



Deliverable D-0.5

Quality Assurance Report

Final Version

CAMPAIGNS AND AWARENESS RAISING STRATEGIES IN TRAFFIC SAFETY

Contract No TREN-05-FP6TR-S07.59641-019520-CAST

Project Co-ordinator: Institut Belge pour la Sécurité Routière (IBSR)

Author(s): Divera Twisk (SWOV), Tamara Hoekstra (SWOV)
Date: 10.09.2009

**Sixth framework programme
Priority sustdev-2004-3.4.1.4.5
Sustainable surface transport priority**

Title	Programme Handbook for QA Procedures
Author(s)	Divera Twisk (SWOV), Tamara Hoekstra (SWOV)
Date	10.09.2009
Report Number	D-0.5
Version status	Final version
Distribution	Public

Table of contents

Table of contents.....	3
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Objectives of the document.....	4
1.2 Structure of the document.....	4
2 Procedure And Guidelines	5
2.1 Objectives of the quality procedure.....	5
2.2 Guidelines	5
3 Implementation and outcome of the quality assurance process.....	7
4 Quality reports.....	8
4.1 Workpackage 1	8
4.1.1 DELIVERABLE 1.3.....	8
4.1.2 DELIVERABLE 1.4	11
4.2 Workpackage 2	15
4.2.1 DELIVERABLE 2.1	15
4.2.2 DELIVERABLE 2.2	18
4.2.3 DELIVERABLE 2.3	22
4.2.4 DELIVERABLE 2.4	26
4.3 Workpackage 3	30
4.3.1 DELIVERABLE 3.2 (3.2A + 3.2B)	30
4.4 Workpackage 4	33
4.4.1 DELIVERABLE 4.2	33
4.5 Workpackage 5	38
4.5.1 DELIVERABLE 5.2	38

1 Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the document

This deliverable describes the QA process and its results. More specifically, the individual requirements and outcomes of the QA process are reported. Furthermore, the implementation of the guidelines that were drawn up in advance are discussed.

1.2 Structure of the document

In chapter 2, the guidelines that were formulated at the start of the CAST project are described. Chapter 3 briefly discusses how and if these guidelines were adhered to. In chapter 4, the quality reports of the public reports are presented.

2 Procedure And Guidelines

2.1 Objectives of the quality procedure

The Quality Assurance (QA) Report describes the quality assurance process within the CAST project. The objective of this QA procedure was to ensure that:

- The best possible "product" was produced
- The objectives were met
- The outcome meets scientific standards
- The product incorporates the current "state of the art"
- The product is appreciated by potential users of knowledge and tools

In order to assure the quality of the products created within the CAST project, a number of guidelines were drawn up in advance. These guidelines were designed to ensure that each product would and could be judged by its individual merits. The guidelines that were formulated are described below.

2.2 Guidelines

Guidelines for quality control of Public Products (PU)

1. At the start of the work, each work package leader sets quality standards for each public deliverables, and describes the process by which he will ensure the quality of the product. This is called the *quality plan*.
2. Aside of quality standards, each plan contains an internal review of the quality of the product and an external review. The Internal review is a review conducted by members of the consortium, which are not involved in the work package that has produced the deliverable. The external review is conducted by experts outside the consortium. The names of the external experts to be consulted are also included in the plan. In addition the plan contains a time line and planning. For the quality plan a standardized form is available in section 4.3. of this handbook.
3. The *quality plan* is submitted to the quality officer, for assessment and comments are returned to the WP leader, who revises the plan. The QA sends the quality plan to the steering committee (SC). The SC approves the plans, and signs each plan off.
4. For the deliverable a template is available in chapter 3 of this handbook.
5. Before submission of the deliverable the work package leader organizes the internal and external review and ensures that suggestions for improvements are dealt with. Together with the deliverable the work package leader produces a document describing the process leading to its production, emphasizing the features that ensure its quality: e.g. external consultations, user group discussions. This document also includes the internal review and external review, and a description of in what ways the product was improved on the basis of the internal and the external reviews. This document is called the *quality report*. For the quality report a standardized form is available in section 4.4. of this handbook.

6. The work package leader ensures that the document meets the quality standards of the plan. The draft deliverable and the quality report are submitted to the Quality Officer using the standardized forms included in section 2 of this handbook.

7. The quality officer reviews the deliverable and the quality report, comparing it with the requirements stated in the technical annex and the quality plan.

Comments are sent to the work package leader. The quality report is submitted together with the deliverable to the quality officer for assessment.

- The QA sends comments to the work package leader.
- The work package leader revises the deliverable and returns it to the QA, together with the quality report with added info about the revision.
- After having received the revised deliverable from the work package leader, the QA sends the plan to the steering committee for approval.

8. The work package leaders will ensure that all comments are considered and all revisions are carried out as required by the QA Officer (after consultation of the Co-ordinator) and will submit a print-ready copy to the QA Officer no later than the date set by the steering committee for final approval. See chapter 6 for the list of deliverables with their submission dates for final steering committee approval.

9. The quality officer reports to the steering committee about the quality procedure. The steering committee signs off the final version of the deliverable. The intention is that all members of the steering committee read all public deliverables before signing them off.

3 Implementation and outcome of the quality assurance process

Most of the guidelines were followed to ensure the quality of the products rendered within the CAST project. First off, general requirements were drawn up for all deliverables. Additional requirements were formulated and tailored to the specific characteristics of each report. Furthermore, all reports were reviewed by a member of the consortium not involved in its conception, as well as a qualified professional in the field of road safety. The outcomes of these reviews were considered and incorporated if necessary, and described in a quality report for each public deliverable (see annexes).

However, in the course of the CAST project, some practical issues led to a revision of some of the guidelines. More specifically, in most occasions, the general and individual requirements for the deliverables were not formally submitted to the quality assurance officer in the form of a quality plan. Instead, these requirements were formulated with the help of the input from many people, such as advertising agencies, policy makers, researchers and so on, both from within and outside the CAST consortium. As such, the quality standards were discussed, reviewed and fine-tuned in a broad forum. In addition to these standards, the quality plan was discussed and approved in the steering committee meetings. These measures meant that it was somewhat superfluous for the quality officer to approve these proceedings as well.

In the following pages, the quality reports for each deliverable can be found.

The quality reports describe:

- The main objectives of the deliverable;
- The quality standards, both general and specific to the content of the deliverable;
- A description the quality process;
- The main results of both the external and internal reviews;
- The names of both internal and external reviewers (However, in some cases, such as with the manual, the review process was so extensive, and the reviewers so numerous, that reviewer names were omitted);
- A indication of the duration of the review process.

The quality reports reveal that the deliverables were generally rated positively by those performing both the internal and external reviews. Furthermore, the quality process was useful in highlighting areas of improvement. Thanks to the feedback provided by both practical experts in the field of road safety and researchers, the authors of the deliverables were able to perfect and fine-tune the written reports published within CAST.

4 Quality reports

4.1 Workpackage 1

4.1.1 *Deliverable 1.3*



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 1.3

EFFECTS OF ROAD SAFETY CAMPAIGNS

Workpackage leader: Truls Vaa (TØI)

Editor(s): Truls Vaa, Ross Phillips

Author(s): Truls Vaa, Ross Phillips , Giannis Adamos, Alain Areal, Karin Ausserer, Patricia Delhomme, Marko Divjak, Werner de Dobbeleer, Sonja Forward, Barbara Krol, Annette Meng, Inger Synnøve Moan, Teti Nathanail, Ewald Pohlmeier, Gian Marco Sardi, Paul Schepers, Eva Sedá, Pål Ulleberg, Esther Walter

Date: 16 January 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- WP1: Describe state-of-the-art regarding applicable theories of behaviour and (partial) effects of campaigns;
- D1.3: Estimate (partial) effects of campaigns on speeding, drink-driving and related accidents, and estimate the (partial) effects of enhanced seatbelt wearing on the reduction of personal injuries by meta-analysis;
- D1.3 (partly): State hypotheses about predictors for behavioural change, establish key elements identified by evaluation studies, by meta-analysis, by road user models, and provide proposals for variables to be measured as integral parts of the evaluation of campaigns

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presentation)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough and easy to understand.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - Layout of document
- The structure is clear, logic, and in accordance with good practice for writing reports for the scientific community and for the public
- The content is in accordance with scientific standards on how to describe, discuss and conclude with regard to the issues addressed
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- The layout of D1.3 is according the required format.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- Objectives achieved: Completely
- A discussion on the definition of what should be regarded as "campaign" has been initiated and completed among CAST Steering Committee and a satisfactory conclusion has been reached
- A thorough discussion and presentation of meta-analysis as a method has been provided
- The effects have been evaluated with respect to the most prevalent and important parameters (accidents and seatbelt use)
- Thorough bivariate (sub-group) analyses have been conducted, appraised and concluded regarding to their relevance of selection for subsequent meta-regression (i.e. multivariate regression analysis)
- Discussion, appraisals and conclusions are in accordance with the data
- The deliverable can be used by researchers and policy makers.

DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

The internal and external review processes shall be described chronologically, which would be the most meaningful:

1. A workshop on theories of behaviour and effects of campaigns was conducted in Oslo in May 2006 in order to assess and map “State-of-the-art” regarding campaigns in partner countries.
2. Two reviews, which may be labelled external, have been performed on selected parts of D1.3: 1) The definition of campaigns, and 2) A “1-page description” of national experiences with campaigns. The discussion on the definition of campaigns has been done among members of the Steering Committee (summer 2007). A first draft, including national experiences from all 14 CAST-countries, was submitted in April 2008 to the SC, the Commission, and all other WP1-partners, for commenting. Comments fed back from partners have been amended and integrated in the Final Draft of D1.3 to be submitted for external review (primo November 2008)
3. The internal review team at TØI has been Ross Phillips, Pål Ulleberg and Truls Vaa. The main authors and editors of D1.3 have been Truls Vaa and Ross Phillips leaving Pål Ulleberg in the role as the main internal reviewer of D1.3, Truls Vaa has acted as internal reviewer of text written by Ross Phillips and Ross Phillips has acted as reviewer of text written by Truls Vaa. In addition to the reading, this team of three has had many “in-group” discussions regarding choice of statistical analysis, development and selection predictors and models, and interpretation of results from meta-analysis and meta-regression
4. The D1.3 was sent to Quality Assurance Manager Divera Twisk primo November 2008 for subsequent distribution to the external reviewers Charles Goldenbeld and Tamara Hoekstra, both employed as research officers at SWOV. TØI received the results of the external review 21st November 2008.
5. Regarding language it should be noted that one of the authors/editors of D1.3, Ross Phillips, has English as his mother tongue, which naturally secures the quality assurance regarding the written language of D1.3.

NAME INTERNAL REVIEWERS

Truls Vaa, Ross Phillips, Pål Ulleberg (all TØI)

NAME EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Charles Goldenbeld and Tamara Hoekstra (both SWOV)

The editors have adapted and distributed the review of D1.3 according to the remarks and suggestions provided by the external reviewers. The work was been divided between the two editors/main authors. The document were finalised and sent to the SC and the European Commission in January 2009.



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 1.4 ROAD USER MODELS AND PERSUASION TECHNIQUES

Workpackage leader: Truls Vaa (TØI)

Editor(s): Pål Ulleberg, Truls Vaa

Author(s): Pål Ulleberg, Truls Vaa, Karin Ausserer, Gitte Carstensen, Sonja Forward, Barbara Krol, Jacek Malasek, Annette Meng, Mette Møller, Inger Synnøve Moan, Ross Phillips, Ralf Risser, Gian Marco Sardi, Eva Sedá, Anabela Simoes.

Date: 16 January 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- WP1 as a whole: Describe state-of-the-art regarding applicable theories of behaviour and (partial) effects of campaigns;
- Develop a generic and theoretically based model for road safety campaigns by ascertaining campaign characteristics (key elements) that contribute to behaviour change and/or reduction in the number of accidents by meta-regression;
- Elaborate a model of the road user, based on applicable theories of behaviour, and empirical evidence of effective strategies for behavioural change;
- State hypotheses about predictors for behavioural change, establish key elements identified by evaluation studies, by meta-analysis, by road user models, and provide proposals for variables to be measured as integral parts of the evaluation of campaigns.

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presentation)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough and easy to understand.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - Layout of document
- The structure is clear, logic, and in accordance with good practice for writing reports for the scientific community and for the public
- The content is in accordance with scientific standards on how to describe, discuss and conclude with regard to the issues addressed
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- The layout of D1.4 is according the required format.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- Objectives achieved: Yes
- The D1.4 is divided in four main parts according to topic:
 - Kinds of road user behaviour to influence
 - Models that can explain road user behaviour
 - How to influence
 - Key elements for evaluation
- Five categories of road user behaviour are identified as suitable for influence because of their documented association with the frequency of accidents and levels of injury: Speeding, drink-driving, failing to yield, tailgating, dangerous overtaking, red-light running, fatigue and drowsiness, driving-and-resting-time regulations, mobile phone use, seat-belt wearing, lack of helmet use. This list of behaviours is regarded to be complete according to what is documented as valid associations
- Seven models that are considered to have potentials of explaining road user behaviour are discussed to some detail. The list is regarded to be complete according to what has been used and what is relevant for issues addressed in WP1 – task 1.4 Road User Model:
 - Protection Motivation Theory (PMT)

- The Health-Belief Model (HBM)
- The Problem-Behaviour Theory (PBT)
- The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)
- The Theory of Interpersonal Behaviour (TIB)
- Hierarchical Driver Behaviour Models
- Eclectic Road User Model based on Risk Monitoring and Emotions
- A section of “How to Influence Road User Behaviour” comprise the following:
 - General Principles for Communication with Road Users
 - Dual-Process Theories of Persuasion
 - Cognitive Dissonance Theory
 - Prospect Theory
 - Causal Attribution and the Actor-Observer Bias
 - Use of Personal Communication
 - The Use of Emotions, including effects of fear appeals and the use of humour

This list is also regarded to be complete according to what has been used as models and what is relevant for issues addressed in WP1 Road User Model. The task may in fact be regarded as “more than complete” as the issue of fear appeals has been elaborated in more detail than could be expected from the CAST Technical Annex. In addition, an experiment on different versions of two fear appeals has been conducted at the University of Oslo and the results from these experiments is included in D1.4

DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

The internal and external review process has been as follows:

6. A workshop on theories of behaviour and effects of campaigns was conducted in Oslo in May 2006 in order to assess and map the “state-of-the-art” regarding: 1) Campaigns in partner countries, and 2) The identification of theories and models.
7. After the initial workshop, two WP1-workshops especially dedicated to the identification of theories and models have been held, the first one in Vienna in March 2007 and the second one in Brussels in November 2007. These workshops stimulated partners to come up with suggestions on specific issues as for example emotions and the use of fear appeals. More models were presented and discussed with the result that still more models came up and found their way to D1.4
8. A first draft was submitted in April 2008 to the SC, the Commission, and all other WP1-partners, for commenting and amendments. Comments fed back from partners have been amended and integrated in the Final Draft of D1.4 to be submitted for external review (primo November 2008)
9. The internal review team at TØI has been Ross Phillips, Pål Ulleberg and Truls Vaa. The main authors and editors of D1.4 have been Pål Ulleberg and

<p>Truls Vaa, but all three have acted as internal reviewers of the text. Several “in-group” discussions regarding the understanding, elaboration and discussion of the theories and models have been held.</p> <p>10. The D1.4 was sent to Quality Assurance Manager Divera Twisk primo November 2008 for subsequent distribution to the external reviewers Charles Goldenbeld and Michiel Christoph, both research officers from SWOV. TØI received the results of the external review 3rd December 2008.</p>	
<p><i>NAME INTERNAL REVIEWERS</i></p>	<p><i>Truls Vaa, Ross Phillips, Pål Ulleberg (all TØI)</i></p>
<p><i>NAME EXTERNAL REVIEWERS</i></p>	<p><i>Charles Goldenbeld and Michiel Christoph (both SWOV)</i></p>
<p>The editors have adapted and distributed the review of D1.4 according to the remarks and suggestions provided by the external reviewers. The work was been divided between the two editors/main authors. The document were finalised and sent to the SC and the European Commission in January 2009.</p>	

4.2 Workpackage 2

4.2.1 Deliverable 2.1



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 2.1

TYPOLOGY OF EVALUATION METHODS: Current practices in campaign evaluation

Workpackage leader: Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Editor(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV) & Marko Divjak (ULFF)

Author(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Marko Divjak (ULFF), Ivanka Orozova-Bekkevold (DTF), Vlasta Zabukovec (ULFF)

Date: 22 November 2007

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- Making an inventory of evaluation methodologies for road safety campaigns in the EU and beyond
- Listing an exhaustive typology of road safety campaigns

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language
 - Writing style
 - Consistent use of terms
 - ...
- The structure is clear and in accordance with good practice concerning scientific publications (introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion)
- The working method is clearly and in great detail described.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives are achieved: completely
- The list of evaluation methods is adequate in reference to the objectives of the respective subtask.
- The listed methods are well described with respect to
 - Definition of terms
 - Clarity
 - Relevance
 - Provided examples
 - Their advantages / disadvantages

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

First the content of the Deliverable has been internally reviewed by WP2 partners other than the main authors. This means that a first draft of the document was sent to the task leader by 15th February 2007. ULFF distributed the document among the other WP2 partners for reviewing by the end of February 2007. The comments were discussed during the WP2 meeting on 12-13 March 2007 in Rotterdam. The editors adjusted and finalised the final draft version of the Deliverable at the end of May 2007 according to the internal review comments. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Outcome internal review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The document should also reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the current evaluation research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Every item in the standard form and how it was filled out is assessed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The database should be seen as a critical review of the produced standard form in order to form a good basis for the reporting tool.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ An overview of the missing elements in the standard form is given in the conclusion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Which campaigns will be analysed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ It was decided not to include non-

and discussed in D2.1?	road safety campaigns in D2.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ D2.1 should contain brief summaries of all the campaigns that were submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is realised in Appendix C of D2.1

The revised document has been sent by Divera Twisk (CAST Quality Officer, SWOV) to the external reviewer (Jan Vissers, DHV, the Netherlands). BIVV as WP2 leader received the comments from the external reviewer on 19 June 2007. The comments were in Dutch but have been translated for the other WP2 partners. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Outcome external review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear theoretical framework is missing and the report is very limited to the description of facts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The purpose and scope of the document is stated more clearly in the introduction. The standard form can be seen as a theoretical framework that we used to test the validity and adequateness of the evaluation report. But it was not the intention to make an exhaustive document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are two main objectives formulated for Deliverable 2.1, but it the clarity of the report would benefit if these objectives were clearly separated in the document. This is possible by devoting separate chapters for each objective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A new structure of the document was chosen. The report has been split up in two subchapters related to each objective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subchapter 2.1: Typology of the collected campaigns ○ Subchapter 2.2: Applied evaluation methodologies in the collected campaigns. ▪ The same subtitles were added to the chapter with conclusions and recommendations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nothing can be found in the report about the (statistical significant) effects of the collected road safety campaigns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is beyond the purpose of WP2. Key elements as essential parts of the evaluation of campaigns will be identified by WP1 in Deliverable 1.1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no attention paid to process evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WP2 emphasises only outcome evaluation. Process evaluation will be discussed in WP3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information is missing about the representativeness, sampling and response rate in the standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This will be an improvement of the used standard form.

The editors adapted the document according to these remarks and suggestions. The work was divided between the two editors and both sent their contribution to each other for a last internal review. The document was finalised and sent to the European Commission on 10 August 2007.



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 2.2

COMPARISON OF RESEARCH DESIGNS

Workpackage leader: Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Editor(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Marko Divjak (ULFF) & Vlasta Zabukovec (ULFF)

Author(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Stijn Daniels (IMOB), Patricia Delhomme (INRETS), Marion Deugnier (INRETS), Marko Divjak (ULFF), Chloé Eyssartier (INRETS), Tove Hels (DTF), Inger Synnøve Moan (TØI), Teti Nathanail (UTH), Ivanka Orozova-Bekkevold (DTF), Marie-Frederique Ranucci (INRETS), Paul Schepers (DGP), Filip Van den Bossche (IMOB), Vlasta Zabukovec (ULFF)

Date: 23 November 2007

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- One chapter should list general (purely methodological) publications on evaluation methods. For certain methods, it can be necessary to include literature from other fields than road safety.
- The evaluation designs are compared from a theoretical and from a practical viewpoint.
- The comparison is based on an exhaustive literature review

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - ...
- The structure is clear and in accordance with good practice concerning scientific publications (introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion)
- The text includes all necessary references in the correct format. ...
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- The layout of the Deliverable is according the required format.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives of the Deliverable are compatible with the objectives of the respective WP.
- The objectives are achieved: completely / partially
- The comparison has been done having in mind the possible isolated effects of road safety campaigns.
- The conclusions are based on the results and are relevant, concrete, applicable...

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

First the content of the Deliverable has been internally reviewed by WP2 partners who are not involved in the writing of that particular chapter. In practice a first draft of the different chapters was sent to the task leader (Vlasta Zabukovec, ULFF) by 15th February 2007. She distributed the assembled document among the other WP2 partners for review by the end of February 2007. The comments were discussed during a WP2 meeting on 12-13 March 2007. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Outcome internal review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What will be the concrete focus of D2.2?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ D2.2 has 2 broad objectives: to describe the best evaluation practice (referring to evaluation design, evaluation method/data collection

	<p>techniques and measurement variables) (1) to measure the effect of a single road safety campaign and (2) to isolate the effects of a mass media campaign from the effect of the accompanying actions (e.g. enforcement). Both will be examined from theoretical and practical viewpoint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considerations can be made about applicability of methods and designs in theory and in practice (cost, availability, etc.) but recommendations will only be made in deliverable 2.3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The section “What is evaluation design” is too elaborated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The focus should be on the definitions of the terms and it needs to be explicitly stated that the main focus is on summative evaluation only.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As WP1 describes different theoretical behavioural models, we should check this in order to use some elements as an input. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional examples and clarifications are necessary to enhance understanding the chapter regarding ‘research designs’. Besides a summarising table will give an overview of the threats, history, and maturation etc. for various designs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several paragraphs are joined together and summarised in a concluding table.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several sections of the draft version of chapter 5 may serve as general introduction of the Deliverable or belong to “Definition of terms”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This will be done by the editors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft chapter 6 and 7 will be integrated in one chapter and feasibility of isolating the effects will be an important part of the final chapter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Every author should apply APA style for referencing and the use of term in the texts should be checked with the terms agreed on during a former WP2 technical meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This has been followed up by the editors.

Every author adapted his text as agreed and the last detailed comments on the Deliverable were sent to the editors by half April 2007. The necessary adjustments were finalised and the revised document was sent to the external reviewer (Divera

Twisk, SWOV, the Netherlands) on 31st May 2007.

The editors (BIVV & ULFF) received the comments from the external reviewer on 29 June 2007. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Outcome external review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is comprehensive, well written, with lots of interesting new material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comment: how will this information be presented in the final tool? A suggestion was to structure the evaluation tool from the viewpoint of the user. Deliverable 2.2 is now clearly written from the perspective of the researcher. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WP2 leader explained that this is foreseen as an activity in the next stage (Deliverable 2.3). One of the objectives of the evaluation tool is indeed to develop a tool for practitioners.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The whole field of data analysis is missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This will be discussed in Deliverable 2.3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a need for a clearer introduction and an introduction regarding the terminology used in the document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a need to specify more the different assessment possibilities related to different characteristics of the campaigns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The 'new' conclusion of D2.1 regarding "Typology of campaigns" is added. The mentioned typologies have to be considered when conducting the evaluation. Consequences for the evaluation itself will be discussed in D2.3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There should be an inclusion of a set of criteria for a 'good' evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We enclosed some theoretical considerations for a good evaluation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of terminology regarding data collection methods and techniques is rather confusing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There has been made a clear distinction between data collection methods, techniques and data collection methodology. WP2 prefers to use the expression 'evaluation and his components' to refer to the whole research. Clear definitions are enclosed.

The editors adapted the document according to these remarks and suggestions. The work was divided between the editors but ULFF started with the changes and sent the document for finalisation to BIVV. The document was finalised and sent to the European Commission on 10 August 2007.



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 2.3 EVALUATION TOOL FOR A SINGLE CAMPAIGN

Workpackage leader: Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Editor(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Author(s):): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Stijn Daniels (IMOB), Marko Divjak (ULFF), Isabelle Goncalves (INRETS), Annette Meng (DTU), Inger Synnøve Moan (TØI), Teti Nathanail (UTH), Ivanka Orozova-Bekkevold (DTU), Paul Schepers (DGP), Koos Tamis (DGP), Filip Van den Bossche (IMOB), Vlasta Zabukovec (ULFF).

Date: 23 January 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- A best practice evaluation tool for single road safety campaigns is developed.
- The 'best practice tool' is achieved based on a theoretical and practical analysis of a large number of road safety campaigns.
- The results of WP1 were used as an important guideline towards developing the tool for campaign assessment.
- The tool is easy to use

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough and easy to understand.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - ...
- The structure is clear and in accordance with good practice concerning a practical tool.
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- The layout of the Deliverable is according the required format.
- The Deliverable is attractive in use and dissemination.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives are achieved: completely
- The conclusions are based on the results and are relevant, concrete, applicable...
- The tool can be used by fieldworkers, researchers and policy makers.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

First the content of the Deliverable has been internally reviewed by WP2 partners who are not involved in the writing of that particular chapter. This means that a first draft of the different chapters has been sent to all WP2 partners in June 2007. The comments are discussed during a WP2 meeting on 2-3 July 2007. The necessary adjustments were finalised in August 2007. This revised document was the final draft version and has been sent to Sonja Forward (VTI), WP4 leader. The aim of WP4 was to assess reliability and validity of the evaluation tool.

In 2008, CAST organised 2 workshops (in Warsaw and in Stockholm) to discuss the interim CAST results with researchers and campaign practitioners outside the CAST consortium. Both workshops devoted a specific session to the evaluation tool. During a WP2 meeting on 1-2 October 2008, WP 2 partners discussed the elements/parts/texts to be changed according to the received suggestions and comments. Hereunder follows an overview of the adaptations:

Comments	Actions
Adding 10 reasons to evaluate campaigns and some counterarguments of why reasons not to evaluate are wrong	OK
Adding minimum requirements	Discussed during the meeting what the minimum standards are and added. And we checked which paragraphs should refer to the minimum requirements
All aspects of evaluation should be included in examples in the measurement variables	OK, we checked the respective WP1 and WP4 reports and decided to add paragraphs about demographic variables, personal norm/moral norm, behavioural beliefs, normative beliefs, control beliefs, and past behaviour/habit.
The tool should contain only relevant information for a practitioner.	The tool has been reread by a WP2 campaigner and checked which elements will go out of the deliverable to an annex.
Add examples to make more practical	OK
More information on how to analyse your data.	We wrote a chapter with suggestions on appropriate analyses (descriptive statistics, correlations, t-tests)

At the end of October 2008 WP2 received a feedback report from the WP4 partners. In November 2008 several amendments will be made based on WP4 suggestions. According to their comments we adapted the structure of the tool (new titles, more clarifications, better introductions...), minimum standards regarding the data analysis is stated based on their experiences, and examples of self-reported measurements were copied from their questionnaires. The revised document served as the final draft that has been sent to the external reviewers (Tamara Hoekstra, SWOV, the Netherlands and Kaisa Hara, Liikenneturva, Finland) in December 2008.

The editor (BIVV) received the comments from the external reviewers on 12 January 2009. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Comment external review	Consequences/Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is comprehensive, easy to understand, well written, with lots of interesting new material, good practical examples,. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comment: highlight the minimum standards in the document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Because of limited time, the structure hasn't been adapted but

	<p>the minimum standards were mentioned in detail both in the executive summary and the conclusions. Furthermore, it is easy to look them up in the table of contents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A part of the reports, especially the introductory sections, is filled with references to insider terminology used within the cast consortium. Since this tool is aimed at practioners, such terms will likely have no meaning for them, and make reading the report confusing. It would be better if references to such CAST terms would be removed or replaced by more common terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The CAST terminology has been left out and now 'real' references were added in stead of Deliverable numbers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This term was used throughout both deliverables. However, I don't think 'asking' is the best word for this. Method of questioning (or method of inquiry?) would be preferable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This term is also used in former reports (which are already publicly available) of WP2. Besides, there are lots of references to these documents in the tool. As a consequence, we decided not to change the term. But the term has been added in the glossary of the tool.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Throughout both the deliverables I found a fair number of abbreviations such as etc. and e.g. in the main text. In general, it is preferable to limit the use of such abbreviations and in the main text especially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes are made throughout the document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of terminology regarding data collection methods and techniques is rather confusing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There has been made a clear distinction between data collection methods and techniques in the glossary. This distinction is also made in the former reports (and already publicly available) of WP2.

The editor adapted the document according to these remarks and suggestions. The document was finalised and sent to the European Commission on 30 January 2009.

4.2.4 Deliverable 2.4



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 2.4 REPORTING TOOL FOR EFFECT OF A SINGLE CAMPAIGN

Workpackage leader: Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Editor(s): Annette Meng (DTU) & Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV)

Author(s): Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Tove Hels (DTU), Lotte Larsen (DTU), Annette Meng (DTU), Ivanka Orozova-Bekkevold (DTU),

Date: 29 January 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- A reporting check-list for fieldworkers and professionals is assembled.
- The checklist enables to report all relevant aspects of their campaigns in a standardized way.
- The checklist is easy to comprehend and to use.

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- The layout of the Deliverable is according the required format.
- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough and easy to understand.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - ...
- The structure is clear and in accordance with good practice concerning a practical tool.
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- The Deliverable is attractive in use and dissemination.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives are achieved: completely all
- The tool can be used by fieldworkers, researchers and policy makers.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

First the content of the Deliverable has been internally reviewed by WP2 partners who were less involved in the writing of the reporting tool. After the WP2 meeting on 2-3 July 2007, we waited for the updated version of the evaluation tool in order to change the reporting tool accordingly. The necessary adjustments were finalised by DTU in December 2007. This revised document was the final draft version and has been sent to Sonja Forward (VTI), WP4 leader. WP4 partners assessed also the completeness and clarity of the reporting tool.

As the evaluation tool was adapted, according to the comments received on the CAST workshops in 2008, the reporting tool had to be changed as well. Especially the new chapter and the minimum standards on data analysis had to be added. Besides, the last chapter of the CAST manual of WP3 (D3.2) is also about reporting. WP2 decided in October 2008 that we should check and harmonise the reporting tool with the suggested structure in this chapter. Furthermore, extra information about how to derive clear conclusions was requested.

At the end of October 2008 WP2 received a feedback report from the WP4 partners. In November 2008 several amendments were made based on WP4 suggestions. According to their comments we adapted the structure of the tool (new titles, more clarifications, better introductions...), minimum standards regarding the data analysis is stated based on their experiences, and examples of self-reported measurements were copied from their questionnaires. The revised document served as the final

draft that has been sent to the external reviewers (Tamara Hoekstra, SWOV, the Netherlands and Kaisa Hara, Liikenneturva, Finland) in December 2008.

The editors (DTU & BIVV) received the comments from the external reviewers on 12 January 2009. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

Comment external review	Consequences/Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The deliverable is well written (easy to understand) and easy to follow, it is of great practical use, and as such should be easily accessible to practioners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The glossary was placed at the start of D-2.3, while it was situated at the end of D-2.4. Was this intentional? Also, the name for the list was different in D-2.4 (list of terms) than D-2.3 (Glossary).Consistency between deliverables might be better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK, done.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A part of the report, especially the introductory sections, is filled with references to insider terminology used within the CAST consortium. Since this tool is aimed at practioners, such terms will likely have no meaning for them, and make reading the report confusing. It would be better if references to such CAST terms would be removed or replaced by more common terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The CAST terminology has been left out and now 'real' references were added in stead of Deliverable numbers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some paragraphs and sections needed more clarification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Throughout both the report a fair number of abbreviations such as etc. and e.g. in the main text was found. In general, it is preferable to limit the use of such abbreviations and in the main text especially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adapted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The term 'method of asking' was used throughout both deliverables. However, I don't think 'asking' is the best word for this. Method of questioning (or method of inquiry?) would be preferable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This term is also used in former reports (which are already publicly available) of WP2. Besides, there are lots of references to these documents in the tool. As a consequence, we decided not to change the term. But the term has been added in the glossary of the tool.

The editors adapted the document according to these remarks and suggestions. The

document was finalised and sent to the European Commission on 4 February 2009.

<i>NAME INTERNAL REVIEWER</i>	<i>WP4 – Sonja Forward, VTI, Sweden</i>
<i>NAME EXTERNAL REVIEW</i>	<i>Tamara Hoekstra, SWOV, The Netherlands Kaisa Hara, Liikenneturva, Finland</i>

Time table

- *Start internal review: 01-08-2007*
- *Start external review: 10-12-2008*
- *Submission to quality officer: 10-12-2008*
- *Submission to steering committee for final approval : 10-01-2009*
- *Contractual delivery date: 01-02-2009*

4.3 Workpackage 3

4.3.1 Deliverable 3.2 (3.2a + 3.2b)



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 3.2

Manual for Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating Road Safety Communication Campaigns

Workpackage leader: Patricia Delhomme (INRETS)

Editor(s): Patricia Delhomme (INRETS), Werner De Dobbeleer (BIVV), Sonja Forward (VTI), Anabela Simões (ISEC)

Author(s): Patricia Delhomme (INRETS), Werner De Dobbeleer (BIVV), Sonja Forward (VTI), Anabela Simões (ISEC), Giannis Adamos (UTh), Alain Areal (PRP), Julien Chappé (INRETS), Chloe Eyssartier (INRETS), Peter Loukopoulos (VTI), Teti Nathanail (UTh), Suzanne Nordbakke (TOI), Heiko Peters (BAST), Ross Phillips (TOI), Maria Pinto (INRETS), Marie-Frédérique Ranucci (INRETS), Gian Marco Sardi (SiPSiVi), Jose Trigoso (PRP), Truls Vaa (TOI), Knut Veisten (TOI), Esther Walter (BFu)

Date: 19-01-09

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- Provide a detailed and practical tool that can be used to design, implement and evaluate road safety communication campaigns
- Help both researchers and practitioners involved in designing and implementing road safety communication campaigns all over Europe
- Give the reader access to a comprehensive body of information about road safety communication campaigns, with two main parts (Part I serves as a reference for Part II):
 - A theoretical part (Part I) providing a background on road safety and communication campaigns, which offer important discussions about human behaviour and how to influence it
 - A more practical part (Part II), which presents a step-by step guide for designing, implementing, and evaluating a road safety communication campaign

QUALITY STANDARDS

Specific quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language and writing style: The used language and style is accurate enough, easy to understand, and corrected by an English-speaking professional.
 - Consistent use of terms
 - ...
- The document is clear, well-organized and readable
- Tables and figures are used in a clear, understandable and relevant way.
- An original layout of the document shall be done by a professional, according to the required format.
- The Deliverable is attractive in use and dissemination.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives are achieved
- The content is reviewed by relevant referees
- The manual can be used by both researchers and practitioners involved in designing and implementing road safety communication
- A booklet of about 10/15 pages summarizing the manual and their practical advice is added for decision makers at political level.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

The first draft of the Deliverable has been reviewed by both CAST partners other than the main authors and by external referees. External reviewers (essentially practitioners) have been mainly solicited during the workshops which were held in Warsaw (Poland, 30 May, 2008) and in Stockholm (Sweden, 13 June, 2008). The aim of these workshops was to gather remarks both on manual structure and content (these comments can be found in Appendix 1 and 2). In May 2008, a manual's editing group of 4 senior researchers involved in the WP3 (Patricia Delhomme, Werner De Dobbeleer, Sonja Forward, and Anabela Simoes) was created in order to improve it. The editors met at Inrets from 16th of June to 20th of June to discuss how to improve the manual according to comments received during the workshop. Then,

the manual was modified at Inrets until mid-July, following this discussion.

The revised draft of the manual has been sent by Patricia Delhomme (leader of WP3) both to WP3' partners, to the steering committee members and to external reviewers (practitioners volunteers found during the workshops, but also academics and researchers) on the 13th July. Referees comments were received from end of August to mid-September 2008 (the main comments and our responses were compiled in one file that can be found in Appendix 3).

The editors adapted the document according to these remarks and suggestions. The work was divided between the 4 editors and their contribution was sent to each other for a last internal review. Then, the manual was sent to an English-speaking professional, whose relevant questions had also helped in improving the manual. Then, Inrets and Werner De Dobbeleer, read and re-read each chapter of the manual and sent the finalised draft of the manual to the steering committee on the 28th November 2008.

4.4 Workpackage 4

4.4.1 Deliverable 4.2



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 4.2

Results of the evaluation of the campaign and relevant findings to validate the tools in WP2

Workpackage leader: Sonja Forward (VTI)

Editor(s): Sonja Forward (VTI) & Ali Kazemi (VTI)

Author(s): Adamos, G. (UTH), Ausserer, K. (Factum), Brijs, K. (IMOB), Brijs, T. (IMOB), Daniels, S. (IMOB), Divjak, M. (ULFF), Forward, S. (VTI), Haupt, J. (Factum), Kazemi, A. (VTI), Krol, B. (IBDIM), Malasek, J. (IBDIM), Nathanail, T. (UTH), Risser, R. (Factum), Tamis, K. (Ministry of Transport NL) & Zabukovec, V. (ULFF).

Date: 31 July 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- Based on the methodology developed in WP2, several evaluations of campaigns will be carried out. The aim of the deliverable is to present the results from these evaluations.

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- Document fluency with respect to the
 - Language
 - Writing style
 - Consistent use of terms
- ...
- The structure is clear and in accordance with good practice concerning scientific publications (introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion)
- The working method is clearly and in great detail described.

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The objectives are achieved: completely
- The number of campaigns is adequate in reference to the objectives of the respective subtask.
- The listed methods and results are well described with respect to
 - Clarity
 - Relevance

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

The internal review has been carried out in two steps, before and after the feedback from the external reviewer; the first step was carried out during the production of the document when a draft of the appropriate section was sent to the editors for review. During the second step authors made the appropriate changes and sent them to the editors who in turn made some further alterations. Before the document was finalized all partners had to approve of the changes being made by the editors.

The revised document was sent to the external reviewer on the 20th of January. VTI as WP4 leader received the comments from the external reviewer on 4th of February 2009. Hereunder follows a summary of the main comments:

1. Executive summary and introduction

- It needs to be made clear that the theory was used to evaluate the study and not to design the study.
- A clear introduction to the three E's.
- Describe how the different campaigns have been selected.
- Emphasize that an extended version of the TPB was used.
- Write some conclusions and recommendations based on the results.
- How it is possible through the use of the TPB select different target groups.

2. Evaluation of the Swedish Bicycle Helmet Wearing Campaign 2008

The following is needed:

- The cost of the campaign is not clear.
- Explain how the theory has been used
- Make the aim of the study clearer
- Discuss the effect of the agreement and the provision of cycle helmets
- Discuss the effect of the target group's background and that they work for an insurance company.

3. Evaluation of the isolated effects of a seat-belt campaign in Belgium

The following information is needed:

- 1) an abstract
- 2) an executive summary
- 3) a clearer description of the objectives of this particular study
- 4) a description of the scenarios used
- 5) with regard to Table 14 please indicate what high score means
- 6) The results need to be discussed in some more detail.

The following data needs to be re-analyzed:

- 1) With regard to Table 15-16 the differences between the different groups and their subjective norms needs to be compared using a t-test.

The following needs to be deleted:

- 1) The description and interpretation of the results from the factor analysis is not very clear and not something the other partners have included.

4. Error! Unknown document property name.

The following needs to be made clearer:

- Not clear how the theory has been used
- One important aim of the campaign was seat belt usage in the back seat. However, this is not reflected in the presentation of the results.
- Table 3.26 what does a high score represent? Is it disagree or agree with the statement. This information is needed with regard to all tables including mean values in the same way as indicated under Table 3.18.
- Table 3.48 – what is the dependent variable?
- What does “nagelkerke” mean?
- The conclusion from the campaigns is not accurate since it failed to show a significant difference before and after. The success of the campaign needs to be considered with greater care.

5. Evaluation of a child restraint campaign in Austria

The following information is needed:

- Make clear why this particular campaign was used
- The aims and objective of the study needs to be clearer

- Zero-order Pearson correlations needs to be calculated for pupils.
- All the results need a short description.
- In the summary and conclusion they need to discuss why the campaign did not affect behaviour in the way they expected (or as much as they would like). Please discuss what could have been done differently to produce a stronger effect of the campaign.

6. Evaluation of an anti-speeding campaign in Slovenia

The following information is needed:

- An abstract
- An executive summary
- The regression analysis needs to be re-analysed. The combined measures should measure the same thing and on the same level of specificity
- The results needs to be more accessible to the audience
- The report would benefit from more references

7. Evaluation of the Greek drink driving campaign

The following information is needed:

- An abstract
- An executive summary
- A clear description of participants involved in the study and procedure.
- A clear description of what type of data used and how the evaluation was conducted.
- A description of the sample used to evaluate the effect of the campaign.
- A description of the procedure.
- Discuss possible bias with regard to the sample.
- Results needs to be explained
- Explain why the pre and post test have been combined in table 20-21.
- A discussion of the results from the regression analysis
- The index used to test the model needs to be modified and only include those which measure the same thing
- It is important that the results from the evaluation are based on what is significant or not. A non significant effect cannot be described as a success.

8. Error! Unknown document property name.

- An abstract
- A clear description of the design of the study
- A clear description of participants involved in the study and procedure.
- A clear description of what type of data used and how the evaluation was conducted.
- A description of the sample used to evaluate the effect of the campaign.
- A description of the procedure.
- Results needs to be explained
- A discussion of the results

- The regression analysis is difficult to interpret and is not according to the theory and should therefore be deleted.

The partners and editors adapted the document according to the remarks and suggestions. The document was finalised and sent to the steering committee on the 7th of July and then sent to the European Commission on 31st of July.

4.5 Workpackage 5

4.5.1 Deliverable 5.2



QUALITY REPORT

Deliverable 5.2 PAN-EUROPEAN ROAD SAFETY CAMPAIGN

Workpackage leader: Werner De Dobbeleer (BIVV-IBSR)

Author(s): Werner De Dobbeleer (BIVV-IBSR)

Date: 12 January 2009

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE

- Designing and implementing a pan-European road safety campaign according to the design guidelines developed in WP3 (including a campaign report)
- Demonstrating the practical use of the design guidelines developed in WP3 (including an internal feedback report)

QUALITY STANDARDS

General quality standards (referring to the way of presenting)

- The campaign materials that are part of the deliverable shall be designed, produced and implemented in accordance with the professional standards of the communication industry
- The campaign materials that are part of the deliverable shall be clear, appropriate, relevant and inciting to the selected target audience

Specific quality standards (referring to the content)

- The deliverable shall be designed, produced and implemented in accordance with the guidelines developed in WP3 (campaign manual). This includes:
 - Detailed situation analysis (problem definition, context, identification of actors, identification of target group(s), available budget,...)
 - Campaign concept and design
 - Media choice and possible supportive actions
 - Evaluation design
 - Production of campaign materials
 - Campaign implementation
 - Campaign report

[Note: the implementation of the evaluation is not part of the project]
- The objectives are achieved: completely / partially

DESCRIPTION OF THE OUTCOME AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE QUALITY PROCESS (INCLUDING EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL REVIEW)

The draft deliverable (campaign design and preliminary campaign report including detailed situation analysis, campaign concept, media choice, and evaluation design) was sent to the internal and external reviewers on 7 August 2008.

On 1 September 2008, the draft deliverable was sent to the Quality Officer and the Steering Committee, for discussion during the Steering Committee meeting in Oslo on 29 September.

In September, the WP leader received the comments from the internal and external reviewers. The main comments are summarized below:

Outcome internal review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The slogan "PIT STOP – Please do not disturb" in the Belgian campaign does not directly relate to driving fatigue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A baseline "PIT STOP, the only real solution to driving fatigue" is added to all Belgian campaign materials.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Apart from the message "stop and rest or sleep" in the Belgian campaign, it would be more useful to propose to	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The message not to drive at all is much more difficult to get accepted. This could be treated in a follow-up

young people not to drive at all when they are tired.	campaign (it is not advisable to mix 2 messages in one campaign).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of roadside billboards might cause distraction and lead to accidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Belgian campaign does not use roadside billboards. The Danish campaign uses roadside billboards since it is the standard medium for road safety campaigns in Denmark. No adverse effects have been reported.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from all drivers that have been chosen to be the main target audience in Denmark, it would be useful to choose only one of the other drivers with higher risk (either young drivers or professional drivers) and try to reach them directly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Danish campaign concept was rediscussed with RfSF, without final outcome.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be nice to try to organize some more activities in Denmark (if possible) apart from folders and posters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This depends on the available budget in Denmark. More activities are unlikely due to financing problems for the Danish campaign.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Greek campaign concept is based on fear induction without providing a clear solution to avoid the danger. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Greek campaign concept was adapted by focusing on the solution (powernap) and a more positive approach (no hard images).

Outcome external review	Consequences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statistics shown in the beginning of the Greek campaign report do not give proof of choosing fatigue as the theme for a campaign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only relevant statistics and research findings are included in the report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is vital to separate fatigue and distraction from each other, and not group them together as one problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the findings on fatigue are detailed in the report, clearly separating fatigue from distraction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The target group for the Greek and Danish campaigns are too wide. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The possibilities of further audience segmentation are investigated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The initial survey omits a very important question, "have you ever fallen asleep behind the wheel". This information could be interesting to build a campaign message. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on self-reported behaviour are included in the before-phase of the campaign evaluation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The message "take a rest" is too general and might be misinterpreted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Stop and sleep 15 minutes" is added in all campaign messages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The message "do not drive when you are tired" (Greek campaign) is not realistic since fatigue often sets in after driving for a while. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The message is made more factual and consistent (focus on 15 minute powernap as a solution)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Pit Stop" in the Belgian campaign does not tell people what to do actually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Stop and sleep 15 minutes" is added in all campaign messages.

On 29 September 2008, the draft campaign reports and the comments were discussed by the Steering Committee.

On 30 September 2008, the comments from the internal and external review, and the

feedback from the Steering Committee were discussed with the campaign partners. The campaign concepts were finalised according to this feedback by 1 November 2008.

The implementation of the Belgian campaign started on 15 November 2008, the implementation of the Greek campaign on 1 December 2008 (the Portuguese and Danish WP partners decided to withdraw from WP 5 due to organisational and/or financing problems).

The internal feedback report was submitted to the Steering Committee on 12 December 2008.

The final campaign report was submitted to the Steering Committee in August 2009.