

# Crowdwave

Survey simulation with documented accuracy and known limits

## Market research takes 6 weeks. Your competitors aren't waiting.

---



**The trade-off:** Simulation is faster and cheaper, but requires calibration to be accurate. Raw AI predictions average 9+ points error. We've reduced that — but not eliminated it.

# Accuracy varies by domain — here's the honest breakdown

Domain	Tests	Mean Error	Confidence	Status
Political Identity & Attitudes	6	2.0 pts	HIGH — stable construct, rich priors	✓ Production-ready
Technology Adoption (50+)	6	2.1 pts	HIGH — AARP validation strong	✓ Production-ready
Institutional Trust	4	1.8 pts	HIGH — Gallup/Pew multi-year	✓ Production-ready
AI Attitudes	4	1.5 pts	MEDIUM — fast-changing domain	⚠ Monitor drift
Consumer Behavior	4	2.6 pts	MEDIUM — context-dependent	⚠ Use directionally
Workplace/Engagement	3	2.7 pts	MEDIUM — limited test cases	⚠ Needs more validation
<b>C-Suite Executives</b>	8	<b>6.2 pts</b>	LOW — major gaps found	<b>✗ Calibration needed</b>

## ⚠ Known Gap: Executive Audiences

Conference Board C-Suite validation revealed significant misses. Cyberattacks concern: predicted 35-40%, actual 60.5%. Uncertainty concern: predicted 25-30%, actual 46.1%. Executive calibration is in progress — do not rely on simulation alone for C-suite research.

# 35 tests, 2.4 pt average error — with important caveats

35

Total test cases

2.4 pts

Overall mean error

2.0 pts

Consumer domains

6.2 pts

Executive domains

79%

Error reduction vs raw AI (consumer domains only)

## What "blind prediction" means in our tests:

- **What we did:** Made predictions before seeing specific study results
- **What we had:** Access to historical benchmarks and related prior data
- **What we didn't have:** The actual survey results being predicted

## What this is NOT:

- Zero-knowledge prediction (we use priors)
- Guaranteed accuracy for novel domains
- Validation of every possible question type

## Statistical confidence (n=35):

- 95% CI on mean:  $\pm 0.7$  pts
- Consumer (n=27):  $2.0 \text{ pts} \pm 0.5$
- Executive (n=8):  $6.2 \text{ pts} \pm 2.1$

Sources: Pew (N=5K+), Gallup (N=13K+), AARP (N=3.8K), Conference Board (N=1.7K), Edelman (N=34K), McKinsey (N=15K+)

# When to use Crowdwave — and when NOT to

## ✓ USE CROWDWAVE

- Ranking 10+ concepts to find top 3
- Audience sizing and segmentation
- Trend validation against benchmarks
- Message testing and positioning
- High-volume screening (kill losers fast)
- Budget-constrained research programs
- Consumer/general population questions

## X DON'T RELY ON CROWDWAVE ALONE

- C-suite/executive audiences (calibration gaps)
- Purchase intent ( $\times 0.30$  intent-action gap)
- Price sensitivity (validate with real data)
- Polarized political topics (segment required)
- Novel categories with no calibration history
- Regulatory/legal decisions requiring human data
- Single high-stakes decision (always validate)

## Traditional research still wins when:

- Legally defensible data required
- Open-end verbatim richness needed
- Academic publication standards apply
- Discovering truly unknown behaviors

# ROI framework — input your own assumptions

## Calculate your potential value:

Additional concepts you could test per year

% that would reveal winners you'd have missed

Average value of each incremental winner (\$)

= Annual discovery value

Calculated

Losers killed before development

Average development cost avoided (\$)

## Why we don't claim specific ROI

Every company's value equation is different. We don't know your hit rate, winner value, or development costs. Rather than invent numbers, we provide the framework — you input reality.

## What we can say:

- Speed: Minutes vs. weeks
- Marginal cost: ~\$0 per simulation
- Accuracy: ±2-3 pts (calibrated domains)
- Volume: 10-50x more tests possible

# Start with a pilot — validate before scaling

---

1

## Pick one project

Choose an upcoming study in a calibrated domain (consumer attitudes, tech adoption, trust). Run simulation alongside traditional research.

2

## Compare results

When real data comes in, measure prediction accuracy for YOUR audience and questions. Build confidence in what works for you.

3

## Define your rules

Set thresholds: When is simulation sufficient? When do you validate? Document criteria so the team can move fast with confidence.

**The honest pitch:** We've validated accuracy in specific domains with specific audiences. We don't know yet if it works for YOUR domain until we test it. Start with a pilot, not a leap of faith.

Simulation accelerates decisions — but doesn't replace judgment on high-stakes calls.

# Crowdwave

Documented accuracy. Known limits. Honest methodology.