

Health Message Testing System Expedited Review Form

Be Antibiotics Aware Educational Effort – HCP Audiences

Attachment B. Incentives

Interview participants will be given a honorarium/token of appreciation for their participation in the one-hour online interview—physicians (MDs and DOs) and dentists (DMD and DDS) will receive \$125; nurses (NPs, RNs, DONs), physician assistants (PAs), and community pharmacists will receive \$75. Incentives serve as an acknowledgment that the information a respondent provides and the time they offer is valuable.^{1,2}

Multiple studies using a variety of data collection methodologies have shown that offering incentives increases response 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 providers are frequently inundated by numerous entities requesting interviews, surveys, or other research participation. As a result, healthcare providers 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, and the proposed study population (described in Attachment A) is restricted to specific types of healthcare providers 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 *Be Antibiotics Aware* education effort and have found that a monetary gift of \$75 for nurses, PAs, and pharmacists and \$125 for physicians and dentists is adequate for a 60-minute, online in-depth interview, given each audience segment’s role and responsibilities related to antibiotic prescribing/dispensing and interactions with consumer audiences. 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, HCPs are more likely to honor their commitment to 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

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).
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.

Health Message Testing System Expedited Review Form

Be Antibiotics Aware Educational Effort – HCP Audiences

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