

EmPower New York Program – Nonresponsive Referred Survey

The purpose of the EmPower New York Nonresponsive Referred Survey was to gather information from individuals that were referred to the EmPower Program but did not participate in the program in order to improve outreach efforts. The survey was designed by Research Into Action, Inc. to contribute to the process evaluation of the EmPower program. The survey was managed by APPRISE Incorporated. Interviews were conducted by Braun Research.

Sample

Target Population

The target population for the survey was nonresponsive referred (NRR) EmPower clients. Two populations were targeted, those who had received EmPower contact from National Fuel and a second population who received contact from all other sources.

Sample Frame

One data file was used to develop the sample frame supplied by the EmPower program. The file included 900 cases contacted by National Fuel and 10521 cases contacted by other organizations. The file included name and address information for each case but did not include phone numbers.

Sample Selection

The data file of contact information was stratified into two samples: National Fuel and other. For each sample, 500 cases were randomly chosen and submitted to Braun Research for a phone number look-up service. From these samples, 284 National Fuel cases and 270 other cases returned numbers. All of the sample cases that had phone numbers were then fielded for the survey.

Data Collection

Overview of Data Collection Procedures

The Nonresponsive Referred Survey was administered as a telephone interview with the NYSEDA project contact. Interviewers from Braun Research conducted the interviews using a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) survey instrument.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was designed to discern why individuals would not respond to a referral to the EmPower Program and to collect information on the quality and effectiveness of specific outreach efforts to households eligible for EmPower services. This included questions on program favorability and awareness of the assisting agency or NYSERDA. Pretests were used to further improve language and skip patterns for the execution of the survey.

Survey Administration

Interviewers called project contacts during weekday evenings and throughout the weekend. If they reached the contact's voice mail, they left a message on first contact. After the first contact, they left a message every three days. The study was in the field for eight days. Once the target number of interviews for a sample was completed, interviewing was discontinued for that sample. Survey administration averaged 12 minutes and 48 seconds per completed interview.

Tables 1 and 2 shows the final disposition of the samples.

Table 1 – “National Fuel” Survey Sample Disposition

Disposition		Number	Percent
Complete	Complete	50	15%
	Partial	15	4%
Contacted	Refused	41	1%
	Not Completed	92	38%
Not Contacted	Quota Met	0	0%
Excluded	Duplicate	0	0%
	Contact no longer available	2	<1%
	Information not available for contact	0	0%
	Unusable number	96	28%
	Not Eligible	43	13%
TOTAL		339	100%

Table 2 – “Other” Survey Sample Disposition

Disposition		Number	Percent
Complete	Complete	50	15%
	Partial	14	4%
Contacted	Refused	28	2%
	Not Completed	123	44%
Not Contacted	Quota Met	0	0%
Excluded	Duplicate	0	0%
	Contact no longer available	0	0%
	Information not available for contact	0	0%
	Unusable number	62	19%
	Not Eligible	48	15%
TOTAL		325	100%

Table 3 shows the number of sampled cases, the number of completed interviews, and the response rate by sample stratum.

Table 3 – Nonresponsive Referred Survey Response Rate

Stratum	Eligible Sample Size	Number of Interviews	Response Rate
National Fuel	144	50	35%
Other	150	50	33%

Data Processing

Coding

The survey included several “field-coded” questions. In these questions, the respondent was asked an open-ended question. The interviewer had the choice of coding the response as one (or more, for some questions) of a number of pre-coded categories (coded from the open-ended responses for the prior surveys), or coding the response as “Other” and entering a text string to summarize the response. For each applicable question, staff reviewed each “Other” response and then selected one of the pre-coded responses or made the response eligible for development of a new code. After reviewing all

questionnaires, text responses were grouped into categories and coded. The Process Team analyst, Robert Wirtshafter, provided the final coding check on the file.

Data Processing

The survey data were checked for consistency with the CATI survey instrument. The survey data were combined with the sample frame data. A number of data file formats were developed, including SAS, SPSS, Stata, and Excel. All files were labeled with variable labels and value labels.

Weights

No weights were assigned to the data files.