

Internal Briefing: Understanding and Addressing Low-Quality Responses in Panel Research

Purpose:

Equip Sales and Client Success teams with the language, rationale, and reassurance necessary to explain occasional low-quality responses in our research studies, without undermining confidence in the overall findings.

What's the Issue?

In a recent study, we identified approximately 10 responses that can be classified as gibberish, irrelevant, or AI-like filler content. These comments do not offer interpretive value and fall outside the standards of thoughtful participant feedback.

While clients may occasionally flag this as a concern, it's essential to recognize that this is a known and manageable phenomenon in all panel-based research.

Why Does This Happen?

Panel research draws from a broad and diverse pool of participants. While the vast majority engage seriously, a small percentage (typically under 10%) may:

- - Disengage due to survey fatigue
- Misunderstand a question
- Lack motivation to provide thoughtful answers
- Be bots or low-effort respondents (in rare cases)

This is not unique to our methodology; it is an industry-standard consideration when working with human data collection at scale.

The Statistical Reality

Even with some low-quality responses, our testing model remains statistically robust:

- Each study is calibrated for 95% confidence in findings.
- Our algorithms are designed to withstand up to 10% unusable responses without compromising interpretive strength.
- We always prioritize qualitative richness and emotional resonance in the majority of responses that are meaningful.

This means our conclusions are still grounded, reliable, and strategically actionable even with a few outliers in the data set.

Trial Science Perspective: Focus on the Meaningful Majority

Our analysis does not hinge on outliers. We intentionally build our emotional and cognitive models around the responses that are contextually rich, emotionally grounded, and analytically useful.

These responses form the foundation of our insights on:

- Persuasive narrative framing
- Emotional impact
- Cognitive bias and attribution patterns
- Gendered response dynamics
- Legal strategy refinement

The signal in the data always outweighs the noise.

Do We Need to Replace These Viewers?

Short answer: No.

The presence of 8 to 10 irrelevant responses in a 100-person test does not justify re-fielding or data replacement. The integrity of the test is still intact, and our confidence in the insights remains high.

If a client flags this, reassure them that:

- This is anticipated and accounted for in our methodology.
- It has no meaningful impact on the test's validity.
- The remaining data provides a solid and story-rich foundation for actionable legal insights.

Talking Points for Clients

Use the following phrases when explaining this to clients:

- In any large-sample study, it's expected that a handful of responses won't meet interpretive standards. Our algorithms and analysis account for this.
- Our focus is always on the majority of responses that reflect genuine emotional engagement and thoughtful evaluation.
- The statistical model is still fully intact and the insight findings remain both reliable and strategically sound.
- It's a bit like tuning out background noise to hear the melody. The core music of the data is clear.

Summary

- Low-quality responses are normal in panel studies.
- Our methodology is built to absorb up to 10% of unusable data.
- The majority of responses remain rich, grounded, and reliable.
- No re-fielding is needed in this scenario.
- Our clients can proceed with confidence in the insights.

If you receive additional questions or need support in framing this with a specific client, please reach out to the Trial Science Insights Team for tailored language or escalation help.