SciencesPo







Please Mr. Postman! The effect of face-to-face first contact on panel recruitment

Blazej Palat & Valentin Brunel Centre de Données Socio-Politique (CDSP)

> **ESRA** 16 July 2021

Introduction & Background

- Reducing non response: a key challenge for recruiting probabilistic samples
- Usual scheme of the recruitment process
 - Information letter
 - o Recruitment attempt (face-to-face, phone, etc.)
- First contact with sampled individuals and its importance for their commitment to the panel
 - Effect of a letter vs. no letter (Leeuw et al., 2007; Nápoles-Springer et al., 2004)
 - Effect of a letter > effect of incentives (Rao et al., 2010)
 - However, its content matters little (Scherpenzeel & Toepoel 2012)
- Hypothesis: foot-in-the-door-like effect (Burger, 1999; Freedman & Frazer, 1966)

Methods

- Field data from ELIPSS panel refreshment
- Recruiting with a traditional postal service provider and a survey institute
 - \circ Stages taken in charge by the postal service provider (n = 4,995)
 - Postmen handing in information letter personally two attempts. Possible outcomes:
 - **Success** (*n* = 2,587)
 - **Absence** (the letter left in the mailbox on the second attempt) (n = 1,321)
 - **Refusal** (*n* = 180)
 - Failure to deliver (the person moved out, impossible to identify the address, inaccessible, etc.) (n = 907)

Methods

- Postmen attempting to recruit panelists two attempts. Possible outcomes:
 - **Success** (*n* = 242)
 - **Failure** (refusal, absence)
- Contact data to be reused by the survey institute that take in charge subsequent stages of recruitment process

Service Provider	Recruitment Stage	Month	Week
Post Office	2	January 2020	1
			2
			3
			4
Survey Institute			

Results

- Testing the effects of handing in information letter personally vs. leaving it in the mailbox on the recruitment result (success or failure)
 - Logistic regression controlling for socio-demographics
 - \circ Excluding cases of failure to deliver and refusal of the information letter (n = 3,800)

	OR	95% CI	p <
Information letter left in the mailbox vs. handed in personally	1.41	[1.2, 1.67]	.0001
Tenant vs. owner	1.27	[1.03, 1.57]	.04
Small vs. medium/big surface	1.13	[1.02, 1.26]	.03
Less than 35 vs. 35-65 years old	1.22	[1.01, 1.48]	.05
Occupying the dwelling since at most 16 vs. more than 16 years	1.17	[1.05, 1.3]	.004

Results

- Exploring circumstances when delivering the letter fails or when the targeted person refuses the letter to the postman vs. accepts it
 - Multinomial regression controlling for socio-demographics
 - Excluding cases when the letter was left in the mailbox (n = 3,573)

Results

	Failure to deliver			Refusal		
	OR	95% CI	p <	OR	95% CI	p <
Flat vs. house	0.78	[0.7, 0.88]	.0001	1.01	[0.8, 1.27]	.93 <i>n.</i> s.
Tenant vs. owner	0.71	[0.64, 0.8]	.0001	0.94	[0.75, 1.18]	.59 <i>n.</i> s.
Small vs. medium/big surface	0.89	[0.82, 0.96]	.004	1.04	[0.92, 1.18]	.52 n. s.
At most 65 vs. at least 66 years old	0.86	[0.79, 0.93]	.0001	1.59	[1.35, 1.87]	.0001
Less than 35 vs. 35-65 years old	0.79	[0.71, 0.87]	.0001	1.62	[1.13, 2.31]	.0009
Occupying the dwelling since at most 16 vs. more than 16 years	0.87	[0.77, 0.98]	.03	0.98	[0.79, 1.21]	.84 <i>n. s.</i>
Occupying the dwelling since at most 6 vs. 7-16 years	0.81	[0.77, 0.87]	.0001	0.91	[0.81, 1.02]	.11 <i>n.</i> s.
Children under 12 vs. at least 12 years old	0.78	[0.72, 0.86]	.0001	1.35	[1.07, 1.7]	.02

Conclusions

- Handing in information personally by a postman effectively enhances the chances of recruitment success
- Factors associated with social stability are positively associated with the chances to distribute information letters and therefore to recruit
- Elderly living with younger people more likely to refuse the information letter
- Study limitations
 - Not an experimental design
 - Messy data
 - Some important information not controlled for
- Future studies: is it really a "postman effect"?