

Research Quality Forum Meeting: *Why We Need FOQ 2.0*

9/26/2011

While the 2008-09 ARF study, Foundations of Quality 1.0 (FOQ 1.0), produced valuable insights into panel overlap and panel management practices that can lift quality, it was narrowed in scope to accelerate the learning on a small number of critical factors. FOQ 1.0 left unanswered several important questions about improving research quality, particularly where respondents are sourced outside panels. At the same time, the preliminary learning from FOQ 1.0 suggested paths to address issues such as undesired behavior by survey respondents which warrant further research.

This meeting of the Research Quality Forum focused on sharing the Forum's recommendations for the ARF Foundations of Quality 2.0.

The Forum's Research-on-Research Committee co-chair, George Terhanian, started with an overview of what Foundations of Quality 2.0 would build upon from Foundations of Quality 1.0.

The first seven priorities laid out for Foundations of Quality 2.0 center on understanding and improving upon various components that account for data error in online survey research. A broader view of error is being emphasized to minimize risk of making bad decisions.

The first seven recommended FOQ 2.0 priorities are as follows:

- 1) Respondent Selection Procedures – how do different methods of respondent selection compare in terms of reliability, validity, and cost effectiveness.
- 2) Post-hoc Weighting Procedures – how do different post-hoc weighting procedures affect response quality and cost effectiveness.
- 3) Undesired Within-Survey Behavior Procedures – assess impact of undesired behaviors, such as speeding and satisficing, on response quality. How to best identify and reduce undesired behaviors.
- 4) Identity Verification – assess different methods of identity verification, and determine if exclusions increase response quality.
- 5) Survey Participation Frequency – evaluate impact of survey participation frequency on response quality. Are methods cost effective? Are responses of frequency reliable?
- 6) Respondent Motivations & Incentives – evaluate incentive impact on response quality and effectiveness.
- 7) Channel Differences – evaluate impact of channel differences and combinations on response quality. Is channel selection worth it? Cost effective?

Chuck Miller, Michael Fallig, and Nancy Brigham then presented the The Research Quality Forum's Router Committee priorities for FOQ 2.0. The Router Committee's focus is to expand industry knowledge and transparency of routers and to assess how different router practices affect research quality.

The two additional FOQ 2.0 priorities presented by the Router Committee are:

- 1) Frame current router practices, key variables & research- examine existing router practices through two focus groups: Practitioner Focus Group and End User Focus group.
- 2) Examine router optimization practices & evaluate router impact on sample & survey results- assess unique router variables, configurations, and sampling strategies, using a quantitative research study with mini-router environment simulations.

There was also discussion of important issues that wouldn't be addressed in FOQ 2.0, like non-US research and survey design. The timeline for the nine FOQ 2.0 priorities is set to be October 2011- June 2012.

William Cook closed with pitching to the group how FOQ 2.0 will produce a measureable payout to the industry with both immediate and long-term benefits to improving research quality. In order to fund this significant Research on Research program, buyer sponsors are asked to contribute \$25K and Provider sponsors are asked to contribute \$25K or to donate services worth \$50K.

The next RQ Forum meeting is set for November 8, 2011. In the meantime, forum attendees are asked to go to their respective companies, clients, suppliers and peers and stimulate discussion and support for the initiative.