is important to have access to comparable measures of the status and well-being of children between states, while more than three-quarters (77%) say it is important to have access to comparable measures between congressional districts.

The survey also asked congressional staff which levels of geography were most and least important to them.

Table 9 – Preferred Levels of Geography

“When you think of the various levels of geography for which you need data or information about children regularly, which level of geography is most important/least important to you?”

(Base: All Respondents)

	Most Important Geography	Least Important Geography
Congressional District	34%	10%
State	30%	6%
National	19%	32%
City	8%	29%
County	7%	19%

As shown in Table 9, the two levels of geography that are most important to congressional staff are congressional districts and states. More than one-third (34%) indicate they regularly need information on children at the congressional district level, while just under one-third (30%) regularly need it at the state level. When asked which levels of geography were least important, about one-third of staff chose either the national level or the city level

Conclusions

Less than half of the congressional staff surveyed were aware of the KIDS COUNT program, and only about one in five were familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book or website. However, after hearing a description of the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the KIDS COUNT project, almost two-thirds of the staff who were not familiar said they would be interested in using the Data Book or website the next time they were looking for information on children's issues.

Among congressional staff who are familiar with KIDS COUNT, two-thirds indicate that they were not aware of it before they began working as a legislative staff member. The primary ways staff learn about KIDS COUNT are through the internet, a newsletter or publication, or by receiving a copy of the Data Book. Congressional staff who are familiar with the KIDS COUNT Data Book rate it very highly. They view it as credible, clear and understandable, and relevant to legislators. Congressional staff also have a positive view of the impact of the KIDS COUNT program. About half think KIDS COUNT has a major or moderate impact on public policy and on public awareness of the problems facing children and families.

The two levels of geography that are most important to congressional staff are congressional districts and states. In addition, more than three quarters say it is important to have access to comparable measures of the status and well-being of children between states and between congressional districts. A majority of congressional staff are satisfied with the data that are currently available, although satisfaction is highest for federal-level data and lowest for data at the congressional district level. Only one-fifth of the staff reported that there was important information on children and teens that they were unable to find.

Appendix 1: Partisan and Ideological Differences

For several survey questions, responses diverged by party or ideology. While some of these differences were noted in the body of the report, there are a few additional ones described in this appendix.

Among staff who are not familiar with KIDS COUNT, there are partisan differences in which attributes are considered most important. A higher share of Democrats say *credibility* is the most important attribute of resources and publications they use regularly, while a higher share of Republicans place most importance on information that is *clear and understandable*. Timeliness is also rated slightly higher by Republicans.

Table 10 – Most Important Attribute by Party

“When you think of the various publications and resources you use regularly, which one aspect is most important to you? Again, while all may be important, I am looking for the one that you consider most important.” (Base: Not familiar with KIDS COUNT)

	Total	GOP	Dem
It is credible	52%	45%	59%
It is clear and understandable	20%	25%	15%
Timeliness	10%	13%	6%
It is relevant to legislators	9%	8%	9%
It is respected by people with differing political views	8%	8%	7%
None of the above	1%	-	2%

Among staff who are not familiar with the Data Book or website, there were also partisan and ideological differences in the share who expressed interest in using KIDS COUNT in the future. After hearing a description of the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the KIDS COUNT project, Democrats were more interested than Republicans (72% vs. 57%) and Liberals and Moderates (76% and 77% respectively) were more interested than Conservatives (45%).

There are also some partisan and ideological differences in the importance of access to comparable measures of the status and well-being of children across different levels of geography. As Table 11 shows, Republicans are more likely to cite comparable congressional district data as important, while Democrats are more likely to cite comparable state data as important. There are also some differences by political ideology. Conservatives are much less likely than both liberals and moderates to say comparable state data are important, but liberals are much more likely to say they are very important than moderates. Although about three-fourths of staff in each ideological group say comparable congressional district data are important, liberals are more likely to say they are very important than moderates or Conservatives.

Table 11 – Importance of Comparable Data by Party and Ideology

“How important is it to you to have access to comparable measures between states/between congressional districts on the status and well-being of children. Would you say it is...?”

(Base: All Respondents)

		Party		Political Ideology		
	Total	GOP	Dem	Cons.	Moderate	Liberal
<i>State data</i>						
Important (NET)	85%	80%	89%	71%	90%	93%
Very Important	38%	29%	46%	31%	32%	62%
Somewhat important	47%	51%	43%	40%	58%	31%
Not important	14%	19%	9%	27%	10%	3%
<i>Congress. District data</i>						
Important (NET)	77%	81%	74%	77%	76%	79%
Very important	33%	27%	39%	29%	31%	45%
Somewhat important	44%	55%	34%	48%	46%	34%
Not important	22%	19%	25%	23%	22%	21%

Appendix 2: Distribution of Survey Responses

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

100. To begin, I will read you a list of some national organizations that compile and disseminate data on children and families. Please tell me if you are aware of these organizations.

	Aware	Not Aware	Not sure (v)
RANDOMIZE LIST			
Heritage Foundation	95%	5%	-
Children's Defense Fund	82%	18%	-
Focus on the Family	81%	19%	-
The Brookings Institution Center on Children and Families	76%	24%	-
National Center for Children in Poverty	63%	37%	-
America's Promise	50%	50%	-
KIDS COUNT/Annie E.			
Casey Foundation	46%	54%	-
Voices for America's Children	29%	71%	-
Child Trends	7%	93%	-

BASE: AWARE OF ORGANIZATIONS (N=VARIABLE BASE)

105 Of these that you are aware of, please tell me how much you use each of these organizations to obtain information on the status and well-being of children. Do you use this organization a lot, some, a little or not at all?

PLEASE NOTE, VARIABLE N: ONLY THOSE AWARE OF ORGANIZATION FROM Q100, ASKED THIS QUESTION

Voices for America's Children

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	9%
Use a lot	-
Use some	9%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	89%
Use a little	5%
Do not use at all	84%
Not sure (v)	2%

America's Promise

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	14%
Use a lot	3%
Use some	12%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	84%
Use a little	14%
Do not use at all	70%
Not sure (v)	1%

National Center for Children in Poverty

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	14%
Use a lot	2%
Use some	12%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	86%
Use a little	17%
Do not use at all	69%
Not sure (v)	-

Child Trends

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	50%
Use a lot	20%
Use some	30%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	50%
Use a little	10%
Do not use at all	40%
Not sure (v)	-

Focus on the Family

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	16%
Use a lot	4%
Use some	12%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	83%
Use a little	16%
Do not use at all	67%
Not sure (v)	1%

KIDS COUNT/Annie E. Casey Foundation

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	16%
Use a lot	7%
Use some	9%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	83%
Use a little	20%
Do not use at all	63%
Not sure (v)	1%

Heritage Foundation

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	21%
Use a lot	10%
Use some	11%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	78%
Use a little	17%
Do not use at all	61%
Not sure (v)	1%

Children's Defense Fund

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	21%
Use a lot	6%
Use some	15%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	78%
Use a little	18%
Do not use at all	60%
Not sure (v)	1%

The Brookings Institution Center on Children and Families

USE A LOT/SOME (NET)	28%
Use a lot	7%
Use some	21%
USE A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	71%
Use a little	11%
Do not use at all	60%
Not sure (v)	1%

(ROTATE Q110 AND Q115)

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

110. How important is it to you to have access to comparable measures **between states** on the status and well-being of children? Would you say it is... (READ LIST)

IMPORTANT (NET)	85%
Very important	38%
Somewhat important	47%
NOT IMPORTANT (NET)	14%
Not that important	9%
Not at all important	5%
Not sure (v)	1%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

115. How important is it to you to have access to comparable measures between congressional districts on the status and well-being of children? Would you say it is... (READ LIST)

IMPORTANT (NET)	77%
Very important	33%
Somewhat important	44%
NOT IMPORTANT (NET)	22%
Not that important	16%
Not at all important	6%
Not sure (v)	1%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

120 Overall, how satisfied are you with the data that are currently available to you at the state level for tracking the status and well-being of children – Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied?

SATISFIED (NET)	66%
Very satisfied	9%
Somewhat satisfied	58%
DISSATISFIED (NET)	24%
Somewhat dissatisfied	19%
Very dissatisfied	5%
Not sure (v)	10%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

121 Overall, how satisfied are you with the data that are currently available to you at the congressional district level for tracking the status and well-being of children – Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied?

SATISFIED (NET)	60%
Very satisfied	13%
Somewhat satisfied	47%
DISSATISFIED (NET)	30%
Somewhat dissatisfied	19%
Very dissatisfied	11%
Not sure (v)	10%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

122 Overall, how satisfied are you with the data that are currently available to you at the federal level for tracking the status and well-being of children – Very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied?

SATISFIED (NET)	72%
Very satisfied	17%
Somewhat satisfied	56%
DISSATISFIED (NET)	19%
Somewhat dissatisfied	13%
Very dissatisfied	5%
Not sure (v)	9%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

125. Is there any specific type of information on children and teens that is important to you but that you haven't been able to find?

Yes	18%
No	81%
Not sure (v)	1%

BASE: UNABLE TO FIND A TYPE OF INFORMATION (N=27)

130 And can you tell me what type of information you were looking for that you were unable to find? (Record Response)

Education issues	37%
Healthcare issues	26%
Safety issues	19%
Sexuality issues	15%
Family issues	7%
Parental/caregiver issues	7%
Other	33%
Not sure	11%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

135 KIDS COUNT is a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation that provides national and state-by-state indicators of child well-being on an annual basis through the national KIDS COUNT Data Book and website. Are you familiar with the national KIDS COUNT Data Book?

Yes, familiar with KIDS COUNT Data book	19%
No, not familiar with KIDS COUNT Data book	81%
Not sure (v)	-

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

136 Are you familiar with the national KIDS COUNT Website?

Yes, familiar with KIDS COUNT website	15%
No, not familiar with KIDS COUNT website	85%
Not sure (v)	-

BASE: NOT FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=115)

140 The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. Through the KIDS COUNT project, the Foundation seeks to enrich local, state, and national discussions concerning ways to secure better futures for all children, by providing policymakers and citizens with benchmarks of child well-being. Now that you have heard more about this organization, do you think you definitely would be interested in using their website or data book, you might be interested in using their website or Data Book the next time you are looking for information on children's issues, you probably are not interested or are you definitely not interested in using their website or data book?

INTERESTED (NET)	64%
Definitely interested	12%
May be interested	52%
NOT INTERESTED (NET)	36%
Probably not interested	26%
Definitely not interested	10%
Not sure (v)	-

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

145. Where are the various places you may have read, heard or seen anything about KIDS COUNT? (READ LIST - RANDOMIZE, ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

On the Internet	44%
In a newsletter or other publication	39%
By receiving the Data Book	31%
In the newspaper	28%
From a legislative staffer	19%
From a legislator	19%
From an advocacy group	17%
From a service provider	17%
From a government agency	17%
On radio or television	17%
From an elected official	14%
Other – ANCHOR	8%

BASE: HEARD ABOUT KIDS COUNT IN AN OTHER WAY (Q145/12)

150 How have you heard about KIDS COUNT?
(RECORD RESPONSE)

No responses given – all not sure/don't know where they heard about Kids Count

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

155. Were you aware of KIDS COUNT prior to working as a legislative staff member?

Yes	33%
No	67%
Not sure (v)	-

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

160. I am going to read you a list of attributes now. Thinking about the KIDS COUNT data book, please tell me if these attributes apply to the data book a lot, somewhat, a little or not at all.

RANDOMIZE

Timely

A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	72%
A lot	47%
Somewhat	25%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	6%
A little	6%
Not at all	-
Not sure (v)	22%

Clear and understandable

A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	83%
A lot	61%
Somewhat	22%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	6%
A little	6%
Not at all	-
Not sure (v)	11%

Credible

A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	81%
A lot	58%
Somewhat	22%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	3%
A little	3%
Not at all	-
Not sure (v)	17%

Useful	
A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	78%
A lot	56%
Somewhat	22%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	6%
A little	3%
Not at all	3%
Not sure (v)	17%

Relevant to legislators	
A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	81%
A lot	42%
Somewhat	39%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	3%
A little	3%
Not at all	-
Not sure (v)	17%

Respected by people with differing political views	
A LOT/SOMEWHAT (NET)	61%
A lot	31%
Somewhat	31%
A LITTLE/NOT AT ALL (NET)	14%
A little	6%
Not at all	8%
Not sure (v)	25%

BASE: NOT FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=115)

165 When you think of the various publications and resources you use regularly, which one aspect is most important to you? Again, while all may be important, I am looking for the one that you consider most important. (READ LIST)

(RANDOMIZE)	
It is credible	52%
It is clear and understandable	20%
Timeliness	10%
It is relevant to legislators	9%
It is respected by people with differing political views	8%
None of the above (v) –ANCHOR	1%
Don't know (v) – ANCHOR	1%

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

170. In what ways do you use the information provided by KIDS COUNT? (READ LIST - RANDOMIZE, ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

To inform yourself about children's needs	64%
To do background research on an issue	58%
In writing speeches	44%
To check or confirm other data source	36%
To help hold government agencies accountable	31%
In support of committee or council deliberations	28%
To help craft legislation, policies or programs	28%
Other – ANCHOR	14%
Not sure (v)	11%

(PN- ROTATE Q175 AND Q180)

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

175. Thinking about all aspects of the KIDS COUNT program, what impact, if any, do you think KIDS COUNT has had on public awareness of problems faced by children and families? Do you think KIDS COUNT has had a major impact, a moderate impact, a minor impact or no impact at all on public awareness of problems faced by children?

Major impact	11%
Moderate impact	36%
Minor impact	39%
No impact at all	3%
Not sure (v)	11%

BASE: FAMILIAR WITH KIDS COUNT (N=36)

180. Thinking about all aspects of the KIDS COUNT program, what impact, if any, do you think KIDS COUNT has had on public policy? Do you think KIDS COUNT has had a major impact, a moderate impact, a minor impact or no impact at all on public policy?

Major impact	8%
Moderate impact	44%
Minor impact	31%
No impact at all	-
Not sure (v)	17%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

185 When you think of the various levels of geography for which you need data or information about children regularly, which level of geography is most important to you? Again, while all may be important, I am looking for the one that you consider the most important. (READ LIST)

National	19%
State	30%
County	7%
Congressional District	34%
City	8%
Not sure (v)	3%

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

190 When you think of the various levels of geography for which you need data or information about children regularly, which level of geography is *least* important to you? (READ LIST)

National	32%
State	6%
County	19%
Congressional District	10%
City	29%
Not sure (v)	4%



The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
www.aecf.org