

Assessing and Reducing Survey Error in Mail Surveys.

Festus Daisi Famule, M.Sc.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Osun State College of Technology,
Esa-Oke, Osun State, Nigeria.

E-mail: daisifamule@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies and describes the primary sources of survey error in mail surveys and some methods typically used to assess and quantify some of these sources of error. Four sources of survey error – sampling error, non-coverage error, non-response error, and measurement error are discussed. Descriptions of how each of these sources of error occurs in mail surveys are provided. The paper summarizes ways of reducing these errors, if they cannot be totally avoided.

(Keywords: survey error, sampling error, non-coverage error, non-response error, measurement error, true score model)

INTRODUCTION

Surveys, perhaps the best method to describe a population too large to observe directly, make it possible for collection of data/information from a small group for the purpose of making inferences on the entire population at large. They may be used to explore, explain, describe, or determine the characteristics of the whole member of the target population. Surveying every member that makes up a population of interest would be costly, time consuming, and at times inconvenient. Therefore, selecting a sample that represents the whole population under study is more realistic.

For the simple fact that they cost less, are easy to implement, are less time consuming, and are more advantageous to people with hearing problem, mail surveys are used more frequently in researches more than other types of surveys such as telephone or face-to-face interviews (Dillman, 1991 and Wei Wei Cui, 2003). Since each survey method has the potential for error or inaccuracy, researchers conducting surveys should take cognizance of and recognize four

potential sources of error—sampling error, non-coverage error, non-response error, and measurement error. Any one or group of these sources of error may render and make survey results unacceptable: Groves (1989), Salant and Dillman (1994), and Dillman (1991, 1999).

This paper identifies and describes the four sources of survey error in mail surveys. Some methods of assessing and quantifying these errors are highlighted. Above all the paper summarizes ways of reducing these errors.

SOURCES OF SURVEY ERROR IN MAIL SURVEYS

Sampling Error

Sampling error is the result of surveying a sample of the population rather than the entire population. In other words it occurs when only a subset of the target population is surveyed yet inference is made about the whole population.

Assuming that no difference exists between the population of interest (inference) and the target population, the sampling error is simply a quantification of the uncertainty in the sample statistic. This uncertainty can be divided into a *variance component* and a *bias component*. Groves (1989) stated that *variance* characterizes the variability in the sample statistic that arises from the heterogeneity on the survey measure (or estimate) among the population. In other words, variance characterizes the variability of an estimate that stems from the fact that drawing a different sample will result in a different estimate. *Bias* on the other hand, is the systematic and the actual population parameter of interest.

Mail surveys, like all other surveys, collect information only from the people who are included in the sample. Because certain members of the

population are deliberately excluded through selection of the samples, their responses are not obtained. Conclusions about the population at large are thus drawn from sample survey results. The heterogeneity of the survey measures among members of the population (in other words, the degree to which it does not represent the entire population) will cause the so-called sampling error.

Sampling error is examined through inferential statistics applied to the sample survey results. When thinking most simply about the precision of statistical estimates that are drawn through probabilistic sampling mechanisms, such estimates are improved by larger sample sizes, which can be achieved by either selecting a larger sample of potential respondents to begin with or minimizing non-response through various mechanisms, or combination of both approaches.

Increasing sample size will generally decrease sampling error when simple random sampling is used. For example, when the sample size is increased from 100 respondents to 1,000 respondents, for a simple random sample, the sampling error decreases from 5% to 3% (Cui, Wei Wei, 2003). Survey organizations tend to consider this an acceptable trade-off between precision of estimate and costs, that is, increase in sample size will definitely bring about increase in costs of the survey. Most national polls in developed countries, for example, reported a 3% margin of error (Cui, Wei Wei, 2003).

For simple random sampling, the margin of error for proportions is:

$$\hat{p} \pm z \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \quad (1)$$

Where \hat{p} denotes the sample proportion, n is the sample size, and z represents the critical value from the standard normal distribution for the desired confidence level. For the 95% confidence level and a reasonable sample size, $z = 1.96$. The margin of error is widest when $\hat{p} = 0.5$.

In the absence of significant non-response, the probabilistic sampling mechanism, such as simple random sampling scheme is assumed to minimize the possibility of bias. Convenience sampling, on the other hand, is generally assumed to result in biased samples (which always increase sampling

error) because the mechanism that generated the sample is not understood (that is, the probability with which an individual is selected into the sample is not known). Convenient sampling frequently is undertaken because it is either too difficult or too costly to create a sampling frame.

Non-Coverage Error

Any discrepancy between the sampling frame and the target population is referred to as coverage error. In other words, if some members of the population are not covered by the sampling frame, they have no chance of being selected (or included) into the sample, non-coverage error results. Furthermore, coverage error is the result of all units of a population not having a known non-zero probability of inclusion in the sample which is drawn to represent the population.

Groves (1989) specifies four different types of populations:

- (i) The population of inference: this is the population about which the researcher ultimately intends to draw conclusions.
- (ii) The target population: is the population of inference minus various groups that the researcher has chosen to disregard.
- (iii) The frame population: is that portion of the target population that can be enumerated via a sampling frame.
- (iv) The survey sample consists of those members of the sampling frame who were chosen to be surveyed.

Coverage error, in the light of the above, is generally defined as the difference between the statistics calculated on the frame population and on the target population.

Non-coverage error is one of the major reasons that mail surveys have not been as useful as desired in surveying the general public as noted by Cui, Wei Wei (2003). If complete, up-to-date lists of populations were available, non-coverage error would not exist. As observed, however, by Cui, Wei Wei (2003); there are no up-to-date lists that provide complete coverage of all households in the United States. The situations on this issue in all the developing countries are even worse. Telephone directories are often out-of-date and also don't include the small number of

households without a phone, Cui, Wei Wei (2003) observed further. A sizeable number of households in developing countries do not have phones. Likewise, driver's license lists don't cover the population. The two most common approaches to reducing non-coverage error generally are:

- (1) Obtaining as complete a sampling frame as possible; and
- (2) Post-stratifying to weight the survey sample to match the population of inference on some key characteristics.

In some cases, it is also possible to employ a "frameless" sampling strategy that, when properly designed, may allow every member of the target population a positive chance to be sampled.

Non-Response Error

This occurs when individual respondents do not participate in any part of the survey (unit non-response) or respondents do not answer individual survey questions (item non-response). Groves (1989) stated that "non-response is an error of non-observation". The response rate, which is the ratio of the number of respondents to the number sampled, is often taken as a measure of goodness. Higher response rates limit the severity of the non-response bias.

When methodological statements are made about surveys, it is the response rate that is often mentioned first. Response rates are measured relative to the size of the sampling frame and therefore are only good as the sample frame itself. Any discrepancy between the sampling frame and the target population is referred to as *non-coverage error*.

No matter how carefully a sample is selected, some members of the sample simply do not respond to the survey questions. When those who respond to the mail survey differ on the survey measures from those who don't, non-response error will become a problem. A low response rate does not necessarily lead to non-response error. However, whether differences exist between the responding and non-responding segments of the sample is not known when the survey is conducted. Therefore, low response has long been considered the major problem of mail surveys, and the vast majority of

research on improving mail survey methods has focused on response rates: Cui, Wei Wei (2003).

Research studies have successfully identified methods for improving response rates and individual factors associated with improved return rates: Cui, Wei, Wei (2003). Heberlein and Baumgartner (1978), for example, used the technique of meta-analysis to test the predictability of 71 characteristics on response rate. They determined that a ten-variable model predicted 66% of the variation in the final response rate. Seven of the ten variables were found to have positive effect on response rate:

- (i) The number of contacts: More contacts will increase the response rate. Advance letters, post cards, follow-ups that include additional copies of questionnaires, and even telephone calls are all examples of such contacts.
- (ii) Topic Salience: Questionnaires are more likely to be returned if respondents consider them relevant. A very common reason given for non-response is that the survey doesn't mean anything to the person who received it.
- (iii) Government Sponsorship: Government-sponsored survey research had higher response rates than that from private organizations.
- (iv) Employee Population: Samples from some special subgroups, such as employees from certain occupations, are more likely to return survey research than the general population.
- (v) School or Army Population: Students and military personnel are more likely to return questionnaires than the general population.
- (vi) Special Third Contact: Following up the advance letter and initial follow-up with the use of special mailing procedures, such as certified mail or special delivery, or with personal or telephone contact increases the response rate.
- (vii) Incentive on the first Contact: incentives included with the first mailing will increase response rate.

Three factors were found to have negative effect on response rate:

- (i) Marketing Research Sponsorship: Market research surveys in which the information will benefit the firm have lower response rates.
- (ii) General Population: Samples drawn from the general population have lower response rates.
- (iii) Questionnaire Length: Questionnaires with more items or more pages have a lower return rate.

Goyder (1982) replicated this study with similar results, except that the negative effect of market research sponsorship disappeared. Church (1993), using meta-analysis, tested the effects of four types of incentives-monetary (cash and check) and non-monetary (entrance to lottery, donation to charity, coffee, books, pens, key rings (holders), tie clips, golf balls, stamps, etc.) incentives mailed with the survey and monetary and non-monetary incentives given upon the return of the questionnaire. His findings demonstrated meaningful increases in response rates only for the two initial mailing incentive conditions and not for those where the incentives were made contingent on return response. Further, no statistically significant difference was found between monetary and non-monetary incentives.

Eichner & Habermehl (1981), using studies from Austria and West Germany, suggested potential cross-cultural differences. In contrast to Americans, the European data suggested that government sponsorship has negative effect on final response rate, while general population and questionnaire length have positive effects.

Fox, Crask, and Kim (1988), using a different meta-analysis method, identified the following six methods of improving response rate. There is little or no interaction effect among these factors:

- University sponsorship (versus business sponsorship)
- Pre-notification by letter
- Stamped return postage (versus business reply)
- Postcard follow-up, first-class (versus second-class and bulk) outgoing postage
- Green questionnaire (versus white questionnaire)
- A small monetary incentive

Armstrong & Luske's research (1987) also shows a positive effect for applying postage to a return

letter (versus including business-reply envelopes).

The Total Design Method for Improving Return Rates

An attempt has also been made to construct a comprehensive system of procedures or techniques to obtain high response rates. Total Design Method (TDM), developed by Don Dillman (1978, 1991) is comprehensive system used to accomplish higher response rates for mail surveys. Guided by social exchange theory, TDM emphasizes how the elements fit together more than the effectiveness of any individual technique, though most of the important factors identified by previous studies are included in TDM. Social exchange theory posits that questionnaire recipients are most likely to respond if they expect that the perceived benefits of responding will outweigh the perceived costs of responding. According to the theoretical frame of TDM, the questionnaire development and the survey implementation process is subject to three considerations:

- (i) Reducing the perceived cost, such as making the questionnaire short and easy to complete;
- (ii) Increasing perceived rewards, such as making the questionnaire itself interesting to fill out; and;
- (iii) Increasing trust, such as using official stationery and sponsorship.

Specific TDM recommendations include the following:

- Let the interesting questions come first.
- Use graphics and various question-writing techniques to ease the task of reading and answering the questions.
- Print the questionnaire in a booklet format with an interesting cover.
- Use capital or dark letters.
- Reduce the size of the booklet or use photos to make the survey seem smaller and easier to complete.
- Conduct four carefully spaced mailings: the questionnaire and a cover letter for the original mailing; a postcard follow-up one week after the original mailing; a replacement questionnaire and cover letter indicating that the questionnaire has not yet been received four weeks

after the original mailing; and a second replacement questionnaire and cover letter to non-respondents by certified mail seven weeks after the original mailing.

- Include an individually printed, addressed, and signed letter.
- Print the address on the envelopes rather than use address labels.
- Use smaller stationery.
- Let the cover letter focus on the importance of the study and the respondent's reply.
- Explain that an ID number is used and the respondent's confidentiality is protected.
- Fold the materials in a way that differs from an advertisement.

Although some research studies (for example, Jansen,1985) question the effect of some parts of the TDM procedure, such as photo reduction, there is evidence that when TDM is used, the response rate typically reaches 50 to 70 percent for surveys of the general public, and 60 to 80 percent for more homogeneous groups where low education is not a characteristic of the population (Dillman, 1978,1983). It should be noted; however, that while TDM is a one-size-fit-all method, different survey situations may require quite different surveys procedures. For example, some surveys may require personal delivery, some may entail completion of diaries for certain days of certain weeks, and others may require the surveying of the same individuals year after year.

Survey researchers have realized that mixed-mode surveys, in which some respondents are surveyed by mail questionnaires, some by electronic mail, some by telephone, and others by face-to-face interview, can help increase the response rate over that of a typical mail survey.

To adapt the original TDM to different survey situations, including those involving the Internet, Dillman developed a new method, called the Tailored Design Method (1999), in which base elements are shaped further for particular populations, sponsorship and content.

Measurement Error

Unlike sampling error, non-coverage error, and non-response error, which arise from non-

observations or non-participation, measurement error results from mistakes made by respondents.

In a mail survey, data are collected by obtaining questionnaires filled in by the addressees (i.e. the respondents). A packet containing a request letter, a printed questionnaire and a postage-paid envelope is mailed to the addressee. This questionnaire, for example, lists questions with their expected replies (options), grouped into suitable number of mutually and exhaustive boxes. A respondent has simply to reply a question by placing a check in the appropriate box provided for that purpose. This box is termed check-box which is a square for checking off a reply on a questionnaire.

Measurement error in a mail survey as described above arises when the check-boxes are not correctly checked off. This can happen when a respondent misunderstands a question. Respondent's negligence or oversight here may lead to a wrong placement of check in the box. On many occasions an addressees may pass on to other the questionnaire for filling in. This may also give rise to measurement errors.

The following model helps a long way in assessing measurement error in a mail survey:

The model: For the hypothetical mail survey described above: Let X_i be the true value (or true score) for respondent i ; and let x_i be the observed variable (i.e. a reported sample value) for person i , both of the X characteristic for the i^{th} population unit. A True Score Model can be written as:

$$x_i = X_i + e_i \quad (2)$$

In the True Score Model, the observed value is equal to the true score and a measurement error. The true score is a latent variable that cannot be measured perfectly (Andy Peytchev & Emilia Peytcheva, 2006).

The difference between X_i and x_i is called the measurement error for the i^{th} population unit, i.e.:

$$e_i = X_i - x_i \quad (3)$$

The process of filling in a questionnaire can be repeated which gives rise to hypothetical infinite population. The particular questionnaire replied by the respondent is an observation from this population. This questionnaire is marked "a",

symbolizing respondent's attempt. Now the model changes to:

$$e_{ia} = X_{ia} - x_{ia} \quad (4)$$

Consider a typical question with only two possible replies, either 1 or 0. Let λ be the proportion of X with 1. We assume that there is a probability ε that the respondent checks off wrongly.

Thus if:

$$X_i = 1, \text{ then } E(X_{ia}/i) = 1 - \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

On the same lines if $X_j = 0$,

$$\text{then } E(X_{ja}/j) = \varepsilon \quad (6)$$

We determine the unconditional probability P that X is one, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= [1 - E(\varepsilon/X_i = 1)]\lambda + (1 - \lambda)[E(\varepsilon/X_j = 0)] \\ &= (1 - \theta)\lambda + (1 - \lambda)\theta \end{aligned}$$

Where,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= E(\varepsilon/X_i = 1) = E(\varepsilon/X_j = 0) \\ &= -\lambda - \lambda\theta + \theta - \lambda\theta = \lambda + \theta - 2\lambda\theta \\ &= \lambda + \theta(1 - 2\lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Incidentally θ may be termed the probability of checking off a box wrongly. The bias B is:

$$B = \theta(1 - 2\lambda) \quad (8)$$

It is interesting to note that the bias vanishes when $\lambda = 1/2$.

In order to improve the measurement of the latent construct of interest, researchers often use multiple measures to identify it: Andy Peytchev & Emilia Peytcheva (2006). Thus the true score can be replaced by multiple measures. We restate the true score model in Equation 1, in terms of a multiple regression of observables.

$$x_i = \alpha + \tilde{\beta}\tilde{x}_i + \tilde{\beta}\tilde{z}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (9)$$

Details of this model are given fully by Andy Peytchev & Emilia Peytcheva (2006).

Measurement error results when respondents fill out surveys, but do not respond to specific questions, or provide inadequate answers to open-ended questions, or fail to follow instructions telling them to skip certain sections depending on their answers to previous questions. Measurement errors also arise from lack of control of the sequence in which the questions were asked, and various respondents' characteristics (Cui, Wei Wei, 2003). These problem areas tend to be balanced by two advantages of mail surveys: the absence of an interviewer lessens the likelihood both of respondents' feeling driven to provide socially desirable response and interviews' accidental or purposeful subversion of the purpose of the survey (Dillman, 1978).

Measurement errors are generally the results of inaccurate response stemming from poor question wording, poor interview, survey mode effects and/or the respondents behavior (Groves, 1989). Biemer and others 1991 identified four primary sources of measurement error:

- Questionnaire: the effect of the questionnaire design, its visual layout, the topics it covers and the wordings of the question, length of questions, order of the questions, open and closed formats and the questionnaire itself.
- Data collection method; the effect of how the questionnaire is administered to the respondents – mail, face-to-face or diary. Respondents may answer questions differently in the presence of an interviewer, by themselves or by using diary.
- Interviewer: the effect that the interviewer has on the response to a question. This effect excludes mail surveys since the respondents are to complete the questionnaire on their own
- Respondent: the effect of the fact that respondents, because of their different experiences, knowledge and attitudes, may interpret the meaning of questionnaire items differently.

These four sources are critical in the conduct of a sample survey. The questionnaire is the method of formally asking the respondent for information. The data-collection mode represents the manner

in which the questionnaire is delivered or presented (self administered or in person). The interviewer, in the case of the in-person mode, is the deliverer of the questionnaire. The respondent is the recipient of the interest for information. Each can introduce error into the measurement process. The sources can, however, interact with each other. The ways in which measurement errors may arise and approaches to quantify them in the context of these four error sources are discussed comprehensively by Daniel Kasprzyk (2005) in his paper, "Measurement Error in Household Surveys: Sources and Measurement".

SUMMARY

Overall, we have so far identified and discussed four sources of survey error as they affect mail surveys – sampling error (the result of surveying a sample of the population rather than the entire population); non-coverage error (the result of all units of a population not having a known, non-zero probability of inclusion in the sample which is drawn to represent the population); non-response error (the result of non-response from respondents in the sample who if they had responded, would have provided different answers than those who did respond to the survey); and measurement error (the results of inaccurate response stemming from poor question wording, poor interviewing, survey mode effects and/or the respondents behavior).

In this regard, we have followed Groves (1989), and his elaboration of the four fundamental sources of survey error, with divers approaches from many perspectives on improving quality of survey data by assessing and reducing these sources of errors.

REFERENCES

1. Armstrong, J.S. and Luske, E.J. 1987. "Return Postage in Mail Survey: A Meta-Analysis". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 51:233-248.
2. Biemer, P.P. et al. (eds.). 1991. *Measurement Errors in Surveys*. John Wiley and Sons: New York, NY.
3. Cui, Wei Wei. 2003. "Reducing Error in Mail Surveys". *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*. 8(18). ISSN 1531-7714.

4. Dillman, D.A. 1983. "Mail and other Self-Administered Questionnaires". In: Rossi, P.H., Wright, J.D., and Anderson, A.B. (eds.). *Handbook of Survey Research*. 359-377.
5. Dillman, D.A. 1991. "The Design and Administration of a Mail Survey". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 17:225-249.
6. Dillman, D.A. 1999. *Mail and Internet Surveys – The Tailored Design Method, 2nd Ed.* John Wiley and Sons: New York, NY.
7. Eichner, K. and Habermeh, W. 1981. "Predicting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires". *American Sociological Review*. 46:361-363.
8. Fox, R.J., Crask, M.R., and Kim, J. 1988. "Mail Survey Response Rate: A Meta-analysis of Selected Techniques for Inducing Response". *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 52:467-491.
9. Goyder, J. 1982. "Further Evidence on Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires". *American Sociological Review*. 47: 550-553.
10. Groves, R. 1989. *Survey Errors and Surveys Costs*. John Wiley and Sons: New York, NY.
11. Heberlein, T.A. and Baumgartner, R. 1978. "Factors Affecting Response Rates to Mailed Questionnaires: A Quantitative Analysis of the Published Literature". *American Sociological Review*. 43: 447-462.
12. Jansen, J.H. 1985. "Effects of Questionnaire Layout and Size and Issue-Involvement on Response Rates in Mail Surveys". *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. 61:139-142.
13. Peytchev, A. and Peytcheva, E. 2006. "Relationship between Measurement Error and Unit Non-Response in Household Surveys: An Approach in the Absence of Validation Data". *Section on Survey Research Methods*. 3864-3871.
14. Terrie, Nolinske. 1995. "Research Forum – Survey Research and Measurement Error". *Journal of Prosthetics & Orthotics*. 7(9):68-78.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Famule, F.D. 2010. "Assessing and Reducing Survey Error in Mail Surveys". *Pacific Journal of Science and Technology*. 11(2):422-428.

 [Pacific Journal of Science and Technology](http://www.akamaiuniversity.us/PJST.htm)