



Project Name: Webinar - June 2022
Segment: Stop Sabotaging Your Research! Why Respondent Quality Matters and How To Ensure Data Integrity

Kelli Hammock: I think we're about ready.

Brett Watkins: All right, 12 o'clock. Hello, everyone out there. I'm Brett Watkins, CEO of L&E Research. Thank you for joining us on today's webinar. I'm super excited too. We've been talking about sample panel quality and issues related to fraud. Now it's been a super popular topic and subject that's in the MRX industry. I can't think of some better experts that we have here today to talk more about it. I'm gonna go through a couple of preambles just to get some information started, but you'll have to jump in as quick as possible as there's so much to cover and we've got the right people here to share more information about it. As I said, a couple of preambles. We are recording today's webinar. For whatever reason, you have to drop out or other things, there are other folks that you might know that are missing it. You can find this recording at our webinar page at www.leresearch.com. We'll be taking Q&A questions after the actual session itself at about the 40 to 45 minutes part of the hour. This webinar will be an hour long. I promised these folks whose time is extremely valuable that we keep it under that so I can keep them on here for probably all the remainder of the day in terms of topics of this conversation, but unfortunately, time is limited so we will try to get to that quickly. Then lastly, at the end, for those of you who well, don't have the opportunity to listen through it all the way through, though I recommend it, we will be sending out a summary. Kelli Hammock, who is obviously here, one of our panelists will be sending out later on within the next 10 days in terms of the summary on that. We also have transcripts of it which will be provided by our transcription partner Focus Forward. Thank you to them as they always do to volunteer and provide that information. Feel free also to share this information and content out there within your networks. Again, I think you're gonna be a lot of interesting conversation. Anybody who's passionate about the MRX, the research industry in general, is gonna get a lot from today's discussion because like I said, these folks are extremely knowledgeable on the subject. With that note, I'd like to welcome our panelists today. We have Tia Maurer, Efrain Riberio, and Kelli Hammock. I'm gonna let each of them introduce themselves so you get a fuller extension of who they are and their backgrounds. I want to

say welcome to all of you and thank you so much to each of you for being here with us today. Hey, before we get this discussion, let's learn, let's just share a little bit about each other. Tia, you wanna get us started off?

Tia Maurer: Absolutely. Brett, thanks for having me. My name is Tia Maurer. I work at Proctor and Gamble here in Cincinnati headquarters. I'm working in home care on the micro band product, products researcher. I've been here for almost 25 years and quality in data is absolute essential to the insights in the business decisions that we make every day. As a researcher who has run a research facility inside of the company for Proctor and Gamble employees, I've seen some of the fraud firsthand and now it's been a passion area of mine to try to mitigate the fraud and give us great data quality so that we're making good insights here at the P&G company.

Brett Watkins: Awesome. Thanks again, Tia for joining us today. Efrain?

Efrain Riberio: Thanks for inviting me to be a part of this discussion. I spent the first half of my career doing media research, radio and television, and then the latter part of the last 20 years I spent it building online panels for TNS, for Ipsos, and for Kantar. I'm supposedly retired right now, but I still have my foot in some of these activities. I became part of CASE and have worked with Tia and Mary Beth Weber on this issue of sample quality, which was always dear to me during the years that I was building panels.

Brett Watkins: Efrain, thanks again for joining us today. Look forward to getting into this discussion with you. Last but not least Kelli Hammock our client solutions manager. Say hello out there, Kelli.

Kelli Hammock: Hello out there, Kelli. Hi, audience. I am Kelli. I work for L&E and my career has really focused on the qualitative side of research. I really worked my way from the ground up so starting with recruitment, going into project management, dabbling in database development and programming so I really consider myself as a frontline warrior to some of these fraudulent panelists because I have seen them at every step in my career and I know it's been a problem in the industry so I'm really excited to talk about ways we can mitigate the fraud within our panels and specifically on the qualitative side of research.

Brett Watkins: Awesome. Kelli, you're doing a lot of great things for us out there and helping clients solve those problems as well as getting research design, which is something we're gonna talk a little about today as well as stopping to address some of that fraud design. One of the things I wanna share

with our audience real quick, too, feel free to use our chat functionality over there. You can chat individually directly with us, or you can also chat amongst yourselves, share your information, share your LinkedIn profile. Feel free to have a conversation out there. As I said, we're gonna be answering questions at the end of this discussion so feel free to put those in there. We have our folks that are keeping an eye on those and I'll address those obviously once we get a little closer to that period of time. Where I start the conversation off today is interesting because, Tia, I obviously noticed that you posted CASE, the Coalition for Advancing Sampling Excellence. I thought it might be a really good place maybe to start, talk a little bit about CASE and what you've all been doing.

Tia Maurer: Mary Beth Weber is the founder of CASE so she's gonna speak to it better than everybody else. However, she kind of is a broker of sorts and she knows the right people to get on board at the right time. She pulled me into when she saw data quality presentation that I made, I believe at IIEX probably in 2018, maybe it was, she met me in the hallway and said, I'm working on this Coalition for Advancing Sampling Excellence and really getting to good data quality to give us good insights and I think that you would be kind of a key person who has a passion in this area that should join CASE. She's formed this CASE for quality website as well with a lot of tips and pointers and past presentations that we've given at QUAX, at IIEX at some of the MRMW conferences. She's pulled Efrain into the mix and also Carrie Campbell who's now working at Ketchum. We've put together this coalition for doing research on research and really understanding how to get better data quality so that we can get better insights ultimately.

Brett Watkins: Interesting. It's been about a four-year effort and that kind of leads really well into, which is what I know you and Efrain both have been working towards, which first piece is fraud. Commonly used term. It's interesting because despite the fact that I look at fraud as a relatively easy term to understand, it has a lot of layers I know in our industry. Which one of you would like to start talking a little bit more about that, for example, what's been going on with CASE and as far as how you would describe fraud?

Efrain Riberio: I can do that. It's true that fraud is kind of a broad topic and lots of things can come under that. The way we were looking at fraud was the way that probably impacts research the most. That is with individuals or larger organizations who are trying to gain the system to try and get incentives from companies that are supplying incentives for people to complete surveys. This problem has been around since the beginning since the creation of online

research. Part of that is because at that moment, the whole incentive process became digitized. Many companies said, boy, this is a great way to give incentives versus sending checks. What they didn't realize at the beginning was that that kind of opens the door for anyone to get access to that. That in combination with no respondent validation, meaning that respondents, anybody can join a panel. Everybody I'm sure that's listening is on a panel and you can sign up for that panel 10 different times. It just opens the door to this type of fraud. We're looking at that specific fraud. We're probably not talking about the guy who signs up two accounts, one for his son and one for himself to get some extra beer money because that's probably a little more difficult to catch, but we're talking about people who actually spend time creating 10 accounts, 15 accounts to really leverage their ability to gain money through the system.

Tia Maurer: I think in short the definition I would say fraud is anyone who's purposefully being dishonest when participating in research. They're not who they claim to be. Maybe they're lying about their age, or perhaps they're claiming to be a user of a specific product or service. Does anybody want liars in their research? Since we're making million and billion-dollar business decisions here at P&G, I don't. Sometimes they create fictitious accounts, they pose as someone else because they don't reside in the country where the research is taking place. They're just interested in doing the research to get the insight [AUDIO SKIPS] was being offered as Efrain had alluded to here.

Brett Watkins: And correct me if I'm wrong, Efrain, you mentioned that this is something obviously that started with research was more of a direct one-to-one process. You filled out a survey, you had the compensation and you got a check mailed. You've had to have a physical address. The digitization process makes complete sense is like, we've gone to this more electronic culture. Have you seen this increase or have there been trends in this? Is it getting better? Is it getting worse?

Efrain Riberio: Well, I think the problem- this is the reason why we decided we wanted to do this research. The reality is over the last 22 years, since the beginning of online research, this problem has existed. There's been little or no research done on this problem. Has it gotten better or worse? Probably worse, but we don't really know because there has been- our study was the first study that's been done on the topic related to consumer research in the US. We wanted to do it because we wanted to kind of be able to say, hey, it looks like this is the amount of fraud that exists in this ecosystem in the US in, I think we did the study in April, in April. We know it's seasonal and we know that it can change depending. If you have a low incident study, it can be a lot worse. It was kind of

like to drop a marker and say, this is where it's at. I think we need more research in order to understand exactly how bad or how much better it is.

Brett Watkins: Efrain, you mentioned fraud. Tia, my question, we talked a little bit about that, but I know it comes in many forms and we certainly experienced that at L&E Research on our own in the efforts that we're making, which for the audience we'll get to here in a moment, because I actually asked Tia to evaluate what we're doing and share that information just so you can see and get a natural benchmark of what's the good things we're doing and hey, there's other possible steps we should be taking. That was unbeknownst to Kelli for all of the audience out there but I asked her to help me with that little secret project. We're gonna share all that with you today because I think it's important not just to see what some companies are doing, but also what more companies can do. That's certainly not something I wanted to talk to you about. When you talk about fraud though, you're mentioning, of course, fake accounts. Somebody's creating various email address accounts or other things. I think Tia, one of the things that really blew me away was a presentation you made at IIEEX a few years ago where there was a picture of a phone bank that had like 20, 30 cell phones and people had them all cabled together. It really would light me and open my eyes to the remembrance or understanding that wow, people, especially in more impoverished countries, the extremes they will go to try to get access to this, but there are other forms of fraud, correct. It's just beyond creating fake accounts.

Tia Maurer: Yes. What you're alluding to are the mobile click farms and you don't have to go very far on YouTube to actually find a video on how to set one up, a how-to guide. There's money in it and people are doing it. There's all kinds of fraud though. There are people who will give you a fictitious driver's license to pose as someone else. There are people who will try to create numerous accounts to collect incentives. A lot of the people who are perpetrating fraud are dumb. They're not smart people, but there are some smart ones and they have these underground mobile click farms and they're artificially taking surveys with fake data. They're artificially inflating the likes on reviews or Amazon-type places, or on Facebook in order to give fake social media elevated scores to products to get people to buy them, that sort of thing. You have everything. You have people who will take home a product and claim to use it and they never used it, but they'll still fill out the survey and so you still get fake data. Fraud comes in very wide variety of forms.

Brett Watkins: I was even just thinking some of the things that I know, which let's get more into your study that you did with CASE because there was just

such a variety of issues that I was just really shocked to see what example of, I don't remember the exact percentage, but the percentage of people that were actually constituting such a large percentage of actual online surveys taken. Could you talk a little bit more about that?

Tia Maurer: Yeah. I think Efrain can get into those points. One of the things that I think that we've seen over time is the sample supply model relies on monetization of respondents and they have routers and survey walls and that breeds unlimited survey taking. People can go to a wall, see this is a 10-minute survey and this is what it pays and they can take numerous surveys. Over the past two years with stay-at-home orders, in-person research wasn't really possible so in order to do research and collect data, the P&Gs of the world and other brands had to move to online research methods and that added further stress to the already stressed system of sample. In order to meet the higher demands, suppliers had to allow panelists to take as many surveys as possible or participate in research more often than they normally would have, which leads to fatigue and satisficing. That's a different sort of fraud. We know where there's money to be made, there's gonna be fraud. With increased unemployment, people stayed at home with time on their hands. They got bored, they needed to make some easy money, and well, why not online surveys or research. We looked into this during the kind of this study that we ran with CASE was during kind of the COVID stay-at-home time frame. It was kind of a two-phase study. We wanted to just kind of see how much fraud was in the ecosystem was kind of the goal when we first started it and then we started saying, well, how are we gonna measure fraud? Well, we've got these fraud detection firms that have popped up all over, which tells you there is fraud if there's a fraud detection firm that's making money detecting the fraud. We decided that we would use those fraud detection firms to check and see how much fraud was in the ecosystem but we took a step back as we designed it and said, wait a minute, we need a two-phase approach because we don't know if they're giving us false positive or false negative. We need to make sure that the fraud detection firm is actually detecting the fraud that it's designed to detect so we hired a security firm to emulate the fraud, to see if it would trip the traps and send the flags up and that way we were able to evaluate how good were the fraud detection firms in detecting the fraud, and then use that knowledge to know if it could detect all the duplicates. Everybody was good at that. How many duplicates were in the ecosystem? If it could detect people who were going on the dark web via tor or using VPN or geolocation mismatch, we could determine how much of that was in the ecosystem. We were presently surprised at some of the things that we found and I'll let Efrain share some of that.

Efrain Riberio: We weren't looking for I think the most surprising thing that we found, but it was staring us in the face and we just had to investigate it. In the survey, we actually asked the respondents what their survey context was, how they got to the survey, how many surveys they did before they did that survey, how many surveys did they do throughout the month? What they told us was that they were doing a lot of surveys. In fact, what they told us was surprising to us. We said, wow, it's incredible how many surveys they're doing. It turns out that one of the survey detection firms, the fraud detection firms has a capability that all the detection firms have because they're doing duping. They're assigning an individual ID, a unique ID to each device. They're able to look at that device as it goes in and out in their ecosystem. One of them actually produces a product that creates a number that says, these are the number of surveys that this particular ID entered in the last 24 hours. We said, bingo, let's look at that and see if it really reflects what these people are telling us. It was actually worse than what the people were telling us because there was a third of the people that said they hadn't done any surveys before they entered our survey and those people had the same amount of activity that the people that were saying that they were completing lots of surveys. What this data told us was that across those eight firms that participated in our study and there were different type of suppliers. They all participated blind. They didn't know that we were doing this study. What it turned out was that on average, and this is within the ecosystem, of this particular company so it's probably greater. The average amount of surveys that the respondents in our study had entered into prior to coming into ours within the last 24 hours was 21.5. There were people, there were devices let's call them devices that had entered into 200. There were many that had entered into 50, et cetera. It was quite surprising. Another one of the firms stepped in and they said, hey, these may not be completed surveys, but we have a database here from a panel company that operates like most panel companies today. They use other people's sample including their own to do studies. We do their in-survey quality monitoring so we actually know how many surveys the people have actually completed within a session. They gave us two months' worth of data of that. That kind of conclusively proved that these respondents are doing multiple surveys, 10, 20 surveys. There's a small group, 3% of the population that they gave us that was actually doing 20% of all the surveys that were part of that database. They were a group of people that were doing 21 or more surveys per session. When we went back and talked to the firms, the detection firms, we said, this must be only a problem that exists here in the US because we have so much volume. They said, no, this is the situation wherever we're monitoring. If you think about it, it kind of makes sense because as Tia was saying, the system that exists right now to supply respondents is the same everywhere. It's built on the same way, monetization of respondents, the use of routers and unlimited surveys. That's the

other thing, unlimited surveys. A respondent can take 100, 200 surveys in a day. That's I think the most surprising thing. We knew there was gonna be lots of survey taken, but we didn't expect it to be that bad. For us really, for me specifically, my area of interest is what's going on with this group of- are these really people? Because 20-minute LOI, you can do the math. You can't do 100 surveys in a day.

Brett Watkins: It's fascinating what you bring up, which we could go down forever and so the one thought I have is let's go to the next step, which is let's just start with what good companies are doing. What are good companies doing to try to prevent these kinds of fraudulent issues?

Efrain Riberio: That's a good question. I think one of the things that companies are doing is they're actually starting to use these detection firms in the front end of their system, not only during recruitment, but before surveys, running the respondents through that to identify obvious fraudulent responders, people that are coming in through our network, et cetera. That's one. I think very, very few are doing the individual respondent validation which if we go back to 40 years ago, I can go back 40 years ago because I was in the industry 40 years ago. Everybody was validated. Everybody was validated, you called up a phone, you knew who you were calling up, or you knew who you were recruiting because you sent them. Today, maybe very few panels exist out there where you actually know who you're talking to. I would say that there's probably a small group of researchers out there that are still validating respondents. Those are two there. I'm sure Tia can come up with a couple more there.

Brett Watkins: Tia, that's a really good question because of course from a brand perspective, you obviously are balancing the equation between data quality and of course budget and knowing the validation pieces, obviously, an opportunity there but also just an additional cost that goes in. What are some other good steps that you see and that a good companies are taking?

Tia Maurer: I think I always provide feedback to the companies that I use. If I go through my data set and I find certain people with certain IDs or whatever on a quantitative level, at least, I do it qualitatively as well, I give them feedback like, hey, these people gave me garbage data or this wasn't my target audience, or this person was disengaged during my focus group discussion or I don't think this really was a user, maybe our screener isn't exactly right, or this person may have, I call it running the screener. They may have purposely FIBB to get into the study. If we're not giving that feedback back to the suppliers, they can't fix it. Just stripping the people out of the data and going on as if nothing is wrong, doesn't

give the feedback, close that feedback loop with the supplier to get the supplier to try to think what can I do or should I quarantine these folks or should I give them a warning or whatever? The other thing that I see is sometimes if somebody gives you really, really, really good feedback, I also report that back and say, could you please let that panelist know that their feedback was super helpful because they wrote a paragraph or they did whatever they went above and beyond in the homework assignment or I wanna show that they're valuable. Even if that means giving them a little extra money, then maybe we should do that to encourage them that they went above and beyond. They should be incentivized a little bit better. I think there's some of those things as well.

Efrain Riberio: Now, what a good company would do with that information and I think we could all agree on, at least, us who are on the panel is that if you receive that information and somebody tells you that these 10 respondents gave you garbage and it was useless, maybe a supplier would put those people on a watch list and eventually eliminate them because they're providing bad information. I actually don't think that anybody practices that in today's environment because if you think about it the way these respondent supply companies work is for every complete, the cash register rings. Not all end clients are like Tia who are scrupulously looking at the data and making sure it's correct. In fact, there's a lot of clients that don't even look at that. They just accept it. I think that most suppliers are probably not doing what they probably ought to be doing when they get information that someone is bad or is providing very useless information. There's a lot of response like that I think when you sit down and look at all this.

Brett Watkins: Kelli, you've been sitting there quietly, obviously absorbing all this in. It's interesting, and thank you, Tia, by the way, as people have been asking questions. She has been multitasking and answering them as well as participating in discussion and not skipping a beat. Appreciate you doing that. Gives us more time to talk. Kelli, I know obviously some of the things we're doing here at L&E as far as fraud detection, we are a qualitative recruitment firm but we've been getting more in the quantitative. Talk a little bit about why some people are asking us to do that and what we're doing and some of the own issues that we've found on our own end as we've gotten more into it. We've had to ensure data quality.

Kelli Hammock: I think to Efrain's point that he mentioned a couple of minutes ago that I wanted to address is looking at suppliers and how we can communicate these blacklisted panelists, which I know on the qualitative side I've done before. If you had a couple of firms working together to complete one

project for a client, if I saw a red flag person come up, perhaps I had seen them before. And this is thinking back to a little bit of the pre-online research days, more of in-facility days, we would always share that. I might reach out to the other supplier and give them a heads up. Like, hey, we kind of know this person is fraudulent. We've experienced them in the past. But now that everything's online and nationwide, it's really hard to identify that. On top of it, it's harder to validate who they are. I might say John Smith is fraudulent, but John Smith may not even be his own name so there's a lot of layers to what makes a fraudulent panelist. And we know why they do what they do. It's all motivated by that incentive so we have to take a step back, and outside of trying to share who these people are, we need to put some other safeguards in place. We're doing that on the technology side to filter out as much as we can, and that kind of takes care of the bots and the click farms, but you really need that human element. You really need to step in and validate identifications. And as Tia mentioned, we have seen people send through identifications that we go to validate it, and we have a really good team in place who said this person's ID has a halo around their picture, so you know they photoshopped an identification to get a \$10 incentive which really doesn't seem worth it, but to them it is. We're also trying to be a little more forceful when we identify these people, and letting them know that we're onto them, and hopefully it will essentially mitigate some of this behavior. But kind of to your original point, Brett, we're seeing a few more requests to get quantitative collection. Because in the quantitative space, this is a bigger issue. Qualitative, it's a little easier to validate. You've got smaller sample sizes, a lot of the time it's going to be a face to face video call where you can validate identity, you can hold the license up to the webcam. We have it a little bit easier on our side of the fence, but that doesn't mean we're not experience fraud the same. It doesn't mean we can sit back, and relax, and think that it's all on the other side because it's not. Liars are liars are liars, and they're going to lie whether it is a quick quant survey, or whether they want to try to claim that they are a health care professional in an in depth interview, which hopefully our clients can identify them quickly, and to Tia's point, let us know so we can blacklist and then never recruit them again. Back to the quantitative, we are getting some of those requests, and we had a specific client come to us a while back and said I'm getting a low of fraudulent data. I only need a smaller sample size to fill, and we're trying to do qualitative as well. But what was happening is they were running their quant, they were getting their results, but when they would try to engage those quant panelists to do something a little more in depth. They were finding that either they were fraudulent, or they never called back. And this is because panels are built a little differently. The type of person who does a quant isn't necessarily going to be the type of panelist you want to do quals. What we proposed to this client and it's been working really well is that we will build a

panel in these markets, we'll run your quant survey, this panel has been pre-qualified through a screener. And then once they review this data, they can kind of go through and pick out, you've got 300 panelists, let's pick out number 50, 75, 49, and so on and so forth. They actually tell us which panelist from that quant survey they would be interested in talking to. The benefits for them, they're going to pay a little bit more on the up front to build that panel, but on the other side we have vetted them, we have verified them. But on the other side of it we have vetted them, we have verified them, so the data is quality. It means that we're not having to throw out data because you find that people are satisfied seeing or just going through and getting that survey fatigue. In the end it might cost a little more on the up front, but it actually saves a lot on the back end when you're not getting all this fraudulent data, and you don't want to be cheap when you've got billion dollar decisions on the line, so you have to ask yourself is my research worth it, and make that decision. And the quality they get on the quant survey is going to be a little more in depth because we're using panelists built for qual. And that means these people are a little bit more engaged, they think on their feet, they're able to be more articulate, more creative. With a quant survey, you might just be looking to get some numbers. But with qual, you're really looking for depth of response. That's actually one of the things we found over the last couple years has helped our clients with - we're kind of doing some hybrid research, and it's working out really well for us. And for our client, not just for us.

Brett Watkins: It's interesting some of the steps that we've taken via the IT, and we're doing what you were talking about, Tia, with geolocation as an example. We are fortunate in the fact that we're only focused on US nationwide. In the US market, that means that we can geo-fence out people that are outside the United States. And barring them coming in through VPNs, or like you said other - which you can identify as well. There's the one thing that companies can do for improving panel quality is utilizing some of those technologies, do that some of the things that we do. That being said however, this still leads into some other issues. We too have run into as we've done plus fraud. We have a woman who's been working for us for a very long time who's very passionate about this subject. Her name is Sheryl. Sheryl is our resident - she's our resident gopher, ferret, whatever animal you want to describe that digs in and finds things, and goes through and trying identify and dig out the fraud in people as we go through the various IT things you can do, the duplication of addresses, or locations, are they matching up with where they say they are? I can trust is it actually coming back to a location and place? When you get to that, one of the things however that hasn't been discussed is a little bit with research design. And Tia, that is something you're super

passionate about as well which is especially with the whole DIY movement, and more people doing their own work, what are clients missing out there that experience researchers are doing like yourself to help improve this process, and ensure that you're putting safeguards in place.

Tia Maurer: One of the things and I have talked this with some folks just in the past few days, is as we have moved to this, everybody's on lockdown but people still need to get insights for their business and move their businesses forward. A lot of people were using or adopting who had not adopted yet. They leaned more into adopting these DIY dashboards and getting their data. And a lot of these DIY dashboards have really nice looking interfaces where they can create you gorgeous charts and everything, but you can't see - you're not looking at the raw data behind it. And when you download and look at the raw data, you will see that there's some inattentive folks, or fraud in that data that you're getting overnight. Faster doesn't always equal better quality, and sometimes it sometimes can be worse because you don't see what you don't see. You're not seeing the raw data. A lot of them allow you do download the raw data and look at it, but people aren't doing that, let's be honest. But then I also think what's been fostered during this time of stay at home is people have adopted these digital tools, whether they were early adopters before, or they adopted because that was the way they got their insights, and now it's a square peg and round hole. As we think about research design getting back to normal, and being able to go to people's homes again, or talk to people in person, sometimes the better solution to answer the business or the better design is doing that. And some of us have gotten lazy in that I can get an answer really quickly, so I'll just publish this online survey when that's not really the right tool that should be used to get the insight that you're looking for to answer the business question.

Brett Watkins: I was also thinking you and I have talked about actual - and survey design is an example, what kind of questions that you're putting in to ensure that you're not getting straight lying and other elements. Talk a little bit more about that.

Tia Maurer: There's some pieces to look at there. People like to call those red herring or trap questions, so can you put a question into your survey to make sure that people are engage and they're paying attention. Even when you have validated everyone, and you do have real respondents, sometimes your topic is a little bit boring. And so if your survey's too long, and the topic is boring, people will trail off, and they've got a pot of water boiling on the stove, and the kids running around the house or whatever, screaming at their brother or sister. And all of a sudden you're disengaged, and you're just wanting to finish the survey,

and you will get people who aren't paying attention. And do you really want that data because it may not be good data? You put the trap question in where you say for quality purposes, please select strongly disagree or what have you. And you can easily filter that, and look and make sure that you have the engagement that you need. Another thing you look at is how much time are they spending on each question in your survey, or on each page? And I look at the time overall, but then a lot of fraudsters, and you can find this on bulletin boards where they say - at the beginning of the survey, it will say this survey will take you 12 minutes to complete. The fraudsters not that down, and then they open up, they answer a few questions really quickly, then they go to another webpage. And then they come back and they speed through the survey to get to the end so they can collect their incentive. If you have the start and end time, you can't see that they sped through in the middle. You can just see they spent 12 minutes, so they don't look fraudulent but they in fact are fraudulent. The open ends when you're looking at the open ends, they'll say this is a great product, or they'll give you some really vague something or other in an open end. And I will say that people who do lie to qualify will forget what they lie about. Sometimes I will ask them for their age in the beginning, and they think that's a demographic question. And then I'll ask them for the year of birth at the end, and they got 10 years older, and my survey didn't take them 10 years to complete. Although there are some long surveys out there. You look at some of those things, and then when they mismatch, you know what's going on. I had a kid who was trying to take a survey in order to get points because his video game - I guess he ran out of pac mans or something, and he needed to power up and get a new pacman for lack of better words. And so he answered, and I had a concept that was an alcohol product. It was the Capri Sun alcohol things that are out there. You stick the straw in and drink them, they're frozen cocktails. And he lied and said that he was 22 or 23, but when he got to that point of the survey and looked at the concept and I asked what you like about the concept. He said I'm only 13 and I'm trying to get points for a game, I'm not eligible to drink. He forgot that he lied to get into the survey. It's just different things like that, that you look for patterns to try to understand is this a valid respondent or not?

Kelli Hammock: We look for the same too when we do screening. It's really the same process, you're kind of weeding them out after the fact. But we have to weed them out on the fly to keep them out of our study. When I build screeners, I really like to hide the target. You don't just start with do you eat at this restaurant this many times a week because they're going to say yes I absolutely do. And that's not how you get there, so you really need to know how to build a proper survey both for your quantitative work, but also just to screen participants to make sure you're finding the right audience. Those red herrings

and trap questions are so important, but there's also something to be said about reviewing with the human element because you start look at the data. And my favorite example, and I shared this with Tia last week is we - this was years, and years ago. We screened someone for a restaurant study, how many hamburgers have you eaten in the past week at this restaurant, that restaurant, so on and so forth. There's a dozen or so restaurants. The recruiter brings the screener into the project manager who reviews it and says did you really look at this? While they were answer, this would have been a phone screening. We did the math on it, and in that single week this individual had personally eaten 97 sandwiches from various restaurants all around town. That's something you also need to be cognizant of is over answering. If you have somebody who selects every single option, then maybe you should take a single look at it and do your re-screener. That's very important to call them back, re-ask those questions, because they are going to forget how many times they claim they went to a certain restaurant last week if they were not being truthful about it.

Brett Watkins: As we kind of get up here on the last 15 minutes, and we're starting to actually see some questions pour in now. I was going to say even though Tia's doing a great job of answering a lot of questions on the fly, so that's great, we get to continue on this discussion. The part I was going to go, and we'll get to it and say it before we get to the Q&A is looking ahead. What are we going to do, how will we make this work? Some suggestions I've heard as an example - in the qualitative institutions for example, years ago there used to be some collective work where facilities in the same market place would share their panel, and their recruit process. A third part would look at all of it and say here's your duplicates who are all running around doing the same thing, they've done multiple studies so clearly if everybody's doing six months, or one year or whatever past par, we all know that they're professional takers. You're not really seeing that kind of cooperation in the industry, some of which is related to budget. Some of that's just related to the fact the industry's so much smaller now today. There's not nearly as many providers as they are. But you all also mentioned some kind of similar concepts, having panels share information so we can - that's one direction, one step the industry can take. What are some other steps that we should be looking at that we can take to try to improve this process? Efrain, you obviously did a lot of work here on this subject, so what are your thoughts?

Efrain Riberio: In the so called panel space, the quantitative space, you can actually with today's tools as we were mentioning, you can actually see a device because that's what they're looking at, they're not looking at respondents. But a device that is going into an immense amount of surveys. That device could be

originating in one panel, but be on multiple panels. You can put limits on - it's possible today to put limits on how often some of these particular devices are going into studies. I wouldn't say that that's the first step to take because I don't think we know what the impact is. We think that somebody taking 30 surveys in a day is a bad thing, and it probably is. But I'm the type that I would want to see proof of how bad it is, or whether there's some type of research where it wouldn't actually impact it. My decision on this issue is that the industry needs to learn a hell of a lot more about what's going on, and actually do that research on research to figure out what is acceptable and what isn't acceptable. Because if today we said we're going to cut out everybody who's doing 15 surveys or more daily, you would be knocking out 40% of the capacity. And everybody would have to pay a lot more for what's available, and what's available is probably not necessarily that great either because it's doing 12, 13. My position right now and I can take it because I'm not actively working today in the industry is to take a step back and start doing what the industry used to do before, and doing some actual research on this problem, and figure out how bad it is and why it exists. We all have theories as to why it exists. I don't know if we can come up - any solution we come up with without understanding the origins and why it's perpetuated could perpetuate the problem.

Brett Watkins: That's a fair point. It's kind of same thing, the old saying the road to hell is paved with good intentions. For every law you create, you create five more laws that have to associate, and then obviously five more people hire to guard and so on. And so it can be a self-fulfilling prophecy to a certain extent, there's no doubt. At our end from a quality standpoint, implementing IT infrastructures, we do have ID validation. But again that's based on where we started, and our panel is in the US, and there's a few million people. It's not a hundred million people. I won't go down that rabbit hole either by the way with people telling me it's a 100 million panel. No it's not, these people did not opt in for that stuff. But let's now move on to another subject and save that for another day. I do think that - because one of the panelists asked a question I saw, the question over here about GDPR, compliance, and sharing information. That's going to come down is when does the industry want to demand change. Because sharing that information would not be a GDPR violation of any kind, it would just simply be a third party that is reviewing information and data, and saying this is where I see crossover, I see the same people, and you all really need to eliminate these people out of your panels. That's going to require that the other companies actually have agreed to participate in that cooperation, assume that cost, or that cost gets passed on to brands. But it's knowing doing so improves the actually quality of the products.

Efrain Riberio: Part of the problem that exists right now is you could do some of that stuff, but the reality is that most panels - I call them panels, but I don't think they're panels. But these respondent sources are all getting the respondents from the same place. They're fishing in the exact same place. You could put limits and do all those things. You almost have to force the sources to actually go elsewhere, because a lot of people use the same sources to recruit the same respondents. How are you going to stop an industry that's actually gone in that direction. And a lot of the respondents that they're recruiting are people that are already they know ahead of time are inclined to doing surveys. And so it's a lot easier to do that and give them 10, 15 surveys per day than it is to actually go and find a totally brand new recruit from a unique kind of origin source which just doesn't exist anymore.

Brett Watkins: You have any final thoughts before we start addressing some of the Q&A? You're doing a great job of responding to some of these folks.

Tia Maurer: I saw one of the questions, it says my experience - Mark has said my experience is looking at the results before and after removing the ones that we can identify has never changed the conclusions, and we've been able to keep them to noise. I think that's great. I have a statistician that partnered with me here at Procter & Gamble, and we did some post mortem analysis on a product that we actually took to market where people had used it and gave us really great feedback, and we got a one star Amazon review in market and tarnished brand equity. And it cost us millions of dollars. And so we did get a different result had we looked at that data after the fact, and then we also went back to one of our hair care studies and we re-analyzed it. After we shared the oral care study with our management, our senior manager said would you go back and look at this hair care study, this shampoo study and tell us what you think of that. And we saw different results on that one as well versus what we leaned forward on market. And so we know that with COVID, and the lockdowns and everything, the fraud has gotten more and more and more prevalent in the research. And so while you may be keeping the noise out right now and getting what you think about the right conclusions, I will tell you P&G has gotten the wrong conclusions more than once. And with the signal getting larger and larger, pretty soon you're not going to be so lucky, and you're going to have those problems. We also run the risk of a lot of our studies are product related studies, so we're placing product with people, so we're spending a lot of time and a lot of money to secure that product, or make that product, pack that product and send it out to consumers. And it's weeks and months of up front time, only to find out that we have to cut 20% of the panel data. You can't just get

that back overnight by saying replace these people. It's another two, three months of clearances, and sending that out, and waiting on the data. And our business decisions can't wait on that, so we're trying to fix it on the front side partially for that reason now.

Brett Watkins: Which begs the question from a supplier side, what you're seeing being done today we didn't really get into as much of the steps that we're taking here at L&E. Again we have the advantage of being more in the qualitative sector where our costs are a little higher because of the way we do things, but we have the validation of steps that are doing it. But what are some other steps that you're looking at? You mentioned obviously in the brand side. Obviously supplier side has responsibility as well. One of the things that I think, and I look at from a supplier side back to brands that I've ventured many times is how do we make this more engaging and more enticing for consumers to where we get more consumers that want to do it? As opposed to people that are just seen as an economic opportunity, how do we actually make this more of a process to where people feel a part of this? The number one feedback we always get from participants face to face is I was so happy to do it, I felt like I was - my opinion counted, and they really valued what I was saying. But we somehow never are able to connect that back to this is the impact that your data had, which they only see and we've gotten feedback when doing our own research for how we can improve our engagement, our relationship with our panelists is it would be really nice to know what happened with that research. Because sometimes they're I saw the product on the shelf, and that was awesome, I participated in that. And we generally get unsolicited feedback from participants that say that to us. That's one thing on our side, but from your brand side, from the supplier side, what are the things that you're like you need to clean this up? What are the things we need to do.

Tia Maurer: That's absolutely one of them. That feedback loop is absolutely important because we had a panel that helped us create the magic eraser, and those ladies did it for free. We have them access to what was like Facebook long before Facebook actually was even invented. And so they would come onto this platform, and in order to get into the platform to converse with each other, and they were from all over the US. They had to answer whatever the research question of the day was, and we actually send them magic erasers over and over and gave them different iterations. And they feel like the magic eraser, that they developed it. They were the actual scientists that were there that did it. And so reaching back out to people, and I've done this before in studies that we've done, quantitative studies, and say thank you for your help. Because of your input, we have now released this product to market, and you want to be one of the first to

see it, here's what it's called. You get a lot of people sending you notes back like I didn't know you cared, and I didn't know how you used my feedback, and I'm so excited. And then they really want to do the research. Is there a way to yes close that loop with them so that they feel the impact on the business, or the impact on what they've done for us, that we've created these products because of them. That is huge because it sometimes feels better to people knowing that they were heard, and that we took their input seriously. I sent out something to our people who called in our 1800 line, and we were trying to understand when I worked on Cascade, a filming issue that people were calling in about. And I asked them to send me a water sample, and then I gave them free product. They either got a Swiffer wet jet. Whatever our new products were that we launched at that point in time, they could choose from those things versus cash. And we sent them those products, but we also reached back out after they had called into the 1800 line, and these people wrote paragraphs. I didn't know you guys cared, I didn't know you listened to us, I will come back to your product again and again because you pay attention and you do care about what we have to say. There's something there, how do we reach out quarterly to your panelists and say because of your feedback, or people like you in our panel, we've now created these three new products that went to market these past six months or whatever.

Brett Watkins: Without question, remember it's - I always tell people when I'm trying to explain the industry to novices who aren't from our world, what do you do? And I just tell them I said we're helping companies connect with their consumers because the reality of what you buy in a grocery store, what you buy in a drug store which is where the majority of where the research is done, those people do not have access to those people, so they need to kind of connect. And completing that circle without question. We see a few other questions here that I'm going to leave out. There's a couple things I want to address though here was in our last couple minutes, and the first thought was Tia and Efrain, with your study with Case is something - has that been published? And is that information that could be shared out with the audience, that they could read that on their own if they so choose?

Efrain Riberio: We presented the results, really top line results at the Insights Association in February. And I believe that you can go to the Insights Association and download the top line results. In turn, we also produced an internal [INAUDIBLE] for the brands who sponsored the research. That hasn't been made available but there's a lot more - as you can imagine, there's a lot more detail than just the stuff that we published. And to get access to that is probably, the best way to do that is if you're a brand and you're interested in this topic is to become a part of Case. Help us to conduct this type of research that we

just did, and if you can support doing some of this research, you can get access to the results. That's what I would say. Right now we have not published it formally in a journal, and part of that is because all four of us are doing this in a pro bono fashion. Even though I'm retired, I do a lot of other things on the side. And Tia has a real job, Mary-Beth has a real job, and Kerry has a real job. We just don't have the bandwidth to produce the type of report that probably we should be doing. The other thing I wanted to say before this thing ends is I've looked at some of the questions that people are putting up in chat. They're great points, and what I will offer to do is when this thing is complete, I'll also go through these. I can't talk and type at the same time like Tia can.

Brett Watkins: Makes two of us.

Efrain Riberio: I'll go through these and answer specifically these questions because some of these get to the root of the point, and there's some great suggestions on how to potentially start to correct the situation.

Brett Watkins: That would be awesome, thanks Efrain. Tia, go.

Tia Maurer: Mary-Beth has posted the link as well for Case for Quality.com, and that has the resources for the presentations, but it also has resources for the question. Somebody has asked, and the question answered, and I didn't get to answer it. What questions should we be asking our supplier, and I believe Efrain authored a paper that we put in there that said these are the questions you need to ask your suppliers.

Efrain Riberio: Those were the fraud questions. The other area - ESOMAR has now what's grown to be from 27, the 38 questions now. And those questions are fantastic questions, but the intent of those questions for end clients is so that you can actually have a good dialogue with your providers. It's not a marketing piece, you really need to look at that and understand what a supplier's telling you when they say they use a router, and they have no limits on how many surveys somebody can take. What they're telling you is they're being transparent, they're telling you that people are going to take lots of surveys. You need to use those questions in a way that creates a dialogue.

Brett Watkins: It's a great point, Efrain, which is I've had this conversation with clients before which is when you look out and they ask questions about quality and such, I always say the industry really needs to get more curious about how the sausage gets made. We all like a great meal, but nobody ever wants to go back and see how it gets made. I said in this case you really do

need to go back in the kitchen, and see, and ask those questions, and understand that. One other thing to that just came to mind here. I know that EMI out of Cincinnati did a study - Mike Holmes is the person you and I were talking about who I forgot was the CEO there. I'll be happy to ask him as well if he'd be willing to share his, which I think it's public information is not though? I'm sure he's happy that I'd be providing some highlight to that which is your mind does basically a sample review and evaluation of the industry as an aggregator of such. And a couple other pieces that I will share out with the industry. Tia is doing this, I don't know Efrain if you are, but there will be a Green Book discussion on sample panel quality. I believe you will be doing that in July, is that right, Tia?

Tia Maurer: It's been recorded, and so that podcast will come out. It was all of us from Case, so we were on that call.

Brett Watkins: For all of you out in the audience, Green Book will be who actually is for our partner in promoting this. We appreciate their help in sharing this information. They will be sharing that podcast, which the discussion will be led by Lenny Murphy. If you are interested in this subject and continuing this on, we'll continue and dive deeper into that. Kelli, I will share along with you if you will pass along the links to the EMI sample study. This will give a lot of good information out there to everybody as well as to allow Kelli to answer any questions as it relates to that L&E samples steps, and what we can do to help you there as well. I could have gone on forever more in terms of this discussion, that's definitely one that I'm passionate about as well. The industry is such that I've been in it for now for over 25 years and want to see it succeed. Thoughts on as we get into other areas as well as matching behavioral, as well as the asked environments. But as I said I promised these folks that I'd keep them here for 60 minutes, and here we are at 63. Want to thank again all of you for coming here today. I'm also going to be for those over here as you log out, there is a quick poll that will be sent out. Please let us know in terms of give us your feedback as to the discussion. Again what to thank Focus Forward for providing the transcript for this which will be again - as a reminder, I saw some of you asking. We will be posting our recording of this webinar at LEResearch.com. Those of you who registered for the webinar, Kelli will be sending both the summary as well as transcript. This here is that Efrain, and Tia, and Kelli all have agreed that they will be answering and questions, and Kelli will be happy to provide and helpful if any other follow up necessary. Again, thank you all to everybody here today. Great discussion, and let you all go, and thanks so much for all of you who came out here to watch today. And we look forward to talking to you about the subject more in the near future. Thanks everybody.

Efrain Riberio: Thanks.

Tia Maurer: Thank you.

Kelli Hammock: Thank you.

Brett Watkins: Thanks everybody. Take care.