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## Information Need:

With nearly every survey Resource Science Division conducts, administration, budgeters, and staff ask "Wouldn't online surveys save MDC money?" and we respond, "It depends!" Online surveys have become attractive as a presumably economical way to measure constituents' preferences, opinions, and attitudes. However, issues such as non-response bias, sample validity, and sampling error due to internet access differences in the population can have effects on representativeness, reliability, and accuracy. We examined response rates, responses, demographics, and potential sources of bias in the 2016 post-season firearms deer and deer hunter opinion surveys using 1) a mail-back paper survey and 2) an online survey sent to a sample of those with an email address in the point-of-sale (POS) system.

## Results:

Deer permit holders with emails tended to be slightly younger and fewer lived in rural areas than those without email addresses (Table 1). Both groups were overwhelmingly male.

Table 1. Permit holder information.

| 2016 Deer Permit Buyers | No Email | Email |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percent Male | $82.7 \%$ | $83.2 \%$ |
| Percent Rural | $80.1 \%$ | $73.8 \%$ |
| Average Age (years) | 43.1 | 37.2 |

Response rates varied between $27 \%$ for the online firearms survey to $38 \%$ for the mail firearms survey (Table 2). Respondents were older, less rural, and more male than non-respondents.

Online surveys allow a nuanced look at response rates, showing that over half of recipients who opened the email responded (Table 3). Small percentages had "bad" email addresses or opted out.

Table 3. Response rates by survey type.

| Survey | Bad <br> Email | Opted <br> Out | Opened <br> Email | Responded <br> to Email |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Firearms | $1.7 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ |
| Opinion | $2.1 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ | $30.5 \%$ |

Looking at responses to key questions by mail vs. email reveals very few substantive differences. On the firearms survey, both mail and email groups hunted mostly on private land, desired a stable or increasing deer population, and had only small, non-substantive differences in perceptions of deer populations and whether they hunted in 2016. On the opinion survey, the groups showed no difference on where they hunted, perceptions of deer population, and only small, non-substantive differences in perceptions of MDC's deer management success. There was a significant and substantive difference in support for the four-point regulation, with $70.1 \%$ support from the email survey and $55.5 \%$ from the mail survey.

## Discussion:

When will it be appropriate to transition to different survey modes, like email, text, and app? These decisions may be driven by influencers such as the future of the postal service system, innovations in technology, decline in survey response, and public acceptability of unsolicited surveys. Will it be acceptable to systematically eliminate a portion of our sampling frame that may not have online access? Given that many survey methods are now experiencing low response rates and are becoming

Table 2. Response rates by survey type and mode.

| Survey | Mode | Response <br> Rate | Group | Percent <br> Male | Percent <br> Rural | Average <br> Age (yrs) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Firearms |  | $34.8 \%$ | Respondent | $87.0 \%$ | $73.5 \%$ | 51.7 |
|  |  |  | $27.0 \%$ | Non-respondent | $81.9 \%$ | $79.5 \%$ |
|  | Mail | $38.0 \%$ |  | $89.3 \%$ | $68.6 \%$ | 44.0 |
|  |  |  | Res-respondent | $84.0 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ | 50.9 |
|  | Email | $30.5 \%$ | Non-respondent | $78.6 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ | 38.8 |
|  |  |  | Respondent | $90.9 \%$ | $67.5 \%$ | 44.6 |
|  |  | Non-respondent | $81.3 \%$ | $76.8 \%$ | 39.3 |  | more costly to conduct, and that no method may truly represent the population of interest, it may make economic (and practical) sense to use the most economical method(s) available, as long as the population may be effectively sampled.

