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| 1 | CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU | 1 | PROCEEDINGS |
| 2 |  | 2 | - - - - |
| 3 |  | 3 | Whereupon-- |
| 4 | In the matter of: ) | 4 | NATHAN NOVEMSKY |
| 5 | INTEGRITY ADVANCE ) | 5 | a witness, called for examination, having been |
| 6 | -------------------------- ) | 6 | first duly sworn, was examined and testified as |
| 7 |  | 7 | follows: |
| 8 | Friday, April 15, 2016 | 8 | EXAMINATION |
| 9 |  | 9 | BY MS. WEINBERG: |
| 10 | Consumer Financial | 10 | Q. Good morning, Dr. Novemsky. |
| 11 | Protection Bureau | 11 | A. Good morning. |
| 12 | 1625 I Street, N.W. | 12 | Q. Am I saying you name correctly? |
| 13 | Washington, D.C. 20006 | 13 | A. You are. |
| 14 |  | 14 | Q. As you know, you are here today for |
| 15 |  | 15 | your deposition. Before we proceed, I just want |
| 16 | The above-entitled matter came on for | 16 | to tell you everybody who is in the room. My |
| 17 | investigational hearing, pursuant to notice, at | 17 | name is Wendy Weinberg. I'm with the Consumer |
| 18 | 9:32 a.m., for the testimony of: | 18 | Final Protection Bureau. With me today are |
| 19 |  | 19 | Alusheyi Wheeler and Vivian Chum. And |
| 20 | NATHAN NOVEMSKY | 20 | representing you today is -- do you want -- |
| 21 |  | 21 | MS. BAKER: Allyson Baker from Venable. |
| 22 |  | 22 | MS. PROFITA: And Hillary Profita from |
| 23 |  | 23 | Venable. |
| 24 |  | 24 | BY MS. WEINBERG: |
| 25 | Reported by: Deborah Wehr, RPR | 25 | Q. Could you please state and spell your |
|  | 2 |  | 4 |
| 1 | APPEARANCES: | 1 | name for the record. |
| 2 |  | 2 | A. Sure. Nathan Novemsky, N-A-T-H-A-N, |
| 3 | ON BEHALF OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION | 3 | N-O-V-E-M-S-K-Y. |
| 4 | BUREAU: | 4 | Q. And your business address? |
| 5 | WENDY J. WEINBERG, ESQUIRE | 5 | A. 165 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, |
| 6 | ALUSHEYI WHEELER, ESQUIRE | 6 | Connecticut, Yale School of Management, 06520. |
| 7 | VIVIAN CHUM, ESQUIRE | 7 | Q. Have you ever been deposed before? |
| 8 | Consumer Financial Protectin Bureau | 8 | A. I have not. |
| 9 | 1625 I Street, N.W. | 9 | Q. Okay. So some basic ground rules. |
| 10 | Washington, D.C. 20006 | 10 | I'll be asking you a lot of questions. You'll |
| 11 | (202) 435-7688 | 11 | be answering a lot of questions today. Our goal |
| 12 | wendy.weinberg@cfpb.gov | 12 | here is to have as clear a record as possible, |
| 13 |  | 13 | which makes it a little different from |
| 14 | ON BEHALF OF INTEGRITY ADVANCE AND THE WITNESS: | 14 | conversations where people tend to sort of |
| 15 | ALLYSON B. BAKER, ESQUIRE | 15 | interrupt each other and there's a natural flow. |
| 16 | HILLARY S. PROFITA, ESQUIRE | 16 | That tends to create a bad record for |
| 17 | Venable, LLP | 17 | depositions. So it's a little less like a |
| 18 | 575 Seventh Street, N.W. | 18 | normal conversation. So I'm going to ask that |
| 19 | Washington, D.C. 20004 | 19 | you let me complete my questions and 1 will do |
| 20 | (202) 344-4708 | 20 | my best, although I will fail at some point |
| 21 | abaker@venable.com | 21 | during this day, to let you complete your |
| 22 |  | 22 | answers before I move on. |
| 23 |  | 23 | If you don't understand any of my |
| 24 |  | 24 | questions, please ask me to clarify the |
| 25 |  | 25 | question. I will do my best to be clear and |

succinct, but I'm sure that there will be times today when our communication isn't perfect. So please let me know if anything $I$ say is unclear to you. If you don't ask for clarification, I'll assume that you do understand the question.

Another thing which is unlike conversation is that gestures aren't recorded. So if $I$ ask you a question and you nod your head, the court reporter isn't going to record that. So I'm going to ask that rather than answering with anything that would include gestures, that you actually verbalize your response.

As I mentioned off the record, if you need a break at any point during the day to stretch or for any reason, please let me know and we'll go off the record. I want you to be comfortable. This could be a long day.

The exception to that is I'm going to ask you not to ask for a break when there's a question pending. There shouldn't be a long delay. And my goal here, as I said is not to make you uncomfortable, but that is the one caveat.

So have you been engaged by the law
firm of Venable in this matter?
A. I have.
Q. Have you ever been hired by that law firm before?
A. No.
Q. And is it your intention to provide testimony in this matter at trial?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's look at your expert report. Is the CV that you provided in Appendix A to your report, is that a complete and up-to-date CV?
A. It is.
Q. When were you hired by Venable in this matter?
A. Around the third week of February. I don't remember the exact date.
Q. And when did you finish writing the report?
A. I believe it was the 25th of March. The date is on the report.
Q. And how long did it take you to write your report?
A. In what sense are you asking how long?
Q. Well, I assume that there was a certain
amount of time that you spent preparing before you started writing?
A. So the total time I spent preparing and writing the report?
Q. How long did you prepare before you started writing? How long did you take to prepare?
A. How many hours you mean?
Q. Yes.
A. I would say around 20,25 hours. I don't remember the exact number.
Q. Okay. And then assuming that your writing took place after your preparation, how long did it take you to write your report?
A. So there was some interweaving, but a total of about 40 hours, including the preparation.
Q. And did you read everything that you included in Appendix D of your report, which was a list of documents?
A. I would not say read. I would say skimmed or read depending on the nature of the document. Some documents I looked at more quickly, some documents more slowly.
Q. Is there anything that you read for
of caution. If you can disclose that information because it wouldn't be disclosing confidential information, to the extent you have been retained in the context of a consultant and that was never made public or that was confidential work product, you can't talk about that. But in other instances when you have been engaged, you certainly can disclose that information to Ms. Weinberg.

THE WITNESS: I don't remember the name of the firm, if that's the question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What was the matter for which you were engaged?
A. The most recent matter for which I was an expert was a defamation case where there was something put into the media and there was a -my expertise was around how people reacted to the statements made in the media.
Q. Did you write an expert report in that matter?
A. I did.
Q. And did that go to litigation?
A. It did not. It did not get to litigation.
them go to litigation?
A. Yeah, many of them went to litigation.
Q. Can you tell me the names of any of those cases?

MS. BAKER: To the extent your involvement in those cases was disclosed, you can. And if it was not, then I would caution you because often the consultants are retained as part of a work product doctrine. That's not something that you can breach.

THE WITNESS: So I don't know that I was revealed in any of those cases.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Have you ever been qualified as an expert in a court or administrative proceeding?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been offered as an expert but not qualified as an expert by a court or an administrative proceeding?
A. No.
Q. What year did you get your doctorate?
A. 2000 .
Q. And what was it in?
A. Social psychology.
Q. And what was the topic of your thesis?
Q. Are there any other instances in which you have been engaged as an expert other than this defamation matter?
A. So I have been engaged many times as part of a team of experts where I'm not the one authoring the report but I'm working with colleagues. One of the colleagues is typically the author on the report. I have done that in many matters.
Q. How many matters would you say?
A. Dozens. I don't have a number off the top of my head.
Q. And so you have never been the author of a report in any of those matters?
A. Correct. In those matters, no.
Q. And what was the subject of those?
A. There are many subjects. False advertising was a big one. Consumer understanding of labels, of products, of claims. That sort of thing was many of them. Often there was a survey involved. So sometimes we were on the side constructing and running a survey or on the side rebutting a survey that had been run. That's a lot of what we did.
Q. And in any of those matters, did any of
A. Decision-making.
Q. In a particular context?
A. It was consumer decision-making. It was in the context of consumer experiences.
Q. Was there a particular type of experience that you were studying?
A. My conclusions were not germane to the experience. We ran experiments which used particular stimuli, but our conclusions were generally about consumer experiences.
Q. Have you ever had an article rejected by a peer-reviewed journal?
A. Yes.
Q. And when was that?
A. These articles were ultimately accepted by journals. So I don't -- remembering the rejection would be a difficult thing. I don't have a date. That's a good question.
Q. What was the article or articles?
A. Material has been rejected by a peer-reviewed journal and then -- I'm trying to think. All of my articles that ultimately were submitted were accepted, but sometimes --
Q. In different journals than the ones you submitted to?
A. Sometimes the same journal; sometimes different journals. It's now part of the game of academia that sometimes you get rejected and then you fix the things they wanted you to fix and then you submit again. You can do to the same journal or you can do to different journals. The history of my submissions of my articles is very hard to recall. So I would be making it up. I don't want to do that.
Q. Have you ever analyzed consumer contracts?
A. Yes.
Q. When?
A. As part of these matters that I was a consultant to experts often had a consumer contract and there was some question of the consumer's understanding of that contract.
Q. Can you be more specific about which matters those were?

MS. BAKER: Same --
THE WITNESS: I guess I would rather not.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Then without naming the matters, can you tell me what your task was in analyzing the
more specific. When you were looking at an ad, for instance, I guess one of your cases involved an ad, what was the survey trying to determine about the ad?
A. It was trying to determine the exact consumer understanding of that ad.
Q. And was the understanding based only on the text or was it based on other things like visual stimuli or --
A. I think I understand the question. So yeah, it was based on anything that was available, if there were visual stimuli, sometimes even maps as part of some of these litigations that involved telecommunications coverage. Then it was based on whatever information was present in the consumer context was attempted to replicate it in the survey. So it could include visual stimuli, yes.
Q. Could it include things like for the ad, was there a particular content in there that you were testing to see what consumers' understanding of that content was? I'm just trying to understand what the work is that you were doing with these ads.
A. Usually there was a particular issue

## contracts?

MS. BAKER: You can disclose that.
THE WITNESS: Sure. So it's an issue of when there's a certain -- you know, certain either disclosure or entire contract, what is the consumer taking away from that contract? What do they understand the terms of the contract to be?

```
            BY MS. WEINBERG:
```

Q. And for that analysis were you looking at the text of the contract or were you looking at other types of variables?
A. Almost invariably we had a consumer survey. Either we would run the survey or the other side would run the survey. Then we would look at the data from the survey.
Q. Was the survey directed at understanding of text or was it looking at other sort of extrinsic variables such as -- well, other extrinsic variables?
A. It would look at whatever -- the target could be a lot of things. The target could be an ad. The target could be a contract. The target could be, you know, whatever is at issue.
Q. Okay. But I'm going to ask you to be
around consumer understanding. So as an example --
Q. Could you be more specific?
A. So one was about cell phone coverage, and so the ad was about cell phone networks. And the question was, what is a consumer's understanding of the extent of coverage after seeing the information, including visuals that was in the ad?
Q. Okay. That's helpful. Can you give me another example of the type of survey work that you were doing in these consulting positions?
A. So some of the survey work was about class certification in some of these consumer matters. So then the question was whether consumers have similar understanding to each other or have the same position vis-a-vis each other and constitute a class or do not constitute a class.
Q. In relation to their understanding of an ad?
A. It could be in relation to their understanding of an ad or a contract. I can't remember the exact materials now. Sometimes that was in relation to a contract.
Q. Can you give me any other examples of the type of work you did as a consultant?
A. So consumer -- just to re-list them in my own head, consumer understanding of ads or contracts, certification of classes related to a consumer matter where the consumers were either similar or different from each other. Those are the broad categories. I can remember the defamation was another one that I mentioned most recently. Those are the classes that come to mind right now, classes of things that I have done.
Q. And in any of those consulting jobs did you not do consumer surveys?
A. I don't recall a matter that did not involve a survey.
Q. Outside of the context of these consulting jobs that you have just referenced, have you done any other research on consumer contracts?
A. I'll take a minute to think about that.
Q. Sure.

MS. BAKER: Can I just ask a question,
Wendy, while Dr. Novemsky is thinking about
this. Consumer contracts, I think you guys are
talking about the same thing, but do you want to just clarify with precision exactly what you mean by that?

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Well, let me ask you, since you have been answering the questions based on my use of those words, what has been your understanding of what a consumer contract is?
A. I'm assuming you mean a written agreement between a consumer and some kind of service or product provider where the consumer often signs and agrees to the terms of a particular contract.
Q. Great. That was my intention.

MS. BAKER: Good. Okay.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. That interrupted your flow of thought. Do you need more time to think about your answer to the question, which was have you ever done research outside of the context of the consulting positions that you just mentioned on consumer contracts?
A. I have done research related to consumer situations where contracts are involved. So many of -- in my CV I list a
number of corporate partnerships. And in those partnerships, I do work on areas where consumers might, as part of their experience, have a contract. So work on consumers' use of credit cards, for example. I don't know if we consider that relevant to a contract. There's certainly a contract in a credit card agreement between a bank and a consumer.
Q. Was your research related to the content of that contract, that credit card contract itself or some other aspect of the relationship?
A. It included every aspect of the relationship, perhaps including the terms of the contract. So it probably wasn't limited only to the contract, but included the terms.
Q. What was the question that you were given to answer?

MS. BAKER: To the extent you can discuss that. And I don't know if you have some kind of NDA, nondisclosure agreement with those companies. And if you do, then what I would -even if you don't, with the absence of knowing that for sure, what I would say is answer Ms. Weinberg's question to the extent you can,
A. It's hard for me to disentangle the product and the contract just based on a financial product...
Q. What percentage of your work would you say was a financial product versus a physical product?
A. Percentage of that particular type of work?
Q. Yeah.
A. I don't know. Maybe a quarter was financial. Twenty-five percent.
Q. And what was the type of financial product that was the subject?

MS. BAKER: That's the caution right there. Just if you can describe it without disclosing something that would give away the nature of the work you have done that I suspect is subject to a nondisclosure agreement, you may do so. But please keep in mind that you do have an NDA and I don't want you to run afoul of that with any of your entities.

THE WITNESS: What I can say is broadly we worked on consumer credit, so credit cards, retirement, and commercial banking products were areas where we did research.
Q. As far as you know, is that form of the contracts that you looked at in Dr. Hastak's report how the contracts appeared to Integrity Advance customers?
A. My understanding is they appeared online. Not in the paper form.
Q. Other than them appearing online, are you aware of any other differences in the appearance of the contracts?
A. No.
Q. And just to make sure that we are completely on the same page on this, so it's your understanding that if you took a printed copy of the contracts that appeared in Dr. Hastak's report and they just appeared on your computer screen, they would look exactly the same as they do other than the fact that you are looking at them on a computer screen?
A. I mean, everything when you translate it to from offline to online changes a bit in out how it appears. But there are no specific differences that I would expect other than that.
Q. Nothing material; is that correct? MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Okay. Did Venable or Integrity Advance give you copies of the contracts that were used with customers of Integrity Advance used by customers of Integrity Advance?
A. Yes. So the loan agreements I did see largely as part of the appendix to Dr. Hastak's report.
Q. Great. And did you look at any other contracts other than those that you have specifically -- contracts between Integrity Advance and these customers other than those that were specifically referenced in your report?
A. Not that I know of.
Q. Are you aware of any other contracts used between Integrity Advance and its customers?
A. I am not, no.
Q. As far as you know, is the form of contracts that were given to you -- and they were given to you by Venable; is that correct? Or you just got them through Dr. Hastak's report?
A. They gave me his report.
Q. Are you aware of any differences at all other than the difference that occurs naturally when any document is viewed on paper as opposed to on a computer screen or a smart phone, I suppose?
A. I'm not aware of any specific
differences other than the translation between offline and online.
Q. Okay. And when you say online, you just mean viewing it on a computer?
A. On a computer or a smart phone or a tablet or digitally, I guess.
Q. Have you ever done research on payday loans?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever done research on payday loan contracts?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any knowledge about the types of people who take out payday loans?
A. I have some from reading relevant to this case, yes.
Q. And what did you read relevant to this case that provided the basis of that knowledge?
A. There are a few academic articles
referenced in my report that talked a bit about who the people were who take out payday loans.
Q. So other than what is cited in your report, do you have any other basis of knowledge about who payday customers are?
A. Just my experiences in the world prior to this matter.
Q. And do you have specific experience with payday loans?
A. No.

MS. BAKER: Something that I want to bring your attention to, Ms. Weinberg, is, I believe, in footnote 2 of Dr. Novemsky's report. And if you want to describe that, there's an additional cite that should be included that was not. We actually have copies of that article if you would like them. It was inadvertently omitted.

MS. WEINBERG: Right now I don't want to take testimony from you, Ms. Baker, but thank you.

MS. BAKER: I'm just telling you that. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. I asked you before if there was anything that you relied on that wasn't in your
study, as this one is, they write several articles on it. I read that article that's cited and I read this article and inadvertently cited that one as having the important -- the thing that's footnoted. Not the correct one, which is sitting on the table now.
Q. Okay.

MS. BAKER: Would you like a copy of it? We brought them along. I don't think it materially changes anything. You are welcome to have copies if you think that that's of use to you.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Other than the surveys that you described in the context of your consulting work, have you done any other consumer surveys?
A. Sure. My research is based largely on consumer surveys. So, yes.
Q. And what is the main area of your research?
A. There are several areas of research that I focus on. Consumer decision-making is one broad area. Consumer experiences is another broad area that I focus on.
report and you said no. Are you changing that testimony at this point to say --
A. So I had a conversation with counsel where they said we are going to add this --

MS. BAKER: We discussed yesterday that this inadvertently had been left out. So we just wanted you to have a copy of the report.

THE WITNESS: So when you asked me what's in my report, I included that. Although it was inadvertently left out, it's been added or being added. So I was under the impression that they had made copies and it was going to be added.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Was that something you relied on in writing your report?
A. It was, yes.
Q. Why wasn't it included in your report?
A. It was an accident because these two authors who wrote this also wrote the article that is in my report. And I ended up citing an article derived from this article, but this is a better citation for that same point from the same people and based on the same data. So they -- often when an academic undertakes a big

## Q. And when you say consumer

 decision-making, can you be more specific about what you mean by that?A. Sure. I study how consumers react to information that's in front of them, what information they use, what information they ignore and then how they go from the information to an ultimate decision.
Q. And the other broad topic that you --
A. Consumer experiences.
Q. And can you be more specific about that?
A. Sure. Consumers experience a product or service or really anything, and then a number of questions arise as to what their memory is of that and how that inputs into future decisions.
Q. And you have published papers, obviously, as noted in your CV. Is it fair to say that the main focus of the papers is the two broad topics that you have just described as the subjects of your research?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there any other types of papers that you have written on different types of subjects?
A. Not coming to mind off the top of my head, no.
Q. So then would it be fair to say that -well, could you characterize your area of expertise, then?
A. Sure. My area of expertise includes consumer decision-making, which I often unpack into some of its parts which include consumer information and processing, consumer experiences. These also impact market research because market research is done with the goal of understanding consumer decision-making. So there are a lot of areas that feed into consumer decision-making that end up being relevant to my research. Consumer psychology is another term for this. Sadly, behavioral economics is another term for this, inappropriately so, I think, but it's the term people tend to use outside of academia. There may be others I'm forgetting. There are a lot of ways to characterize them, but they are all quite related fields. They get different names at different moments but they are all related fields.
Q. Do you have any expertise on the
understanding of the meaning of the analysis that Dr. Hastak undertook around clear and conspicuous disclosures is relevant insofar as it influences consumer understanding of the things that are being disclosed. And so I certainly do have expertise around how consumers form an understanding about information that is disclosed either clearly or unclearly, either conspicuously or inconspicuously.
Q. But then is it fair to say that your specific expertise has to do with how consumers make decisions about information that they read in a document rather than on analyzing a document itself?
A. I think it's all part of the process. I think decision-making, as academics like myself understand it, starts from the moment from what are they exposed to, what experiences do they have in the past, all the way through to what information do they process, what do they remember, what do they understand and then how do they make a decision ultimately. So all of those pieces, I think, fall within my expertise.
Q. So again, I just want to clarify. Am I understanding your testimony correctly to say
clarity of disclosures in written documents?
A. So that is about consumers using information, and I certainly do have expertise about how consumers go from information presented to them to their understanding, ultimately to a decision relevant to that information.
Q. But I want to ask you specifically not about consumer choice or decision-making, but about clarity of disclosures or text in a document.
A. I have to ask what you mean by clarity specifically.
Q. Well, Dr. Hastak's report focused primarily on the clarity, whether certain disclosures were clear and conspicuous.

MS. BAKER: Is there a question pending?

MS. WEINBERG: If you would let me finish, there would be.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So my question is, do you have expertise specifically on whether disclosures in a written document are clear and conspicuous?
A. So as I mentioned in my report, my
that your expertise has to do with consumer decision-making based on either the text of a document or other variables?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Assumes facts not in evidence.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Do you understand the question?
A. No.
Q. It appears -- is it fair to say that your expertise involves consumer decision-making?
A. Yes. And as I -- consumer decision-making is not just the moment of do I chose. It includes the moments of information acquisition, information exposure, memory, experience and all those pieces of the decision-making process. Not just the ultimate decision.
Q. Right. So then what your focus has been is on decision-making, including a consideration of lots of different types of input that a consumer has that go into making a decision, the ones that you have just laid out in your previous statement; is that correct?
A. Yes. Included in that statement was
how they process information that's disclosed to them.
Q. And putting aside the question of how consumers make decisions based upon reading a particular document, just separating the consumers from this experience entirely, have you done -- do you have any expertise on simply looking at a document, cutting out the consumers and analyzing whether a document is conveying a message clearly?
A. I don't think it's meaningful to analyze the conveyance of a message without thinking about the person it's being conveyed to. So it's hard for me to even think about a document conveying a message unless I have some consideration of the person receiving that conveyed message.
Q. So then your context does not include only looking at the document. It only includes how that document would impact a consumer reading the document?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Assumes facts not in evidence. Form.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Is that a correct statement of your
to that document, then you need some consideration of the consumer.
Q. Have you ever done reports about disclosures in documents? Specifically just disclosures?
A. So I'm going to tell you what I think, what I understand by the word "disclosures." Disclosures to me just means communicating information to a consumer. And so, yes, I have certainly done work that involves just communicating information to consumers.
Q. And what work is that?
A. Much of my research is about how consumers respond to information presented. For example, the advertisements work that we talked about earlier, the question there was, when an advertisement is shown to a consumer, what answer understanding do they take away? I consider that of this form.
Q. And have you always -- when you have written those reports, have you always done a survey for those reports?
A. Yes, either done a survey or responded to someone else's survey.
Q. Have you formed any opinions in this
expertise?
A. I'm not sure I understand the statement. Could you repeat it?
Q. Sure. Is it fair to say then that your expertise -- if I understand what you have said, then you don't believe it's possible to separate a document itself outside of a consumer's understanding of that document, an analysis of the document itself?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form.
Compound.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you think it's possible to analyze a document without considering how a consumer would react to that document?
A. That would depend on the goal of the analysis. If the goal of the analysis is ultimately consumers' understanding of what's been disclosed, then you need to think about the consumer. You could analyze the document for other purposes, like is it a nice font, and then you would not need to refer to the consumers. But if you want to analyze a document in a way that has conclusions for how a consumer would understand that document or do anything related

## case?

A. Yes.
Q. What are they?

MS. BAKER: You can answer that if you can remember it.

But I think you have a report from Dr. Novemsky.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I would say there are many and they are in my report.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What would you say your main opinion is coming out?
A. So to be clear, my task about which I formed an opinion was to analyze Dr. Hastak's report. And my main conclusion from Dr. Hastak's report is in the absence of evidence in his report, it's hard for me to see what conclusions in his report about consumer understanding are valid.
Q. Okay. Does your report contain all the opinions that you intend to offer at trial?
A. At this moment it does. If new information comes to light, I might form new opinions. But right now, yes.
Q. What type of new information?
A. I don't know. I just leave open the possibility.
Q. In terms of Dr. Hastak's report, which he has testified -- you've read the transcript, that it's complete, I'm having trouble imagining what type of new information would affect your opinions if what you are responding to is Dr. Hastak's report. Maybe you could tell me what you are thinking about.
A. I don't know. New academic work comes to light on this topic that reveals something about how consumers think about these areas would be one example.
Q. Any other examples?
A. Someone goes and finds consumers who have taken out payday loans and interviews them and gains knowledge about their understanding of various things from that would be another example, I suppose.
Q. So also academic work --
A. Or nonacademic versions of that, yeah.
Q. Such as?
A. If someone were to go and survey consumers. For example, in this matter, if someone decided to run a survey saying, you
Q. The report will be $\mathbf{1}$ and the appendices will be 2 . Does that look like an accurate copy of your report and the appendices?
A. It does.

MS. WEINBERG: So I would like to offer Exhibits 1 and 2 into evidence.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What, if anything, did you do to prepare for this deposition?
A. I reviewed documents in both my report, Dr. Hastak's report and related documents.
Q. Anything else?
A. I met with counsel to talk about what is expected --

MS. BAKER: Don't talk about what we discussed. We met. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. How many times did you meet?
A. Twice.
Q. And how long did you meet?
A. One time extremely briefly. I would say 15 minutes. One time for, I would say, about three hours.
Q. Okay. Did you conduct any studies or surveys on Integrity Advance's disclosures?
know, using aspects of the loan agreement, that would be new information that I certainly would want to see.
Q. Meaning they surveyed consumers who had taken out loans with Integrity Advance?
A. Or other consumers who could be surveyed about these same topics.
Q. The topics meaning the loan agreements with Integrity Advance?
A. Correct.
Q. So other than these two caveats that you have just given, that there might be new literature or research done into payday loans, have you completed your analysis so that the opinions in your report are complete?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I would like to offer your report into evidence. And it is in two separate documents so that the appendix and the report itself are stapled separately. Would you please look at this and tell me if this represents -I'm giving one to the court reporter.
(Novemsky Deposition Exhibit Numbers 1 and 2 were marked for identification.)

BY MS. WEINBERG:
A. I did not.
Q. Did you contemplate conducting any such studies?
A. I did not.
Q. Why not?
A. That was not the task I was given. I was told to analyze Dr. Hastak's report.
Q. So let's turn -- you still have your report in front of you. Let's turn to paragraph 14, which is on page 4 of your report. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Your second full sentence there says, Consumer understanding of the loan agreement is extremely context-dependent.

Is that an accurate reading of your report?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do anything to evaluate the context within which Integrity Advance's customers would understand their loan agreements?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by the term "evaluate."
Q. Did you do any study, any research on
that?
A. Research as to what was the context when they examined the loan agreement?
Q. Yes.
A. I did not.
Q. And why not?
A. It was not my task.
Q. And what sort of variables in this -within this frame of saying that understanding of a loan agreement is context-dependent, what sort of context would be important for understanding, for looking at consumers' understanding?
A. So the things listed in the next sentence in my report would be examples.
Q. So it says, The consumer's current thoughts.

So you didn't look at the consumer's current thoughts here, right?
A. I did not.
Q. In order to do that in this context, would you have had to speak with those consumers at the time that they were taking out the loan agreement?
A. That's one way to do it. I would not
has uncovered. So in order to look at consumers' understanding of Integrity Advance's loan agreements, is it your testimony that a survey should have looked at all of these factors?
A. A survey would do its best to control those factors and to put consumers in a mindset, goals, et cetera, that are similar to how an actual consumer making an actual loan decision would be. So it's not that you need to examine them as much as be aware and control for them typically. In some cases you might examine them.
Q. And how could you replicate the actual experience of Integrity Advance's customers reliably without knowing what each individual was going through at the time they took out the loan?
A. So the scientific method that the field of consumer behavior uses is we put people, similar people in similar situations as well as we -- as similar as possible to the situation of interest to us. We can't always put people in the exact consumer situation and we can't always study the exact consumers. But the scientific
have to. There are other ways.
Q. What else?
A. One could put them in a similar situation again, more similar consumers in a similar situation again, present them with similar context and information and then, you know, ask some questions of them and try to ascertain their thoughts in that context with the loan agreement.
Q. And the other factors that you list here, momentary goals, mindset, level of depletion, what do you mean by level of depletion?
A. Depletion is a psychological construct that's come up about the last 15 years. Research in psychology has shown that people, when they exert -- when they do something they don't want to and they have to exert concentration, for example, sitting in a deposition, over time their ability to exert that same concentration and to resist impulses they might have goes down. That's what I mean by depletion.
Q. And then you list level of distraction and many other factors that behavioral science
community has found ways to draw generalizations from putting similar people in similar situations and then examining them through a survey or other measure and drawing conclusion about how things likely play without in the real situation. And then the peer review process often points out factors that were not controlled for and then they get controlled form. We get as close as possible. It's not a perfect examination, but it's the best that science can do in this area.
Q. But here you didn't do any empirical research on how context would influence consumer behavior for Integrity Advance consumers?
A. Correct.
Q. And does context, as we've just been talking about it, impact the clarity of loan disclosures?
A. Yes.
Q. Context -- it's your testimony that context influences the content of the clarity of the loan disclosures as they appear on a piece of paper themselves?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. That's not quite what he said.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Is it your testimony -- well, why don't you just state how you think context influences the content of a written document.
A. Okay. So this comes back to our discussion earlier. I don't think the clarity of a document is a meaningful construct above and beyond how consumers understand that document. And I do think that consumers' understanding of a document so the clarity with which it conveys a particular message to a consumer or a set of consumers is dependent on the context. That's the sense in which I mean context affects the clarity of documents.
Q. To do a consumer survey of whether consumers understood the terms of the loan, would you need generally to replicate the experience of Integrity Advance consumers?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by the experience of Integrity Advance consumers.
Q. The experience they were having when they took out the loan agreement.
A. You would do your best to replicate all the aspects of the context that you think are relevant to their understanding and decision
A. I don't know offhand. I don't know how it appeared online. If I were running the survey and the original loan document was presented online, I would present it in the survey online if I could.
Q. And what if you didn't know how it appeared online?
A. I would present it as best as I would -- as close to how I think -- I would use everything I know about how it appeared online to make it as similar as possible to how it may have actually appeared online in my survey.
Q. Do you know how Integrity Advance's loan agreements appeared online?
A. I do not.
Q. So you would have no basis for showing it to consumers in one way or another if you were attempting to replicate their experience here; is that correct?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Compound question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. I'm not sure -- if you could repeat the question.
around that loan agreement when you do a survey of them to try to understand their comprehension of the loan agreement.
Q. Would how that loan agreement appeared online be relevant to your ability to do a survey that replicates their experience? MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Could you replicate consumers' experience without knowing how Integrity Advance's loan agreements appeared online?
A. So when you do a consumer survey for the purpose of understanding what consumers take away from a loan agreement, let's say, you do your best to replicate as many aspects of the experience you are interested in as possible. You never replicate all of them exactly. That's generally impossible. But you replicate them as closely as you can given the factors you think are influencing them. And then you draw conclusions based on as near replication as you can do of the experience. It's never perfect.
Q. Do you think that an important variable in consumers' understanding of their loan agreements was how it appeared to them online?
Q. You have just testified that you don't know how Integrity Advance's loan agreements appeared online.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. So here you could not, you would have no basis for showing customers or consumers who were involved in a survey the loan agreements in one format versus another; is that correct?
A. I would glean all the information I could about how they appeared online, for example. If they were signing in certain places online, I would replicate that aspect. If I knew anything else about how the information was displayed online, I would replicate those aspects. So I would use what information I have. It's not no information. Nor is there complete information. So I would use, for example, information about there were points at which the consumer was asked to sign or initial. So I would certainly want to replicate those aspects, for example.
Q. Do you have any information about how that, where consumers signed online in Integrity

Advance's loan agreements, about how that appeared online at the time that they were actually signing the agreements?
A. I don't remember the specifics, but I believe in some of the documents I reviewed there was discussion of where loan agreements were being initialled. I remember Dr. Hastak's report was one place. There might have been others where loan agreements were being signed at particular points in the agreement. So I would certainly want to replicate, let's have them sign again in those same points in the agreement that we know they did in the original situation.
Q. Do you have any information about how that actually appeared to consumers who actually took out loans from Integrity Advance?
A. That is information about how it appeared. If it appeared with a signature box at this point, that's a piece of information I have that I would use in an online survey.
Q. But do you know how the signature box appeared online?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Asked and answered.
A. I have not.
Q. Have you ever studied signature boxes online, in online agreements?
A. I have not.
Q. So your testimony is based on your personal experience with signing documents online; is that correct?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Assumes facts not in evidence.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What is the basis of your testimony about signature boxes as they appear online?
A. Casual observation, personal experiences, but not research.
Q. What kind of casual observation?
A. If I had gone online and seen signature boxes for anything I was doing. I don't remember the specific circumstances surrounding it. It wasn't memorable.
Q. So this is personal experience that you are talking about?

MS. BAKER: Are you finished with your answer?

THE WITNESS: Sure. BY MS. WEINBERG:

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. I would assume it appeared like a standard signature box.
Q. And what is the basis of that assumption?
A. I would look at other signature boxes that appear online for similar contracts.
Q. So you have no basis of knowledge about how it actually appeared for Integrity Advance customers?
A. I would have no knowledge about how it was differentiated from other signature boxes that naturally appear for similar contracts. I wouldn't have specific information beyond that, perhaps.
Q. So in your experience, sometimes signature boxes obliterate text that appears behind them; is that correct?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Assumes facts not in evidence.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Have you ever seen signature boxes that appear online that make the text behind them harder to read?

Advance without knowing how a conversation with an Integrity Advance employee synced with what the consumer is reviewing onscreen?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. I think I have an answer.
Q. You do, you said?
A. Yes. So and this will come back to the answer I gave earlier, in replicating a consumer's experience with any aspects of the Integrity Advance communications, including phone calls or loan agreements, I would use the information I know about what happened before to build as close as possible replication of all the aspects that I have knowledge of. And if I have knowledge of -- detailed knowledge of the phone call, I would use that. If I don't have detailed knowledge of the phone call, I would do my best to use what knowledge I have.
Q. Do you have any knowledge in this case about how a conversation between a consumer and somebody working for Integrity Advance synced with information that appeared online?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by synced
loan agreement.
Q. You said you have no information on the phone calls. So then --
A. Other than the idea that they had the opportunity to ask questions.
Q. Okay. Just so that I can try to convey the question that $I$ was -- I am going to take it outside the context of Integrity Advance. There can be like a TV commercial, right, and the announcer is saying loudly, This is the best bread slicer that's ever been invented and it has all of these wonderful characteristics. And you hear that voice, and at the same time at the bottom of the screen there's text that says, This is a lousy bread slicer and it doesn't have any of these characteristics.

So when I'm talking about syncing the consumer experience with what's happening on the phone, it's similar to what I'm saying about the oral presentation in the commercial as opposed to the text that the consumer may or may not be reading while watching that commercial. Does that make my question any clearer to you?
A. So I think it follows the answer to my previous question, which is I don't know what
with.
Q. So somebody could be looking at -let's take it out of the context of Integrity Advance. There could be -- well, let's keep it in the context. Strike that.

Let's keep it in the context of Integrity Advance. The question is whether you have information about what somebody -- what an Integrity Advance employee was saying, when they were saying that, what a consumer was looking at on the screen. So at the moment that they might have been saying anything, that there would be a particular text on the screen at that moment.

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Compound and vague.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Do you understand the question?
A. I'll give the following answer. I don't know if it answers the question, but I believe it does. I don't know what information was in the phone calls. So I don't know how it relates to what was on the screen. My one understanding of the phone calls is people had the opportunity to ask questions if they were confused about anything that they saw in the
was said on the phone other than consumers had the opportunity to ask questions if they were confused. So I don't know what else I can say.
Q. And you don't know when those conversations happened in relation to whether the consumers were signing the documents or looking at the documents?
A. My understanding is for some of them, I don't know, maybe all of them, that I am not sure, for some of them it was happening concurrent with their deciding whether to sign the document.
Q. Do you have any information about what they were looking at?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. When they were having that conversation?

MS. BAKER: Same objection. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer it.
A. If you could say it in other words.
Q. You've testified that you have some information that consumers could speak with an Integrity Advance representative when they were
signing the loan document; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. If they were confused, is that a correct --
A. They may have -- some, I don't know how many, but some consumers -- my understanding is some consumers spoke with an Integrity Advance representative while signing the loan document. Others may have spoken to them at a later time. I don't know if all of them spoke while signing or if some spoke while signing and some spoke later. That's the extent of my understanding of the timing of the phone call.
Q. Okay. So to the extent we are focusing just on consumers who were talking to a customer service representative at the time they were signing the loan agreement, do you have any information about what the consumers were looking at at the time that they were having the conversation?
A. I understand they were looking at the loan agreement. I don't have more specific information beyond that.
Q. Okay. And you've testified that you have no information on the phone calls. Do you
possible to the actual experience. More information you have is better, but there's no particular piece of information that is necessarily critical.
Q. So the telephonic communications you would not consider critical?
A. No.
Q. No, you would not?
A. No, I would not consider them critical.
Q. And the same question, then, for what was appearing online. Could you replicate consumers' experience with Integrity Advance, I think you have said that you could replicate it looking at other variables if you didn't know exactly what they were looking at online; is that correct, at the time that they were signing the loan documents?
A. I'm sorry, I didn't follow that.
Q. Do you think it would be critical information to have in attempting to replicate the consumer's experience with Integrity Advance to know what the consumer was looking at online at the time that they were signing the loan documents?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague.
have any information about the content of the phone calls?
A. Nothing beyond that consumers had the opportunity to ask questions for clarification of the loan document.
Q. And would that affect your ability to replicate the consumer's experience with Integrity Advance in any survey that you or someone else might choose to do?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. If you can say it in other words, it would help me to answer.
Q. In order to do a survey that would replicate the consumer's experience with Integrity Advance, would you need to know what the customer service representatives were saying on the telephone?
A. You would not need to. The more information you have, the better. As I said earlier, when you build a consumer survey and attempt to replicate an actual consumer experience, you use whatever information you have to build the replication as close as

THE WITNESS: In particular, I'm not sure what you mean by what they are looking at online.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. I'm referring to whatever appeared when they were signing the loan agreement.
A. My understanding is they were looking at the loan agreement online. We know they were looking at the loan agreement online, and I would certainly show them the loan agreement as part of an attempt to replicate their experience.
Q. Could you do that without knowing exactly how it appeared online?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would be the basis for your presenting it to them in one form rather than another form?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. If you were going to offer them -- if you were going to conduct a survey and present a loan agreement to the survey participants online, what would be the basis of your presenting it to them in one format versus

## another format?

A. So the basis would be, A, anything I know about how it was actually presented at the time --
Q. And here do you have any knowledge about that?
A. As I said, we have, for example, knowledge about where they were signing. And my understanding is some of the written -- the printed document that we have does represent some aspects of the original document. For example, there's a TIL box at the beginning and it has a box around it and it has certain fonts and what have you. I would try to replicate using all the information I have. And to the extent there's specific information I don't have, I would fill it in using what is most common practice in that or related kinds of agreements when presented online.
Q. But in this instance, your testimony is that you have no specific information about how it appeared online for Integrity Advance's customers; is that right?
A. As I said, the specific information we have, we have several pieces of specific
information. One example is where it was signed. Another example, there's a TIL box near the beginning. It has a box around it. Certain things were in bigger font. Certain things were in smaller fonts. There's a number of pieces of information we have about how it would appear online.
Q. But do you know what the screen looked like for consumers when they were signing in the signature boxes?
A. I know that it contained the loan agreement that had largely similar representation to what the printed document has.

## Q. And what is the basis of that

 statement?A. My understanding is the printed document was generated by taking the agreement that was actually used and somehow generating an offline version of it. I assume that preserved many of the characteristics of the original document.
Q. What is the basis of your saying that that is how it was done?
A. I was told when I was given the loan agreements, I can't remember who it was from,
counsel or Dr. Hastak's report, I was told that these are paper versions of the loan agreement. And when I hear that, I take that to mean it represents many aspects of the original agreement.
Q. But again, you have no -- is it fair to say you have no specific knowledge of how in practice these loan agreements appeared other than the assumption that you are making based on viewing a printed document?
A. There is the assumption based on the printed document being similar. There's also statements in Dr. Hastak's report and possibly in other materials for this case about where signatures appeared and other particulars about the loan agreement. I would assemble all those particulars, including the printed document, and those are all the pieces of information I would have to generate an online version of the document for purposes of a survey.
Q. And other than Dr. Hastak's report, you said other materials. Can you recall specifically what other materials contain that information?
A. I don't have very specific memories,
materials. Any place I would have seen them, I would draw on those to build an online version of it for purposes of a survey.
Q. And is it fair to say that all of those materials would have been listed in the appendix?
A. It is, to my report.
Q. Appendix $D$ of your report?
A. It is fair to say that.
Q. Could you replicate consumers' experience with Integrity Advance without knowing how many consumers talked to customer service representatives?
A. Yes.
Q. How?
A. As I said earlier, you would use the knowledge you have. If you don't have knowledge about people talking to Integrity Advance representatives, you might not include that in the replication.
Q. And is this because, as you testified earlier, the information in that phone call you don't think is critical for conducting a survey?
A. I believe one can conduct a valid survey without that information.
the interaction between Integrity Advance and its customers occurred, are there any obstacles that you would imagine in trying to replicate their experience in order to do a survey?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you think you would have any difficulties in conducting a survey that would attempt to replicate the experience between Integrity Advance and its customers in originating the loan?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Same objection.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. If I were to perform a survey for the purpose of replicating customers' understanding when originating a loan with Integrity Advance, I would show them all the things that I believe they had seen at the time in whatever context they had seen them at the time and try to draw conclusions from that.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to your report again and look at paragraph 15. You suggest that -- well, I'm going to read the entire
Q. And would it affect your ability to do a valid survey if not every Integrity Advance customer saw a loan agreement when they obtained a loan?
A. Let me be clear about what the purpose of a survey would be. If the purpose of a survey would be to say what do consumers understand when faced with this loan agreement, then I would present them that loan agreement and take some measurements to try to ascertain what it is they understand following viewing that loan agreement. I'm not sure what survey one would be interested in if we thought consumers did not see the loan agreement. So you would have to start with what is the purpose of the survey.
Q. What if the purpose of the survey was to ascertain or find out what consumers understood the terms of the loan would be without looking at the loan agreement?
A. Then I would try to ascertain what is it they are basing their understanding on and replicate that as closely as I can.
Q. Given the information that has been provided to you and your understanding of how
paragraph. Hypotheses or ideas regarding consumers' understanding of the loan agreement could be based on prior research and general expertise and experience, but these hypotheses need to be tested to be considered valid, as would be expected, when submitting such ideas to a peer-reviewed journal for publication in the field of consumer behavior.

Does that accurately reflect the statement that you made in that paragraph?
A. It does.
Q. Do peer-reviewed journals accept articles that are just conceptual rather than empirical?
A. Conceptual articles are generally based on some data, whether it's data presented for the first time in that article or an accumulation or reference to data from other articles. But you wouldn't have a conceptual piece that lives completely independent of the data.
Q. So it's your testimony that peer-reviewed journals do not include articles that are just about theory?

MS. BAKER: Objection --

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Is that correct?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague and assumes facts not in evidence.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What do you mean by conceptual?
A. Remind me where I used the word "conceptual."
Q. Well, I asked do journals accept articles that are just conceptual rather than empirical. How did you understand that term when I used it or when you were answering my question?

MS. BAKER: That term being
"conceptual"?
MS. WEINBERG: Yes.
THE WITNESS: So there are articles that focus on bringing new data to light. That's the vast majority of articles and as a reviewer, the kinds of articles I would be positively disposed to encouraging publication in a journal. There are other articles where bringing new data to light is not the focus of the article, but synthesizing previous data and generating a new concept or theory is how I
A. The paragraph actually continues on the next page, but that's the last line on page 3, yes.
Q. Okay. Correct. I see that. And it says -- it goes on to talk about the need for empirical support. Is that the thrust of that paragraph?
A. The thrust of that -- that's not all the paragraph.
Q. Is there something relevant that I omitted?
A. The paragraph is saying that renewal costs may not be a factor in consumers' decision-making at the time of loan origination is the main thrust of that paragraph. There is no empirical support that indeed they are relevant at the time of loan origination. Those are the two takeaways I have from that paragraph.
Q. And so this is a theoretical framework that is sometimes used to analyze consumer behavior, what consumers are thinking about when they are taking out a loan?
A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. Well, you say there are two lines of
understood your word "conceptual" to mean. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So I want to make sure I understand your testimony. You are saying that -- are you saying that all articles that appear in peer-reviewed journals are based on empirical data either directly or indirectly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Looking at paragraph 13 of your report --

MS. BAKER: And again for the record, his report is Exhibit 1.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Exhibit 1, and it's page 3 of his report. And you say that there is two lines of research that suggest that consumers may not consider renewals when taking out a loan. Is that a fair statement of that paragraph?
A. That is one of the sentences in that paragraph, yes.
Q. Or specifically your last sentence says, There are at least two lines of consumer behavior research that directly suggests that consumers may not be considering renewal at all when taking out an initial loan.
behavior research.
A. Yes.
Q. That consumers may not be considering renewals, right?
A. Yes.
Q. At the time they take out the loan.

And then you cite a couple of articles; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So is it fair to say that these lines of consumer research provide a theoretical framework through which to understand consumer behavior?
A. I'm not sure I would use the word
"theoretical framework." For clarity, those two bodies are referenced in paragraphs 22 and 23, those two lines of research. The first body is in 22; the second body of research is in paragraph 23.
Q. And if you wouldn't use the phrase theoretical framework, what would you use?
A. I would say those are two pieces of scientific evidence that suggest that people -that consumers may not consider renewal costs when originating a loan.
Q. And is there other scientific evidence that consumers do consider renewal costs when taking out loans?
A. I don't have any evidence off the top of my head of that.
Q. Are you aware of any other research other than what you have cited that addresses that question?
A. I have not made the connection to other research that I know as whether it addresses this question.
Q. Have you read any other research on this topic other than what is cited in your report?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. I don't know what you mean by "this topic."
Q. This topic on what consumers consider when taking out a loan.
A. Have I read any other research that's relevant to what consumers consider when taking out a loan?
Q. Yes, other than these two things that
Q. Are you aware of research in your field on the importance of prominence of a disclosure?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of research in your field related to placement of text in a disclosure?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form and vague. Actually, this whole line of questions is vague. If you can answer, go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I don't think the researchers in my field use the framework from the FTC guidelines with words like "placement," "proximity," "prominence," et cetera. And so I don't recall research that's fitting the criteria as you are describing them. It doesn't mean they aren't related, but those aren't terms that I see in the consumer behavior literature. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Setting aside the word choice, are you familiar with research that maybe doesn't use the word "prominence," but deals with how -- I'm having trouble thinking of a good synonym, how boldly or --
A. So I think consumer behavior researchers don't dimensionalize consumer information presentation into those dimensions,
you cite here in the report.
A. Maybe the best answer to this question is how I think about how consumers process information about taking out a loan. I think my conclusions about how consumers process information when taking out a loan are related to my conclusions about how consumers process information when making other decisions as well. It involves principles that have been garnered from past research on consumers' information processing and decision-making. And so lots of research is potentially relevant. But as I said earlier, I have not made a particular connection between a piece of research that I might already know about and how it might bear on this. I made the connection between these two pieces of research when I thought about it, but that doesn't preclude that there might be others.
Q. Prior to reading Dr. Hastak's report, were you aware of the FTC guidelines on clear and conspicuous disclosures?
A. I was not.
Q. Are you aware of other people in your
field using them?
A. No.
whether using those labels or other similar labels. I think we wouldn't imagine thinking about how much prominence is there, how much proximity, et cetera, for the different dimensions. I don't think that's a framework that's applied using those or related words in the academic field.
Q. Okay. This might be a little tedious. I'm going to ask you to bear with me because I want to go through each of these six factors just to make sure we are completely clear. So you've testified about prominence and I think you've also testified about placement, if I'm correct?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Assumes facts not in evidence.

But I mean, go ahead.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Are you aware of research -- you have testified about your awareness of research on prominence of text, using both that phrase and that concept. You said that you are not aware of research on that concept or word. Is the same true for the concept of where text appears, its placement in a document?
A. There is research on where you put text, but it's not where you put it vis-a-vis other text, which is what proximity means.
Q. What about just placement? As you know, Dr. Hastak has six factors that he looked at, prominence, placement, proximity, avoidability, clarity and repetition.
A. I'm sorry. I got confused between placement and proximity.
Q. I'm going to ask you the questions, so we are on the same page here, for all six of these. I think we've gone through prominence. So I just want to move on to what he considers the second factor, which is placement. So my question is, are you aware of research on the importance of placement of text in a document as that concept is described in Dr. Hastak's report?
A. I am aware of research that says you put things -- you put things at the beginning, for example, versus the end of a document. Someone is more likely to read it. That might count -- again, this dimensionalizing in the FTC guidelines is foreign to me, but I'm trying to relate it to what I understand in the research.

And I guess it would be related to research saying that putting something near the beginning is more likely to be read than, for example, putting something near the end of a document.
Q. Are you aware of any other research other than that on the placement concept? MS. BAKER: Objection. Form and vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You can answer.
A. There is research about text being placed at eye level versus not at eye level is more likely to be seen. That may fit the definition of placement. I'm not sure.
Q. So let's move on to Dr. Hastak's third factor, proximity. Are you aware of research that addresses the importance of having text that qualifies a disclosure in close proximity to the actual disclosure itself?
A. No.
Q. What about Dr. Hastak's fourth factor -- I shouldn't say Dr. Hastak. I should say the FTC's fourth factor, avoidability. Are you aware of research on the importance of this factor of avoidability as described in Dr. Hastak's report in consumer understanding?
A. I'm not sure I can map the concept of avoidability as mentioned in his report and in the FTC guidelines to particular constructs. It may be related to some things that are studied, but avoidability, as it's discussed, doesn't correspond to a particular primitive to me that I can map to the research.
Q. And when you say primitive, how are you using that term?
A. A psychological construct that I'm aware of, something that we know affects the psychology of consumers.
Q. And what about the FTC's fifth factor,
clarity, are you aware of any research on the importance of clarity in disclosures to consumers' understanding?
A. Clarity is such a broad and vague term
A. Clarity is such a broad and vague term
that I could connect it to a number of things, I suppose or I could not. Clarity, again, is not -- that concept, as it's described in Dr. Hastak's report, is not used similarly in research that I know. But one could say that some things that are done in research actually do have implications for clarity as he's using it or vice versa, clarity applies to those

$\qquad$
 (
things. But the mapping wouldn't be clear because these aren't terms or even concepts that are typically the way we organize our research in consumer behavior.
Q. Okay. And the final factor in the FTC's guidelines, repetition, are you aware of research --
A. I am.
Q. -- that -- okay. For the record, let me finish the question. Research on the importance of repetition for consumer understanding of disclosures?
A. I am.
Q. And what is that?
A. More repetition is more likely to lead to memory of disclosures. More repetition is less likely to lead to attention to those disclosures.
Q. Could you repeat that, please?
A. Sure.

MS. BAKER: Could you read it back, please, Ms. Court Reporter.
(The record was read as requested.)
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What did you mean by that second
phrase?
A. If you say something over and over again to people, they stop paying attention to it.
Q. But based on your first sentence, they have more memory of it?
A. If you can get them to pay attention to it, then they will have more memory of it. It's a well-known challenge in the marketing literature of how do you repeat something but retain attention.
Q. Do you have an opinion on whether adherence to the FTC guidelines increases the clarity of disclosures?
A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?
Q. Do you have an opinion on whether adherence to the FTC guidelines that Dr. Hastak used in his report increase the clarity of disclosures?
A. I don't have an opinion.
Q. In your opinion, were the costs of loan renewals disclosed in a clear and conspicuous manner in Integrity Advance's loan agreements?
A. To me that's an empirical question
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THE WITNESS: To me the meaning of clarity is would more consumers understand it. And I don't even know how many consumers understand it as it is. So I can't say whether that can be improved.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion on whether a consumer could calculate the cost of loan renewals based on Integrity Advance's loan agreement?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is your opinion?
A. My opinion is that they could.
Q. I'm going to -- let's look at, since you said that you looked at the loan agreements that were appended to Dr. Hastak's report, so let's take a look at those. I'll make this Exhibit 3. And I'm giving you a copy.
(Novemsky Deposition Exhibit Number 3 was marked for identification.)

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. If you could go to the back of the report that $I$ just handed you. This is the complete -- for the record, this is Dr. Hastak's complete report. It does not include all the
which I can't answer without data.
Q. So you have no opinion; is that correct?
A. I have no scientific basis for an opinion. As an expert in consumer behavior, I would have no basis for a scientific opinion. I might have my personal thoughts and feelings, but I know they don't correspond to the consumers necessarily.
Q. You've established that you didn't do any empirical research here. And putting aside your personal views, based on your professional expertise, do you have any opinion on whether the loan renewals were disclosed in a clear and conspicuous manner?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Asked and answered.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You are shaking your head no.
A. I said no and I continue to say no.
Q. Okay. Do you have any opinion on
whether the disclosures could have been clearer on the cost of loan renewals in Integrity Advance's loan agreements?

MS. BAKER: Same objection.

MS. WEINBERG: These are redactions.
MS. BAKER: Okay. That was my question. Thank you.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Anyway, I think we are all potentially on the same page here. So let's just look at the first loan agreement here which, for the record, appears as CFPB042566 through 042575.
A. Yep.
Q. You have it, okay. So if a consumer chose to roll over their loans, this particular consumer who had an amount financed of 500 and a finance charge of 150 , what would the cost of the renewals have been for that consumers?
A. Each renewal would cost 150.
Q. And what would be the total cost if the consumer went through the auto renewal and auto workout process?
A. It would take me a few minutes to calculate that.

MS. BAKER: Are you asking the witness to calculate the cost of renewals based on his review of this document? I'm not sure I understand --

MS. WEINBERG: Yes.

MS. BAKER: Do you have a calculator? BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. In so doing it, if you could tell me what you are doing to make that calculation?

MS. BAKER: Do you have a calculator?
MS. WEINBERG: No, I don't have a calculator.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Would you need a calculator?
A. It will take me a while without one. I will have to sit with pencil and paper.
Q. Do you want some paper and pencil?
A. I would need that if I were to do that.

MS. BAKER: Let the record reflect that Ms. Weinberg has asked the witness to engage in addition, subtraction calculations without a calculator for some inexplicable reason.

Please go ahead.
MS. WEINBERG: Thank you for that unnecessary characterization. I think the record was perfectly clear about what I was asking Dr. Novemsky to do.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Here is a pen and it is, for the record, 11:26, I believe.

MS. BAKER: So you are asking him to do math.

MS. WEINBERG: Yes.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. You have a degree in mathematics?

MS. BAKER: I know he does. I wasn't suggesting he couldn't.

THE WITNESS: I can. It will take me a few moments.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What is the degree that you have mathematics?
A. My undergraduate degree is in psychology, physics and mathematics.
Q. And where was that undergraduate degree from?
A. Wesleyan University.
Q. Do you have any degrees in mathematics post college?
A. No.
Q. But you were a triple major?
A. I was.
Q. You were busy. So yes, I am going to ask you to calculate what that would be for this consumer.

MS. BAKER: Are you finished?
THE WITNESS: I am.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. For the record, it's now 11:30. And could you tell me, could you state for the record what you did to calculate the costs of renewals for this consumer?
A. I started with the payments that would occur during the initial period and for auto renewal periods.
Q. And what were those payments?
A. The payments would be 150 for five times at the end of period one and then the four auto renewals. So five times 150 for a total of $\$ 750$ in payments. Oh, I didn't realize I made an error which I have fixed.
Q. Did you want to correct something?
A. No, what I said was correct. I was looking ahead. By saying that, I looked ahead and realized I needed to fix something.
Q. So you started by saying you started with the cost of --
A. The cost of the first period is a $\$ 150$ finance charge. That would be paid at the initial due date. $\$ 150$ would be paid at the end
of auto renewal one, two, three and four for a 2 total of five payments of $\$ 150$ or a total of $\$ 750$ in payments.
Q. Did you do any further calculations after that?
A. Sure. Then after that we go into auto workout. At auto workout, at the end of the first period you pay the same finance charge of 150 , but you also pay $\$ 50$ in principal. In the next period your principal is now not 500 but 450. And so at the end of that period you would pay a reduced finance charge on the 450 which is 135 , $\$ 15$ on every $\$ 50$ or $\$ 30$ on every 100 plus the $\$ 50$ principal payment.
Q. So just to break that down so I'm clear, to make that calculation, you took -- you had to calculate a new finance charge?
A. As the principal reduces, the finance charge also reduces, correct.
Q. And to get that number then you had to do what to get the new finance charge? What was the calculation you had to do?
A. It's $\$ 30$ for every hundred. So you multiply the principal remaining by $\$ 30$ for every hundred or point-3.
Q. So I'm sorry, please continue with how you made your calculation.
A. So at the end of auto workout period one, they pay 150 finance plus $\$ 50$ principal for a total of 200. At the end of auto workout period two, they pay $\$ 50$ principal plus 135 in finance charges and so on with the finance charge going down by $\$ 15$ every period. As the principal is reduced by 50 , the finance charge goes down by 15 until the principal reaches zero, which looks like approximately ten auto workout periods.
Q. And the total amount that you say this consumer would have paid if he or she had gone through the renewal and auto renewal and auto workout?
A. Is $\$ 2,075$.
Q. And what was the error you made initially when you were doing this calculation?
A. I had them pay the principal twice. When I thought about the end of the five auto renewals, I thought he paid the principal. But the principal remains and is paid through the auto workout. So I added in the principal twice and I shouldn't have.
Q. Do you have an opinion -- and as far as you know, was that cost, $\$ 2,075$, do you have an opinion about whether it would have influenced consumer behavior to disclose the cost of going through the auto renewal and auto workout process more clearly in the document? So in other words, for this consumer if it said somewhere if you go through auto renewal and auto workout, the cost will be $\$ 2,075$, do you think that would have influenced consumer behavior if that information appeared in addition to the cost of a single-payment loan?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Compound question and a vague question. Form.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. No. The clarity I would need is exactly how it's said. That could be described to consumers in a variety of different ways. And depending on how you describe it, it may or may not have a positive or a negative influence on a consumer's decision to take out this loan.
Q. And under what circumstances would you think it would have an influence on consumers' decision to take out a loan?
communication of that that would influence how consumers are affected by it. And there are many possible examples of that. So I would have to think through which examples might possibly have a particular influence. That would be an exercise I would have to spend time engaging in. I don't have a simple answer to that question. It's a complex question.
Q. Well, let's take a discrete scenario, then. What if right under the TILA box it said, you know, as the TILA box said what it says here, your APR is this, your finance charge is this, your amount financed, total payments for a single payment loan and then it had the same information on APR, finance charge, amount financed and total payments for a complete auto renewal scenario. Auto renewal, auto workout scenario that you have just calculated would have been $\$ 2,075$ for this consumer. Do you have an opinion about whether that would have influenced consumer behavior?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Compound question.

THE WITNESS: I don't have an opinion because I don't know that they would understand
that.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Why wouldn't they understand that?
A. As I state in my report, consumers are focused on the here and now, by and large. I don't know when you say complete auto renewal and auto workout, they would read those words and may or may not think through what the implications of those are for them.
Q. Do you have an opinion about whether it would have affected consumer behavior to put the cost only of the full auto renewal and auto workout cost of a loan with Integrity Advance in the TILA box rather than the cost of a single-payment loan?
A. Again, it would depend on how you represent it in the TILA box. I can't answer that in the absence of a particular instantiation of the TILA box.
Q. What if for this loan -- and you have the calculations, I don't, but let's just assume it said finance charge here -- well, let's just say the total payments box, which is the only number that $I$ have based on your calculations, said $\$ 2,075$ instead of $\$ 650$ and that the other
numbers corresponded with the correct mathematical calculation of the cost of auto renewals?
A. If you gave them the same box and changed the total payments and other numbers, particularly the finance charge, that might have an effect on consumers, sure.
Q. What effect do you think it might have?
A. They would find the loan in likelihood less attractive if you said the total payments were $\$ 2,075$ instead of $\$ 650$.
Q. Let's go back to your report.

MS. BAKER: Just for housekeeping purposes, it's 11:45. Can we break for lunch at noon or maybe even a little before noon since we've already been going about an hour?

MS. WEINBERG: You want to go until noon?

THE WITNESS: Noon sounds fine for me. MS. BAKER: If that works for you, Wendy.

MS. WEINBERG: That's fine.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So let's look at paragraph 21 of your report, which is on page 6 of your report. And
paragraph in the second column on that page, you say, Evaluating opportunity cost requires consumers to consider outside options that are not explicit components of a purchase decision.

Then the second sentence, which is the one I'm going to ask you to focus on here, you refer to much psychological research showing that judgments and preferences are based primarily on information that is explicitly presented. Do you see that sentence?
A. Um-hum.
Q. Can you describe the psychological research, the judgments about judgments and preferences being based on information that's explicitly presented?
A. That's a very broad statement deriving from a broad set of studies, but a summary of it might be people pay attention to what's in front of them and tend to ignore things that aren't in the immediate environment even if those things are very relevant to the decision at hand.
Q. And taking us back to the context of Integrity Advance's loan agreements, would you agree that what's explicitly presented in terms of the cost of the loan is the cost of a
Q. What does explicitly presented mean as --
A. Explicit -- sorry.
Q. As used in this article?
A. Explicitly presented means the information is in front of you in the present environment. The contrast drawn in this article is to things that are not presented, for example, opportunity costs. If I don't spend my money on the stereo that I'm staring at, what else could I spend my money on? Those options are not in my current environment. I would have to bring them to mind spontaneously myself.

In the loan agreement, renewal, auto workout, all finance charges are explicitly mentioned. There's nothing that you have to bring to mind from your own experience or past or future behavior as you would in -- that the article is referencing.
Q. And it's your testimony, is it your testimony that renewal costs are explicitly presented even though it took you four or five minutes to calculate the cost?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the other psychological research
single-payment loan without rollovers?
A. I think -- no, I would not agree with that.
Q. Why not?
A. I think the loan agreement presents the costs of auto renewal and auto workout as well.
Q. And it's your testimony that that's explicitly presented?
A. It is. That's how I made my calculation, for example.
Q. But nowhere in that loan agreement was that $\$ 2,075$ cost explicitly presented, was it, in the agreement that you were just looking at?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form.
Compound. Vague.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Is it your testimony that the cost in this instance, as you have calculated, $\$ 2,075$, for the cost of going through auto renewal and auto workout was explicitly presented in the loan agreement?
A. Yes. There's a confusion between explicitly presented and presented in sum. The sum is not presented, but the parts of it are explicitly stated in the loan agreement.
that you refer to here, is that also how they are using the phrase "explicitly presented"?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you know the meaning of the term "explicitly presented" in the other psychological research that you reference in the sentence that we have been talking about?
A. I don't know whether they use that specific term. We are characterizing their research using that term. And our characterization of that term is explicitly presented means the thing you are talking about is in the present environment explicitly. It is not something you have to pull from some other environment, as I said, from your memory, past experiences or something else.
Q. I would ask you to turn to the second page of this article which, for the record, is Opportunity Cost Neglect of which you are one of the authors. On page 554, second paragraph -second column, first full paragraph at the top of the page, the first full sentence ends, Preferences shift towards cheaper options when
the price difference is made explicit even without mentioning other purchases. Can you explain what that means?
A. Let me read it for a second.
Q. Sure.
A. Sure. So if you mention -- so without context, this won't make sense. So I'll give a bit of context.
Q. Thanks.
A. If you talk about buying -- so in study 1, buying a DVD for 14.99, you can label the options as buy or not buy. And you can also label the options as buy or keep the 14.99 for other purchases. The latter is referred to in this phrase an option described as keeping the money for other purchases. What that does is that shifts preferences towards cheaper options when the price difference is made explicit. So I realize I have given a bad example because it doesn't shift towards cheaper items. It shifts towards not buying.

But in some cases referenced in that sentence you can buy the more expensive item or buy a cheaper item. For example, in Figure 2 -MS. BAKER: Where are you looking?

THE WITNESS: This is on page 555. At the bottom there's a box labeled Figure 2. There are two options, one option for \$399; another option for $\$ 299$ or the option not to buy.

If you add the explicit difference in price, that parenthetical remark, leaving you the $\$ 100$ in cash, which was presented to some participants but not others, when you present that, you tend to push people towards option B, the cheaper option and away from option A. So you shift preferences toward the cheaper option when you make the difference in costs explicit, meaning you write it on the page as opposed to not writing it on the page.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you agree that the price differences between rollovers and single-payment loans was not made explicit in Integrity Advance's loan agreements?
A. Sorry, say that again.
Q. The price difference between rollovers and auto renewals and single-payment loans was not made explicit in Integrity Advance's loan agreements as the phrase "explicit" is used in
here?
MS. BAKER: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Any implication is too vague for me. I'm not sure what you are asking me.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Would influence consumer behavior in choosing to take out the loan?
A. I don't know if it would because as I said in my report, I don't know that renewal was relevant to them when choosing to take out the loan. So the difference between price of renewed and unrenewed loans is not -- may not be on their minds when they are choosing do I originate this loan or not.
Q. You don't know that it was on their -you are saying you have no basis for knowing whether it was or wasn't on their minds?
A. I have cited research that suggests it might not be. We referred to that earlier in my report. So I have some basis for thinking maybe it wasn't, but without data, I can't say for sure whether it was or it wasn't. But I have some reason to believe it might not be. I have a hypothesis that it was not. That's

|  | 105 |  | 107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | unconfirmed. | 1 | AFTERNOON SESSION <br> (12.57 pm) |
| 2 | Q. And I just asked you this question | 2 |  |
| 3 | about whether making the price difference | 3 | MS. WEINBERG: So we are back on the |
| 4 | explicit in the loan would have affected | 4 | record at 12:58. I wanted to start by, I wanted |
| 5 | consumer behavior in terms of choosing the loan. | 5 | to have Dr. Novemsky's calculations marked as an |
| 6 | I want to ask you the same question in terms of | 6 | exhibit and entered for the record. |
| 7 | whether you think it would have affected | 7 | (Novemsky Deposition Exhibit Number 5 |
| 8 | consumer behavior in terms of understanding the | 8 | was marked for identification.) |
| 9 | loan. | 9 | BY MS. WEINBERG: |
| 10 | MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague | 10 | Q. Dr. Novemsky, are you aware of any |
| 11 | question. | 11 | research that shows that costs aren't important |
| 12 | BY MS. WEINBERG: | 12 | to consumers when they are borrowing money? |
| 13 | Q. Do you understand the question? | 13 | A. Costs aren't important to consumers, |
| 14 | A. I'm not certain I do. | 14 | no, I'm aware of no research that makes that |
| 15 | Q. Okay. The question is whether if | 15 | specific conclusion, no. |
| 16 | Integrity Advance's loan agreements had | 16 | Q. Do you think that this is a proposition |
| 17 | explicitly set forth the cost of single-payment | 17 | that requires research or is it the type of |
| 18 | and auto workout and I think, if we understand | 18 | proposition that could be accepted on its face? |
| 19 | auto workout, would mean the full calculation | 19 | MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague. |
| 20 | that you just did where somebody takes the full | 20 | THE WITNESS: I think it requires |
| 21 | renewals and auto workout options that are | 21 | research. |
| 22 | available under the loan, if they had been | 22 | BY MS. WEINBERG: |
| 23 | explicitly presented, both of those costs, that | 23 | Q. Okay. You are just not aware of any |
| 24 | it would have influenced consumer behavior in | 24 | research on that topic? |
| 25 | understanding the loan agreement? | 25 | A. Correct. |
|  | 106 |  | 108 |
| 1 | A. I don't know. I don't know if it | 1 | Q. Do you have an opinion on whether costs |
| 2 | would. It's an empirical question. | 2 | would be important to consumers who utilize |
| 3 | Q. Okay. | 3 | payday loans? |
| 4 | MS. BAKER: Is this a good time for you | 4 | A. I don't have an opinion on that, no. |
| 5 | to break? It's up to you. We can go a few more | 5 | Q. Let's go back to your report which, |
| 6 | minutes if you would like. | 6 | again, is Exhibit 1, paragraph 22, which is on |
| 7 | MS. WEINBERG: We could break. It's | 7 | page 7. Okay. And in there you say, There's a |
| 8 | five of. | 8 | body of research that finds that consumer |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: That's fine with me if | 9 | decision-making is driven much more by cost and |
| 10 | you are not in the middle of something. | 10 | benefits that are immediate compared to benefits |
| 11 | MS. WEINBERG: I am, but it's nothing | 11 | that are further away in time. |
| 12 | critical. | 12 | Is that a correct statement of what's |
| 13 | (Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., a lunch | 13 | in your report? |
| 14 | recess was taken.) | 14 | A. It is. |
| 15 |  | 15 | Q. Do you have an opinion on whether |
| 16 |  | 16 | clarity of disclosures on costs that are further |
| 17 |  | 17 | away in time would improve decision-making for |
| 18 |  | 18 | consumers choosing to take out a loan? |
| 19 |  | 19 | A. I do not. |
| 20 |  | 20 | Q. So sticking with paragraph 22 that we |
| 21 |  | 21 | were just talking about, you are talking about a |
| 22 |  | 22 | body of research on what consumers find |
| 23 |  | 23 | important. Is that a correct statement? |
| 24 |  | 24 | A. Not exactly. |
| 25 |  | 25 | Q. Tell me how I erred in that. |

A. I would say it's a body of research about how consumers consider things that are in the here and now versus things that are distant in time.
Q. So that's one conceptual way of looking at how consumers make decisions. Is that a correct statement?
A. Sure.
Q. And you didn't do any research here to apply this framework to the specific consumers who would have been taking out Integrity Advance loans; is that right?
A. I did no research with respect to Integrity Advance loans, that is correct.
Q. Does this conceptual framework about benefits that are immediate compared to benefits that are further away in time consider the clarity of loan disclosures?
A. No, they don't.
Q. Does this conceptual framework impact an analysis on the clarity of disclosures?
A. They may insofar as the impact, someone's motivation to process those disclosures. As I said earlier, the clarity of a disclosure is related to the consumer trying
are further away in time have any impact on an analysis of the clarity of loan disclosures?
A. As I said a minute ago, when I think about the clarity of loan disclosures, I can't separate that from the person reading it in the context in which it's being read. So if the loan disclosure is about something happening at a certain point in time, then this theory and framework do speak to it.
Q. Let's move on to paragraph 23 of your report.
A. Okay.
Q. And is it a fair summary of that paragraph to say that consumers might not consider renewal costs because they are optimistic about their future?
A. That is a fair summary.
Q. It's also -- is it also possible that they might consider renewal costs?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Do you have an opinion on whether this potential optimism makes it important to disclose costs of renewals in order for consumers to understand the consequences of taking out a loan?
to understand it. If it's further away in time, the consumer will have less motivation to understand it. So it may seem less clear in the sense that it may have a harder time getting through the customer's understanding.
Q. And if the analysis were limited to the clarity of a specific document, not the consumer's understanding of it, and I understand we have been back and forth on this -- you say that it's difficult to disentangle those two, but if you could disentangle those two and limit the analysis just to what a document says, would this conceptual framework impact the analysis on clarity? This conceptual framework being the one we've just been talking about, about immediate benefits versus benefits that are further away in time.

MS. BAKER: Objection. Compound. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. It was a long question.
Q. Yes, it was a long question. Let me try and make it shorter. Does this theory that we have been talking about in paragraph 22 that compares immediate benefits versus benefits that
A. I don't have an opinion on that in the absence of data, no.
Q. So in order for you to apply this framework, you would have to do -- you or someone would have to do a study. Is that a fair statement?
A. That is a fair statement.
Q. Does this theory about consumer optimism consider the clarity of loan disclosures?
A. No. It's a much -- no.
Q. In paragraph 25 , you say -- well, on page 8, which is sort of the middle of your paragraph 25, you say, It could be that consumers find loan renewal option despite its costs not to be a deterrent to accepting Integrity Advance's offering.

Do you see that sentence?
A. I do see that sentence, yes.
Q. Is it also true that it might not be that consumers consider -- might it be true that the inverse is true on that sentence?
A. Yes.
Q. And in order to know which statement of that sentence was true, is it fair to say you
would have to do empirical research?
A. That's what I would say, yes.
Q. And again, to beat that dead horse, you didn't do empirical --
A. I did not do empirical research.
Q. And does this theory consider the clarity of loan disclosures?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. The theory that consumers find the loan renewal option despite its costs not to be a deterrent to accepting Integrity Advance's offering.
A. I would say this conjecture about what consumers might feel about loan renewal is not relevant to clarity.
Q. Okay. And was there any basis for this conjecture in your report?
A. Yes. It's listed in the following paragraphs.
Q. Okay. And those are the -- okay. Can you be more specific about which paragraphs you are referring to?
A. I can. Give me a moment to review them.

MS. BAKER: To the extent you can answer the question without disclosing something covered by an NDA, please do so.

THE WITNESS: I will try to. I'm thinking that through. We talked about -- so for certain companies who regularly send e-mail to their customers, we talked about ways and we, in fact, studied ways to -- we tested certain e-mails, formats of e-mails, wording of e-mails, wording of e-mail subject lines, time of day of e-mails and other factors that would increase or decrease the likelihood that a consumer would read that e-mail from their service provider.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. And do you know the percentage of people that read e-mails from commercial sources?
A. No.
Q. And you very quickly listed a bunch of factors that influence whether people read e-mails. To be honest with you, I didn't get them all but they are in the record. Other than those factors that you just recited, are there any other factors you can think of?
A. My memory is only as good as yours, I'm

## Q. Sure.

A. I believe it's everything from that paragraph through to paragraph 33 on my quick looking.
Q. So 26 through 33 is what you are --
A. I think that's right.
Q. In paragraph 26 you refer to a welcome e-mail and another e-mail that you describe as a reminder e-mail; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you have any expertise on whether consumers read e-mails?
A. I have expertise relevant to whether consumers read e-mails, yes.
Q. And what is your relevant expertise?
A. I have understanding of some of the factors that might drive whether consumers read an e-mail or not.
Q. Have you done research in this area?
A. I have worked on projects with some of the corporate partners of the Yale Center For Customer Insights on issues that are relevant to customers reading e-mails, yes.
Q. Can you be more specific about what that research is?
afraid.
MS. WEINBERG: Could you read back what he said, please, on the factors.
(The record was read as requested.)
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So you said subject line, time of day were the two ones that you explicitly mentioned?
A. There was content.
Q. Content of the e-mail itself?
A. There was framing, I think, of the e-mail.
Q. And what do you mean by framing?
A. The words that are used. You can talk about something as avoiding a loss versus approaching a gain. And people -- the same content can be described in either of those frames and it changes someone's propensity to read it. That's one example of framing, but there are lots.
Q. And does the question or the concept of framing have any relevance to Integrity Advance's e-mails?
A. I would have to review their e-mails.
Q. The e-mails are part of your report in the appendix. And for the record, it is

Appendix B and Appendix C of Dr. Novemsky's report. And these are the two e-mails that you were referencing in your report; is that accurate?
A. Yes. Can you repeat the question?
Q. Does the concept of framing have any relevance for Integrity Advance's e-mails? And again, referring specifically to Exhibit $B$ and C.
A. When you say have any relevance, what are you asking me?
Q. Well, what you specifically said about framing is that it can have an impact when you talk about avoiding loss or potential gain. Is that an accurate restatement?
A. That's one version of framing, yeah.
Q. Is there anything in these two e-mails that either talks about avoiding loss or potential gain that would make the concept of framing relevant?
A. The concept of framing is broader than just losses and gains. That's an example of one way to reframe something. There are many ways to reframe something. One could reframe really any communication from anyone. And if you use a
Q. Okay. I think that was my question. So without doing an empirical analysis, you couldn't --
A. Without doing an empirical analysis, I wouldn't have a conclusion to draw about how many people read these e-mails.
Q. Okay. Thank you. In paragraph 26, can you tell me what -- you write -- the last sentence of that paragraph you say, These two e-mail messages, and again I think you are referring to your Appendix $B$ and $C$, clearly bear on a customer's knowledge at the time they choose to renew their loan.

Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. And what is the basis for that statement?
A. These two e-mail messages provide clear information about loan renewal and they were received prior to loan renewal. And so it is likely the case that they influenced consumers at the time of their choosing to renew their loan.
Q. And what is the basis of your statement that they were received prior to renewal?
different frame on something, you can make it more or less likely to engage the person receiving it.
Q. Okay. So we've talked about subject line, time of day, content and framing. Are there any other factors that come to your mind about whether -- that influence whether people read e-mails?
A. Sure. The nature of the service being provided, the level of perceived risk, the importance, the monetary value of the thing being mentioned. I'm sure there are more if I had more time to think.
Q. And did you analyze any of these factors that you have mentioned, nature of service, risk, value, subject line, time of day, content, framing, in relation to Integrity Advance's e-mails?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by analyze. If I --
Q. To see whether these e-mails would have been more likely to be read or not.
A. That wouldn't be the way I would answer the question, how likely they would be read. I would answer that question empirically.
A. My understanding is that the welcome e-mail is sent out upon or within shortly after loan approval. So that would certainly be prior to loan renewal. And my understanding is that the reminder e-mail is sent a few days before loan renewal would be possible or before the first due date.
Q. And is this from information that you obtained from counsel or from Integrity Advance?
A. Or one of the many documents that I looked at. I can't remember the source now.
Q. But to summarize your previous testimony, and tell me if I'm wrong, I'm sure you will or I'm sure your counsel will, you don't have any opinion on whether consumers actually read these e-mails because you -- is that correct?
A. I don't have any opinion on how many consumers read these e-mails, that is correct.
Q. And you said that the information in these e-mails is clear. Is that a correct statement?
A. I may have. What I was saying was the material in these e-mails is clearly relevant to the loan renewal.
Q. I see. So you weren't making a statement about the content of the e-mails?
A. I was making a statement that the content of the e-mails is relevant to loan renewal.
Q. But you weren't talking about clarity of disclosure in that?
A. I wasn't talking about clarity in the way that Dr. Hastak talked about clarity.
Q. And do you have any knowledge about whether consumers received any e-mails before they signed the loan documents?
A. I don't have any knowledge about that.
Q. And just to clarify, when you said you have no knowledge about when they got that e-mail, were you referring to both e-mails, Exhibit B and Exhibit C?
A. I don't think that's --

MS. BAKER: Objection. That assumes facts not in evidence. That's not what he said. MS. WEINBERG: Could you read back the answer prior to this.
(The record was read as requested.)
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So what was your assumption about when
customers received the welcome e-mail?
A. My understanding was that customers received the welcome e-mail shortly after being approved for the loan.
Q. And what is your understanding about how that occurred in relation to the signing of the loan documents?
A. I would presume that approval occurs after signing of the loan documents.
Q. Okay. And just to be clear, when we say loan documents, we are talking about the loan agreement that is in Dr. Hastak's report as exhibits --

MS. BAKER: If you can clarify what you mean by loan document.

MS. WEINBERG: That's what I'm trying to do. The two loan agreements that are in Dr. Hastak's, and they are B and C.

MS. BAKER: So would you mind re-reading Ms. -- reading back Ms. Weinberg's last question given her clarification just now, please. I assume that's the question pending?

MS. WEINBERG: I don't think there's a question pending.

MS. BAKER: I'm sorry. Never mind,
then.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. My only question was to try to clarify that the loan agreements that we were talking about, the ones that were in Appendix $B$ and $C$ of Dr. Hastak's report.

MS. BAKER: Could you read back the last three questions that were asked and the answers that were given, please. I want to make sure I have a clean record here.
(The record was read as requested.)
MS. BAKER: Are you okay with those answers, given the clarification with the documents? I just want to make sure because we were talking about documents, and it wasn't clear what documents we were discussing.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. What is the basis for your assumption about the timing of the welcome e-mail?
A. I was either told by counsel or it was in one of the documents I reviewed.
Q. Okay. And I want to ask you these same questions about the reminder e-mail. What were your assumptions about when consumers got the
reminder e-mail? And for the record, the reminder e-mail is Exhibit $C$ in your report; is that correct? Is that what you were referring to as the reminder e-mail?
A. It is what I was referring to, yes.

MS. BAKER: So it's Appendix C of Exhibit 2.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Okay. Yeah, it is Appendix C. I think I might have given it a different name.

So again, what were your assumptions about when consumers got that reminder e-mail, which we have now clarified was Appendix $C$ in your report?
A. A few days before their first due date.
Q. And what is the basis of that assumption?
A. It was either from counsel or one of the documents that I reviewed.
Q. And again, that would have been a document that was listed in your Appendix D, which are the documents you considered?
A. That's correct.
Q. And would that have been before origination or after?
A. After origination.
Q. And what were your assumptions about which consumers got e-mails, either -- let's start with the first one. What were your assumptions about which consumers got the welcome e-mail?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Form. Vague question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Did you have an assumption about the number or percentage of consumers that got the welcome e-mail?
A. I don't have a particular assumption about the number who got the e-mail.
Q. And would it have been relevant to your opinion to know the percentage of consumers who received the welcome e-mail?
A. The more received the welcome e-mail, the more paragraph 26 applies.
Q. But you didn't review any records or receive any information on the percentage of consumers who did receive the welcome e-mail?
A. I can't recall exactly. I may have been told that it was a matter of policy that everyone receives the welcome e-mail.
A. I have no information about that.
Q. Would that matter to your analysis?
A. No.
Q. Is it your opinion that consumers are just as likely to read e-mails that come as text in the body of an e-mail versus opening attachments?
A. No, that's not my opinion.
Q. What is your opinion?

MS. BAKER: Opinion concerning what?
MS. WEINBERG: Whether consumers are just as likely to read an e-mail that appears as text in the body of the e-mail versus in an attachment to that e-mail.

MS. BAKER: Are you asking as specific to this case or are you asking him more generally?

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Generally, do you have an opinion about whether consumers are more or less likely to read e-mails that come in one form, attachment, versus another --
A. They might well be more likely to read them in one form or another. I have no data on the subject. So I don't know exactly what the
Q. And do you remember who told you that?
A. It would either, again, come from counsel or one of the documents in Appendix D.
Q. And you said it was a matter of policy. Do you have any information on whether that policy was implemented?
A. I do not.
Q. And the same question for the reminder e-mail which, for the record, is exhibit -Appendix C to your report. Do you have any information, did you make any assumptions about what percentage of consumers received that reminder e-mail, Appendix C?
A. I did not make any assumptions.
Q. And would that have been relevant to the statement you made in paragraph 26?
A. Sure. The more consumers received it, the more that part of paragraph 26 would be relevant to them.
Q. Do you know the format in which these two e-mails that we have been referring to, Appendix B and C, were sent? In other words, whether they were sent as an attachment, like in a Word file or as text that appeared in the body of an e-mail?
case is here.
Q. And as a concept, do you have an opinion separate and apart from its application in this case?
A. Again, it would depend on the situation, I think. That's an empirical question as to how many people read an e-mail of one form or another.
Q. So you are not aware of any research on this topic?
A. Specifically on attachments versus text in the body, I am not aware of specific research on that, no.
Q. Is it your opinion that the welcome e-mail -- and again, I would like us all to turn to Appendix B in your report. Does that convey the cost? Is it your opinion that that e-mail conveys the cost of loan rollovers?

MS. BAKER: I just want to, for the record, clarify something. Are you asking him to give an opinion on that question?

MS. WEINBERG: I'm asking if he has an opinion on that question. And if he doesn't, that's what the record will reflect.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the

| 129 |  | 131 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | question? | 1 | addition, subtraction or other mathematics. |
| 2 | BY MS. WEINBERG: | 2 | Q. So they would have to know the finance |
| 3 | Q. Do you have an opinion about whether or | 3 | charge? |
| 4 | not the welcome e-mail conveys the cost of loan | 4 | A. That's correct. |
| 5 | rollovers? And rollovers, as we discussed | 5 | Q. And is it possible that consumers could |
| 6 | earlier about going through the auto renewal and | 6 | read that e-mail to confirm their |
| 7 | auto workout relative to the calculation that | 7 | misunderstanding that the total of payments that |
| 8 | you made this morning. | 8 | was due under the loan was the amount reflected |
| 9 | A. I don't know how well consumers | 9 | in the TILA box in their loan agreement? |
| 10 | understand the cost of their rollover from | 10 | MS. BAKER: Objection. Compound |
| 11 | reading this e-mail. I think that is an | 11 | question. |
| 12 | empirical question, looking at the e-mail. | 12 | BY MS. WEINBERG: |
| 13 | Q. When you say you don't know whether | 13 | Q. You can answer. |
| 14 | consumers understand the cost, is that what you | 14 | A. I'm not sure which scenario you are |
| 15 | just said? | 15 | referring to. |
| 16 | MS. BAKER: No, that's not what he just | 16 | Q. Let's assume a scenario in which the |
| 17 | said. | 17 | consumer looks at the loan agreement -- and to |
| 18 | MS. WEINBERG: Could you repeat what | 18 | make things abundantly clear, let's look at the |
| 19 | exactly he said. | 19 | one in Dr. Hastak's report again. |
| 20 | (The record was read as requested.) | 20 | So we are looking at the same agreement |
| 21 | BY MS. WEINBERG: | 21 | that you analyzed before, which was, I think, |
| 22 | Q. Could you just say something further | 22 | his Exhibit B. So in that case let's assume |
| 23 | about what you mean I don't know how well | 23 | that this person read the TILA box where it says |
| 24 | consumers understood the cost of the rollovers | 24 | total of payments is \$650 to mean that each time |
| 25 | from reading this e-mail? | 25 | he or she paid the finance charge of 150, it was |
|  | 130 |  | 132 |
| 1 | A. There are phrases in this e-mail that | 1 | being credited towards the total amount they |
| 2 | refer to the costs. Particularly point one, | 2 | would have to pay, which here they would believe |
| 3 | after the first initial payment, the next four | 3 | is $\mathbf{\$ 6 5 0}$. Is that clear? |
| 4 | renewals require -- only require payment of the | 4 | A. Could you repeat the question part |
| 5 | finance charge starting with the fifth renewal | 5 | again? I get the scenario now. |
| 6 | in addition to the finance charge, and it goes | 6 | Q. Sure. So if this consumer thought that |
| 7 | on. That may convey to consumers that there is | 7 | the total amount they would have to pay in this |
| 8 | going to be a finance charge paid with each | 8 | case was 650, the amount reflected in the total |
| 9 | renewal, in which case they would know, it would | 9 | of payments, is it possible that a consumer |
| 10 | communicate to them the cost of the renewal. Or | 10 | could read this welcome e-mail that we were |
| 11 | they may not read that to mean there's a new | 11 | talking about to confirm their misunderstanding |
| 12 | finance charge for each renewal. That's an | 12 | that the total of payments that was due was the |
| 13 | empirical question, which of those two | 13 | amount reflected in the TILA box? |
| 14 | possibilities obtained. | 14 | A. It is possible. |
| 15 | Q. And do you think that consumers could | 15 | Q. Okay. Let's move to paragraph 27 of |
| 16 | calculate the cost of a renewal based on this | 16 | your report. And here I'll just read the whole |
| 17 | e-mail? | 17 | paragraph. Consumers also receive a phone call |
| 18 | A. Yes, they could. | 18 | from Integrity Advance. During that call |
| 19 | Q. And would they have to do the same | 19 | consumers had the opportunity to ask any |
| 20 | calculation that you did this morning on paper | 20 | questions they had about costs of the loan, |
| 21 | in order to do that? | 21 | including renewal costs. If they were confused |
| 22 | A. No. It's a much simpler question. | 22 | about renewal costs after examining the loan |
| 23 | It's just, what is my finance charge? That's | 23 | agreement, this phone call would have been an |
| 24 | what I have to pay for renewal if they are | 24 | opportunity to clear up those confusions. |
| 25 | reading point one correctly. So there's no | 25 | Is that an accurate reading of your |


| 133 |  | 135 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | statement? | 1 | agreement, in other words, has the wrong |
| 2 | A. It is. | 2 | understanding of the costs? |
| 3 | Q. And what were your assumptions about | 3 | A. It may or may not. I think that's an |
| 4 | when such a call for the confused consumer would | 4 | empirical question whether you get confirmation |
| 5 | have occurred? | 5 | bias in this situation. |
| 6 | A. That statement doesn't require any | 6 | Q. So it is possible, then, that consumers |
| 7 | assumption around when it occurred. | 7 | who are confused -- well, not confused, but just |
| 8 | Q. So it could have been after they had | 8 | were wrong about what they thought the loans |
| 9 | signed the loan agreements that we have been | 9 | would cost would not have received any |
| 10 | referencing in Dr. Hastak's report? | 10 | correction in their misinterpretation through |
| 11 | A. It could have been. | 11 | this phone call? |
| 12 | Q. Did you make any assumptions or did you | 12 | A. It is possible. |
| 13 | have any information about how such a call | 13 | Q. Are you aware of any complaints filed |
| 14 | between a consumer and an employee of Integrity | 14 | by customers of Integrity Advance in which the |
| 15 | Advance would have occurred? In other words who | 15 | customer stated that they didn't understand that |
| 16 | would have initiated the call? | 16 | renewals would cost more money? |
| 17 | A. My understanding was Integrity Advance | 17 | A. I don't remember specifically enough |
| 18 | initiated the call. | 18 | whether that was in the complaints. I did look |
| 19 | Q. And what is the basis of your | 19 | at complaints. I don't remember whether I saw |
| 20 | understanding? | 20 | that exact thing. |
| 21 | A. Either I was told the procedure by | 21 | Q. How many complaints did you look at? |
| 22 | counsel or by one of the documents in | 22 | A. I skimmed -- there were, I would guess, |
| 23 | Appendix D. | 23 | hundreds in there. I don't know the exact |
| 24 | Q. If a consumer was not confused but | 24 | number. I skimmed and I read closely a few |
| 25 | simply misunderstood the costs, such as the | 25 | dozen and skimmed a bunch more. I don't have an |
|  | 134 |  | 136 |
| 1 | person we were talking about before who | 1 | exact number beyond that, I'm afraid. |
| 2 | misunderstood that the total cost would have | 2 | Q. Do you recall seeing any complaints |
| 3 | been 650 under the loan agreement we were just | 3 | from consumers who said that they didn't |
| 4 | examining, you understand the first part of that | 4 | understand that renewals would cost more money |
| 5 | question? | 5 | than that amount stated in the TILA box? |
| 6 | A. I think so. | 6 | A. I don't remember that specific idea |
| 7 | Q. Would this call help? So they weren't | 7 | being there. |
| 8 | confused. They are just wrong in their | 8 | Q. What is your recollection of the |
| 9 | interpretation of the loan agreement. | 9 | content of most of the complains? |
| 10 | MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague question. | 10 | A. There were complaints that stated that |
| 11 | Also a compound one. | 11 | this violated their state law and so they wanted |
| 12 | BY MS. WEINBERG: | 12 | their money back, whether all of it in some |
| 13 | Q. You can answer. | 13 | cases or what they thought was an overpayment |
| 14 | A. I think my answer is it might help. | 14 | relative to their state law in other cases. |
| 15 | Q. Are you aware of the concept of | 15 | That was a big theme in what I remember. |
| 16 | confirmation bias? | 16 | Q. Do you remember any other themes? |
| 17 | A. I am. | 17 | A. Not specifically. |
| 18 | Q. What is that? | 18 | Q. Are you aware of any research that |
| 19 | A. It's where individuals tend to look at | 19 | analyzes whether disclosures in a phone call are |
| 20 | information that confirms preexisting notions | 20 | clear and conspicuous? |
| 21 | they have and tend to ignore information that | 21 | A. I am not. |
| 22 | disconfirms preexisting notions they have. | 22 | Q. Did you listen to any recordings of |
| 23 | Q. And does that concept of confirmation | 23 | phone calls between employees who worked for |
| 24 | bias have any application to this scenario of a | 24 | Integrity Advance and consumers? |
| 25 | consumer who just misunderstands the loan | 25 | A. I did not. |

Q. Why not?
A. None were made available to me.
Q. Did you ask that they be made available?
A. I don't recall. I think it was my understanding that they were not available.
Q. Let's turn to paragraph 27. And in that you say -- this is the one we were just looking at. Do you have any expertise in analyzing whether telemarketers adhere to scripts?
A. I don't know if I have expertise. I have listened to telemarketers knowing what their scripts are and I have heard claims from some of our -- some of the companies I have worked with about how telemarketers adhere. But I don't know if that constitutes expertise.
Q. Are you aware of research that indicates that telemarketers tend to vary from the scripts they are given for phone calls?
A. I'm not aware of such research.
Q. Are you aware of research that indicates that telemarketers engage in adaptive behavior in reacting to consumers' questions?
A. I'm not aware of research to that
Q. This is an article that's mostly about brand loyalty; is that right?
A. It's an article that's about exchange versus communal relationships with a brand.
Q. And can you please explain what you mean by exchange versus communal relationships?
A. Certainly. An exchange relationship is a relationship where I engage with another party, entity, someone where I expect that kind of a quid pro quo situation. If I give, I expect to get; if I get, I expect to give, as contrasted with a communal relationship where there's a deep concern for the other's well-being and you give with no particular expectation of reciprocity and you get with no expectation of reciprocity.
Q. And how does that conclusion in the article, how does that support the premise that you have cited for here that when consumers receive additional benefits, they expect to pay for them?
A. In that article, among other things, it says that relationships with -- and I can't remember the words they use, but I'll use the word commercial transactions tend to be exchange
extent, no.
Q. In paragraph 29 of your report, Exhibit 1, which is a long paragraph, on page 9 you say, When consumers receive additional benefits, they expect to pay for them.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you know whether Integrity Advance's customers expected to pay more for a longer loan?
A. I don't have any scientific basis for making that statement whether they do or don't have that expectation.
Q. And the article that you cite for this premise was listed in footnote 8. It's -- I'm not going to try to say this. It's
A-G-G-A-R-W-A-L. The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior; is that right?
A. That is cited in that paragraph, yes.
Q. And that's the article that you cite for this particular proposition that when consumers receive additional benefits, they expect to pay for them?
A. Correct.
relationships, which is to say they tend to be these quid pro quo type relationships where when I give, I expect to get or when I get, I expect to give.
Q. But that wasn't in the context of paying more for a longer loan?
A. The article was not studying loans in particular. But the claim seems to apply in the consumer behavior literature that that article also relies on that this is generally -exchange relationships generally dominate in commercial transactions.
Q. Let's turn to paragraph 30. You say, If the renewal option is a valuable aspect of the loan, it is unlikely that some altered version of a disclosure of the renewal costs in the loan agreement would serve to dissuade interested consumers from taking out a loan.

Do you see that sentence?
A. I do.
Q. What's the basis for that statement?
A. So let me summarize the statement first. If consumers like renewal, then telling them more about -- if people like renewal, telling them more about how much it costs may
not dissuade them from taking out a loan. If you expound on a feature that they enjoy about a particular product or service, that doesn't make them not want the product or service.
Q. But applying that specifically to Integrity Advance and its agreements with its customers, is there any basis for the statement that the renewal option might be valuable to Integrity Advance's customers specifically?
A. I'm sorry. I'm not sure what the question was in that.
Q. Did you have any basis for a statement that the renewal option might be valuable to Integrity Advance's customers?
A. Yes. And that is --

MS. BAKER: Where is that statement?
MS. WEINBERG: What he just made. He said if it's a valuable -- I'm not going to paraphrase it.

MS. BAKER: Could you please read back the last three questions and answers.
(The record was read as requested.)
MS. BAKER: I'm not sure he made that statement, but you can ask him that question. That's not the rendering that was just read
Q. Despite receiving these e-mail messages reminding them when the loan is due and how to execute each of the possible payment options is further support of the idea that consumers prefer renewal to paying off the loan even after receiving these initial disclosures.

So is it your assumption that people are actively choosing to renew their loans rather than having the operation of the default scenario which we'll get into later?
A. That's a longer -- that's a complex question and we'll have to have a long answer to that.

## Q. Right. We'll get into the defaults

 later. Let me just say, is it your opinion that consumers who rolled over the loans were actively choosing to do so?A. It is my opinion that many of them did not have a strong preference not to do so.
Q. Can you explain what you mean by that?
A. The number of consumers who rolled over their loan actively is an empirical question. I don't have a number without some data, which I don't have. If you refer to my paragraph, sorry to pull us ahead, but that's where this is
back.

## BY MS. WEINBERG:

Q. Could you answer the question, the last question, then, as she read back. Do you think that the renewal -- do you have any basis for saying that the renewal option was valuable to Integrity Advance's customers?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is that?
A. I believe that -- I'm just going to reference the paragraphs. There are several paragraphs in my report that provide support for that. I'm going to try to reference all of them.
Q. Okay.
A. Paragraphs 30 and 31, I think, provide my reasoning for why the renewal option might be valuable.
Q. But in paragraph $\mathbf{3 0}$ you say if it's a valuable aspect of the loan.
A. Right. But prior to that is the evidence.
Q. The fact that more than 85 percent of consumers choose to renew their loans?
A. Continuing.
going, is paragraph 47.
Q. And that's getting into defaults.
A. Yes, which is what the question is kind of getting into.
Q. Okay. And I want to ask you the same question for the second clause in the sentence we have been looking at: If the renewal option is a valuable aspect of the loan, it's unlikely that some altered version of the disclosure of the renewal cost and the loan agreement would serve to dissuade interested consumers from taking out a loan.

MS. BAKER: So back to paragraph 30 ?
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Back to paragraph 30. Do you have any basis for the statement that the altered version would not dissuade consumers?

MS. BAKER: I just want to object to that question. It assumes a fact not in evidence. If you are asking him -- I'm not sure exactly what you are asking him. So it's a vague question also.

If you understand it, answer it. But it's not a clear question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you understand the question, Dr. Novemsky?
A. I'm thinking it through. My presumption when I wrote "some altered version" was a version that provides greater disclosure of the renewal costs. And if renewal is an option that consumers value, including its costs, then as I said earlier, expounding on that option to them isn't going to dissuade them from originating the loan.
Q. So in order for that statement to be true, would consumers have to understand what the costs of the renewal were?
A. In order for which statement to be true?
Q. The statement you just made about the renewal option being valuable to consumers.
A. I'm sorry. I'm lost as to what the question is.
Q. Okay. You just said that consumers may find the renewal option to be valuable to them; is that correct?
A. They may find the renewal option to be valuable to them, correct.
Q. And this sentence says that because
they might find the renewal option to be valuable, it's unlikely that some altered version of a disclosure of the renewal costs in the loan agreement would serve to dissuade interested consumers from taking out a loan, right?
A. Right.
Q. So my question is, does this assume, this statement that they find renewal option to be valuable, assume that they understand the costs of a loan renewal?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay.

MS. BAKER: Could we take a five-minute break if now is an okay time to do that?

MS. WEINBERG: This is fine.
(A recess was taken.)
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So it is now $2: 10$. We are back on the record. And before the break we were talking about circumstances about whether a renewal option was valuable to Integrity Advance's customers, right?
A. Right.
Q. If the renewal option is valuable, in
your opinion, is there a downside of disclosing the total costs of loan renewals?
A. There's a number of, I think, assumptions in what you are asking. So let me try to be clear.
Q. Okay.
A. If the renewal option is valuable for someone who understands the cost of the renewal option, then disclosing the costs of the renewal option to that type of customer would not make them less likely to take the loan.
Q. And conversely, if the person did not understand the costs of the loan renewal, would it be valuable?
A. I'm sorry, too many pronouns there.
Q. You said that, if I can paraphrase, if the renewal option is valuable to somebody who understands the cost of the loan, then disclosing the cost of the loan, essentially, doesn't add anything to the equation. Is that a fair summary?
A. That is a fair summary.
Q. So if you take a person who does not understand the costs of the loan but finds the renewal option valuable, do you think it is

| 149 |  | 151 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | experienced a loan, including its costs, which | 1 | for the cost of a cup of coffee a day, you could |
| 2 | they would have had to experience through their | 2 | save this child, which was a very famous ad |
| 3 | account being debited are aware that those | 3 | campaign some years ago and many of you may |
| 4 | debits happened after the loan is concluded. | 4 | remember it, in that situation you get to |
| 5 | Yes, I am. | 5 | compare something. You get to compare to |
| 6 | Q. Is it also possible that consumers | 6 | something in that case not substantial, like a |
| 7 | never calculate the total cost in spite of | 7 | cost of a cup of coffee, and say, oh, this is |
| 8 | having their account debited? | 8 | actually more important than my coffee. So I'm |
| 9 | A. It's possible. | 9 | going to do this instead. |
| 10 | Q. Are you aware of marketing done to | 10 | Q. Let's look at paragraph 32. And in |
| 11 | consumers that emphasizes monthly payments | 11 | this paragraph you talk about lead generators. |
| 12 | rather than total costs? | 12 | Is that accurate? |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | A. That is. |
| 14 | Q. And do you know why some marketers | 14 | Q. What is your understanding of how lead |
| 15 | choose to emphasize monthly payments rather than | 15 | generators work? |
| 16 | total costs in their marketing? | 16 | A. My understanding is the customer can |
| 17 | MS. BAKER: Are you speaking presumably | 17 | put information in about themselves into a lead |
| 18 | not about this case? | 18 | generation website and then providers of that |
| 19 | BY MS. WEINBERG: | 19 | service, in this case, loans, would reach out to |
| 20 | Q. No, I'm asking generically. | 20 | them in some way. |
| 21 | A. Can you repeat the question? | 21 | Q. And how did you come to that |
| 22 | Q. The first question was whether you are | 22 | understanding? |
| 23 | aware of marketing done to consumers that | 23 | A. That's just my general knowledge about |
| 24 | emphasizes monthly payments rather than total | 24 | lead generation websites and how they operate. |
| 25 | costs. And you said yes. And my follow-up | 25 | Q. What is your basis for the statement |
|  | 150 |  | 152 |
| 1 | question was whether you knew why some marketers | 1 | that coming through lead generators suggests |
| 2 | chose to market in that fashion, emphasizing | 2 | that renewal costs aren't critical to consumers? |
| 3 | monthly payments rather than total costs? | 3 | A. Could you point me to that? |
| 4 | A. Do I know exactly why? I do not know | 4 | Q. Sure. In the sentence that begins |
| 5 | exactly why marketers would choose to do that. | 5 | "when," which is the third sentence, When a |
| 6 | Q. Are you aware of any research on this | 6 | customer chooses Integrity Advance, it suggests |
| 7 | topic of marketing to consumers using monthly | 7 | that they are either not finding disclosures |
| 8 | payments rather than total costs? | 8 | about renewal costs a critical piece of |
| 9 | A. I'm not aware specifically of research | 9 | information for making their loan provider |
| 10 | on monthly payments versus total costs. | 10 | decision. And let's just -- |
| 11 | Q. You said specifically. Are you aware | 11 | A. I think the rest of that sentence is |
| 12 | of research that is related to this question? | 12 | critical. Or -- |
| 13 | A. I am aware of research that's related, | 13 | Q. I was going to ask you about them |
| 14 | yes. | 14 | separately since that's a compound sentence. |
| 15 | Q. What is that? | 15 | But if you feel like you can't answer -- |
| 16 | A. There is research on something called | 16 | A. I think I'm not making the claim that |
| 17 | the pennies a day phenomenon. When you describe | 17 | you have stated. I'm not making the claim that |
| 18 | the cost of something in how many cents or | 18 | consumers don't find it critical. I'm making |
| 19 | dollars per day it is, that's different than | 19 | the statement that they either don't find it |
| 20 | describing it as in its total cost. | 20 | critical or the second half of the sentence. |
| 21 | Q. And what is the benefit of advertising | 21 | Q. Or Integrity Advance is offering |
| 22 | that something costs pennies a day versus the | 22 | complete with disclosures about renewal costs |
| 23 | total cost? | 23 | sufficiently attractive to end up choosing |
| 24 | A. One benefit of it is it allows them to | 24 | Integrity Advance as their loan provider? |
| 25 | compare to other purchases. So if I say this is | 25 | A. So I don't know which of the two is |


| 153 |  |  | 155 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | true. I know that one of the two is true. | 1 | disclosures about renewal costs sufficiently |
| 2 | Q. And you haven't done any empirical | 2 | attractive to end up choosing Integrity Advance |
| 3 | research, again, to make any conclusions about | 3 | as their loan provider. |
| 4 | which of these might be true here? | 4 | First of all, this assumes that |
| 5 | A. Correct. | 5 | consumers understood the costs of the loan |
| 6 | Q. And you haven't cited any studies here | 6 | renewal; is that correct? |
| 7 | that would lead to one conclusion or the other? | 7 | A. That is not correct. |
| 8 | A. Correct. | 8 | Q. Why is that not correct? |
| 9 | Q. In the preceding sentence in that same | 9 | A. They don't -- so the first half of that |
| 10 | paragraph 32, you said, This means they have the | 10 | sentence is the scenario where that's not |
| 11 | opportunity to consider more than one provider | 11 | correct where they say I don't care about or |
| 12 | when choosing a loan. | 12 | think about or worry about a renewal cost. I |
| 13 | What is the basis of that statement? | 13 | just want to choose a loan provider. That's one |
| 14 | A. Coming back to my general understanding | 14 | of the two possibilities. So there they would |
| 15 | of a lead generation website is it sends your | 15 | not need to understand renewal costs. |
| 16 | information to more than one provider, and so it | 16 | Q. So are you testifying that some |
| 17 | is often the case that more than one provider | 17 | consumers who were taking out loans from |
| 18 | then reaches out to you, resulting ultimately in | 18 | Integrity Advance didn't care about the cost at |
| 19 | a choice for the consumer as to which provider | 19 | all? |
| 20 | to engage. | 20 | A. I am testifying they may not have cared |
| 21 | Q. Do you know if Integrity Advance's | 21 | about the cost of renewal. |
| 22 | consumers had a choice? | 22 | Q. But again, you have no basis for saying |
| 23 | A. I don't specifically know that, no. | 23 | whether they did or did not? |
| 24 | Q. Do you know if Integrity Advance | 24 | A. Correct. |
| 25 | purchased any leads on an exclusive basis? | 25 | Q. So going back to the question, |
|  | 154 |  | 156 |
| 1 | A. I don't know that either, no. | 1 | hopefully without reading that one sentence |
| 2 | Q. Would it change your opinion to learn | 2 | again, referring to the last sentence in |
| 3 | that Integrity Advance instructed its | 3 | paragraph 32, would that sentence change, your |
| 4 | representatives to not disclose the APR on a | 4 | conclusion or your hypothesis change if you |
| 5 | loan until after a consumer had applied for the | 5 | learned that Integrity Advance instructed its |
| 6 | loan? | 6 | representatives to not disclose the APR on a |
| 7 | A. Would it change which opinion? | 7 | loan until after the consumers had applied for |
| 8 | Q. That's stated in the last sentence of | 8 | the loan? |
| 9 | paragraph 32, when a consumer chooses Integrity | 9 | A. No, it would not. |
| 10 | Advance, they are either finding the disclosures | 10 | Q. Why not? |
| 11 | about renewal costs critical or sufficiently | 11 | A. The first part of that sentence refers |
| 12 | attractive, to summarize the statement without | 12 | to that scenario. If consumers are choosing a |
| 13 | reading it in its entirety. | 13 | loan provider and the loan provider omits |
| 14 | A. I'm sorry, I have lost -- can you | 14 | information important to the consumers, perhaps |
| 15 | repeat the question now? | 15 | information they would have gotten from other |
| 16 | Q. Let's -- I think we are all getting a | 16 | loan providers and are eager to compare, then |
| 17 | little tired. So I better read the sentence in | 17 | they would either not choose that person or |
| 18 | its entirety to make sure we are completely on | 18 | demand that particular information from that |
| 19 | the same page here. | 19 | person. |
| 20 | You wrote, When a customer chooses | 20 | Q. Okay. I'm going to very ambitiously |
| 21 | Integrity Advance, it suggests that they are | 21 | try to discuss two paragraphs at once. |
| 22 | either not finding disclosures about renewal | 22 | Paragraphs 34 and 48 both discuss information |
| 23 | costs a critical piece of information for making | 23 | overload. Is that an accurate statement? I'll |
| 24 | the loan provider decision or they find | 24 | give you a minute to look at your report and |
| 25 | Integrity Advance's offering complete with | 25 | tell me if that's correct. |


|  | 157 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Thirty-four and 47? | 1 |
| 2 | Q. No, 34 and 48. | 2 |
| 3 | A. Okay. | 3 |
| 4 | Q. So is it a fair statement to say that | 4 |
| 5 | both of those paragraphs discuss information | 5 |
| 6 | overload? | 6 |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 |
| 8 | Q. Is it your opinion that cost is | 8 |
| 9 | important to consumers seeking to borrow money? | 9 |
| 10 | A. What do you mean by cost? | 0 |
| 11 | Q. Cost of the borrowing. | 11 |
| 12 | A. That's an empirical question. | 12 |
| 13 | Q. So you have no opinion on whether cost | 13 |
| 14 | is important to consumers who are borrowing | 14 |
| 15 | money? | 15 |
| 16 | A. I have no definitive statement to make | 16 |
| 17 | in this context whether cost is relevant to | 17 |
| 18 | consumers borrowing money. You can reference my | 18 |
| 19 | paragraph, I want to say, 13. Not 13. The end | 19 |
| 20 | of paragraph 13. | 20 |
| 21 | Q. So do you have any opinion about | 21 |
| 22 | whether the cost of borrowing money would be | 22 |
| 23 | important to payday customers specifically? | 23 |
| 24 | A. I'm sorry, I missed the first part of | 24 |
| 25 | the question. | 25 |

Q. Do you have an opinion on whether the cost of borrowing money is important to payday loan customers?
A. I don't have an opinion. There's evidence that it isn't cited in my paragraph 13. And there's some reason to believe that it might be. So without further study, I don't know.
Q. So it either might be or it might not be?
A. Correct.
Q. And you have no opinion unless you can do research; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. If cost is important, I'm just going to ask you to accept that premise for a second, would it help to overcome information overload to highlight the cost of loan renewals more prominently in a loan agreement? MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague question. BY MS. WEINBERG:

## Q. Do you understand?

A. My answer would be no. Importance of information doesn't, especially raising the importance of information as your predicate is doesn't reduce overload. It potentially
increases overload.
Q. So you think that -- is it your testimony that all information that a consumer reads in an agreement is processed equally?
A. No.
Q. So is the converse true that some information is processed more readily by consumers than other information?
A. Most likely true, yes.
Q. And we talked about this this morning about prominence being -- or placement being one of the factors that might affect this; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So then is it a fair statement to say that it is possible to highlight certain information in a loan agreement to make it more likely to be read by a consumer?
A. Yes, that is certainly possible.
Q. So just assuming for a second that cost is important, would it be possible and do you think it would help consumers to overcome information overload to highlight the costs more prominently of loan renewals?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague question.

Form.
THE WITNESS: I don't think it would help with information overload to highlight any particular piece of information, including cost. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Do you have an opinion on what the most important piece of information is to consumers seeking to borrow money?
A. I do not have an opinion.
Q. In your paragraph 35 , you say, Renewal costs may not be the information consumers are interested in, in understanding or using for their loan origination decision.

Do you see that sentence that's in the third and fourth line of paragraph 35 ?
A. I do.
Q. What is the basis for that statement?
A. Paragraphs 21 to 23 that are referenced in that sentence.
Q. Anything else?
A. Let me think for a moment. No, those are the main reasons for that sentence.
Q. But again, you didn't do a study on this. Is that fair to say?
A. I did not do a study on this.
Q. So it is possible that renewal costs are important as well?
A. It is possible that renewal costs are important.
Q. And you would need to do empirical research in order to form an opinion on this. Is a correct statement?
A. That would be a correct statement, yes.
Q. You cite Lawrence and Elliehausen in your footnote 2. And let me give you that article.
A. This is the citation we corrected at the beginning of the deposition.
Q. So you weren't citing this cite?
A. These two are very related articles, but I really meant to be citing what they handed you.
Q. Let's stick with what you actually cited and we can -- I haven't looked at the new one.
(Novemsky Deposition Exhibit Number 6 was marked for identification.)

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Tell me if this is, in fact, the article that you cited in your report.
decision relevant to those fees.
Q. And is it possible that even if they don't think about the fees when making the choice, it is nonetheless important to them?
A. It's possible that it's important to them. It's also possible that it is not important to them. That's a separate empirical question.
Q. And you didn't do any research on the question. So is it fair to say you don't have an opinion?
A. I did no research on that question of whether costs are important to them in this context.
Q. Does that mean you don't have an opinion?
A. All I can do is cite the research in the corrected citation of this article which shows that, you know, many more people, very few people reference cost as important to them.
Q. I want to turn to or back to your report. And we are skipping ahead. And you say, referring to the schedule of charges and fees that are referenced in Dr. Hastak's report, and $I$ think we need to look at them in order to
A. Yep, this appears to be.
Q. And I would refer you to Table 6, which is on page 313 of this report. And in Table 6, to the statement the government should limit the fees charged by payday advance companies roughly 75 percent, if we are adding strongly agree and somewhat agree together, roughly 75 percent of consumers say that the government should limit fees that payday companies can charge. Do you see that?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And is my math correct it's roughly 75 percent of consumers?
A. Yes.
Q. Doesn't this indicate that most payday customers are concerned about costs?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. There is a difference between what people think about when making a decision and how people respond to a question when you make a particular issue salient. So if I ask you about fees, 99 out of 100 people are going to tell me, I would like them to be lower. That doesn't mean they think about the fees when making a
have intelligible testimony on this.
MS. BAKER: What page are you on?
MS. WEINBERG: I am on his report, paragraph 43 , which is page 13 going on, and we are talking about the schedule of charges and fees, and I think we are going to have to look at them. So let's go back to Dr. Hastak's report, Appendix B.

MS. BAKER: For the record, Exhibit 3, right?

MS. WEINBERG: Yes. And the schedule of charges and fees in this report appears on CFPB042569. Are we on the same page here?

MS. BAKER: Um-hum.
BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Okay. Were you told anything about this schedule by Integrity Advance or --
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You state here, My impression was that the information was presented clearly in the schedule. Do you see that, which is in the middle on page 14 in the middle of the paragraph?
A. I do.
Q. Can you tell me what your understanding
of the schedule is?
A. My understanding of this schedule -these two schedules are that whether your loan varies anywhere between 8 and 23 days, you pay the same finance charge on a particular loan size.
Q. And does this provide any information about the cost of loan renewals?
A. By extension it does, because the loan renewal cost is the same as the original loan cost for the next period.
Q. I'm sorry, could you say that again.
A. My cost in these loan charges are the cost of the loan for a single pay period. Any renewal would have identical finance charges.
Q. But of course that would change once they were in the auto workout?
A. Auto workout would be different, correct.
Q. So if we are looking at the chart, it shows days going from 8 to 23 days, as you noted, on the left-hand column, right? And it also shows the same fee of $\mathbf{\$ 2 4}$ per hundred on the top chart and $\$ 30$ per hundred on the bottom chart for an eight-day loan as well as a 23-day
loan; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is one possible interpretation
consumers could have had of that schedule that fees don't go up regardless of how long a loan is outstanding?
A. That sounds like one possible interpretation.
Q. So let's move on to default effects. And you start talking about that -- I'm going to start on paragraph 45 of your report. And you refer to your own research on default effects in that paragraph.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe your research on default effects?
A. Sure. It's a version of what's called the dominance effect where you put people in one of two states of ownership, either they, for example, have a mug or don't have a mug. And so then you ask the people who have a mug what is their willingness to sell the mug. You ask the people who don't have a mug what is their willingness to buy the mug. It's a very well-known paradigm in my field. And you get
very different answers from those two people. So they tend the stick with the default in the sense that those who have a mug really don't want to sell it and those who don't have a mug don't particularly want to buy it even though you've randomly assigned people to have a mug or not have a mug. So default position seems to have an influence on their choice in that situation.
Q. And can I understand your statement to mean that people are more likely to stick with the default situation? Is that what your conclusion is?
A. Correct.
Q. In your opinion, would the default option in Integrity Advance's loan agreements have affected renewals? In other words, affected whether or not a consumers would renew their loan?

MS. BAKER: Objection. Compound question.

THE WITNESS: I think default would affect renewals, yes. BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. And how would it affect them?

Whereas, if auto renewal is the default, then they would be debited $\$ 150$. So the likelihood of an overdraft, for example, would be much lower with a renewal default than with a pay-in-full default.
Q. And were you provided information or do you have any information on the average amount that consumers paid above the listed finance charge in the TILA box?

MS. BAKER: Objection as a vague question.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand that.

MS. BAKER: I don't understand the question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Were you provided any information on the amount that Integrity Advance's customers paid in costs for their loan above that amount that was reflected in the TILA total of payments box?
A. I was not.
Q. And did you have any information on or what was the calculation that you made in what the costs would be to a consumer who had the

## default pay-in-full option?

A. So I wouldn't refer to it as a calculation, but my reasoning for why pay-in-full might be more costly than an auto renewal default is that pay-in-full involves a much larger debit to the consumer's account. One of the things that that can result in is, for example, an overdraft or just a lack of money for the ensuing pay period. So that consequence could be worse to consumers than the consequence of renewal.
Q. But you didn't do an actual calculation about how much overdraft costs a consumer would likely experience or if there was the pay-in-full option?
A. That's right. There was no calculation because this isn't a completely monetary issue. Consumers clearly have an aversion to overdrafts. And that's, in this context, for reasons other than just the cost of overdraft. For example, credit consequences.
Q. So when you were talking about potential harm, you weren't talking about just financial harm; is that accurate?
A. I wasn't talking about just immediate
financial harm, that's correct.
Q. And you were considering things like what it would do to their credit report?
A. Yes.
Q. Anything else? Any other types of harms that were embedded in that assessment?
A. It would leave them -- I don't know if you consider this financial. It would leave them potentially illiquid for the remainder of their pay period.
Q. So this was not supposed to be a mathematical comparison of the costs of renewals versus the actual costs of a pay-in-full?
A. That's correct.
Q. It was a broader statement?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. In paragraph 47 you say, In my experience, default effects are most pronounced when the decisionmaker does not have a strong preference for a particular course of action. That's the last sentence of that paragraph. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Does that statement assume that the decisionmaker understands the implications of
choosing one option over another?
MS. BAKER: Objection. Vague question. THE WITNESS: I don't understand the question.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Well, let's get it more specifically within this context. If Integrity Advance's customers didn't understand the cost implications of the rollover option, would that influence the default effect?
A. Potentially. It is not clear.
Q. It's not clear?
A. Whether it would or not.
Q. Is this the same answer where you would have to do research in order to provide an opinion on it?
A. Yeah. I see no obvious connection between understanding the renewal costs and the size of the default effect. The size of the default effect occurs through the strength of preference which may or may not be related to understanding of the costs of the renewal.
Q. Well, I guess my question is here you are positing that a decisionmaker doesn't have a strong preference for one course of action over
another.
A. I am not positing that.
Q. You say the default effects are most pronounced when the decisionmaker doesn't have strong preferences --
A. I am saying that.
Q. -- for one course of action over
another, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. In order for a consumer not to have preference for one course of action over another -- strike that.

Let's move on to remotely created checks. Do you know what remotely created checks are?
A. I have some understanding of them.
Q. What is your understanding?
A. That someone other than the accountholder generates a check on the accountholder's account and sends it to the bank, and it is paid to that other person.
Q. How did you obtain your knowledge about remotely created checks?
A. Mostly from thinking about this case and the documents in my Appendix D.
A. I have no opinion on it.
Q. Do you have an opinion on whether the disclosures in Integrity Advance's loan agreements concerning remotely created checks were conspicuous?
A. I don't have an opinion on that.
Q. Do you have an opinion on whether the disclosures in Integrity Advance's loan agreements concerning remotely created checks were clear?
A. I don't have an opinion on that.

MS. WEINBERG: Let's take a ten-minute break.
(A recess was taken.)
MS. WEINBERG: We are back on the record at 3:02.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. I just had one question. You have or your counsel provided us with a copy of something called Payday Advance Credit in America, An Analysis of Customer Demand, which I believe you testified you wanted to supplement your footnote 2 with this document?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there a particular part of this
Q. So you didn't have experience with remotely created checks prior to reading this report or the materials?
A. That's correct.
Q. In your opinion, would it be important to consumers to know that after they decided they didn't owe a company money and had revoked their ACH authorization that the company could still create a remotely created check to take their funds?
A. I'm sorry, I missed the -- is it important to consumers?
Q. Yeah.

MS. BAKER: Could you read back that question.
(The record was read as requested.)
THE WITNESS: I need more context to the question is it important to consumers.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Would it be important to consumers in making a decision to take out a loan with a company to know this in advance of taking out that loan?
A. That's an empirical question.
Q. So you don't have an opinion on that?
rather lengthy document that you were citing specifically to support that paragraph?

## A. There is.

MS. BAKER: Are you entering this into the record, this document? It's your deposition.

THE WITNESS: It's going to take me a second to find the page. The electronic version I can search it. So I never noted the page number to myself. Let me just flip through and find the table.

At long last, page 51. In particular, 523, that's some kind of table or some kind of number, and the second half of that table, most important reason for choosing payday advance over another source. And I was referring to that quick, easy process, fast approval, less paperwork, get 60 percent of people saying that's why. Whereas, less expensive gets 4 percent of people saying, yes, that's why.

So my footnote 2 refers to this idea that people care more about a quick, easy process than they care about something being a less expensive option.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. Can't that also be read that they don't choose it because payday loans are, in fact, more expensive than other forms of borrowing?
A. It suggests to me they would choose it not because of cost-related considerations. They choose it because of ease and speed considerations.
Q. Do you know if in doing this survey they were given the option of choosing anything other than the five --
A. Yes, there is the other category.
Q. I see the other, which was 7.1. And was this study sponsored by the payday lending industry?
A. I don't believe so, but you can look on page -- the governing board is on page -- I don't see a page number prior to page 1 , prior to the table of contents. My guess would be no, because there's no payday lenders -- there might have any deeper knowledge than looking at this right now.
Q. And is it your intent to substitute this document, which I will introduce into the
coming in today. I have no further questions. And thank you for bearing with a semi-long day. MS. BAKER: We'll obviously read and sign the deposition.

MS. WEINBERG: We'll send you the PDF.
(Reading and signature not waived.)
(Whereupon, the proceedings at 3:07
p.m., were concluded.)
record as Exhibit 7, for your previously cited report?
A. I am happy to substitute or supplement.

I think substitute is fine.
Q. So even though the report that you have cited is from 2008 --
A. It's based on these same data, I
believe.
MS. BAKER: Are you supplementing or substituting? You can do either.

THE WITNESS: I'm fine with substituting.

BY MS. WEINBERG:
Q. So you are substituting an early -- a later report with an earlier report?
A. Yes, because this is a more complete reporting of the data on which the later report is based.
Q. I see.
A. This has much more detail and much more data. The later report is a derivative, I believe, of this data collection effort.
(Novemsky Deposition Exhibit Number 7 was marked for identification.)

MS. WEINBERG: Okay. Thank you for
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