



**HAL**  
open science

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

Blazej Palat, Valentin Brunel

► **To cite this version:**

Blazej Palat, Valentin Brunel. Please Mr. Postman! The effect of face-to-face first contact on panel recruitment. European Survey Research Association, Jul 2021, Online, Germany. hal-03860543

**HAL Id: hal-03860543**

**<https://sciencespo.hal.science/hal-03860543>**

Submitted on 18 Nov 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

---

## 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
  - 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
  - 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
<i>Post Office</i>	1	<i>January 2020</i>	1
			2
	2		3
			4
<i>Survey Institute</i>	...	...	...

# 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
  - 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. s.</i>
Tenant vs. owner	0.71	[0.64, 0.8]	.0001	0.94	[0.75, 1.18]	.59 <i>n. s.</i>
Small vs. medium/big surface	0.89	[0.82, 0.96]	.004	1.04	[0.92, 1.18]	.52 <i>n. s.</i>
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. s.</i>
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”?