



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 extrapolates correctly

Rafal Gajdamowicz, CEO | Glen Collins, EVP Global Commercial Group | 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 - rigour applied to the psychology of why people buy.

## NIELSEN

Created measurement infrastructure that was reproducible, 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

The hardest part of the process isn't the AI, it's who you're talking to

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 promising 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."*

# The Engagement Gap: Where Online Needs Support

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



For senior, niche, and global audiences, the verification requirement goes up, not down

**For B2B and healthcare audiences, respondent verification becomes the defining quality variable.**

*"Data that looks complete. Respondents who weren't really there."*

**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 = shaky output

Strong data + AI = sharp output

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

# The Respondent You Can't Reach Online

If your sample is easy to reach, it might not be the one shaping the market.



## 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 B2B and complex global studies, 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.



**10m+**  
Telephone Accessible Pool

**1m+**  
Engaged Qual Community

**28m+**  
Online Access Panel

- B2B, healthcare, consumer — 85+ countries
- Online, CATI, face-to-face, qual — chosen for the audience
- Complex global quotas, low-incidence, multi-market delivery
- Verification built in, not bolted on — 96% show rate

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

# Working through a complex study right now?

**96%**

Show Rate  
- verified respondents

**20+**

Years of Delivery  
- global execution reach

**Multi-Mode**

Online • CATI • F2F • Qual

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

**We specialise in studies where execution risk is highest.**

# What Clients Don't See, But Should

Research quality is determined by hundreds of decisions clients never see:

- 1 How tight is the screening criteria, and who enforces it at the margins?
- 2 What happens when a respondent passes the screener but something feels wrong?
- 3 Is mode selection driven by feasibility reality, or by what's easiest to quote?
- 4 How are cross-border respondents verified in markets with lower digital trust?
- 5 What's the drop rate, and what's the threshold for removing someone mid-study?

**These decisions happen before the first complete. Before the first data point.**

*"Great research is built long before analysis begins."*

# 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 up front saves time at the back end. No recalls, no re-field

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

# Case 1: Food Processors — The Feasibility Gap

## SITUATION

A study with Food Processing Company DMs. Plant Managers, Procurement Managers in firms at least \$50+, The key challenge was having enough feasibility (at least 100n) for Online panel with this very niche B2B audience.

## HIDDEN RISK

If this were only conducted with Online panel alone, feasibility would be low and not reach the needed sample size. Insights would be more questionable, and there might not be enough readable data to develop solid insights.

## WHAT CHANGED

We utilized a Mixed mode research design leveraging CATI resources. The final delivery was 79 Online with 22 CATI completes, for a total of 101n completes.

## OUTCOME

Achieving a readable sample size data set. Enhanced insights for a niche B2B target audience, and increased confidence in the research project.

*“For Niche B2B Target audiences, leveraging multi-mode can help reach desired overall quotas and enhanced insights.”*

## Case 2: 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 3: Finance and ITDMs — Customers vs. Non-Customers

### SITUATION

The end client wanted to interview customers and non-customers across 4 markets. There were doubts regarding customer validation online and the best methodology.

### HIDDEN RISK

If this was conducted as a purely Online study, there would be increased risk to reach the correct respondents for the customer and non-customer quotas.

### WHAT CHANGED

We utilized a Mixed mode research design leveraging CATI resources. The CATI team used pre-screen and telephone screening to help with the more difficult quotas. The final delivery was 227 Online with 183 CATI completes, for a total of 410n completes.

### OUTCOME

The research agency was able to mitigate risk by leveraging multi-mode to increase confidence in the customer and non-customer quotas in each market and the overall data set.

*“For customer and non-customer studies, leveraging multi-mode can help reach desired overall quotas with increased confidence enhanced insights.”*

## Case 4: 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 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.

"Senior financial executives don't join panels. Access at this level needs multi-layer validation — and a reason to trust the process."

## Case 6: CLT Device Testing — 5,000+ Respondents at Scale

### SITUATION

Large-scale central location test across 5–6 US cities. Hand-movement and 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 colours, 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 7: F2F Intercepts — Global Beverage Tracking Study

### SITUATION

Large-scale global tracking study. 25–30 countries across Asia-Pacific, Africa, and the Americas. Face-to-face intercept interviews. Consumers aged teens and above. Non-alcoholic beverage consumption and awareness. 8,000–20,000 surveys per market annually. Daily quotas split by time of day, gender, and age. 365 days a year.

### HIDDEN RISK

Target audiences included rural and low socio-economic communities where digital recruitment simply doesn't work. Complex daily quota management across 25+ markets raised risk of imbalance. A 365-day tracker required consistent interviewer coverage and quality control in every country, every day.

### WHAT CHANGED

Rostered field interviewer teams across designated intercept locations with structured daily schedules and backup resources. Tablet-based interviewing integrated with GPS tracking and geofencing — every interview verified by time and location. Real-time monitoring of quota compliance throughout.

### OUTCOME

Large annual sample volumes delivered across 25–30 countries including hard-to-reach rural populations. Precise quota control by time-of-day, gender, and age — no over- or under-achievement. Client gained reliable insights from markets that online methods could never have reached.

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

## Case 8: 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 9: 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.

### 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 behavioural 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."

## Case 10: Hospitality Decision-Makers — The Mid-Field Pivot

### SITUATION

US quantitative study targeting senior decision-makers in hospitality: coffee chains and quick-service restaurants. Procurement, marketing, and business leads at Director and VP level. 180 completed surveys. Launched as a fully online study.

### HIDDEN RISK

First 30–40 online completes were technically valid but lacked depth. Senior hospitality decision-makers recruited purely online produced a proportion of superficial responses. Completing online-only risked 180 completes the client couldn't confidently act on.

### WHAT CHANGED

Shifted to mixed-mode mid-field: interviewer-administered CATI, standard online, and phone-to-web for the remaining sample. The hybrid approach improved respondent validation, engagement quality, and response consistency across all three modes.

### OUTCOME

All 180 surveys delivered on time and within budget. Rejection rate below 2% after quality checks. Open-ended responses — though limited — were well-articulated and meaningful. Client received verified senior industry insights, not volume-first data.

"When the first wave of online data feels thin, the right call is to adapt the methodology — not fill the quota and hope."

# 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 screens
- Real variation and genuine nuance
- AI synthesis of authentic responses
- Faster to act on, easier to trust

*Qual that earns its place.*

*"Qual at scale either becomes the new deeper quant, or it disappears."*

## Speed Without Design



Lukewarm hotdog

## Speed With Engineering



Delicious steak

*Welcome to Texas.*

# The Human Access Stress Test

5 questions. Before you approve any complex study.

1 Is this audience digitally reachable at scale, or are we assuming they are?

2 What happens to our data if our assumed incidence drops significantly?

3 Is there a secondary mode pre-designed and ready, not reactive?

4 Have we validated feasibility beyond platform counts and estimates?

5 Where is fraud or title inflation most likely to enter this study?

*"Hope is not a fieldwork strategy."*

# Four Futures for Research

## UGLY

Automation dominates. Panels on autopilot. Trust erodes silently.

## AVERAGE

Mixed quality. Some good, some not. Hard to tell apart.

## GOOD

AI + execution discipline. 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."*



- AI will keep accelerating. That's not the question.
- Execution discipline must keep pace.
- Access to the right humans must be engineered, not assumed.
- **Better inputs = stronger AI = faster, more trusted research.**

**"That future is entirely within our reach."**

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