



U **State of the Field: Incentives Used in Mail Surveys by International Business Researchers*** B

- **Agnieszka Chidlow,**
- The University of Birmingham, UK
- **Pervez N. Ghauri**
- The University of Birmingham, UK

***Source To cite:**

Chidlow, A., & Ghauri, P. (2015) What incentives are being used by international business researchers in their surveys: A review. The William Davidson Institute, The University of Michigan. *Academic Working Paper Series*, No 1086 (January)

ABSTRACT*

Following a number of studies on the factors that might affect response rates in cross-national research, this work examines the types of incentives mentioned by international business scholars in mail surveys as well as how the use of such incentives affects the response rate. This work uses a content analysis of articles published in four leading international business journals in the period of 2000 - 2009. The results show that out of 217 studies under examination only 42 mentioned any type of incentives for enhancing the response rate. The most common incentives used by authors are confidentiality and anonymity, followed by a business reply envelope and a free report. Generally speaking, the results demonstrate that studies reporting incentives achieve, on average, a lower response rate from those that do not report them.

* *It was recently listed on SSRN's Top Ten download list for: ERN: Collection of Data in Microeconometrics.*



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

Overview

1.1. Objectives

1.2. Theoretical Basis/Past Research

1.3. Data Methodology & Collection

1.4. Results

1.5. Conclusions



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

I. Objectives

1.1. Paper's objectives:

- To examine what types of incentives were used by IB researchers between 2000 – 2009.
- To investigate whether studies that report incentives achieve higher response rates from those that do not report them.

Why?

- Handful and fragmented information so far.
- Mail surveys are still popular methods of data collection
- Can be applicable to electronic survey (Dillman, 2009)



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

II. Theoretical Basis/Past Research

2.1. Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1973)



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

III. Data Methodology & Collection

- 3.1. Content Analysis
- 3.2. JIBS, IBR, MIR, JWB
- 3.3. 2000-2009

Overall reviewed 1440 papers

652 (45%) – used Primary data

Out of 652 – 348 (53%) – used Questionnaire as data collection method



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

III. Data Methodology & Collection

□ Sample Characteristics: N= 271

67(31%) – Continent/Europe

84(39%) – Pilot Study /Used

42(19%) – Incentives/Mentioned

14(7%) – Confidentiality & Anonymity

38% – Average Response Rate

4.1. By Journal - Incentives Mentioned

JWB = 27 (41%) - Highest

IBR = 10 (24%)

JIBS = 8 (19%)

MIR = 7 (17%) - Lowest

4.2. By Year - Incentives Mentioned

2002= 7 (17%) - Highest

2001 = 2 (5%) - Lowest



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

IV. Results

4.3. Average RR by Incentives

Not Reporting (175) = 38%

Reporting (42) = 34%

4.4. Incentives Type & Average RR

Incentives	n(%)	<i>Avr RR</i>
Confidentiality and Anonymity	<i>n=14(33.33)</i>	41%
Confidentiality, Anonymity and Free Report	<i>n=4(9.52)</i>	38%
Confidentiality, Anonymity and Business Reply Envelope	<i>n=4(9.52)</i>	40%
Free Report	<i>n=6(14.29)</i>	28%
Free Report and Non-monetary gifts	<i>n=1(2.38)</i>	17%
Business Reply Envelope	<i>n=7(16.67)</i>	30%
Endorsement Letter	<i>n=2(4.76)</i>	18%
Monetary Gifts ⁴	<i>n=3(7.14)</i>	22%
Non-monetary gifts ⁵	<i>n=1(2.38)</i>	33%
Total	<i>N=42</i>	34%



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

IV. Results

4.5. Average RR and Type of Incentives Reported/Not

<i>Incentives used</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Average RR</i>	<i>Sample size n(%)</i>
Confidentiality and Anonymity	Not reported	30.%	28 (67%)
	Reported	41%	14(33%)
Confidentiality, Anonymity and Others	Not reported	27%	20(48%)
	Reported	40%	22(52%)
Free Report	Not reported	35%	36(86%)
	Reported	28%	6(14%)
Free Report and Non-monetary gifts	Not reported	35%	35(83%)
	Reported	27%	7(17%)
Business Reply Envelope	Not reported	35%	35(83%)
	Reported	30%	7(17%)
Business Reply Envelope and Others	Not reported	34%	31(74%)
	Reported	34%	11(26%)
Monetary Gifts	Not reported	35%	39(93%)
	Reported	22%	3(7%)
Non-monetary Gifts and Others	Not reported	34.%	40(95%)
	Reported	25%	2(5%)



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

V. Conclusions

Objective 1: To examine what types of incentives were used by IB researchers between 2000 – 2009.

Confidentiality and Anonymity	<i>n=14(33%)</i>
Confidentiality, Anonymity and Free Report	<i>n=4(10%)</i>
Confidentiality, Anonymity and Business Reply Envelope	<i>n=4(10%)</i>
Free Report	<i>n=6(14%)</i>
Free Report and Non-monetary gifts	<i>n=1(2%)</i>
Business Reply Envelope	<i>n=7(17%)</i>
Endorsement Letter	<i>n=2(4%)</i>
Monetary Gifts	<i>n=3(7%)</i>
Non-monetary gifts	<i>n=1(2%)</i>



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

V. Conclusions

Objective 2: To investigate whether studies that report incentives achieve higher response rates from those that do not report them.

The results show that studies reporting incentives achieve, on average, a lower response rate from those studies that do not report incentives

Surprising & Interesting result!!!



'Triple-crown' accredited



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

Thank you*!

- **Agnieszka Chidlow,**
- The University of Birmingham, UK
- **Pervez N. Ghauri**
- The University of Birmingham, UK

***Source To cite:**

Chidlow, A., & Ghauri, P. (2015) What incentives are being used by international business researchers in their surveys: A review. The William Davidson Institute, The University of Michigan. *Academic Working Paper Series*, No 1086 (January)



'Triple-crown' accredited



**UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM**