

Releasing FoQ Results: Lessons Learned from The Netherlands

The Effects of Panel Recruitment and Management on Research Results

**Dutch Online Panel Study
NOPVO 2006**

**An initiative of
Pieter Willems - Millward Brown
Robert van Ossenbruggen -
ProCression
Ted Vonk - Onderzoekpaleis**



Dynamics of Change



- » All groups attempt to maintain equilibrium and maximize autonomy.
- » Coping, growth, and survival all involve maintaining the integrity of the group.



- » There must be a motivation to change (it's basically emotional)
- » 3 elements must be present:
 - enough *disconfirming data* to cause serious discomfort and disequilibrium
 - connection of disconfirming data to important goals and ideals causing *anxiety and/or guilt*
 - a psychological safety net: enough sense of identity and integrity to go ahead with change.
- » Disconfirming data shows that goals aren't being met or systems are unbalanced, e.g.:
 - Sales are off
 - Complaints are up
 - Turnover is high
- » Once group is in enough pain they will listen to disconfirming info.

Cognitive Restructuring



- » Leadership 'unfreezes' group (emotional), and then takes action (rational)
 - Offers a vision, solution, challenge, plan, etc.

- » Once unfrozen many different paths can be followed
 - Trial and error
 - Imitation of role models/best practices
 - Fact-based learning



Refreezing



- » Based on transformational learning
 - A (re)learning process
 - Develop new procedures, practices, and protocols

- » Best examples mirror ORQC
 - Core learning group dedicated to fact-based change
 - Core group must be 'transformed' first before they can 'practice' leadership

- » We become collectively accountable



The Effects of Panel Recruitment and Management on Research Results

**Dutch Online Panel Study
NOPVO 2006**

**An initiative of
Pieter Willems - Millward Brown
Robert van Ossenbruggen – ProCression
Ted Vonk - Onderzoekpaleis**



NOPVO 'Approach'



- » NOPVO did *not* keep suppliers in the loop after they gained cooperation
- » NOPVO went straight to the public with results
- » If they had a second chance, they would:
 - Talk to participants and supporters about the results first
 - Use first look meeting to build consensus from supporters and participants; but do not hold dissemination off too long
 - Issue a blinded benchmark report
 - Be prepared that the study “will raise more questions than it answers”

This Led Us To..



- » Consider carefully how to present the results to the industry; how to evaluate the impact of the results; and how to phrase conclusions so as to avoid a 'shock' to the system (industry)

- » Some initial ideas:
 - Be prepared to discuss and defend areas of study left out of the first study due to constraints.
 - Fully flesh out to the greatest extent possible anticipated future analyses (B to B; River; etc.)
 - Highlight credibility and usefulness of the first study to grow and retain support for next phases
 - Discuss results frequently and in many forums
 - Disseminate top line report widely

On General Release of Results



- » **Prepare the industry**
- » **Vet the results with participants and supporters – this will also help build consensus and legitimate support from these influencers**
- » **Prepare results so they are not too provoking (need to find the right balance)**
- » **Realize some findings will be questioned (be prepared): anticipate challenges**
- » **Hold ‘first look’ session with participants and supporters – but communicate to general industry in a clear and transparent way *why* we are doing this and that this will in no way influence the outputs**
- » **It is ‘how’ it is presented – not ‘what’ is presented**
- » **Build a step by step plan – reach out and build consensus, bring people and groups in, in a logical way**
- » **Make sure ORQC owns ‘official communications’ of the results – establish upfront that ARF/ORQC is the only reliable source of results – continuous management of communications essential**



Strong Statements from The Dutch

- » **Prohibit suppliers from marketing the results – under no circumstances publish unblinded results – make no value judgments (good vs. bad) in any report.**
- » **“Communicate as often as possible not about the quality of an individual panel, but the general quality of *panel research*. Not good, better, worse than another panel”
Stay away from comparisons.**