

NON-Substantial Change Request OMB# 0990-0459

For the survey, we will be using a panel provider (Lucid) and hope to get the majority of our sample filled using that source; that is what was approved by OMB last year. If the panel doesn't bring us enough of the different kinds of people that we need, then we want to be able to reach out to recruit people to the survey using a targeted social media approach; that is the new piece.

The incentive for the panel participants is approximately \$8.00. The panel participants have ongoing opportunities with the panel provider. In the potential targeted social media outreach, the proposed incentive is \$25.00. For those recruited through the social media outreach, there is no ongoing engagement, responding to the survey is a one-time engagement.

As OMB requested, we have developed a justification for the additional recruitment method based on the OMB questions. Providing it for your review and transmission.

1. A detailed justification on why the incentive is needed.
The social media sampling strategy has been requested as a contingency plan due to prior experience sampling this population during another survey effort. Once our panel samples had exhausted their capabilities, we were challenged to reach sufficient sample for the statistical power needed to conduct the study. We conducted outreach to LTG's partners to bring in additional sample with mixed results which required considerable time and effort, likely because there was no compensation for respondent's time.
2. Why the previous incentive was insufficient.
Respondent panels require compensation for completion of surveys which is delivered through a point system. In the previous survey, we were able to bring in more than the panels anticipated, but other sample sources struggled to provide respondents at their anticipated levels due to the lack of incentive.
3. What groups the increased incentive levels is needed to reach
There are three segment groups that have a lower prevalence in the population based on our prior survey. We also know from the recent focus group study that these groups are less engaged generally, which is why we would like to have a backup plan to conduct additional outreach to fill these groups. We may not need to include the additional social media recruitment strategy, but want to be prepared in case we are unable to recruit sufficient numbers in the low prevalence groups.
4. How the increased incentive level was determined.
We typically offer an incentive based on the time required to take the survey. As this survey requires viewing a video, a post card, and social media posts and providing feedback on the materials, we anticipate it will take approximately 25 minutes. On a general basis, we typically offer \$1 per minute of time. We also want to ensure that we have ample response to the survey to encourage a quick fielding period due to the aggressive timeline goals for the study to enable launch of the campaign. This study provided as a reference was designed to compare different types of incentives in terms of timing of the survey and other factors, but the amounts provided indicate the typical incentive level for a 15 minute survey which is similar to



what we are planning for a 25 minute survey:

<https://www.surveypractice.org/article/2822-effects-of-incentive-amount-and-type-of-web-survey-response-rates> Additional references can be provided as needed.

5. How this change will affect total cost to the government.

This will have a cost neutral impact to the government because due to the reduction in overall sample size by not including a control comparison and only testing for red flags among the audiences, the funding should have ample room to accommodate the cost of providing a gift code in appreciation for the time it takes for respondents to complete the survey.

