The art of soaping the sample
Theoretical overview of the impact of incentives and interview methods on response quantity and quality
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The problem of selection awards for the intergenerational quiz „Tean ja ei tunne“
By the end of this lesson

you will all know about different type of incentives ($X$),

most of all will know about decoy strategy ($Y$)

and some of you will know about impact of prepaid and post-interview cash incentives ($Z$)

Danish time-use and consumption survey (2008/09): questionnaire, diaries and an expenditure booklet; CAPI and CAWI

Respondents in the 18–74 age. Duration 12 months. Up to nine reminder calls per instrument per participant

**Dynamic strategies for providing incentives.**

**Lottery** prizes were increased considerably during the final six months

- **Weeks 1-39** Monthly prizes:
  - 1 prize for 5,000,  
  - 2 prizes for 1,000  
  (Expected average payout per person: 17.5 eur)

- **Weeks 40-65** Monthly prizes:
  - 1 prize for 10,000  
  - 1 prize for 5,000  
  - 1 prize for 2,000  
  (Expected average payout per person: 42.5 eur)

Lottery prizes were doubled if they had used only the CAWI method.

Finally, the ordinary follow-up call procedure was supplemented from week 40 with the offer of cinematic tickets to all the survey participants in the family.
At the time of the changes in incentives (week 40), the response rates went up for all the instruments.

The doubling of these prizes for using the web had a high impact on the number of respondents choosing this method.

The response quality (less socially expected/accepted answer options) was higher when respondents did CAWI compared to CATI.
4 months, 52 closed questions in CAWI the database was divided into “mailing groups”, two regions for each week.

Response rate 16.34% of all and 17.73% of effectively sent e-mails (1,029 responses).
An e-mail was not received by 14.19%
The lowest rate was 9.77% in one region. (depended on perceived interest of partner organisations)

52% (a total of 470) of the responses were obtained after the initial mailing,
48% (439) after the reminders.

A reminder procedure, information campaign, and involvement of a variety of organizations are crucial to the effectiveness of this type of study.
In the survey, General Practitioner organizations were invited to take part in the study by informing their members on aim, schedule, and advantages of the study.

Their role was to share information (in face-to-face meetings; through website, by sending special e-mails) to promote the study among associated organisations.

Organisations had always the up-to-date information, they had access to the primary information sources of the survey.

Partners’ additional informational activities were performed before and during the time reminders were sent.

Pawel et al., 2015
Brand-recognition etc
CAWI, 2016, 6 months
A random sampling (all of them are active users of social media tools)
476 respondents

Online questionnaire through the multiple channels
(e-mail, call-to-action embedded in blogs, discussion forums,
the greatest emphasis was put on the use of social networks:
Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, YouTube, Pinterest, Google+,
Instagram, Snapchat, and Tumblr.

The largest group younger than 21 (23.94%; N = 114).
Next 28–31 (22.90%; N = 109).
Next 25–27 (18.28%; N = 87).
Next 22–24 (18.07%; N = 86)
the last group 32 years old and older (16.81%; N = 80).

CAWI in 2015
the whole population of Milan University (students, administrative staff, teaching staff) 70,975 individuals
Questionnaire available on line from 14th May to 1st July
weekly e-mail reminders
response rate **14.4 %**;
Students 69.2 %
academic staff 21.4 %
non-academic staff 9.4 %
An informational brochure about CMV (the virus, its epidemiology and its behaviour) was downloadable for participants who completed the survey

Multiple methods (apps, sms, e-mails and calls) can be especially useful in the context of a panel study.

57% of panel members with a mobile phone used it when being prompted in a dynamically programmed survey.

The Relationship Dynamics and Social Life (RDSL) – panel, weekly reports. Axinn, Gatny, and Wager found that allowing panel members to switch modes kept more participants in the study compared to a web only approach.

Six online waves of the GESIS Panel in Germany offered different channels for respondent.

For smartphone survey completion, the indicators of measurement and nonresponse error tend to be higher than for tablet completion.

Increased number of surveys

The time depends on the survey burden. The burden depends on
the length of the survey,
the (cognitive) complexity
invasiveness.

Perceived burden also depends on respondent's attitude.
logistical and schedule factors
personal expectations


An increase in working hours (people are more time-constrained)

People with weak community ties may also respond less often (Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Abraham et al., 2006)
Bobbing and shaking minutes
**Motivation rising strategies**

**Advance letters** explaining the importance of doing research, information about how time expense.

The impact is mixed from positive and significant (Hembro et al., 2005) to no significant (Singer et al., 2000).

**Increasing the number of follow-up calls**

**Scratch cards** (the recipient cannot resist scratching the card and thereafter feels obligated to participate in the survey irrespective of whether or not he/she has won a prize.)

**Personal in-kind gifts** (as prepaid rewards), **charitable donations**, lottery

**Cash – pre-paid; post-interview.**
Only prepaid cash incentives have a positive impact on mail surveys and donation, gifts, lottery have not (Warriner et al., 1996; Armstrong, 1975)

Post-interview cash incentives have a positive impact on the response rate if they are of appropriate amounts (Fahimi et al., 2006)

Post-paid and lottery incentives have little or no impact, or that if they have an effect this is found to diminish as the size of the prize is increased (Warriner et al., 1996; Singer et al., 2000; Ryu et al., 2006.)

Contingent incentives (only those who answered every question) decreased responses to the study compared to unconditional incentives (all participants were eligible). The quality and retention had no difference (Göritz, 2005)

Redeemable bonus points, money lotteries or gift lotteries had an impact on response quality (Göritz, 2004)

Whether the prize in a cash lottery is given as a single payout or split up into several prizes has been found to have no impact on response and retention rates in online panels, nor does the amount of the prizes affect these rates (Göritz, 2006)
All of the previously mentioned studies included reminder procedures as key elements influencing response ratio.

Dynamic strategies in providing incentives.

How to get people to choose the option what you want them to do

Let go together
to Riga at Hilton hotel (100 eur)
to Riga at Radisson hotel (50 eur)
to Vilnius
How to get people to choose the option what you want them to do

Let go together
to Riga at Hilton hotel (100 eur)
to Riga at Radisson hotel (50 eur)
to Vilnius
Christian Von Wagner (University College London) explored people’s intentions to undergo a vital – but unpleasant – screening for colorectal cancer.

Version 1
arranging an appointment for the screening
not having the procedure at all

Version 2
arranging an appointment for the screening
an appointment at a less convenient hospital with a longer waiting time
not having the procedure at all

The third option (decoy) made the screening at the original hospital appear less burdensome.
“The decoy effect might be used to encourage people to make healthier life choices”

Would you like to be examined by a doctor of the same gender (the preference) or by a doctor of a different gender (the decoy)?

not to be examined
If you do come across two candidates who are similar, but one is slightly superior to the other, it will heighten your regard for them compared to the other competitors.

Would you like to answer the questionnaire by getting a pre-paid incentive to answer the questionnaire by getting a post-interview incentive or not to answer the questionnaire?
Ender:
Mission completed?

Are you X, Y and Z?

X you know about different type of incentives

Y you know about decoy strategy

Z you know about impact of prepaid and post-interview cash incentives
Thank you
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