

Health Message Testing System Expedited Review Form

Get Ahead of Sepsis Educational Effort – Healthcare Professional (HCP) Audiences

Attachment B. Incentives

Interview participants will be given a honorarium/token of appreciation for their participation in the one-hour online interview—emergency medical services (EMS) personnel (EMRs, EMTs, paramedics) and long-term care (LTC) medical technicians and sitters will receive \$55; LTC nurses (RNs, LPNs, LVNs) will receive \$75. Incentives serve as an acknowledgment that the information a respondent provides and the time they offer is valuable.^{1,2} 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.¹⁻⁸ 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 interviewees, 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.²

In the contractor's experience conducting multiple formative research and materials testing projects, healthcare professionals are frequently inundated by numerous entities requesting interviews, surveys, or other research participation. As a result, healthcare professionals often decline to participate, even though they do not have to physically travel to a site. Because the work being proposed needs to be completed in a short timeframe, and the proposed study population (described in Attachment A) is restricted to specific types of healthcare professionals in select states, offering a token of appreciation to participants can help ensure that the work is completed within the time allotted.

CDC has contracted with ICF to conduct previous rounds of research for the *Get Ahead of Sepsis* educational effort and have found that a monetary gift of \$75 for LTC nurses is adequate for a 60-minute, online in-depth interview, especially given their training and education, specialization, and role and responsibilities related to sepsis recognition and treatment. The proposed dollar amounts are the same as those offered to similar HCP target audiences in previous rounds of research related to this educational effort (2016-2017). Even at these levels, research recruitment proved to be difficult within the time frame available for this work, resulting in lower than desired participation numbers. In response to offering this incentive level, nurses are 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.⁵

Based on previous rounds of research for this educational effort, a monetary gift of \$55 for EMS personnel and LTC medical technicians and sitters is adequate for a 60-minute, online in-depth interview. Because of the lower level of training and education, CDC and their contractor feel that a lower incentive is appropriate for this audience compared to the LTC nurses.

References

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).

Health Message Testing System Expedited Review Form

Get Ahead of Sepsis Educational Effort – Healthcare Professional (HCP) Audiences

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, 3rd edition*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA