

REASONS ANGLERS DID NOT RESPOND TO AN INTERNET SURVEY AND EVALUATION OF DATA QUALITY

Larry M. Gigliotti¹ and Kjetil R. Henderson²

¹U.S. Geological Survey
South Dakota Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007, USA

²Department of Natural Resource Management
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007, USA

*Corresponding author: Larry.Gigliotti@sdsstate.edu

ABSTRACT

Natural resource management agencies have traditionally used statewide mail surveys to gather information from anglers, but cost savings and faster returns occur using the internet. This study examined mail or internet fishery survey return rates and associated data by license type of South Dakota resident anglers. Junior anglers (ages 16-18; Junior Combination license) had the lowest internet and mail survey return rates (20% and 28%, respectively), followed by adult anglers (ages 19-64; Adult Fishing and Adult Combination licenses; 30% and 39%, respectively), and senior anglers (ages 65+; Senior Fishing and Senior Combination licenses; 42% and 66%, respectively). The three age groups were significantly different on three email use characteristics (shared email, frequency of use, and comfort level). The primary reason for not responding to the internet survey was not receiving or noticing the email request, and secondarily, being too busy to respond. Although having a relatively low response rate, data collected by the internet compared to follow-up mail surveys of internet non-respondents were similar.

Keywords

Angler surveys, human dimensions, internet surveys, nonresponse bias

INTRODUCTION

Natural resource management agencies often use surveys to collect stakeholder information. In particular, angler surveys have been used to measure participation in fishing (e.g., where, when, frequency, type), estimate catch and harvest, evaluate programs and regulations, estimate economic impact, measure satisfaction and benefits sought, generate user profiles, and collect opinions on various management issues (Brown 1991). Typically, statewide surveys have used the

mail and telephone to collect information from license holders. Using internet-based surveys results in cost savings by eliminating printing, postage, and stuffing envelopes and encoding data, in addition to faster response times, (Cook et al. 2000; Ward et al. 2012; Wright and Schwager 2008). However, concerns have been raised about natural resource management internet surveys due to poor data quality as a result of incomplete email address coverage and lower response rates (Couper et al. 1999; Duda and Nobile 2010; Frazee et al. 2003; Gigliotti and Dietsch 2014; Kaplowitz et al 2004; Nulty 2008; Stern et al. 2014; Vaske et al. 2011).

Response rate has traditionally been one indicator of survey quality (Kaminska et al. 2010). In many cases, internet survey return rates have been substantially lower than comparable mail surveys (Couper et al. 1999; Fan and Yan 2010; Frazee et al. 2003; Resnick 2012; Shih and Fan 2009). Gigliotti (2011) reported a 44% email-invitation internet survey return rate by turkey hunters versus 75% for a mail survey. Kwak and Radler (2002) reported a lower response by university students to an internet survey (27%) than a corresponding mail survey (43%). Nulty (2008), summarizing eight studies, reported an average return rate of 33% for online surveys and 56% for paper-based surveys. Manfreda et al. (2008) summarized 45 studies and reported internet surveys yielded an 11% lower response rate than other survey methods. Low response rates raise concerns about the representativeness of results.

Response rates measure only the potential for nonresponse bias and may be a poor measure of survey data quality (Fisher 1996; Kaminska et al. 2010; Kreuter 2013; Peytchev 2013; Peytchev et al. 2009; Wagner 2012). If non-respondents respond similarly to survey respondents on the variables measured, effort taken to increase response rate uses resources that could be better used elsewhere (Becker and Iliff 1983). Agencies have the responsibility to use resources wisely and must consider both data quality and cost. If both mail and internet surveys can be shown to collect representative data, the internet may be the better choice.

The South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks (SDGFP) is considering a switch from a large-scale, statewide angler survey of licensed anglers performed every five years to conducting a shorter survey annually, if costs can be significantly reduced while still maintaining quality. The objectives of this study were to: 1) identify reasons why anglers did not respond to an email request to complete an internet survey about fishing during the previous year, and 2) evaluate the quality of data collected by an internet survey by measuring internet nonresponse bias using a mail survey. This paper focuses on the problem of low response rates to internet surveys compared to mail surveys. Additionally, the extent of incomplete email address coverage is discussed in perspective to overall survey design.

METHODS

Email coverage from 2010 through 2013 was obtained from the SDGFP for the five types of resident fishing licenses. The license types included three combination licenses that provide both fishing and small game hunting privileges [junior (ages 16-18), adult (ages 19-64) and senior (ages 65 and older)] and two

annual fishing licenses providing only fishing privileges [adult (ages 19-64) and senior (ages 65 and older)]. For this analysis, anglers with and without email were divided into groups. The internet survey represented only the anglers with email and this study evaluates only internet nonresponse bias (internet data quality in respect to incomplete email coverage is not included in this study).

Internet data were collected by sending personalized (first and last name) email invitations to all 2012 licensed resident anglers with an email address in the SDGFP database asking them to participate in an internet survey about their 2012 fishing activities in South Dakota. The email contained a link to an internet survey hosted by SurveyMonkey (www.SurveyMonkey.com). The initial email invitation was sent at the end of the 2012 fishing season (2013 January 1), with an email reminder seven days later. A final email reminder was sent after another seven days specifying the survey would close in a week (closed 2013 January 24). The email invitation stated that the survey should take only about 5 to 7 minutes if the recipient fished in South Dakota in 2012 or less than 1 minute if no fishing occurred.

Following the conclusion of the internet survey, we randomly selected 200 anglers from each of the five resident annual licenses who did not respond to the internet survey email invitation to receive a one-page mailed survey. The paper survey was mailed at the end of the third week of January, followed a week later by a postcard reminder, with a second mailing of the questionnaire occurring three weeks later.

Mail Questionnaire—The first question asked whether the respondent provided a home or work email address, or neither, when purchasing their 2012 fishing license. The neither option was intended to identify anglers in the email database who do not actually have an email address in the SDGFP database, which can happen if anglers have someone else buy their license online. The second question identified anglers who have a shared email address (e.g., with spouse) versus an exclusive address. This could affect internet response rates, especially when personalized email invitations are sent and opened by someone other than the intended recipient. The following two questions measured the frequency with which anglers access their email and their general comfort level with communicating via email. Next was a question asking whether they remembered receiving the email invitation to participate in the fishing survey, followed by a request to identify reasons for not responding to the internet survey from a list of possible reasons. The final four questions (days of fishing, satisfaction, importance of fishing, and sex) were included for comparing responses to the original internet survey responses.

Analyses—South Dakota's five license types were grouped into three age groups for analyses: a) junior anglers (Junior Combination: ages 16–18); b) adult anglers (Adult Annual and Adult Combination: ages 19-64); and c) senior anglers (Senior Annual and Senior Combination: ages 65+). The email use variables for the three age groups were compared using a chi-square analysis and Cramer's V was used to measure effect size. To evaluate the quality of the internet data, the fishing variables (proportion not fishing, mean days of fishing, satisfaction, and

importance of fishing) collected by the mail survey of internet non-respondents were compared with those collected by the internet survey using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and 95% confidence intervals with *eta* (η) for the effect size measure. A record-linking technique (Smith 2008) was used to compare the sex ratios of fishing license purchasers with sex ratios of the internet survey data for each age group using a chi-square analysis and *phi* (ϕ) for the effect size measure.

Internet return rates were based on the actual number of emails sent (the number of email addresses in the database minus the number of email addresses that were previously opted-out or were invalid). Previously opted-out emails occur when someone has previously received an email invitation to participate in any survey hosted by SurveyMonkey and elected to opt-out of the survey. Invalid addresses are those not having the proper email address format. Internet and mail survey return rates were compared by age group and combined using a chi-square analysis with *phi* (ϕ) for the effect size measure.

RESULTS

Email coverage for South Dakota's resident fishing licenses has increased 8% from 2010 through 2013 (48%, 52%, 52%, and 56%; respectively). Email coverage measured in 2013 varied among the five resident license types from 29% for the Senior Fishing license to 78% for the Adult Combination license (Table 1). Email coverage was higher for the combination licenses (fishing and hunting privileges) than the fishing-only licenses.

Internet and mail survey return rates increased with age; junior angler return rates were lowest (20% internet and 28% mail), adults were next (30% and 39%, respectively), and senior anglers were highest (42% and 66%, respectively) (Table 2). The mail survey of internet non-respondents achieved higher return rates than the internet survey for all three age groups: junior anglers 8% difference, adult anglers 9% difference, and senior anglers 24% difference.

The three age groups were statistically similar on two of the email-use characteristics: providing an email address and providing a home versus a work email address. Overall, 41% of the anglers said that they did not provide an email address when purchasing their 2012 fishing license, which can happen if someone else purchases the license online for them: 35% of junior, 36% of adult and 46% of senior anglers ($\chi^2 = 4.41$, $P = 0.110$, Cramer's $V = 0.101$). Most anglers providing an email address said it was a "home" email address (96%): 100% of junior, 92% of adult and 98% of senior anglers ($\chi^2 = 5.70$, $P = 0.058$, Cramer's $V = 0.150$).

Significant differences were found among age groups for percent sharing an email address, frequency of checking their email and comfort level with communicating via email. More senior anglers (68%) shared an email address than did junior (39%) and adult (37%) anglers ($\chi^2 = 23.86$, $P < 0.001$, Cramer's $V = 0.302$). Junior anglers reported checking their email less than adults or senior anglers, although about 31% of the seniors and 15% of the adults infrequently (1–4 times per month) check their email (Table 3). Adult anglers were more comfortable communicating via email than junior and senior anglers (Table 4).

The Cramer's V effect size statistic indicates a moderate association for the difference in percent sharing an email address and a weak association for the differences in frequency of checking email and comfort level with communicating via email (Rea & Parker 2005).

Overall, 59% of the anglers did not recall receiving the January 2013 email: 72% of the junior, 52% of the adult and 61% of the senior anglers ($\chi^2 = 4.90$, $P = 0.086$, Cramer's V = 0.137). For the anglers who remember receiving the email request, "being too busy during the survey period" was the most often cited reason (43%) for not responding (Table 5). Junior (70%) and adult anglers (61%) were more likely to select being "too busy" as a reason for not completing the internet survey than senior anglers (14%) ($\chi^2 = 27.57$, $P < 0.001$, Cramer's V = 0.505). The high value for Cramer's V suggests a relatively strong association (Rea and Parker 2005). Seven of the eight respondents selecting the "not fishing in 2012" reason for not responding to the internet survey were senior anglers.

The internet survey and the mail survey of internet non-respondents collected similar responses for the percent of licensed anglers not fishing in 2012, mean days of fishing in 2012, satisfaction with the 2012 fishing experience, and anglers' rating of the importance of fishing when analyzed by age group (junior, adult and senior anglers; $P > 0.05$) so the age groups were combined (Table 6). The only significant difference was internet respondents rated the importance of fishing slightly higher compared to the internet non-respondents contacted by mail, although the difference was negligible as indicated by the small eta effect size (Cohen 1988).

Females were underrepresented in the internet survey for adult anglers (14% internet vs. 19% license database) ($\chi^2 = 172.81$, $P < 0.001$, $\phi = 0.047$) and senior anglers (11% vs. 13%; respectively) ($\chi^2 = 5.91$, $P = 0.015$, $\phi = 0.026$) and over-represented in the internet survey for junior anglers (20% vs. 16%; respectively) ($\chi^2 = 6.76$, $P = 0.009$, $\phi = -0.037$). The statistical significance is more attributable to the inherent sensitivity of the chi-square analysis to sample size rather than meaningful differences in sex ratios for the three age groups (as evidenced by negligible phi effect sizes).

DISCUSSION

Email Coverage—Coverage will be a potential problem with conducting email invitation internet surveys until an agency collects email addresses from all licensed anglers (Vaske 2008). However, the coverage issue may eventually become insignificant as more people provide the agency with an email address. About 80% of the adult population is estimated to use email by 2014 (96% of the adult internet users) (eMarketer 2013). Email coverage for South Dakota resident anglers has been slowly but steadily increasing over the past four years without any special effort by the SDGFP. Email coverage for senior licenses is likely to continue increasing simply due to adults with emails already in the database reaching age 65. Tsotsis (2011) reported a 28% increase in email use in 2010 among the 65 and older age group. However, we believe that an agency can take steps to augment this natural increase in coverage. Providing an email ad-

dress, which is optional, is the last piece of personal information collected when license purchasers complete their profile information. The only encouragement for providing an email address is the following statement; “*To receive information from GF&P regarding your license information please provide a valid email address.*”

Email Use Characteristics and Internet Response Rate—Similar to previous research (Couper et al. 1999; Fan and Yan 2010; Frazee et al. 2003; Resnick 2012; Shih and Fan 2009), our follow-up mail survey had a response rate higher than the internet survey. In this case, the mail survey sent to a sample of anglers who, for various reasons did not respond to the internet survey, had a higher response rate than the internet survey itself. The survey topics were somewhat different with the internet survey asking about their 2012 fishing and the mail survey asking why they did not respond to the internet survey and a few fishing questions. However, a related component of this project also found much higher response rates to the mail survey compared to the internet survey when an identical questionnaire was sent to a random sample of internet non-respondents (Henderson 2014).

Similar to Gigliotti and Dietsch (2014), this research found that response rate increased with age. Differences in email use characteristics may account for some of the age-related difference in internet response rate. Senior anglers had the highest internet survey response and the highest percent of shared email addresses. A shared email address may contribute to an increased response rate by increasing the probability that email invitations will be noticed, although the relationship may be spurious.

Response to a question about the frequency of email use suggests some non-response may be attributed to missing the invitation because of infrequent email use. Infrequent use may reflect individual preferences other than email for communicating. Although email is the most popular online activity (eMarketer 2013), email use by teens is declining (Palis 2012). Palis (2012) reported a 31% decline in email use by 12-17 year olds for 2011, with young people turning to texting and social networks (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter) to communicate (Lee 2011; Tam 2012). Junior anglers had the lowest email use frequency which may, in part, account for the lower internet response rate observed with this age group.

Being “too busy” was most often chosen as the primary reason for nonresponse by junior and adult anglers who recalled receiving the email. Cranford et al. (2008) also found that “too busy” was the most common reason (46%) given by undergraduate college students for nonresponse to a web-based survey. Gigliotti and Dietsch (2014) suggested that higher survey response rates by seniors may be due to having more time to complete a survey. Nisbett and Wilson (1977) caution that people may be unaware of the cognitive processes leading to a decision not to participate in a survey; selecting easily accessible and simple responses to quickly complete the survey. In other words, being “too busy” may be a simple and convenient excuse masking underlying motivations for not participating in the survey. However, being “too busy,” as a reason for nonresponse, may be more common in internet surveys than mail surveys. Paper questionnaires are more flexible than internet surveys in when and where they can be completed. Nichols

(2012) reported that when offered a choice between responding to a survey by paper or via the internet, convenience was the most frequently cited reason by people selecting the paper option. Also, an email request to complete an online survey may be perceived as less important since it is less expensive than a mailed questionnaire, and subsequently, easier for people to reject under the excuse of being “too busy” (Nisbett and Wilson 1977). This difference impacts data quality from internet surveys only if anglers too busy to complete the internet survey differ on measured variables from anglers who complete a mail survey.

Internet Data Quality—Internet survey data that do not accurately measure the percent of active/inactive anglers can negatively impact the quality of internet survey data. Percent fishing affects the calculation of fishing effort, catch, harvest, and economic impact. The email invitation stated the survey should take about 5 to 7 minutes or only 1 minute if the person did not do any fishing in 2012. This was done to encourage licensed anglers who did not fish in 2012 to participate in the survey by reducing the perceived burden on this subset of anglers (Crawford et al. 2001). Only a small percentage of anglers listed their inactivity as a reason for not responding to the internet survey and both survey modes had statistically similar results for the percent fishing. However, “not fishing” may be an important reason why anglers do not complete angler surveys in general because they believe that their information is not needed.

Responses from the internet survey and the mail survey of internet non-respondents were also similar for mean days of fishing and satisfaction in 2012, and had only small differences in angler rating of the importance of fishing and sex bias by survey mode. Importance of fishing may be correlated with higher internet response rates. Interest in the survey topic (salience) has been shown to be strongly correlated with survey response (Groves et al. 2004; Sheehan and McMillan 1999). Although salience may be responsible for a slight increase in internet response compared to follow-up mail surveys, importance of fishing may be strongly related to survey response in general, regardless of survey mode (Heberlein and Baumgartner 1978). The sex bias in the internet data was small, but because exact sex ratios are known for license buyers, this variable can be weighted to adjust for sex related response differences (Huggins et al. 2002; Rogelberg and Stanton 2007; Vaske 2008).

Our results found slightly higher response rates by males for the adult and senior anglers compared to Smith (2008) who reported a higher response rate to an online survey by female faculty (36%) than male faculty (24%). Smith (2008) suggested gender differences in communication styles as the reason, based on the research findings of Jackson et al. (2001) showing higher email use by females was consistent with stronger interpersonal communication motives. Lower email use by males was consistent with their tendency to use the internet more for seeking information. Smith (2008) concluded that responding to an email invitation to take an internet survey was more a type of online information-exchange behavior than an information-seeking behavior, thus explaining their finding of a higher female response. However, our results suggest other factors (e.g., salience, level of interest in the survey topic) are involved in explaining sex-related differential internet survey response rates for anglers (Brown 1984; Sheehan 2001).

Although studies have found lower response rates for internet surveys than mail surveys (Hayslett and Wildemuth 2004; Knapp and Kirk 2003, Kypri et al. 2004; Yun and Trumbo 2000), Groves (2006, p. 670) states that there is “no simple relationship between nonresponse rates and nonresponse biases” and that “covariances between survey variables and response propensities are highly variable across items within a survey, survey conditions, and populations.” Identifying and correcting for nonresponse bias is a critical component of survey research (Barriball and While 1999; Fisher 1996; Vaske 2008). A number of researchers have concluded that it may be more appropriate to spend resources to identify and correct for nonresponse biases than to blindly work to increase response rates (Babbie 2004; Crompton and Tian-Cole 2001; Krosnick 1999). Even with response rates of 70% or more, nonresponse could strongly bias variable estimates (Brown and Wilkins 1978; Crompton and Tian-Cole 2001).

Cost savings is one main benefit for agencies selecting the internet versus mail to survey anglers. However, due to incomplete coverage and lower internet response rates, it has been suggested that some of the cost savings of the internet can still be obtained by utilizing the internet in a mixed-mode survey (Dillman 2007). However, our data suggest an internet/mail mixed-mode survey of anglers with email may not sufficiently address nonresponse bias, as a mail follow-up of internet non-respondents would still have an unacceptable (<80%; Office of Management and Budget 2006) response rate. We estimated an internet/mail mixed-mode survey would have received response rates of 42% for junior anglers, 57% for adult anglers and 80% for senior anglers (64% combined) for this survey. A better use of resources might be to conduct a smaller, but more intensive, representative sampling of non-respondents rather than conducting a follow-up mail survey (Crompton and Tian-Cole 2001; Groves 2006; Rogelberg and Stanton 2007).

Increasing the Value of Internet Surveys—Increasing email coverage offers benefits beyond having a cost effective way to conduct stakeholder surveys by providing an interactive information outlet to proactively interact with stakeholders during the management process. As more governmental agencies turn to the internet as the primary venue to disseminate information and provide transaction services, State natural resource agencies could consider requiring on-line license purchasers to provide a valid email address. All State natural resource agencies offer the opportunity to purchase a fishing license online, and for half of them, an email address is mandatory (Southwick Associates 2013).

Educating the public about the importance of the survey information and the potential cost savings of internet surveys may stimulate future participation in agency surveys. Tse (1998) stated that paperless surveys (internet) may be perceived as environmentally friendly, a fact that could be included in an educational message. Groves et al. (1992) reported that an appeal to the helping norm may significantly increase participation in a survey. Schaefer and Dillman (1998) reported that a prior email notification increased response rates. Fan and Yan (2010) provide advice for increasing internet response rates based on the four stages of the entire internet survey process: a) survey development, b) survey

delivery, c) survey completion, and d) survey return. We also suggest the courtesy of providing feedback from the survey results. Respondents donated their time to provide input and may appreciate receiving results in a short nontechnical format. For a mailed survey, this would be relatively expensive; however, costs are negligible for an email survey. This inexpensive type of feedback sent to both the respondents and non-respondents may increase participation in future surveys by demonstrating that the information is being used.

Conclusions—Email is one of the most prevalent communication tools used in business now and for the foreseeable future (eMarketer 2014; Fauscette 2012; Pogue 2015). Thus, email is likely to remain a valuable communication tool of government agencies and serve as an inexpensive avenue for providing and receiving information from stakeholders. Internet survey research presents some unique research opportunities, as well as some design and implementation challenges not found in mail surveys (Andrews et al. 2003; Archer 2008; Atif et al. 2012; Graefe et al. 2011; Huang 2006; Lesser et al. 2011; Manzo and Burke 2012; Rhodes et al. 2003; Sexton et al. 2011). Continued research is needed to use this tool more effectively and efficiently. For example, can offers of sending time sensitive fishing information increase email coverage, what is the most effective number of email reminders, how does survey length affect internet response rate and data quality, and do offers to provide survey results increase participation?

Note: Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this research was provided by Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration funds (Project F-15-R, Study 1523) administered by South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks; South Dakota State University; and by the United States Geological Survey. South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks staff providing assistance with this project: Corey Huxoll (sample selection), Cynthia Longmire (survey design), John Lott and Geno Adams (coordination of staff review of survey instruments).

LITERATURE CITED

- Andrews, D., B. Nonnecke, and J. Preece. 2003. Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard-to-involve internet users. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 16:185-210.
- Archer, T.M. 2008. Response rates to expect from web-based surveys and what to do about it. *Journal of Extension* 46(3). Available at: <<http://www.joe.org/joe/2008june/rb3.php>> [Cited 22 December 2014].

- Atif, A., D. Richards, and A. Bilgin. 2012. Estimating non-response bias in a web-based survey of technology acceptance: A case study of unit guide information systems. *Proceedings of the 23rd Australasian Conference on Information Systems (ACIS)*. Geelong, Australia. Available at: <<https://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30049121/atif-estimatingnon-2012.pdf>>_[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Babbie, E. 2004. *The practice of social research*. 10th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barriball, K.L., and A.E. While. 1999. Nonresponse in survey research: A methodological discussion and development of an explanatory model. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 30: 677-686.
- Becker, B. H., and T.J. Iliff. 1983. Nonrespondents in homogeneous groups: Implications for mailed surveys. *Leisure Sciences* 5:257-267.
- Brown, T.L. 1984. Non-respondents in homogeneous groups: Implications for mailed surveys – a comment. *Leisure Sciences* 6:509-512.
- Brown, T.L. 1991. Use and abuse of mail surveys in fisheries management. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 12:255-261.
- Brown, T.L., and B.T. Wilkins. 1978. Clues to reasons for nonresponse, and its effect upon variable estimates. *Journal of Leisure Research* 10:226-231.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, C., F. Heath, and R.L. Thompson. 2000. A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 60:821-836.
- Couper, M. P., T. Blair, T., and T. Triplett. 1999. A comparison of mail and e-mail for a survey of employees in U.S. Statistical Agencies. *Journal of Official Statistics* 15:39-56.
- Cranford, J.A., S.E. McCabe, C.J. Boyd, J. Slayden, M.B. Reed, J.M. Ketchie, J.E. Lange, and M.S. Scott. 2008. Reasons for nonresponse in a web-based survey of alcohol involvement among first-year college students. *Addictive Behaviors* 33:206-210.
- Crawford, S.D., M.P. Couper, and M.J. Lamias. 2001. Web surveys: Perceptions of burden. *Social Science Computer Review* 19:146-162.
- Crompton, J.L., and S. Tian-Cole. 2001. An analysis of 13 tourism surveys: Are three waves of data collection necessary? *Journal of Travel Research* 39:356-368.
- Dillman, D. A. 2007. *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*, 2nd edition, 2007 update with new internet, visual and mixed-mode guide. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Duda, M.D., and J.L. Nobile. 2010. The fallacy of online surveys: No data are better than bad data. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 15:55-64.
- eMarketer. 2013. With mature US online population, small gains for email, search usage. Available at: <<http://www.emarketer.com/Articles/Print.aspx?R=1009704>>_[Cited 22 December 2014].
- eMarketer. 2014. Email: The old kid in the block still got it. Available at: <<http://www.emarketer.com/Article/Email-Old-Kid-on-Blocks-Still/1011047/1>> [Cited 22 December 2014].

- Fan, W., and Z. Yan. 2010. Factors affecting rates of the web survey: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26:132-139.
- Fauscette, M. 2012. The future of email is social. International Data Corporation white paper Available at: <<http://asmarterplanet.com/dk/files/2013/07/The-Future-of-Email-is-Social-.pdf>> [Cited 22 December 2014].
- Fisher, M.R. 1996. Estimating the effect of nonresponse bias on angler surveys. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 125:118-126.
- Fraze, S.D., K.K. Hardin, M.T. Brashears, J.L. Haywood, and J.H. Smith. 2003. The effects of delivery mode upon survey response rate and perceived attitudes of Texas agri-science teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 44:27-37.
- Gigliotti, L.M. 2011. Comparison of an internet versus mail survey: A case study. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:55-62.
- Gigliotti, L.M., and A. Dietsch. 2014. Does age matter? The influence of age on response rate in a mixed-mode survey. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 19:280-287.
- Graefe, A., A. Mowen, E. Covelli, and N. Trauntein. 2011. Recreation participation and conservation attitudes: Differences between mail and online respondents in a mixed-mode survey. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:183-199.
- Groves, R.M. 2006. Nonresponse rates and nonresponse bias in household surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70:646-675.
- Groves, R.M., R.B. Cialdini, and M.P. Couper. 1992. Understanding the decision to participate in a survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 56:475-495.
- Groves, R. M., S. Presser, and S. Dipko. 2004. The role of topic interest in survey participation decisions. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68:2-31.
- Hayslett, M.M., and B.M. Wildemuth. 2004. Pixels or pencils? The relative effectiveness of Web-based versus paper surveys. *Library & Information Science Research* 26:73-93.
- Heberlein, T. A., and R. Baumgartner. 1978. Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: A quantitative analysis of the published literature. *American Sociological Review* 43:447-462.
- Henderson, K.R. 2014. Evaluating the value of the internet for the collection of scientific data (use, harvest and attitudes) from anglers. M.S. Thesis, South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota.
- Huang, H. 2006. Do print and Web surveys provide the same results? *Computers in Human Behavior* 22:334-350.
- Huggins, V.J., M.J. Dennis, and K. Seryakova. 2002. An evaluation of nonresponse bias in internet surveys conducted using the knowledge networks panel. Pages 1525-1530 in *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section, American Statistical Association, Alexandria, VA*. Available at: <<http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/Proceedings/y2002/Files/JSM2002-001016.pdf>> [Cited 22 December 2014].
- Kaminska, O., A.L. McCutcheon, and J. Billiet. 2010. Satisficing among reluctant respondents in a cross-national context. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74:956-984.

- Jackson, L.A., K.S. Ervin, P.D. Gardner, and N. Schmitt. 2001. Gender and the internet: Women communicating and men searching. *Sex Roles* 44:363-379.
- Kaplowitz, M.D., T.D. Hadlock, and R. Levine. 2004. A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68:94-101.
- Knapp, H., and S.A. Kirk. 2003. Using pencil and paper, internet and touch-tone phones for self-administered surveys: Does methodology matter? *Computers in Human Behavior* 19:117-134.
- Kreuter, F. 2013. Facing the nonresponse challenge. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645:23-35.
- Krosnick, J. A. 1999. Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology* 50:537-567.
- Kwak, N., and B. Radler. 2002. A comparison between mail and web surveys: Response pattern, respondent profile, and data quality. *Journal of Official Statistics* 18:257-273.
- Kypri, K., S. Stephenson, and J. Langley. 2004. Assessment of nonresponse bias in an internet survey of alcohol use. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* 28:630-634.
- Lee, A. 2011. Email use plummets among teens. *The Huffington Post*. Available at: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/08/email-use-teens_n_820121.html>.[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Lesser, V.M., D.K. Yang, and L.D. Newton. 2011. Assessing hunters' opinions based on a mail and a mixed-mode survey. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:164-173.
- Manfreda, K.L., M. Bosnjak, J. Berzelak, I. Haas, and V. Vehovar. 2008. Web surveys versus other survey modes. *International Journal of Market Research* 50:79-104.
- Manzo, A.N., and J.M. Burke. 2012. Increasing response rate in web-based/internet surveys. Pages 327-344 in L. Gideon (Ed.). *Handbook of Survey Methodology for the Social Sciences*. New York: NY: Springer.
- Nichols, E. 2012. The April 2011 American community survey internet test: Attitudes and behavior study follow-up. *American Community Survey Research and Evaluation Report Memorandum Series #ACS12-RER-16*.
- Nisbett, R.E., and T.D. Wilson. 1977. Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review* 84:231-259.
- Nulty, D. D. 2008. The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 33:301-314.
- Office of Management and Budget. 2006. *Standards and Guidelines for Statistical Surveys*. Available at: <www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/inforeg/statpolicy/standards_stat_surveys.pdf>.[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Palis, C. 2012. Email use is on the skids among teens. *The Huffington Post*. Available at: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/10/teens-email-use-study_n_1268470.html>.[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Peytchev, A. 2013. Consequences of survey nonresponse. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 645:88-111.

- Peytchev, A., R.K. Baxter, and L.R. Carley-Baxter. 2009. Not all survey effort is equal: Reduction of nonresponse bias and nonresponse error. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73:785-806.
- Pogue, D. 2015. Is email dead? *Scientific American* 312(3):27.
- Rea, L.M., and R.A. Parker. 2005. *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. 3rd Edition. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Resnick, R.M. 2012. Comparison of postal and online surveys: Cost, speed, response rates and reliability. *Education Market Research and MCH Strategic Data*. Available at: <<http://mchdata.com/collateral/white-papers/Comparison-of-Postal-and-Online-Surveys.pdf>>.[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Rhodes, S.D., D.A. Bowie, and K.C. Hergenrath. 2003. Collecting behavioral data using the world wide web: Considerations for researchers. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 57:68-73.
- Rogelberg, S.G., and J.M. Stanton. 2007. Understanding and dealing with organizational survey nonresponse. *Organizational Research Methods* 10:195-209.
- Schaefer, D.R., and D.A. Dillman. 1998. Development of a standard e-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62:378-397.
- Sexton, N.R., H.M. Miller, and A.M. Dietsch. 2011. Appropriate uses and considerations for online surveying in human dimensions research. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:154-163.
- Sheehan, K.B. 2001. E-mail survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 6(2):0. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2001.tb00117.x
- Sheehan, K.B., and S.J. McMillan. 1999. Response variation in e-mail surveys: An exploration. *Journal of Advertising Research* 39(4):45-54.
- Shih, T.H., and X. Fan. 2009. Comparing response rates in e-mail and paper surveys: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review* 4:26-40.
- Smith, W.G. 2008. Does gender influence online survey participation? A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online survey response behavior. [Online Submission]. ERIC Number: ED501717. Available at: <<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED501717>>.[Cited 22 December 2014].
- Southwick Associates. 2013. RBFF online fishing license assessment: 2012. Available at: <[http://takemefishing.org/uploadedFiles/Content/General/About_RBFF/Research_and_Evaluations/National%20Report%20-%20Online%20Fishing%20License%20Assessment%20-%20Final\(1\).pdf](http://takemefishing.org/uploadedFiles/Content/General/About_RBFF/Research_and_Evaluations/National%20Report%20-%20Online%20Fishing%20License%20Assessment%20-%20Final(1).pdf)> [Cited 22 December 2014].
- Stern, M.J., I. Bilgen, and D.A. Dillman. 2014. The state of survey methodology: Challenges, dilemmas, and new frontiers in the era of the tailored design. *Field Methods* 26:284-301.
- Tam, D. 2012. Teens love texting and social networks but ignore e-mail. Available at: <<http://www.cnet.com/search/?query=Teens+love+texting+and+social+networks+but+ignore+e-mail>> (Cited 22 December 2014).
- Tse, A. 1998. Comparing the response rate, response speed and response quality of two methods of sending questionnaires: Email vs. mail. *Journal of the Market Research Society* 40:353-361.

- Tsotsis, A. 2011. ComScore says you don't got mail: Web email usage declines, 59% among teens! Available at: <<http://techcrunch.com/2011/02/07/com-score-says-you-dont-got-mail-web-email-usage-declines-59-among-teens/>> [Cited 22 December 2014].
- Vaske, J.J. 2008. Survey research and analysis: Application in parks, recreation and human dimensions. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Vaske, J.J., M.J. Jacobs, M.T. J. Sijtsma, and J. Beaman. 2011. Can weighting compensate for sampling issues in internet surveys? *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:200-215.
- Wagner, J. 2012. Research synthesis: A comparison of alternative indicators for the risk of nonresponse bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76:555-575.
- Ward, P., T. Clark, R. Zabriskie, and T. Morris. 2012. Paper/pencil versus online data collection: An exploratory study. *Journal of Leisure Research* 44:507-530.
- Wright, B., P.H. Schwager. 008. Online survey research: Can response factors be improved? *Journal of Internet Commerce* 7:253-269.
- Yun, G.W., C.W. Trumbo. 2000. Comparative response to a survey executed by post, email, web form. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 6(1):0. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2000.tb00112.

Table 1. Number and email coverage for the five types of South Dakota resident annual fishing licenses in 2013.

Resident License Type	Number	Proportion of Resident Licenses	Number with Email	Percent Coverage
Adult Fishing	65,115	0.47	29,326	45%
Senior Fishing	12,528	0.09	3,663	29%
Junior Combination	8,025	0.06	4,335	54%
Adult Combination	45,689	0.33	35,555	78%
Senior Combination	6,452	0.05	3,822	59%
Total	137,809	1.00	86,701	56%

Table 2. Return rates for the internet survey of anglers and the mail survey of non-respondents by age group.

Angler Age-Group	Internet Survey		Mail Survey		χ^2	<i>p</i>	ϕ
	Total Number	Return Rate	Total Number	Return Rate			
Junior	3,835	20%	196	28%	8.14	0.004	0.045
Adult	54,874	30%	375	39%	16.17	<0.001	0.017
Senior	5,442	42%	387	66%	87.90	<0.001	0.123
Combined	64,151	30%	958	48%	141.28	<0.001	0.047

Table 3. Anglers' monthly frequency of accessing their email in 2012 by age group: How many times per month do you access this email account?

Age Group	Sample Size	1 - 4	5 - 9	10 or more
Junior (16-18)	36	36%	14%	50%
Adult (19-64)	93	15%	13%	72%
Senior (65+)	118	31%	5%	64%
Combined	247	26%	9%	65%

$\chi^2 = 13.39$, *p* = 0.010, Cramer's V = 0.165

Table 4. Anglers' reported comfort level with communicating via email in 2012 by age group: How comfortable are you communicating via email?

Age Group	Sample Size	Not Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Very Comfortable
Junior (16-18)	35	17%	49%	34%
Adult (19-64)	97	17%	22%	62%
Senior (65+)	139	31%	30%	40%
Combined	271	24%	29%	47%

$\chi^2 = 19.57$, *p* < 0.001, Cramer's V = 0.190

Table 5. Reasons why anglers who recall getting an email request to participate in an internet survey did not complete the internet survey (multiple responses possible).

Reasons for not responding to the internet survey...	Number	Percent of Cases
I was too busy during the survey period	42	43%
I chose to not complete this survey	16	17%
I deleted it thinking it was SPAM / did not trust the link	14	14%
I think I completed the on-line survey	11	11%
I do not complete internet surveys	10	10%
Other	9	9%
I did not fish in 2012	8	8%
The link did not work	6	6%
Total (Cases = 97)	116	120%

Table 6. Proportion not fishing, means days of fishing, satisfaction with fishing experience in 2012, and anglers' rating of the importance of fishing comparing anglers who responded to an internet survey with a sample of internet non-respondents contacted by mail.

Parameter / Survey	Mean	95% C.I.	N	F	p	η
Proportion Not Fishing				0.42	0.517	0.01
Internet Respondents	0.10	±0.5	19,322			
Internet Non-respondents	0.10	±2.9	444			
Days Fished in 2012 ¹				1.40	0.237	0.01
Internet Respondents	18.5	±0.3	17,496			
Internet Non-respondents	19.9	±2.9	398			
Satisfaction ²				2.45	0.117	0.01
Internet Respondents	1.37	±0.02	16,148			
Internet Non-respondents	1.25	±0.15	394			
Importance of Fishing ³				5.01	0.025	0.02
Internet Respondents	2.32	±0.02	17,311			
Internet Non-respondents	2.19	±0.11	425			

¹ Excludes anglers who did not fish in 2012² Satisfaction scale: -3 = Very Dissatisfied, -2 = Moderately Dissatisfied, -1 = Slightly Dissatisfied, 0 = Neither or No Opinion, 1 = Slightly Satisfied, 2 Moderately Satisfied, and 3 = Very Satisfied.³ Importance scale: 0 = Not Important, 1 = Slightly Important, 2 = Moderately Important, 3 = Very Important, and 4 = Most Important Recreational Activity