Online Neuromarketing with Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy

https://www.rogerdooley.com/thomas-zoega-ramsoy-online

Full Episode Transcript

With Your Host

Roger Dooley

The Brainfluence Podcast with Roger Dooley

http://www.RogerDooley.com/podcast

Online Neuromarketing with Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy

https://www.rogerdooley.com/thomas-zoega-ramsoy-online

Welcome to Brainfluence, where author and international keynote speaker Roger Dooley has weekly conversations with thought leaders and world class experts. Every episode shows you how to improve your business with advice based on science or data.

Roger's new book, *Friction,* is published by McGraw Hill and is now available at Amazon, Barnes & Noble, and bookstores everywhere. Dr Robert Cialdini described the book as, "Blinding insight," and Nobel winner Dr. Richard Claimer said, "Reading Friction will arm any manager with a mental can of WD40."

To learn more, go to RogerDooley.com/Friction, or just visit the book seller of your choice.

Now, here's Roger.

Roger Dooley: Roger here. Just a quick note for my audio listeners. After this episode, we're taking a summer break and pausing new episode releases for about eight weeks. Part of the reason is to rethink our format and I would love to get your advice. Do you like the interview episodes? Or would you like to hear more of my own content on neuromarketing, customer experience, the science of effort, and so on? Would you prefer shorter or longer episodes? Which shows did you find really interesting or useful? And were there any you bailed out of after just a few minutes? Who do you really want me to interview?

Please hit me up on Twitter, LinkedIn, or send a quick email to roger@rogerdooley.com with “podcast advice” in the subject line. I read every email tweet and LinkedIn message, and would love to hear from you. In the meantime, I will be releasing new YouTube videos. Just type “Roger Dooley” into the YouTube search box, and my channel will be the first thing you see. There are plenty of full podcast episodes plus even more Brainfluence briefs, short segments focused on one idea that is just a few minutes long. You can also find my writing at Forbes.com and my

neuromarketing blog. I do enjoy the audio format, and I'll be back in your head very soon. In the meantime, enjoy the summer or winter for your southern hemisphere listeners and stay safe.

Welcome to Brainfluence. I'm Roger Dooley. Today's guest has done more to bridge the gap between academia and business in the neuromarketing space than anyone I can think of. Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy is the CEO and founder of neurons Inc, a global leader in applied neuroscience. Thomas is a neuropsychologist by training and has a Ph.D. in neurobiology and neuroimaging. He's worked with leading universities like Oxford, Cambridge, Stanford, and Harvard using a combination of psychology and neuroscience to understand what drives our choices and behaviors. Thomas has previously founded and directed the Center for decision neuroscience, a multidisciplinary research lab at the Copenhagen University Hospital and Copenhagen Business School that is written extensively on applied neuroscience, including an excellent textbook on the topic. Welcome back to the show, Thomas.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Hey, Roger. Nice to be here again.

Roger Dooley: Yes. The last time we spoke was, I think, before the pandemic had begun, or at least was on our radar. And we know that had some pretty significant effects across the industry. Initially, lab studies were out of the question for a little bit as everything was completely shut down in most countries, that had some dramatic effects on other folks in the space, notably, Nielsen, who had been a huge player, closed all labs and eliminated lots and lots of positions. But things have evolved since then. Now as we speak, we are hopefully exiting the pandemic, although it's different in different countries in the US. We're getting vaccinated fairly quickly, but the pace has slowed. And we're seeing a little bit of a surge. So in any case, though, I think that we are on the way out of it. So I hope we are what has the pandemic change, do you think in the neuromarketing space, how did you guys adopt? And what do you see happening coming

out of this?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Yeah, I agree. It was a big blow for everyone, especially for in-lab research. That was, it was definitely one of the big challenges for us because we're based out of Copenhagen at the time that we didn't have a US lab. So that also meant that we had to send people to the US, for example, our US clients, of course, they have a stop to their budgets. So everyone was hit during that part of the crisis. And I think that is still kind of resonating throughout the industry, and also the adjacent industries as well. So that was kind of the big challenge, I think was how can we navigate this space? My thinking is that in general, we have at least three different types of neuromarketing. One is the basic research, which is more of a circle the academic research, we have the applied research, which is what we very often do, and then we have what we can call kind of translational research, which is taking inspiration from your marketing and neuroscience to use in market research and consumer insights, for example. So I think that the applied research really well hit so to speak because of the lab limitations, but people who were more kind of on the consultants inside could actually survive during this going online. I think that a lot of us have been assumed fatigue, but I think that It still made us possible to actually work still, for us, it meant that we had a strategy for 2021 to focus much more on a kind of SaaS software platform scalability approach. So that was on the plan we have throughout many years, we have built kind of huge database of applied neuroscience data for eye-tracking For eg kind of emotional and cognitive responses. And the plan was to then start building solutions based on that we had some very good first steps into that area. But as the pandemic hits, we have people sent home in February, I think, squared 2020. And then during the spring, just in three months, we finalized some kind of the first steps of our year online platform, and then also what's called the new revision platform, which is all kind of online platform solutions. And now they're to be quite transparent about that they are about 50% of our revenue model. So you kind of read a dramatic shift from high-end lab work to now 50% being online scalable

solutions.

Roger Dooley: I think that's really exciting. For the last, boy, probably 15 years I've been explaining to audiences around the world who weren't necessarily experts in neuromarketing, or what neuromarketing was. And usually, I would approach it with caution. Yes, here are some of the tools that are used by neuro marketers ranging from FMRI, which is mainly of course, academic, medical, but occasionally gets a commercial application. And then, of course, the other things like eg and biometrics, but basically always had the caution. But these are mainly used by big brands who have the budgets and are trying to answer expensive questions. If you want to know if your which version of your Superbowl ad is going to work, you don't really mind dropping some 10s of 1000s of dollars into studies to see if one appears to perform better be more engaging or have a more emotional impact or something. But if you are a smaller scale business, or even if you are a large business answering a smaller scale question, "Gee, I'm revising this little part of my website, which imagery works best?" That was not the kind of question that you could answer using those rather costly neuro-marketing studies. And so I tended to focus primarily on applying knowledge from behavioral science, psychology, and what we could glean from those neuromarketing studies, but apply elsewhere and say, "Okay, well, here are rules that you can follow guidelines that you can follow." And then, of course, use other tools like testing of AB testing or multivariate testing, to get your answer. But what I've seen, particularly in the last 12 months or so, is a great increase in more affordable solutions. You've talked mentioned this here, and I want to get into your assertions a bit more. Just a few weeks ago, we had a Paul Zak on the oxytocin pioneer, who is now part of immersions labs. He is the founder of immersion labs. And they have a SaaS solution that uses smartwatches and smartphone app to conduct studies. And I've also seen more traction for tools that do things like online eye tracking, so you don't have to bring people into a lab and outfit them with costly Toby glasses and such. But instead, these things can be done, it'll be in a somewhat cruder way. But they can be

done, he can get some results from over the web, or from somebody's mobile device. So I think it's really exciting. One should go into a little bit more detail on what you can now do where without costly lab studies?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Sure. Yeah, I definitely agree that neuromarketing has had the need, so to speak, to move out of heavy and high-end lab solutions only. Because that has limited severely the kinds of people who can use it as disabled people with larger research budgets with a longer kind of tolerance for longer project times. They don't typically your client wants to have their responses yesterday. That also means that you typically get clients for these high-end solutions that have the tolerance for a couple of weeks-long projects, for example. So that being said, what has been needed is these online solutions. Unfortunately, for a long time, we've seen that there have been a lot of suggestions for using facial coatings, automated facial recognition, and also facial expression recognition. We've seen eye tracking being done on webcams, and unfortunately, a lot of those early versions have not been up to quality standards. To be honest, that means that for a user of these kinds of data, there have been sometimes false positives or false negatives, which basically means that you can make the wrong conclusions based on those data, and you can execute the wrong strategy. So that being said, we've also seen that there's been a lot of improvements in the technology, the browser technology, the way that we can program and collect the data and also validate the data that has allowed us now to move into that space for online panel testing. I think for us, one of the really kind of big things that we have seen is that we can reliably measure people's response time through a browser, either on the phone or just a normal PC. That that allows us then to measure things such as Implicit Association Tests, or fast response tests that are heavily relying on response times, if you can measure response time down to 10s of milliseconds, then you can start making those tests. And then as soon as this has been possible, then it allows us to go back and see 20-30 years of psychological research that we can kind of build solutions on. So those that's kind of one thing that we've seen in the house...

Roger Dooley: Let me interrupt us, we're throwing out terms like Implicit Association test, there may be some of our audience members who aren't familiar with what that is, and sort of the history of it. Can you briefly explain that and what kind of business problems you might use it to solve because you've academically it's often been implied for determining implicit biases, for example, but explain now what it is and how you can use it in business.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Sure. So when you think about Implicit Association, so let's start with the explicit Association or conscious Association, so when I say, for example, Coca Cola to you, and I asked you to just immediately say whatever comes to mind, you can think about the color red, you think about the logo, how it looks, you think about certain attributes to it, maybe you think about Santa Claus, or something because these are things that are associated with the brand. Some of them, you will be able to say and state consciously, some of them are more like imagery, and you don't really think about them too much, but they're still there. So the explicit associations, that's what you can get when you ask people questions, what they think about, but the implicit associations are more related to things that you cannot say typically but are still influencing the way you feel about certain brands, the associations or the thinking you have about certain brands, and eventually, how you decide. And there are many different ways you can measure this. But one way to measure this is that you basically, you can imagine that you show a brand, you can have a kind of a dual-task. So for example, you have a brand being shown on a screen, and you have two response options, right? One response option is Coca-Cola. And the other one is McDonald's, for example. It seems like a very easy task is that the only thing you have to do is whenever there's a McDonald's on the screen, you press McDonald's, whenever there's a Coca Cola, you press the Coca Cola button, right? It's very straightforward. And it is, but what we do sometimes then is before each time you see a logo, we show you a simple word. So that word could be happy. Or it could be San it can be a lot of different things. And the idea here is that if you

have a very strong bond between that word and the brand, it will basically prepare you. So when you see Santa Claus, for example, it will make you more prepared to say Coca-Cola if you have a Coca-Cola prime coming up. So your response time will actually be slightly faster when you see Coca-Cola and slightly slower when you see a McDonald's brand because you have to readjust, you know a little bit.

It sounds like kind of very kind of small changes and they are, it's like few milliseconds, but it's enough. And it's reliable enough for us to measure the strength of that association between the brand and the concept. So that's in a nutshell, one way to measure implicit associations. The other thing I mentioned was the fast response test. It is basically kind of uses that same thinking that you can use response time to measure certain motivations if you like. The idea here, let's put a very simple question. So let's say you have two options on the screen. And you can select whether you want chocolate A or chocolate B, for example, now you're hungry, and you want a piece of chocolate. But the thing for you is that these pieces of chocolate, are about the same value for you, that means that you will spend a little bit of time actually figuring out Should I go with A or B. Now instead of two chocolates, let me say I show you one chocolate and rotten tomato. Now that choice is easy for you, right? So that means a response time will actually be much faster. So by looking at the response time we have to certain products, we can then and that's just the simple version of it. But we can then measure your motivation towards those things, for example. So that's a loaded combination. You can use this for pricing, you could use it for brands and different things. But that's kind of a motivation test if you like implicit and most motivation tests.

Roger Dooley: So for example, you could throw up a Coke and Pepsi and see how quickly the person shows their preference. And the speed of that would be an indicator of perhaps how strong the preference was.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Exactly, yes. It's almost like your certainty if like in

your choice. So one thing you saying that 49% said Coca Cola, 51 said Pepsi Cola, but people that respond and Coca Cola responded much faster so that we're not certain about their choices, for example.

Roger Dooley: Well, they can be very useful information for a brand. Now, one nut that people have been trying to crack for years is sort of simulated eye-tracking. I remember, it must have been 10 years ago, there was a tool online that now has disappeared that claim to be able to do that. But I mean, it was okay it but what four edges and things I think of something, and it may have given you a crude approximation, you've got your neural vision tool, that is, you can explain how it works or how you have created it. But basically, it is designed to simulate human eye tracking subjects. I mean, initially, eye tracking was very expensive, because he needed specialty equipment that and would be done in a lab. There have been some solutions have been done online that provided a cruder approximation, but using webcams or device cams and such. And though even those, though, still take panels of people to do what even if they're not that accurate, you're still going to have 10 or 20 years, some number of 50 or 100 people who need to be tested to see what they're looking at. Now, neural vision is an automated system that can basically happen instantly explained how it works, how it works, and how you know that it simulates humans.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Sure. Yeah, this is one of the kinds of big changes we'll see and neuromarketing. And also beyond this, this combination of using AI. and machine learning is probably a better term. But AI is a good reference for everyone, combined with neuroscience data be that eye-tracking or neuroscience data, for example. So in refer kind of 10-year-old models, they have typically been mathematical models that have been based on our theories about how vision works, we have constructed models and come up with different ways that how we can predict people's attention by using those models, but it's been very kind of theory-driven. And they have been only to a certain limit accurate, so to

speak, relative to live tracking studies. Now, the other thing with AI research is that you can have, we've seen that there's been very kind of a lot of advancements in how good AI models and machine learning models have become. But however good your model is, you still need quality data. And this is one of the things that of course, over the years, numerous have collected thousands and thousands of people, I think we are close to 15,000 people now that we have, we have scammed with eye-tracking e.g., that means that we have a vast database of eye-tracking that we can mine and with a lot of different versatile materials, and also from people around the world that we have fed to machine learning models to say can you make can you learn from this data to predict accurately where people will look? Now the way you do it is that you took to take half your dataset or 30% of the data set aside and you train on let's say 70% of the data, you say to the machine, this is how people this is where people are looking, try to learn that, basically try to come up with ideas for how that works.

And then we reserve the 30% that's where you're going to be tested up against. And then we're going to see how good you are. And that's kind of this, for doing that comparison, we do at least three different types of comparisons, we first do head to head comparisons, statistical comparisons of an eye-tracking heatmap, and the model's prediction heatmap. And to see how much overlap is there? What is the correlation basis? What is the linear regression to be a bit more technical as well? The second type of analysis is when we do areas of interest for anyone done eye-tracking research, we can draw areas of interest around the brand or the product or the person and then we extract the average attention to those both from the eye-tracking and from the model prediction. And then we correlate them to see how well does the model predicts the actual tracking data. And then finally, we do something I think we have come up with uniquely but that we blindfold basically people to whether they are looking at eye-tracking heat map or model heat map. And then we ask people to say how much attention do you think there is to the brand to the person and basically draw some conclusions and inferences from the heat

map to see are people doing making the same inferences regardless of where the heat comes from? And by doing that we've been able to kind of hone in on models that have been not kind of exceeding 90 92% accuracy, which is crazy. I did not expect that to happen but you, it's been blowing my mind. And so the funny thing is that as I've seen these models become better, they have actually moved in the same direction that we know vision works. So from the basic attentional modules to more kind of recognizing faces and objects and brands, for example. So it's pretty interesting to follow that development.

Roger Dooley: And what this enables, obviously, are much less expensive eye-tracking studies, because you aren't actually tracking human eyes, you're simulating that with software. So this is part of the whole democratization of neuromarketing, I guess, where it's making these tools accessible to everyone. Now, what kind of problems... I think it's great that this tool exists, but of course, knowing what people are looking at or might look at an ad or on something else a screen is important. But that's only a part of the equation, where would you use eye tracking either simulated or conventional? And actually say, "Okay, we can get some useful information from this" or where would you want to combine it with other tools?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Yeah, great question. I think that we have seen that it's been using, being used that and now being more used, we see that as an early vetting tool, for example, we see that designers are now using it more and more for it just early vetting of the creative. Are people going to see this product on the shelf, for example, how are they going to look at the Checkout button for a website, is the ad going to be seen on this social media feed, for example. So a lot of different early vetting of trying out designs, you also see it being used for other types of purposes, such as part of a larger study, just, you can imagine that if we're doing a packaging study, and you do this on like an online panel test, for example, they are still doing kind of a first reading again, of of the visual materials, just to make sure we using five different packagings, we want to test we have a

kind of a swath of 20 different versions, but let's boil it down to five and just using your vision to boil it down to five, four, for example. And we also see it as a post hoc thing, if you have a company that says we have this wonderful ad, and it really scored high on our focus group, for example, but for some reason, it fails. Why does that happen? And they go back using your vision and say, "Oh, it's because it's not drawing any attention at all." So, people that see it, they love it, but it's the only kind of 5% that sees it. So that's kind of helping them diagnose the problem, so to speak.

Roger Dooley: Right. Well, seeing whatever you want people to see is really important, not the whole thing, certainly, you can put something that's very visually salient in an ad, that doesn't mean people are going to like the product or the brand or buy it, but at least you know that they are, they are seeing it. And after I've mentioned in a couple of past podcasts where I ran an eye-tracking study with my FRICTION book cover in an Amazon simulated Amazon lineup, because I feared, okay, people rarely go to bookstores now, especially during the pandemic, I suppose. But even before the pandemic, online was the primary method for distributing books and tested various cover designs and color combinations in a simulated row of Amazon thumbnails, which is how people encounter products on Amazon. And, to me, that was an ideal way just to see if you could get people to see your cover. I mean, whether they would like the idea or whether they would buy it, that doesn't tell you anything at all, necessarily. But what you probably don't want is to have a cover that pretty much disappears, in comparison to other covers. So, you know, I think that that's, and I'm what I should do now is a run on neural vision test. If I can find the original images out, that'd be really fun to see if how well that that compared, but it was, I think, a very useful tool limited in scope and in benefit. But if you're trying to see are people going to see your product? Hey, it's a good start.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Absolutely. And I think that going to your book example, I did actually the same thing for one of my previous books, the

leading transformation, one, both looking at people who see this on the shelf, are they going to see it on Amazon, and also when they're looking only on it at it? What will they pay attention to when they see it? So what we found was that we tried like that the upside here is that you can test a gazillion designs, and it won't cost you anything per se because you don't need to test an extra 100 people every time you have that question, you could just throw it in and just do multiple iterations on the same design without the machine is not going to get tired, right? So you could just continue to try it out and fine-tuning your design. So that's one of the really kind of big upsides to this.

Roger Dooley: Yeah, it's great. And one thing I did not then look at the design itself to see okay if people actually see the full-size image or see the actual book in a bookstore, what will they then be looking at, are they going to look at the title endorsement, there's not a lot of imagery on it. So it's probably not that complicated. I can almost predict what people be looking at which is the title in big letters there. But I think for covers that have various imagery or obviously product packaging and such, you first you want to see, are people going to see this thing on the shelf? Then okay, what if they pick it up and look at it? What are they going to be looking at? So, great tool for answering various kinds of questions. How do you see Thomas the interaction between these sorts of various tools, whether they're biometric, or EEG or various types of eye-tracking, and so on? How do you see them interacting with behavioral science, psychology? That sort of understanding of how people behave? Are these separate fields or do you find a way to sort of combining the two?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Absolutely, I think that behavioral science is great for understanding certain types of biases and certain types of drivers of our behaviors. If you take a kind of a very good example of this some kind of priming effect, or some kind of framing effect, that you use a certain type of information to affect the way that people are going to behave. The problem is that if you design a frame, it could be a brand, but it could also be the

name of something or something else, if people don't see it, it's not gonna work, right. So if people are not exposed to it. And also the second is that even if they look at it, they can have a 1000 mile stare, they can just look straight at it without really processing the information. So you need to also be able to understand and measure whether people actually resonate with it, whether they understand the information, and then you can see, it actually works. And that also means that if you have a behavioral science team, and they want to instigate some kind of interaction or intervention, they typically come to us and say, we want to make sure that it works, or we want to diagnose why this doesn't work. We have this wonderful frame, and everybody else has done it. We can't figure out why it doesn't work. And then we can go back and we can see, we can run a study, for example, and then say, "Well, did they see it? When did they see it? Did they resonate emotionally with them?" And then finally, did it actually lead to a change in their cognitive processing. And these are things that you can measure with lab solutions, we can also start looking at some of these online panel testings for doing that as well. So all of a sudden, we start seeing that there is a way that you can use this kind of combination between these predictive models, the online panel test, and then the lab settings, to diagnose and as cutting to understanding the depth of behavioral biases, but also behavioral effects.

Roger Dooley: Just as we're speaking, I'm thinking that if somebody after reading one of my books, or perhaps reading Brainfluence or something, it's like, "Okay, well, based on all this, I think that I really need to incorporate social proof and scarcity into my advertising." And so that's purely a sort of science-based assumption that these things will work with my customers. And of course, you can find that out eventually, when you introduce the product or use the ad or whatever, you could use the tools controls you're talking about, just to see, okay, are people even seeing the social proof there, maybe they're going straight to the product and the model that's holding up the product, and they don't even see the social proof.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: And what we've seen since ours, as well as that, when you're doing a retail study, for example, if people see the price or the offering before they look at the product, or whether it's if they see the product, and then the price, it really changes it just a total 180 degrees clip in how they are negotiating their decision making. It's almost like an anchoring effect, where you see that if they look at the pricing, first, it becomes a kind of value proposition negotiation. If they look at the branded product First, it becomes more like brand new human effects of the branding effect in itself. And then the price becomes almost secondary, especially for those people who love the brand. They're much more affected by the brand. And then the price, they're much more kind of price tolerant, if you like less price-sensitive if they look at that product first.

Roger Dooley: So in that example, the eye-tracking timeline would be important to not just looking at a static image of hotspots, but okay, where people go first where they go next, and so on. And then you might Intuit something about their interaction with the ad or the packaging, or whatever.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: This is something that is unique to neuroscience, right? Because you can't ask people these kinds of questions, did you look at the product before the price? Nobody knows that. You can't really remember, you can't even ask people to monitor themselves when they do that. So this is one of the real upsides of using neuroscience, but if it's predictive models, or if it's eye-tracking research, is that you can do that and untangle that with millisecond accuracy. So you can tell exactly what's going on from 10s of seconds to 10 seconds, which is that's powerful.

Roger Dooley: Another area of interplay that I see I'm curious to get your views on Thomas is digital data, digital behavioral data, and tools of neuromarketing because today, marketers and business people have so much data about what their customers are doing when they use apps, they use websites, I mean, right down to... I mean, even things like not just web

analytics that you might get from Google Analytics. But scroll data, click data, click tracking where people you see not just what people clicked on for result, but what people clicked on with no result and so on. How do you see integrating this massive amount of digital data, and enhancing that or combining that with neuromarketing tools?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: I definitely see that a lot happening these days. And I think we can start by doing an analogy today's from the retail industry, what we've seen is that given example, we saw that in retail, there's been this kind of old saying that the longer the customer is in the store, the better, basically. So if you have people spending a lot of time in the shelf area, then you should be happy. But what we saw was that in certain types of studies is that when people spend a lot of time walking along the aisles, their cognitive load is actually to the level of being stressful, because they can't find their product, they can navigate the space, they can even find the aisles, for example. So spending a lot of time in the store can sometimes be really negative, one of the adjustments will be to reorganize the shelves. And in a certain type of study for one of the big news, US retailers suppose that when we rearrange ourselves, we saw a significant drop in the time that was spent in that aisle. But we also saw that the motivation kind of emotional positivity went straight up, we also saw that the committed demand went down. And people overall were just much happier with, with the experience and also with a story in itself. So so drawn that over to the digital, we see a lot of data tracking on, measuring basically people's behavior, but you don't always know exactly why they behave in that way. And that's why kind of the power of neuroscience comes into play, again, diagnose the problem to see when people are behaving this way. Is that a good thing or a bad thing in itself? But also if we have some kind of behavior we want to obtain? How can we use these kinds of micro-decisions, if you like, all the way to achieve that successful goal? So there's a lot of combination possibilities.

Roger Dooley: Great. Well, we could go on for hours, I think, Thomas, but

it's probably a good place to wrap up. How can people find you?

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Oh, there are multiple ways. So one is to check in at neuronsinc.com. There's a lot of stuff going on. We're just about to release a new website with these kinds of three different solutions that we have. And follow me @tzramsoy at Twitter, also @NeuronsInc Twitter handles there as well. I think also, I have a website that is called Thomas website.com. So I will provide those links to you.

Roger Dooley: Okay, great. And we will link to all those places and any other resources we mentioned on the show notes page at rogerdooley.com/podcast. We will also have audio, video, and text versions of our conversation there too. Thomas, thanks for coming back on the show. It's been fun.

Thomas Zoëga Ramsøy: Absolutely. Thanks for having me.

Roger Dooley: Roger here. Just a quick note for my audio listeners. After this episode, we're taking a summer break and pausing new episode releases for about eight weeks. Part of the reason is to rethink our format and I would love to get your advice. Do you like the interview episodes? Or would you like to hear more of my own content on neuromarketing, customer experience, the science of effort, and so on? Would you prefer shorter or longer episodes? Which shows did you find really interesting or useful? And were there any you bailed out of after just a few minutes? Who do you really want me to interview?

Please hit me up on Twitter, LinkedIn, or send a quick email to roger@rogerdooley.com with “podcast advice” in the subject line. I read every email tweet and LinkedIn message, and would love to hear from you. In the meantime, I will be releasing new YouTube videos. Just type “Roger Dooley” into the YouTube search box, and my channel will be the first thing you see. There are plenty of full podcast episodes plus even more Brainfluence briefs, short segments focused on one idea that is just a few

minutes long. You can also find my writing at Forbes.com and my neuromarketing blog. I do enjoy the audio format, and I'll be back in your head very soon. In the meantime, enjoy the summer or winter for your southern hemisphere listeners and stay safe.

Thank you for tuning into this episode of Brainfluence. To find more episodes like this one, and to access all of Roger's online writing and resources, the best starting point is RogerDooley.com.

And remember, Roger's new book, *Friction*, is now available at Amazon, Barnes and Noble, and book sellers everywhere. Bestselling author Dan Pink calls it, "An important read," and Wharton Professor Dr. Joana Berger said, "You'll understand Friction's power and how to harness it."

For more information or for links to Amazon and other sellers, go to RogerDooley.com/Friction.