

THINK DRINK
Buying them alcohol doesn't
buy them a good time

Impact Evaluation

Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand

April 2011



The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and should not be attributed to the Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand (ALAC).

This evaluation report may be cited as:

Collie, C. (2011). *Think Drink: buying them alcohol doesn't buy them a good time: impact evaluation*. Wellington: Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand.

ISBN

978-1-877373-87-9 (Print)

978-1-877373-88-5 (online)

Prepared for ALAC by Carmen Collie

ALCOHOL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF NEW ZEALAND
Kaunihera Whakatupato Waipiro o Aotearoa

© Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand
Level 13, Craigs Investment Partners House
36 Customhouse Quay
PO Box 5023
Lambton Quay
Wellington 6145
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 917 0060
Fax: +64 4 473 0890
central@alac.org.nz
www.alac.org.nz
www.waipiro.org.nz

April 2011

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Recommendations.....	2
1 Context and Methodology	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Introduction.....	4
1.2.1 Project description	5
1.2.2 Aim of evaluation	6
1.2.3 Methods of evaluation	6
2 Evaluation Findings	8
2.1 Quantitative feedback.....	8
2.1.1 Customer questionnaires in bottle stores	8
2.1.2 Controlled Purchase Operations	9
2.1.3 Alcohol Drug Helpline calls.....	10
2.2 Qualitative feedback.....	11
2.2.1 Retailers	11
2.2.2 Internal stakeholders	14
2.2.3 Other external stakeholders	18
2.3 Review of process information	22
2.3.1 Project planning and design	22
2.3.2 Unexpected impacts	24
2.3.3 Financial accountability	25
2.3.4 Key messages	25
2.3.5 Sustainability	25
2.3.6 Moving forward	26
3 Discussion of Findings.....	27
3.1 Impacts on target audiences	27
3.2 Impacts on unintended audience	27
3.3 Relationship-building	28
3.4 Planning.....	29
3.5 Communications.....	29
3.6 Clarity of message.....	30
3.7 Profile, reach and sustainability	30
4 Conclusions and Recommendations	32
4.1 Recommendations for the future.....	33
5 Appendices	34

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The THINK campaign 2009-2010 achieved significant impacts, both intended and unintended, including: a raised profile of drink-drive messages in the community; increased compliance with the Sale of Liquor Act 1989; and improved relationships with licensees. The high turnover of bottle stores annually suggests that these gains will be difficult to sustain and that project organisers should investigate more sustainable outcomes for future THINK campaigns.

The campaign achieved four out of five of its post-dated objectives.

- The campaign demonstrated very favourable Controlled Purchase Operation¹ returns, indicating an increased awareness of supply to minors as an issue by retailers.
- Very favourable levels of uptake of the drink-drive message were taken from customer surveys in bottle stores, with 79 percent of respondents identifying this as a key message.
- Very favourable levels of intent to think before supplying alcohol to minors were recorded, with 85 percent of customer respondents in bottle store surveys indicating they would think about reducing how much alcohol they bought for or gave to young people.
- Feedback from external stakeholders indicated favourable impacts on the secondary audience (parents and other adults), who were often shocked by the consequences of supply to minors displayed in the DVD.
- Feedback from external stakeholders, and in particular retailers, indicated questionable impacts on the primary audience (18- to 22-year-olds). Interviewees perceived this age bracket to be somewhat light-hearted and jocular about the DVD and its messages.

The campaign was a positive relationship-building exercise, with the vast majority of external stakeholders indicating support for the initiative and an inclination to work together with enforcement agencies again. This particularly relates to the alcohol industry.

Room for improvement was identified within joint planning, communication and reporting processes. Shortfalls in each of these areas resulted in lost opportunities for increased positive outcomes for the campaign.

¹ A description of a controlled purchase operation is on page 13.

No impact on call numbers originating from this campaign was recorded by the Alcohol Drug Helpline.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Upon consideration of the above findings, the researcher recommends that future campaigns:

1. *employ a robust project planning process engaging all key stakeholders and clearly defining roles and responsibilities*
2. *clarify the key message and ensure this is focus-group tested for maximum impact*
3. *investigate how campaign organisers might influence more sustainable systemic change*
4. *make more overt links between similar campaigns to provide a consistent message to the target audiences*
5. *investigate further opportunities to work in partnership with licensees, and in particular with national chain operators*
6. *develop a communications strategy prioritising increased and strategic communication with both internal and external stakeholders.*

Further to this, the researcher recommends that the campaign organisers:

7. *focus-group test the DVD with younger audiences prior to further engagement with school-based programmes to ascertain the impact on young audiences*
8. *proceed with care in the delivery and management of programmes utilising the DVD in schools.*

1 CONTEXT AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 BACKGROUND

Research² shows that over half of all New Zealand youth (12-17 years) have consumed alcohol, with 21 percent being further classified as binge drinkers. Ninety-one percent of those young people classified as binge drinkers have reported suffering from some form of alcohol-related harm in the form of violence or drink-driving as well as embarrassment, humiliation and regret.

The need to influence behaviour and reduce alcohol-related harm in respect of this identified population is nearing critical levels in the Counties Manukau Police District.

The Counties Manukau Police District is predominantly urban and rural in its make-up. The District has a number of commercial business districts and satellite shopping facilities that contain clusters of licensed premises, including off-licence premises.

It is common to find areas within the Counties Manukau Police District that have 10 or more licensed premises grouped within 500 metres of one another, including on- and off-licences. There is significant community concern within the Counties Manukau Police District that the number of off-licence premises is disproportionate to demand. This concern is elevated in areas such as Manurewa and Mangere.

The Counties Manukau Police District experiences a disproportionate spike in offending linked to the supply and inappropriate consumption of alcohol by young persons and minors who are obtaining alcohol from off-licences. Home-based drinking accounts for approximately 70 percent of alcohol consumption in New Zealand.³ There is no current law that prevents supply to minors in a home-based environment, and no ability to monitor the supply or use of liquor in that environment.

Since 2007, Counties Manukau Police, the Manukau District Licensing Agency (DLA) and the Manukau City Road Safety Team have worked together to address issues relating to the supply of alcohol to young persons in the form of the THINK programme.

² Cited in: Counties Manukau Police District and Manukau DLA. 2009. *Community-based Initiative to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harm Project Proposal: Think Drink 2009*. Counties Manukau Police.

³Ministry of Health. As cited in Counties Manukau Police District and Manukau DLA. 2009. *Community-based Initiative to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harm Project Proposal: Think Drink 2009*. Counties Manukau Police.

1.2 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the THINK DRINK programme was to:

Reduce supply of alcohol to young people by influencing the target groups to consider that supply.

The five objectives driving this programme were to:

1. raise awareness of the risk of drinking and driving within the Manukau community
2. influence those persons purchasing alcohol for, or supplying alcohol to, young people, to consider the potential for alcohol-related harms to those persons when making the purchase or considering the supply
3. raise peer and parental awareness of the consequences of combining alcohol, young people and vehicles
4. reduce the number of alcohol-related crashes involving young persons aged 14-24 years in Counties Manukau
5. reduce the number of failed Controlled Purchase Operations (CPOs) by off-licences in Counties Manukau.

A range of research⁴ has identified that 63 percent of supply to minors is most frequently carried out by two distinct groups: young persons aged 18-22, and parents and guardians. The **primary audience** for this campaign was 18- to 22-year-olds who often purchase for younger siblings and friends. The **secondary audience** was parents and associates who need to be made aware of the risks and dangers of supplying to minors.

In alignment with the Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand's (ALAC's) three priority audiences, the campaign sought to reduce the disproportionate harm suffered by all three priority audiences: young people aged 12-24, Maori and Pacific peoples.

The geographic spread of the campaign encompassed all of the Counties Manukau Police District, incorporating Manukau, Franklin and Papakura Districts. The primary focus was on Manukau.

⁴ As cited in Counties Manukau Police District and Manukau DLA. 2009. *Community-based Initiative to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harm Project Proposal: Think Drink 2009*. Counties Manukau Police.

1.2.1 Project description

The THINK DRINK campaign ran in Counties Manukau over a nine-month period between May 2009 and March 2010. The campaign was a partnership between Counties Manukau Police, the Manukau DLA and the Manukau City Road Safety Team.

The project linked to the pre-existing, intersectoral THINK campaign, which has been under development since September 2007 as a local alcohol-related harm reduction initiative. THINK has been a collaborative project between the above parties and this campaign was seen as a natural extension of that programme.

This project utilised a visual messaging system with the creation of a DVD that showcased adverse behaviours displayed by young persons under the influence of alcohol. The DVD was developed by Greenstone Pictures and consists of three 30- to 40-second scenarios, played on loop in bottle stores. The primary message is: 'Buying alcohol for young people doesn't buy them a good time'. A secondary message relating to previous iterations of the THINK campaign is 'Recruiting Now. Drink. Drive. Disfigure. Death. Think'.

Central to the project was participation by off-licence bottle stores. Licensed premises were initially prioritised based on past and recent failed CPOs. Subsequent roll-outs were more random in nature. Prior to the initiative, strong support was garnered from both national and independent retailers.

The campaign began with a launch event attended by the Mayor of Manukau City, Greenstone Pictures, the Police District Commander, Government agencies, actors and families, Police officers and some of the larger liquor companies.

In an optimal setting the DVD was positioned behind the point of sale (cash register) to be played at times when purchase for supply was most significant. The DVD could be played with or without an audible soundtrack in order to not unduly influence the licensee's decision to play the DVD.

A large number of bottle stores took part in the campaign, which involved their playing the DVD on loop in stores using audio-visual equipment provided by the campaign organisers. This message was reinforced by: the bagging of purchases in reusable tote bags bearing the campaign slogan; counter mats bearing the slogan; and short survey forms that customers were encouraged to complete in relation to the DVD and its key messages. Promotional banners and information sheets were also developed. The campaign ran in each bottle store for a five-week period.

The campaign sought to maximise outcomes by offering potential opportunities for follow up discussion about alcohol for the viewer through the promotion of the Alcohol Drug Helpline number. The 0800 number was incorporated into the DVD and promoted at regular intervals of 45 seconds, following each vignette. Further to this, Helpline wallet cards in plastic holders were distributed along with the DVD and other promotional material to stores for the first six-week roll-out of the campaign and for as long as stocks lasted after that.

Further to the off-licence component of this campaign, it was intended that the DVD be used by the Manukau City Road Safety Team as part of their ongoing work with colleges and the community. This aspect of the campaign is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

1.2.2 Aim of evaluation

This study takes the form of an impact evaluation, the aim of which is to ascertain the short-term impacts of the THINK DRINK campaign on internal and external audiences and environments.

1.2.3 Methods of evaluation

Impact evaluation assesses the changes that can be attributed to a particular intervention, both the intended and the unintended. Impact evaluation is structured to examine the extent to which programme objectives have been achieved by the strategies that are put in place to meet them.

Types of information collected within this study included:

- stakeholders' perceptions of the programme
- short-term changes in the knowledge, attitudes and behaviour of people involved with the programme
- quantitative data demonstrating changes in behaviour
- short-term changes in environments directly affected by the programme.

This study also seeks to:

- assess the extent to which the programme met its objectives
- review the process evaluation information.

In total, 12 liquor stores were visited and eight one-on-one interviews were carried out across Manukau with bottle store managers and including one interview with the National Operations Manager of a large franchise chain. The aim of the interviews was to ascertain the impacts of the campaign on the retailers and any perceived impacts on the customers.

A total of six face-to-face interviews were carried out with internal stakeholders with the aim of gauging their satisfaction with, and perceived impacts of, the campaign. Internal stakeholders

consisted of Counties Manukau Police (two), Manukau City Road Safety, Manukau DLA, Papakura Road Safety and Franklin Road Safety.

Five interviews were carried out with external stakeholders. External stakeholders included Greenstone Pictures (two), an actor involved in filming the DVD, a parent of an actor and the Alcohol Drug Helpline.

Quantitative data was collected via three sources. Customers were encouraged to complete an in-store survey outlining their responses to the campaign and, in particular, to the DVD running in-store. Responses were received from 79 bottle stores and collated by Manukau City Council.

The Alcohol Drug Helpline collated information relating to calls to its service in response to the THINK DRINK campaign.

Police undertook a series of CPOs across Counties Manukau in the period during and post this campaign.

2 EVALUATION FINDINGS

Findings have been separated into quantitative and qualitative groupings, the former investigating demonstrated change through various data-collection methods and the latter offering feedback from key stakeholders involved in the campaign.

2.1 QUANTITATIVE FEEDBACK

Quantitative feedback was gathered from three key sources, including:

- Customer questionnaires in bottle stores
- CPOs
- Alcohol Drug Helpline data.

2.1.1 Customer questionnaires in bottle stores

The THINK DRINK campaign targeted 96 bottle stores in Counties Manukau. These stores were chosen from an initial list of 108 off-licences. For a range of reasons predominantly relating to the type of business (e.g. internet, florist), 12 were culled from the initial list.

Seventy-nine stores returned customer questionnaire forms (82 percent of all stores involved in the campaign). The 18 percent that did not return questionnaires are not deemed to have fully participated in the campaign. From these 79 stores, 4,567 customer questionnaires were completed. Ninety-five percent of customers claimed to have viewed the DVD. Of those who viewed the DVD:

- 85 percent responded that they would THINK about reducing supply to young people in future
- 79 percent identified a 'don't drink and drive' message
- 54 percent identified a 'buying alcohol for young people' message
- 50 percent identified a 'giving alcohol to young people' message
- 47 percent identified an 'alcohol-related harm' message
- 4 percent identified other messages. These 'other' messages can be summarised as:
 - Alcohol makes people stupid
 - Young women are vulnerable to rape when intoxicated
 - Raise the drinking age
 - Buying alcohol for young people doesn't buy them a good time
 - Young people's drinking should be supervised.

Results may or may not have been prejudiced by their order or ranking on the questionnaire form. Results correspond in descending order to the prompts on the questionnaire.

Quantitative data from bottle stores

	Total number	Percentage
No. of stores in campaign	96	
No. of stores participating (responses received)	79	82%
No. of customers participating in survey	4,567	
No. of customers who viewed DVD	4,324	95%
Don't drink and drive message	3,399	79%
Buying alcohol for young people message	2,330	54%
Giving alcohol to young people message	2,180	50%
Alcohol-related harm message	2,020	47%
Other	177	4%
Customers who responded they will THINK about reducing supply to young people	3,660	85%

2.1.2 Controlled Purchase Operations

CPOs are planned operations designed to monitor and enforce the provisions relating to the sale of liquor to minors in the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 (SoLA). They involve supervised volunteers aged under 18 attempting to buy alcohol from licensed premises, particularly off-licence premises such as supermarkets, bottle stores and grocery stores. Should a volunteer's purchase prove successful, the premises' operator, manager or licensee is liable to prosecution or other sanction via the Liquor Licensing Authority or the District Court.⁵

Initial premises were identified for inclusion in the THINK DRINK campaign based on previously failed CPOs. Counties Manukau, until recently, has experienced a consistent CPO failure rate of around 25 percent.⁶ This has been brought down in recent times to around 10 percent. The last two CPOs had no sales. This is considered an unusual outcome.

During the campaign Counties Manukau Police ran a region-wide CPO that included 30 premises that had either failed CPOs or about which they had intelligence of sales, in the previous 24 months. Based on this history of selling to minors, Police expected a higher-than-normal percentage of completed sales. Fourteen minors visited 72 sites and completed eight sales: a failure rate of only 11 percent.

⁵ Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand. (2004). *Controlled purchase operations guidelines: helping to reduce alcohol-related harm among minors*. Retrieved 1 Aug 2010, from <http://www.alac.org.nz/DBTextworks/PDF/CPOguidelines.pdf>.

⁶ Interview with Gavin Campbell, 25 May 2010.

On the whole, CPO results during the THINK DRINK campaign show favourable indications. Zero returns had not commonly been seen prior to this campaign and were not an uncommon result during the campaign. The overall failure rate for CPOs between July 2009 and April 2010 dropped as low as 7.8 percent.

Breakdown of CPOs June 2009 – April 2010

Date of CPO	Completed sales	No. of premises compliance-checked	District	Failure rate
17 July 2009	2	9	Manurewa	22%
16 July 2009	1	11	Otahuhu	9%
16 October 2009	8	72	Region wide	11%
11 December 2009	1	9	Manurewa	11%
11 December 2009	0	14	Howick	zero
11 December 2009	2	9	Manukau	22%
11 December 2009	0	12	Otara	zero
19 March 2010	1	20	Howick	5%
16 April 2010	0	11	Papakura	zero
16 April 2010	0	25	Howick	zero
Total	15	192		7.8%

2.1.3 Alcohol Drug Helpline calls

No calls to the Alcohol Drug Helpline explicitly identified the THINK DRINK campaign as a motivator for the call.

2.2 QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

2.2.1 Retailers

Initial interviews with bottle store retailers demonstrated that the campaign had had positive impacts both on the retailers themselves and on the customers. Retailers reported that significant levels of discussion had been had in stores around the messages within the DVD:

"I have been discussing it with customers – asking what their views are. The promotion gives good awareness teaching."

"Struck up conversations with customers – customers don't admit to buying for their underage children."

"Had some great feedback from some customers whose kids had been involved in making the DVD."

Retailers were asked about the perceived impacts of the DVD on customers. Their comments varied across the spectrum but could loosely be bundled into two categories: older customers and young customers.

"Older people are already converted and understand the consequences – those around 18 don't care about the consequences. Those around their mid-20s were starting to think more about the message and their personal responsibility."

"Young ones were laughing; the older ones took it more seriously."

"A few rude boys said something about it being a stupid DVD."

"Some don't know the law around supply to minors – the DVD raised their awareness. Made them aware of the issues – they generally thought it was a good movie."

"Those in the 25 age range [sic] are maybe hearing the message loudest – in some instances a penny is dropping, especially if they have younger siblings."

"Younger customers have a negative view [of the DVD] as they feel attacked – they think it is their right to drink as they please."

"School kids that made that video gave 100 percent clarification on how it would come across to teenagers – they thought it was cool. The whole scenario of the video gave the wrong message to kids. Totally wrong."

"They were scared and shocked by what they saw."

“A little bit of impact on parents. Not sure about other audiences.”

“Even young people – they may be laughing in the store, but they stop and watch the DVD quietly.”

Some retailers spoke of their social responsibility, taking personal accountability for on-sale or supply to minors, while others turned a blind eye to what happened outside their doors.

“We are indirectly selling to minors by allowing others to purchase on their behalf – they [young people outside the store] can walk away giving me the fingers when they manage to get someone to buy for them.”

“When I see someone who is making a purchase to then pass on to minors in the car park, I will ask for their full details from them. Engaging with the customer like this makes them panic. I let them know why I want their details and explain that if those kids get into trouble it comes back to him. They usually ditch the purchase and pass the money back to the kids in the car park. I sometimes then follow up by walking outside towards this group with the phone to my ear like I am calling the cops and they take off.”

“We don’t know what’s going on outside the door.”

One retailer went as far as to condemn the campaign for getting the message entirely wrong and for being out of touch with the community.

“I understand far more about what happens in the community – if they won’t listen to us [retailers] then how can they know about the community? I was blown away by the launch. They were heading down the wrong track and are not listening to the trade. I am a multi-rate payer and totally disagree with ratepayers funding this sort of thing.”

In most instances, previous dealings between enforcement agencies and retailers had been limited to Manager’s Certificate applications and SoLA administration. Current working relationships with enforcement agencies were seen in a range of lights, from very positive to decidedly negative. Most found their dealings to be fine.

“Very good! Great to deal with and knows what he is doing. He is involved in a lot and knows what is happening in the community – very presentable.”

“Fine!”

“... they rock up with no information ahead of time, no information sheet about the campaign and assume they can tell me to do this and that. I had a run-in with X years ago and my trust in him was diminished. We never got an answer about whether the campaign was compulsory despite repeatedly asking. I eventually threw them out of the store when I found it wasn’t. They were very unprofessional.”

Retailers, as the group who viewed the DVD more than any other, took a range of key messages from the DVD, which included:

- Drink-driving
- Parental supply is a problem
- Beware when drinking – take care
- Should be aware of the laws and how we can reduce liquor abuse in the community
- Not selling to underage
- Drink-driving and underage.

Retailers' thoughts regarding the 'consequences of sale to minors' pre and post campaign had not significantly changed, although two conceded that it:

"Made us more aware of family suffering and the consequences."

"Made me think a bit more about it."

While one retailer declined to show the DVD in store, he did have a strong point of view regarding the appropriateness of placing these messages within a commercial environment:

"People come in to buy our products to have fun – we all know alcohol can make you do silly things. Education is the answer – either through schools or parents. This [campaign] is not a tool for reaching parents... ...I am law abiding and can't control what happens after I have sold to someone of age, outside the store. We are all in business to make money and times are hard – this is an inappropriate way to tell customers this message."

A number of retailers called for more of this type of moderation message to educate their customers:

"Good. We need more – continuous. Not just one-off. Also more education in schools; young kids try to come in here and buy gum or coke. They don't know the law. Also they don't understand why they can't just use their student ID to prove their age. I had to remove the word 'guardian' from my signage; it was too difficult to try and explain to extended families. Need more education."

"When we just see these things one time, they leave the mind."

"Good programme. Should keep going. Not just one time."

Only one retailer was able to link the campaign to other initiatives in the community. The connection was made between the DVD messages and the booze buses as a means of reducing drink-driving. Not one retailer was able to link the campaign to other THINK campaigns or messages carrying the same strapline or imagery.

2.2.2 Internal stakeholders

Internal stakeholders consisted of the group involved in the planning and implementation of the campaign. These included:

- Counties Manukau Police
- Manukau DLA
- Manukau Road Safety Team
- Franklin Road Safety
- Papakura Road Safety.

Within this group was an inner core or working group that included Police, Manukau DLA and Manukau Road Safety.

Internal stakeholders reported that the campaign had had an advantageous effect on their working relationships with off-licence retailers. In the past, enforcement agencies have not tended to work together with retailers in this way locally, with dealings limited to compliance and enforcement communications.

“It was our first time working like this with smaller independent outlets in an attempt to influence rather than enforce.”

“In general it placed them on better speaking terms with Police – who don’t tend to interfere with their business unless necessary. ‘If we’re not talking to them they’re doing a good job’ – good to have positive interaction.”

“It has given us more access to licensed premises. They appear to be more open to us approaching – especially non-constabulary members. Previously we were more enforcement focused. A positive by-product of the campaign.”

“Some premises actually requested a second roll-out of the campaign in their stores. Another threw us out of the store.”

Some within the alcohol industry, including retailers, could see no immediate benefits in working together with enforcement agencies and were less responsive to the campaign, as evidenced by the following:

“This was our first collaboration with the industry and we had a range of responses. [One small chain group with nine outlets in Manukau] told us that they ‘sell advertising space; if you want space – you buy it’.”

“Yes, it has had an effect [on our relationship with licensees]. There are two categories of licensee – those in it for the money and those in it for the long haul, who tend to care more about their role in the community. This was a revelation [for me]

within this campaign. There was significant improvement in working relationship with some, and it reaffirmed my ideas about others.”

“Some licensees were a bit off about the campaign and two outright said no. I suspect some didn’t even turn their TVs on and completed the forms themselves or placed no forms in the boxes.”

Internal stakeholders were asked what impact they thought the campaign had impressed upon the retailers:

“I believe life is easier for them if they are seen to do their part. It has given them a better understanding of what we are all here to do and that is minimise harm to the community.”

“The stores that most needed the information couldn’t be less interested in taking part in the campaign – they would probably benefit most from CPOs, although they tend not to learn. There is a great divide between the good premises and the bad.”

“One store has become very proactive and asking what we are up to next. They previously knew me as a customer, but now they know me in this role and have become a lot more friendly.”

Not a lot of direct feedback was provided to internal stakeholders from retailers regarding the campaign. This was read as good news by enforcement agencies that, on the whole, regard silent licensees to be good licensees.

“There wasn’t a huge amount of feedback, either positive or negative about the campaign. Silence is golden in this industry!”

“Not sure whether Police have had feedback – they try to avoid us if they can.”

With the promotion in each store for between five and six weeks, it appeared that some retailers needed some positive follow-up or encouragement to continue to promote the campaign.

“Yes, on the odd time I was in stores there was some positive. Some stores needed follow-up; I would get reports that stores were not running the DVD and required prompting to play it.”

“DVDs were in store for six weeks – if only two customer surveys were completed then they [retailers] were clearly not buying in to the campaign and the promo would be placed back in those stores for a second roll-out.”

Chain operators tended to be more supportive of the campaign than the small, independent outlets.

“Super Liquor – very positive and supportive. Our failing was that we didn’t follow up on them having their logo placed on bags. Heard anecdotally that several stores refused to take part in campaign.”

“Liquorland; he was very positive. The licensee found it interesting to see the response of customers. He found that some viewed the DVD without understanding what was going on. He had conversations with customers whose feedback ranged across the spectrum, but most were receptive to the message. We had a lot of buy-in from franchised companies and less from the independents – some who took part only under duress.”

Other direct feedback from retailers related to the campaign demands placed on them to monitor their TVs and have customers fill out forms. Both tasks were seen as quite a commitment from some retailers.

“One loved it, but found it hard to keep an eye on the TV and to place it somewhere safe. Counter space needed to be kept clear. In one location someone tried to walk out with it.”

“A lot of people looked at the TV but didn’t fill in the forms – couldn’t be bothered. So obviously there were a lot more people exposed to the campaign than recorded. The campaign needs to be self-sustaining; people behind the counter should not have to drive it by getting people to fill in forms.”

Internal stakeholders’ perceptions of the impacts on the target audience were based only on observation and the limited feedback provided.

“I know what the questionnaires are telling us but not sure that this is an accurate reflection of what parents are doing.”

“We are trying to reach through these intermediaries to their clientele/suppliers to young people – rather than the licensees themselves – and it is impossible to measure the impact.”

“Got them thinking – not sure how often it was on – but at least it got them thinking. Generated discussion amongst parents.”

“Survey responses tell us it did [have an impact]. When we started we thought if we prevented one death or serious injury then we would have paid for the campaign. Bags are still in circulation as are bar mats – continuing to build upon brand awareness and delivering the message. The message has also since been linked to after-schools in letters to all secondary schools in the region.”

“Tricky to know. The graphics of the grim reaper really appealed to young people. Maybe more posters or bar mats to support the campaign would have been a good idea.”

In general the campaign assisted in enhancing the working relationships between internal stakeholders:

“Certainly met a lot more people. Closely worked with Cat and her team which was a good experience. Also Greenstone – they really got in behind the promotion and gave us a lot more for our money – quite community spirited.”

“Because of some historical issues, we needed to build some trust between teams. Has been successful in doing this with an ability to deliver being demonstrated.”

“Road Safety work quite closely already. This campaign may have strengthened relations with other internal stakeholders simply through working together.”

“No difference. We are all working together all the time anyway.”

Were the campaign to be repeated, internal stakeholders identified a range of things they would do differently. In essence, these came down to better planning and communication. Individuals acknowledged that this was a larger project than anything they had undertaken before and they had misjudged how resource intensive the campaign would be. Clearer objectives, roles and responsibilities and better monitoring of licensed premises were identified as key factors for improvement.

“I felt that if we were going to do it we needed to do it properly. We had to make sacrifices around funding. We had an idea of what we wanted but not how to do it. Working across local authority boundaries was a challenge to remaining inclusive. Proper planning is needed next time. We had never done anything like this before – in scale, scope or budget. We didn’t understand how labour intensive it would be – we would need to plan better for this in future. There was a lot of putting the cart before the horse at the beginning – we were all excited about the idea with no understanding of the logistics.”

“I think we took too big a bite with this project – we are very much a business-as-usual organisation with very limited resources for harm-minimisation projects – however they are necessary.”

“Set clearer objectives.”

In particular, the logistics of managing the roll-out into licensed premises and the ongoing monitoring of this would have benefited from more thorough planning.

“We targeted the worst first but then became more random in our approach and the paper trail was not great, causing some confusion.”

“Monitor roll-out more closely.”

“Not enough warning of location changes [retail outlets] so we were left out of that process. Would have liked to be involved but too short notice. It worked really well with the first roll-out when we were there.”

“Should I have been in stores following up and liaising with retailers? If so, this wasn’t communicated at the start of the project and, had it been, I would have been able to set aside the necessary resource to cover this. From what I gather, the merchandise was dropped off and then collected again with little other follow-up. There was probably an opportunity to gain feedback from retailers about the campaign at this stage.”

Ongoing communication with external stakeholders is required to maintain commitment to the campaign through the roll-out:

“Campaign would have benefited from a boost somewhere during the roll-outs to reinvigorate participants.”

“MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] with partner agencies – large liquor companies to ensure they are doing what they agreed to.”

Various internal stakeholders raised the need for more clarification of the key message owing to the majority of people taking the primary message to be about drink-driving.

“... very well planned and put together. Perhaps be more clear about the message – not so strong on the drink-driving – needed to be more clear and succinct about the message. Wouldn’t deal with The Warehouse again – 25 percent of stock had to be returned for repair – poor customer service.”

“Unfortunately the drink-drive message came out very strongly.”

“Strong drink-drive message due to strong Road Safety involvement – they would certainly be happy with the outcome – however the primary message was not clear.”

Finally, the sustainability of this type of programme was raised by one stakeholder:

“ACC funding was denied due in part to sustainability issues. There has been a real issue with premises changing hands and in past campaigns also. The attrition rate means that these types of campaign are very difficult to demonstrate sustained action and impact.”

2.2.3 Other external stakeholders

External stakeholders included those people engaged in the campaign but not central to the planning and implementation of the campaign. They included:

- Greenstone Pictures
- Actor and parent
- National industry chain manager.

The relationships built with external stakeholders appeared to have been very positive, although more could have been done to further engage with industry partners.

“Not much to do with them other than the actual filming work – no liaison. Great feedback from them on my work. Really awesome atmosphere – actors, adults and everyone pro what was happening.”

“Tremendous support – it was a very positive experience and the people involved had a good complement of skills between them. They were full of compliments for our work and all had a ‘can do’ attitude and very proactive. Sometimes a client can be difficult on location but they were fantastic – offering safety, assistance, management of bystanders etc. We used the Police canteen as a base – they all made sure everyone was looked after – genuinely marvellous.”

“They were good – in the last scene [filming] they were really helpful.”

“Purely at the launch and at the shoot. Fantastic to deal with.”

“Fine – I would say that had we had more involvement the campaign could have been more successful. We felt quite peripheral to the action and weren’t kept in the loop with updates.”

External stakeholders took a range of key messages from the campaign that were somewhat congruent with the original intent. These included:

“Don’t give kids alcohol if they are underage.”

“Youth responsibility. You hear a lot of crap on TV but these guys were realistic about what could be achieved – young people are not going to stop drinking so it’s about reducing some of the harms. Great approach.”

“Drinking irresponsibly can lead to death.”

“Parents giving kids alcohol – how widespread this is. Lack of proper supervision.”

The majority of external stakeholders had not thought too much about the consequences of parental supply prior to their involvement with the campaign.

“Probably never thought too much about it. Brought my kids up with supervised drinking at home – they are responsible kids.”

“As a mum, I wasn’t aware how prevalent it was. In particular – the scene with the Howick Mum – how common it was that middle-class parents were implicated in supplying to their children.”

“Never really gave it a thought.”

“Definitely shouldn’t be able to buy for under 20s. If my daughter drinks it must be with responsible adults.”

With the exception of those in the liquor industry who experienced no change, most external stakeholders spoke of increased awareness of the issues surrounding youth drinking.

“No change – I believe there should be severe penalties for supplying to minors. Should do more of this stuff.”

“Given it a lot of thought – I don’t know if I did it right or wrong (I was hit by a drink-driver and have sustained injuries). It is irresponsible to supply. It didn’t have a direct impact as I no longer supply to my children who are older now. If it had been available in my day possibly I would not have even supplied to my kids.”

“More aware of prevalence of supply to young people – personally more aware of the discussions I will have to have with my daughter in the future.”

“I guess it is all right if they are drinking supervised, but it’s not all right to be drunk and doing stupid stuff.”

Feedback on the promotion was on the whole very positive, with good reports on in-store promotions and the effect on the actors at the launch.

“Not really a drinker, good that someone had taken this on board to promote to other families. I have been in store when the DVD was playing. Some comments were passed – people were blown away that it was playing. Witnessed it being played in three or four settings. Blown away that people were doing something about it and that stores showed it and the message. A retailer actually started talking to me, explaining what it was about and taking the time to explain. It was right by the counter.”

“The impact on actors at the launch and when they were making the DVD was amazing. They had the experience of having really been involved in these scenarios.”

“Great. Particularly liked the use of real kids alongside the actors. The most powerful scene was the fight scene. These were real kids from James Cook High School – they really got into the groove – they lived the life and it really worked. The local papers picked up on this – it was all they talked of – it was a great promotion to have real people involved.”

A number of stakeholders questioned the reach of the campaign as a one-off promotion in liquor stores, suggesting the impact could have been greater if tied to other initiatives or promoted beyond the bottle store environment.

“It was all right. On its own I don’t know if it has much impact – there could be more success if it were tied in to other things.”

“Definitely a good start – there again, it needs to go further – maybe into cinemas.”

“I think it was good – but I don’t really think many people saw it. It is like real-life parties – I’ve seen people go off with random people and stuff.”

“Saw it in liquor stores with the volume down. In one store, the TV was obscured by the retailer behind the counter. The message on the beer mat was more visible than the TV.”

“I want more parents to be aware of this DVD/message. I’m sure it could go wider – I would be prepared to sign off a release with no financial gain, in order for it to go national.”

When asked what impact they thought the campaign had had on target audiences, external stakeholders thought that others had probably found the DVD to be thought-provoking and quite shocking.

“As a crew we discussed it quite a lot; as parents we were shocked at the prevalence of the issue and shared horror stories. The parents of the kids involved were very supportive and quite surprisingly happy to have them involved in less than flattering circumstances.”

“Others who were involved in making the DVD didn’t say much about the DVD itself; just that they had fun doing it. Others had pretty much the same ideas as me. It wasn’t until it was edited and shown at the launch – it was like WOW! It hit me not to be stupid and act like this. There are risks involved.”

“I imagine it impacted greatly on students – although it is just part of their lives. I guess for those involved in making the DVD, they had time to reflect on what they were doing.”

Chain operators were generally seen to be positive about the campaign, but a national industry stakeholder questioned the profile of the campaign in amongst other alcohol advertising messages.

“People who I spoke with (franchise operators) were positive. I got the impression there was a general lack of follow through and the campaign just disappears in amongst all the other stuff.”

External stakeholders were full of praise for the campaign, reiterating previous calls for a more sustainable and wider-reaching campaign. These stakeholders were unaware of any negative feedback towards the campaign.

“That it was really brilliant and well received. Brilliant idea.”

“Using real-life kids – particularly good for publicity and keeping it local. Enjoyed being involved – the Police were just so good. Enjoyed the kids. Most people working on it did enjoy the experience. Extensive resource was contributed by Greenstone with time and human resource allocated from other projects gratis.”

“Keen to help in future. The campaign needs to be part of something bigger. There also needs to be more communication backwards and forwards.”

“They should put it on TV. I don’t think much [sic] people saw it. Hard to see it in bottle stores.”

“Put it out into a wider realm. Don’t think enough people are seeing it in bottle stores.”

2.3 REVIEW OF PROCESS INFORMATION

The aim of this section is to establish how the campaign was implemented and whether any factors involved in the planning and implementation had an impact on what the programme achieved.

2.3.1 Project planning and design

A significant amount of road safety funding (NZ Transport Agency [NZTA]) was then secured for the campaign and at this stage the project took a strong road safety direction.

Unfortunately there is little documentation supporting this plan change.

The project proposal provides an overview of the programme and provides two project aims to:

- influence those persons purchasing or supplying alcohol to young people, to consider the potential for alcohol related harms to those persons when making the purchase or considering the supply
- reduce the number of failed Controlled Purchase Operations by Off-Licences in Counties Manukau.

The proposal does not clearly state any programme objectives. These are necessary in that they state what the programme hopes to achieve and provide clear, measurable, attainable outcomes against which the project can measure its success.

This study draws on the above project proposal in combination with the *Road Safety Project Report 2009-2010*. The two documents share a goal and, in the absence of any stated objectives within the Police project proposal, the road safety objectives form the basis of this

evaluation. The second goal of the Police proposal has been repositioned as a fifth objective, as it is specific and able to be measured.

Programme objectives	Status
<p>Objective 1</p> <p>To raise awareness of the risk of drinking and driving within the Manukau community.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3,400 individuals (79% of campaign respondents) identified drink-driving as a key issue within the campaign.
<p>Objective 2</p> <p>To influence those persons purchasing alcohol for, or supplying alcohol to, young people, to consider the potential for alcohol-related harms to those persons when making the purchase or considering the supply.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4,324 individuals viewed the campaign DVD and completed a short questionnaire. 3,660 individuals (85% of campaign respondents) responded they would THINK about reducing supply to young people. The overall CPO failure rate from July 2009 to April 2010 dropped as low as 7.8% from a previous range of 10-25%.
<p>Objective 3</p> <p>To raise peer and parental awareness of the consequences of combining alcohol, young people and vehicles.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3,400 individuals (79% of campaign respondents) identified drink-driving as a key issue within the campaign.
<p>Objective 4</p> <p>To reduce the number of alcohol-related crashes involving young persons aged 14-24 years in Counties Manukau.</p>	<p>Yet to be ascertained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The data is not yet available to measure the success of this objective.⁷
<p>Objective 5</p> <p>To reduce the number of failed CPOs by off-licences in Counties Manukau.</p>	<p>Achieved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall CPO failure rate from July 2009 to April 2010 dropped as low as 7.8% from a previous range of 10-25%.

The overarching goal of a community programme such as this one is to focus the project and provide a vision to which the project will contribute but will not necessarily achieve on its own.⁸ In this instance the project might have benefited from a more ambitious goal than simply influencing target audiences and used this as an objective within the campaign. The objectives are somewhat repetitious and do not directly relate to the project aim. Objective 2 paraphrases the project aim.

⁷ As stated in *Road Safety Report 2009-2010*. Received 20/7/2010.

⁸ Waa, A., Holibar, F., & Spinola, C. (1998). *Programme evaluation: an introductory guide for health promotion*. Auckland, N.Z.: Alcohol & Public Health Research Unit, University of Auckland.

While much has been achieved by a small dedicated working group, the identified gap of a communications strategy has resulted in lost opportunities to maximise engagement with retailers and other stakeholders.

2.3.2 Unexpected impacts

The campaign had a range of unexpected positive and negative impacts on stakeholder audiences and on licensed environments:

Unexpected positive impacts from the campaign included:

- overwhelming support from and improved relationships between law enforcement agencies and licensees/retailers
- improved compliance by retailers with SoLA as indicated in the CPO failure rate
- the amount of interest shown by communities around the country and the ensuing demand for information/resources
- positive written feedback to the Mayor of Manukau City
- stronger-than-expected outcomes for road safety
- Mayor Len Brown's awareness and promotion of the message
- ongoing exposure of the message via tote bags circulating in the community post campaign
- Greenstone Pictures committed significant resources gratis to the DVD production, enabling a better outcome for the DVD development
- continuation of the message within new settings post campaign both within Counties Manukau and around New Zealand
- DVD transformed to cinema format and played in Palmerston North cinemas.

Unexpected negative impacts from the campaign included:

- Lack of clarity in key messages, resulting in the poor uptake of the primary message
- The hugely resource-intensive nature of the campaign, which placed strain on existing workloads.

2.3.3 Financial accountability

Manukau City Council managed the NZTA funding along with the Papakura and Franklin District Councils' funding allocated to the THINK DRINK project. This amounted to \$102,000.00. Additional funds of \$15,000.00 from ACC and ALAC were allocated to assets and logistics, and were managed by Police. In total, the campaign cost \$117,000.00.

Funding organisation	Amount funded
<i>Manukau Road Safety</i>	<i>95,000.00</i>
<i>Papakura Road Safety</i>	<i>5,000.00</i>
<i>Franklin Road Safety</i>	<i>2,000.00</i>
<i>New Zealand Police (ACC funding)</i>	<i>10,000.00</i>
<i>ALAC</i>	<i>5,000.00</i>
Total income	117,000.00

2.3.4 Key messages

This campaign was the third iteration of the THINK campaign in Counties Manukau. The two key messages promoted across this particular campaign included:

- 'buying alcohol for young people doesn't buy them a good time'
- 'recruiting now. Drink. Drive. Disfigure. Death. Think'.

While the project aim was to reduce the supply of alcohol to young people by influencing the target groups to consider that supply, the interpretation of this message within the DVD weighted the messages strongly towards not drink-driving. This was reinforced by the prominent placement of the grim reaper logo and strapline across merchandise and at regular intervals on the DVD. As funding for this campaign came predominantly from the road safety sector, this will not be seen as a negative outcome for that sector.

2.3.5 Sustainability

The sustainability of programmes that seek to raise awareness and influence behaviour is limited in the delivery of a one-off campaign. Acknowledging this, the campaign organisers linked

the programme to other initiatives, which went some way towards ensuring the ongoing presence of a consistent key message. This was the first time that the message had been delivered through off-licences, so despite this being the third iteration of a local THINK campaign, participants within this study were unable to link this campaign to any other

initiative past or present, despite the common logos and slogans used across the three THINK campaigns implemented in the previous three years.

The continued employment of resources and assets post campaign offers a greater return on investment for the programme.

The unintended positive relationship-building with retailers does offer some sustainable impact, although the high level of turnover within the industry locally means that even these gains are limited. The goodwill and commitment to working together in future displayed by this group provide a launching platform for future initiatives.

The reduction in failed CPOs indicates that the programme may have had a positive impact on retail compliance with the SoLA in relation to sales to minors. With a high level of licence turnover in Counties Manukau, it will prove a challenge to maintain these outcomes.

2.3.6 Moving forward

New initiatives have already followed on from this campaign. These take a range of forms that include:

- a new Police alcohol infringement campaign addressing youth access with an enforcement focus
- the use of DVDs in secondary schools by SADD (Students Against Drink Driving) groups and Police education officers
- the after-ball campaign, which also uses off-licences as a vehicle for key messages
- the project's presentation at the ALAC conference 2009. About 600 DVDs were given away at the ALAC conference 2010
- the distribution of DVDs around a range of communities both within Counties Manukau and nationally.

3 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Ninety-six bottle stores within Counties Manukau were engaged in the THINK campaign between May 2009 and April 2010.

The campaign offered excellent results for road safety. A high takeout of the drink-driving message was evidenced in the bottle store customer questionnaire returns, in which 79 percent of respondents identified drink-driving as a key message.

3.1 IMPACTS ON TARGET AUDIENCES

It is very difficult to ascertain the impacts on the identified target audiences other than through anecdotal evidence. Feedback from retailers told us that responses to the DVD varied across audiences.

The programme was well pitched to capture the attention of the campaign's secondary audience: parents and associates. Feedback from retailers indicated that older customers were shocked by the consequences of supplying to young people as illustrated in the DVD. This was reiterated by a number of parents within the external stakeholder group, who expressed shock and an increased awareness of the consequences of supplying alcohol to their teenagers following exposure to the DVD. Some had previously not thought through the issue and others saw it as something they would need to discuss with their teenagers.

The programme's primary audience, 18- to 22-year-olds who often purchase for younger siblings and friends, displayed a less positive reaction to the messages within the DVD. There was a perception amongst some stakeholders that younger audiences were tending to find the content exciting and cool. This was reflected in feedback forms from licensed premises. According to retailers, this group tended to react to the DVD in a more light-hearted fashion, in some instances laughing at the scenarios depicted and generally making light of the message. Because of this, caution should be exercised in using and promoting this DVD amongst a younger audience.

3.2 IMPACTS ON UNINTENDED AUDIENCE

A non-stated secondary audience for this campaign was licensees and staff in retail outlets who were co-opted into the campaign as delivery agents and were exposed to the DVD arguably more than any other audience. Staff in bottle stores were drawn into discussions about the subject matter of the DVD and/or initiated discussions with their customers. As such, their awareness of the issue was raised significantly through repeated exposure to the issue. Unexpected impacts on retailers included:

- better relationships with enforcement agencies, based on working together rather than enforcement of the SoLA
- ongoing exposure to the message

- engagement with customers regarding the message – they became something of a delivery agent – needed more information/engagement from earlier in the campaign
- opening the door to future opportunities to work together.

Further to this, retailers' working relationships with regulatory agencies improved in many instances. Previously, these had been relationships of silence where any interaction tended to be enforcement focused and avoided where possible. The benefits of improved relationships between the two provide a very positive offshoot to the campaign. As subsequent campaigns roll out into these same stores (after-ball campaign – May 2010), licensees are receptive to working together once again with regulatory agencies. Retailers also made a strong call for ongoing campaigns to have a sustained effect on target audiences.

Retailers did not recall the campaign's key message or strapline. As the evaluation follow-up was in some cases many months after their involvement in the campaign, this was not unexpected. They were able to recall a range of related alcohol-harm-reduction themes. Retailers had significantly greater exposure to the campaign messages than any other group. As such, they were an unintended audience who in some instances claimed that they were now more aware of the consequences of on-supply to minors. With only one exception, all retailers interviewed saw the campaign in a very favourable light, suggesting that more of this type of education was required and that they were keen to be involved in future campaigns.

During the course of the campaign and immediately following, failure rates for CPOs took a considerable drop, on top of an already declining number of sales to minors. This might be attributed to an increased awareness of the issues surrounding youth access to alcohol, brought about by a range of recent activities including:

- The current 'Buying them alcohol doesn't buy them a good time' campaign
- Previous iterations of the THINK campaign within the Manukau district
- Increased awareness of regulatory agency activities
- Relationships built between regulatory agencies and licensees through recent campaigns.

3.3 RELATIONSHIP-BUILDING

The campaign was very successful in developing a rapport between enforcement agencies and off-licence retailers. Previously little focus had been placed on relationship-building with this audience in the Counties Manukau district, and dealings had remained minimal and enforcement focused. A number of retailers expressed a positive attitude towards working together with enforcement agencies in future. National chain operators also expressed goodwill towards the project both prior to and post the campaign. Those involved in the DVD filming process spoke very highly of their working relationships with the organising team of internal stakeholders.

3.4 PLANNING

Joint planning is a key component of good collaborative community action. Carried out in conjunction with key stakeholders, it provides a shared vision and a process to realise that vision. Joint planning across organisations is not without its challenges however, as this campaign demonstrated. The absence of programme objectives and strategies outlining clear roles and responsibilities led to missed opportunities and a lack of clarity regarding some aspects of the campaign, and also created difficulties in measuring the success of the programme.

The programme was significantly larger both financially and operationally than any previous programmes undertaken by the three agencies. It also demanded significantly greater human and time resources than initially anticipated. This placed a strain on Police in particular, who took primary responsibility for the operational aspect of managing and coordinating the promotional hardware. Significant achievements were made with limited resources.

3.5 COMMUNICATIONS

The absence of a communications strategy led to an ad hoc approach to internal and external communications. A communications strategy would have ensured that a more considered approach was taken to engaging with retailers and other external stakeholders. Significant benefits were demonstrated where this did happen with national chain operators, who were then able to influence their bottle stores through internal channels and consider their own responses/contributions to the campaign. These same stakeholders felt that they had not been kept abreast of developments throughout the course of the campaign and that opportunities had been lost as a result. Despite this, goodwill was established, providing opportunities for future partnerships.

Retailers on the whole were very positive about the campaign, however it was evident that one retailer in particular had not grasped the aim and intention of the programme although engaged sufficiently to attend the launch function. It is worth looking at this in more depth. It was evident from comments made by this retailer that he misunderstood the target audience for this campaign and felt somewhat victimised and targeted by the enforcement agencies. This might have been avoided had he received some form of communication ahead of the implementation phase of the campaign, giving prior warning and information as opposed to feeling the campaign was 'thrust' upon him. The evaluation process provided this retailer with an opportunity to vent some of his frustrations. He has since shown himself to be more receptive to a subsequent campaign, although still claiming it to be a waste of time. It should be acknowledged that the subsequent campaign was not so threatening and easier for him to engage in.

Feedback would suggest that chain operators tend to be more supportive than independents. This may be due in part to support garnered from franchise national offices in the early stages of the campaign and the directives then passed on to retailers.

3.6 CLARITY OF MESSAGE

The campaign achieved its aim of influencing people to consider the consequences of supplying to young people, as demonstrated by the 85 percent of customers who stated they would now think about reducing how much alcohol they bought for or gave to young people, following exposure to the campaign.

The prominence of the key message, 'Buying alcohol for young people doesn't buy them a good time', was superseded by the drink-drive message and visuals. This was evidenced in customer feedback within bottle stores, in which 79 percent took a 'drink-drive' message from the campaign, while 54 percent took a 'supply to young people' message.

Internal stakeholders considered brand awareness an important aspect of this current THINK campaign, with the expectation that audiences would link current and past campaigns through the grim reaper imagery and strapline. There is a plethora of alcohol industry advertising with which these moderation messages compete, and when combined with the short exposure of this campaign message within the marketplace (five to six weeks per bottle store) it is not surprising that no connection is made across campaigns from year to year.

Other factors, such as the sound reportedly being turned down on DVDs playing in stores, DVDs not playing, and the short timeframe spent by most customers in front of the DVD, all contributed to the degree of message uptake. These factors were, in the main part, out of the control of campaign organisers. It is possible that the layout of customer questionnaires in licensed premises had some small impact on the strong drink-drive message taken from the campaign.

Retailers also reported customers viewing the DVD without understanding what was going on, requiring follow-up/engagement from the retailers. This is positive in that it generated discussions around the issue and actively involved the retailers in the delivery of the message, however it could have been a demand on retailers. Again this requires that retailers be well briefed about the intent of the campaign.

3.7 PROFILE, REACH AND SUSTAINABILITY

Stakeholders were very supportive of the campaign, making a strong call for more of this type of promotion, and reiterating previous calls for a more sustainable and wider-reaching campaign. The commitment to community displayed by some licensees opens the door for further partnerships with these audiences.

Influencing systems and structures can offer more sustainable outcomes for a programme. Future programmes might seek to build on current gains made, including a raised profile, increased compliance and improved relationships with licensees, to look at more sustainable outcomes.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The THINK campaign 2009-2010 achieved significant impacts, both intended and unintended, including: a raised profile of the drink-drive messages in the community; increased compliance with the SoLA; and improved relationships with licensees. The high turnover of bottle stores annually suggests that these gains will be difficult to sustain and that project organisers should investigate more sustainable outcomes for future THINK campaigns.

The campaign achieved four out of five of its post-dated objectives.

The campaign demonstrated very favourable CPO returns, indicating an increased awareness of supply to minors as an issue by retailers.

Very favourable levels of uptake of the drink-drive message were taken from customer surveys in bottle stores, with 79 percent of respondents identifying this as a key message.

Very favourable levels of intent to think before supplying alcohol to minors were recorded, with 85 percent of customer respondents in bottle store surveys indicating they would think about reducing how much alcohol they bought for or gave to young people.

Feedback from external stakeholders indicated favourable impacts on the secondary audience (parents and other adults), who were often shocked by the consequences of supply to minors displayed in the DVD.

Feedback from external stakeholders, including retailers, indicated questionable impacts on the primary audience (18- to 22-year-olds). Interviewees perceived this age bracket to be somewhat light-hearted and jocular about the DVD and its messages.

The campaign was a positive relationship-building exercise, with the vast majority of external stakeholders indicating support for the initiative and an inclination to work together with enforcement agencies again. This particularly relates to the alcohol industry.

Room for improvement was identified within joint planning, communication and reporting processes. Shortfalls in each of these areas resulted in lost opportunities for increased positive outcomes for the campaign.

No impact on call numbers originating from this campaign was recorded by the Alcohol Drug Helpline.

4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Upon consideration of the above findings, the researcher recommends that future campaigns:

1. *employ a robust project planning process engaging all key stakeholders and clearly defining roles and responsibilities*
2. *clarify the key message and ensure this is focus-group tested for maximum impact*
3. *investigate how organisers might influence more sustainable systemic change*
4. *make more overt links between campaigns to provide a consistent message to the target audiences*
5. *investigate further opportunities to work in partnership with licensees, and in particular with national chain operators*
6. *develop a communications strategy prioritising increased and strategic communication with both internal and external stakeholders.*

Further to this, the researcher recommends that the campaign organisers immediately:

7. *focus-group test the DVD with younger audiences prior to further engagement with school-based programmes to ascertain the impact on young audiences*
8. *proceed with care in the delivery and management of programmes utilising the DVD in schools.*

5 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Internal stakeholder interview schedule

1. Has the campaign had any effect on your working relationship with licensed premises?
2. Have you received any direct feedback (either positive or negative) from licensees regarding this campaign? (Explain)
3. Have you seen any change in attitudes or behaviours of those bottle stores taking part in the campaign?
4. Do you think that the campaign adequately influenced those persons purchasing or supplying alcohol to young people? How do you know this?
5. Were there any unexpected positive impacts on the immediate or wider community/bottle-stores/relationships resulting from this campaign?
6. Were there any unexpected negative impacts resulting from this campaign?
7. Has the campaign had any impact on your relationship with internal stakeholders?
8. What would you do differently next time?
9. Did the campaign reduce the number of failed Controlled Purchase Operations by Off Licences in Counties Manukau?

APPENDIX 2

THINK DRINK external stakeholder interview schedule

1. Have you worked with DLA or Police prior to this promotion? (Give details)
2. Describe your dealings with enforcement agencies around this promotion
3. What was the key message you took from the campaign?
4. Describe your thoughts on supply to minors **prior** to your involvement with this promotion
5. Describe your thoughts on supply to minors **post** the promotion (Did the promotion make you think about the consequences of supplying alcohol to young people?)
6. Describe your thoughts on the promotion itself
7. How do you think this promotion impacted on others involved in making DVD?
8. Did you witness any negative reaction to the DVD?
9. Do you have any specific feedback you would like to pass on to the organizers for future campaigns?

APPENDIX 3

THINK DRINK retailer interview schedule

Retailer impact

1. Have you worked with DLA or Police prior to this promotion? (Give details)
2. Describe your dealings with enforcement agencies around this promotion
3. What was the key message you took from the campaign?
4. Describe your thoughts on supply to minors **prior** to your involvement with this promotion
5. Describe your thoughts on supply to minors **post** the promotion (Did the promotion make you think about the consequences of supplying alcohol to young people?)
6. Describe your thoughts on the promotion itself

Perceived customer impact

7. What reaction did you witness from customers upon viewing the DVD?
8. How do you think this promotion impacted on customers?
9. Did you witness any negative customer reaction to the DVD?

Finally,

10. Can you see any connection between this campaign and any other recent promotions in Counties Manukau?
11. Do you have any specific feedback you would like to pass on to the organizers for future campaigns?