

Department for Transport Drink Drive Creative Development

19th October 2015



Background

The Department for Transport are developing a new drink drive campaign to run at the end of this year. The campaign will focus on young men who tend to drink just over the limit because they feel they are fine to drive. They're usually in denial that what they're doing is dangerous, and the main purpose of the campaign is to get them to reflect the risk they're taking.

Two creative routes were tested in this research...

The first of these was "Unpopular, But Alive". In the first nights of groups we tested two scripts: "Billy" and "Brendan". After issues with the "Billy" script, more were developed and in the final night of groups we tested: "Malcolm", "Simon" and "Brendan".

The second route was "The 1% Project" for which we had one script. This script remained the same throughout the research.

Sample

The sample was focused on the core demographic for the campaign: men aged 18 – 34, from a spread of areas (rural, suburban, urban) around the country.

The key split in the sample was an attitudinal one. The majority were recruited to be Ostriches: they tend to drink just over the limit before driving. We also spoke to Jekyll and Hydes: they also drink just over the limit, but on occasion they drive when they are well over the limit.

	Segment	Gender	Lifestage	Area	SEG	Location
1.	Ostrich	Male	18-24yrs	Rural	BC1C2	South East
2.	Ostrich	Male	25-34yrs	Suburban	BC1C2	Manchester
3.	Ostrich	Male	18-24yrs	Urban	BC1C2	Birmingham
4.	Ostrich	Male	25-34yrs	Suburban	BC1C2	South East
5.	Jekyll & Hyde	Male	18-24yrs	Urban	BC1C2	Manchester
6.	Jeykll & Hyde	Male	25-34yrs	Rural	BC1C2	Birmingham

Unpopular, But Alive

A campaign with potential for engagement

Of the two campaigns researched this was probably the most difficult for participants to imagine. If it were to be made, much of the engagement is likely to come from the cast, the performances and the delivery of the voiceover. Nonetheless the scripts showed potential for engagement.

The Malcolm and Simon scripts were felt to be most entertaining: the unfortunate employee with the overbearing boss, and the reluctant footballer with the over-the-top captain were generally seen as enjoyable characters.

“With Gavin being ‘The Gavnor’ and things like that, you can picture the scene when they are in the club and he is a big lad. You can picture that and it’s more lighthearted.” (Ostrich, 18 – 24, London)

The Brendan script also had potential to be humorous. The forlorn husband in the doghouse was a familiar comic situation, but overall had a slightly gloomier feel.

“I initially felt sorry for the bloke, sleeping on a mattress, you just feel sorry for him. But if you had someone like Peter Kay delivering the message then maybe it would be quite funny.” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead)

The Billy script was the one instance where the humour didn’t quite take off. A situation where a man has been isolated from his friends was more difficult to enjoy, and the bullying character of Big Vern was disliked.

It’s worth noting that the flat response to the Billy script had an impact on the response to this route in the first groups. Replacing it with the Malcolm and Simon scripts greatly improved engagement.

A potential concern raised with this route before the research was that the humour would feel out of place in a drink drive advert, but this wasn’t the case. Participants were open-minded about humour being used as a new approach to the issue.

The shift from comedy to tragedy was generally seen to work

One issue that was sometimes raised in relation to humour was the shift from comic exaggeration to grim reality that happens during the crash scene.

In some of the early groups this was seen as problematic. It was felt that making such a dramatic shift would seem too strange.

But in most of the groups it wasn’t such a problem. Indeed some assumed it would be a deliberately shocking moment to give the viewer a jolt.

“It goes from really funny to really gruesome very very quickly. It could be more impactful because of that” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead)

The crash scene was the most memorable moment

The groups felt that the crash would be the memorable moment in the advert. It was expected to be quite shocking and potentially quite graphic to make the point.

The impact of this moment was generally strongest in the Brendan script because the wife was also seen dead in the car. As is often found in research with this audience, it was the thought of killing others rather than killing themselves that they found most disturbing.

“You see him and his missis dead. That would maybe stay with you a bit more”.
(Ostrich 18 – 24, Maidenhead).

Mostly the scripts showed scenarios that the audience could relate to

Everyone we spoke to could identify with feeling pressure to drink when they're driving. In most cases this was seen as implicit pressure where someone else had expected them to drink. But nearly everyone also recognized more explicit pressure where someone had urged them to drink. Indeed it was often noted as a positive of this route that it used scenarios the audience could relate to.

“It was good, it was different to what we are used to, putting it into some sort of context you can relate to” (Jekyll & Hyde, 25 – 34, Manchester)

It's worth bearing in mind, however, that the reality of these scenarios isn't black and white. Whilst they were aware of the peer pressure, in most cases this audience were happy to have their arms twisted. They were comfortable with stretching the limit, and they wanted another drink.

The scenarios at the core of each script were easily recognized: someone buys you a pint you didn't ask for (Billy), you end up having an extra drink after work (Malcolm), you feel you should join in with a big group particularly after sports (Simon), someone asks for a lift after you've been drinking (Brendan).

“I think that's a big part of office culture. A scenario where come 5 o'clock you have done your week, you go to the pub, you almost, not become unpopular, but you have got to go to be seen to be making the effort” (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Birmingham).

These weren't just familiar, they were mostly seen to be quite common situations. The one exception being the situation of drinking at home and being asked to give someone a lift depicted in Brendan. This was something that the audience could identify with but it didn't happen as often as the others.

The reactions of the other characters were more likely to be questioned

Whilst the scenarios in the scripts were easily recognised, the reactions of the other characters were sometimes questioned.

The one script where this was consistently raised as an issue was Billy. The groups struggled to identify with a scenario where someone like Big Vern would isolate Billy from their group of friends because he turned down a pint of beer. Even allowing for a certain amount of exaggeration it was something they couldn't imagine any of their friends would ever do.

“I can't relate to it. The blanking in the park. It's so childish. If you're old enough to drive and go to the pub you're not going to be in a blanking in the park situation”
(Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead).

In contrast, it was believable that a wife might take time to forgive a husband that made her walk home in the rain, that an overbearing boss might take issue with an employee who showed him up, and that a team captain might put a player on the subs bench if they didn't join in with the celebrations.

It's fair to say that the audience had never experienced this level of unpopularity themselves because they turned down a drink. But they understood it as an exaggeration of the momentary unpopularity they might feel.

It's important the unpopularity isn't too long or harsh a sentence

The dramatisation of being unpopular was generally understood to be tongue in cheek. But when it went a little bit too far it caused some to start questioning the driver's decision to turn down the drink. The unpopularity felt like too high a price to pay.

"He [Billy] gets hammered for doing the right thing. It should be OK the next morning when they've sobered up. Rather than being isolated. You think 'If this is how I'm going to be treated why would I do the right thing?'" (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Maidenhead)

This was particularly raised as an issue with the Malcolm and the Billy script. Malcolm, for example, was seen to have ruined his career prospects. Faced with a life spent photocopying many concluded he probably should have accepted the drink and taken the risk.

"I does leave you thinking at the end, if he'd had that extra shot where would he have been? He could have got a promotion. He's done the right thing but he's ended up photocopying." (Ostrich, 18 – 34, Birmingham)

Simon's unpopularity was seen to be more short term: he was assumed to be warming the subs bench for one weekend and not much more. Brendan's time in the doghouse was understood to be temporary, but it was still felt to be lasting a little too long.

The dominant message was "don't give in to peer pressure"

Most interpreted the message to be about peer pressure. When asked to write what the message of the ad was it was usually described as "don't give in to peer pressure", "just say no", "don't listen to others" or "do what you think is right".

This was because the scripts were seen to be telling a story of peer pressure, and the consequences of resisting peer pressure....

The moment of decision was seen as a moment where the protagonist is resisting peer pressure. Whilst the dialogue made reference to the number of drinks (e.g. "A couple!" said The Gav'nr. "Man up, fella! One more drink won't hurt") it was mostly seen to be dramatizing someone being put under pressure to drink (e.g. "There's no I in team" said the Gav'nr).

Then the consequence of the decision was unpopularity. Whilst there is a moment when the protagonist reflects on the fatal accident that might have happened, the reality is that he's going through a period where he's shunned by his peers.

"It's saying make the right choice, even if there are repercussions with other people" (Ostrich, 25 – 34, Manchester).

The line “Unpopular...But Alive” was seen to neatly sum up the story: it’s worth resisting peer pressure to drink because whilst you may be unpopular, at least you’ll be alive.

Some also noted the campaign might be targeting the person pushing someone else to drink in these situations. It was implicitly saying “don’t pressure others to drink”.

“Tells both sides of it really, she shouldn’t be ringing him asking for a lift because she knows he has had a drink and then he shouldn’t have said yes.” (Jekyll & Hyde, 18 – 24, Manchester).

The underlying message was “don’t have that extra drink”

Whilst the main message was seen to be about peer pressure, there was an underlying message about the decision to have the extra drink.

At the moment of decision in the script it is mentioned that the protagonist has had had a couple of drinks, and is being asked to have an extra drink. And the consequence of having that extra drink would have been a fatal accident. This was sometimes mentioned spontaneously, and was generally understood to be part of the script when prompted.

“It shows what might have happened if you did have that extra one, the message was obviously it’s better to be safe than potentially dead, and then the ad actually said, that one extra pint doubles your chance of causing an accident” (Jekyll & Hyde, 18 – 24, Manchester)

The line that contains the key fact “just one extra drink might double the chances of killing yourself or someone else” was rarely mentioned spontaneously for this route and often missed on prompting.

It’s worth being mindful that this may partly have been a result of having the script read out rather than seeing the line appear on screen. And some noted it might be more powerful when used in conjunction with the crash scene.

“I think if it comes after that image at the end, then it puts it into writing doesn’t it. You could have that powerful image then not say anything, just putting it into writing and you are like yeah, this is what could happen” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead)

Framing the decision as “one extra drink” made sense to Ostriches

Ostriches were mostly seeing their drink driving behaviour in terms of having a couple of drinks, then having one extra because they thought they could get away with it. As a result the phrase “one extra drink” immediately made sense to them.

This was the interpretation of most people in the groups, and is likely to be the way it would be received by the audience, but two other interpretations are worth being aware of...

Some participants (most likely to be in the Jekyll & Hyde groups) had a far less definite idea of what an extra drink might be. It might come after four, five, six other drinks.

“I’d find it a lot easier if we knew how many drinks they mean beforehand, it could be zero or it could be five or six.” (Jekyll & Hyde, 25 – 35, Birmingham)

There were also one or two participants in the Ostrich groups who felt this assumed people would drink something before driving, and might encourage people who weren't drinking anything to have one or two instead. We might expect this to come up more often if we were conducting the research with a sample of people who weren't drinking anything.

Doubling your chances of killing yourself or someone else had an impact

Generally this was seen to be an impactful way of framing the difference an extra drink could make. It associated drinking just over the limit with fatal consequences.

"You would expect someone to be absolutely blottoed for a fatal accident, not just one drink over. I would anyway. I wouldn't think it would double your chances" (Jekyll & Hyde, 25 – 34, Manchester)

It felt from the reactions we heard that the line was a little bit too long, with the interest tailing off towards the end. As such it might be worth considering something a little more succinct (e.g. just an extra drink could double your chances of a fatal accident").

"If it could be condensed slightly then it would be very, very, impactful" (Ostrich, 25 – 34, Maidenhead).

The majority of participants felt positively about the use of the fact, but as is often the case with facts in THINK! advertising there were some who questioned it. Mostly because the phrase "could double your chances" meant it might not necessarily double your chances.

Some potential to impact on behaviour

This campaign was seen to be asking people to think about the extra pint before giving in to peer pressure.

Some focused more on the advertising being about the consequences of the extra drink. The scripts placed them in a very familiar scenario and showed them that an extra drink in that moment could lead to a fatal accident. This had potential to make them think.

"It's a scenario you can relate to. The temptation of him having that one extra pint is the good thing in there. And the impact of seeing the crash that came from the extra pint he had". (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Maidenhead)

Others focused more on the advertising being about resisting peer pressure than the impact of the extra drink. The scripts were dramatizing the challenge of doing the right thing, rather than making a point about the extra drink.

This led them to feel the campaign wasn't as thought provoking. Whilst they could relate to peer pressure they didn't see it as a particular problem. Crucially, in most cases *they were happy to give in to pressure to have an extra drink*. That was because they didn't see the extra drink as increasing their risk of a crash.

"I'm not sure it's about the peer pressure. I should be thinking, 'Well I've had two should I have a third'. Then I wouldn't really care if my friends were like 'you are boring'"(Ostrich, 18 – 24, Birmingham)

When the campaign was understood to be highlighting the dangers of having an extra drink it was more thought provoking. When it was seen to be focusing on the struggle of standing up to peer pressure it was more easily brushed off.

The key issues for development

This research would suggest that the scripts with most potential in this route are Malcolm and Simon. They tell stories that the audience could identify with and found humorous.

There are three development points to consider..

1. The most important development point is making sure the sub-plot about the increased risk of the extra drink feels more fundamental to the final advert. The thought of this increased risk was most likely to make the audience reconsider their behaviour, and is important if they are to take on board why it is worth resisting peer pressure in the first place.
2. Another consideration is to make sure the unpopularity doesn't feel too harsh, or seem to last too long. It is enough to show, for example, someone sitting out one game on the subs bench. Making too much of their unpopularity made it feel like too negative a consequence, and led some to question their decision.
3. Whilst there were some issues, the line used in the scripts ("Just one extra drink could double the chances") was working well, although it would be worth making it a little more succinct.

The 1% Project

A particularly engaging idea for this audience

Whilst the Unpopular, But Alive route was a little bit difficult for participants to imagine from the script, The 1% Project was immediately understood. Most could quickly see how a documentary style film featuring sportsmen might look, and described something very similar in tone to the Adidas adverts featuring Johnny Wilkinson and David Beckham.

A large part of the appeal came from seeing famous sportsmen being tested. In particular it was expected to be interesting, and humorous, to see them struggling to do the things that they're famous for.

"I am into sports so the sports people would initially attract my attention to that. I find it quite funny as well, to see them doing their sports a little bit over the limit, it would just be interesting." (Ostrich, 25 - 34, Maidenhead)

An idea that would ideally feature famous people

Some felt that this campaign only needed to show someone who might usually perform to an elite standard, suddenly finding they can't perform anymore. It didn't matter if they were a famous person or not.

Most, however, pointed out that much of the interest would come from seeing these tests performed on someone well-known.

"It's bringing in people that you know, bringing in celebrities. That's what is going to grab people's attention. They are people you can relate to in some way." (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Maidenhead)

Seen to be saying "a little bit of alcohol can make a big difference"

The campaign was seen to be suggesting two subtly different things...

Mostly it was seen to be taking sportsmen to a point where they were marginally (1%) over the legal limit, and then demonstrating what a big difference that was making to their performance.

"I really like the idea of The 1% Project. Saying that just that 1% is going to effect you. Proving that tiny bit over is going to have a massive effect" (Jekyll and Hyde, 18 – 24, Manchester)

Another interpretation, usually mentioned on prompting, was that this was showing sportsmen who have been drinking but claim to feel fine suddenly realising that they aren't fine after all.

"It's saying it's regardless of how you feel. They all felt fine, they all weren't fine. Even people who are the best at their jobs" (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Manchester)

Whilst it wasn't often mentioned spontaneously this second interpretation was just as powerful, if not more powerful, than the idea of being just over the legal limit.

The key moment came in the demonstration

The most memorable part of the advert was expected to be the moment when we see the sportsman miss his target, and his reactions to having missed. It was seen as the moment of truth in the advert, when someone who thought they were fine discovers they are impaired.

“Showing that 1% will move you out by that much. I think that moment will open people’s eyes. If they are only a tiny bit over and they miss by that much, imagine if they’re driving. If they come across as shocked, like ‘I can’t believe I missed that because I feel fine’” (Ostrich, 25 - 34, Maidenhead)

Because of this it was felt that the moment would need to be as visually impactful as possible: completely missing a clay pigeon, missing a series of penalties, hitting a golf ball significantly over the target. The moment that was sometimes questioned in this context was Tom Daley making a mistake in his dive. It was assumed that it would be harder to see a meaningful difference between his good dive and his bad one.

It would be worth tightening up the connection to the road

One question raised about this route before the research was how well the demonstration of a sportsman being impaired playing his sport would relate to a driver being impaired on the road. It’s something that would probably be worth looking at in development.

Roughly half the sample we spoke to made the connection quite easily: seeing the sportsmen impaired showed that they would also be impaired if they were driving.

“Yeah, it’s just showing the effects of alcohol, if you have a drink it could impact on your driving. Just 1% and you can see the effect” (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Birmingham)

The other half of the sample took a little bit longer to make the connection: they didn’t see how someone impaired performing in sport related to someone on the road.

“I got the message that going over the limit by that 1% will affect sports performance, I got that, but then how does that affect drink driving, I don’t know that the link was really there.” (Jekyll & Hyde, 18 – 24, Manchester).

On further discussion it was clear that those who were making the connection were interpreting the demonstrations in one of two ways...

The clearest interpretation was to see the film as a demonstration of reaction times. In particular, Joe Hart and Peter Wilson were seen to be sportsmen who needed super-fast reactions. This was easily connected to the impact that alcohol has on a driver’s reaction times: you might feel absolutely fine, but if someone stepped out into the road you might take a little longer to hit the brakes.

“I think that would be a good link. Reaction times in sport, reaction times on the road. If the sports are based on reaction times that could make it easier for the audience to relate to driving” (Ostrich, 25 – 34, Maidenhead).

Another, slightly more conceptual, interpretation was around accurate judgment. Peter Wilson and Justin Rose needed to accurately judge distances to hit their target.

This was also seen as a part of driving that might be impacted by alcohol: you need to judge the distances between your car and anything else that might be on the road.

“I think you can relate to the golfer hitting the target. He needs to be skillful to judge that and switched on to it. You need to have that same awareness” (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Maidenhead).

The balance required by Tom Daley to execute the perfect dive wasn’t something that could be so easily related to diving.

In order to tighten up the connection with driving on the road it might therefore be worth putting more emphasis on the most relevant areas of impairment, particularly reaction times.

Unsurprisingly, the sportsman most often suggested by the groups was Lewis Hamilton. A Formula 1 driver would be directly relevant to the road, and seeing him driving just over the legal limit would be particularly interesting.

It’s important the audience trust the results of the experiments

An important consideration for this campaign will be making sure the audience trust what they’re seeing on screen. There are two areas that it will be important to get right...

Firstly, these need to feel like robust experiments. Participants were keen for them to feel very carefully set up, and precisely measured. Most notably, they were quick to point out any variables that might invalidate the results (i.e. if Joe Hart missed a penalty it could be because the penalty taker had struck the ball particularly well).

“With the Joe Hart one is it just someone kicking a ball or is it a machine firing it? I think that a machine would be better because it is consistent then.” (Jekyll & Hyde, 25 – 34, Manchester).

Secondly, these need to feel like authentic experiments. We didn’t hear too much skepticism about the experiments, but there were some participants who noted they could be staged (e.g. Justin Rose actually hits the target with his first few shots but the film only shows the shot where he misses). It will be important the final film doesn’t feel too staged or scripted.

“What I start thinking was ‘I wonder how genuine it is?’. It sounds bad but I starting thinking ‘Did they all miss purposely?’” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Manchester)

The crash photographs at the end of the film weren’t adding to the impact

The series of photographs of crash scenes that appeared at the end were rarely mentioned in the responses we heard, and weren’t seen to be adding to the impact of the advert.

It could be that a series of photos of crash scenes wasn’t expected to be particularly striking on screen (compared to the drama of the scenes in *Unpopular, But Alive*).

“I think the documentary thing works better for me. I don’t really need to see the shock pictures of people getting knocked over because I know it happens, seeing the documentary thing, that sort of makes me think a lot more” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Manchester)

It may well be that a crash scene could still add to the impact at the end of the advert, and would be worth considering in development. It was sometimes suggested that having clearly demonstrated impairment with the sportsmen (e.g. reaction times), it would be a powerful jolt to show it transferred to the reality of the road.

“If you first showed that they [the sportsmen] didn’t react quick enough, then showing someone who didn’t react quick enough and died, then that is it.” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead).

The focus on 1% was working relatively well

It’s very difficult to find a way of talking about drinking over the limit that makes its point in a clear way. But the idea of drinking 1% of the limit worked relatively well.

It was mostly seen as a way of testing people when they are a fraction over the limit. They didn’t think closely about exactly what 1% over the limit might mean, but they understood the point that was being made.

“You don’t necessarily know what 1% is. But you know it’s really small.” (Ostrich, 18 – 24 yrs, Manchester)

There were some who found it a little bit complicated. They pointed out that they didn’t know what the legal limit was in the first place, and couldn’t appreciate what 1% over that limit might mean.

“It is a bit confusing. You wouldn’t know what to do, what to drink. You don’t know what 1% over the limit is” (Jekyll & Hyde, 18 – 24, Manchester).

Those who found the 1% complicated usually suggested one of two ways they might more easily relate to it.

Partly by showing the number of drinks each sportsman has had. This wasn’t a suggestion that the film become “The 2 Pint Project” (different individuals might be able to drink different amounts). Rather it was suggested it would be useful to be shown what the sportsmen were drinking to get to the legal limit (with the assumption this would only be 1 or 2 drinks).

“They could leave the glasses he has drunk out of on the table next to him, so it is like ‘Oh right there is two and a half pints, that is what it takes Joe Hart to be 1% over” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead).

Mostly by emphasizing that the sportsmen are feeling fine at the point when they’re tested. Everyone immediately identified with making a judgment that they “feel fine” before making the decision to drive.

“That works for me a lot more because that is the judgment I make in the pub. I don’t go right up to my limit because I don’t know my limit. That is the judgment I make every weekend” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Manchester)

The fact at the end of the script was more likely to be noticed

Given that this campaign was seen to focus more explicitly on the difference being just over the limit makes to impairment, the fact about the increased chances of a fatal accident was more likely to be noticed.

As with Unpopular, But Alive it was mostly seen to make sense to talk about an “extra drink”, and it was impactful to point out this would “double your chances” of a crash.

We also tested the idea that “any amount” of alcohol could increase your chances of a crash, which was reasonably well received. Although it was seen to have a slightly different emphasis, suggesting the alcohol you drink below the limit is also increasing your risk.

“Even the first drink. You take one sip and it’s going to affect you” (Ostrich, 25 – 35, Maidenhead)

Overall, however it was the lines that referenced feeling fine that were mostly picked out as the next best alternative to the current option (*“Even if you feel fine, don’t drink and drive”*; *“Don’t rely on how you feel, don’t drink and drive”*).

“If I feel fine then I think I am not over my limit, so that line to me challenges my theory about my limit so that is why that is effective with me” (Ostrich, 25 – 34, Manchester)

This route showed potential to get drivers thinking about their behaviour

The 1% Project was consistently picked out as the route most likely to make the audience think about their behaviour.

It directly addressed that they don’t really think they’re taking a risk when they stretch the limit a little: they feel fine and they assume their driving hasn’t been impaired.

“Adverts tell you not to drink and drive but they don’t always tell you something new. You’ve never seen this before” (Jekyll & Hyde, 25 – 34, Birmingham)

As a result they were genuinely interested in seeing the results of the experiments, and the differences they imagined seeing made them reflect on what they were doing.

“It does make you think about towing the line. Close to the edge lots of people drink when they shouldn’t. They think one more won’t hurt, so this is enforcing that that one could be the one what does you” (Ostrich, 18 – 24, Maidenhead)

The key issues for development

This research suggests that “The 1% Project” has a lot of potential but there are a number of areas worth considering for development.

1. Most importantly, this route relies on seeing a key moment of truth. It needs a striking demonstration of the difference that being just over the limit can make.
2. The experiments don’t necessarily require famous sportsmen, but a lot of the engagement is going to come from seeing someone famous.
3. The connection to the road would ideally be made clearer. The most immediate connection would come from a demonstration of reaction times, but accurate judgment also had potential.

4. The crash photography at the end was often missed, but it might still be worth considering bringing the film back to the grim reality of the road in some way.
5. The film will need to feel like something the audience can trust: it needs to be a robust experiment and it can't feel staged or scripted.
6. Overall the idea of being 1% over worked but often participants struggled to relate it to their own behaviour. The idea that the sportsmen were still feeling fine was probably the easiest way for the audience to relate to what was happening.
7. As before the line ("Just one extra drink could double the chances...") was felt to work well. But might be worth making more succinct.

Conclusions and recommendations

Both routes shown in this research showed potential, but in both cases there are some key considerations to think about for development...

The route that showed most potential to make this audience think about their behaviour was "The 1% Project". It was expected to be engaging and directly addressed the issue that this audience assume they'll be fine to drive if they stretch the limit a little.

There are a number of development points for this route. But the most important thing to consider is that it relies on an impactful moment when the sportsman who thinks he's fine discovers he's impaired. If, for example, Justin Rose feels he can still play reasonably well just over the legal limit it obviously won't work.

"Unpopular, But Alive" had some potential to make the audience think about their behaviour, but it was more limited. Scripts like Malcolm and Simon could be engaging, but the dominant message was "don't give in to peer pressure".

There were fewer development points for this route, but again there is one particularly important issue to consider. Ultimately many in this audience were brushing off the thought of peer pressure to have an extra drink because they didn't see an issue with having that extra drink in the first place. If the emphasis of the film could more clearly be that this extra drink leads to an increased risk of a crash, the campaign could have more impact.