

White space quality criteria (3 Dec 2013)

| | Differentiation | Appeal | Resilience | Prompting Action |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>A. Is the subject topical?</p> <p>B. Is it different to what others are doing – either because of the topic or angle taken?</p> <p>C. Is the article revelatory and/or contrary to prevailing views?</p> | <p>A. Is the reader likely to continue past the first paragraph of writing?</p> <p>B. Does the report <u>look</u> good?</p> <p>C. Do the structure and writing style make it easy to read?</p> <p>D. Does the report do anything interesting to make the material stick in the reader's mind?</p> | <p>A. Is there any quantitative primary research?</p> <p>B. Is there any qualitative primary research?</p> <p>C. Is there any secondary research?</p> <p>D. How good is the analysis of either primary or secondary research?</p> <p>E. Are credible internal experts used effectively?</p> <p>F. Is the methodology clearly described?</p> | <p>A. Does the article clearly articulate action steps for the reader?</p> <p>B. Does the article give the reader a clear idea of how the consulting firm could help whilst avoiding being a thinly disguised sales pitch?</p> |
| 1 | <p>A. Subject is past its sell-by-date</p> <p>B. Has been written about extensively by other consulting firms for some time</p> <p>C. States the obvious</p> | <p>A. Introduction off-putting</p> <p>B. Presentation is poor and actively deters the audience from reading the document</p> <p>C. Writing style is very poor, often with too much jargon</p> <p>D. Nothing to make the material stick</p> | <p>A. No quantitative primary research</p> <p>B. No qualitative primary research</p> <p>C. No secondary research</p> <p>D. No analysis of the data</p> <p>E. No contributors named</p> <p>F. No description of research methodology, analysis or sources</p> | <p>A. No sense at all as to what the reader ought to take from the article</p> <p>B. Makes no reference to a firm's services OR standard boiler plate OR thinly disguised sales pitch</p> |
| 2 | <p>A. Subject has little long-term resonance and no immediate appeal</p> <p>B. Covers the same ground as some other consulting firms</p> <p>C. Some interesting points but in the main states the obvious</p> | <p>A. Introduction does nothing to encourage the reader to continue</p> <p>B. Presentation is weak</p> <p>C. Writing style is boring</p> <p>D. Hardly anything to make the material stick</p> | <p>A. Quantitative research carried out with fewer than ten organisations / people</p> <p>B. Qualitative research with one or two people or companies</p> <p>C. Very limited secondary research</p> <p>D. Poor / limited analysis of data</p> <p>E. Author or experts named but credentials unclear</p> <p>F. <i>Score not available for this question</i></p> | <p>A. Hints at what the reader ought to do next</p> <p>B. Contains description of relevant practice</p> |
| 3 | <p>A. Subject has long-term resonance, but is not an immediate burning platform</p> <p>B. Subject has been written about before but angle is different</p> <p>C. Raises a number of interesting points</p> | <p>A. Introduction provides some encouragement to continue</p> <p>B. Presentation is professional</p> <p>C. Writing style is clear and jargon-free</p> <p>D. At least one compelling story, case study or analogy that is likely to stick in the reader's mind</p> | <p>A. Quantitative research carried out with 10-50 organisations / people</p> <p>B. Qualitative research with 3- 5 people or companies</p> <p>C. Some secondary research</p> <p>D. Basic analysis of data</p> <p>E. Author or experts named and credibility established</p> <p>F. Basic description of research methodology, analysis or sources</p> | <p>A. Attempts to define the next steps but lacklustre</p> <p>B. Report gives an impression of the firm's relevant services</p> |
| 4 | <p>A. Links effectively to events in the past year</p> <p>B. Substantially different to what has gone before</p> <p>C. Challenges current thinking in some areas</p> | <p>A. Reader likely to continue after reading introduction</p> <p>B. Presentation is both professional and appealing</p> <p>C. Writing style is clear, jargon-free and engaging</p> <p>D. Reader is very likely to remember extremely compelling story, case study or analogy</p> | <p>A. Quantitative research carried out with 50-200 organisations/people</p> <p>B. Qualitative research with 5-10 people or companies</p> <p>C. Good secondary research</p> <p>D. Good level of analysis of data</p> <p>E. Main report contains opinionated commentary by credible internal expert</p> <p>F. <i>Score not available for this question</i></p> | <p>A. Clear, actionable next steps for the reader</p> <p>B. It is very clear how the firm would help with this topic and what experience it has</p> |
| 5 | <p>A. Links effectively to events in the past six months</p> <p>B. Very different to what has gone before</p> <p>C. Presents a revelatory and challenging viewpoint</p> | <p>A. After reading the introduction, reader is compelled to continue</p> <p>B. Stunning presentation</p> <p>C. Writing style is best-in-class</p> <p>D. Would be almost impossible to forget</p> | <p>A. Quantitative research carried out with more than 200 organisations/people</p> <p>B. Qualitative research with more than 10 people or companies</p> <p>C. Extensive secondary research</p> <p>D. Outstanding analysis of data</p> <p>E. Main report contains opinionated commentary by multiple credible internal experts</p> <p>F. Clear (but not cumbersome) description of research methodology, analysis or sources</p> | <p>A. Clear, actionable next steps and the reader is compelled to take action</p> <p>B. Very clear how firm would help with this topic and what is unique about its approach</p> |