



Platinum Sponsor | Quirks Dallas | March 10 - 11, 2026

Real Humans. Real Research.

Reducing Risk in B2B & Complex Global Research

Credible respondents • Multimodal execution • AI that amplifies correctly

Rafal Gajdamowicz, CEO | Siva, VP Client Services

The Acceleration Era

Research has never been more accessible or powerful:



AI has transformed how we analyse research at every level



Anyone can now write a survey, summarise interviews, build a report



Consulting teams, brand managers, product leads all doing research independently



Turnaround times that used to take weeks now take hours

"Accessibility is exciting. But accessibility is not the same as reliability."

1937: The Formula That Worked

80 years of trusted research.

GALLUP

Predicted a national election from a carefully chosen sample. Scientific method applied to human opinion - not guesswork.

DICHTER

Built motivational research - rigor applied to the psychology of why people buy.

NIELSEN

Created measurement infrastructure that was repeatable, consistent, and trusted for decades.

What they had in common – Two non-negotiables:

Real, verified respondents + Robust methodology matched to the question
= Results that correctly represent the real world.

That formula produced 80 years of trusted research. Adapt it for the AI age. Don't abandon it.

The Four Pillars That Made It Scientific

What made research trustworthy - and what still does:

1. CREDIBLE RESPONDENTS

Verified, engaged, genuinely representative. Not just available.

2. SOUND METHODOLOGY

Mode chosen for the audience and the question - not for convenience.

3. RIGOROUS PROCESS

Screening that holds. Quality gates. A design someone else could replicate.

4. INDEPENDENT INTERPRETATION

Analysis guided by expertise - not by what the algorithm suggests.

"Remove any one of these 4 and you have an opinion dressed as science. That is exactly what is at risk right now."

Research has never been faster.

But has it ever been more fragile?

As analysis speeds up, execution discipline is under pressure

And in complex studies, that challenge is getting harder, not easier

Who Is Feeling This?

Both sides of this room are under different versions of the same pressure:

END CLIENTS

- Under pressure to move faster, cut costs, self-serve
- More research needed, fewer specialists, tighter timelines
- AI tools promise speed, but who validates the results?

Goal: decisions you can defend to the board.

FULL SERVICE AGENCIES

- Feasibility risk sits with you, and so does reputation
- Competing with platforms and automation on price
- Margin pressure. Less room for error on execution

Goal: delivery you can stake your relationship on.

"When execution weakens, credibility erodes. Quietly."

Where We Are Right Now

The landscape in 2026:



B2B and specialist audiences harder to reach than 5 years ago



Panel respondent engagement declining, less motivated, less attentive



Fraud more sophisticated, harder to detect and easier to scale



Timelines compressing, budgets tightening



Multi-country quotas more intersected and complex



Feasibility assumed, not stress-tested

"These aren't warnings about tomorrow. They're happening in your studies today."

The Hidden Failure Point

Most research failures don't happen where you look for them. They happen much earlier:



Feasibility

Was this audience actually achievable via the chosen mode?



Access Design

Was the method chosen for the audience or for convenience?



Methodology

Was the design reproducible, validated, stress-tested?



Respondent Quality

Were the people who answered the right people?

By the time you're looking at the data, the problem is already baked in.

The good news: these failure points are preventable with the right execution design.

Online Panels: When They Work Brilliantly



Consumer studies with broad populations, fast, scalable, cost-effective



B2B panels for mid-to-senior audience profiles in white-collar sectors



Healthcare panels: digitally active HCPs, non-rare patient communities



Category tracking, brand awareness and usage/attitude studies at scale



Price sensitivity and conjoint: volume and speed required, online delivers



Iterative testing: concept, creative, packaging, messaging

"Online panels are one of the most powerful tools in research. The question isn't whether to use them. It's when, how, and with what verification."

What are the online limitations

The challenge isn't the method. It's what happens to quality when verification lightens.



Respondents taking 3-5 surveys a day, optimising for incentives, not accuracy



Consistent panelists who recognise question patterns and 'know' expected answers



Title and credential inflation, particularly acute in niche B2B and healthcare

Respondent verification becomes the defining quality variable.

"Data that looks complete"

**AI CAN SUMMARISE
10,000 OPEN-ENDS
IN 30 SECONDS.**

**IT CANNOT FIX
SPEAKING TO THE
WRONG 10,000 PEOPLE.**

Better Inputs = Better AI

This is not an anti-AI message. It is the opposite.

AI clustering amplifies weak signal just as powerfully as strong signal

Pattern detection magnifies bias. It doesn't correct it

Sentiment models can't distinguish genuine response from routine answer

Synthetic modelling built on thin or biased data compounds errors at scale

Fragile data + AI = confident error

Strong data + AI = sharp output

*"When respondent quality is engineered, AI becomes exponentially more powerful.
Better humans in = better intelligence out."*

Some Respondents You Can't Reach Online

Online does not have to be the only methodology you should consider to reach these audiences:



C-suite executives

Live offline, delegate surveys, titles inflated



Physicians and HCPs

High panel saturation. Credential inflation rife. Specialist panel or registry recruitment outperforms general panels.



Very Niche B2B

Online only for super niche B2B exposes risk for readable and high quality results



Emerging market consumers

Partial digital access, better reached face-to-face



Customer and non-Customer Audiences

Online verification alone for 'customer' based studies is risky.

"Who we don't speak to matters as much as who we do. And the gap is wider than most people think."

"I'm not anti-online."

"I'm anti-single-mode thinking."

Multimodal doesn't mean doing more. It means designing smarter:



Online

Where it excels: broad consumer, brand tracking, iterative testing



CATI

To supplement and verify: B2B seniority, complex eligibility, hard-to-reach professionals



Face-to-face

To complement: markets with partial digital reach, intercepts, exit surveys, mystery shopping, CLTs



Mixed-mode

To enhance: datasets that reflect the real target population

Why Risk Mitigation Is the Real Conversation

This session is fundamentally about risk mitigation.

In complex global studies and some difficult B2B, the risks are different:



Respondent misrepresentation: title inflation, self-declared credentials



Feasibility failure: incidence estimates based on platform counts, not reality



Cross-market inconsistency: same methodology producing incomparable data



Single-mode dependency: no contingency when one channel stalls



AI amplification of the above: making fragile data look authoritative

The goal isn't to make research harder. It's to help you achieve your client's goals and protect your own.

"Multimodal, verified execution is how you deliver results your clients can act on."

MAVRIX: The Execution Layer

We don't produce insights. We protect the inputs.

INSIGHTS & STRATEGY

DESIGN and AI ← accelerating fast

EXECUTION & ACCESS ← Mavrix

1M+

Engaged Qual Community

5.5M+

Online Access Panel

8M+

Telephone Accessible
Pool

B2B, healthcare, consumer - 85+ countries

Verification built in, not bolted on - 96% show rate

Complex global quotas, low-incidence, multi-market delivery

Online, CATI, face-to-face, qual - chosen for the audience

"AI is transforming the top two layers. The bottom layer determines whether any of it means anything."

MAVRIX

Working through a complex study right now?

20+

Years of Delivery
- global execution reach

Multi-Mode

Online • CATI • F2F • Qual
- chosen for the audience

96%

Show Rate - verified respondents

B2B • Healthcare • Global Quant • Complex Qual • Low-Incidence • Multi-Market

We specialize in studies where execution risk is highest.

Case 1: B2B Exec Study - The Feasibility Illusion

SITUATION

Senior procurement leaders. 5 countries. Among those who could provide stats on annual spend per category. Purchased in detail. AI-enhanced survey instrument with smart adaptive routing. Online-only recruitment based on feasibility estimates of procurement pros in the designated industries that looked solid on paper.

HIDDEN RISK

Title and credential inflation throughout the panel. Field incidence at roughly half of projected estimates. Job titles were technically correct - actual decision-making seniority was not., nor were a large number able to provide granular detail.

WHAT CHANGED

Phone validation launched for title and real role before online stalled. Multi-source recruitment running in parallel. Parallel CATI stream added to the field plan mid-study.

OUTCOME

Fewer gross completes than originally targeted. Significantly higher executive authenticity throughout the dataset. Timeline protected. Client received the decision-makers they needed. With detailed information on annual spend patterns

"AI made the survey smarter. Mixed-mode made the data real. You need both."

Case 2: Qual at Scale - 12-Month B2B Community

SITUATION

12-month long-term B2B research community in the United States. Approximately 1,200 respondents. Multi-method design: focus groups, short surveys, in-person sessions, and an ongoing community platform across the full year.

HIDDEN RISK

Sustaining engagement across 12 months risked attrition and declining participation quality over time. Large-scale recruitment raised fraud risk. Low articulation could erode qual insight quality across all community touchpoints.

WHAT CHANGED

Blended verification: phone validation, video verification, and online screening. 65–70% of respondents validated by phone or video.

Articulation checks and tighter controls applied throughout every recruitment wave.

OUTCOME

Over-recruitment requirement held to just 8–10% - well below the industry norm.

Richer, more articulate responses across all touchpoints.

Video verification let the client preview engagement style before committing to focus group participants.

"When a community runs for 12 months, verification isn't a one-time check. It's built into every single wave."

Case 3: CLT Device Testing - 5,000+ Respondents at Scale

SITUATION

Large-scale central location test across 5–6 US cities. Technology device testing. 90-minute in-person sessions. 5,000–6,000 respondents, 800–1,000 per city. Daily sessions 7 days a week. Highly specific quotas: extreme heights, beard types, skin tones, eye colors, ethnicities.

HIDDEN RISK

Unusual quota profiles were extremely hard to source at this volume. Maintaining consistent show rates across multiple cities and daily sessions risked disrupting the testing schedule. Speed and scale combined with stringent requirements increased no-show and mismatch risk.

WHAT CHANGED

Blended recruitment: online pre-screening, phone recruitment, and in-person sourcing to reach niche profiles. Multi-stage verification: online screening followed by phone validation. Intelligent confirmation system using messaging, email reminders, and phone confirmations before each session.

OUTCOME

5,000–6,000 qualified participants delivered across all cities. 96%+ show rate maintained across every daily session - uninterrupted testing throughout. Strict quotas met, budget targets hit, no schedule disruption at any location.

"96% show rate across 5,000 respondents with specialist quotas. That requires verification - and confirmation - at every stage."

Case 4: Global Quant - The 8-Market Stress Test

SITUATION

Major brand. 8-country quantitative study. Uniform online methodology applied globally. Sample quotas assumed achievable across all markets using the same approach.

HIDDEN RISK

4 markets performed as planned. 2 borderline from week one. 2 collapsed mid-field. A reactive fix would mean delays, cost spikes, and cross-market data that couldn't be compared.

WHAT CHANGED

Contingencies pre-built before field launched. Parallel CATI in 2 markets. Offline intercept in 1 region. Centralised quota rebalancing managed throughout to preserve comparability.

OUTCOME

Timeline preserved. Cross-market data comparability maintained. The client never saw a problem. All 8 markets delivered on schedule with consistent, usable data.

"AI needs cross-market comparability. That only exists when access is engineered per market - not assumed uniform."

Case 5: F2F Intercepts - Global Beverage Tracking Study

SITUATION

Global beverage tracking study – 30+ countries. F2F intercepts considered as additional to online. 10,000 – 20,000 surveys per market annually. Daily quotas by time of day, gender, and age. 365 days a year.

HIDDEN RISK

Rural and low-income communities unreachable digitally. Daily quota management across 25+ markets risked imbalance. 365-day consistency required in every country.

WHAT CHANGED

Rostered field teams with structured schedules. F2F Tablet interviewing with GPS tracking and geofencing. Real-time quota monitoring throughout to infuse specific F2F recruited respondents.

OUTCOME

Full volumes delivered across all markets including hard-to-reach rural populations. Precise quota control. Insights from markets online could never reach.

"For audiences without smartphones or panel memberships, the only way in is face-to-face. GPS-verified, quota-controlled, every day."

Case 6 Qual at Scale - Depth Without Compromise

SITUATION

120 video interviews. 4 segments. 3-week timeline. Platform-only recruitment filled volume targets fast. Transcripts arrived on schedule and looked complete but lacked depth.

HIDDEN RISK

Recycled panelists. Rehearsed answers. Smooth verbatims that sounded right but lacked genuine variation or surprise. Volume was there. Real depth was not.

WHAT CHANGED

Multi-source recruitment introduced. Phone pre-screens used as a behavioral filter - a real conversation, not a checklist. Drop criteria enforced strictly throughout all waves.

OUTCOME

First wave slightly slower to recruit. Subsequent waves richer, more varied, and genuinely usable. Client noticed the difference. Findings reflected real views, not panel habits.

"AI summarisation is only as good as the people it is summarising. Real respondents make it extraordinary."

Qual at Scale: A Crossroads

As recruitment becomes more automated, qual discipline risks being compromised.

VOLUME WITHOUT CONTROL

- Fast, platform-recruited
- Surface-level verbatims
- AI synthesis sounds confident
- Trust in qual declines

Looks like qual. Functions like thin quant.

ENGINEERED DEPTH

- Multi-source, behavioural screening
- Real variation and genuine nuance
- AI synthesis of authentic responses
- Faster to act on, easier to trust

Qual that earns its place. We built our recruitment for exactly this.

"Qual at scale is becoming a methodology in its own right. Between qual and quant. But only if the humans are real."

Speed vs Quality: A False Choice

Clients want it fast. You want it right. It feels like a permanent trade-off. It doesn't have to be.



Online is the fastest mode when feasibility holds. We use it where it should be used



Pre-designed parallel modes protect delivery when online stalls



CATI in B2B reaches the right respondent efficiently. Quality velocity matches volume velocity



Quality control upfront saves time at the back end. No recalls, no re-fielding

"The fastest path to delivery is the one that doesn't break mid-field."

Speed Without Design



Lukewarm hotdog

Speed With Engineering



Delicious steak

Welcome to Texas.

Five Questions That Protect Your Next Study

Before you approve any complex study, ask these.

- 1 Where is fraud or title inflation most likely to enter this study?
- 2 Is this audience genuinely reachable at scale via the method we've chosen?
- 3 What's our plan if assumed incidence drops by half?
- 4 Have we validated feasibility with real data, not platform estimates?
- 5 Is there a secondary mode designed and ready before field launches?

"Hope is not a fieldwork strategy."

Four Futures for Research

UGLY

Automation dominates.

Panels and platforms on autopilot.

Trust erodes silently.

AVERAGE

Mixed quality.

Some good, some not.
Hard to tell apart.

Cost control dominates choices

GOOD

AI + execution discipline.

Careful methodology considerations

Faster and more reliable.

AMAZING

Engineered execution.

Verified access.

AI amplified.

Research more trusted than ever.

"The opportunity is real. The path is clear. We just have to build for it."



Better humans in. Better intelligence out.

"That future is entirely within our reach."

Q&A: We'd love to hear what resonates, and what challenges you're working through.



Thank you.

Case 5: Wealth & Asset Management - 20-Country Senior IDIs

SITUATION

Global qualitative study. 20 countries, 4 regions. 60-minute virtual IDIs with senior executives across retail banking, private banking, wealth and asset management. Required advisors managing HNW clients with \$1M+ in onshore wealth. Target: 250–300 interviews, 10–15 per country.

HIDDEN RISK

Senior decision-makers - Private Banking Directors, Heads of Wealth Management - are hard to access and cautious about disclosing portfolio data.

Several markets had strict norms around financial disclosure, creating risk of guarded responses.

WHAT CHANGED

Multi-layer validation: LinkedIn profiling plus web-based professional verification.

Phone verification and articulation checks before each interview. Pre-interview form captured quantitative data to structure and deepen the discussion.

OUTCOME

250–300 high-quality IDIs delivered globally, 10–15 per country across all 20 markets.

Sustained 45–60 minute discussions with genuine depth. Findings went to board level - including both strategic views and quantitative indicators.

"Access at this level needs multi-layer validation - and a reason to trust the process."