IMPACT ASSESMENT OF NILSEN AS A RESEARCH FIRM USING EDITORIAL ONLINE MEDIA

Jolly Masih and Sonalee Chauhan

Institute of Agribusiness Management, SKRAU, Bikaner-334006, India

ABSTRACT: Online media is revolutionising the world through it new creative outputs and thus condensing entire world into a global village. Users of online media are increasing many folds every year. Online media mainly consist of Editorial media (online newspaper editions, journals, publication house, magazines) and Social media (Facebook, Twitter, Reviews and Forums, Youtube, Pininterest etc.). Online media is not only the source of branding and advertising but also a major source to create an impact and impression in minds of Readers/users. Nielsen is leading marketing research and information firm with nearly 34,000 employees in 100+ countries around the world. Nielsen is aggressively using online media to create a positive impact on the masses about their surveys, researches and other services. 5 major keywords performance (KPI'S) indicators namely Innovation, Consumer Study (what consumer buy and watch), Global provider, Insights and Spokesperson were being used for impact assessment. Entire data bulk was being divided in 4 tiers (levels) based on impact factor of the journal/publications. A modified Harvard tool called "Popping impressions" was being used to assess the effectiveness of KPI'S. Impact was assessed on basis of presence of keywords in articles which refers to exact or similar meaning of that particular KPI. 714 articles from different newspaper editions, journals, publication house, and magazines were being assessed. Studies showed that performance of KPI'S differed at each Tier. At Tier 1 and 4 Insights has made maximum impact of 12.7% and 7.6% respectively as major KPI. Consumer study ruled as major KPI with values of 13% and 19.2% respectively for Tier 3 and 4.

KEYWORDS: Nielsen impact assessment, Popping impression, innovation, insights, global provider, consumer study (what consumer buy and watch), spokesperson

INTRODUCTION

Objectives of Study

- 1. To assess the level of impact of all Tiers (Tier Total) at individual KPI of each Tier
- 2. To determine the sentiments associated with each KPI Tier wise
- 3. To perform mapping of keywords using Popping Impressions Model for each KPI

Hypothesis

- 1. Ho: Level of impact of each KPI of particular Tier is same at Tier Total H1: Level of impact of each KPI of particular Tier is different at Tier Total
- 2. Ho: All KPI'S of each Tier follows no definite pattern for sentiments H1: All KPI'S of each Tier has different sentiment which is unique but even though they follow some sentiment pattern.

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

METHODOLOGY

Study Area

United Kingdom was the area of research. Since the study is about Nielsen UK, thus Online Editorial media of United Kingdom was taken for study. It includes list of Publications being divided into 4 tiers as per their impact higher. Google search for Nielsen UK was also included in this study.

Data Collection

In Tier 1, 2 and 3 Purpose Sampling Technique was used. A list of all online Editorial media in UK was being prepared, then their impact factor based on potential viewership and unique visitors were being determined.

In Tier 1 Publications having impact factor of 7-10 were included.

In Tier 2 Publications having impact factor of >5-<7 were included

In Tier 3 Publications having impact factor of >3-<5 were included

In Tier 4 Google searches were included along publications having impact factor <3.

Sample Size

714 articles were being taken from all four Tiers to study the impact assess.

Number of articles about Nielsen in each Tier varied as publications in Tier 4 and 1 published more articles about Nielsen in that particular month.

Analytical Technique

Following set of keywords were used to identify each KPI

1. **Global Provider**: This KPI says that Nielsen is an international firm, or a global or international company.

Keywords: Global, International, Multinational, Transnational, World-wide, at world level, around the globe.

Articles which has mention of above keywords with reference of Nielsen were taken in this KPI.

2. **Insights**: This KPI says that Nielsen is an information or data or insight providing company.

Keywords: Data, insight, information, rating, rank, score, study, research, survey, report, drawing, recommendation, finding.

Articles which has mention of above keywords with reference of Nielsen were taken in this KPI.

3. **Innovation**: This KPI says that Nielsen is a company which promotes innovation or new thoughts and ideas.

Keywords: Innovation, innovative, idea, creativity, young mind, thoughtful, out of the box, creative, new concept, discovery, new thought, new process.

Articles which has mention of above keywords with reference of Nielsen were taken in this KPI.

4. **Consumer study**: This KPI says that Nielsen studies what consumer buy and watch, consumer behaviour, shopping trends etc.

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

Keywords: studies what consumer buy and watch, consumer behaviour, shopping trends, TV ratings, retail, retailer, consumer, consumer confidence.

Articles which has mention of above keywords with reference of Nielsen were taken in this KPI.

5. **Spokesperson**: This KPI deals with official members of Nielsen and statement given by them for Nielsen.

Keywords: Chairman, Vice-President, President, Executive, Analyst, MD, Manager Articles which has mention of above keywords with reference of Nielsen were taken in this KPI.

POPPING IMPRESSIONS MODEL: A META RESEARCH TOO

"Popping Impressions", this model studies the movement of keywords for each parameter e.g. KPI'S in this case in 4 zones:

- 1. **Zone of Popping In:** Here those keywords (along with their numbers or percentage in research) are written which has emerged recently and are likely to get good response in future
- 2. **Zone of Excellence**: This zone deal with keywords with highest popularity. Keywords which draw high attention of readers, these keywords could be new or old.
- 3. **Zone of Popping Out**: This zone tells about keywords which initially had high audience/readers' attention but they faded with time, i.e., their readability and importance degraded quickly.
- 4. **Zone of All Time Favourite**: This is the zone of keywords performing consistently well over decided time frame. They are more stable in nature and do not easily fade with time. In this research, mapping of keywords has been done, for the month of May 2014. All articles were arranged date wise and movement of keywords was studied starting from 1st week of month of last week of month.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Obejctive 1: To assess the level of impact of all Tiers at individual KPI of each particular Tier

Table 1: Case summary for Tier 1: Cross tabulation value is 714 (total no. of articles of all 4 Tiers)

| Case Processing Summary | y |
|-------------------------|---|
|-------------------------|---|

| | Cases | Clases | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|--|--|--|
| | Valid | Valid | | Missing | | | | | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | | | |
| Global Provider Tier 1 * Tier1 | 12 | 1.7% | 702 | 98.3% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| InsightsT1 * Tier1 | 91 | 12.7% | 623 | 87.3% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| InnovationT1 * Tier1 | 20 | 2.8% | 694 | 97.2% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| CST1 * Tier1 | 44 | 6.2% | 670 | 93.8% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| SPT1 * Tier1 | 12 | 1.7% | 702 | 98.3% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |

Table 2: Multiple Value Analysis - Cross tabulations of Categorical (5 KPI'S) Versus Indicator Variables (Tier 1)

Tier1

| | | | Total | Positive | Neutral |
|------------------------------|---------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Global Provider Tier 1 | Present | Count Percent | 12 1.7 | 1 16.7 | 11 6. 5 |
| Insights Tier1 | Present | | 91 12.7 | 2 33.3 | 89 52.4 |
| Innovation Tier1 | Present | Count Percent | 20 2.8 | 2 33.3 | 18 10.6 |
| Consumer Study Tier 1 | Present | Count Percent | 44 6.2 | 2 33.3 | 42 24.7 |
| Spokesperso n Tier 1 | Present | Count Percent | 12 1.7 | 1 16.7 | 11 6.5 |

Table 1 and 2 shows percentage impact which each KPI of Tier 1 puts on Tier Total having total of 714 articles.

KPI-Insights made the **maximum impact of 12.7%** (91 articles) on Tier Total with maximum positive (2 articles) and neutral (89 articles) articles. Consumer study made moderate impact of 6.2%. Impact of Innovation (2.8%), Global Provider (1.7%) and Spokesperson (1.7%) were quite low due to limited article volume.

Total impact made by Tier 1(composed of 5 KPI'S of Tier 1) **over Tier Total** (sum of articles of all the Tiers) **was 25.1%**

Above data proves that Nielsen is being highly considered as information or insight providing company and they have special on consumer surveys about what people buy and watch.

Table 3: Case summary for Tier 2: Cross tabulation value is 714(total no. of articles of all 4 Tiers)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | Cases | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|--|--|--|
| | Valid | Valid | | Missing | | | | | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | | | |
| GPT2 * Tier2 | 3 | 0.4% | 711 | 99.6% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| | 54 | 7.6% | 660 | 92.4% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| InnovationT2 * Tier2 | 5 | 0.7% | 709 | 99.3% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| CST2 * Tier2 | 18 | 2.5% | 696 | 97.5% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| SPT2 * Tier2 | 2 | 0.3% | 712 | 99.7% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |

Table 4: Multiple Value Analysis - Cross tabulations of Categorical (5 KPI'S) Versus Indicator Variables (Tier 2)

Tier2

| | | | | Positive | | Missing |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|-----|----------|------|---------|
| | | | 82 | 0 | 8 | SysMis |
| Global | Present | Count | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Provider Tier 2 | Tresent | Percent | .4 | .0 | 3.7 | .0 |
| Inciabta | Dragant | Count | 54 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Insights Tier 2 | Present | Percent | 7.6 | .0 | 66.7 | .0 |
| Innovation | Present | Count | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Tier 2 | Piesein | Percent | .7 | .0 | 6.2 | .0 |
| Communication | Dungant | Count | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Consumer Study Tier 2 | Present | Percent | 2.5 | .0 | 22.2 | .0 |
| | D | Count | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Spokesperso n Tier 2 | Present | Percent | .3 | .0 | 2.5 | .0 |

Table 3 and 4 shows percentage impact which each KPI of Tier 2 puts on Tier Total having total of 714 articles.

KPI-Insights made the **maximum impact of 7.6%** (54 articles) on Tier Total with maximum neutral (54 articles) articles. Consumer study made moderate impact of 2.5%. Impact of Innovation (0.7%), Global Provider (0.4%) and Spokesperson (0.3%) were quite low due to limited article volume.

Total impact made by Tier 2 (composed of 5 KPI'S of Tier 1) over Tier Total (sum of articles of all the Tiers) was 11.5%

Above data proves that Nielsen is being highly considered as information or insight providing company and they have special on consumer surveys about ratings of T.V. shows

Table 5: Case summary for Tier 3: Cross tabulation value is 714(total no. of articles of all 4 Tiers)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | Cases | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|---------------|------------|----------------|------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | Valid | Valid | | | Total | | | | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | | | |
| GPT3 * Tier3 | 1 | 0.1% | 713 | 99.9% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| InsightsT3 * Tier3 | 77 | 10.8% | 637 | 89.2% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| InnovationT3 * Tier3 | 16 | 2.2% | 698 | 97.8% | 714 | 100.0% | | | |
| CST3 * Tier3 SPT3 * Tier3 | 93 17 | 13.0% 2.4% | 621 697 | 87.0% 97.6% | 714 714 | 100.0% 100.0% | | | |

Table 6: Multiple Value Analysis - Cross tabulations of Categorical (5 KPI'S) Versus Indicator Variables (Tier 3)

Tier3

| | | | Total | Positive | Negative | Neutral | Missing |
|--------------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| | | | | | | | SysMis |
| Global | Present | Count | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Provider Tier 3 | Fiesem | Percent | .1 | .0 | .0 | .6 | .0 |
| | | Count | 77 | 5 | 3 | 69 | 0 |
| Insights Tier 3 | Present | | | 33.3 | | 39.4 | .0 |
| Innovation | Present | Count | 16 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Tier 3 | Pieseiii | Percent | 2.2 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 5.7 | .0 |
| Communication | Descent | Count | 93 | 7 | 5 | 81 | 0 |
| Consumer Study Tier 3 | Present | Percent | 13.0 | 46.7 | 35.7 | 46.3 | .0 |
| | D | Count | 17 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 0 |
| Spokesperso n Tier 3 | Present | Percent | 2.4 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 6.3 | .0 |

Table 5 and 6 shows percentage impact which each KPI of Tier 3 puts on Tier Total having total of 714 articles.

KPI-Consumer Study made the **maximum impact of 13%** (93 articles) on Tier Total with maximum positive (7 articles), negative (5 articles) and neutral (81 articles) articles. Insights made moderate impact of 10.8%. Impact of Innovation (2.2%), Global Provider (0.1%) and Spokesperson (2.4%) were quite low due to limited article volume.

Total impact made by Tier 3 (composed of 5 KPI'S of Tier 1) **over Tier Total** (sum of articles of all the Tiers) **was 28.5%**

Above data proves that Nielsen is performing well on consumer studies especially on Television Ratings & advertisement efficiency

Table 7: Case summary for Tier 4: Cross tabulation value is 714 (total no. of articles of all 4 Tiers)

Case Processing Summary

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------|-----|---------|-------------------|---------|
| | Valid | Valid | | Missing | | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| GP4 * Tier4 | 31 | 4.3% | 683 | 95.7% | 714 | 100.0% |
| InsightsT4 * Tier4 | 54 | 7.6% | 660 | 92.4% | 714 | 100.0% |
| InnovationT4 * | 119 | 16.7% | 595 | 83.3% | 714 | 100.0% |
| Tier4 | 117 | 10.770 | 373 | 03.570 | / 1 1 | 100.070 |
| CST4 * Tier4 | 137 | 19.2% | 577 | 80.8% | 714 | 100.0% |
| SPT4 * Tier4 | 45 | 6.3% | 669 | 93.7% | 714 | 100.0% |

Table 8: Multiple Value Analysis - Cross tabulations of Categorical (5 KPI'S) Versus Indicator Variables (Tier 4)

Tier4

| | | | Total | Positive | Negative | Neutral | Missing |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|-------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | | | | | | | SysMis |
| Global | Present | Count | 31 | 10 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Provider Tier 4 | Fiesem | Percent | 4.3 | 27.0 | .0 | 10.3 | .0 |
| T 114 | D 4 | Count | 54 | 14 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| Insights Tier 4 | Present | Percent | 7.6 | 37.8 | .0 | <i>19.7</i> | .0 |
| Innovation | Present | Count | 119 | 16 | 1 | 102 | 0 |
| Tier 4 | Present | Percent | 16.7 | 43.2 | 8.3 | 50.2 | .0 |
| C | Dungant | Count | 137 | 16 | 1 | 120 | 0 |
| Consumer Study Tier 4 | Present | Percent | 19.2 | 43.2 | 8.3 | 59.1 | .0 |
| | D | Count | 45 | 12 | 0 | 33 | 0 |
| Spokesperso n Tier 4 | Present | Percent | 6.3 | 32.4 | .0 | 16.3 | .0 |

Table 7 and 8 shows percentage impact which each KPI of Tier 4 puts on Tier Total having total of 714 articles.

KPI-Consumer Study made the **maximum impact of 19.2%** (137 articles) on Tier Total with maximum positive (16 articles), negative (1 articles) and neutral (120 articles) articles. Innovation made moderate impact of 16.7%. Impact of Insights (7.6%), Global Provider (4.3%) and Spokesperson (6.3%) were quite low due to limited article volume but their contribution was still remarkable as compared to low performing KPI'S of other Tiers (Tier 1,2 3)

Total impact made by Tier 4 (composed of 5 KPI'S of Tier 1) **over Tier Total** (sum of articles of all the Tiers) **was 54.1%**

Above data proves that Nielsen is making efforts to boost their section of consumer study and innovation by Major projects for Ratings of Daily soaps & reality shows like American Idol (part of consumer studies).

As an innovating company, Nielsen launched a new service measuring Twitter TV demographics and organised innovation breakthrough awards .

OBEJCTIVE 2: To determine the sentiments associated with each KPI Tier – wise

Table 9: Global Provider * Tier 1,2,3 and 4 Cross tabulation (No. of articles) Count

| Count | Count | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------|-------|---|---|-------|----|--|--|--|--|
| | | Tiers | | | Total | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | | |
| Global | POSITIVE | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | | | | |
| Provider | NEUTRAL | 11 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 36 | | | | |
| Total | | 12 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 47 | | | | |

Table 9 shows that **Neutral sentiment** was **highly** attached to KPI Global Provided. This sentiment came out heavily in Tier 4 and moderately in Tier 1

Table 10: Insights * Tier 1,2,3 and 4 Cross tabulation (No. of articles) Count

| | | Tiers | Tiers | | | | |
|----------|----------------|-------|-------|----|-----|-----|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| | POSITIVE | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 18 | |
| Insights | NEGATIV E | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | |
| | NEUTRAL | 90 | 53 | 68 | 106 | 317 | |
| Total | | 91 | 54 | 77 | 119 | 341 | |

Table 10 shows that **Neutral sentiment** was **highly** attached to KPI Insight. This sentiment came out heavily in Tier 4 and moderately in Tier 1

Table 11: Innovation* Tier 1, 2,3 and 4 Cross tabulation (No. of articles) Count

| | | Tiers | | Total | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-------|---|-------|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Innovatio n | POSITIVE | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 13 |
| | NEGATIVE | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| | NEUTRAL | 19 | 5 | 12 | 106 | 142 |
| Total | | 20 | 5 | 16 | 119 | 160 |

Table 11 shows that **Neutral sentiment** was **highly** attached to KPI Insight. This sentiment came out heavily in Tier 4 and slightly in Tier 1 and 3. Tier 4 shows some number for positive sentiment as well.

Table 12: Consumer Study * Tier 1,2,3 and 4 Cross tabulation (No. of articles)

Count

| | | Tiers | | Total | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------|----|-------|-----|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Consumer POSITIVE | | 2 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 22 |
| Study | NEUTRAL | <i>42</i> | 18 | 87 | 123 | 270 |
| Total | | 44 | 18 | 93 | 137 | 292 |

Table 12 shows that **Neutral sentiment** was **highly** attached to KPI Consumer Study. This sentiment came out heavily in Tier 4 and 3, moderately in Tier 1 and slightly in Tier 2. Tier 4 and 2 shows some number for positive sentiment as well.

Table 13: Spokesperson * Tier 1, 2, 3 and 4 Cross tabulation (No. of articles) Count

| | | Tiers | | | Total | |
|------------------|----------------|-------|---|----|-------|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| | POSITIVE | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Spokesperso n | NEGATIV E | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 |
| | NEUTRAL | 11 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 31 |
| Total | | 12 | 2 | 17 | 14 | 45 |

Table 13 shows that Neutral sentiment was highly attached to KPI Spokesperson. This sentiment came out heavily in Tier 1 and 4, moderately in Tier 3 and slightly in Tier 2. From above cross tabs it has been proved that a sentiment trend exist in all KPI'S at each Tier. All KPI'S exhibit maximum of Neutral sentiment followed by Positive sentiment. Deviation from this trend was seen in Tier 4, where Negative sentiment was second highest after Neutral sentiment.

OBEJCTIVE 3: Mapping of keywords, using Popping Impressions Model for each KPI Table 14: Keyword mapping using Popping Impressions Model for each KPI

| KPI'S | ZONE OF POPPING | ZONE OF EXCELLENCE | ZONE OF POPPING | ZONE OF ALL TIME |
|--------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | IN | EACELLENCE | OUT | FAVOURITE |
| Global Provider | Consumer retailer | Survey information, 17% | Global information | Global information and |
| | research measurement, 15% | | company, 4.2% | measurement company, 60% |
| Insights | Ratings, 4.22% | Analysis/Analytics,7.6% Demographic analysis, 5% | Facts 2.9% | Information, 14% |
| Innovation | New product/ newly created, 5% Creator, 6.8% | Change,26% | New Devices, 1.25% | Innovation,34% |
| Consumer Study | Consumer confidence, 6.16% | Consumer retail, 21% | Consumer demographic, 2.73% | Consumer information, 29% |
| Spokesperson | Nielsen VP/Vice- President, 15.5% | Online campaign ratings, 27% | Twitter TV Ratings, 8.8% | Spokesperson, 29% |

Table 14 shows role of keywords in providing high potential viewers of an article. Keywords in Zone of **Excellence and Zone of all-time favourite** should be specifically used by with article/news writers for high viewership. Strong keywords increase the crawling chances of a particular article/news.

CONCLUSION

- 1. Consumer study and insights were the strongest KPI amongst all KPI'S.
- 2. Consumer study became a popular KPI'S due to specific studies of Nielsen like Ratings of Daily soaps & reality shows like American Idol (part of consumer studies).
- 3. Tier 4 (54.1%) made maximum impact on Tier Total due to highest article volume followed by Tier 3(28.5%), Tier 1(25.1%) and 2(11.5%).
- 4. Innovation emerged as stand out KPI in Tier 4 with impact of 16.7% because as an innovating company, Nielsen launched a new service measuring Twitter TV demographics and organised innovation breakthrough awards.
- 5. All KPI'S exhibit maximum of Neutral sentiment followed by Positive sentiment.
- 6. Wise use of keywords increases Viewership of as article. Keywords in fading zone should be constantly replaced by new emerging keywords to keep crawling of articles at a good pace.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. More journal or publications should be identified in Tier 1 and specially in Tier 2 (it has lowest article number) so that they could be contacted to publish about Nielsen, since Tier 1 and 2are of high importance and impact factor (based on viewership, credibility, authenticity and coverage)
- 2. More focus should be laid on innovation as KPI since every data company is being known for its innovations and new data tools. Efforts should be made to make innovation as strong KPI of Tier 1 and 2.
- 3. Trend of Neutral sentiment should be broken down and efforts should be made to increase the number of positive articles in each KPI.
- 4. Factors leading to negative articles should be identified and minimised.
- 5. Popping impressions tool can be explored further for efficient mapping of key words.

REFERENCES

- Shirai, M. (2014) Impact of "High Quality, Low Price" Appeal on Consumer Evaluations. Working Paper #317, Faculty of Business Administration, Yokohama National University, Yokohama.
- Bolton, L.E., Warlop, L. and Alba, J.W. (2013) Consumer Perceptions of Price (Un)Fairness. Journal of Consumer Research, 29, 474-491. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/346244 14, Part 2 of 2, G161-G169.
- Mazumdar, T., Raj, S.P. and Shinha, I. (2005) Reference Price Research: Review and Propositions. Journal of Marketing, 69, 84-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.2005.69.4.84
- Garbarino, E. and Slonim, R. (2003) Determinants and Effects of Distinct Internal Reference Prices on Perceptions and Demand. Psychology & Marketing, 20, 227-249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mar.10069