

# Health Message Testing System Expedited Review Form

## Communication Support for the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases

### Attachment B. Incentives

In-depth interview participants will be given a \$50 honorarium/token of appreciation of their participation. Incentives serve as an acknowledgment that the information a respondent provides and the time they offer is valuable.<sup>1,2</sup> The incentives will also help to off-set any costs associated with participation, such as childcare and/or time away from work.

Multiple studies using a variety of data collection methodologies have shown that offering incentives increases participation rates.<sup>1-8</sup> Incentives are offered to increase the likelihood of participation and to thank a respondent for their time and input to the study. While the incentive amount may vary by the type of interview participants, the length and burden of the interview, and other factors, the impact of an incentive on the participation rate does not vary by data collection type.<sup>2</sup>

In the contractor's experience conducting multiple formative research and materials testing projects, a monetary gift of \$50 is adequate for 60 minutes.

The proposed dollar amounts are based on those offered to similar consumer target audiences in previous research the contractor for this effort has conducted (2018) and expert recommendations from potential recruiting vendors. Previous experience has shown that lower incentive levels can lead to difficult recruitment within the timeframe available for the research, resulting in lower than desired participation numbers. In response to offering this incentive level, respondents are much more likely to honor their commitment of participating in the interviews. Lower incentive amounts could lead to inadequate participation, delayed results, and/or higher recruiting costs and burden to the public due to the need for additional screening.<sup>5</sup>

1. Bonevski, B.; Randell, M.; Paul, C.; Chapman, K.; Twyman, L.; Bryant, J.; Brozek, I.; Hughes, C. Reaching the hard-to-reach: A systematic review of strategies for improving health and medical research with socially disadvantaged groups. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol* 14(42).
2. Salant, P. and Dillman, D.A. (1994). *How to Conduct Your Own Survey*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
3. Church, A.H. (1993). "Estimating the effect of Incentives on Mail Survey Response Rates: A Meta Analysis." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 57: 62-79.
4. Groves, R. and Couper, M. (1998). *Nonresponse in Household Interview Surveys*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
5. Krueger, R. and Casey, M. (2009) *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.
6. Robinson, K.A., Dennison, C.R., Wayman, D.M., Pronovost, P.J., and Needham, D.M. (2007). Systematic review identifies number of strategies important for retaining study participants. *J Clin Epidemiol*; 60(8): 757-765.
7. Singer, E., N. Gelber, J. Van Hoewyk, and J. Brown (1997). *Does \$10 Equal \$10? The Effect of Framing on the Impact of Incentives*. Paper presented at the American Association for Public Opinion; Norfolk, VA.
8. Singer, E., Van Hoewyk, J., and Maher, M.P. (2000). Experiments with Incentives in Telephone Surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(3):171-188.
9. Stewart, D.W. and Shamdasani, P.N. (2014). *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA