BETWEEN THE COVERS OF "INTERNET, PHONE, MAIL AND MIXED-MODE SURVEYS"

Dillman, Smyth and Christian

Presentation for DC AAPOR November 12, 2014

Agenda

4:00-5:00pm Opening Comments from the Authors

- Leah Christian What's New in This Book and Why?
- Don Dillman Applying Social Exchange in Today's Rapid-Fire Communication Environment
- Jolene Smyth Creating Mixed-Mode Survey Designs that Work

5:00-5:30pm Open Discussion

5:30-6:00pm Informal Reception and Follow-up with the Authors

WHAT'S NEW IN THIS BOOK AND WHY?

Leah Christian

Director, Nielsen

leah.christian@nielsen.com

Who we are

- Don A. Dillman. Regents Professor, Department of Sociology and Deputy Director Research and Development, Social and Economic Sciences Research Center, Washington State University.
- Jolene D. Smyth. Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Director, Bureau of Sociological Research. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Leah Melani Christian. Director, Research Methods, Nielsen. Previously, Senior Researcher at the Pew Research Center and Researcher/Adjunct Professor at the University of Georgia.

Where we are



Presentation for DC AAPOR 11/12/14

Evolution of the book



How is the book organized?

- 1. Sample Surveys in Our Electronic World
- 2. Reducing People's Reluctance to Respond to Surveys
- 3. Covering the Population and Selecting Who to Survey
- 4. The Fundamentals of Writing Questions
- 5. How to Write Open and Closed-Ended Questions
- 6. Aural vs. Visual Design of Questions and Questionnaires
- 7. Ordering Questions and Testing for Question Order Effects
- 8. Telephone Questionnaires and Implementation
- 9. Web Questionnaires and Implementation
- 10. Mail Questionnaires and Implementation
- 11. Mixed-Mode Questionnaires and Survey Implementation
- 12. Responding to Societal Change and Preparing for What Lies Ahead

7

Presentation for DC AAPOR 11/12/14

Why a new edition now?

- Our communication environment has changed rapidly and that has implications for how we design and conduct surveys.
 - Social exchange theory continues to be relevant in designing effective strategies for maximizing response.







Why focus on mixed-mode surveys?

- Single mode surveys increasingly face coverage, sampling and nonresponse issues.
 - Single mode telephone and email/internet surveys often do not provide adequate quality.
- Mixed mode survey designs are often necessary to help address these limitations.
 - The increased use and research on mixed-mode surveys has helped us in better understanding which approaches are more effective and how best to leverage different modes.

Key themes

- Survey quality depends on the joint contributions of surveyors and respondents to reducing error (coverage, sampling, nonresponse and measurement error).
- Social exchange provides an effective framework for maximizing response rates and quality.
- Tailored designs, customized to the survey situation, are more effective than attempting to use the same procedures for all situations.
- A holistic design approach that focuses on how information is presented throughout the implementation process is critical to maximizing cooperation.

Key themes

- Using **different modes of contact** increases the chance people will receive the communications and attend to them.
- Successful mixed-mode surveys depend on how the mode of contact and mode of response are coordinated.
- Unified mode question construction improves data quality in mixed-mode surveys (by minimizing measurement error).
- Methods for designing and implementing single-mode surveys are essential to deploying these modes in mixedmode designs.

A new companion website



Where are we headed?

- Combining data from different sources (and understanding the biases associated with each)
 - Big data and administrative records
 - Other passive measurement via mobile devices and technology
 - Survey data, cross-sectional and longitudinal/panel data
- Greater variety of sampling approaches, including nonprobability methods
- More international and cross-cultural surveys

Can Social Exchange Explain Response Behavior in Today's Asynchronous Rapid-Fire Communication Environment ?

Don A. Dillman Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-4014 <u>dillman@wsu.edu</u>

Many people have their own theory about why people do not respond to survey questionnaires

- People are too busy.
- They hate answering survey questions.
- There are too many questions.
- The questions asked in surveys are:
 - Too difficult.
 - Invade my privacy.
 - Are silly.
- Answering surveys results in me getting more surveys.
- People hate surveys.
- I have heard each of these explanations for low survey response rates from some top-flight survey designers.

Others suggest theory is a waste of time and effort

- From a departmental colleague: "It must be nice to be a methodologist; that means you don't need to use theory."
- From students when I teach data collection I get two reactions:
 - Practitioner oriented students often glaze over.
 - The theory lovers want to talk forever--abstractly and without conclusion....
- From a statistician: Your theory of response is "not quite up there with the law of gravity".
- Additional reaction—isn't social exchange getting a little old. If a theory isn't new, how can it be useful?

Many theories have been suggested for explaining why people respond to surveys

1 Cognitive Dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957): People seek consistency in their lives—response to previous surveys encourages response to your survey.

2 Reasoned Action theory (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980): Appeal to positive attitudes and subjective norms that favor responding in order to encourage behavioral intention to respond.

3 Interpersonal Influence theory (Cialdini, 1984): Discrete actions, scarcity of opportunity, consistency with past behavior, reciprocation for previous favor, enjoyment, social proof, what others have done.

4 Adult-to-adult communication style (Comley, 2006): Approach people as adults rather than children who are told, "You must do this today!"

Additional theories

5 Leverage-salience theory (Groves, Singer and Corning, 2000): Identify and make more salient features that can have a positive effect, and deemphasize negative features.

6 Cost-Benefit Theory (Singer, 2011): Focus explicitly on reducing costs people associate with responding to surveys, and increase the benefits of responding.

7 Gamification Theory (Pulleston, 2012); Make responding to surveys fun through being more like a game, with full visual appeal and the awarding of games and points.

What's good and not so good about these theories?

- Each theory touches the (response) challenge in a somewhat different, but probably relevant, place.
- Most tend to focus either theoretically or practically on one or two features of design.
- All of these approaches seem to stop short of providing comprehensive guidance for designing specifics of the data collection process and how the completed design package (questionnaire and implementation procedures) might affect response behavior.

What do we want from a theory of survey response?

- 1 A theory needs to take into account when and where response to the survey request breaks-down.
- 2 We need a holistic theory that is consistent with a general theory of human behavior. Social exchange is such a theory.
- 3 We need to use social exchange to shape each aspect of the questionnaires and implementation process and connect them to each of the other parts in mutually supporting ways.
- 4 The response power of mixed-mode designs depends on contact modes as much or more than response modes.
- 5 I will elaborate each of these four assertions in the remainder of these brief comments.

1 A theory needs to take into account when and where response to the survey request often breaks-down.

The Response Process for mail/web can break down at different stages

- Unaware of response request (letter, email not received)
- No immediate action taken; request forgotten
- Response request not opened
- Response request not read
- Questionnaire not started
- Questionnaire started, but not completed
- Completed Questionnaire not returned

Non response does not happen at only one stage or reason. Multiple interventions are needed to overcome barriers to response.

The Telephone Process also breaks down at different stages

- Phone not answered.
- Immediate hang-up before request made.
- Hang-up during request, with or without comment.
- Termination after exchange of comments.
- Selected respondent not available.
- Termination after 1-2 questions.
- Termination comes later.
- Termination of refusal conversion call.
- Refusal conversion calls may be blocked/ignored.

One difference between telephone and other modes is feedback from call attempts may sometimes be obtained, but multiple interactions are especially difficult to achieve.



Implication

- Our best opportunity for overcoming these potential breakdown points, is likely to involve using multiple contacts
- Each aspect of the communication process, from appearance and timing to questionnaire layout and content needs to be designed to help.

We need a holistic theory 2 that is consistent with a general theory of human behavior that will guide the design of our communication efforts. Social exchange is such a theory.

How Social Exchange

Theory can help do that



- Original sociological application of social exchange was to explain the development and continuation of interaction with others.
- It posits that individuals respond to human requests on the basis of perceived <u>rewards</u> they <u>trust</u> will be received by responding to the request, and the belief that rewards will outweigh the perceived <u>costs</u> of providing that response.
- These three elements can be <u>mostly social</u> (benefitting a group the person identifies with) <u>or self-oriented</u>. Most people derive a sense of reward from both.
- The combination of <u>rewards, trust and costs</u> plus the <u>social and self-</u> <u>interest</u> appeals provides a myriad of ways to consider how to motivate response.

Some ways of providing benefits (from a much longer list)

- How are results useful
- Ask for help/advice
- Ask interesting questions
- Sponsorship by legitimate organization
- Cash/material incentives to encourage reciprocity
- Benefits have additive effects



Some ways of decreasing perceived costs of responding

- Reduce length
- Reduce complexity



- Visual design to ease task of responding
- Avoid subordinating language
- Make it convenient
- Reduce uncertainty that request is legitimate
- Avoid requiring uncomfortable answers

Establishing trust that benefits will outweigh costs

- Provides means for authenticating legitimacy of request
- Sponsorship by legitimate authority
- Build on previous relationships/friendships
- Token of appreciation in advance
- Assure confidentiality and data protection
- Trust is a huge problem with internet and surveys from unknown sources

What's different between applying social exchange in 1970's and 2010's?

- Social interaction is now more spontaneous.
- Communication now likely to be asynchronous.
- It now occurs in rapid-fire sequences.
- Trust in source of communication is now more likely to be withheld until proven.
- Trust now more important for making connection between "costs" and "rewards" of responding.

How certain design features may affect response process

• Plain brown larger envelope \rightarrow	Get envelope open	
• \$ token of appreciation clipped to letter \rightarrow	Get letter read	
 Questionnaire cover → 	Stimulate broad interest	
 First questions → 	Interesting to most of sample	
 Booklet, < 12 pages → 	reasonable burden	
 Visual design principles → 	Ease response task	
 Enclosed stamped envelope → 	Visible easy way of responding	
 Thank you reminder → 	Positive encouragement	
 Replacement questionnaire → 	This is important	
• Second incentive \rightarrow	Get new letter/appeals read	
 Sponsorship → 	Trust	

How do we get kinds of actions to add up?

Even <u>small</u> design changes may be additive

Tarnai and Schultz, 2012; medium (vs. small) envelope; \$1 with request (vs. no incentive), Stamped (vs. business reply) return envelope. A replacement questionnaire was sent to all treatment groups.



• Conclusion; Small elements can add-up; theoretically their combined use makes sense.

Expected response effects from adding QR Code and url/password options to these base elements?

		Effect
•	\$1 with request	base
•	Medium envelope	base
•	Stamped return	base
•	Replacement questionnaire	+
•	QR Code and cell response	-
•	URL, password, web option	-
•	Change \$1 to \$5	+

Negative effect of QR and URL is because "Choice" is being added and that makes decision-making more difficult; survey response by cell phone also requires "greater" effort.

Research on Census Questionnaires: Dillman, Sinclair and Clark, 1995



Proven Effects of Adding additional elements to the 2000 Census Questionnaire

(Assume a base response of about 60%)

- Respondent friendly visual + 3 (already included)
- Replacement questionnaire
- Envelope: Mandatory Resp. + 9-11
- Add Marketing style and color 5-9
- Greater Length

- 3-12

+ 6-12 (not included 2000)

Interpretation: 2000 Census limited to "four elements" PN, Reminder, Friendly Design, Mandatory message. It produced response rate of ~70%.

Incentives: Small prepayments to establish reciprocal obligation override large payments afterwards, but both may be beneficial.


An Implication

- The decision on whether to add something to a design needs to take into account what's already there and whether the effect is likely to be additive.
- Not much of that research gets done—it requires too many test panels and the implications are inevitably constrained. My suggestion is to think through the possibilities theoretically, and then consider whether to add or take something away.

4 The response power of mixed-mode designs depends on contact modes as much or more than response modes.

The strength of social exchange for influencing behavior depends upon:

- Understanding <u>relative strength</u> of means for affecting costs, rewards and trust
- Achieving <u>additivity</u> among those means
- Enhancing additivity through:
 - o multiple contacts
 - multiple modes of communication
 - Changing communication across contacts to reach different audiences may be helpful.
 - Offering multiple modes of responding (but choice lowers response rates)

Good Survey Design Needs to turn negatives into positive

- Many surveyors think offering **choice** will improve response.
- choice produces two effects:
 - A lower response rate.
 - Most people respond by mail
- We can change that by adding email augmentation—a quick email (if email address is available) after mail contact that makes it easier for people to respond.

Response Rates: Mail > Choice > Web when only postal contact is used with student sample; Web with <u>email augmentation</u> had higher response rate! (Millar and Dillman, POQ, 2011)



Follow-up Test of How To Turn Choice from Negative to Positive (Millar and Dillman, POQ 2011).

Requested Mode of response	Nov 9/10 Invitation	Nov 12/13 Invite prompt	Nov 18/19 Thank you/reminder	Dec 7/8 Replacement	Dec 10/14 Replacement prompt
1. Choice	\$				
2. Chaice	\$				
3. Mail	\$				
4. Web	\$				
5.Web	\$				
6.Web					
7.Web		L 🔺	A -	A	

Results: Choice with email augmentation higher than alternatives.



Detailed Conclusions from 7 panel test

- Initial postal contact with \$2 has largest effect ~18 percentage points.
- Choice with only mail contact adds ~3 percentage points over using email only following initial postal incentive.
- Choice with email augmentation adds ~5 points over limiting contacts to mail.
- Choice with email augmentation adds ~4 points over push-toweb with email augmentation.
- From social exchange perspective; we are cutting costs of responding to a preferred mode by adding convenience, thereby <u>overcoming the negative effect of choice</u>.

Application of email augmentation results: 12 page survey of 600 students writing dissertations (Millar, 2013)

Needed to implement survey in less than month and produce report within six weeks.

- Day 1 Postal request for web response with\$2 (reward with request; trust encouraged by sponsorship)
- Day 4 Email augmentation with electronic link (decrease inconvenience, i.e. cost)
- Day 10 Second email (survey is important, as social reward)
- Day 18 Postal request with <u>paper questionnaire</u> (reduce cost to some of respondents; also conveys message survey is important)
- Day 22 Final email. (survey is important and trust encouraged by repeated contacts.)

The 4th contact paper questionnaire



Two inside pages of the 12 page paper questionnaire

Q15.Do the theories, concepts, and/or perspectives you use to shape your dissertation research questions:	Next, we'd like to ask a few questions about your impressions and experiences in your doctor if program.			
All come than one field of study Modify one from one field of study Modify one from one field, but its tweet from other field(s) Come advances/ from ourse field	Q21. What is the name of the WSU department, program, center, or comm that supervises your dictoral studies?		r, ar comn	rittee
	Departmentio	riseli oranitas (pro	per l	
Q16.Do the methods, tools, techniques, and/or data used in your dissertation research:				
All come trais one field of allally Modifycame train one field but it swises train offwar field(s) Come extensioned train one field	Q22.How much training would you say your doctoral j each of the following?			
	Nove	181+ 50		NA
	Ferrolizing original research quantum O.	0, 0		Q,
017. Will the implications of your dissertation research be relevant or applicable to	Designing and conducting data analysis O	0,0	000000	0,
one field or multiple fields?	Designing and teaching www.owe discuss O	0, 0	V 9	0,
	Preparing and delivering propertations at conferences or meetings	00	, Q.	0,
O Crie Reld O Multiple Teleza	Preparing and submitting research management for publication 🔹 🔿	0, 0	N 90	0
O, water man	Preparing and submitting grant propertials	00) <u>0</u>	0
	Proposing to application materials O. State-serving for julys	000		00
O No	students for each of the following issues?			Iscalart
	Reding an abdear		0, 0,	0
Q19.Have you either published, or think you might publish, your dissertation	Persing a committee Overcarring doctable to transitofié degree condiction	0	0,00	DD
research in a journal (or other outlet) that speaks to multiple fields?	Ruding appropriate balance between work/trchcol and perconsidianily iffe		0'0'	ă
0, No. 0, Vec	C			
Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research <u>modifies (alters)</u> elements of	Q24. To what extent does each of the following statem in your doctoral program?	ients descri	be the st	idents
0, No Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research modifies (alters) elements of multiple fields in order to create common ground between them?		147		
0, No Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research modifies (alters) elements of multiple fields in order to create common ground between them?	in your doctoral program?	355 .	some	Aget
Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research <u>modifies (alters)</u> elements of		355 .	some	*ggt
0, No Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research modifies (alters) elements of multiple fields in order to create common ground between them?	in your doctoral program? Theodes as sports of reservice	355 .	attie store	Aget
0, We Q20. Would you say that your dissertation research modifies (alters) elements of multiple fields in order to create common ground between them? 0, No. 0, No. 0, We	In your doctoral program? The suders as separities of vise awher there is high morels among studens.	355 .	some	*ggt

Response rate was 77%; email augmentation moved response from 8 to 29% in 10 hours. Mail and 2nd email aug. produced additional 12%.



How did this happen?

- Postal mail used token cash incentive to provide a <u>reward</u> and get attention to the attached communication.
- Email augmentation of that contact to provide electronic link <u>decreased costs</u> of responding.
- Multiple communications by multiple modes and paper copy improved <u>trust</u> that responding to the survey was important.

Putting the Parts together

- Effective design of data collection means getting beyond thinking about single factor causation, whether achieving cognitive consonance, communicating adult-to-adult, gamification, scarcity of opportunity, or asking people what is important to them.
- We have to think about multiple factors all at once, and how they connect with one another.
- Social exchange encourages this kind of thinking and provides a behavioral matrix focusing on costs, benefits and trust, for combining elements together consistent with <u>a general theory of human behavior</u>.
- It also encourages us to link together modes of communication, and thinking simultaneously about practices that increase or decrease response when used with other implementation practices in mixed-mode designs.

Wrap-Up. The four points

- 1 We need to take into account where the response can and often does break-down.
- 2 We need holistic theory consistent with a general theory of behavior that can encompass the specifics of survey design. Social exchange is such a theory.
- 3 We need to use social exchange to shape specific response stimuli as well as how each of them fits/connects with other parts.
- 4 The response power of mixed-mode designs depends on contact modes as much response modes.

For additional information...



- Chapter 2 describes how social exchange was rethought for the 4th edition.
- Elaboration is provided as it applies to questionnare design and implementation in 4-11.

Thank you!

- For additional information on these studies contact Don Dillman at: dillman@wsu.edu
- Web page information is at: http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/
- Postal address: Don A. Dillman, Ph.D. 133 Wilson Hall Washington State University Pullman, WA 99163-4014 United States of America

Creating Mixed-Mode Survey Designs that Work

Jolene Smyth University of Nebraska-Lincoln Lincoln, NE 68588 jsmyth2@unl.edu

My plan...

 Talk about some of the key ideas from the new edition of the book about how to design effective mixed-mode surveys.

The goal of mixed-mode design

- Bring together multiple features to...
 - Create a holistic design with all of the features working together to...
 - Address known areas where single-mode surveys break down...
 - With strategies intended to establish trust, increase benefits, and reduce costs of responding.

Since 2007, we have conducted 6 separate experiments that form the basis of our mixed-mode design guidelines

- Driving Question: How do we get the general public to respond by web?
- Most contained 12-page booklet mail questionnaires matched by web surveys with 50-60 screens.
 - One was a 4-page booklet questionnaire

- Topics varied
 - Community satisfaction
 - Economic issues
 - Electricity
 - Water management
 - Quality of life
- Sponsors
 - WSU
 - UNL

Let's look at one example

- The Washington and Nebraska Water Study
 - Intended to test the effects of sponsorship on response rates and response to the web.
 - Designed using much of what we had learned from previous experiments

Source: Edwards, Michelle, Don A. Dillman and Jolene D. Smyth. 2014. "An Experimental Test of the Effects of Survey Sponsorship on Internet and Mail Survey Response." *Public Opinion Quarterly. doi:* 10.1093/poq/nfu027

The vitals

- April June 2012
- Sample Frame: USPS Delivery Sequence File
- 8 Experimental Treatments

Sponsor	Mode	State
UNL BOSR	Mail-only	NE
UNL BOSR	Mail-only	WA
WSU SESRC	Mail-only	NE
WSU SESRC	Mail-only	WA
UNL BOSR	Web-First	NE
UNL BOSR	Web-First	WA
WSU SESRC	Web-First	NE
WSU SESRC	Web-First	WA



The questionnaires used a unified-mode design (i.e., eliminate all unnecessary differences across modes)

• The mail and web used the same pictures, titles, subtitles and colors.





• The mail and web used the similar colors and the same fonts, question formats, answer spaces, spacing, emphasis, and single-item regions.

Q1.	Please think about the city or town where you receive your postal mail. For about how many years has your mailing address been in this city or town?	Please think about the city or town where you receive your postal mail. For about how many years has your mailing address been in this city or town?
02	Which of the following <u>best</u> describes where your home is in relation to this city or town? O Within this city or town limits O Codside this city or town limits	reas
Q3.	Most Nebraska homes have running water that comes out of indoor taps or faucets. How safe do you feel the tap water in your home is for drinking? O Completely safe O Very safe O Socrewiral safe O Signity safe O Not at all safe O Not sure	Ourside this city or town limits
Q4.	How often does your tap water have a bad taste and/or odor? O All of the time O Most of the time O Sometimes O Rately O Never O Not sure	Question 3 of 48 Most Nebraska homes have running water that comes out of indoor taps or faucets. How safe do you feel the tap water in your home is for drinking?
Q6.	What kind of drinking water do you use at home? O Tap water <u>with additional purfication</u> O Tap water <u>with additional purfication(such as a pitcher filter, faucet filter, tank filter, or boiled water</u>) O Bottled water O Other (please specify). O Not sure	Completely safe Very safe Somewhat safe Slightly safe Not at all safe Not sure
Q6.	Which of the following water suppliers provides your home with tap water? O Privately owned individual well O City, community, or municipality owned public drinking water supplier O Privately owned public drinking water supplier O City, iplease specify) O Not sure	Question 4 of 40 How often does your tap water have a bad taste and/or odor?
Q7.	When people open their faucets to get water, they may be tapping a source close to home or many miles away. From where do you get your tap water? O. From a take, inver, stream, or pond O. From a below ground source of water O. Other (please specify): O. Not sure	All of the time Most of the time Sometimes Rarely Never
1		Not sure Interventered

Exceptions to unified mode design



Exceptions to unified mode design

- Numbering differed so web respondents could have the same sense of total length as mail respondents.
- The web questionnaire automated skip patterns; the mail questionnaire did not.
- Both of these changes are expected to help respondents without negatively affecting measurement.



Why make both the wording and visual design so similar? Why unified mode design?

- Previous research shows very few measurement differences between the web and mail modes when we unify the designs in this way.
 - Minor Exceptions:
 - Slightly higher item nonresponse in mail.
 - Better open-ended responses in web (i.e., longer with more information).
- We hope to get coverage and response advantages by mixing modes of response without increasing measurement error.

The questionnaire design was informed by social exchange principles

To reduce costs:

- The design was simple & consistent
- There was a clear navigational
- Lead with easy questions.

To increase benefits:

- The first questions were interesting.
- The cover design was state-specific.
- The questionnaire had highly salient state-specific water questions.

To build trust:

- Sponsor contact information was provided on the questionnaire.
- The questions were ordered in a logical conversational flow.
- The questionnaire design was professional in appearance.
- Gratitude and a genuine interest in people's responses were expressed.



We used postal mail contacts for all treatments; no email contacts

- Why?
 - Coverage
 - No email sample frame for the general public in Washington and Nebraska.
 - Using the USPS Delivery Sequence File as a frame gave us great coverage of these populations.
 - Response
 - Postal mail does not get caught in spam filters or rejected if there is a small typo in the address (i.e., increases the chances of delivery and making the initial contact).
 - Postal mail allows us to incorporate more social exchange elements into our contacts (i.e., increases the chances of cooperation once contact is made).

Contact materials were carefully designed from a social exchange framework, taking into account response mode

• 4 carefully timed postal mail contacts

Trust Inducing Features	Features to Increase Benefits	Features to Reduce Costs
 Printed in color on sponsor's letterhead 	 Personalized to address and community 	URL highly visible in color
 Real blue-ink signature Multiple types of sponsor contact information provided Incentive mentioned as token of appreciation Consistency between contacts 	 Message framed as request for help Survey topic clearly stated Incentive mentioned as a token of appreciation Results website provided 	 URL made of meaningful words (www.opinion.wsu.edu/ washingtonwater) Addressed problems sample members alerted us to
Responsiveness problems		

In the mixed-mode treatment, we used a sequential instead of a simultaneous (i.e., choice) design

- Why?
 - Previous research shows that choice designs...
 - Reduce response rates vis-à-vis mail-only designs (Medway & Fulton 2012)
 - Reduce the proportion responding by web in mixed-mode designs



Source: Smyth, Jolene D., Don A. Dillman, Leah Melani Christian, and Allison O'Neill. 2010. "Using the Internet to Survey Small Towns and Communities: Limitations and Possibilities in the early 21st Century." *American Behavioral Scientist*. 53:1423-1448.

In the mixed-mode treatment, we offered webfirst and mail second

Response Rates by Mode from Five Studies that Start with Web Versus Mail First



Why?

Our research shows that more people respond by web when it is offered first.

It is not worth the costs to program a web option in a mail-first design for the 1 to 3 percent who will use it.

In the mixed-mode treatment, we withheld the mail option until the fourth and final contact

Response Rates with Mail Offered at the Third versus the Fourth of Four contacts

Web Response Mail Response — Mean Web Response

Why?

More people respond on the web when mail is withheld until the fourth of four contacts.

Mean = 25.5% vs. 20.0%



We used a \$4 prepaid incentive in all treatments

Why?

- Previous research is clear that a prepaid incentive increases response rates.
- Our research suggests much of the benefit in web-first mixedmode designs is in getting more people to respond in the web mode.



We also used an additional \$2 incentive with the 3rd contact

- Why?
 - We hoped the second incentive would be an attention-getter making people more likely to read the appeal in the letter and thus more likely to be exposed to our messages about trust, benefits, and costs (i.e., interconnection of design features)
 - This idea is untested, but we think it has great promise.
 - One previous test resulted in a higher response rate in a web-first treatment with a second incentive (52%) than with no second incentive (48%) but this difference was not statistically significant.

We were testing the effects of sponsorship because previous research suggested it may be important

- 2011 Electricity Study
 - Sent to residents in three states
 - Sponsored by Washington State University.
- Proximity to the sponsor increased response rates by increasing the proportion responding on the web.
 - Response to the mail was virtually unchanged.



Source: Messer, Benjamin L. 2012. "Pushing households to the web: Results from Web+mail experiments using address based samples of the general public and mail contact procedures." Ph.D. Dissertation. Washington State University, Pullman.

So how did we do in the mixed-mode treatment in the water study?

- Response Rates (AAPOR RR2)
 - Overall = 43.1%
 - Washington = 40.7%
 - Nebraska = 45.6%



Did sponsorship matter in the water study? Yes!



- In both states, response rates are higher with the instate sponsor.
- In-state sponsorship led to more respondents answering by web, but little change in response by mail.
- Trust is key to getting web response in these designs!!

What if we just used mail?

• In most of our studies, mail-only has produced higher response rates than web-first.



Why not just use mail then?

• With large projects there may be cost advantages to getting response by web.

• Looking to the future, as more people become comfortable with the web we expect web-first designs to perform better.

Water Study Summary

- Our goal was to create a holistically designed survey informed by social exchange to improve coverage and response with little impact on measurement.
- Questionnaire design used a unified mode strategy and a design meant to increase trust and benefits and reduce costs.
- Postal mail contacts allowed us to incorporate many social exchange elements as well as use a good sample frame.
- Sequential, web-first design with mail withheld until the end improved response rates and pushed more respondents to the web.

Conclusions

- ~10,000 design decisions (±5,000!) went into creating our mixed mode treatment.
- We chose a sample frame with the best coverage we could get and designed samples to fit our needs (Chapter 3)
- We used best practices for writing questions (Chapters 4 & 5), visual design (Chapter 6) and ordering questions (Chapter 7)
- We also followed many of the best practices for designing web and mail questionnaires (Chapters 9 and 10).
- But there were times when the mixed-mode nature of the study meant we could not rely on single-mode design strategies. We had to create synergy between the two modes (Chapter 11).
- All of the decisions were made within the social exchange framework, taking into consideration the goals of the project, target population, and budget (Chapter 2).

• Different circumstances might have required a different design, but the social exchange framework and holistic design goal would remain the same.

Questions/Comments?

