

MarkSc Ltd.: Sampling the Unsampleable

Designing Research for MamaHeart's First Colour Cosmetics Launch

This fictitious case was prepared solely as a basis for class discussion and is not intended to illustrate effective or ineffective handling of a business situation, nor to serve as a source of primary data. MarkSc Ltd., MamaHeart, HeartGlow and all individuals named are fictitious; any resemblance to real organisations or persons is coincidental. Industry statistics are drawn from published sources listed in the endnotes.

Abstract: On a humid Monday evening in October 2026, Meera Iyer, Vice President of the Consumer & Healthcare practice at MarkSc Ltd., stared at three spreadsheets on her screen. Each represented a different answer to the same question: how should MarkSc study the women that MamaHeart wanted to sell to? MamaHeart, a six-year-old direct-to-consumer (D2C) personal care brand built around expecting and new mothers, was preparing to launch its first colour cosmetics range, HeartGlow: a line of pregnancy-safe, fragrance-light tinted products. Its co-founder and CEO, Nidhi Sehgal, wanted a consumer survey to validate demand, pricing and pack sizes before committing ₹14 crore to manufacturing and launch marketing. MarkSc's proposal was due on Friday. Inside MarkSc, opinions had hardened into three camps. Nidhi herself wanted speed: "We have 4.2 lakh customers who already love us. Survey them. Done." MarkSc's Head of Research Methods, Dr. Arvind Krishnan, insisted that anything short of a probability sample would produce "a very expensive mirror." Field Director Farhan Qureshi argued that mothers of newborns were simply not where textbooks expected them to be: not on panels, not at home at 4 p.m., and certainly not in the mood for a 25-minute questionnaire. Meera had a budget of ₹42 lakh, a ten-week window, and a target population that, as Farhan put it, "is busy, sleep-deprived, and completely changes every nine months." She needed a research design her client would accept and her methods head could defend.

1. Background of MarkSc Ltd.

MarkSc Ltd. began life in 2008 in a two-room office above a pharmacy in Gurugram's Sector 14. Its founders, Rajiv Malhotra and Shalini Menon, had met as young executives at a multinational research agency, where Rajiv ran field operations across north India and Shalini, a statistician trained at the Indian Statistical Institute, designed samples for the agency's largest consumer studies. Both had grown frustrated with what Shalini called "the tyranny of the convenient sample": studies designed in boardrooms, executed wherever respondents were easiest to find, and reported with a confidence the data rarely deserved.

The firm's first five years were spent as a "field-and-tab" subcontractor, collecting and tabulating data for larger agencies across Delhi NCR, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Rajasthan. The work was unglamorous but formative. MarkSc built a reputation for disciplined fieldwork, back-checking 20% of interviews when many competitors checked half as many, and for investigators who could work in Hindi, Punjabi, Haryanvi and Bhojpuri with equal ease.

In 2013, MarkSc began serving end clients directly. A healthcare practice followed in 2016, built around a doctor panel that would eventually exceed 18,000 physicians. In 2019 the firm launched MarkSc Pulse, a proprietary online consumer panel, and in 2021 it opened an analytics hub in Bengaluru. By FY2026, MarkSc reported revenues of ₹186 crore, employed 640 full-time staff and

engaged about 2,500 freelance field investigators from offices in Gurugram, Mumbai, Bengaluru, Kolkata and Lucknow (see **Exhibit 1**).

Unusually for an Indian research firm, nearly 60% of MarkSc's revenue came from domestic clients in FMCG, beauty and personal care, healthcare, automobiles and fintech. This made the firm a close observer of a shift in Indian marketing: the rise of D2C brands that wanted answers in days rather than months, and preferred dashboards to 120-slide decks.

The shift was both an opportunity and a threat. D2C founders were curious, data-literate and willing to experiment, but they had grown up with do-it-yourself survey tools and often asked why a "proper" study cost ten times as much as an online form. MarkSc's leadership believed its future lay in proving that methodological rigour was worth paying for, without becoming so slow that clients stopped asking.

A framed sign in the Gurugram office captured the firm's creed: "No data without a design." Beneath it, someone had added a sticky note that nobody had ever removed: "...and no design survives the first respondent."

2. The Marketing Research Industry in India

India's market research and insights industry has grown from a handful of opinion-polling and retail-audit outfits into one of the largest research markets in the world. The founding of the Indian Market Research Bureau (IMRB) in 1970 is commonly treated as the industry's starting point. Over the following decades global networks such as Nielsen, Kantar, Ipsos and GfK built large Indian operations, while home-grown firms such as Hansa Research and Market Xcel developed strong local franchises.

Size and growth

According to the Market Research Society of India (MRSI), industry revenues reached ₹29,008 crore (about US\$3.5 billion) in FY2025, up 10.9% from ₹26,300 crore (US\$3.2 billion) in FY2024.¹ Growth had been faster in earlier years: 12.6% in FY2024 and 17.6% in FY2023.² MRSI's leadership described an industry entering maturity, with growth driven "less by volume and more by value."¹ By MRSI's reckoning, India now ranks behind only the United States and the United Kingdom among research markets,³ and the industry employs well over 125,000 people.⁴ (See **Exhibit 2**.)

Structure

MRSI divides the industry into three service lines. Analytics (customer, marketing and business analytics) is the largest and fastest-growing, accounting for close to 60% of revenue and growing about 14% in FY2025. Custom market research, the bespoke surveys and qualitative studies for which firms like MarkSc are best known, grew 8%, with techniques such as facial coding, eye tracking and emotional-response measurement gaining ground. Syndicated research, including retail audits, media measurement and subscription panels, grew 6%.¹

Domestic demand comes chiefly from FMCG, media, automobiles, banking and financial services, healthcare and, increasingly, e-commerce and D2C brands. MRSI expects future growth to be supported by the expansion of multinational captive centres, rising demand for hyperlocal insights, and greater use of research by small and medium enterprises in their decision-making.¹

An export-led industry

A defining feature of Indian research is its dependence on overseas demand. International clients account for roughly 80% of industry revenue, and about 90% of analytics demand comes from outside India.^{2,3} Multinational captive centres and offshore teams in India handle analytics, coding, data processing and survey programming for clients worldwide. Domestic demand has

historically lagged: many Indian companies, especially smaller ones, have treated research as a discretionary expense rather than an investment.

The digital turn

India's internet expansion is reshaping data collection. The country had an estimated 958 million active internet users in 2025, with rural India accounting for about 57% of them.⁵ Yet reach is not representativeness: about 38% of the population remained non-active internet users, and roughly 18% of users went online through someone else's phone, most of them in rural areas.⁵ Online panels have grown quickly; Ipsos, for instance, acquired the Gurgaon-based mobile panel company Crownit to speed its shift away from offline collection, with its India chief conceding that the industry had been slow to move online.⁶ Even so, face-to-face interviewing remains essential for reaching older, rural, lower-income and less digitally active consumers.

Persistent challenges

The industry faces several recurring problems: achieving representative samples in a population divided by language, region, income and community; data-quality concerns, including fraudulent and "professional" panel respondents; respondent fatigue; staff attrition that industry observers put at around 30%; and price pressure from DIY survey platforms. The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 has added consent, purpose-limitation and data-minimisation obligations to the customer lists and panels researchers increasingly depend on. Generative AI, meanwhile, is changing questionnaire design and the coding of open-ended answers, and has prompted debate about "synthetic respondents."

For mid-sized domestic firms like MarkSc, the result was a strategic squeeze: global majors with deep panels above, cheap DIY platforms below, and clients who wanted rigour and speed at DIY prices.

3. The Services Provided by MarkSc Ltd.

MarkSc organised its offerings into six service lines, delivered through four industry practices: Consumer & Healthcare; Technology & Fintech; Automotive & Durables; and Public & Social. **Exhibit 1** shows the revenue mix.

Custom quantitative research (38% of revenue). The firm's core business covered usage-and-attitude (U&A) studies, market sizing, concept and product testing, brand health tracking, and pricing research using the Van Westendorp price-sensitivity meter, Gabor-Granger and choice-based conjoint analysis. Projects ranged from 400-respondent concept tests to 20,000-household tracking studies. MarkSc's statisticians designed samples ranging from simple random draws from client databases to multi-stage stratified cluster samples spanning dozens of towns.

Qualitative research (14%). Focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, in-home ethnography, accompanied shopping and online communities. The qualitative team had particular expertise in sensitive-topic research, including menstrual hygiene, infertility, contraception and maternal health, using all-female moderation teams and paired interviews.

Healthcare and HCP research (16%). Built around a panel of more than 18,000 doctors, including about 2,400 obstetricians and gynaecologists and 1,100 dermatologists. Services included prescription audits, doctor surveys, patient-journey mapping and key-opinion-leader interviews. This was where Meera Iyer had made her name, leading a series of studies on infant nutrition and maternal supplements.

Panel and data-collection services (12%). MarkSc Pulse had about 3.1 lakh registered members, of whom roughly 1.2 lakh had answered at least one survey in the previous 90 days. Like

most Indian online panels, it skewed urban, younger and more educated than the population. The field division ran computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), telephone interviewing (CATI), central location tests, mall and hospital intercepts and mystery shopping, and sold data collection to other agencies.

Analytics and data science (13%). Customer segmentation, marketing-mix modelling, churn and lifetime-value models, social listening and text analytics. Increasingly, clients asked MarkSc to fuse survey data with their own transaction data, which required careful handling of consent under the new data-protection law.

A typical new-product engagement moved through four stages: a discovery workshop to convert business questions into research objectives; an exploratory qualitative phase; a quantitative phase sized to the decisions at stake; and an activation workshop translating findings into launch recommendations. Meera's practice had run eleven such engagements for beauty and personal care brands since 2022, though never one in which the target consumer was, in her words, "simultaneously a beauty shopper and a patient."

D2C Express (7%). Launched in 2024, D2C Express promised a fully reported online survey within seven working days, using a client's customer list or the Pulse panel, from ₹2.5 lakh. It was MarkSc's fastest-growing line, with 64 projects in FY2026, and a source of quiet internal tension. The sales team loved it. Arvind Krishnan called it "the drive-through of market research: fast, cheap and occasionally regrettable," and insisted that every D2C Express report state that its results described respondents, not the market.

Across all lines, quality processes included ISO 20252 certification, GPS and audio verification on CAPI interviews, back-checks on 20% of face-to-face interviews, and attention checks and digital fingerprinting to weed out duplicate or fraudulent online respondents. Every proposal passed through a 45-minute "methods review" in which Arvind's team challenged the target definition, sampling frame, sampling method, sample size and data-collection mode. Account managers called it "the viva."

Pricing reflected this rigour. A face-to-face interview with a hard-to-reach respondent could cost MarkSc ₹2,000–3,500 to deliver, against ₹150–400 for an online panel complete. For clients used to DIY tools, that difference was often both the first and the last question of the sales conversation.

4. Challenges Faced by MamaHeart for the New Product Launch

MamaHeart was founded in 2020 in Noida by Nidhi Sehgal and her husband, Rohan. Nidhi, a former brand manager at a large FMCG company, started the brand after her own pregnancy, when she found herself reading ingredient labels "like a chartered accountant reading a balance sheet." The brand's promise was toxin-free, dermatologically tested, fragrance-light care for expecting and new mothers. Its first products, a stretch-mark oil and a nipple butter, sold through Instagram and the brand's website. By FY2026, MamaHeart offered 46 products across mother care and baby care, reported revenues of ₹212 crore and had raised three rounds of venture funding.

About 62% of revenue came through MamaHeart's own website and app, 28% from online marketplaces and beauty platforms, and 10% from quick commerce, modern trade and pharmacies. The brand had about 4.2 lakh active customers, defined as those who had bought at least once in the previous 12 months (**Exhibit 3**).

HeartGlow would take MamaHeart into colour cosmetics for the first time: a tinted moisturiser with SPF, a lip-and-cheek tint, a smudge-proof kajal and a concealer for what the internal brief bluntly called "3 a.m. feed under-eyes." The working positioning was "makeup you don't have to

Google during pregnancy.” The board had approved a provisional launch budget of ₹14 crore, conditional on research validating demand. The challenges were considerable.

Category stretch. MamaHeart’s equity rested on safety and care. Makeup is driven by different motives, such as self-expression, confidence and social occasions, and competition is far more intense. Some board members feared a colour range could dilute the brand’s clinical credibility; others saw it as the logical next step in “owning the mother.”

A crowded, fast-moving market. Redseer and Nykaa valued India’s beauty and personal care market at about US\$21 billion, projecting US\$34 billion by 2028, growth of 10–11% a year, and online channels contributing about a third of sales.⁷ More than 3,500 beauty brands already competed online.⁸ HeartGlow would face mass and premium makeup brands as well as well-funded D2C peers.

A customer base that “graduates.” As children grow, mothers move on; the average active customer stayed with MamaHeart for 22 months. Colour cosmetics could extend the relationship, but only if mothers saw HeartGlow as relevant beyond the baby years.

Unknown demand drivers. The team did not know how many pregnant women and new mothers used makeup, on which occasions, or whether “pregnancy-safe” mattered for products applied to the face rather than the belly. Nor did it know how demand differed between working mothers and homemakers, metros and Tier 2 cities, or first-time and experienced mothers, or how much husbands, mothers and mothers-in-law influenced such purchases.

Pricing and claims. HeartGlow would carry a premium, but how large a premium could the safety promise support? Any “pregnancy-safe” claim would also need substantiation under cosmetics regulations and advertising self-regulation codes.

Investor pressure. MamaHeart’s investors wanted profitable growth. A failed launch would waste more than ₹14 crore; it could dent the core franchise. Nidhi’s research brief listed six questions (**Exhibit 3**). She wanted answers in eight weeks.

5. Challenges in Data Collection and Research Design

When MarkSc’s team sat down to design the study, the difficulties began with a deceptively simple question: who, exactly, is the population?

Defining the target population. Nidhi’s brief described the target as “expecting and new mothers.” The team debated whether that meant the second and third trimesters or all three; mothers of babies up to 12 months or up to 36 months; women aged 22–40 or any age; SEC A and B households only, or C as well; and the 12 cities that generated 80% of MamaHeart’s sales, or the whole country. Nidhi also wanted “women planning a pregnancy in the next year,” a group that, Farhan noted, could only be found by asking a very personal question of a great many strangers. Each choice changed the size of the universe, and hence the cost of finding it (**Exhibit 4**).

No sampling frame. For most consumer studies MarkSc could draw households from electoral rolls or census enumeration blocks, or recruit from its panel. No list of pregnant women or new mothers existed that MarkSc could legally use. Hospital records were confidential, birth registers were closed to commercial use, and under the data-protection law even MamaHeart’s customer list could be used only within the purpose customers had consented to. The Pulse panel held about 6,800 self-identified mothers of children under three and 1,100 pregnant women, overwhelmingly urban, working and online. Even the panel’s profiling data were up to a year old, long enough for a “pregnant” panellist to have become a mother.

The customer database. Nidhi's preferred option, an online survey of customers drawn systematically from the database, was cheap, fast and based on a genuine frame: of customers. But 71% of customers lived in eight metros, nearly all bought online, and all had already chosen MamaHeart. "If we only ask people who already love us whether they will love us more," Arvind said, "we get a very expensive mirror." A pilot email survey to 5,000 customers drew a 4.1% response rate, skewed towards the most loyal buyers (**Exhibit 6**).

Low incidence. In a door-to-door pilot in two Delhi NCR localities, only 6.8% of contacted SEC A/B households contained an eligible woman willing to be interviewed. Achieving 1,500 interviews this way would mean contacting more than 22,000 households, before allowing for locked doors and the fact that, as one investigator observed, "new mothers are mostly asleep when we are awake."

Heterogeneity and subgroups. Nidhi wanted to compare life stages, working and non-working mothers, first-time and experienced mothers, and metros and Tier 2 cities. Arvind's rule of thumb was at least 150 interviews per subgroup. Crossing even three variables produced more cells than the budget could fill.

Access and sensitivity. Pregnancy and early motherhood are intensely private in many Indian families. Interviews would need female investigators; many communities observe a 40-day postpartum confinement; husbands or mothers-in-law often act as gatekeepers. Questions about appearance and spending on oneself invited socially desirable answers. Measurement posed its own problems: makeup use varies sharply by occasion, so a single "how often" question could mislead, and recall of brand purchases among sleep-deprived new mothers was likely to be patchy.

Mode trade-offs. Online surveys were cheap but missed less digitally active mothers. Face-to-face interviews were more representative but slow and expensive. Hospital and paediatric-clinic intercepts offered high incidence, since waiting rooms are full of exactly the right women, but needed permissions, over-represented private healthcare users and caught women at a moment of anxiety rather than shopping. Snowball recruitment through WhatsApp mothers' groups was fast and inexpensive, but such networks are homogeneous and their members unusually engaged.

Design beyond sampling. The team also had to decide whether to begin with exploratory qualitative work; whether the concept test should be monadic or sequential monadic; how to correct for stated purchase intent, which typically overstates actual buying; and whether a small in-market test on MamaHeart's website would tell them more than any survey.

6. The Dilemma and the Way Forward

By Monday evening, three designs sat on Meera's desk (**Exhibit 5**).

- **Nidhi's "Customer Pulse":** an online survey of 5,000 customers drawn by systematic random sampling from the database, topped up with 1,000 panel respondents. About ₹9 lakh; three weeks.
- **Arvind's "Gold Standard":** 16 focus groups and in-depth interviews, followed by a multi-stage stratified cluster sample of 2,400 women across 12 cities, stratified by city tier and life stage, with census enumeration blocks as clusters and door-to-door screening. About ₹58 lakh; 14 weeks.
- **Farhan's "Field Reality":** quota sampling of 1,800 women by city, life stage and working status, recruited through clinic intercepts, the Pulse panel and snowball referrals from mothers' groups. About ₹36 lakh; eight weeks.

None fit. Nidhi's design met the budget and timeline but answered a narrower question than the board was asking. Arvind's would survive any methods seminar but was 38% over budget and

would miss the launch window. Farhan's was pragmatic but relied on non-probability methods whose biases nobody could quantify.

Meera wondered whether the answer was a hybrid, and if so, which pieces to combine, how to weight the results, and how to explain to a CEO who had built a ₹200-crore brand on instinct why “whom you ask” mattered as much as “what you ask.” MarkSc's credibility with a fast-growing D2C client base was also at stake. Rajiv Malhotra had made his view clear in the corridor that afternoon: “Win the account, but don't put our name on a study we can't defend.” Recommend something too slow, and MamaHeart would run an online form. Recommend something too loose, and MarkSc's name would sit under a launch decision built on sand.

She opened a blank slide, typed “Proposed Research Design: MamaHeart HeartGlow,” and stared at the blinking cursor. Friday was four days away.

Exhibit 1 MarkSc Ltd. at a Glance

Item	Detail
Founded	2008, Gurugram (Haryana)
Offices	Gurugram (HQ), Mumbai, Bengaluru, Kolkata, Lucknow
People	640 full-time employees; ~2,500 freelance field investigators
Panels	MarkSc Pulse: 3.1 lakh registered, 1.2 lakh active (90 days) Doctor panel: 18,000+ (2,400 Ob-Gyn; 1,100 dermatologists)
Client mix (FY2026)	Domestic 58%; international 42%
Certification	ISO 20252; member, Market Research Society of India

Revenue (₹ crore)	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026
Total revenue	112	131	149	166	186
Growth (%)	—	17.0	13.7	11.4	12.0

Service line	Share of FY2026 revenue	₹ crore
Custom quantitative research	38%	70.7
Healthcare & HCP research	16%	29.8
Qualitative research	14%	26.0
Analytics & data science	13%	24.2
Panel & data-collection services	12%	22.3
D2C Express	7%	13.0
Total	100%	186.0

Source: Company records (fictitious, for teaching purposes).

Exhibit 2 The Indian Research & Insights Industry

Indicator	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025
Industry revenue	US\$2.9 bn	₹26,300 cr (US\$3.2 bn)	₹29,008 cr (US\$3.5 bn)
Annual growth	17.6%	12.6%	10.9%

Service line (FY2025)	Approx. share of revenue	Growth in FY2025
Analytics	~60%	14%
Custom market research	~28%*	8%
Syndicated research	~12%*	6%

Other indicators	Value
Share of revenue from international clients	~80%
Share of analytics demand from international clients	~90%
Industry employment	125,000+ (MRSI inaugural industry report)
Active internet users in India (2025)	958 million, of which ~57% rural
Population not actively online (2025)	~38% (about 579 million people)

Sources: MRSI, *The Indian Research & Insights Industry 2025 Update* and earlier editions, as reported in *Research Live*, *Social Samosa* and *DRNO*; IAMA–Kantar, *Internet in India Report 2025*. *Custom and syndicated shares are approximations derived from MRSI's FY2024 split (custom ~29%) and are indicative only.

Exhibit 3 MamaHeart: Company Snapshot and Research Brief

Item	Detail
Founded	2020, Noida; founders Nidhi Sehgal (CEO) and Rohan Sehgal
Revenue	FY2024: ₹98 cr FY2025: ₹154 cr FY2026: ₹212 cr
Portfolio	46 products across mother care and baby care
Channel mix (FY2026)	Own website/app 62%; marketplaces & beauty platforms 28%; quick commerce, modern trade & pharmacy 10%
Active customers	~4.2 lakh (purchased in last 12 months)
Customer geography	71% in eight metros; 80% of sales from 12 cities
Average active customer life	22 months

Proposed HeartGlow range	Indicative MRP
Tinted moisturiser with SPF 30 (30 ml)	₹649
Lip-and-cheek tint (8 g)	₹449
Smudge-proof kajal	₹349
Brightening concealer	₹549

Research questions in MamaHeart's brief

1. What share of expecting and new mothers use colour cosmetics, how often, and on which occasions?
2. How important is a “pregnancy-safe” claim in choosing colour cosmetics, compared with care products?
3. What is the appeal of, and purchase intent for, the HeartGlow concept and each product?

4. What price range is acceptable, and what premium over mainstream brands can HeartGlow command?
5. How do needs differ by life stage, working status, first-time vs. experienced mothers, and city tier?
6. Which channels and influencers (doctors, social media creators, family) shape the purchase?

Source: Company records (fictitious, for teaching purposes).

Exhibit 4 Target Universe vs. Available Respondent Pools (12 Priority Cities, SEC A/B, Women 22–40)

Segment	Est. universe ('000)	Universe %	MamaHeart customers %	Pulse panel mothers %
City tier				
Tier 1 (6 metros)	1,910	74%	89%	86%
Tier 2 (6 cities)	660	26%	11%	14%
Life stage				
Pregnant	540	21%	18%	14%
Mother of child 0–12 months	700	27%	46%	31%
Mother of child 13–36 months	1,330	52%	36%	55%
Working status				
Working (full/part-time)	800	31%	58%	66%
Not working outside home	1,770	69%	42%	34%
Total	2,570	100%		

Note: Tier 1 = Delhi NCR, Mumbai MMR, Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Chennai, Kolkata; Tier 2 = Pune, Ahmedabad, Jaipur, Lucknow, Chandigarh, Indore. Customer percentages are for customers within the 12 cities. Source: MarkSc estimates based on census projections, birth-rate data and SEC distributions (illustrative, for teaching purposes; not official statistics).

Exhibit 5 Three Competing Research Designs

Dimension	A. “Customer Pulse” (Nidhi)	B. “Gold Standard” (Arvind)	C. “Field Reality” (Farhan)
Population covered	MamaHeart customers (+ panel mothers)	Pregnant women & mothers of 0–36 m, SEC A/B, 12 cities	Same as B
Sampling frame	Customer database; Pulse panel	Census enumeration blocks → household listing	None formal; clinics, panel, WhatsApp groups
Sampling method	Systematic random (database) + panel convenience	Two-phase: purposive qual; then multi-stage stratified cluster (probability)	Quota (city × life stage × working status) + snowball
Sample size	5,000 + 1,000	16 FGDs/IDIs + 2,400 interviews	1,800 interviews
Mode	Online (email/app/panel)	CAPI, door-to-door	CAPI intercepts + online
Cost (₹ lakh)	~9	~58	~36
Timeline	3 weeks	14 weeks	8 weeks
Main strength	Fast, cheap, large n; knows buyers well	Projectable estimates with known error	Fits budget; reaches non-customers; subgroup reads
Main risk	Coverage & self-selection bias; “expensive mirror”	Over budget; misses launch window	Unknown selection bias; homophily in referrals

Budget available: ₹42 lakh. Time available: 10 weeks. Source: MarkSc internal working papers (fictitious).

Exhibit 6 Results of Pilot Data Collection (September–October 2026)

Method	Contacted / invited	Eligible & willing	Completes	Key rate	Cost per complete (₹)
Customer email survey	5,000 customers	—	205	Response 4.1%	180
Pulse panel (women 22–40)	12,000 invited; 3,850 started screener	235	214	Incidence 6.1% of starters	350
Door-to-door, 2 NCR localities	1,020 households contacted	69	61	Incidence 6.8%	3,400
Clinic intercepts, 3 private clinics	352 eligible women approached	134	121	Acceptance 38%	1,900
WhatsApp snowball (3 waves)	20 seed respondents	—	289	3.2 referrals per respondent	420

Observations noted by the field team:

- Customer survey: 63% of respondents had bought from MamaHeart five or more times; median completion time 11 minutes.
- Clinic intercepts: 22% of interviews were cut short when the respondent was called in by the doctor.
- Snowball: 81% of respondents were working women, 77% were graduates or above, and 68% followed three or more beauty creators.
- Door-to-door: 31% of contacted households did not open the door or asked investigators to return later.

Source: MarkSc field pilot (fictitious, for teaching purposes).

Endnotes

1. Market Research Society of India (MRSI), “The Indian Research & Insights Industry 2025 Update,” as reported by Social Samosa and Research Live, 2025.
2. Research Live, “India’s market research industry valued at \$3.2bn” (FY2024 figures), and “Indian market research industry grows to \$2.9bn,” December 2023.
3. Research Live, “Indian market research industry grows 10.9% in 2025.”
4. Research Live, “Indian insights industry to reach \$4.2bn by 2026,” reporting MRSI’s inaugural industry report.
5. IMAI and Kantar, “Internet in India Report 2025,” as reported in trade press.
6. Research Live, “Ipsos buys Indian research business Crownit.”
7. Nykaa–Redseer Beauty Trends Report (2024), as reported by YourStory; Invest India, Beauty & Personal Care sector page.
8. Redseer Strategy Consultants–Nykaa report, as cited in trade press, 2025.