

Title: Fresh Google Consumer Survey Results\*\*\*

Author: Get-It-Got

Created 2021-09-24 02:02:48 UTC

Permalink: /r/DDintoGME/comments/pu9zli/fresh\_google\_consumer\_survey\_results/

Url: [https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/pu9zli/fresh\\_google\\_consumer\\_survey\\_results/](https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/pu9zli/fresh_google_consumer_survey_results/)

\*\*TL;DR -- Retail investors own a shit ton of GameStop shares. In fact, it looks like they own WAY more than the total number of Outstanding Shares.\*\*

Hey All,

So I have some interesting results from another set of Google Consumer Survey (GCS) which I've been running over the past week or so.

Anyone not familiar with my GCS efforts can learn all about it in my previous posts, complete with results and a detailed breakdown of the methodology, surveying platform, etc.

\*\*The most recent result with AAPL control data:\*\*

[[https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/oxjv1n/google\\_survey\\_update\\_gme\\_ownership\\_w\\_aapl\\_control/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/oxjv1n/google_survey_update_gme_ownership_w_aapl_control/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3)]([https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/oxjv1n/google\\_survey\\_update\\_gme\\_ownership\\_w\\_aapl\\_control/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/oxjv1n/google_survey_update_gme_ownership_w_aapl_control/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3))

\*\*Post w/ the complete dataset of the first round of surveying (include N=2,200 results):\*\*

[[https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/omdafo/final\\_update\\_of\\_google\\_consumer\\_survey\\_n2200\\_at/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/omdafo/final_update_of_google_consumer_survey_n2200_at/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3)]([https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/omdafo/final\\_update\\_of\\_google\\_consumer\\_survey\\_n2200\\_at/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/omdafo/final_update_of_google_consumer_survey_n2200_at/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3))

\*\*First GCS post with tons of info on methodology, survey design, GCS platform, etc.\*\*

[[https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/o2cnd4/using\\_randomized\\_representative\\_surveying\\_data\\_to/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/o2cnd4/using_randomized_representative_surveying_data_to/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3)]([https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/o2cnd4/using\\_randomized\\_representative\\_surveying\\_data\\_to/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web2x&context=3](https://www.reddit.com/r/Superstonk/comments/o2cnd4/using_randomized_representative_surveying_data_to/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web2x&context=3))

.....

So this time around, I took a different approach from past efforts. The previous survey design took a highly conservative "tip of the iceberg" approach. I deliberately maximized every conservative aspect of the survey's design and approach to results analysis. I took a draconian approach to penalizing coupled households, and I capped ownership at 101 shares, which obviously had a massive impact on average shares held. Sure, there are plenty of retail investors with XX, but there is also a massive amount with XXX+. So this time around I restructured the response buckets as follows:

<https://preview.redd.it/4cmqgkx5ycp71.png?width=838&format=png&auto=webp&s=039974f0fd85e21664fa94b59e7d94751e7fec21>

Not only did I restructure the response options, I also took an entirely different approach to the question, revising from an individual question to a household question. Here is the difference between how the question was posed:

# Original Survey Question: "Do you own shares in the company GameStop (\$GME)?"

# New HH Survey Question: "Approximately how many shares of the company GameStop (\$GME) are owned by your household (including you, spouse, roommates, dependents, etc.)?"

So obviously, this should spark much larger results, especially considering the availability of larger buckets.

I should also mention this latest round of surveying was conducted over three different surveys... we'll call them Survey 1, Survey 1.5, and Survey 2.

So I initially launched Survey 1 as a multiple choice because I wanted to get the extra bucket that could be had with the inclusion of "None of the above," but after I had got deep into the survey (243/300), Google caught on and paused the survey. You can find that survey here:

[<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=t34lwqwrhfh7g2b2wopmgykdi>](<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=t34lwqwrhfh7g2b2wopmgykdi>)

Note that this was a multichoice, and two respondents provided two answers in a single survey ... those results have been struck from the analysis.

So that led me to launching Survey 1.5 as a single response survey. You can find that survey here:

[<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=khowqghah6vyvrhmaj2gi5gq6y>](<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=khowqghah6vyvrhmaj2gi5gq6y>)

Finally, there is Survey 2. So I had shared the link to the first survey while it was in process, and someone pointed out that results would be better served with a randomized answer order. I originally locked the response order to ascending to improve the experience, but what this person was pointing out was totally true in terms of surveying best practices. I didn't think it would make much of a difference, but it kept bugging me, so I relaunched the survey with randomized answer order. It turns out it didn't make much of a difference, which acted as a proof point for the accuracy of the results, and it also added another N=300 to the sample size. So it's all good. This survey can be found here:

[<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=i7msp7adtnetykt3pybb6qrbju>](<https://surveys.google.com/reporting/survey?survey=i7msp7adtnetykt3pybb6qrbju>)

# So the results ...

Before I go there, I must say I was quite shocked but what the results showed. Of course, given the massively conservative approach I've taken in the past, I expected a bump. But these household results are showing WAY more than a bump. In fact, I'm left thinking one of three things:

\*\*1) I somehow fucked up\*\* ... either in my analysis and/or design approach ... please, any wrinkly, mathematician, statistician apes ... PLEASE CHECK MY WORK ... maybe the HH approach does work, maybe I should be dividing the result

\*\*2) My previous approach was way more conservative than I thought\*\* and there are way more XXXX+ holders than I ever could have imagined

\*\*3) Hedgies knew we'd be doing more surveying\*\* on GCS platform, so they hired a bunch of clowns to troll the platform for \$GME related survey and inflate the results

I should say I almost didn't post these results because they were so out of whack with previous results that I didn't want this post to be perceived as FUD. But in the end, I decided censorship wasn't the way ... the data is what the data is ... so here we go ...

<https://preview.redd.it/q1yzcloaycp71.jpg?width=780&format=jpg&auto=webp&s=b28486fb3c38c9c318455c83de615cb8c411a34a>

<https://preview.redd.it/rcnq962dycp71.png?width=1404&format=png&auto=webp&s=fb7a4d875745d9113ce4713dd7e3f1c7c24ddb7e>

Yeah, 7.1B shares. Honestly, I don't see how it's even possible. Even in January during the sneeze, daily volume was only in the low XXXMM range. If this number is anywhere near reality, it would mean U.S. came into the January sneeze already hold billions of shares, and almost all volume since January (maybe 20MM-25MM/week) has been strictly buy and hold. Even that doesn't come anywhere near 7.1B shares ... or, it would imply that the volumes we see on the lit exchanges are total bullocks, and apes are buying

hundreds of millions of shares every week. With all the DRSing going on, I suppose we'll find out at some point.

I also took another approach, assuming #3 above was the case ... that is, since GCS results have come out, SHF fucks have hired a bunch of clowns to join the GCS platform to look for and fuck with these surveys. If that's the case, let's throw out all the 2001 Shares or More results. Here's what that looks like:

<https://preview.redd.it/368eglwvycp71.png?width=1404&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=4efb5af97b1940b977cbb98a8782314c6d265cfd>

So this is a lot more reasonable, and actually in-line with what I've seen pitched by others. It is still way about previous GCS results, but that is expected. In fact, the AAPL control results should that the previous survey design was probably only revealing a fraction of actual ownership ... perhaps as little as 20% of the actual. So multiply the previous GCS result (163MM) by 5X and it looks like 815MM shares.

Anyway, the data is what the data is, but I'm really hoping someones reaches out to me and says, "Hey you big dummy! ... you really needed to divide the result by 3 because of XYZ." And I suppose there will be some who will say, "Yep, those results look about right." As for me, I've got to take these results with a massive grain of salt. Previous results looked right and made sense ... but this ... this leaves me scratching my head.

Of course, none of this information constitutes financial advice, and I'm not a financial advisor. Regardless of these GCS results, I remain convinced that retail owns WAY more share than Outstanding, and my personal approach remains the same:

<https://preview.redd.it/bpy1amq1zcp71.jpg?width=586&format;=jpg&auto;=webp&s;=f2fd8ef3b2e1bfe0a01c9827b128439718c8c4e0>