

## Report on Seminar: Interpretation and Presentation of Results

Tuesday, 29 November 2011, Aachen, Germany

Adrian Zlocki

All materials can be found on: <http://www.fot-net.eu>

### Agenda:

1. Introduction: Adrian Zlocki (IKA)
2. How do you take into account the impact question from the beginning of a project?:  
Barbara Metz (University of Wuerzburg)
3. Interpretation of results: Moderator: Oliver Carsten (University of Leeds)
  - euroFOT - Freek Faber (TNO)
  - Lancashire ISA - Frank Lai (University of Leeds)
  - TeleFOT - Pontus Engelbrektsson (Chalmers University), Ruth Welsh (University of Loughborough)
  - Drive-C2X - Pirkko Rämä (VTT)
4. Exercise on presenting negative and positive outcomes of a FOT: Eline Jonkers (TNO)
5. The stakeholder's point of view: Moderator: Yvonne Barnard (University of Leeds)
  - Point of view of politicians - Lars Tysklind (Swedish MP, Committee on Transport and Communications)
  - Discussion on other points of view
6. Experiences and good practice on dissemination and publicity
  - Introduction: Irina Silva (ERTICO)
  - The Freilot approach: Zeljko Jeftic (ERTICO)
  - From FOT to implementation strategies: getting public, authority and stakeholders' awareness of ISA: Sven Vlassenroot (University of Ghent)
7. Small group exercise: drafting a press release on an outcome of a FOT: Irina Silva (ERTICO)
8. Conclusions and wrap-up: Yvonne Barnard (University of Leeds)

**Number of participants: 31**

## **Introduction**

Adrian Zlocki introduced all participants to FOTNET and the agenda of the seminar.

## **Interpretation of results**

During the discussion it was stated that interpretation is not immediately obvious from the collected data

- Research of impacts:
  - Driver reactions (behaviour and opinions), show benefits (users, industry, transport system managers), enhance deployment
  - Different impact focus for different target groups

The difficulties in the interpretation were identified as:

Challenges: indirect impact assessment, upscaling, debundling, integration

- Why is the expected outcome not the same as the outcomes from the data?
  - Different system configurations, sample size too small for fully interpreting results, especially when disaggregating data
- Merging data across FOTs
- Between subjects design adds complexity
- Multi-function systems are assessed
- Budget, recruitment, drop-out, time constraints
- New research questions may come up when the data are analysed, but time and budget is a problem

Some solutions were provided:

- Plan for impact from the very beginning, consequences for data logged and hypotheses
- Pilots very useful for getting feeling for system impact and data quality; don't assume data are OK because they look OK
- You need a lot of effort and interaction between partners to ensure the impact questions can be answered
- Focus on the main findings first
- Significant is not the same as meaningful
- It takes time to conclude what is really important
- Use other FOT data for interpretation
- Assumptions have to be made for interpretation, these should be made explicit

What happened in reality?

- You need to ask participants, otherwise you might just speculate
- You need to measure how participants perceive the product
-

- More consideration should be given to subjective data, and there is a potential for overconfidence in logged data
- Open questions reduce uncertainty in interpretation
- Create understanding, not only descriptive statistics
- Subjective data not enough for interpretation, collect “meta-data”: problems and issues encountered, specific to participant or country
- Exit interview, identify reasons for lack of use of device

Identified recommendations on impact are:

- Keep it simple: it’s hard to give up your own agenda!
- Stakeholders: bring them together and discuss the issues, involve them, have a manageable set of research questions

### **Exercise on presenting negative and positive outcomes of a FOT**

The participants were divided into four groups and they got the exercise to create a poster which shows the results of a FOT.

The design of the different posters varied a lot. The participants created several different approaches to present the results of the FOT. After the presentation of these posters, they were analysed in the following discussion.

The different results are:

- Keep it simple, even if the results are complex
- Go directly to the main results
- Concentrate on things you can really prove
- Attract attention by graphics
- Visualise
- Graphs are good for expert public
- Question: how do you show small differences?

### **The stakeholder’s point of view**

After Lars Tysklind gave his presentation about the point of view of politicians, a discussion with Roland Schäfer and Tom Alkim followed, who represent the point of view of one OEM and of an employee of a ministry for traffic and water engineering. The main points of the presentation of Lars Tysklind and the following discussion are mentioned below:

- Scientific facts, easy to communicate
- Insight in the users’ behaviour and behavioural adaptation
- Directions for deployment
- The role of public opinion
- Priorities in spending public funds
- To use results: maybe legislation, standards, but also incentives

## **Experiences and good practice on dissemination and publicity**

Dissemination activities should be conducted by means of:

- TV, video clips
- Local/national dissemination is very important
- Joint events, but beware of visibility
- Showcases
- Role-model drivers:
  - more awareness, also on related issues
  - media attention
  - public acceptance
- Demonstration car
- The right messenger e.g. local champion
- Informal dissemination
- Long term dissemination strategy

Recommendation on dissemination activities were given in terms of:

- Positive experiences in euroFOT, TeleFOT, Drive C2X and CityMobil
- What do you want to achieve with dissemination?
- Different sites, different stories, dissemination should be adaptable
- Good dissemination may lead to getting more participants (organisations) on board
- Political debate may have different effects (on implementation and image), both positive and negative
- Need to have a communication plan
- Be open about the project, even when things go wrong
- Know your opponents

### **Small group exercise: drafting a press release on an outcome of a FOT**

The exercise, which was given to the participants, was to write a press release based on information of a finished project. They should try to write this press release without the help of any tools only by means of brainstorming and discussion. Every group had to point out which are the main points and which have to be mentioned in a press release.

Afterwards, all four press releases, written by the groups, were discussed and compared to the official press release of the project.

### **Conclusions and wrap-up**

Yvonne Barnard presented the wrap-up of the seminar and closed the day.