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Abstract

Due to ever decreasing response and return rates, finding a cost-effective method for following up media research panels is an increasingly important issue, especially for radio listening research (Gendall and Davis 1993). This paper reports the findings of an experimental study that examined the effectiveness of two different modes for following up members of a radio diary panel. The modes tested were telephone contact and a mailed letter. The combined follow-up strategies increased the return rate of completed diaries by 23 percent. However, there was no real difference in either the return rates or the cost effectiveness of the two modes. The telephone treatment eliciting just three more returned diaries than the mail treatment, and cost $1.17 per return compared with $1.22 for the mail treatment. These results suggest that, for improving the return rate in radio research, it makes no difference whether non-respondents are followed up by mail or telephone.

Introduction

Radio diaries are the most frequently used method for researching radio listening, primarily due to lower administration costs and the ease of implementation (Webster, Phalen and Lichty 2006, Gunter 2000). The diary method also has the major advantage that it minimises reliance upon memory and help reduce confusion over station identification (Starkey 2004). However, obtaining reasonable agreement and return rates has long been a problem. Agreement rates, that is respondents who agree to complete a radio diary, vary according to various sources from between 20% to 30%, while diary return rates (that is the number of people who agree to complete a diary and send it back) vary between 50% to 70% (Arbitron 2002; Research International 2001).

Low agreement and return rates are of concern since these expose the research to possible non-response error (McDonald and Adam 2003; Dilman 1991; Lyberg and Kasprzyk 1991), and radio research, along with research in general, has demonstrated that low response rates typically introduce some biases in favour of the sample population most interested in the topic (Fowler, Gallagher, Stringfellow, Zaslavsky, Thompson, and Cleary 2002) – in radio’s case – heavy listeners. Since this may introduce non-response bias and thus jeopardise the validity of the data collected from the respondents (Westrick and Mount 2007; Gendall and Davis 1993; Day 1975), the issue of low agreement and return rates warrants attention.

The question addressed in this paper is how to improve radio diary return rates? Based on well established survey research practice, the obvious way to improve return rates is to make follow-up contact with non-respondents who had previously agreed to take part in the diary panel (Dilman, 1991), with the practical options being telephone
or mail. Westrick and Mount (2007) found that these were the two preferred options with pharmaceutical research, with mail being less expensive than telephone, but producing lower return rates.

The present study evaluates and compares the efficacy of two follow-up strategies to increase radio diary return rates - a telephone and mail follow-up of respondents who had agreed to complete a radio diary. Efficacy is evaluated in terms of radio diary completion and administration costs. Radio diary completion is assessed by comparing the outcome rates of both telephone and mail follow ups in terms of return rates (i.e. the number of diaries returned depending on the treatment). Survey administration costs in terms of cost per response for both follow up modes are compared. The study’s specific objectives are to:

- Compare the radio diary return rates of respondents who were contacted by the two follow up methods – telephone and mail, and
- Compare the cost per unit or cost per returned radio diary of the two follow up methods – telephone and mail.

**Method**

The radio research was undertaken over a four week period from Monday 17th October to Sunday 13th November 2005 as diary based quantitative research. A sample of 4980 people aged 15 years or older were randomly selected from the Manawatu telephone directory, and invited to take part in the diary panel.

After the study and the task were explained to them, potential respondents were invited to complete a diary of their radio listening over a one week period. If the respondent agreed they were posted a radio diary package containing the following items:

- A seven day radio listening diary, with instruction and information sheets.
- A thank you letter designed to encourage completion of the diary
- A small bar of chocolate as a thank you gift
- A reply paid envelope enabling the respondent to return the diary upon completion.

The 1399 respondents who agreed were assigned to one of four groups. Each group was required to complete their diary every day for one week (7 days). Each group was assigned to one of the following four weeks of listening (Group 1= week 1, Group 2 = week 2, Group 3 = week 3 and Group 4 = week 4)

The region surveyed has a population of approximately 95,000 people fifteen years or older, and is served by 20 radio stations (17 commercial or semi-commercial and three non commercial stations). These stations range from nationally syndicated commercial and non commercial networks to totally locally produced programmes. The range also includes stations that have, for example, a local component in the breakfast shows (6am to 10am) before syndicating for the remainder of the day.
Fifteen stations broadcast on an FM frequency, five on an AM frequency with one non-commercial station simulcasting on both FM and AM.

Each diary was pre-printed with all the known radio stations in the region being listed. During that week respondents were required to record in the diary the radio station(s) they listened to for each period of 8 minutes or more. The definition of radio listening was the same as that used in the official New Zealand radio research being; ‘that respondents are able to hear the spoken announcements being broadcast and so identify the station broadcasting’.

Those respondents who had not returned their diary by the Thursday of the week following the recording of their radio listening were followed up. The follow-up was by either the telephone or mail treatment. Respondents were randomly selected for either of the treatments. Those respondents who were selected for the mail follow-up treatment were sent a letter thanking them for agreeing to complete a radio diary and reminding them to please return it. Those respondents who were selected for the telephone treatment were then phoned on the Thursday night and asked if they would please return their completed diary. Respondents who could not be contacted on the Thursday night were called back on Friday – during both the day and the evening. No more than three call backs were made.

Of the 1,399 respondents who agreed to complete a radio diary 817 (58.4%) returned their diaries by the end of their respective first week leaving 582 (41.6%) respondents who would require following-up. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the respondents by treatment for each of the four weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Returned Diaries and Allocation of Diaries by Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Radio Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairies returned end of first week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaries not returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents selected for Telephone treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents selected for Mail treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results and Discussion**

Table 2 below shows the radio diary return rates for four groups following the initial mail-out of diaries (Response to First Mail-out), and for the week following the follow up treatments (Response to Follow-up). Any diaries that were returned later than 10 days after the finish of the allocated recording period were not included in the analysis.
The majority of respondents (58% on average) returned their diaries during the week following the week for which they recorded their listening. The follow-ups increased the response rate a further 23% from an initial 58% to 81% (see Table 1).

**Table 2: Return Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group One</th>
<th>Group Two</th>
<th>Group Three</th>
<th>Group Four</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to First Mail-out</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Treatment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Treatment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall response after Follow-up</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 2, there is effectively no difference between follow-up mode for any of the four groups with regards to the number of diaries returned ($x^2=1.41$, df = 3, p>.05). Indeed, by the cut-off for the follow-up phase, the telephone treatment had produced just three more diaries than the mail treatment.

What is also clear from Table 2 is that irrespective of the follow up mode being used, the fact that non-responders had been followed up increased the overall return rate from 58% to 81% - an increase of twenty-three percentage points. This finding, whilst not part of the actual study, strongly supports Gendall and Davis’s (1993) assertion that a structured follow up program is important to maximise return rates.

The second objective was to compare the cost-effectiveness of the two follow-up modes. The cost per returned diary for a mail follow-up was $1.22 per diary and the cost per returned diary for the telephone follow-up was $1.17 per diary.

(In determining the cost effectiveness of each form of follow-up the following costs and charges were used in the calculations: labour at $15/hr; letter postage at 0.50c per letter. In terms of telephoning a call rate of 25 attempts/hr was used. The administration costs of mail processing were based on 100 envelopes/hr.)

**Conclusion**

This study on follow-ups simply looked at whether a telephone follow-up produced different results from a mail follow-up in terms of the overall radio diary return rate. It also looked at the cost-effectiveness of the two different modes in terms of the cost per radio diary returned.

The study supports prior research (Dillman 2000; Gendall and Davis 1993; Brennan 1992; Chiu and Brennan 1990; Day 1975) showing that following-up non-respondents is important – especially with media research as it improves the overall sample and
thereby reduces potential non-response bias. However, the main aim of the experiment was to compare the efficacy of two different follow-up methods for achieving an increased return rate from radio diary panel members. Did one follow-up treatment achieve a better return rate? And was one method more cost effective?

While the telephone follow-up method achieved a return rate of 54% compared to 53% for the telephone follow-up, there was no real difference between the two methods. Therefore it appears that either follow-up method could be used successfully to increase the overall return rate. However, it is intuitive to suspect that if the initial contact with the respondents was by telephone then a telephone follow-up may be preferable, and telephone has the advantage of being faster to implement.

Likewise, when it came to comparing the cost-effectiveness of both methods, the cost per return for the telephone method was $1.17 compared with the mail follow-up’s $1.22 per return. Such a small difference is probably not important in small scale research projects but even this 4% difference in cost could be important with large projects.
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