



WAYS TO USE DiBL | WHITEPAPER 2 OF 6

# Survey & Polls

*How real-time surveys and adaptive polls turn audience feedback into insight, and insight into better decisions.*

---

dibl.eu | Serious Games Interactive | 2026

## Executive Summary

Decisions made without evidence are a gamble. Yet most organisations rely on guesswork far more than they realise: assumptions about what participants know, what audiences think, what learners have understood, what teams feel about a strategy. The feedback loop between what facilitators believe is happening in the room and what is actually happening is often broken.

DiBL Survey and Polls closes that loop. By making it easy to capture structured, quantitative, and qualitative feedback in real time, during or after any session, DiBL gives facilitators and organisations the data they need to make better decisions, improve programmes, and demonstrate impact.

This is the final whitepaper in the Ways to Use DiBL series. Where earlier papers focused on generative and learning-focused activities, this paper focuses on the evaluative dimension: using surveys and polls to understand your audience, measure outcomes, and build a culture of data-informed facilitation.

## The Challenge: The Feedback Gap

Most organisations collect feedback. Few act on it. The reasons are structural: feedback tools produce outputs that are difficult to interpret, arrive too late to inform the current session, or generate data that is never reviewed systematically. The result is a feedback loop that exists on paper but fails in practice.

Even where feedback is well intentioned, the tools often get in the way. Post-session paper surveys are completed in a hurry. Anonymous online forms are distributed but rarely responded to. Verbal check-ins capture the most confident voices and miss everyone else.

The more fundamental problem is that most feedback is collected after the event, when it is too late to change anything. Facilitators learn what went wrong in a session only after it has ended. Learners' misconceptions persist through the whole workshop because there was no mechanism to surface them in the moment.

Real-time feedback tools solve the timing problem. But most of them, including the most widely used options, are designed to show results, not to help facilitators understand and act on them. DiBL Survey and Polls is designed for both.

## The Learning Science

### Formative Assessment

---

The evidence for formative assessment, feedback used to adapt teaching and learning while it is still happening, is among the strongest in education research. Black and William's (1998) landmark review found that formative assessment produces significant learning gains, with effect sizes comparable to the highest-performing educational interventions. The key condition: feedback must be rapid enough, and facilitators must have the tools and disposition to act on it in the moment.

DiBL polls used during a session provide exactly this: a real-time window into participant understanding that allows facilitators to adapt their approach before the session ends. Discovering that 60% of a group misunderstands a key concept halfway through a session, rather than in an end-of-course survey, has transformative implications for learning outcomes.

### Survey Design and Response Quality

---

The quality of survey data depends critically on question design. Research on survey methodology (Tourangeau et al., 2000) identifies several common design flaws that reduce data quality: leading questions that prime a desired response, double-barrelled

questions that ask two things at once, vague response scales that participants interpret differently, and question order effects that bias later responses.

DiBL's adaptive questioning feature, where the flow of questions adjusts based on participant responses, addresses one of the most fundamental limitations of static surveys: the inability to follow up when a response is unexpected or ambiguous.

## **Psychological Safety and Anonymous Input**

---

Research on psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) shows that people are significantly more honest in environments where they feel their input will not be used against them. Anonymous polling lowers the social risk of giving a minority or unpopular opinion, which is precisely when honest feedback is most valuable.

DiBL Survey and Polls supports anonymous input as a default, creating conditions where participants are more likely to give accurate responses about their learning, their confusion, and their concerns. This is particularly important in evaluation contexts where power dynamics between participants and facilitators might otherwise skew results.

## What DiBL Survey and Polls Is

DiBL Survey and Polls is a live and asynchronous feedback tool that lets facilitators capture structured input from participants during or after any session. Polls can be facilitator-led, advancing at the facilitator's pace, or participant-driven, with automatic adaptation based on each person's responses.

Results appear in real time on a shared dashboard. Individual and aggregate data are available for export, and the adaptive questioning flow means surveys can branch to follow-up questions when participants signal that more context is needed.

### KEY CAPABILITIES

- **Flexible question flow:** Questions can be facilitator-led or participant-driven with automatic adaptation based on responses.
- **Instant feedback:** Capture responses live during sessions or asynchronously, ideal for meetings, workshops, or evaluations.
- **Real-time analytics:** See trends, patterns, and participation levels immediately, no waiting for delayed reporting.
- **Exportable insight:** Download results for planning, reporting, or follow-up actions.
- **Low-friction participation:** Participants answer on their own device, smooth, accessible, and anonymous by default.

## Designing Questions That Work

The most common failure in survey design is asking what is easy to measure rather than what actually matters. The principles below distinguish high-quality survey design from box-ticking.

### Start with the decision you need to make

Before writing a single question, ask: what will I do differently depending on the answer? If the answer is "nothing", the question should not be in the survey. Every question should serve a clear purpose: understanding prior knowledge, identifying misconceptions, measuring confidence, gauging satisfaction, or informing future design.

## Match question type to purpose

---

- **Scales (1-5, agree/disagree):** best for measuring attitudes, confidence, or satisfaction across a group.
- **Multiple choice:** best for knowledge checks and preference mapping where you want to compare across defined options.
- **Open text:** best for capturing nuance, unexpected perspectives, or follow-up detail where you don't yet know the answer space.
- **Rating with follow-up:** best for combining quantitative measurement with qualitative insight.
- **True/False:** great for quick check-ins with an image, video, or one-liner statement.
- **Image options:** useful when input concerns something visual or when an image communicates the question more clearly than words.

## Use adaptive flow for richer data

---

DiBL's adaptive question flow allows surveys to branch: participants who rate their understanding low are asked a follow-up; participants who indicate a particular concern are directed to more specific questions. This produces data that is far richer than a flat survey, without making the experience longer for participants who do not need the follow-up questions.

## Sequence for psychological safety

---

Start with easier, less sensitive questions to build comfort before moving to questions about performance, confusion, or critical feedback. Participation rates and response quality both improve when participants feel the survey is a supportive tool, not an evaluation of them personally.

## How DiBL Compares

Survey and polling tools are a mature and crowded market. Here is how DiBL Survey and Polls compares to the most widely used alternatives.

Tool	Strengths	Where DiBL goes further
<b>Mentimeter</b>	Strong live polling with real-time visualisation. Widely used in corporate and higher education. Good range of question types.	DiBL separates Cases from Sessions, so data from each run is cleanly separated and comparable. DiBL also adds adaptive branching, facilitator-side metadata input, and share links for live data dashboards.
<b>Wooclap</b>	Good audience interaction with polling. Strong PowerPoint integration. Popular in higher education.	Wooclap surveys are static and linear with no session-level data separation. DiBL supports branching logic, facilitator-only questions for metadata, and professional data export with session-level granularity.
<b>AhaSlides</b>	Affordable with survey and polling features. Good free tier. AI-assisted question generation.	DiBL's Case/Session architecture means you can run the same survey hundreds of times and keep every run's data separate. Facilitator-side questions capture metadata without burdening participants.
<b>Slido</b>	Widely used for Q&A and polling in meetings and conferences. Strong Webex/Zoom integration.	Slido is meeting-focused with no separation between runs. DiBL is built for evaluation at scale, with session-level exports, facilitator metadata, live share links, and integration with learning activities in the same case.

## Three Features That Set DiBL Apart

Beyond adaptive branching and real-time results, DiBL has three architectural features that fundamentally differentiate it from tools like Mentimeter, Wooclap, and AhaSlides for survey and evaluation work.

### 1. Cases and Sessions: A Professional Data Architecture

In Mentimeter, Wooclap, or AhaSlides, you create a presentation or activity and all responses accumulate in a single pool. You cannot easily distinguish who facilitated a

particular session, when data was collected, or separate one run from another. If you run the same survey 20 times across different classrooms, all 20 runs merge into one dataset.

DiBL works differently. A Case is your template: the questions, flow, and design. A Session is a specific run of that case, with its own participants, facilitator, timestamp, and exportable dataset. This is the same architecture used by professional survey platforms like SurveyXact and Qualtrics, and it means you can run the same case hundreds of times while keeping every session's data cleanly separated, filterable, and comparable.

- Export data from a single session, a date range, or across all sessions for a case.
- Compare results between facilitators, locations, or time periods.
- Track trends over time without manual data cleanup.

## **2. Share Links: Live Data Dashboards**

---

DiBL lets you create a Share Link that gives stakeholders access to survey results, either from a specific date range or as a live feed that updates as new data comes in. This means a programme manager can see aggregated results from all sessions in real time, without needing to log in to DiBL or request exports.

- Share a link to live results with your team lead, client, or research partner.
- Set a date range to share results from a specific programme period.
- Results update automatically as new sessions are run, no manual export needed.

## **3. Facilitator-Side Questions: Metadata Without Burdening Participants**

---

In most survey tools, if you want to know which class, location, or facilitator a set of responses belongs to, you have to ask every participant. This wastes time, adds friction, and produces inconsistent data.

DiBL solves this with facilitator-side input. You can place questions on the Facilitator page, invisible to participants, where the facilitator enters their name, location, class, or any other metadata once at the start of the session. This data is then attached to every participant response in that session's export.

- Facilitator enters name, location, and class once on the facilitator screen.
- All participant responses in that session inherit the metadata automatically.
- Exports include both facilitator metadata and participant responses in a single dataset.
- No risk of inconsistent spelling or missing data from participants.

## The Five Poll Templates

DiBL includes five ready-to-use poll and survey templates, each designed for a specific facilitation need. You can start any of them directly from the template library in the case builder, and adapt them as a starting point for your own session design.

### Template 10

#### Quick Poll

One question, one reveal, instant results. Run a quick anonymous poll on a single question and let participants see the aggregate results the moment everyone has responded. Takes under three minutes from launch to discussion. Use it as an opening pulse-check, a decision-making tool in the middle of a session, or a closing temperature-read.

[Preview template](#)

### Template 11

#### Live Session Evaluation

A short structured evaluation built for use at the end of any session. Participants respond on their own devices, and results appear immediately on the shared screen, giving the whole group a collective view of what worked, what was unclear, and what they are taking forward. Discuss the results in real time rather than waiting for a debrief days later.

[Preview template](#)

### Template 12

#### Before and After Poll

Run a short poll or survey before your event, then run the same questions afterwards and compare the results side by side. Use this to measure attitude shifts, track how understanding develops, or demonstrate the impact of a session to stakeholders. Works equally well as a 3-question confidence check or a full 10-item evaluation instrument.

[Preview template](#)

### Template 13

#### Multi-Round Poll Series

Three questions asked in quick succession, where each question is informed by the response to the previous one. Use this when you want to move a group from surface-level opinion to deeper reasoning: the first question opens up the topic, the second challenges assumptions, and the third invites a considered position. Structured disagreement becomes possible without conflict.

[Preview template](#)

#### Template 14

### **Dynamic Brainstorm and Poll**

The facilitator selects both the brainstorm prompt and the follow-up poll question live, in the moment, based on how the session is developing. Start with a free-text brainstorm to surface ideas, then immediately poll the group to prioritise or react to what has emerged. Particularly powerful in strategy sessions and workshops where the agenda needs to stay responsive to the room.

[Preview template](#)

All five templates are available in the DiBL template library. Sign up free at [dibl.eu/sign-up](https://dibl.eu/sign-up), open the case builder, choose a template, write your questions, and you are ready to run your first poll session in minutes.

## In Practice: How to Run a DiBL Survey Session

### Before the Session

---

Effective survey design starts with a clear purpose: are you measuring prior knowledge before a session, checking understanding during it, or evaluating outcomes after? Each purpose requires different question types and timing.

- **Pre-session:** Use a short poll (3–5 questions) to gauge prior knowledge, expectations, and context. This data shapes how you facilitate.
- **During session:** Use quick 1–2 question pulse checks at natural transition points to assess understanding before moving on.
- **Post-session:** Use a structured evaluation survey (5–10 questions) to assess learning, satisfaction, and application intent.

Set up adaptive branches in advance. If a participant rates their confidence below 3, decide what follow-up question will help you understand why.

### During the Session

---

Live poll moments should feel natural, not disruptive. The best facilitators integrate polls seamlessly into their session flow.

- Frame each poll before launching: "Before we move on, I want to check where everyone is with this concept."
- Share results immediately and use them to adapt: "About a third of you indicated low confidence here, so let's spend more time on this."
- Use unexpected results as facilitation prompts, not just data points: "More of you chose X than I expected. Who can explain why?"

### After the Session

---

- Review aggregate data within 24 hours, when patterns are most actionable for your next session design.
- Share key findings with participants as a closing loop: "Here's what the group told us, and here's what we are going to do about it."
- Track metrics over time across multiple sessions to identify whether outcomes are improving.
- Export data for reporting, stakeholder communication, or programme evaluation.

## From Survey to Programme Evaluation

The three features described above, Cases and Sessions, Share Links, and Facilitator-side metadata, are not just conveniences. Together, they enable something that no competitor in the live polling space offers: continuous programme evaluation at scale.

Consider an NGO running a youth intervention programme across 50 locations, delivered by 30 different facilitators over two years. With Mentimeter or Slido, each session's data disappears into a shared pool. There is no way to compare facilitators, track trends over time, or produce a credible evaluation report without extensive manual data work.

With DiBL, the same Case is run as a new Session each time. Every Session captures the facilitator's name, location, and group metadata automatically. Share Links give the programme manager a live dashboard of incoming results. And the Case/Session architecture means that cross-session analysis, comparing locations, time periods, or facilitator effectiveness, is built into the data structure from the start.

This is the DiBL Evaluation Loop: design a case once, run it across many sessions, collect structured data with automatic metadata, analyse across sessions, improve the programme, and repeat. It is the architecture that makes DiBL not just a survey tool, but an evaluation system.

#### WHO BENEFITS FROM PROGRAMME-LEVEL EVALUATION?

- **NGOs and foundations:** Run the same impact survey across all delivery partners and produce aggregated evaluation reports for donors and boards.
- **Education programmes:** Track student outcomes across classes, schools, and semesters, with facilitator metadata built in.
- **Training companies:** Compare session effectiveness across trainers, client organisations, and programme iterations.
- **Government initiatives:** Collect structured citizen feedback at scale across municipalities, time periods, and delivery channels, with session-level granularity for accountability reporting.

## Real-World Examples

### Case study

#### **Waterwise – Measuring Behaviour Change Through Embedded Surveys**

The Waterwise project used DiBL to run a structured water conservation programme where surveys were embedded directly into the session. Participants completed a baseline survey measuring their water-use attitudes and behaviours, participated in facilitated activities, and then completed a follow-up survey one week later to track whether awareness translated into action.

Six 5-point Likert scale questions captured attitudes toward water use, covering daily consumption estimates, water-use awareness, sustainable habits, and reduction intent. Detailed behavioural questions covered shower frequency and duration, toilet flushing habits, laundry practices, and dishwashing methods.

Of 19 participants, 16 responded to the one-week follow-up. Half reported specific behaviour changes: four had started turning off running taps, two took shorter showers, and others described increased general awareness. Statistical analysis showed a significant increase in water-use consideration ( $p=0.006$ ), even though measured water consumption had not yet dropped significantly. Awareness shifts precede measurable behaviour change: the baseline survey was not just data collection, it was a facilitation tool that anchored group discussions in personal reality.

### Case study

#### **Borns Vilkar – Anonymous Surveys for Sensitive Youth Topics**

Borns Vilkar (Children's Welfare) used DiBL surveys to understand youth perspectives on sensitive social issues, topics where young people are unlikely to share honest opinions in a group setting. The anonymous input format was critical: participants who would not raise their hand in a discussion responded honestly to a private digital survey.

The real-time results gave facilitators an accurate picture of the room's thinking before the facilitated discussion began. Rather than asking "what do you think?" and hearing only the most confident voices, facilitators could say: "The survey shows that most of you feel X, so let's talk about why." This grounded the conversation in what participants actually believed, not what they felt comfortable saying aloud.

DiBL's facilitator-side questions were particularly valuable: facilitators entered the school name, class, and session context once, and that metadata was automatically attached to all participant responses. This gave the central team

clean, comparable data across dozens of sessions without ever asking young participants administrative questions.

### Case study

## **Green Rooftops Cyprus - From Voting Data to Policy Recommendations**

The Green Roofs Cyprus project demonstrated how DiBL polling can bridge the gap between public aspiration and policymaking. Over five 3-hour sessions, the "Rooftops Reimagined" programme brought together citizens, architects, and urban planning students to explore how green roofs could reshape urban Cyprus.

Voting data across multiple rounds was remarkably consistent: building managers received 64% support in round 1, young couples 69% in round 2, and families with children 66% in round 3. This data surfaced a crucial insight: senior citizens, despite representing a significant urban population segment, never won a single vote, revealing a gap in existing policy discussions.

Participant responses about perceived benefits were categorised into eight outcome areas: environmental and climate benefits (24%), social and recreational value (17%), urban farming potential (15%), wellbeing (14%), ecological improvement (12%), aesthetic enhancement (10%), and functional advantages (8%). Voting data collected live was categorised, published in the GREAT Green Roofs Cyprus Insights Report 2025, and directly informed ten policy recommendations presented to government stakeholders.

## Getting Started with DiBL Survey and Polls

The fastest way to start is to replace the feedback form you already use with a DiBL survey. Build 5 questions covering what you normally ask, understanding, satisfaction, confidence, and application intent, add one adaptive branch for participants who indicate low confidence, and run it at the end of your next session.

1

### Define your purpose

Decide what decision the survey data will inform: prior knowledge, in-session understanding, or post-session evaluation.

2

### Design and branch

Write 5–8 questions, add at least one adaptive branch for low-confidence responses, and set up real-time display.

3

### Run and act

Share results during or after the session, use unexpected findings as discussion prompts, and export data for follow-up.

Learn more: [dibl.eu/surveyandpolls](https://dibl.eu/surveyandpolls) Sign up: [dibl.eu/sign-up](https://dibl.eu/sign-up)

## Key Takeaways

### SUMMARY

- Formative assessment, feedback used to adapt facilitation while it is still happening, produces significant learning gains (Black and William, 1998). DiBL live polls make formative assessment practical in any session.
- DiBL's adaptive question flow, branching surveys based on participant responses, produces richer data than static surveys without increasing participant burden.
- Anonymous input improves response quality, particularly for sensitive topics and evaluative feedback where participants might otherwise self-censor.
- DiBL's Case/Session architecture enables continuous programme evaluation at scale: run the same survey across many facilitators, locations, and time periods, and keep every session's data cleanly separated, filterable, and comparable.
- Compared to Mentimeter, Wooclap, AhaSlides, and Slido, DiBL is not just a polling tool. It is a structured evaluation system with session-level data separation, facilitator metadata, live share links, and adaptive branching.
- The most important survey design principle: start with the decision you need to make, then design backward to the questions that will give you the data to make it.

## Continue Reading

### Build It Yourself

Ready to build a survey or poll in DiBL? Our builder guide walks you through interaction types, data structure, the Export Configurator, and change management step by step.

- **Whitepaper 12: Building Survey and Polls, How to Build with DiBL Series**

### More in the Ways to Use DiBL Series

- Whitepaper 1: Brainstorms – Facilitated brainstorming with simultaneous digital input
- Whitepaper 2: Dilemmas – Facilitated decision-making through branching scenarios
- Whitepaper 3: Presentations – Interactive, facilitator-led content delivery
- Whitepaper 4: Quiz and Mini-Games – Knowledge checks with scoring and gamification
- Whitepaper 5: Simulations – Multi-round scenarios with variables and consequences

## References

Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7-74.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.

Egenfeldt-Nielsen, S. (2026). Hvordan kan mobiler skabe vaerdi i en skoleklasse? Manuscript, Serious Games Interactive.

Merry, A., and Zachariou, A. (2025). Rooftops Reimagined: Green Roofs Cyprus Insight Report 2025. Frederick University Cyprus. GREAT Project (EU Horizon Programme).

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., and Rasinski, K. (2000). *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge University Press.