



Deliverable 2.4
REPORTING TOOL FOR EFFECTS OF A
SINGLE CAMPAIGN
Final version
Public

CAMPAIGNS AND AWARENESS RAISING
STRATEGIES IN TRAFFIC SAFETY

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

Project Coordinator: Belgian Road Safety Institute
(IBSR/BIVV)

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

Date: 06 March 2009

Sixth framework programme

Priority sustdev-2004-3.4.1.4.5.
Sustainable surface transport priority

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Title | Reporting tool for effects of a single campaign |
| Authors | Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV), Tove Hels (DTU), Lotte Larsen (DTU), Annette Meng (DTU), and Ivanka Orozova-Bekkevold (DTU). |
| Editor | Ankatrien Boulanger (IBSR/BIVV) & Annette Meng (DTU) |
| Date | 24/02/2009 |
| Report Number | Deliverable 2.4 |
| Version status | Final version |
| Distribution | Public |
| QA check | 9 January 2009 by K. Hara (Liikenneturva, Finland) 12 January 2009 by T. Hoekstra (SWOV, the Netherlands) |

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <u>GLOSSARY OF TERMS</u> | 5 |
| <u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u> | 7 |
| <u>1 PREAMBLE</u> | 8 |
| 1.1 THE CAST PROJECT | 8 |
| 1.2 WHY SHOULD I REPORT THE CAMPAIGN RESULTS? | 9 |
| 1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE DOCUMENT | 10 |
| 1.4 HOW TO USE THE REPORTING TOOL | 10 |
| 1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT | 11 |
| <u>2 HOW TO WRITE AN EVALUATION REPORT STEP BY STEP</u> | 12 |
| 2.1 BASIC ELEMENTS TO START A REPORT | 12 |
| 2.1.1 THE TITLE PAGE | 12 |
| 2.1.2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 12 |
| 2.1.3 ABSTRACT AND KEYWORDS | 12 |
| 2.1.4 TABLE OF CONTENTS | 12 |
| 2.1.5 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 13 |
| 2.2 INTRODUCTION | 13 |
| 2.2.1 THEME AND OVERALL GOAL OF THE CAMPAIGN | 13 |
| 2.2.2 THE RESPONSIBLE ORGANISATION(S) FOR THE CAMPAIGN | 14 |
| 2.2.3 CAMPAIGN STAKEHOLDERS | 14 |
| 2.2.4 EXTERNAL RESEARCHERS AND AGENCIES | 14 |
| 2.2.5 TOTAL BUDGET | 15 |
| 2.3 BACKGROUND | 15 |
| 2.3.1 PROBLEM DEFINITION AND ANALYSIS | 15 |
| 2.3.2 TARGET GROUP | 16 |
| 2.3.3 THEORETICAL MODEL OF THE CAMPAIGN | 17 |
| 2.3.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE CAMPAIGN | 17 |
| 2.3.5 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION STUDY | 19 |
| 2.4 CAMPAIGN STRATEGY | 20 |
| 2.4.1 SCOPE OF THE CAMPAIGN | 20 |
| 2.4.2 TIMING AND DURATION OF THE CAMPAIGN | 20 |
| 2.4.3 MESSAGE AND SLOGAN | 21 |
| 2.4.4 PRE-TESTING THE CAMPAIGN MESSAGE | 21 |
| 2.4.5 MEDIA PLAN | 22 |
| 2.4.6 INFORMATION ON SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES | 24 |
| 2.4.7 CAMPAIGN LAUNCH | 25 |
| 2.4.8 CAMPAIGN COSTS | 25 |
| 2.5 THE EVALUATION STUDY AND METHODOLOGY | 25 |
| 2.5.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS | 26 |
| 2.5.2 STAKEHOLDERS RELEVANT FOR THE EVALUATION | 27 |

| | | |
|------------|---|------------------|
| 2.5.3 | RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE STUDY | 27 |
| 2.5.4 | MEASUREMENT VARIABLES..... | 28 |
| 2.5.5 | DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND TECHNIQUES..... | 28 |
| 2.5.6 | SAMPLING..... | 29 |
| 2.5.7 | THE COSTS OF THE EVALUATION | 31 |
| 2.6 | DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS | 31 |
| 2.6.1 | DATA ANALYSES..... | 31 |
| 2.6.2 | RESULTS | 32 |
| 2.7 | DISCUSSION..... | 33 |
| 2.8 | CONCLUSIONS AND MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS | 34 |
| 2.8.1 | CONCLUSIONS | 34 |
| 2.8.2 | RECOMMENDATIONS | 34 |
| 2.9 | BASIC ELEMENTS TO END A REPORT | 34 |
| 2.9.1 | REFERENCES..... | 34 |
| 2.9.2 | APPENDICES RELEVANT FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT | 34 |
| 3 | <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</u> | <u>36</u> |

Glossary of terms

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Data collection methods: | Data collection method is the general orientation towards data collection (e.g. the method of asking, the observational method and the method of document analysis). |
| Data collection techniques: | Data collection technique is more concrete than data collection method and specifically refers to the actual means/instruments/procedures for data collection (e.g. within the method of asking there are various options of how to approach the data gathering, such as by means of questionnaires, interviews, etc.). |
| Economic evaluation: | Economic evaluation critically reviews the costs and the benefits of a road safety campaign and concludes if the costs for campaign design and implementation are justified either in terms of monetary or other savings (e.g. saved lives). |
| Evaluation: | Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the activities, characteristics and outcomes of a road safety campaign, and the implementation of a methodological strategy to determine its effectiveness with regard to the attainment of pre-set road safety objectives. |
| Evaluation methodology: | Evaluation methodology is a general term which refers to all relevant elements/components of evaluation such as research design, measurement variables, data collection methods and data collection techniques. |
| Formative evaluation: | This type of evaluation is designed to collect data while a campaign is being developed or when an existing campaign is modified, with the intention to improve it. It is used to evaluate the opportunities and barriers of a campaign before it really starts, in order to minimise costly mistakes. |
| Measurement variables: | A measurement variable represents a measure of the success or failure of a road safety campaign, relative to the aim of the campaign. |
| Method of asking: | A data collection method that implies communication between the investigators and the subject of the study. It is also called surveying. |
| Method of document analysis: | A data collection method that extracts and organises relevant information from a set of documents in a structured way. |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Method of observing: | A data collection method that involves the direct observation of phenomena (behaviour or attitude) in their natural setting without interference of the investigator with the subjects of the study. |
| Outcome evaluation | See summative evaluation |
| Process evaluation | See formative evaluation |
| Research (evaluation) design: | Research (evaluation) design is a framework that structures the research process, so that it shows how all its major parts (groups of subjects, methods of assigning subjects to different groups, measurement variables and interventions) are related in answering the research question. |
| Summative evaluation: | This type of evaluation measures the effectiveness of an intervention on the target population, and determines whether an implemented initiative has had the intended effect and reached the pre-set objectives. |

Executive summary

It is important that campaign makers and researchers can learn from previous experiences with campaigns and campaign evaluations. Therefore it is essential to write detailed and structured campaign (evaluation) reports where the information as well as the order in which this information is presented is standardised. This way it is easy for the reader to find the exact information he or she needs, and it ensures that all essential information is included in the report. Therefore the reporting tool was developed as part of the CAST project.

Because the evaluation study is a fundamental part of the campaign process and dependent of the campaign type, this reporting tool treats the whole campaign process. The final campaign report should present a clear and concise overview of all the steps carried out in the campaign. Therefore the reporting tool has become a template to write down the campaign process, including the evaluation study, in a standardised way. The tool exists out of a step by step guide on how to write a campaign report. By following these guidelines, it is ensured that all important information will be included in the report. In addition, the campaign details will be provided in a standardised order which makes it easier for the reader to find the requested information.

The main sections of an evaluation report are:

- Basic elements to start a report
 - o Title page
 - o Page with acknowledgements
 - o Page with abstract and keywords
 - o Table of content
 - o Executive summary
- Introduction
- Background
- Campaign Strategy
 - o Description of the campaign design
- Evaluation
 - o The evaluation study and methodology
 - o The data analyses and results
 - o The discussion
- Conclusions and main recommendations
- Basic elements to end a report
 - o References
 - o Appendices

1 Preamble

1.1 The CAST project

The CAST project is a research project executed from 2006 until 2009 and supported by the European Commission. The main goal of CAST is to provide practical tools to encourage the proper design and evaluation of road safety campaigns in all EU countries (and beyond). The *design tool* or the manual (Delhomme, P. et al, 2009) contains detailed guidelines for designing and implementing a campaign. The *evaluation tool* (Boulanger, A. et al, 2009) aims at guiding the users to the best evaluation practice depending on the characteristics of the road safety campaign to enable a thorough effectiveness evaluation. Finally a *reporting tool* provides precise guidelines for reporting the results of a (single) campaign and its evaluation in a standardised way. These tools ensure that new campaigns can be planned and executed in a way that they will have the optimal effect.

The research activities regarding campaign evaluation in the CAST project aim at dressing up an inventory of evaluation methodologies for road safety media campaigns and at the development of an evaluation tool for (cost)-effectiveness of a single media campaign. This development has been achieved on the basis of a theoretical and practical analysis of large numbers of road safety campaigns, based on an exhaustive literature review. This document covers the reporting tool. The aim is to enable fieldworkers, evaluators, and campaigners to report all relevant aspects of their campaigns and the results of the evaluation study in a standardised way. This tool has been based on the content of the CAST manual (Delhomme, P. et al, 2009) on one hand, and the evaluation tool (Boulanger, A. et al, 2009) on the other hand.

The *CAST manual* (Delhomme, P. et al, 2009) is designed to find easy information about the design of road safety campaigns. The manual outlines six different steps on how to proceed. Evaluation is a fundamental part of a campaign. In practice, the campaign evaluation study is mentioned for the first time in the third step. Three types of evaluation are distinguished in the manual namely: process, outcome and economic evaluation. The *CAST evaluation tool* will help you through the decisions that you need to make about the *outcome evaluation*. The choice for the appropriate evaluation methodology is dependent on the specific characteristics of the concerned campaign. The evaluation tool is a practical tool that can be used to carry out a proper effectiveness evaluation study according to the specific campaign characteristics.

Two other CAST reports contributed to the realisation of the evaluation tool:

- The first report (Boulanger, A. et al, 2007b) lists an exhaustive typology of road safety campaigns. To identify the attributes of a campaign that influence the evaluation methodology, an inventory of different media campaigns and the applied evaluation methodology in (and beyond) the EU have been made.
- The more theoretical aspects of 'what possible evaluation methodologies could be applied' are treated in another CAST report (Boulanger, A. et al, 2007a). This report lists all possible evaluation designs, measurement variables and data collection

methods and techniques that are at least theoretically possible to use for a campaign evaluation.

All these reports delivered input for this reporting tool.

1.2 Why should I report the campaign results?

The evaluation tool (Boulanger, A. et al, 2009) taught us that the evaluation of road safety campaigns is essential to establish whether these campaigns are effective at improving road user safety. Evaluation allows knowing the campaign effectiveness, learning about the campaign, benefitting for future campaigns, justifying the costs, facilitating future fund raising and so forth. It is therefore also necessary to publish the campaign evaluation results and make them public available.

Besides, the CAST database of the evaluation reports (Boulanger, A. et al, 2007b) revealed how road safety campaigns have been evaluated so far throughout Europe and concluded about the strengths and the weaknesses of these evaluation reports. The database also gave an overview of the relevant information that each evaluation report should contain. There are multiple reasons why some relevant data (inputs) were missing in the database: lack of information in the reports, insufficient skills of the evaluator (inadequate scientific knowledge), bad reporting, problems with submitting the data to the standard form, unavailable information (as the variable was not studied in detail) etc. Nevertheless, some of these elements should become points of special interest in the future campaign reports.

To deal with these shortcomings in the future, CAST developed clear guidelines for field workers and other professionals that makes it possible for them to report the effects of single road safety campaigns in a standardised way. Because the evaluation study is a fundamental part of the campaign process and dependent of the campaign type, this reporting tool treats the whole campaign process. The final campaign report should present a clear and concise overview of all the steps carried out in the campaign. Therefore the reporting tool has become a standardised template to write down the campaign process, including the evaluation study.

The standardisation of the future campaign reports will:

1. increase the accessibility and adequateness of relevant information in the domain of road safety media campaigns;
2. more complete evaluation reports and thus more relevant, high quality campaign evaluation data;
3. facilitate the (scientific) evaluation of road safety campaigns, for example by means of meta-analyses;
4. help to identify effective criteria or develop new campaign strategies; and thus will
5. increase the general knowledge about road safety campaigns.

1.3 Objectives of the document

The objective of the reporting tool is to provide practitioners with guidelines for reporting the whole campaign process and its evaluation in a standardised way.

The CAST database (Boulanger, A. et al, 2007b) has revealed the strengths and the weaknesses of the evaluation reports throughout and beyond Europe. The results show the variety and incompleteness of the various evaluation reports and points clearly to the need for a standardised reporting tool. Standardising ways of reporting will increase the accessibility of relevant information regarding road safety campaigns and will facilitate the evaluation of several campaigns jointly by running meta-analyses.

1.4 How to use the reporting tool

The reporting tool is aimed at fieldworkers, researchers and other professionals involved in campaigns and/or the evaluation of campaigns. The tool should be seen as a structured directive for writing a complete campaign report. The focus of this tool is very practical; the terminology is only described to a very limited degree. This means that we assume that the user of this tool is already familiar with the campaign terminology and with the various aspects of campaign evaluations. Therefore this tool offers only very limited explanations of these terms and aspects. However, if the user is unclear about certain elements that need to be reported, all terms are explained in the theoretical report on research designs (Boulanger, A. et al, 2007a), the CAST evaluation tool (Boulanger, A. et al, 2009) and the CAST manual (Delhomme, P. et al, 2009). These documents have to be consulted when needed.

By following the step by step guideline on how to write a campaign report it is ensured that all important information will be included in the report. In addition, the information will be presented in a standardised order which makes it easier for the reader to find the information he or she is looking for.

Beneath every introductory explanation of each subject that have to be reported, a box was placed containing an overview and some examples of the information to be described. The space foreseen in the boxes is indicative and must be modified according to the needs. The examples are not exhaustive, but should be regarded as essential information to be reported if available. Other relevant information should be reported as well. It is also the intention that the information will be elaborated. For example, instead of just stating that questionnaires were used, the general content of the questionnaire should be described (and the questionnaire itself should be added as an annex).

The boxes provided can also be used for writing (preliminary) notes – this is particularly useful if more than one person has to gather the information needed to write the report. The evaluation report itself might be a separated document, but it should also follow the order of the step by step guide. Although we recommend integrating the evaluation results in the campaign report.

1.5 Structure of the document

This first chapter summarises why and how a campaign report should be as complete as possible. To facilitate the use of its main content and data, the final campaign report must have a standardised structure. The next chapter describes step by step the content and the structure of a complete campaign report. Each section summarises which information should be given. It is recommended to obtain a copy of the main sections of this second chapter when writing a campaign report. The chapter provides boxes with examples of the type of information required and (indicative) space to write (preliminary) notes to aid the report writing.

2 How to write an evaluation report step by step

For road safety campaigns to be efficient and to result in an increased traffic safety, it is crucial to ensure successful planning, implementation and evaluation of each campaign. In order to do so, each step of the campaign, from planning to evaluation, must be reported. Thus, each subtitle in this section should be included in your campaign report. This is necessary to ensure that experiences and evaluations of various campaigns can be collected systematically and in the course of time improve campaign practices for example by providing the possibility to learn from previous campaigns such as successful campaign characteristics and working methods. The CAST manual (Delhomme, P. et al, 2009) recommends a length of the main body of the full report of about 30 – 50 pages. However, the length depends on how many tables and graphs and so forth that will be included in the report. So in the end the most important job is that all relevant information has been included and described in sufficient detail to provide the reader with a clear picture of the campaign and its evaluation.

2.1 Basic elements to start a report

2.1.1 The title page

The campaign report should always have a title page that displays the title (commonly “Evaluation of” and then the name of the campaign that has been evaluated), the name of the authors and the date of publication. Some graphics, the logo or the campaign slogan etcetera can be added here as well.

2.1.2 Acknowledgements

Next follows a page with acknowledgements to thank financiers, stakeholders....

2.1.3 Abstract and keywords

The next page consists of the abstract. It must be very brief, no longer than 300 words, and only state the key elements (such as the campaign goal, the campaign duration and its effectiveness) and conclusions. There should be an English version of the abstract to ensure easy access for the international community. Both the English and the original language version can be on the same page. Finally, it is a good idea to write 4 – 5 keywords in both languages as well.

2.1.4 Table of contents

The following page is the table of contents.

2.1.5 Executive Summary

Always include an executive summary in the report as recipients of campaign evaluation reports often have limited time and therefore might avoid reading the very comprehensive reports. This can be solved by guiding them through the report by means of an executive summary which contains condensed versions of all the sections/chapters of the entire report. In addition, if they choose not to read the whole report, the readers will have an overview of the main points and the conclusions thanks to this executive summary. The summary should be no more than 2 - 4 pages and should cover the most important things that the stakeholders and the other readers might want to know. When writing the summary, keep the following points in mind:

- the primary focus should be on the results and the recommendations (if any);
- take into account the priority of potential readers' interests;
- go to the point and the conclusions quickly;
- use short descriptions - only long enough to convey the essential idea;
- use bullets, highlighting and differences in typeface and size;
- and the summary should serve as a guide for the rest of the report.

An English version of the executive summary must always be available to ensure that the international community has access to the information.

2.2 Introduction

Before the results of the campaign evaluation will be given, the campaign itself has to be described. It is important to provide as much detail as possible to allow the reader to compare the campaign with his or her own campaign. The sections on the background and the campaign strategy give guidelines on the details that should be included. But to start, this brief introduction provides some general information on the campaign.

2.2.1 Theme and overall goal of the campaign

Describe briefly the campaign theme and the slogan to inform the reader on the topic of the report. The general goal of the campaign states briefly the identified road safety problem.

Theme and slogan of the campaign:

Overall goal of the campaign:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

2.2.2 The responsible organisation(s) for the campaign

Note down explicitly which organisation was responsible for running the campaign as the reader may want to contact them for further information or to initiate co-operation. Therefore, detailed contact information (e.g., website, phone number) should be provided.

| |
|--|
| Please note down the organisation(s) responsible for running the campaign: (name and contact information of the campaign initiator) |
| |

2.2.3 Campaign stakeholders

If certain stakeholders (or campaign partners) were involved in the campaign they should be mentioned in the report. It is necessary to make a clear distinction between different types of stakeholders. They can be:

- involved in setting up and conducting the campaign or the campaign evaluation;
- investors in the initiative;
- potential users of the results of the evaluation (government, etc.) or initiators of similar campaigns in the future;
- opponents of the initiative.

Furthermore, the stakeholders could have different levels of involvement in the campaign: affected, involved, and interested.

| |
|---|
| Please describe the stakeholders: (level of involvement: interested, involved, affected, in which way are they involved, and any other relevant information) |
| |

2.2.4 External researchers and agencies

It is possible that you have contacted several external agencies or researchers to carry out the design of the campaign, the pilot study of the target group, the pre-test of the message, the evaluation study and so on.

| |
|--|
| Please describe the external researchers and agencies (name, contact information) and their contribution: (advertising agency, marketing research agency, media buying agency...) |
|--|

2.2.5 Total budget

Give the total budget of the campaign. You should make an overview of the budget by each partner/sponsor. The budget allocated for each of the different campaign elements shall be given in section 2.4.8.

Please, give the total budget of the campaign (per sponsor):

2.3 Background

The background of the campaign represents an overview of why the problem by the campaign was addressed. This is important as it influences the main intent (or specific objectives) of the campaign and sets the scene for the whole campaign. Therefore, an extra item to write in this section is the main goal and the type of evaluation studies that will be executed. This should only be stated very briefly in order to take it into account when designing the campaign. The evaluation study itself (and its detailed objectives) will be described in more detail later in the report.

2.3.1 Problem definition and analysis

Thus, it must be explained why the campaign was needed and which road safety problem it addressed. This could be realised by a description or an evaluation of the magnitude of the road safety problem and the related road safety figures (number of victims, accidents, etc. divided into various stratifications if relevant (according to gender, rural versus urban areas, etc.)). With the aid of former campaign reports, literature review, and/or statistics etcetera the following questions should be answered in this section:

- What is the road safety problem and what are the consequences for the state or the community?
- What is the size of the problem, generally as well as in the various segments (roads, road users...)?
- What are the causes of the road safety problem? To what extent is it related to the infrastructure, the road user (knowledge or behaviour) or the transport mode? Is it

mainly caused by road users with specific characteristics (age, social group...) or by the geographical differences (urban versus rural), etc.

It is important to add the references (and a short summary) of the data and/or the reports on which the problem analysis has been based. Sometimes this a-priori knowledge can be used for the evaluation study as well (for example as baseline data).

Please describe why the campaign was needed (problem definition + results situational analysis): (road safety problem addressed, consequences, analysis of the magnitude of the problem, causes of the road safety problem, target audience...)

Please give and describe briefly the *a-priori* knowledge of the campaign if available (references):

2.3.2 Target group

It is very important to know who the campaign aims to reach and influence. Therefore the target group(s) must be carefully described. Sometimes a pilot investigation has been made in order to get relevant and specific information about the target group. Examples could be a survey examining the target groups current attitudes or beliefs about the road safety problem of interest, or information on the best way to approach the particular target group.

Remember that target groups can be divided into direct (e.g., young male drivers) and indirect (e.g., young female passengers in young male driver cars) and again into specific (e.g., male drivers between the age of 18 and 25) and non-specific (e.g., all drivers).

Please describe carefully the possible pilot investigations used to get relevant information about the target group: (which information was obtained (e.g., the existing attitudes/beliefs about the current road safety problem; their lifestyle characteristics (how to approach the particular target group)), how this information was obtained, etc.)

Please describe the target group:

- **Specific:**

- Direct: (gender, age group, road user type, passengers, profile/profession)
- Indirect: (gender, age group, road user type, passengers, profile/profession,

relation to target group)

- **Non-specific:**
 - o Direct: (explain)
 - o Indirect: (explain)

2.3.3 Theoretical model of the campaign

It is recommended that campaigns are based on theory. Therefore, if a specific theory (behaviour model) is used when designing the campaign it must be described explicitly. It is also useful to know why this particular theory was chosen. If it was explicitly decided not to base the campaign on a theory, this should be reported and explained.

Please describe the theory the campaign is based upon: (or if it was not based on a theory)

Please explain why this particular theory was chosen: (or why no theory was chosen)

Please describe the link between the target group and the theoretical framework of the campaign and explain thus the main predictors of their behaviour (if applicable):

2.3.4 Objectives of the campaign

The specific objectives of the campaign are one of the key elements of the evaluation and the conclusions of the evaluation. Therefore, it is essential to describe all the specific objectives of the campaign as detailed as possible (for example by using the SMART method, see Boulanger, A. et al, 2009) in order to measure the success of the campaign.

Here you find examples of different objectives:

- Knowledge: to increase the knowledge about a new law concerning the limit for blood alcohol concentration among car drivers in a specific country from 50% to 75% of the population being aware of this new law (the knowledge about the exact legal limit is of interest).
- Awareness: to increase the awareness of the population about possible accidents that speeding may cause. To raise the awareness of 18-30 year old drivers of the danger of drug driving.
- Attitude: to increase a positive attitude towards a new legal limit for blood alcohol concentration among car drivers in a given country from 50% to 75% of the population.
- Behaviour: to increase the percentage of young adults (18 – 25 years old) who wear a seat belt all the time from 80% to 95%.
- Accidents: to decrease the number of alcohol related accidents in a specific country with 30%.

Please describe the specific objectives of the campaign as precisely as possible: (if it is a primary or secondary objective, the desired level of change, the attainment or accomplishment (e.g., a 20% increase in awareness) and the time period (e.g., campaign period) when the effect is expected to have occurred)

Increasing knowledge: (the knowledge of what, as well as the desired “amount of increase” in knowledge and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Increasing awareness: (the awareness of what, as well as the desired level of accomplishment (e.g., 20% increase in awareness) and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Changing attitudes: (the attitudes towards what, which changes were desired and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Changing behaviour: (which behaviour, how and to which extent this should change and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Decreasing rate of accidents: (which type of accidents, the desired decrease and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Decreasing seriousness of consequences of accidents: (how and how much, and (if applicable) within which timeframe)

Other objectives: (for example related to the theoretical model or otherwise regarding subjective norms, descriptive norms, perceived behaviour control and behavioural intention...)

How do the specific objectives of the campaign relate to the theoretical model of the campaign:

2.3.5 Purpose of the evaluation study

The idea is to state briefly the main goal of the evaluation study or studies. For example, is it an evaluation of the effectiveness alone or will the process and the cost-effectiveness also be assessed (process, outcome and/or economic evaluation).

What is the main goal of the evaluation study (or studies): (what will the evaluation study aim to evaluate)

2.4 Campaign strategy

In this paragraph a detailed description of the campaign design (and thus the campaign characteristics) will be given.

2.4.1 Scope of the campaign

The scope (or the scale) of a campaign refers to the coverage of the campaign. Among other things, this influences which evaluation design is most suitable and should thus be reported.

In general two main levels can be distinguished:

- national scope (the campaign is implemented in the entire nation or country);
- regional or local scope (the campaign is implemented in one or more states, regions, provinces, cities or municipalities).

Please describe the scope of the campaign: (national, regional/local, combination)

2.4.2 Timing and duration of the campaign

Some campaigns are planned as a long term strategy or could be part of a long term strategy, while other campaigns are just one-off events. It is important to know the date on which the campaign started and the date on which it ended. This makes it for example possible to check if other major events, which could have altered the effect of the campaign, took place within the same timeframe.

Please describe the timing and duration of the campaign: (start and end date, was it repeated - if so, on which date(s), total length of campaign activity in days)

Please, indicate the reasons for the choice of the timing of the campaign implementation: (statistics showing that certain periods are more salient for the problem addressed (e.g., motorcycle accidents tend to happen in summer thus campaigns aimed at motorcyclists should be run in summertime)...))

If the campaign is part of a long term strategy:

- **Please describe the campaign as a part of the long term strategy:** (explanation of the long term strategy, other past or future events, any additional activities which have not been implemented yet etc.)

- **Please describe timing and duration of the campaign in relation to the long term:** (out of which other elements consists the strategy etc.)

2.4.3 Message and slogan

A central part of a campaign is the (approach of) message and thus also the slogan. It is also useful to know why these were chosen. If this information is available it should therefore also be reported.

Please describe the campaign slogan and why it was chosen:

Please describe the approach of the message and why it was chosen:

2.4.4 Pre-testing the campaign message

At this point in the report any relevant information regarding any preliminary testing of the campaign message should be reported.

Please describe the pre-test and the results of the campaign message: (method, number of participants, results, advantages, difficulties, etc.)

If the campaign message was not tested beforehand, please note down the reasons why: (financial, timing, etc.)

2.4.5 Media plan

The media plan concerns the choice of the media channels (and the media vehicles) for the execution of the campaign and should naturally be included in the report. Even if you do not execute a detailed process evaluation, it is still important to collect data on the means of communication for the benefit of the comprehension of the outcome evaluation results. In case one of the purposes of the evaluation study (see section 2.3.5) is the execution of a process evaluation, this information helps you to measure the objective campaign exposure.

Please indicate which media channels (and media vehicles) were used in the campaign as well as (if available) more specific information of the media used:

Internet:

- did the campaign include a website (the internet address, the number of visits to website...)
- E-newsletters, direct emails, internet forum, SMS (number, target group...)

Audiovisual media:

Did the campaign include audiovisual media (title and description of commercial)?

- television (emission, spot, timing (inside or outside prime time), number, frequency...)
- radio (emission, spot, timing (inside or outside prime time), number, frequency...)
- cinema (commercial, emission, spot, timing (inside or outside prime time), number, frequency...)

Printed media:

Did the campaign include printed media (which type and how many, article, message, visual...)?

- newspaper (national, local...)
- free or paid press
- specialised press (magazines)
- flyers, leaflet, brochures...: (how many, where/when distributed...)
- direct mailings
- ...

Outdoor media:

- billboard posters (number, where distributed, location...)
- posters (number, where distributed, location...)
- banners (number, where distributed, location...)
- ...

Other media types:

Distribution of stickers, gadgets and so on: (how many, where)

Interpersonal communication:

- local events: (which kinds, how many, which period of time)
- discussion (personal or group, content, public...)
- lectures, speeches...

Was there any pre-testing of the media plan? Please describe any pre-testing and readjustment of communication/readjustment of channels:

If no pre-testing of the media plans were performed please note down the reason for this: (financial, timing, etc.)

Please indicate any differences (in the number of posters/leaflets or the duration of spots, for example) between the proposed media plan (by your advertising agency) and the final dissemination (in order to check if these differences affected the success of the campaign): (in case you carry out a complete process evaluation, describe this in section 2.6.2)

2.4.6 Information on supportive activities

In case of integrated campaigns, the campaign media activities are combined with other types of activities (e.g., enforcement, education (e.g., people attending courses or other activities), actions in driving schools, rewards/incentives handed out, technical improvements, new legislation, specific infrastructural measures and so on). As these activities are part of the campaign design, they should be described as detailed as possible in the report.

In case of an integrated campaign:

- **Please describe which supportive activities are combined with the media plan:** (as well as describing the activity try also to quantify e.g., enforcement: number of cars inspected: courses: content of course and number of people attending the course etcetera)

- **Please describe how the supportive activities relate to the objectives of the campaign:**

- **Please describe how the supportive activities were timed with the campaign (before, during, after):**

- **Please describe how these activities are evaluated (if not, explain why):**

- **Other relevant information:**

2.4.7 Campaign launch

To launch the campaign it is possible to organise some special actions on the first day of the campaign for example.

Please describe in detail the actions used to launch the campaign: (press releases, press conference, press kits, interviews with journalists, other events...)

2.4.8 Campaign costs

The production costs are the funding sources and the other resources (people, information, etc.) that were used when designing and implementing the campaign. This information is essential as it helps creating a picture of the conditions under which the campaign was executed. Please remember to report both direct and indirect costs for each of the different campaign elements. Furthermore you need this information for the economic assessment of your campaign (see also section 2.3.5 – purpose of the evaluation study).

Please describe the production costs of the campaign: (amount of money spent, number of person hours spent on the campaign, number of person hours spent on supporting activities, number of organisations involved, include the cost of all stages of the campaign itself (pilot studies, pre-tests, materials, media, evaluation study...))

2.5 The evaluation study and methodology

After the campaign description, the next part of the report has to describe information on the evaluation(s). Depending on the types of evaluation studies conducted, the structure of

this section can look differently. In case you conducted a process, an outcome evaluation and an economic evaluation study, it might be better to discuss each study separately. This means that the subjects mentioned below will be (more or less) repeated for each type of evaluation study.

2.5.1 Evaluation objectives and questions

The first step is to describe what the specific objectives of the evaluation were. At this point more details should be provided than it was the case in section 2.3.5. Refer also to the type of evaluation(s) conducted. Specific evaluation questions might be performed to focus on the effectiveness' objectives of the campaign evaluation.

Please describe the detailed objectives of the evaluation study (which hypotheses were tested related to the type of evaluation):

- **process evaluation:** for example - the campaign elements were implemented as intended

- **outcome evaluation (please list all the specific evaluation questions of the effectiveness study):** for example - the percentage of young adults (18 – 25 years old) who wear a seat belt all the time changed significantly

- **economic evaluation (cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) or cost-benefit analysis (CBA)):** for example - the campaign has been cost-efficient

If applicable, link the evaluation objectives/questions to the theoretical framework of the evaluation: (example: a campaign based on the Protection Motivation Theory will try to increase the *coping appraisal* by increasing the *response efficiency* by providing the target audience with knowledge about the effective countermeasure)

2.5.2 Stakeholders relevant for the evaluation

These stakeholders may or may not be the same as the stakeholders relevant for the campaign in general. Remember that there are many types of stakeholders (see section 2.2.3).

Please describe the stakeholders relevant for the evaluation of the campaign and the degree of their involvement: (affected, involved, interested, active, observer, advisor, collaborator, group, company, individual, in what way and how much did they contribute to the campaign evaluation study)

2.5.3 Research design of the study

The chosen research design affects which conclusions you can draw from the collected data. Therefore it is very important to describe which evaluation research design was used for the outcome evaluation study and, if available, the reasons for this choice.

Please describe the evaluation design used for the campaign evaluation: (experimental, quasi-experimental, control group design, single group design, before-after design, time-series/trend analysis etc. and why was this design chosen)

Please describe all elements of the particular design: (e.g., the number of measurements, timing in relation to the campaign, duration of measurements, participant groups, number of participants, different interventions, control and/or comparison group etc.)

Please comment on the internal validity of the study: (the extent to which accurate conclusions about the cause - effect relationship could be formulated)

Describe the participants of the evaluation study: (who is the population of the evaluation study or the actual group that will be sampled (see further), how does it relate to

the target group and the objectives of the campaign, etc.)

2.5.4 Measurement variables

Here the evaluation questions and the related measurement variables (all variables measured in the outcome evaluation study) should be described. Typically three types of variables are distinguished: self-reported measures, observed measures, and accident statistics. The campaign objectives are determinative for assessing the success or the failure of the campaign. As a consequence, the measurement variables should be related to these objectives. You can also make a distinction between the measurement variables related to the various types of evaluations (process, outcome, economic).

Please describe the respective measurement variables (which elements of the campaign were evaluated): (e.g. likeability and comprehension of the campaign, subjective campaign exposure (recall and recognition), social cognitive variables – attitudes, normative beliefs, descriptive beliefs, behavioural intention, risk perception and so on - behaviour, number of accidents, number of saved lives (part of cost-effectiveness analysis) etc.)

Please make the link between the measurement variables and the campaign/evaluation objectives or evaluation questions (as described in section 2.5.1):

2.5.5 Data collection methods and techniques

The purpose of this part is to make it visible to the reader what data were collected and in which way (for example self reported data by means of face-to-face interviews). It should be described in such detail that the reader is able to repeat the study after reading the report. For example, if a questionnaire was used, the main themes of the questions should be roughly described. It is advisable to include a copy of the entire questionnaire, the observation sheet, the interview guide or the questions and so forth in the appendix of the report. Don't forget to differentiate between the methods and the techniques for the different types of evaluations.

Please describe in detail the data collection method and technique used in the campaign evaluation (and why it was chosen):

- **Method of asking:** (how were the questions presented to the respondents: questionnaires (electronic, paper...), interviews (face to face, telephone), focus group interviews (face to face, on line...), interviews with key informant(s), follow-up interviews...)
- **Method of observing:** (how were the behaviours observed and recorded: on-site observing, video recording, participating observation...)
- **Method of document analysis:** (which documents were used to gather the information: statistical documents (such as accident statistics) or published literature (references, dates, number...))

Please describe the data collection materials used (and the link to the campaign objectives): (interview questions, details from observation sheets (checklists), questions in questionnaires...)

Please report the time planning of the evaluation measurements: (during how many days, weeks or months were the data collected (mention this for the different measurement periods), number of days or weeks before/during/after the campaign period...)

2.5.6 Sampling

The next step to report is how the participants of the evaluation study were recruited. As it is not possible to include everyone who has been exposed to the campaign (or not exposed in case of a control group) in the evaluation study, a sample has been selected in most of the evaluation studies. To understand the link between the target group and the participants of the evaluation study, it is necessary to describe the sample itself. Mention also the possible biases in the sample situation such as the most common ones: selection bias, response bias and non-response bias.

Please describe as detailed as possible the sampling technique used in the evaluation study (for the intervention group, control group and/or comparison

group): (possible sampling techniques: probability sample, simple random, sampling without replacement, stratified random, stratified, cluster, two-stage, multistage, deviant case, maximum variation, snowball, convenience sampling...)

Please describe the correspondence between the sample and the population (target audience) represented: (if a control group was included remember to describe the correspondence between both control and intervention group and the population)

Please describe the sample size: (number of participants: how many questionnaires/interviews were carried out – both before and after the campaign, how many persons were observed etc.)

Please give the response rate: (proportion persons contacted and persons reacted)

Please describe any possible sample bias in the evaluation of the campaign: (selection bias, response bias, non-response bias...)

Please describe the characteristics of the respondents (intervention and control/comparison group) in terms of the relevant demographic variables and/or other background information: (age, gender, education, road user type, car driving frequency...)

2.5.7 The costs of the evaluation

It is important to know how much money was spent on the evaluation and on what exactly it was spent. This information indicates the extent of the economic constraint of the evaluation. Both direct and indirect costs should be reported. It is also relevant to know if the evaluation was included in the campaign budget or if it was independent. Furthermore you need this information for the economic assessment of your campaign (see also section 2.3.5 – purpose of the evaluation study).

Please state whether the evaluation budget was included as part of the campaign budget or independent:

Please describe the details of the evaluation costs (make a distinction between the different types of costs): (personnel costs, transportation costs, communication costs, copying and printing costs, postage, supplies, equipment costs, software, and other)

2.6 Data analyses and results

2.6.1 Data analyses

Ideally both *descriptive statistics* (e.g., what is the average rate of seat belt use, how many persons have seen the road safety campaign), and *inferential statistics* (when the probability theory is used to test hypotheses, it is permitted to make inferences from a sample to a population, and to test if descriptive results are likely to be due to random factors or to a real relationship (e.g., does gender relate to speeding?)) should be performed on the data if possible. It is very important to know which statistical tests were performed, but also why these particular tests were chosen. This information must thus definitely be included in the report.

Please describe the way the raw data were treated and why: (coding, weighting...)

Please describe which data analyses/statistical tests were applied to the data and why: (descriptive analyses, inferential analyses, t-test, ANOVA, Chi- square...)

Please describe the software used to analyse the data:

Please describe the variables you used for the analysis:

Please indicate possible problems regarding the sample size and the statistical analysis (according to the statistical tests):

2.6.2 Results

An evaluation often produces a lot of results - some more desired than others. However, it is important to report all the results even the ones that are considered (wrongly) as bad results. There are no bad results. The purpose of the evaluation is to learn and improve the campaign practices and this can only be achieved if all results are reported and as far as possible explained.

If carried out, please give the results of the process evaluation:

Please describe the campaign exposure results: (percentage of the target audience reached, percentage of the audience remembering the campaign (spontaneous recall, aided recall), the likeability of the campaign, the perception of the main message (was the message understood?))

Please give an overview of the results regarding the outcome of the campaign (mean, standard deviations, frequencies...): (change in knowledge, awareness, attitudes, behaviour, risk perception, risk of detection and/or change in accidents, the public/audience who were affected by the campaign, the level of attainment or accomplishment (e.g., 20% increase in awareness), the p-values obtained in the inferential analyses (also if the result is not statistical significant)...)

In case a theoretical model was used, please demonstrate how well the model explained the data: (identify the model parameters, the regression analysis...)

If executed, please describe the results of the cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit analyses (economic evaluation):

2.7 Discussion

The purpose of the discussion is to try and explain profoundly the results related to the evaluation questions. More specifically, the effects of the campaign, as identified by the evaluation study should be discussed, as well as any alternative explanations. Specifically, the possible factors that could have influenced the results should be identified, along with an explanation of the possible ways in which this influence could have taken place. Both factors from the campaign and the evaluation themselves, as well as various external factors, should be considered.

Please write down the discussion: (are the objectives of the campaign reached (why or why not), are there any unintended effects of the campaign (if so, which and why), what could be improved (regarding the campaign, message, media plan, field actions, evaluation study...)

2.8 Conclusions and main recommendations

2.8.1 Conclusions

Finally, the report should be completed with a conclusion. The conclusions should be rather short and clear, as the explanations and the interpretations of the results have already been given in the former section.

Please state the conclusions of the evaluation: (did the campaign meet its objectives, did the benefits/effects outweigh the costs...)

2.8.2 Recommendations

This is one of the most important sections of the report as it will contain the direct advice to the colleagues and the stakeholders, based on the campaign experiences, on how to improve future campaigns and their evaluation. Therefore it is very important to make sure that the recommendations have a strong foundation and are not merely speculative.

Please state the recommendations: (recommendations relevant to campaigns in general, relevant to campaigns of the particular type evaluated in the report, relevant to campaign evaluation, other recommendations)

2.9 Basic elements to end a report

2.9.1 References

If you have referred to any literature or electronic sources of information, you must remember to list them in the reference section of your report. This makes it possible for the interested reader to obtain them as well.

2.9.2 Appendices relevant for the evaluation report

An evaluation report will often include appendices, as it may interfere with the readability of the report if too much information is included within the text.

Please add all relevant appendices to your evaluation report: (copies of questionnaires, interview guides, observation sheets, summary tables of the descriptive and inferential statistics' results, transcripts of the interviews, raw data...)

3 Bibliography

Boulanger, A., Daniels, S., Delhomme, P., Deugnier, M., Divjak, M., Eyssartier, C., Hels, T., Moan, I., Nathanail, E., Orozova-Bekkevold, I., Ranucci, M., Schepers, P., Van den Bossche, F., & Zabukovec, V. (2007a). *Comparison of research designs*. CAST project, Brussels: BIVV.

Boulanger, A., Daniels, S., Delhomme, P., Deugnier, M., Divjak, M., Eyssartier, C., Hels, T., Moan, I., Nathanail, E., Orozova-Bekkevold, I., Ranucci, M., Schepers, P., Van den Bossche, F., Zabukovec, V. (2007a). *Comparison of research designs*. CAST project, Brussels: Belgian Road Safety Institute

Boulanger, A., Divjak, M., Orozova-Bekkevold, I. & Zabukovec, V. (2007b). *Typology of evaluation methods: current practices and campaign evaluation* (A. Boulanger & M. Divjak, Eds.). CAST project, Brussels: BIVV.

Boulanger, A., Daniels, S., Divjak, M., Goncalves, I. , Meng, A., Moan, I., Nathanail, E., Orozova-Bekkevold, I., Schepers, P., Tamis, K., Van den Bossche, F., & Zabukovec, V. (2009). *Evaluation tool for road safety campaigns* (A. Boulanger, Ed.). Brussels: BIVV.

Delhomme, P., De Dobbeleer, W., Forward, S., Simões, A., Adamos, G., Areal, A., Chappé, J., Eyssartier, C., Loukopoulos, P., Nathanail, T., Nordbakke, S., Peters, H., Phillips, R., Pinto, M., Ranucci, M. -F., Sardi, G. M., Trigoso, J., Vaa, T., Veisten, K., Walter, E. (2009). *Manual for designing, implementing and evaluating road safety communication campaigns*. Brussels: BIVV.