



Chad Focus <iamchadfocus@gmail.com>

Fwd: Timed hostage test on posts

1 message

Chad Arrington <chadmmp@gmail.com>
To: Chad Arrington <iamchadfocus@gmail.com>

Fri, May 29, 2020 at 3:05 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Chad Arrington** <chadmmp@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, May 4, 2020 at 12:28 PM
Subject: Fwd: Timed hostage test on posts
To: Chad Arrington <iamchadfocus@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alex Miller** <mail@alexmillier.com>
Date: Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 3:04 PM
Subject: Re: Timed hostage test on posts
To: Chad Arrington <chadmmp@gmail.com>

NP, talk soon :)

Alex Miller*Co-Founder, SEO Operations Director*PosiRank.com

On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 1:37 PM, Chad Arrington <chadmmp@gmail.com> wrote:

Alex,

Your conversation literally mirrors mine... Like word for word... You see.

I'm in accounting meetings all day. I'll text you on Skype when I finally get off.

You see they'd rather continue to confirm what we already know instead of putting in a PLAN to execute and TAKE MASSIVE ACTION. Wasted more time on emails that actually addressing corrections.

Again, thanks for clarifying and drilling the same points!

Catch you soon.

Chad

On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 2:32 PM, Alex Miller <mail@alexmillier.com> wrote:

Hi Megan - we did not get to cover that aspect as the entire call was pretty much taken up discussing the 500+ duplications etc.

What Chad and I are also concerned about is content production moving forward. Basics such as unique title tag creations on new posts are resulting in duplications...which means these duplications will stack up again unless the Editorial Team know how to avoid them.

Here's just 2 examples of (MANY) duplications we found:

Every title tag is the same - at the very least, they would add a date / month at the end of the title to make it unique.

<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-14/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-15/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-16/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-2/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-3/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-5/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-10-songs-and-albums-on-the-itunes-store-6/>

and

Same issue here, if you open up 2 of the pages below you'll see the same title tag:

<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-12/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-13/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-14/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-16/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-17/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-2/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-3/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store-8/>
<http://moneymorning.com/market-news/the-top-iphone-and-ipad-apps-on-app-store/>

I would strongly urge you to brief the team on basics such as:

- * unique title tags for each page (that fit the available width, contain a keyphrase or two and will draw-in the click)
- * unique meta descriptions for each page

and avoiding cookie-cutter templates that result in duplication.

Just following those simple guidelines will avoid MM having to clean up another 500+ titles in the near future.

These habits, on top of creating unique content vs machine-produced is what will recover MM alongside everything else that's being done. The writers just have to be on the same page otherwise fixes that are implemented now will be drowned out by posts going out today/tomorrow etc.

Hope that helps,

Alex Miller

Co-Founder, SEO Operations Director

PosiRank.com

On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 8:36 AM, Megan Hughes <mhughes@moneymappress.com> wrote:

We do have a lot going on! Which makes it difficult to measure with so many other moving parts, so, it was unfair for me to say that.

Thanks for the updates. We have turned off posting automated content and need to decide how we want to remove the content from the site. Where you able to talk to Chad about this on your call with him Wednesday night?

From: Alex Miller <mail@alexmillier.com>

Date: Friday, September 9, 2016 at 9:15 AM

To: Megan Hughes <mhughes@moneymappress.com>

Cc: Kathryn Melchor <KMelchor@MoneyMapPress.com>

Subject: Re: Timed hostage test on posts

Hi Megan,

Can you elaborate on this point as I'm not totally understanding: "Unfortunately we have not seen a spike in traffic or rankings which is what we were trying to test."

At the moment there are so many moving parts with all the changes being put in place; yesterday we started on finally getting 500+ pages of duplicate title tags fixed so that's going to be awesome when they are finished and uploaded by your team.

The sitemap changes went live a few weeks ago and will be kicking in very soon. The disavow will be now recognized by Google but until their internal algorithm rolls out to reflect those changes in the SERP's, we won't see much benefit there. That shouldn't be too long though as a Penguin update is well overdue.

But what remains a big issue is still the amount of duplicate content being pumped out to MM and indexed in Google, there are hundreds and hundreds of these pages :/ I understand the model on your end of producing content in this way, but Google hates it. The stock price update pages for example are all the same with just a few words changed (stock ticker etc). Not sure if you guys are planning anything on your end with respect to those big issues...

The good thing is that we're fixing as much of the other problems as we can!

Alex Miller

Co-Founder, SEO Operations Director

PosiRank.com

On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 8:05 AM, Megan Hughes <mhughes@moneymappress.com> wrote:

Great, thanks Alex, I really appreciate your feedback.

What you have explained makes sense. Unfortunately we have not seen a spike in traffic or rankings which is what we were trying to test.

From: Alex Miller <mail@alexmillier.com>

Date: Thursday, September 8, 2016 at 6:56 PM

To: Megan Hughes <mhughes@moneymappress.com>

Cc: Kathryn Melchor <KMelchor@MoneyMapPress.com>

Subject: Re: Timed hostage test on posts

Hi Megan,

There are multiple reasons why I can never recommend a tactic like this:

1. There are thousands of human reviewers at Google who go out and look at web pages (based upon industries, keywords, high traffic sites etc) to verify that they deserve to rank. Remember Google's #1 goal is user experience. Locking people out of content like this is something that a reviewer might catch - and therefore downgrade your site. This happens everyday.

2. This I'm not 100% sure about, but it truly wouldn't be difficult for Google to "flag" (for review or just instantly downgrade) pages that use the CSS "display: none" and anything else technical that **could** mean you're hiding something from the user and forcing them through hoops to see it (Google hates this).

I totally and utterly understand that this approach is brilliant for conversions, but this is where you get into SEO-trouble. If you want to be in Google's best graces, they'll hate this stuff. This is one of the reasons why companies setup feeder "perfectly SEO'ed" sites that then direct traffic to non-SEO sites that are all about conversions.

I'm not saying 100% that your site has been hit by this, or will do - but it's a risk I would not personally take. It would be interesting to see if the rankings of those pages (assuming the content was 100%

original) increased after taking out the hidden content after 60 seconds. But the bottom line is this is risky - for SEO.

Hope that makes sense,
-Alex

Alex Miller

Co-Founder, SEO Operations Director

PosiRank.com

On Thu, Sep 8, 2016 at 2:31 PM, Megan Hughes <mhughes@moneymappress.com> wrote:

Hi Alex,

I'm reaching out to ask about a name gen test we are running on our stories.

One of our top converting zones is a "hostage" zone where we gate/hide the bottom half of a story after 60 seconds of being on the page by using CSS to "display: none" the selected content of the post and running a signup ad.

To view this test you can go to this page (uncooked) as an example: <http://moneymorning.com/2016/08/29/silver-spot-price-is-correcting-get-ready-for-the-rebound/>

We chose 60 seconds because we wanted allow enough time for google to read the page if it was being crawled. Attached are screenshots varifying that the full content of the story was rendered and why there was a partial score.

I was wondering if you had any experience with gating content this way and if you knew of any reason why this would be harmful to run.

Thank you,
Megan