Remind Me Again?
Prompting and Reminding to Increase Response Rates

Methodological Brief
SESSION MODERATOR

Mary McDougall | CEO, Survox Inc.
RECAP PRESENTER

Brian Fowler | COO, Survox Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remind Me Again? Prompting and Reminding to Increase Response Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Harm than Good? An Experimental Approach to Examining the Value of <em>Evening and Weekend Calls</em></td>
<td>Casey A. Easterday Project Coordinator</td>
<td>HealthPartners Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examing <strong>Phone Follow-up</strong> Effort in School Recruitment</td>
<td>Yan Wang Principal Research Scientist</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing The Impact Of <strong>Web Option</strong> For Mothers Of New Children Using The Tailored Design Method.</td>
<td>Kurt Johnson CRS Research Manager</td>
<td>RTI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating the Effects of <strong>Survey Links</strong> on Response Rates</td>
<td>Rael Moore Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>ACT, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Me? An Experimental Examination of Including a <strong>Deadline</strong> on Survey Communications</td>
<td>Rebecca Powell Research Survey Methodologist</td>
<td>RTI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing the Impact of the <strong>Type of Mail</strong> Used on Augmenting Response Rates for a Leave-Behind Questionnaire in a Face-to-Face Survey</td>
<td>Daniel Lawrence Survey Director</td>
<td>NORC at the University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Unintended Consequences of an <strong>Email Reminder</strong> Strategy for a Household Survey with an Address-Based Sample Frame</td>
<td>Cameron McPhee Senior Researcher &amp; Methodologist</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Casey Easterday

Survey Research Center
HealthPartners Institute
More Harm than Good?

An Experimental Approach to Examining the Value of Evening and Weekend Calls

72nd Annual AAPOR Conference
May 19th, 2017
HealthPartners Survey Research Center

What we do:

• Consult on survey design
• Prospective research
• Direct patient recruitment
• Retrospective research

In 2015, we

• Served 40 projects nationally
• Recruited 700 patients
• Made 81,000 outbound calls
• Surveyed in 4 languages
Methods

• In August 2016, conducted full-factorial experiment

• Geography based sample with landlines in MN and Western WI

• Nonresponders randomized to 1 of 18 treatments for first call
Methods
Results – Contact Rate

DAY OF THE WEEK?

VARIATION BY DAY
WEEKDAY vs. WEEKEND
NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE
Results – Contact Rate

TIME of DAY?

EVENINGS BETTER THAN AFTERNOONS
EVENINGS vs. BUSINESS HOURS
NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE
Results – Completion Rate

BEST:
1. SATURDAY
2. MONDAY
3. TUESDAY
Results – Completion Rate

AFTERNOON CONTACTS HAD HIGHEST COMPLETION RATES
Results – Refusal Rate

Evening contacts were least cooperative.

* \( p < .05 \)

** \( p < .01 \)
Our results are:

- Discordant with previous research suggesting Evening and weekend calls improve contact and completion
- Support previous studies suggesting greater refusals in evening

Staffing alternative hours may be ineffective in increasing RR and may actually decrease RR through increase refusals

Future research to improve generalizability to broader populations and communication methods
Questions?

Casey.A.Easterday@HealthPartners.com
Jeanette.Y.Ziegenfuss@HealthPartners.com
Examining Phone Follow-up Effort in School Recruitment
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ED School Climate Surveys (EDSCLS)

• 2013 White House initiative to provide schools, districts, and states with reliable, actionable data on school climate
• EDSCLS: a free-to-use open source school climate measurement and reporting system

- **Consists of four surveys:**
  » Students in grades 5-12
  » Parents
  » Instructional staff
  » Noninstructional staff (including principals)

- **Covers 3 domains:**
  » Engagement
  » Safety
  » Environment

Recruitment effort was done in 2016-17 to create a baseline
Recruitment Practices and Concerns

• Most school-based surveys start recruitment before the beginning of the school year in which they hope to collect data
  – Accommodate calendar planning, testing schedules, vacation breaks, et cetera

• NCES’s Principal Attrition and Mobility report in 2014 shows that roughly 22% of public school principals left their schools in a one-year follow-up
  – Rates were even higher for public charter schools, compared to traditional public schools
  – Makes it difficult to maintain rapport and continue conversations about survey participation, with a newly installed principal

Timing of recruitment was key due to seasonality of school year and high principal attrition
Research Questions

1) Is late **spring** or early **fall** a better period of time in which to recruit schools?

2) **How many times** should one attempt to call schools to gauge interest in survey participation?

3) Regarding **effort** needed for a successful recruitment, are there any differences among particular **school types**?
Recruitment Stages

1. Data collection in **spring 2017**

2. **1000** schools sampled, with assumption of 50% school participation rate

3. Sampled schools randomly divided into **two batches** – 700 vs. 300
   - If a participation of 70% could be achieved, the second batch would not need to be released, thus reducing cost and burden

4. Roughly 590 schools contacted in late spring of 2016 after removal of out-of-scope schools and schools in special districts

5. An additional 230 schools were added in the second batch, for a total of approximately **700** schools in active recruitment in the early **fall of 2016**
   - Including schools from approved districts and excluding schools that had made a decision
Recruitment Methods

**Mail – advance letter**
- Including covering letter, questionnaires, flyer, FAQs, etc.

**Mail – recruitment package**
- Including identical recruitment materials

**Email – recruitment package**
- Including identical recruitment materials

**Phone follow-up**
- Up to 20 dials
- Stop calling after a hard refusal
- Left voicemail in 1 out of 3 attempts
- Questions or requests answered within a day
- Dialing during different time of the school day
- A toll-free number and email address dedicated for inquiries
Call Results

- First Round – late spring/early summer
  - 44% calls were picked up
    - 12% Principal not available
    - 15% Scheduled call back
    - 17% Left message
  - 56% were not
    - 28% Answering machine
    - 23% No answer
    - 4% Phone busy
    - 1% Other (e.g., number stopped working)
  - Average attempts: 13

- Second Round – late summer/early fall
  - 48% calls were picked up
    - 16% Principal not available
    - 15% Scheduled call back
    - 17% Left message
  - 56% were not
    - 25% Answering machine
    - 13% No answers
    - 12% Phone busy
    - 2% Other
  - Average attempts: 10

Similar results between Spring & Fall starts
School Responses

- After two rounds of recruitment, 51% of the total 820 schools offered a decision, with only 17% doing so after the first round.
- Among the schools that provided us with a decision, 72% agreed to participate after the first round, with the percentage decreasing to 42% after two rounds.
- Overall participation rate after two rounds of recruitment: 20%
School Responses

• On average, it took 59 days, and 12 follow-up call attempts to recruit a participating school

• It took more attempts and a longer period to recruit rural schools, and fewer attempts to recruit urban/suburban schools
Lessons Learned

• It is exceedingly **difficult to reach a likely decision-maker** at the school (most likely principal), due to the busy nature of school days.

• **Minimizing study burden** for schools is the key.

• **Highlighting direct benefits** for schools is necessary - e.g. school data, reports, incentives.

• Recruitment needs to **start early**, and allow enough time for schools to make a decision. At least one **additional round** of recruitment should be planned for the beginning of the data collection school year.

• Our results also show that **rural, small schools, in smaller districts**, with more students eligible for FRPL are **more likely to participate**.
  
  - Schools with limited resources are the target users of the EDSCLS platform
Thank You!

Yan Wang  
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Assessing the Impact of Web Option for Mothers of New Children Using the Tailored Design Method
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Effectiveness of Multi-Modal Methodologies
A significant amount of research has been done on the use of the web option in multi-modal data collection.

The traditional Tailored Design Method (TDM) relies on multiple points of contact over a predetermined period of time. In most cases this includes up to 4 mail contacts, with a final alternative mode contact over the course of roughly 6 to 8 weeks.

Dillman et al. (2017) have recently been suggesting that a Push-to-Web methodology may be a more cost-effective means of collecting self-administered (SA) data with some populations.

Concerns for Push-to-Web center around the profile of respondents that are more likely to complete surveys via the web, as well as the overall impact on survey response rates.

The purpose of this study is to examine how the Push-to-Web methodology may benefit a traditional TDM Survey.
Our data comes from the State of Ohio’s Pregnancy Assessment Survey (OPAS).

The CDC’s PRAMS Survey has informed the direction of this research.

- PRAMS combines a traditional Tailored Design Methodology with an invitation to complete the survey via the internet; this invitation is delivered during the last self-administered contact.

Similar in content and approach to PRAMS, the OPAS uses birth records to create a survey sample consisting of mothers with recent births in the state of Ohio.
To encourage Push-to-Web with recent mothers, we created three broad treatments for delivering the invitation to participate online:

1. **Traditional TDM** – The invitation to complete the web survey was included with the final contact of the mail survey.

2. **Varied Invitation to Web** – The invitation was systematically rotated across each mail survey contact.

3. **Push-to-Web** – The initial invitation consisted of letters encouraging participants to complete the survey online. Subsequently two mail survey contacts were made after the invite to web.

- At initial invite, regardless of treatment, participants were provided an initial incentive of $1.
- All treatments had a phone non-response follow-up. These data are not reported in this presentation.
Self-Administred Response by Mode by Treatment

Web had higher participation from Push-to-Web group. Mail was preferred in other two methods.
### Respondent Characteristics by Mode (TDM)

#### Traditional TDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% with Previous Child</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with 4 year degree</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Married*</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Prenatal Medicaid coverage</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Web preferred by Married and those with Children**
- **Mail preferred by Whites**
Respondent Characteristics (Rotating Invite)

Rotating Web Invite

Differences were reduced
Respondent Characteristics (Push-to-Web)

Push-to-Web really influenced Educated & Married. Multiple Child households preferred Mail.
Total SA Completes by Treatment

Total SA RR by Treatment

- TDM: 27.0%
- Varied: 26.3%
- Push to Web: 23.6%

Push-to-Web had lowest Response Rates
Conclusions

- We found that the overall survey response rate is slightly lower using the Push-to-Web methodology than the TDM.

- This is consistent with some of the general population research in this area.

  - While the approach may reduce cost in the self-administered stage, the lower self-administered response rate may require additional non-response follow-up efforts.
Conclusions

- We found that overall the **Push-to-Web** methodology showed the **greatest difference in mode choice** by respondent characteristics.

- Further research should focus on timing, incentive pushes, and administration with a wider variety of populations.
Kurt Johnson Ph.D.
Senior Research Operations Manager
919.926.6515
kjohnson@rti.org

Michelle Menegay M.P.H.
Research Analytics Consultant
614.685.3103
michelle.menegay@osumc.edu
Date Me?

An Experimental Examination of Including a Deadline on Survey Communications

AAPOR 2017—New Orleans, LA
May 19, 2017

Rebecca J. Powell
Emily M. Geisen
Marshica Stanley Kurtz
Murrey G. Olmsted
Goal to increase response rates in a timely manner

Can language in the cover letter portray importance?

Previous literature shows mixed results:
- Increased RR when using a deadline compared to no deadline — Porter and Whitcomb, 2003; Martin, 2009
- No differences in RR when using a deadline compared to no deadline — Bouffard et al., 2004; Dillman, 1991

Suggestions by Dillman and colleagues (2014):
- Use “as soon as possible” for most communications
- Reserve a deadline or the term “approaching soon” for the final mailing
2017 Physicians Survey

- National survey of physicians

- Data is used to calculate a reputation score for U.S. News & World Report Best Hospitals and Best Children’s Hospitals

- Mail survey where physicians write in nominations for best hospitals in their specialty
  - 16 adult specialties (200 physicians in each)
  - 10 pediatric specialties (150 physicians in each)
  - Sampling frame: list of Doximity non-members
  - Probability of selection is proportionate to size (PPS) within each census region: Midwest, Northeast, South, and West
Survey Examples

Survey of Adult Physicians

Survey of Pediatric Physicians
Data Collection

- Data collection timeline
  - Adults: January 4th – April 25th
  - Pediatrics: January 11th – April 25th

- Mailing Protocol: 4 mailings
  - Invitation letter with incentive ($2 bill and pen) sent USPS
  - Reminder letter sent USPS
  - Reminder letter sent USPS Priority
  - Final reminder letter sent UPS
Randomly Assigned Physicians to one of three conditions:

1. **Deadline**: Deadline of March 15th (for adults) or March 1st (for pediatrics) included in all four mailings (Adults N=1066; Pediatrics N=500)

   Please submit your responses by March 15, 2017.

   Please submit your responses by March 1, 2017.

2. **ASAP**: “as soon as possible” included in all four mailings

   (Adults N=1066; Pediatrics N=500)

   Please submit your responses as soon as possible.

3. **Switch**: “as soon as possible” for the first three mailings then switch to include a deadline of March 15th (for adults) or March 1st (for pediatrics) in the final mailing

   (Adults N=1068; Pediatrics N=500)
Analysis

- **Response Rates (RR):**
  - Compare final RR across the three conditions
  - Compare boost in RR after each mailing across the three conditions
  - Compare RR at the deadline of March 1\textsuperscript{st} (or 15\textsuperscript{th})

- Average time to return the survey across conditions

- Average number of nominations across conditions
Results
Results: RR by the end of data collection

- The “switch” condition had slightly higher RR for Pediatric physicians.

- However, there are no differences in RR across the three wording conditions for either Adults or Pediatrics.
Results: Additional Completes after each mailing

No significant differences in additional completes after each mailing for either survey
Results: RR by the deadline

- Trend: “Switch” treatment has higher response rates by deadline

- However, no significant differences
Results: Average Number of Days to Return

- Opposite results for adults and peds.
  - Adults: “Switch” treatment took on average fewer days to return
  - Pediatric: “Switch” took on average more days to return

- No significant differences
Results: Average Number of Nominations

- Adult physicians can nominate a max of 5 hospitals
- Pediatric physicians can nominate a max of 10 hospitals
- No significant differences across the treatments
Conclusions and Future Research

- Conclusions:
  - Did not see significant differences by treatment
    - Response Rates (Overall, By deadline, After each mailing)
    - Days to Return
    - Number of Nominations
    - Demographics and Physician Specialty
  - Respondents most likely do not read the letter fully.
    - Especially later letters

- Future Research:
  - See this replicated on other surveys
    - Non-physician population
Thank you! Questions?

Rebecca J. Powell, PhD
RTI International
rpowell@rti.org
Investigating the Effects of Survey Links on Response Rates

Raeal Moore, Ph.D., Emily Uhl, B.A., Lebena Varghese, Ph.D.
AAPOR 2017 Annual Conference
The people

- September 10, 2016 national test date (N = 361,864)
- Stratified random sample of 43,920 students invited
- Grades 9-12
The design

3 manipulated experiences to the invitation message

1. Survey link location
2. Survey link type
3. Number of survey links
Dear ${m://FirstName},

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

Please take the Student Information Survey here.

We thank you for your time and look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely, ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may ${l:/OptOutLink?d=choose not to participate}. 
Dear ${m://FirstName},

Please take the **Student Information Survey** here.

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

We thank you for your time and we look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely,

ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may ${l://OptOutLink?d=choose not to participate}. 
Dear $\{m://FirstName\},

Please take the Student Information Survey here.

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

We thank you for your time and we look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely,

ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may $\{c://OptOutLink?d=choose not to participate\}.
Dear $(firstName),

Please take the Student Information Survey here:
https://act.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_37X9SqOZfQNy8iV

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

We thank you for your time and we look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely,
ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may $!(l://OptOutLink?d=choose not to participate).
Dear $[my/FirstName],

Please take the Student Information Survey here:

https://act.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_37X93gOZtQNy8IV

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

Or take the Student Information Survey here.

We thank you for your time and we look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely,

ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may$[ly/OptOutLink?]d=choose not to participate).
Dear $(m//FirstName),

Please take the Student Information Survey here.

Thank you for recently registering for the ACT® test. ACT is dedicated to gathering feedback from students. We would like to ask you just a few questions about yourself. Ultimately, we hope that the answers you provide will help us to improve the questions we ask at registration.

ACT will not ask you to buy anything based on your responses, and no one will contact you as a result of your participation. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, reported in group form only. Your decision to participate will not influence your ACT score or when you receive your score.

Or take the Student Information Survey here:

https://act.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_37X9SpOZfQNy8IV

We thank you for your time and we look forward to your candid input.

Sincerely,

ACT

If you do not want to receive additional e-mails from ACT concerning this project, you may go here to choose not to participate.
The survey
participants

11.7% response rate
5,140 students answered at least 80% of the survey
The survey participants

- Male: 30.6%
- Female: 69.4%

Racial and Ethnic Backgrounds:

- White: 62.3%
- African American: 7.1%
- Hispanic/Latino: 10.2%
- Asian: 11.5%
- Two or more races: 3.9%
- No response: 4.7%
- Amer Ind/Alaska Nat: 0.2%
- Nat Hawaiian: 0.1%
RQ1: Link type & location

LOCATION MATTERS | TYPE DOES NOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hyperlink: Top 11.5, Bottom 12.4
- Generic: Top 10.9, Bottom 10.9
**RQ2: Ordering of two links**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperlink Bottom; Generic Top</th>
<th>12.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyperlink Top; Generic Bottom</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LONG URL AT TOP > MASKED URL**
RQ 3: one or two links

- Hyperlink Bottom; Generic Top: 12.6
- Hyperlink Top; Generic Bottom: 11.3
- Bottom: 11.2
- Top: 11.9

LOCATION MATTERS MORE THAN REPETITION
Summary

1. Large sample sizes and practical significance

2. Place the link at the top of the email invitation

3. It doesn’t matter if the link is generic or a hyperlink

4. One link is sufficient in the email message

5. If you choose to provide two links, place the generic link at the top of the email
Thank you

Raeal Moore, Ph.D.
Senior Research Scientist
Raeal.moore@act.org
Testing the Impact of the Type of Mail Used on Augmenting Response Rates for a Leave-Behind Questionnaire in a Face-to-Face Survey

Daniel Lawrence, Erin Burgess, Ned English, Katie Archambeau, and Colm O’Muircheartaigh

May 19th, 2017
Study Background

- The NSHAP interview
  - In-person CAPI
  - Physical measures collection
  - Supplemental PAPI leave-behind questionnaire (LBQ)

- The National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP) is a longitudinal survey of adults born between 1920-1947, conducted at five-year intervals
  - Returning Respondents (RR)

- Wave 3 of NSHAP included the screening and recruitment of a new, younger cohort of respondents born between 1948-1965
  - New Cohort Respondents (NC)
  - Wave 3 data collection occurred 2015-2016, with 4,777 completed interviews
Leave-Behind Questionnaire (LBQ)

- **Description**
  - Approximately 90 items
  - Estimated 25-35 minutes to complete

- **Distribution protocol**
  - Given to all respondents at conclusion of in-person interview
  - Different version by cohort type (NC slightly longer)

- **Prompting protocol**
  - If unreturned after three weeks, eligible for a sequence of up to three telephone prompting contacts
  - LBQ re-mailed upon request, but not automatically
Experimental Design

- Experiment began ~9 months into data collection
  - LBQ return rates lagging behind previous waves’ benchmarks

- Two-part research question
  - Would a mail follow-up to the standard telephone prompting protocol increase response rates?
  - Would the type of mail used for the follow-up have a differential impact?

- Initial phase drew random sample of respondents eligible for LBQ prompting
  - Group 1: Control (n=345)
  - Group 2: Initial Regular Mail Treatment (n=255)
  - Group 3: Initial FedEx Treatment (n=253)

- Treatment groups received a new copy of the LBQ and another prepaid return envelope by either regular mail or FedEx
Results – Three Weeks Post-Remailing

**LBQ Return Rate after 3 Weeks**

- **Control**
- **Regular Mail**
- **FedEx**

**TYPE OF MAIL MATTERS**
Treatment Timeline

- **Treatment Group**
  1. Experimental Control (n=345)
  2. Regular Mail Treatment (n=255)
  3. FedEx Treatment (n=253)
  4. Eligible for 2nd Remail (n=184)
  5. Eligible for 3rd Remail (n=101)

- **1st Remail 6/27/16**
  - No Treatment
  - Regular Mail
  - FedEx

- **2nd Remail 8/31/16**
  - FedEx
  - FedEx
  - No Treatment

- **3rd Remail 10/5/16**
  - No Treatment
  - FedEx
  - FedEx

- **Final Return Results**
  - 33%
  - 44%
  - 51%
  - 39%
  - 60%

Remail quickly.
Use FedEx.
### Change in Overall LBQ Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall Return Rate before Experiment</th>
<th>Overall Return Rate - Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returning Respondents (RR)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cohort Respondents (NC)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDING MAILING = 10% RESPONSE RATE GAINED**
Lessons Learned

- FedEx clearly outperformed regular mail
  - Increased cost possibly offset by fewer prompting hours
  - Regular mail still provided a clear boost over the control group

- Proximity of follow-up mailing to interview date likely a key factor
  - Lowest return rate for group 1 (average time between interview and remail: 260 days)
  - Highest return rate for group 5 (average time between interview and remail: 71 days)

- No evidence that unannounced remailing alienated respondents

- Future rounds of NSHAP
  - Use FedEx
  - Send after very modest waiting period
  - Perhaps even more important with the new, younger cohort

Use FedEx, Do so Quickly, No need to pre-announce mailing
What Happens When I Ask for Your Email Address?

Potential Unintended Consequences of an Email Reminder Strategy for a Household Survey with an Address-Based Sample Frame

Sarah Grady, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)
Cameron McPhee, American Institutes for Research (AIR)

This presentation is intended to promote the exchange of ideas. The views expressed during the presentation and in presentation materials are part of ongoing research and analysis and do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Education.
Background

- Web surveys can leverage email reminders to encourage respondents to complete.
  - only if email addresses are on the frame or if the survey has collected email addresses from non-completers.
- Is this a good idea?

- Experiment conducted in 2016 National Household Education Survey (NHES).
Design of the experiment

• Embedded within a web response rate experiment (web survey size, n = 35,000)

• NHES is a nationally representative, two-stage survey with an address-based sampling (ABS) frame and mail materials

• 50 percent of cases randomly pre-assigned to receive email question
### Asking for email did not lower unit response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second-stage survey</th>
<th>R was asked for an email address</th>
<th>R was not asked for an email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of young children (ECPP)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of school-aged, enrolled children (PFI-E)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of school-aged, homeschooled children (PFI-H)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of adults (ATES)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes a statistically significant difference from 92 percent estimate of response rate when R was not asked for an email address.

NOTE: Includes only cases where the screener respondent was also the second-stage survey respondent. Numbers are rounded to nearest 10. Screener unit response rate was 40%. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES:2016).
### Percentage of respondents who provided an email address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Item-level response rate to email question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second-stage survey total</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of young children (ECPP)</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of school-aged, enrolled children (PFI-E)</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of school-aged, homeschooled children (PFI-H)</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of adults (ATES)</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

~80% provided email when asked

NOTE: Includes only cases where the screener respondent was also the second-stage survey respondent. Screener unit response rate was 40%.

Don’t ask respondents for email address of others

Adult Training and Education Survey unit response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second-stage survey</th>
<th>R was asked for an email address</th>
<th>R was not asked for an email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey of adults (ATES), different second-stage sample member</td>
<td>Number 560</td>
<td>Percent 57.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number 770</td>
<td>Percent 64.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes a statistically significant difference from 64 percent estimate of response rate when R was not asked for other adult’s email address.

NOTE: Numbers are rounded to nearest 10. Screener unit response rate was 40%.

Percentage of adult survey screener respondents who answered “yes” to “Are you [sampled person]?” though another adult was sampled, by whether the respondent was asked for other adult’s email address.

* denotes a statistically significant difference from 7.1 percent estimate of respondents who answered “yes” to “Are you [sampled person]?” question when R was not asked for email.


Asking for another’s email triggered 2x more lying.
Conclusions and Next Steps

• Asking for respondent’s email address is a viable strategy
  – Unit response rates not measurably lower.
  – About 8 in 10 respondents provided an email address.
  – Over 98 percent of those addresses were usable.

• Asking for another household adult’s email lowered unit response and encouraged proxy response.

• Next: comparison of cost savings from email prompt vs. cost of setting up an email operation.
Questions?
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Voice Is The New Data
## IVR in CX Healthcare

### 20 – 40% Cooperation Rate in Healthcare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Questions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hang Up</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt Out</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start and Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Survey</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Connections</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You can download the white paper

*Phone 2.0 | Voice Reimagined*

for full details on the IVR healthcare research.
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Oct 12  Zero Learning Curve | Fantasy or Reality for New Supervisors
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