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Introduction

• CLA Survey Services – What we do
• Our Clients – Faculty, Graduate Students, & University Administration
Client Constraints

- Financial
- Timing / Time (temporality)
- Access to Respondents
Respondent Pools
Student Populations

• Types:
  – Managed lists – Psychology, School of Journalism & Mass Comm., Carlson School of Management
  – Ad hoc – Classroom(s), College-wide, University-wide

• Attributes:
  – Younger, interested group
  – Little to no costs
  – Homogeneous
  – Generalizability concerns
Respondent Pools
Third Party Samples

• Types:
  – Customized Sampling:
    • KnowledgeNetworks $$$$$
    • StudyResponse $$$
  – Ad hoc Sampling:
    • Mechanical Turk (Amazon) $

• Attributes:
  – Better access to diverse groups
  – Representative samples
  – Higher costs
Respondent Pools
Additional Sources

- **Sites – Facebook, MySpace, …Craigslist**
  - Recruit for very specific population characteristics
  - Lower costs (or none at all)
  - Unlikely to be representative sample
  - Highly variable response rates

- **Industry lists**
  - Access to specific groups
  - Unknown list quality and response rates

- **Employee Lists**
  - Academic and non-academic partnerships
  - More controlled environment
  - Coordinating with another organization
Audience Characteristic Effects

- Students vs. others
- Targeted population
- Age
- Income Level
- Level of Education
- Race/Ethnicity
- Gender
Audience Characteristic Effects

Gender

• Psychology REP program historical split (’07-’11)
  – 62% Female / 38% Male
• REP Gender Participation Rates by Semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Semester</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Survey Participants¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Participation rates based on online surveys conducted by our service.
Recruitment Techniques

- Multiple communication channels
- Personalization
- Source credibility
- Reminders to non-responders
- Incentives:
  - Extrinsic Incentive Influence
    - None
    - Altruism
    - Final results disseminated, Topic saliency
    - Prize drawings (e.g. iPad, gift card)
    - Rewards points, Extra credit
    - Cash, Gift card
  - High
Prize Drawing Experiment
Background

• Our secondary research - Median Response Rates by Incentive Type:

![Bar chart showing response rates](chart.png)

- No Incentive: 29% (32 surveys)
- Drawing: 15% (7 surveys)
- All Received Incentive: 71% (9 surveys)

• However...other primary research:
  - Several studies – No impact
  - Bosnjak and Tuten (2003) - Prize drawing group had higher willingness to participate rate versus no incentive group.
Prize Drawing Experiment
Overall

- Treatment ($100 Prize drawing) vs. Control

“Please take our survey & enter a drawing”

Initial Invitation Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Incentive</th>
<th>Prize Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall*</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
## Prize Drawing Experiment
### Gender & Incentive Interaction

### Percentage Female by Experiment Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Incentive Group</th>
<th>Prize Drawing Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.

### Gender Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.

### Gender Response Rates by Experiment Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Incentive Group</th>
<th>Prize Drawing Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
More Research Needed!