

SRBI METHODOLOGY: NJ FAMILYCARE ENROLLED/DISENROLLED STUDY

Submitted to: The Center for State Health Policy – Rutgers the State University of New Jersey

This document describes the procedures SRBI employed in the conduct of the NJ FAMILYCARE ENROLLER/DISENROLLER STUDY. Appended is a copy of the interviewer training outline which serves as documentation of how questions and situations, not covered with on-screen instructions, were handled. (Attachment A)

Sample

Design:

Sample was drawn by the Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services (DMAHS), part of the New Jersey Department of Human Services. Sample selection was stratified by region of the state, type of plan (A, B, C, D), and family member enrollment status as of March 31, 2002.

For DMAHS sample selection CSHP assigned all of the counties within New Jersey to one of five geographic regions.

Region 1: Cape May, Cumberland, Salem, Atlantic

Region 2: Gloucester, Camden, Burlington

Region 3: Ocean, Monmouth, Middlesex

Region 4: Mercer, Somerset, Morris, Hunterdon, Warren, Sussex

Region 5: Passaic, Bergen, Union, Essex, Hudson

Plans A, B, C were stratified by household enrollment status as follows:

PLAN A:

AKEPE	Child enrolled and parent enrolled
AKDPN	Child disenrolled and parent not enrolled
AKEPN	Child enrolled and parent not enrolled
AKDPE	Child disenrolled and parent enrolled



PLAN B/C (combined):

BCKEPE	Child enrolled and parent enrolled
BCKDPN	Child disenrolled and parent not enrolled
BCKEPN	Child enrolled and parent not enrolled
BCKDPE	Child disenrolled and parent enrolled

CSHP set desired target quotas by plan and enrollment status within plan as follows:
 (D = disenrolled E = enrolled)

	<u>Parent E Child E</u>	<u>Parent E Child D</u>	<u>Parent D Child E</u>	<u>Parent D Child D</u>	<u>Total in Plan</u>
Plan A	60	60	40	40	200
Plan B/C	60	60	40	40	200
Plan D	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>250</u>
TOTAL	120	120	205	205	650

After receipt of the sample database from CSHP, SRBI was responsible for systematically and randomly selecting households to be included in the sample. Each household had to have an equal chance of being selected. Therefore each household needed to be represented only one time. Sample strata AKEPE and BCKEPE contained households with multiple children who were either enrolled or disenrolled. In the database, each of these children were represented as separate line entries. To give all households the same chance for selection, multi-listed households had to be identified and included in the sample selection as one entry.

Once the household selection was accomplished, and chosen households were assigned to sample replications, it was necessary to select one child in multi-listed households to be the index child. SRBI inserted a random sequence command allowing the computer to randomly select one child from each of these households as the focus child. (See "Total Households Represented - Table B)

From the beginning of the field process it was evident that household status, within plan type, was often not what it was designated to be. Recent status changes and/or clerical mistakes in the records produced significant differences. Table A reports the number of interviews completed, within sample strata. The number of completes in **boldface** for each strata indicates the designation we expected for that sample.

TABLE A

(Based on questionnaire response E = enrolled/D = disenrolled)

SAMPLE		Child E <u>Parent</u> <u>E</u>	Child D <u>Parent</u> <u>D</u>	Child E <u>Parent</u> <u>D</u>	Child D <u>Parent</u> <u>E</u>	Other
<u>Plan A</u>						
AKEPE	36 100%	34 94.44%		2 5.56%		
AKDPN	52 100%	7 13.46%	25 48.08%	10 19.23%	10 19.23%	
AKEPN	38 100%	10 26.32%	5 13.16%	19 50.00%	3 7.89%	1 2.63%
AKDPE	61 100%	35 57.38%	10 16.39%	1	15 24.59%	
Sub-total	187	86	40	32	28	1
<u>Plan D</u>						
	250 100.00%	14 5.60%	101 40.40%	124 49.60%	8 3.20%	3 1.20%
<u>Plan B/C</u>						
BCKEPE	46 100%	42 91.30%		1 2.17%	2 4.35%	1 2.17%
BCKDPN	46 100%	8 17.39%	19 41.30%	15 32.61%	4 8.70%	
BCKEPN	36 100%	6 16.67%	4 5.56%	23 63.89%	2 5.56%	1 2.78%
BCKDPE	119 100%	44 36.97%	26 31.93%	9 7.56%	38 31.93%	2 1.68%
Sub-total	247	100	49	48	46	4
TOTAL	684	200	190	204	82	8

Strata AKEPE was one of the most predictable, with 94.44% of the completed interviews being with PLAN A households where the child and a parent were enrolled. Plan D also provided about 90% of the expected distribution. The worst instances were ADKPE with only 24.59% of the completed interviews being with households fitting that strata description (PLAN A children disenrolled and parents enrolled.) Similarly, BCKDPE provided only 31.93% of PLAN B children disenrolled and parents enrolled.

SRBI expected to obtain interviews in households where both the child and the parent were enrolled from AKEPE and BCKEPE. Surprisingly AKDPE and BCKDPE produced more completed interviews fitting this description. Therefore, it was decided not to be concerned with minimum quotas by sample designation, but to try to achieve a large enough balance within the four enrollment classifications to be able to analyze them individually.

Table B (arrayed by strata) details the number of records received from DMAHS, the number of unique households this represented, the total number of records from which we were provided a telephone number, and the total number of records we fielded. (Fielded records are those that were sent letters and included in the telephone sample: whether or not we had a telephone number for that record.)

Telephone number search: Upon receipt of the sample file, SRBI sent the entire file to Survey Sampling Inc. to have the names and addresses run through the national electronic directory for telephone number search. This data was added to the sample database.

As households were selected to be included in replications, if the original data file provided a telephone number, that number was considered to be correct and was fielded. If the sample did not have a phone number, and the electronic match from SSI provided one, that number was used. If the electronic match did not provide a number, SRBI contacted directory assistance. If a number still was not found, the household was mailed the advance letter and the endorsement letter, along with a note asking respondents to contact SRBI at our toll-free number to set up an appointment for an interview.

Throughout the course of interviewing, if a number provided from the original data file turned out to be incorrect, we would substitute the SSI matched number, followed by a call to directory assistance, followed by an additional mailing of the two letters with a note to have the respondent contact us at our toll-free number.

TABLE B

Sample Designation	Total Listings Received	Total Listings w/ Phone #	Total Households Represented	Total Households Fielded	Total Households Fielded w/Phone	% Total Households Fielded
AKDPE	556	411	556	424	237	42.63%
AKDPN	393	335	393	299	202	51.40%
AKEPE	495	415	103	87	87	84.47%
AKEPN	328	292	328	144	140	42.68%
BCKDPE	562	552	562	387	318	56.58%
BCKDPN	394	390	394	141	141	35.79%
BCKEPE	495	492	95	93	93	97.89%
BCKEPN	328	318	328	93	93	28.35%
<u>D</u>	<u>2247</u>	<u>2242</u>	<u>2247</u>	<u>713</u>	<u>711</u>	<u>31.64%</u>
TOTAL	5798	5447	5006	2381	2022	40.39%

Sample Management:

SRBI used the Quancept CATI software for the administration of this study. The system’s sampling module managed the distribution and record keeping of the sample. Throughout the field process, SRBI’s project management team conducted careful analyses of dialing results, time of day and day of week results and “at home” rates. All telephone numbers were automatically dialed by the system to ensure that there were no interviewer misdials.

Project specifications called for a maximum of 20 dialing attempts to be made to each number. (Ten dialing attempts were made to reach a household member. An additional ten dialing attempts were made to speak to the correct respondent once a household member was reached.) To maximize household contact, attempts were stratified over day of week and time of day including weekends, weeknights and business day hours. Additional dialing attempts were made to many numbers as part of our effort to enhance response rate.

- Older replications were reopened months later for (an) additional dialing attempt(s).
- Numbers with multiple callback appointments were re-tried additional times.
- Numbers that had several dialing attempts clustered around a holiday weekend were given additional attempts after the holiday.
- Refusals were re-contacted for refusal conversion several weeks after the initial refusal event.
- The sampling module counted answering machine dispositions. Every time three simultaneous answering machine dispositions had been recorded, the interviewer received an on-screen message to leave a short message on the answering machine.

Data Gathering/Interviewing

Field Dates:

- A pre-test was conducted April 8, 2003 and April 9, 2003. Interviewers were given a comprehensive training, which was later duplicated for the main project training. This included purpose of the survey, description of household, complete explanation of all terms and questionnaire sections and a thorough read of the entire questionnaire utilizing a mock household situation. Project training sessions lasted four hours each.
- All interviews were conducted from our centralized telephone facility in West Long Branch, New Jersey. Telephone interviews were conducted from May 20, 2003 to September 19, 2003.

Response Rates

SRBI employed a number of procedures that contributed significantly to obtaining an overall response rate of 52%.

- Interviewers were evaluated on a daily basis for a balance of acceptable production rate (number of interviews conducted in a measured time period) and response rate. Counseling was provided as needed in order to maintain the correct balance.
- Interviewers were trained to listen to the respondents' tone and words during the introductory conversation in order to recognize and address their concerns regarding participation, and try to dispel these concerns and objections before they were stated by the respondent. Aside from respondents who automatically assumed we were a telemarketing firm, most often the objection was the inconvenience of the call at that particular time, and we were often able to successfully reschedule.
- In addition, special supplementary mailings were made in an attempt to get the attention of some hard-to-reach respondents. They are as follows:

On June 23, 2003 SRBI mailed 211 households who were at maximum dialing attempts with the disposition of "callback." Three additional dialing attempts were added to all numbers in field and specifically to these 211 numbers.

On July 30, 2003 we repeated the same procedure with another 290 households.

On August 1, 2003 we sent mailings to 262 respondents whose status was "non working or disconnected, probably unassigned number, fax/modem line,

business or wrong number, with an appended note asking them to contact SRBI via our toll free number.

Finally, on August 7, 2003, we added three more dialing attempts to all live numbers and mainlined to an additional 14 households who had reached maximum dialing attempts without being contacted.

- Refusal conversion attempts were made to all respondents who refused to be interviewed or terminated an interview before it was completed. (In order to count as a completed interview, all appropriate questions according to skip patterns, had to be asked.) Refusal conversion attempts were made approximately one month after the refusal event to place as much distance as possible between the two events. In the interim, it was hoped that the frame of mind or personal situations of these respondents may have changed, enabling them to be more agreeable to participating in a long telephone conversation.
- The number of households with telephone lines for purposes other than voice communication is growing. This poses a particular dilemma in reporting accurate response rates. Over the years various formulas and calculations have been employed by many researchers in an effort to identify this proportion of numbers that appear to be "live," but will never be answered by a person. Additionally, non-working numbers aren't always identified by a recording or automatic telephone company device.

SRBI used a careful and conservative approach to identify this population. Our formula has been accepted by federal government agencies. When a telephone number, dialed over different days of the week and times of day, was consistently "no answer" it was set aside as a possible unassigned number. For the purposes of labeling, an unassigned number means it probably is either non-working or not assigned as a voice line. These numbers were run against the national telephone reverse directory. All numbers not assigned in the directory were classified as "probably unassigned numbers." This was less than 1% of the total numbers fielded.

Sample Disposition

The final sample disposition by sample designation and in total is provided in Attachment B. Explanation of disposition labels is as follows:

Non-working/disconnect numbers = Telephone company recording of it.

Probably unassigned numbers = Explained earlier in response rate section.

Out of range: All of these numbers were excluded from the calculation of response rate because they were not within the approved sample frame of the project.

Fax/modem lines: Identified by signal received.

Business numbers/wrong numbers: Business numbers are identified by respondent answering or by content of answering machine/voice mail. Other wrong numbers are identified by householders who say focus individuals on sample are not and have never been a member of that household or reachable at that number.

Cell phones: Identified by the person answering the phone.

Language barriers other than Spanish: Identified by the person answering the phone.

Child only lines: Identified by the person answering the phone and confirming an adult will not accept a call at that number.

No answer: Last status of the call was a “no answer” and that number was never a refusal, terminate or in callback status.

Busy: Last status of the call was a “busy” and that number was never a refusal, terminate or in callback status.

Answering machine: Last status of the call was an “answering machine” and that number was never a refusal, terminate or in callback status.

Callback: At one time a household member was reached and a callback appointment was made to contact the correct/another household member. All the numbers in this category have not had a final disposition. The actual final dialing result could have been a no answer, busy or answering machine. The actual final dialing result would not have been a refusal or terminate.

Hearing problems: Either the respondent or a household member who answered the phone had sufficient hearing difficulty so that a conversation could not be conducted.

Long term health problems: The qualified respondent had serious or long-term health problems that rendered them incapable of participating in a lengthy telephone questionnaire.

Away for duration of field period: The qualified respondent was out of the area until after September 19, 2003.

Refusals: All refusals that occurred before the first question could be administered and answered.

Mid-interview terminates: All conversations that were terminated by the respondent after the response to Q.1 was asked and recorded. In some cases this includes interviews that were interrupted and SRBI was asked to callback and complete, but the respondent was never again reachable.

Non-eligible categories are recorded as screen outs as directed by the questionnaire program.

Quota out – cell completed: Eventually all cells were completed except <200% FPL in all regions.

Completed interview: All appropriate questions were asked and responded to and the interview contributed towards the overall quota.

Cooperation rate is defined as the percentage of “completed contacts” when “refusals” and “completed contacts” equals 100%.

Response rate is defined as the percentage of “completed contacts” when “total numbers perceived to be working and residential” is 100%.

Miscellaneous Information

The average questionnaire length was 46 minutes.

Interviewing was conducted in both English and Spanish. Both languages were administered via QUANCEPT (computer assisted interviewing) software.

Attachment C contains the advance letter and endorsement letter sent to respondents. As indicated previously, all respondents received both letters at the start of the project and when their telephone number of record, was discovered to be incorrect.