



## CAST NEWS



### Inside this issue

### Editorial

#### News

- ◆ Meta-analysis and Road user model (WP1)
- ◆ Evaluation tool (WP2)
- ◆ Manual to design, implement and evaluate campaigns (WP3)
- ◆ Campaigns Evaluation (WP4)
- ◆ Campaigns (WP5)
- ◆ Dissemination (WP6)

#### Future Events

- ◆ CAST 2nd plenary meeting in Oslo
- ◆ CAST presentation - European Road Safety High Level Group
- ◆ CAST - Next steps
- ◆ Final Conference - CAST results presentation
- ◆ Newsletter n°3

#### Interviews

- ◆ Mr. Bojan Žlender, Head Slovene Road Safety Council (Slovenia)
- ◆ Mr. Matti Järvinen Managing Director Liikenneturva (Finland)

#### Consortium

- ◆ 19 European research centres

Dear Sir/Madam,

Welcome to the second newsletter for the CAST project. CAST is a research project, supported by the European Commission, aiming to enhance traffic safety by means of effective road safety campaigns. Both a manual and an evaluation tool for campaigns will be developed and assessed using real campaigns in 2008.

The past year has been one of great achievements. On the one hand, reports have been finalised, while on the other hand two work packages have started their activities. With the project being more than half completed, CAST already has some interesting results to show. This second issue of the CAST newsletter will inform you of the progress made over the previous months within the different activities of the project. All public reports that have thus far been produced are also available online at [www.cast-eu.org](http://www.cast-eu.org).

In May and June 2008, two workshops were organised in Warsaw and in Stockholm. The focus lay specifically on collecting new inputs from experts outside the consortium in order to improve the manual and the evaluation tool for road safety campaigns.

The CAST Consortium would like to take this opportunity to thank to all participants for the success of both workshops and for their important and fruitful contributions to the CAST project. The workshop's minutes can be found on the CAST Website.

Lastly, I would like to remind readers that this newsletter is open to everybody who wishes to announce/advertise events and happenings or send articles related to the effectiveness of road safety campaigns.

We wish you a pleasant read!

**Ankatrien Boulanger**  
Project Coordinator



## News

### Meta-analysis and Road User Model (WP1)

The main objectives of WP1 are to elaborate and describe - by means of meta-regression, qualitative methods, and established driver models - a road-user model and its key elements. These should be observed and measured in any research design aiming at evaluating the effects of campaigns on behaviour and/or accidents.

The last WP1-meeting was held on 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> November 2007 in Brussels. The status of WP1 is as follows:

- ◆ A first draft of **Meta-analyses (D1.1)** includes a section on campaigns definitions and sums up and finalizes a discussion and exchange of viewpoints on the definition of campaigns. It also includes partner responses to the request of summing up national campaign experiences in respective partner countries. All partners have elaborated a “1-page description” of national experiences in their respective countries.
- ◆ The second draft, which was sent to partners by the end of March 2008, contains new data from the meta-analysis.
- ◆ A first outline of **Road User Model (D1.2)** was provided in the presentations at the Brussels meeting. A second and complete draft of theories and models was elaborated.

### *The use of fear appeals*

Based on the theoretical contribution from Denmark's Tekniske Universitet (DTU) on emotions, and the quite frequent use of fear appeals in European campaigns, the meeting discussed the topic of using fear appeals. Several issues were raised:

- ◆ What exactly are the theory/theories behind using fear appeals in campaigns against road traffic accidents? In what ways is it justified?
- ◆ How is the coping aspect described in theories addressing the use of fear appeals?
- ◆ What happens when you use fear appeals on groups who already are anxious and scared of the potentials for road traffic accidents? What

happens when you “scare the ones already scared”?

- ◆ When using fear appeals: How can you be sure that you use the appropriate media channels so that other/outside groups are not exposed?
- ◆ Do fear appeals really affect the right target groups (e.g. the drivers who speed, drink and/or do not use seat belts)?
- ◆ How can one adequately discern between the dangers of road traffic and fearing traffic? Is there an ethical difference between the two?
- ◆ There is a need to acknowledge the difference between displaying “the final, inescapable outcome” in terms of personal injuries and death and, alternatively, just sketching possible outcomes by providing a potential solution (i.e. a way of avoiding the undesirable outcome) if you behave appropriately. Isn't there also an ethical difference between these two scenarios?
- ◆ What do we know about the risk of hurting or killing yourself, compared to the risk of hurting or killing others?
- ◆ When young people are targeted, is it better to show the social consequences rather the consequences of accidents?

A proposal to emerge from the Brussels meeting was that the issue of using fear appeals should be extended and discussed in more detail and depth in D1.2. This also includes also the ethical aspects of using fear appeals. Pål Ulleberg (from TØI and the University of Oslo (UiO)), designed an experiment using psychology students at UiO. He examined the potential difference between “exposing it all” and just indicating the possible injuries one is risking if a seat belt is not used or if a person falls asleep at the wheel. The results are presented in the second draft of D1.2 that was sent to partners at the end of March 2008.

The draft deliverables D1.1 and D1.2 will exist as “living documents” until the end of October 2008, at which time they will be submitted for final approval.



## News

### Evaluation tool (WP2)

In the CAST project's second year, WP2 finalised the theoretical and practical comparison of all campaign evaluation designs and methodologies. Two deliverables are available on the CAST website ([www.cast-eu.org](http://www.cast-eu.org)).

WP2 started with an inventory of different types of road safety campaigns in the EU (and beyond) and their evaluation methodologies. A total of 74 evaluation reports of road safety campaigns were submitted to the database by means of a digital questionnaire on the CAST website. This questionnaire contemplates the basic principles one should think about when implementing, designing and evaluating a particular campaign and all relevant information each evaluation report should cover.

In addition to building knowledge and establishing the current state-of-the-art regarding road safety

campaigns and their evaluation, the aim of the review was also to identify relevant attributes of road safety campaigns that have significant implications for evaluation. The first WP2 Deliverable, **Typology of evaluation methods (D2.1)** defines scope, target group, (pre-set) objectives, supportive activities and a-priori knowledge as factors that need to be considered when selecting the appropriate methodology to evaluate a campaign. The relationship between evaluation components and campaign attributes will be further dealt with in the Deliverable **Evaluation tool for a single campaign (2.3)**.

Further analysis of the database revealed the strengths and weaknesses of current evaluation reports. The table hereunder summarises the most important positive and negative aspects of current media campaigns and their evaluation reports. The negative elements should be special points of interest both when evaluating future campaigns and when reporting on the results of the evaluation.

Positive aspects	Negative aspects
cover one single theme of road safety	objectives not clearly defined
combine various media to disseminate the message	measurement variables for evaluation often inconsistent with pre-set objectives,
address target groups that are defined and described in detail	control group designs rarely used
integrated with supportive actions	lack of economic evaluation (cost-benefit and/or cost-effectiveness analyses)
evaluated in terms of both impact (reach, recognition/recall) and effectiveness (e.g. knowledge, attitude, behaviour) variables	frequently missing information about the exact running period / duration of the campaign
...	...



## News

### Evaluation tool (WP2)

The second Deliverable of WP2 **Comparison of research designs (D2.2)** aims to list all possible measurement variables, evaluation designs, data collection methods and techniques that are theoretically possible to use for a summative evaluation of a road safety campaign. By comparing all evaluation components in terms of their merits and weaknesses to measure the effect of a campaign, it is possible to propose an appropriate evaluation methodology for different campaign types. In addition to theoretical arguments, the choice is of course also based on the costs and other practical issues.

Special attention is paid to the isolation of the effects of an integrated campaign. The first step is to choose an appropriate design for evaluation. Next, a comparison is required between different phases

and elements of the campaign; namely, a pre-post design may be used and different groups may be defined, where each group corresponds to each element of the campaign (e.g., media, enforcement, education...). Two research designs are discussed in the deliverable to deal with the issue of isolating the effects of integrated campaigns. Theoretically, it is possible to measure the effect of integrated road safety campaigns. In practice, the appropriate evaluation methodology depends on many factors; namely, the characteristics of the campaign on the one hand and the size of the country on the other. This aspect will be dealt with in detail in Deliverable 2.3 of the CAST project.

In the final year of the project, the preliminary evaluation tool (Deliverable 2.3) will be assessed to determine whether this methodology is sufficiently sensitive to detect the effect(s) of a campaign. Thereafter, the tool will be adjusted in accordance with suggestions provided by WP4 (see page 5).

### Manual to design, implement and evaluate campaigns (WP3)

The objective of CAST WP3 is to write a manual on how to design, implement and evaluate a road safety campaign. 16 partners from 10 institutes and 9 countries are involved in this WP.

In the previous 12 months the manual structure has been improved and a first draft has been completed.

The manual is composed of two main parts. Part I is theoretical in focus and provides the background on road safety and communication campaigns. Part II is practical in focus and provides guidelines for the design, implementation and evaluation of a road safety campaign. Part I serves as a reference for Part II.

Part I consists of two chapters dealing with road safety and road safety communication campaigns:

- ◆ Chapter 1 presents European road safety statistics and then goes on to specify the main causes of road accidents, stressing the greater importance of the human factor compared to factors such as the vehicle and infrastructure. More specifically, the importance of road users' intentional and non-intentional risky behaviour is highlighted, which is why campaigns should directly target such behaviours and beliefs. Finally, this chapter presents the main theoretical models describing important factors determining change behaviour, as well as persuasion and motivation models to assist in the formulation of the message.
- ◆ Chapter 2 contains the following six sections dealing with road safety communication campaigns: campaign types and marketing strategy factors; key elements for increasing the effectiveness of campaigns by learning from the past; the target group; the message; features of communication campaigns; and, evaluation of campaigns.

## News

### Manual to design, implement and evaluate campaigns (WP3)

Part II details the different steps that are needed to complete the campaign process: getting started; situation analysis; designing the campaign and the evaluation; implementation of the pre- evaluation; implementation of the campaign; implementation of the evaluation and drawing conclusions; and, writing a final report.

To sum up, we provide recommendations stressing the importance of basing campaigns on available research and of doing complementary research based on a theoretical model. We also provide insight into how to transform the general aim into specific objectives, into choosing the strategy to adopt, into planning the campaign realistically, and into selecting a specific target audience in order to

better reach it with messages based on persuasion models. Finally, we provide assistance with respect to evaluating the campaign in order to draw clear conclusions and in writing a final report to make the results available for the general road safety community

We attended two workshops to discuss the manual. The first took place in Warsaw (Poland) on May 30<sup>th</sup>, and the second in Stockholm (Sweden) on June 13<sup>th</sup>. Project partners, practitioners and researchers were brought together, something which we found very useful. As the manual is aimed at practitioners and researchers of road safety campaigns, it was particularly interesting for us to discuss the manual with them and, of course, we will take their comments into account in future drafts and the final product. Moreover, after these workshops, the Editing Group met from June 16<sup>th</sup> to June 20<sup>th</sup> in Arcueil (France) to improve the manual.

### Campaigns Evaluation (WP4)

Last autumn yet another work package within CAST started; namely, WP 4. The aim of this task is to carry out an evaluation of campaigns using the methodology developed in WP2 in seven different countries (Sweden, the Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, Poland, Greece and Slovenia). This number of countries will help to take the influence of cultural differences into consideration and to see if the tool is able to detect local expectations. More specifically, the objectives of the task are as follows:

- ◆ Evaluate campaigns using a questionnaire measuring self-reported attitudes, norms, intentions and behaviour. The remaining questions will be designed for the specific campaign in accordance with the guidelines provided by WP 2.
- ◆ If possible a control area or control group will be included.

- ◆ Records will be made of external events that might have an impact on the results.

During 2008, both before- and after-studies were carried out with the topic of campaigns covering a broad spectrum: speeding, seat-belt usage, drink-driving, and child restraints. The target groups are general as well as selective and the activity itself uses printed material, the media and direct communication. The results from the evaluation will be presented at the end of the project in a final report.





## News

### Campaigns (WP5)

Also last autumn, Work Package 5 became active. This WP concerns the design and implementation of a road safety campaign according to the recommendations given in the CAST Manual. Its aim is to test and demonstrate the use of the Manual as a practical tool for designing and implementing campaigns. The WP 5 campaign will run in four EU member states: Belgium, Denmark, Greece and Portugal.

WP 5 held a kick-off meeting in December 2007 to discuss the procedures detailed in the manual, timing issues and possible themes for campaigns. A further meeting was held in February 2008 to discuss the practical details of organising the WP 5 campaign. Driver vigilance, with a specific focus on fatigue, was chosen as the campaign theme. A literature review on driver fatigue was planned, as well as a representative survey based on the Danish risk awareness and knowledge survey of 2007. The survey results should allow us to say more about the groups which are most at risk, while at the same time constituting a baseline measurement (on knowledge, attitudes, self-declared behaviour) that

could serve to evaluate the campaign. Depending on the results of the survey and on the international literature, it will be possible to select one or more target audiences for the campaign.

During two teleconference meetings in April and May, the status of work per country, the relevant findings from the data analysis and the contents of the campaign briefing were discussed, as was the timing for the next steps in the campaign elaboration procedure. It was decided that the campaign will focus on different target groups in the 4 countries: young drivers in Belgium, the general driver population and shift workers in Denmark, professional drivers in Greece and motorway users in Portugal.

The campaign concepts will be finalised in July, the campaigns themselves will be implemented from October 2008 in the four participating member states.



### Dissemination (WP6)

WP6 is solely devoted to dissemination of the knowledge and technology produced within the CAST project among several target groups, the most important being field workers and policy makers.

During the previous year IBSR continued to update the CAST website ([www.cast-eu.org](http://www.cast-eu.org)). The website is an important communication tool among partners and is used to disseminate the project at a public level. The website gathers all the information concerning the CAST project and is used to place the main deliverables of all WPs.

The first CAST Newsletter was launched in April 2007 and disseminated to all consortium members, PRI members, FERSI, ERSO, consortia of several European projects under the responsibility of DGTREN, as well as other international organisations. It was also distributed at the PRI General Meeting on 15 June, 2007.

The CAST poster and leaflet were also finalised and disseminated among partners.

During the second year, the CAST project was presented at two different international gatherings. SIPSIVI presented CAST at the EFPA Congress (European Federation of Professional Psychologists), while PRP presented CAST at the PRI General Meeting on 15 June, 2007.



## News

### Dissemination (WP6)

WP6 planned and organised two workshops for technical discussions, whose aims were to discuss the first results of the CAST project (first draft of the manual and evaluation tool) and to collect new inputs from experts and practitioners outside of the consortium with a great deal of experience in developing campaigns.

Several organisations from different European countries were invited and participated in one-day workshops in Warsaw on 30 May, and in Stockholm on 13 June, 2008.

In both workshops the contribution from participants was very good. Important feedback and new ideas were collected, both of which will be taken into account so as to improve the final results of the CAST project.

**Third CAST newsletter will be distributed in November 2008**

### CAST and AdRisk

CAST is actively looking for opportunities to connect with other initiatives in the European field of risk-related communication. Therefore, a member of the CAST consortium participated in the International workshop on "Media and Tool Development - Preventing Injuries: National Campaign development on risk taking behaviour in adolescents". This workshop was held on 7-8 April 2008, in Vienna and organised by the AdRisk consortium. Participation in the workshop proved to be a stimulating experience for both consortia because of the similarities between the two projects.

The Community Action on Adolescents and Injury Risk (AdRisk) project responds to the call for an integrated approach to reduce the injury risk among adolescents. AdRisk defines adolescents as young people aged 15-24. The project focuses on national policy and strategy development, situation analysis, network development and the provision of tools and good practices. AdRisk refers to the 2006 EC Communication "Actions for a safer Europe", which defines injury and accident prevention as a priority for the Public Health Programme.



The similarities between the projects are the focus on the communication of risks. The differences are the sole focus on adolescents in the AdRisk project. Furthermore, the AdRisk project targets all risk behaviours including traffic, whereas CAST only covers risk behaviour in traffic.

More detailed information about AdRisk can be found on their website <http://www.eurosafe.eu.com/csi/eurosafe2006.nsf/wwwVwContent/13adriskproject.htm>



## Future Events

### CAST 2nd plenary meeting in Oslo

The second CAST Plenary Meeting will take place in Oslo on 30 September 2008 and will be hosted by Transportøkonomisk institutt (TØI). This meeting aims to discuss mid-term results and to keep all consortium members up to date on the project's progress.

### CAST presentation - European Road Safety High Level Group

The CAST Project will be presented by project coordinator, Ankatrien Boulanger, to the High Level Group by the end of 2008.

### Final Conference — Final results presentation

A final conference will be held in Brussels on 26-27 January 2009 to present CAST final results at a public level. Participation will be free of charge.

### CAST - Next steps

The results of the meta-analysis and the road user model drafts, deliverables D1.1 and D1.2, will be submitted for final approval at the end of October 2008.

The results from WP2 and WP4 will be integrated and the evaluation tool will be finished.

In the coming months and following the recommendations of the CAST manual, partners from Belgium, Denmark, Greece and Portugal will design, implement and evaluate their own campaigns in order to test the manual contents.

## FINAL CONFERENCE

### CAST final results presentation

**BRUSSELS**  
**26-27 January 2009**

**Registrations on-line at:**

**[www.cast-eu.org](http://www.cast-eu.org)**  
**(From August 2008)**

Before the production of campaign materials, the implementation of a campaign and any accompanying actions foreseen up to September 2008, the campaign design, evaluation design and report will be submitted to an internal and external review based on the Quality Assurance procedure.

The experience and results from WP5 campaigns will be useful for making adjustments and improvements to the contents of the manual.

The manual contents will be completed by the end of 2008.

## Interviews



with Mr. Bojan Žlender

**Head, Slovene Road Safety Council  
Directorate of the Republic of Slovenia for Roads  
Ministry of Transport  
(Slovenia)**

**In your opinion, what is the importance of carrying out the evaluation of road safety campaigns in a systematic way and in which way can the results from the evaluation can contribute to the development of future campaigns?**

Any road safety work should be finished with an evaluation and this is also important for road safety campaigns.

Evaluation is necessary to know if the aims of the campaign were achieved, if the target group was reached, if the right campaign materials were designed and used (e.g., posters, billboards, radio, TV spots), how many people had contact with the campaign and how they reacted, and how other actions/methods (e.g., enforcement, legislative changes) were implemented.

Without evaluation it is not possible to prepare future campaigns or to use other measures in an effective way.

**Besides the development of the manual for design, implementation and evaluation of road safety campaigns, the CAST project is developing an independent evaluation tool. What content do you think is useful in such a tool?**

A campaign evaluation should follow some key steps and find the answers to some key questions. Content related to this might be useful:

What data do we need before the campaign? (e.g., statistics, observations)?

How do we motivate, inform and, in some cases,

organise training to involve partners? (e.g., journalists, teachers, police offices, volunteers)

How do we evaluate objective data? (e.g., what is a useful methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of different campaigns on speeding, child-restraint systems, misuse of alcohol, and how do we carry out pre-tests, measurements during the campaign, as well as measurements after the campaign?).

What are the best ways to determine many people saw the campaign and what they remember? (i.e., logo, message, content, did they like the campaign and/or did they change their behaviour?) Using a kind of pre-prepared questionnaire with all necessary questions would be useful to include in such a tool.

How do we evaluate other measures if they were used? (e.g., police enforcement, work of volunteers or other dedicated persons, as was the case in the BOB campaign)

When do we need qualitative (in-depth questionnaires, interviews) and/or quantitative evaluations?

When are control groups necessary or useful? Is it possible to set performance indicators and which are the most appropriate for the specific campaign?

Is it possible to define the cost-effectiveness of the evaluation? (A kind of cost-effectiveness that sets standards with respect to what is an absolute minimum and what is optimum when there are insufficient funds for the campaign itself).

## Interviews



with Mr. Matti Järvinen

**Managing Director  
Liikenneturva  
Finland**

**In your opinion, what is the importance of carrying out the evaluation of road safety campaigns in a systematic way and in which way can the results from the evaluation contribute to the development of future campaigns?**

It's very important to carry out the evaluation of road safety campaigns:

It must be a systematic process. It helps us to know if actions have the desired effect or not. In order to know why road safety communication campaigns have succeeded or failed we need evaluations. With evaluations we can provide solid recommendations or issue warnings for colleagues, and we can show in a concrete way that we are worth the money we receive from decision makers, while at the same time increasing the appreciation of road safety. Evaluation results also detail the path we have followed in order to obtain our results, also illustrating the stronger and weaker points of the entire process.

**Besides the development of the manual for design, implementation and evaluation of road safety campaigns, the CAST project is developing an independent evaluation tool. What content do you think is useful in such a tool?**

A guide to evaluate campaigns should be short and, in my opinion, should have the following contents:

Problem analyses; objectives; partial objectives; indicators of each activity; examples of different cases.

**Newsletter created by CAST**

**Dissemination Manager**

**Portuguese Road Safety Association**

**[www.prp.pt](http://www.prp.pt)**



## CAST - Campaigns and Awareness-raising Strategies in Traffic Safety

### Consortium



CAST Project Coordinator  
Belgian Road Safety Institute  
(IBSR/BIVV) - Belgium



Portuguese Road Safety Association  
(PRP)  
Portugal



Institute of Transport Economics  
(TOI)  
Norway



Institute for Road Safety Research  
(SWOV)  
The Netherlands



The French National Institute for  
Transport and Safety Research  
(INRETS) France



Swiss Council for Accident Preven-  
tion (bfu)  
Switzerland



Swedish Road and Transport Re-  
search Institute (VTI)  
Sweden



Transport Research Centre (CDV)  
Czech Republic



The Federal Highway Research  
Institute (BAST)  
Germany



University of Thessaly (UTH)  
Greece



Technical University of Denmark  
(DTU)  
Denmark



University of Ljubljana Faculty of  
Arts (ULFF)  
Slovenia



FACTUM Chaloupka & Rissler OHG  
Traffic and Social Analyses (FAC)  
Austria



Education and Science Institute  
(ISEC)  
Portugal



Hasselt University , Transportation  
Research Institute (IMOB)  
Belgium



Ministry of Transport, Public  
Works and Water Management  
The Netherlands



Danish Road Safety Coun-  
cil (RfSF)  
Denmark



Road and Bridge Research Insti-  
tute (IBDiM)  
Poland



Road Safety Institute (RST-SIPSiVi)  
Italy

