



Global- GMG

Lost Opportunities

Survey Quality  
Moderator Report

Sheila Robinson  
April 2013

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright

---

Global Radio  
YouGov  
Survey Moderator Statement

Contents

1. Overview
2. Technical Report
3. Project management
4. Interviewing
5. Implications for the survey data
6. Survey Moderator Involvement

1) Overview

The survey on which I am commenting here was commissioned by Slaughter and May on behalf of their client Global Radio.

As such my involvement is limited to post-hoc discussion with the agencies and listening in to interviews, rather than on-going observation as would be the case with a survey commissioned by the Competition Commission.

All comments relate to the Lost Opportunities survey. The Existing Customer survey was the subject of a separate report (January 2013).

2) Technical Report

The technical report (dated 30 Oct 2012) provided a comprehensive summary of the research; sample source, method, questionnaire design and actions taken during interviewing as well along with copies of the questionnaires.

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright

The research appeared sensible and well documented, and to have been conducted in line with normal practice within the industry.

The technical report states

“ As agreed with Slaughter and May, the method used in this research was Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) and the interviews themselves were carried out by YouGov’s field units”.

This has subsequently proved incorrect. I understand that the Lost Opportunities research was sub-contracted to RSM and Indiefield, separate market research companies, who did all the fieldwork and provided clean datafiles to YouGov.

### 3) Project management

It is not possible for me to comment authoritatively on the project management skills of the YouGov team, as I had no experience of working with them as the study progressed.

### 4) Interviewing

It has been established that RSM conducted the first main wave of Lost Opportunities interviewing (452 interviews – East Midlands, West Midlands, North East, Wales, North Wales and London) and Indiefield conducted a later wave (210 interviews – Yorkshire, Scotland and North West ).

I understand that an additional 36 interviews were later conducted by Indiefield in the regions where RSM had conducted the wave 1 interviews.

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright

a) RSM

- i) Briefing documentation was provided
- ii) Twelve interviewers had been involved and the work was generally spread across interviewers across regions
- iii) We listened to interviews conducted by eight interviewers, including four completed by one interviewer who had done rather more interviews than the others
- iv) The quality of the interviewing was good, with questions being read in full and prompt lists being used correctly.

b) Indiefield

- i) I was told that a verbal briefing had taken place
- ii) Seven interviewers had been involved and the work was generally spread across the regions
- iii) We listened to interviews from seven interviewers from the main Indiefield fieldwork, including three from the interviewer who had done rather more of the work than the others.
- iv) Whilst five interviewers were conducting the interviews correctly, two (for whom we listened to two interviews each) were very poor. Questions were not being read out as scripted and questions were not prompted when there were clear instructions to do so. The two poor interviewers were responsible for ca 20% of the total Indiefield wave 2 fieldwork (39 interviews ) and 35 (all bar 1) of the additional boost interviews in the areas covered by RSM.
- v) A subsequent audit of the work from these interviewers showed that their work was of an unacceptable standard and should not be included in the study.
- vi) There appeared to be pre-screening of the sample. Interviewers were checking that the potential respondent had used radio advertising within the past three years (this was not a screening

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright

requirement). This was subsequently proven and ascribed to programming error. This is very important as it means that sample specification used by the two agencies was not consistent.

- vii) Question lists (e.g. of media types) were not being rotated as they should have been i.e. Everyone was being asked the question with the same order of responses. This was found to be a result of a programming error when the questionnaire was scripted.

#### 5) Implications for the survey data

Overall, I conclude that RSM were conducting interviews in line with the specification and in a consistent way, but that Indiefield were not.

Having two agencies conduct different waves of interviewing for the same study is not of itself a problem, assuming the same questionnaire and interviewer instructions are used.

If, however, the sample definition was different this makes the data non-comparable across regions, unless all of the data is re-analysed on a sample structure specified as 'had advertised on radio in past 3 years'.

The wave 2 interviews conducted by the two poor quality Indiefield interviewers need to be removed from the data set.

I did not listen to any of the 36 interviews which Indiefield conducted in the wave 1 areas. Given however that 35 of them were conducted by the two poor interviewers, using the Indiefield questionnaire with additional screening, this data should also be removed from the total so as to leave the regional data from RSM 'clean'.

Non-rotation of lists by one of the agencies may have resulted in response differences which are not a function of respondent opinion but of the way

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright

in which the questionnaire was administered. In my opinion this is not likely to have had such a significant effect on the survey data as the other fieldwork problems, but it should be noted.

6) Survey Moderator Involvement

The opinions in this report are based on meetings at RSM and Indiefield offices on 21<sup>st</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> March 2013 respectively, and information provided then and subsequently. Michael Wagstaff of YouGov was present at both meetings.

---

Sheila Robinson Associates  
Marketing Research Consultancy

Email: [Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com](mailto:Sheila.Robinson.Associates@googlemail.com) |  
Telephone: 00 44 (0) 20 8892 5529

Photo copyright