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1 INTRODUCTION

Email solicitations are the primary means of contacting respondents for Web surveys. They replace both the survey introduction read to respondents in a telephone survey as well as the freelance techniques that interviewers employ to encourage participation. They create a “moment of truth” when a potential respondent decides whether to accept or reject the survey offer. (In survey lingo this is known as producing positive “salience.”) Thus, careful crafting of the initial contact message is an essential part of building a successful survey.

Traditional mail or “snail mail” is also employed as a means of inviting potential respondents to Web surveys. These solicitations share many of the same objectives and features of successful email solicitations; however, some differences do exist. One difference is that mail invitations can be somewhat longer and more detailed than email solicitations. In general, the text of an email should be visible without scrolling and the text of a mail invitation should be limited to a single one-sided page (Dillman 2000). This document provides guidance for both email and traditional mail solicitations. Whenever necessary, the differences are clearly distinguished and examples are given in Appendix A, B, and C.

2 OBJECTIVES

The solicitation, whether by email or traditional mail, typically has two primary objectives: (1) to encourage survey participation and (2) to describe how to participate.

2.1 Encouraging Participation

Encouraging participation has many dimensions that include:

- Legitimizing the survey request
- Making the topic seem interesting
- Making the study goal appealing and relevant
- Offering an incentive
- Assuring confidentiality and voluntary participation
- Offering contact information for assistance or additional information

Constructing solicitations that effectively encourage participation is an art. While we can describe the components of the message (and do below) the precise wording used is largely a matter of considerations about the type of respondent we are contacting, the pre-existing relationship that our client or we have with the respondent, and the subject matter of the survey.

2.2 Describing Participation

Describing how to participate is a matter of explaining clearly and briefly what steps the respondent must take to access the survey. It is also important to note that the respondent may return to the survey if he is not able to complete it during his first visit. For this, MSI has standard wording that is given below (3.1 for email and 3.2 for traditional mail).

3 KEY INVITATION COMPONENTS

3.1 Email Header (To, From, and Subject)
The header is the first thing the respondent will see in his or her email inbox. It needs to distinguish itself from SPAM and induce the respondent to open it and read it rather than simply delete it.

The \textit{To} component is generally displayed only when the R opens the email but nonetheless you should use and display the full email address. MSI does not use bulk mailers, which sometimes do not display the address or use SPAM-like phrases such as “Undisclosed participants.”

The \textit{From} component should have some degree of familiarity to the respondent. Even though the originating email address must be an MSI address, our mailing software offers the option to include a text field that will display in most inboxes. The client name or some variant can be displayed, or even the name of some individual the respondent might recognize, but only if the person whose name is used grants his/her permission and approves the email text.

Additionally, recent research suggests that the so-called ‘power’ of the sender can affect response rates (Joinson, Woodley, and Reips 2005; Joinson and Reips 2005). For instance, in a study by Joinson and Reips (2005) participants were assigned to either a ‘neutral power condition’ or a ‘high power condition’ in which emails varied the name given in the first and final line of the email. Respondents were sent an invitation that included either “[name], (Strategy, Planning and Partnerships), The Open University” or “From professor [name], Pro-vice Chancellor (Strategy, Planning and Partnerships), The Open University” for the neutral and high power conditions respectively. The results suggest that although power itself exerts only a minor (non-significant) effect on response rates, when coupled with a personalized salutation, a high power source can lead to significantly better response rates (Joinson and Reips 2005). This study replicated a similar study by Joinson, Woodley, and Reips (2005) that found a significant association between power and response rate, as well as a marginally significant effect of salutation when power was high (Joinson, Woodley, and Reips 2005).

The \textit{Subject} text should be constructed thoughtfully. Early research on email use suggests that people determine whether to read or delete email based on information provided in the subject line. Their decisions are often based on interest in the topic and recognition of the sender’s name (Tuten 1997). If possible, the subject line should convey the client’s name, the topic of the survey, and the word “survey.” There is also some evidence that asking respondents for assistance or help, rather than offering an opportunity to share opinions, can improve response rates (Trouteaud 2004; Porter and Whitcomb 2005). Although the MSI mailer does not limit the number of characters displayed in the subject line, there may be display restrictions imposed by the recipient’s email provider, so bear in mind that there may be a limit to how much is displayed in the typical inbox. Be creative but concise.

\section{3.2 Personalizing Traditional Mail Invitations}

Dillman, et al (2001) explain that researchers have been trying to understand the influences of personalized invitations on response to mail surveys since the 1940’s. Although the various studies had somewhat contradictory findings, a general conclusion regarding personalization is that it will not lower response rates and may even improve them (Dillman, et al 2001). Personalization of an invitation is accomplished in a variety of ways. The general idea is to make the respondent feel that they are an individual and personally important to the study. This can be accomplished through correspondence details such as stationary, postage, salutation,
signature, and more. A list of personalization techniques recommended by Dillman (2000) is given below.

- Letterhead stationary
- First-class postage rather than third class or bulk rate mail
- Real names rather than generic salutations (Also, Dillman et al 2001 suggest that if respondents names are unknown, a group identity salutation, such as “Dear MSI Employee” is a helpful alternative.)
- Real signature in contrasting ink
- Stamped return envelope rather than a business reply envelope

3.3 Salutation

The effect of personalized salutations in Web survey invitations is not completely understood. Some studies find no effect of personalized salutations (Porter and Whitcomb 2003, Pearson and Levine 2003), some find that it increases response rates (Heerwegh, Vanhove, Matthijs, and Loosveldt 2005; Joinson, Woodley and Reips 2005), and others find that the effect is dependent on the ‘power’ of the sender (Joinson and Reips 2005; see also 3.1 above). Overall, it seems that personalizing a salutation will not threaten and may even improve response rates. Unfortunately, the results of some studies have indicated that personalization may increase social desirability bias (Heerwegh, Vanhove, Matthijs, Loosveldt 2005) and reduce disclosure of sensitive information (Joinson, Woodley, Reips 2005) because respondents question the anonymity of their responses. If this is a concern, consider using a generalized salutation or emphasizing confidentiality and anonymity.

The research on how best to construct the salutation is somewhat inconclusive in terms of such things as titles and whether to use both first name and last name. For instance, although Pearson and Levine (2003) found no significant differences when they varied salutations, a recent study by Joinson and Reips (2005) found that an informal personal salutation (“Dear John”) resulted in higher response rates than any of the other three salutations tested (formal personal salutation “Dear John Doe”, informal impersonal salutation “Dear Student”, or formal impersonal salutation “Dear Open University Student”). However, it is important to note that this study was conducted using a sample of students.

**MSI recommends using an informal personal salutation** unless circumstances or client requests suggest otherwise. Also, remember that if the respondent’s personal name is unknown, a group identifier (such as “Dear MSI Employee”) may be helpful.

3.4 Explanation of the Request

Dillman (2000) suggests that the invitation include an explanation of what action is being requested, why the action is requested, why the action is appropriate and useful, and how the respondent was selected. However, he cautions authors to avoid any biased explanations that may influence the respondent in any way.

Furthermore, in some circumstances it may be useful to include a link to a Web site that will legitimize the survey or further explain its importance. For instance, in a survey for the American Customer Satisfaction Index, prior MSI invitations have included a link to “learn more” about the ACSI. Again, caution must be taken so that any additional information does not bias the respondent’s opinions in any way.
3.5 Incentives

3.5.1 General Information

When informing respondents about incentives it is important to tell them what the incentive is, how it will be delivered to them, and when they can expect to receive it.

3.5.2 Sweepstakes

There are very specific laws that govern the use of sweepstakes, prize drawings, and other giveaway forms. Therefore, it is necessary that incentive offers be stated in a manner that conforms to set legal boundaries. MSI uses a sweepstakes, which comply with relevant laws by not requiring the respondent to participate in the survey in order to qualify for the drawing. The respondent has the option to sign up only for the sweepstakes itself. (An example of appropriate wording for these rules is given in Appendix D.) It is important to note that the specific rules and other information regarding the incentives are generally not included in the body of the invitation. Instead, this information is usually included on a separate page and only a link is provided in the actual solicitation.

3.6 Selectivity Statement

The Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO) gives standards for ethically conducting survey research in general, as well as standards that are specific to Internet research. These standards offer guidance on the survey organization’s responsibilities to respondents, clients, the public, outside contractors, and interviewers. Among these responsibilities is the need to inform respondents of how they were selected. CASRO explains that survey organizations cannot send unsolicited emails to recruit respondents. In fact, respondents must have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research before an organization may contact them. This expectation must be based on a pre-existing relationship with the organization, the client, or the list owner.

3.7 Offer to Remove

Furthermore, it is necessary to give respondents the choice to be removed from future email contacts. The MSI preferred text is shown below. (See Appendix E for a more detailed explanation of the CASRO Standards and Ethics.)

If you do not wish to participate in this study, please respond to this email with the word REMOVE in the subject line along with your Survey ID#.

3.8 Confidentiality Statement

Dillman (2000) notes that the statement of confidentiality should be honest, but brief. He warns that research by Singer, Von Thurn, and Miller (1995) suggests that detailed explanations of confidentiality can discourage participation by causing respondents to think, “There must be a problem or they wouldn’t be telling me so much about protection.”

3.9 Instructions on How to participate

3.9.1 Authentication

Researchers recently have taken an interest in the effect of authentication, or login procedures in Web surveys. Results from two of the first studies suggest that the authentication
method can influence both data quality and response rates (Crawford, Couper, and Lamias 2001; Heerwegh and Loosveldt 2002). Although both studies tested an automatic login procedure, each compared a different version of the manual login and their results were somewhat mixed. Believing that the outcome differences were a result of definitional differences, Heerwegh and Loosveldt (2003) replicated the studies and tested both versions of the manual login procedure together with the automatic authentication. Specifically they compared: 1) a manual authentication in which two IDs had to be keyed in by the respondent; 2) a semiautomatic authentication in which only one ID had to be keyed in; and 3) an automatic procedure where the ID was embedded in the URL for the survey.

Authentication can influence both response and completion rates. To consider these effects, Heerwegh and Loosveldt (2003) considered both the rate of starting the survey and the rate of completion. In regard to the survey start rate, the highest response rate was found in the semiautomatic (one factor) authentication procedure, while the manual procedure had the lowest response rate. Although the differences were not statistically significant, the direction of the effect is important to consider, especially because these results replicate and clarify results from the two previous studies (Crawford, Couper, and Lamias 2001; Heerwegh and Loosveldt 2002). The results from completion rate comparisons do reach statistical significance (Heerwegh and Loosveldt’s 2003). Specifically, they show that the manual login procedure produces the highest completion rates, followed by the semiautomatic, and lastly the automatic procedure. Heerwegh and Loosveldt also combined the two rates to evaluate their net effect and found that overall a semiautomatic authentication outperforms both the automatic and the manual login procedures. Heerwegh and Loosveldt (2003) also show that authentication can influence duration of the survey and feelings of confidentiality. They found modest support that a semiautomatic authentication may increase survey duration (longer response times are generally thought to indicate careful answering of survey questions) and may also increase respondents’ feelings of confidentiality. Although their findings were not statistically significant, completion time and confidentiality measures indicate possible support for these theories.

Although not all of their findings are statistically significant, the results have several implications for survey practitioners. Heerwegh and Loosveldt (2003) conclude that automatic authentication should not be preferred simply because it reduces respondent burden. Furthermore, they say “the benefits of the manual or the semiautomatic login procedures compensate for the higher login burden imposed on the respondent” (Heerwegh and Loosveldt 2003).

MSI has also conducted internal research to evaluate these effects. Our findings show directional effects similar to those found by other researchers. Differences indicate that although the automatic login condition gets better initial response rates (often called “click through rates”), respondents in the semi-automatic procedure are more likely to complete the survey. These differences are statistically significant. Considering these results, MSI recommends a semi-automatic login procedure in which respondents must key in one ID. Although this method may cause greater respondent burden and lower initial response rates, the benefits of higher completion rates, longer survey duration, and stronger feelings of confidentiality outweigh the potential respondent burden.

3.9.2 Email Invitation Instructions

MSI standard wording for electronic (email) communications:
To participate in the survey:

1. Take note of your unique survey ID: {RESTORE ID}

2. Go to http://www.msisurvey.com/studyname and enter your survey ID in the space provided.

NOTE: If you are unable to click on the link directly, please type the entire link into the Address or Location field at the top of your Web browser, and press the ENTER key on your keyboard to access the survey Web site.

3.9.3 Traditional Mail Invitation Instructions

MSI standard wording for traditional mail (non-electronic mail, snail mail) communications:

To participate in the survey:

1. Take note of your unique survey ID: {RESTORE ID}.

2. Launch your Web browser, go to http://www.msisurvey.com/studyname and enter your survey ID in the space provided.

NOTE: Please type the entire link into the Address or Location field at the top of your Web browser, and press the ENTER key on your keyboard to access the survey Web site.

3.9.4 Instruction to Resume the Survey

Each invitation and reminder should also include instructions on how to resume the survey if the respondent is not able to complete it during her first visit. Standard wording is given below.

If you are unable to finish the survey during your first visit, please follow the same instructions given above to resume the survey. Once you have accessed the survey, you will automatically be directed to the place where you left off. The answers given during your first visit will already be saved and you will not have to answer them again.

3.9.5 Survey Deadline

Research by Porter and Whitcomb (2003) found that the inclusion of a deadline and a selectivity statement (suggesting that the survey is a rare opportunity) significantly increased response rates. For their study they used the following deadline and selectivity statements respectively: “the Web site will be closed at midnight on [closing date]” and “you are one of a small group of students who have been randomly selected to provide feedback about our institution.”

3.10 Contact Information

It is important to give respondents a way of contacting MSI if they need assistance. For this, MSI’s standard wording is:
If you have questions or require technical assistance, please contact the MSI Support Desk by sending an email to [INSERT EMAIL ALIAS]@msisurvey.com or by calling toll-free, 1.866.674.3375. Please refer to the [INSERT SURVEY NAME] survey and provide your survey ID: [INSERT SURVEY ID].

3.11 Formatting

It may be useful, especially for electronic mail, to format the document in a way that makes it easy to skim. Many respondents may skim a solicitation before deciding to either consider the request or throw it away. Try to keep paragraphs concise and consider bolding any key features.

3.12 Thank You

As noted by Dillman (2000), during any correspondence it is important to thank respondents for their help.

4 REMINDER CORRESPONDENCE

Reminders are an important part of the survey process. Dillman (2000) suggests that “without follow-up contacts, response rates will usually be 20-40 percentage points lower than those normally attained, regardless of how interesting the questionnaire or impressive the mailout package.” Below are general guidelines on how to design successful follow-ups as well as specific information for each type of reminder.

4.1 General Reminder Notes

- Similar contents to the invitation
- Wording should be varied slightly to appeal to non-respondents
- Should also ‘look’ different so that respondents do not think they have already read the correspondence
- Thank those respondents who have already completed the survey
- Do not send subsequent reminders to those who have already responded
- Dillman (2000) also notes that the post-script is very visible and generally read by respondents - he suggests that authors can add a post-script to express thanks, discuss incentives, or mention any other relevant information

4.2 First Reminder / Postcard / Thank you

The first reminder is just that – a reminder in case the respondent set the survey aside and forgot about it. Another link to the survey should be included. This correspondence is also an opportunity to thank those who have already responded. Dillman (2000) notes that it can be delivered as a postcard if using traditional mail correspondence.

4.3 Second Reminder Letter

Again, the contents of the second reminder should contain similar information to the invitation, but stated differently and the letter itself should ‘look’ different. Additionally, it may help to include the following information:

- Feedback noting that attempts have been made to contact the respondent and that we have not yet heard back from him/her
• Notification that others have responded
• Feedback regarding possible concerns of the respondent, such as ineligibility

4.4 Final Reminder

Again, the final reminder should contain similar information, but stated or packaged differently in an attempt to appeal to non-responders. Furthermore, Dillman (2000) suggests that using a different mode of contact may express the importance of a reply. Consider including the following:

• Notice / reminder / connection to previous contacts
• Notice that time is running out
• A different mode of contact, such as telephone, traditional mail, priority mail, etc along with an explanation for this special contact

4.5 Survey Closing Notice

The survey closing notice is a short correspondence that informs the respondents that the survey is closing and gives them one last chance to complete it.

5 TIMING OF CORRESPONDENCE

Below is a guide for scheduling correspondence. Although there is little methodological work on the timing of correspondence, the following table draws on what is known. The guidelines for traditional mail contacts come from Dillman’s (2000) suggestions, while the Web guidelines (those with asterisks) come from a study by Crawford, Couper, and Llamias (2001). They varied the timing of reminders and found that when compared to an alternate, the following schedule given not only increased response rates but also increased the speed of returns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondence</th>
<th>Traditional Mail (Dillman 2000)</th>
<th>Web (*Crawford, et al 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-notice</td>
<td>Few days to one week before the questionnaire</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation / Cover Letter (Included with questionnaire)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard / Thank you / Reminder (Different from the cover letter)</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>*2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder Letter (Shorter/different, sent only to NR’s.)</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>*4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder – Final Contact (Using a different mode of contact)</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Closing Notice (Web only)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6  FURTHER READING (REFERENCES)


APPENDIX A: Sample Email Invitation

Subject: VHA Member Opinion Study

Dear [[salutation]] [[first_name]] [[last_name]]:

You are invited to participate in the 2005 VHA Member Opinion Study. Feedback from senior leaders in VHA member organizations is an important component of VHA’s ongoing planning and improvement processes.

Each year VHA conducts surveys of healthcare executives in key areas like finance, operations, information technology, nursing, materials management, and pharmacy. The survey results provide important information, which helps form our strategy development and enables us to make appropriate adjustments to our service delivery efforts. For this reason, once a year we ask that you personally complete this important survey.

To make participation as convenient as possible, we offer you the option of completing the survey via the Internet or by telephone. **We encourage you to participate via the Internet so that you can complete this brief survey at your leisure.** Completing the survey by the Internet is the easiest and most efficient way to participate in this study.

**Please note that the survey itself has been significantly shortened from previous years and should now take no more than 10 minutes to complete.**

To participate in the online survey:

1. **Take note of your unique survey ID: {RESTORE ID}**
2. **Go to http://www.msisurvey.com/memsat and enter your survey ID in the space provided.**

   NOTE: If you are unable to click on the link directly, please type the entire link into the Address or Location field at the top of your Web browser, and press the ENTER key on your keyboard to access the survey Web site.

   *If you need to interrupt the survey, simply exit the site. Re-enter by clicking again on the above link and you will return to the same point on the survey automatically.*

Please note that if you experience any technical difficulties with the Internet survey and need assistance, you may email us at memsat@msisurvey.com or call Market Strategies, Inc. (MSI) at 1-800-492-5119 and ask to speak to a supervisor about the **VHA Member Opinion Study.**

**You will be receiving another email reminding you to complete the survey online in about one week.** However, if you would rather participate in the study by telephone, a representative from MSI will call to schedule an appointment with you in the next several weeks. Should you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to contact Ellen Averyt of MSI at (734) 779-6822.

We appreciate your time and assistance in providing information and input that will help us enhance the value of VHA to your organization.
APPENDIX B: Sample Email Reminder

Subject: VHA Member Opinion Study – Reminder

Dear [[salutation]] [[first_name]] [[last_name]]:

We recently contacted you on behalf of VHA to request your participation in the 2005 VHA Member Satisfaction Study. If you have not yet completed the survey via the Internet, we would like to extend a reminder to you that you are still able to do so.

To participate in the online survey:

1. Take note of your unique survey ID: {RESTORE ID}
2. Go to http://www.msisurvey.com/memsat and enter your survey ID in the space provided.

   NOTE: If you are unable to click on the link directly, please type the entire link into the Address or Location field at the top of your Web browser, and press the ENTER key on your keyboard to access the survey Web site.

If you previously began the survey but have not yet completed it, you may simply click on the above link and be taken to the point in the survey at which you left off.

Please note that if you experience any technical difficulties with the Internet survey and need assistance, you may email us at memsat@msisurvey.com or call Market Strategies, Inc. (MSI) at 1-800-492-5119 and ask to speak to a supervisor about the VHA Member Opinion Study.

If you would prefer to participate in the study by telephone, a representative from MSI will call to schedule an appointment with you in the next two weeks. Should you have any questions regarding the study, please feel free to contact Ellen Averyt of MSI at (734) 779-6822.

We appreciate your time and assistance in providing information and input that will help us enhance the value of VHA to your organization.
May 11, 2005

{First Name Last Name}
{Title}
{HCO Name}
{Address 1} {Address 2}
{City}, {State} {Zip}

Dear {RESTORE FIRST NAME FROM SAMPLE}:

You are invited to participate in the 2005 VHA Member Satisfaction Study. Feedback from senior leaders in VHA member organizations is an important component of VHA’s ongoing planning and improvement processes.

Each year VHA conducts surveys of healthcare executives in key areas like finance, operations, information technology, nursing, materials management, and pharmacy. The survey results provide important information, which helps form our strategy development and enables us to make appropriate adjustments to our service delivery efforts. For this reason, once a year we ask that you personally complete this important survey.

To make participation as convenient as possible, we offer you the option of completing the survey via the Internet or by telephone. We encourage you to participate via the Internet so that you can complete this brief survey at your leisure. Completing the survey by the Internet is the easiest and most efficient way to participate in this study.

Please note that the survey itself has been significantly shortened from previous years and should now take no more than 10 minutes to complete. The survey can be accessed any time between May 9 and June 26, 2005.

To participate in the online survey:

1. Take note of your unique survey ID: {RESTORE ID}
2. Launch your Web browser and go to www.msisurvey.com/memsat and enter your survey ID in the space provided.

If you need to interrupt the survey, simply exit the site. Re-enter by clicking again on the above link and you will return to the same point on the survey automatically.

If you are planning to complete the survey by Internet, you need to keep this letter until you have completed your survey, as it contains your personal password and you cannot complete the survey without it. If you experience any technical difficulties with the Internet survey and need assistance, e-mail us at memsat@msisurvey.com or call Market Strategies, Inc. (MSI) at 1-800-492-5119 and ask to speak to a supervisor about the VHA Member Opinion Study.
If you would like to participate in the study by telephone, a representative from MSI will call to schedule an appointment with you in the next two weeks, or, if you prefer, you or an assistant may contact MSI at 1-800-492-5119 to schedule an interview. When calling MSI, please ask for a supervisor and tell them you are calling regarding the VHA Member Opinion Study.

Should you have any other questions regarding the study, please contact Ellen Averyt of MSI at (734) 779-6822. You will not be asked to complete the survey more than once during the year 2005.

We appreciate your time and assistance in providing information and input that will help us enhance the value of VHA to your organization.
APPENDIX D: Sample Sweepstakes Rules

Project Drawing Rules

Dates:
Entries for the drawing may be submitted beginning at 9:00AM EST, Wednesday, May 23, 2000 and ending at Midnight EST, Sunday, June 4, 2000. The drawing will be held on or about June 15, 2000.

Prizes:
Four prizes of $1000USD each will be awarded.

Odds:
The odds of winning will be determined by the number of entries received.

Participation:
All persons receiving an email solicitation for the eshop project are invited to participate. Persons may enter either by completing the survey requested in the email solicitation or by sending an email with their name and email address to eshop@msiresearch.com. There is a limit of one entry per person. Winners will be selected on or about June 15, 2000 by a random drawing from all eligible entries received. Market Strategies, Inc. reserves the right to reschedule the drawing without notification to participants. Winners will be notified via email to the address submitted in the entry. To claim their prize, winners must reply by email within ten business days of the date of notification. Failure to do so will result in forfeiture of the prize and another entrant selected by random drawing. Market Strategies, Inc. is not responsible for failed notifications due to incorrect or inoperable email addresses. Any notification message or prize returned as undeliverable will result in the forfeiture of the prize and the selection of an alternate winner as described above. All prizes will be paid in the form of a cashier’s check made payable to the winner and sent to the mail address supplied in response to the email notification of having won. Participants may request a list of winners by emailing said request to eshop@msiresearch.com prior to June 30, 2000.

Eligibility:
For U.S. entrants, all legal U.S. residents 18 years of age or older are eligible. All legal Canadian residents (except residents of the province of Quebec) who have reached the age of majority also are eligible. Void where prohibited or restricted by law. Employees of Market Strategies, Inc. and their immediate family(s) or household members are not eligible.

Disclaimers:
Any taxes or fees in excess of the prize amount are the sole responsibility of the prize winner. Unaccepted prizes may not be awarded. Prize is nontransferable. Winner is subject to these complete and official rules. Market Strategies, Inc. is not liable for damage, loss, or injury resulting from computer malfunctions, misdirected or incomplete entries. Winners assume liability for injuries, damages, losses or expenses of any kind caused or claimed to be caused by participation, or by the acceptance, possession, use or misuse of any prizes. By participating and redeeming a prize, each winner releases Market Strategies, Inc., its directors, officers, employees and agents, from any and all loss, liability or damages resulting from or arising out of participation in this contest.
APPENDIX E: CASRO (2004) Standards and Ethics

_A complete, up-to-date version of the CASRO Standards and Ethics can be retrieved from_ [http://www.casro.org/](http://www.casro.org/). Below is an excerpt of items pertaining specifically to Web surveys.

3. Internet Research

A. The unique characteristics of Internet research require specific notice that the principle of Respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that Survey Research Organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit Respondents for surveys.

(1) Research Organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

(a) A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the Research Organization, the Client or the List Owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

(b) Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

(c) Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

(d) The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

(2) Research Organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential Respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals’ awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

(3) Research Organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting Respondents over the Internet.

(4) When receiving email lists from Clients or List Owners, Research Organizations are required to have the Client or List Owner verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.