

### **EmPower New York Program – Education Workshop Attendees Survey**

The purpose of the EmPower New York Education Workshop Attendees Survey was to gather information from individuals that attended the “Save Energy, Save Dollars” workshop/presentation in order to learn about the impact of the workshop had on attendees energy consumption practices and ways the workshop could be improved. 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 attendees of the Heartshare presentation or the Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE) workshop.

##### *Sample Frame*

Two data files of workshop attendees, one consisting of 93 Heartshare attendees, the other consisting of 183 CCE attendees, were combined to create a total sample frame of 276 cases. The file included name, telephone number, and attendance date. Address information was included only for the CCE attendees; no address information was available for the Heartshare attendees.

##### *Sample Selection*

The CCE and Heartshare contact information data files were combined to form one sample file. All of the sample cases that had phone numbers were then fielded for the survey.

##### *Advance Letters*

In an effort to improve the response rate, advance letters were sent to the CCE sample the morning of the field period. No advance letters were sent to the Heartshare sample; no addresses were available.

## Data Collection

### *Overview of Data Collection Procedures*

The Education Workshop Attendees 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 what attendees gained from the workshop and the changes they made to their home energy consumption habits. This included perceived gains in knowledge and attribution of changes in the home to the topics discussed in the workshop. Pretests were used to further improve language and skip patterns for the execution of the survey.

### *Survey Administration*

Interviewers called project contacts during daytime and evening weekday hours 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 fielded for fifteen days, the length of time it took to meet the targeted number of completed interviews. Survey administration averaged 16 minutes per completed interview.

Table 1 shows the final disposition of the sample.

**Table 1 – Survey Sample Disposition**

Disposition		Number	Percent
Complete	Complete	100	36%
	Partial	6	2%
Contacted	Refused	12	3%
	Not Completed	86	33%
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	41	15%
	Not Eligible	29	11%
TOTAL		274	100%

Table 2 shows the number of sampled cases, the number of completed interviews, and the response rate by sample stratum.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 2 – Nonresponsive Referred Survey Response Rate**

Eligible Sample Size	Number of Interviews	Response Rate
183	100	55%

## **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 or coding the response as “Other” and entering a text string to summarize the response. For each applicable question, APPRISE 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eligible sample size is calculated by adding the number of eligible respondents to the number of cases where eligibility was unknown multiplied by the estimated eligibility rate.