

Is More Better?

A Test of Different Incentives in a Nationwide RDD Survey

Sandra Gordon Richman
Patricia Gallagher
Carol Cosenza

Center for Survey Research
University of Massachusetts – Boston

Study Purpose

- Gather information about consumer perceptions of different ways to provide risk and benefit information in prescription drug advertising
- Initial goal was to receive 400 completed questionnaires

Study Design

- Mixed mode study
- Nationwide RDD sample
- Eligibility criteria: age 35-70, English-speaking
- Respondents offered pre-paid and promised cash incentives
- Once respondents agreed to participate, they were mailed a questionnaire



The Problem

How do we encourage respondents who have agreed to participate in a mail survey to return their completed questionnaires to us?





Incentives

- *Initial Study Design*: \$10 pre-paid cash incentive and \$10 promised cash incentive
- *Modified Study Design*: \$20 pre-paid cash incentive and \$30 promised cash incentive
- Participants remaining in original \$10/\$10 condition at time of design change now offered \$30 during reminder calls

Test Conditions

Test Condition	Pre-paid	Promised
Test Condition 1	\$10	\$10
Test Condition 1	\$10	Now offered \$30 at time of reminder call
Test Condition 2	\$20	\$30

Field Procedures

Field Procedure	Time Frame	Respondent Group
Questionnaire and cash incentive mailed	Initial mailing	All
Postcard reminder mailed	After 2 weeks	All
Follow-up letter and replacement questionnaire mailed	After 4 weeks	Non-respondents
Reminder calls began	After 6 weeks	Non-respondents
Final letter and replacement questionnaire mailed	After 8+ weeks, at close of study	Non-respondents
Thank you letter and promised cash incentive mailed	Upon receipt of completed questionnaires	Respondents who returned questionnaires

Cumulative Return Rates (N=533)

(N=451)

(N=82)

Cumulative Return Rates	Test Condition 1 (\$10/\$10-\$30)	Test Condition 2 (\$20/\$30)	T-Test Level of Significance**
Returns after 1 mailing	229/451 = 51%	54/82 = 66%	.018++
Returns after 2 mailings	114/451 = 25%	9/82 = 11%	.004++
Returns after reminder calls	31/451 = 7%	1/82 = 1%	.044++
Returns after 3 mailings	9/451 = 2%	3/82 = 4%	.351
Overall return rates	383/451 = 85%	67/82 = 82%	.461

** A T-Test for independent samples was performed to evaluate whether the differences in return rates between the two test conditions were statistically significant for each field procedure and for overall return rates.

++ Indicates statistically significant difference between the two test conditions

How much does it cost?

Cumulative Return Rates	Test Condition 1 (\$10/\$10-\$30)	Cost per Respondent	Test Condition 2 (\$20/\$30)	Cost per Respondent
Returns after 1 mailing	229/451 = 51%	\$26.68	54/82 = 66%	\$56.68
Returns after 2 mailings	114/451 = 25%	\$33.36	9/82 = 11%	\$63.36
Returns after reminder calls	31/451 = 7%	\$58.56	1/82 = 1%	\$68.56
Returns after 3 mailings	9/451 = 2%	\$65.24	3/82 = 4%	\$75.24
Overall return rates	383/451 = 85%	\$32.15	67/82 = 82%	\$58.58

Results of Logistic Regression

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step a 1	topic	.420	.244	2.959	1	.085	1.522
	adtype	.645	.248	6.758	1	.009	1.906
	testcondition	-.263	.318	.683	1	.408	.769
	Constant	1.257	.193	42.426	1	.000	3.515

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: topic, adtype, testcondition.

** Covariates known for entire sample (n=533) were questionnaire topic, type of ad, and test condition.

** No interaction effects between covariates.

Demographic Composition

- Demographic information about race, gender, education, income, and age was obtained for respondents who returned surveys
- One way ANOVAs found no statistically significant difference between the two test conditions for all demographic variables

Conclusions

- Save your money! Offering respondents more money did not significantly increase return rate
- Offering respondents a higher incentive than initially promised (during reminder calls) caused a boost in return rate