

PWGSC Contract: OD160-195506/001/CY

POR Registration: 107-18

Contract Award Date: January 09, 2019

Delivery date: February 18, 2019

EKOS Research Associates Inc.

Concept Testing for Drug Impaired Driving Campaign

Focus Group Findings Report

Prepared for:

Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français

For more information on this report, please email:

ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca

EKOS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Contact: Susan Galley

Ottawa Office

359 Kent Street, Suite 300

Ottawa, Ontario

K2P 0R6

Tel: (613) 235 7215

Fax: (613) 235 8498

E-mail: pobox@ekos.com

www.ekos.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Methodology	2
2. Findings	3
2.1 Experiences of Participants	3
2.2 Feedback on Creative Concepts	4
2.3 Summary of Overall Results	10
2.4 Current Campaign Video	13

Appendix A – Recruitment script

Appendix B – Discussion Guide

Appendix C – Concept Rating Sheet

Appendix D – Creative Concepts

SUMMARY

Public Safety Canada is updating their ongoing national marketing and advertising campaign designed to increase public awareness of the dangers and risks associated with cannabis-impaired driving, even as its legal status changes. The purpose of the research is to test reactions to three creative concepts to support final decisions around the implementation of messages and creative for the advertising with youth who is the primary target audience for the campaign.

Ten focus groups were held across five locations. Groups were held in Moncton, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. Two sessions were held in each centre and were attended by six to ten participants in each group (77 participants in total). Participants ranged in age between 16 and 24, with a good mix of ages. Groups were held in English with the exception of Montreal.

Highlights

Participants described a range of intensity of cannabis use from daily use to infrequent use (e.g., monthly or less often), indicating that patterns of use have not changed significantly in the lead up to or since legalization in 2018. They also described a range of behaviour when it comes to driving high, from those who never do so, to those who do and are convinced that cannabis improves, or at least does not impair, their driving ability.

Some participants said that they had seen the first campaign ad; In An Instant, at some point in the last year or so, although more than half said that they did not recall seeing it. Many agreed that the ad would command attention and send a clear message, although some described it as somewhat unclear, particularly in terms of the connection with cannabis use. The use of social media in the video was most often described as relevant for the age group and an interesting or unique approach.

Participants were shown rough animatics of three proposed concepts for a new video to be introduced in 2019, in a second phase of the public education campaign aimed at 16 to 24 year old Canadians. Once shown the video concept several times they were asked to rate their impressions of it along a number of dimensions and then reactions were explored in more detail. Ratings reflected closely the reactions described in discussions, although the ratings also helped to distinguish the relative ranking among the two more popular concepts.

W to L –This concept depicting a party scene, featuring cannabis use, followed by a car scene and being pulled over by the police, was viewed as the least favourable overall. Although it was found to be relatable to some in terms of the party scene, it was also seen

as a poorer depiction of realistic cannabis use, with too much focus on the energetic party and not enough attention on the message of how cannabis can impair driving, or the specific consequences (a ticket, loss of license, or criminal record) of driving high. Some appreciated this concept as a more likely scenario of driving impaired, and that not all commercials should end with a tragic accident; however, acknowledged that it has less emotional impact. Ratings provided by participants confirmed this to be the weaker of the three concepts.

Shattered - This concept depicted a scene where someone who had driven high waited alone, with heavy guilt while hospital staff worked to save his girlfriend who was a passenger, told through flashbacks to earlier cannabis use and an accident. At the end of this video the police were seen approaching the driver in the background. This concept was described as a strong and clear depiction of the message about the consequences of driving high. Participants who preferred it liked the impact of guilt of harming another, combined with the legal consequences of the decision to drive high. Some, however, found it somewhat confusing and/or bland, and a few others suggested that the legal consequences need to be clearer. While many participants in the discussions said that they liked it and even preferred it because of the combination of consequences depicted, ratings placed this concept second among the three presented.

Eye Opener – This concept also depicted a hospital scene shown from the first-person perspective of the high driver who has been hurt, as has his girlfriend passenger. This concept relies on greater suspense, and brings in anxiety and concern from parents who are hovering over the hurt driver. This concept was preferred by many in the discussions, saying that the harm to the driver, the girlfriend and the anxiety caused to parents made the greatest emotional impact. Many also liked the style of the concept, told through blinking of the eyes and flashbacks, creating a suspenseful effect that may found captivating “like a movie”. A few suggested, however, that the use of flashbacks may be confusing to some, and need to be depicted more clearly. Ultimately, although seemingly almost tied with Shattered in reactions from participants during the discussions, ratings place this concept as the clear front-runner among the three presented. Many participants said that the approach and introduction of parents made it the most effective concept, although some also said that finding a way to introduce the legal consequences into this approach could increase its effectiveness even farther.

Reactions to all three concept suggested the need for a stronger and clearer connection of the driver’s use of cannabis to ensure that there is no mistaking what lead to the harm. Some also suggested that alcohol impaired driving is widely acknowledged as dangerous and not socially acceptable, although some do not necessarily make the same connection with cannabis use and

driving. Illustrating how cannabis impairs driving, and sending the message that “impaired is impaired” no matter the cause of the impairment could be effective, according to these participants.

Some participants saw how the creation of either Shattered or Eye Opener as a sequel to In An Instant could be helpful in commanding even greater attention. Many argued that if you had not seen In An Instant this would not be obvious, although no one felt that this would detract from the ad. Either of the two more popular concepts were seen to work as a natural extension. Either concept was also seen as likely to have greater impact than the first ad because of their focus on the aftermath of the crash and the consequences, making them harder hitting emotionally and more effective.

The contract value for the POR project is \$56,192.64 (including HST).

Supplier Name: EKOS Research Associates

PWGSC Contract: OD160-195506/001/CY

Contract Award Date: January 09, 2019

To obtain more information on this study, please e-mail

ps.communications-communications.sp@canada.ca

POLITICAL NEUTRALITY CERTIFICATION

This certification is to be submitted with the final report submitted to the Project Authority.

I hereby certify as Senior Officer of EKOS Research Associates Inc. that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research.

Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed by: Susan Galley (Vice President)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Public Safety Canada's mandate is to keep Canadians safe from a range of risks, including drug-impaired driving. Research has shown that many Canadians are concerned about drug-impaired drivers on public roads, and that many cannabis users – particularly younger users – are not aware it impairs driving, underestimating the risk. The Department therefore launched an ongoing national advertising campaign late in 2017 that is designed to increase awareness about the risks and penalties associated with drug-impaired driving (DID) that is primarily targeted to youth, between the ages of 16 and 24. Now in its second year, the campaign is updating the advertising materials with a new concept.

a) Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this research is to gather reactions to three proposed concepts for the video to be aired on speciality television channels, YouTube, electronic posters on-campus at post-secondary institutions and in pre-shows in cinemas. This information will support final decisions in the national campaign around the implementation of creative for the advertising targeting youth.

Participant feedback will help to determine if changes are required to communicate the most effective and appropriate message possible. Specific objectives include:

- To determine the concept variation that is most noticeable, appealing, and convincing to the target audience;
- To ensure the target audience can identify with the creative concept chosen, and that it is credible, and relevant, and perceived to be produced by a reliable information source;
- To ensure the materials are clearly understood in the manner intended for target audiences and that they are culturally and emotionally sensitive; and,
- To assess whether they are likely to have the intended impact in motivating behaviour change.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

In order to add further context and understanding to the survey results, ten focus groups were held in five Canadian cities (Montreal (2), Toronto (2), Winnipeg, (2), Vancouver (2) and Moncton (2). Participants were recruited using the EKOS Probit panel as well as ads placed on Kijiji in each of the five cities (recruitment screener can be found in Appendix A). Groups were stratified to ensure a balance of males and females, with a good mix of teens (16 to 19) and young adults (20 to 24). In total, 77 youth participated in the discussions, of the 107 recruited. A focus group guide (provided in Appendix B) was developed by EKOS in consultation with the client. Discussions centred on the provision of feedback on three creative concepts, as well as reactions to the video currently in use (In an Instant). Ratings sheets were used to capture views about the strength or weakness of the three concepts. Most discussions were held in English, with the exception of the two focus groups held in French in Montreal.

Each focus group was 90 minutes in duration. Groups were held in professional focus group facilities. Refreshments were provided and participants were provided \$110 for their attendance. Video or audio recordings, researchers' notes and observations from the focus groups formed the basis for analysis and reporting of results.

It should be kept in mind when reading this report that findings from the focus groups are qualitative in nature, designed to provide a richer context rather than to measure percentages of the target population. These results are not intended to be used to estimate the numeric proportion or number of individuals in the population who hold a particular opinion as they are not statistically projectable.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS

Focus group participants were first asked to describe whether they drive and how they typically get around. They were then asked about the frequency of cannabis use in their social circle. Most participants in the larger cities described public transit as their only or primary form of transportation. They also described either their own use of cannabis or said that many individuals in their social circle use cannabis. Some described cannabis use as frequent, with a few who personally are daily consumers, and some said that they and/or their friends regularly consume cannabis on the weekends. Others, however, described their personal or social circle cannabis use as more occasional (i.e., monthly or several times per year). A few said they have tried cannabis at some point, but do not intend to continue to use it. Only a few have never personally used nor have people within their social circle who consume cannabis. Participants described regular use of cannabis in many forms, including joints, bong, vaporizers, oils, and edibles.

- “Pretty much everybody I know.” (Toronto)
- “[Frequency] really varies. Usually when I’m with a group of friends we’ll use it, but not so much on my own, more socially. Not daily, just weekends, parties, things like that.” (Toronto)
- “I don’t do it, but a few of my friends do. It’s around.” (Moncton)
- “People use weed as an everyday thing whereas when you’re drinking it’s usually like a party thing.” (Vancouver)

Many participants said they know people who regularly drive after consuming cannabis. Some were adamant that they or their friends never drive high and always establish a designated driver or stay over at someone’s home. Many noted that they “grew up” with drunk driving ads and it is much less socially acceptable to drive drunk than drive high.

- “I think the stigma of driving high is definitely not like drunk driving.” (Toronto)
- “I feel like I have friends who think that its way safer to smoke and drive than it is drink and drive but like that’s not true at all, you’re totally impaired either way. But I do know that’s how some of my peers look at it.” (Vancouver)
- “In my group of friends, it’s rare that we’re, say, ten people smoking, so surely there’s someone who can drive.” (Montreal, translated)
- “Some of my friends smoke all the time and I am pretty sure they drive when they’re high.” (Montreal, translated)

- “I don’t like interacting with friends who are high. They think they are fine, but they are definitely different. Their decision making is impaired. The impeded ability to make decisions scares me.” (Moncton)

Most participants said that the cannabis use in their social circle has not changed much since legalization. A few said they know of individuals who tried cannabis because it was legal to do so. A few said that they use cannabis less frequently, with one offering the anecdote that having to go to a dispensary to buy it is a hassle compared to having someone deliver it to their home. Some said that marijuana use has become more “open” now, with less need to hide its use and more discussion about marijuana use, including with parents. A few noted that more information is now available about marijuana since legalization, including from the government.

- “[Since legalization, new users are] curious about it so they get drawn into it but it might not necessarily mean they’re going to be marijuana users.” (Toronto)
- “I have friends who got high with their parents at Christmas”. (Moncton)
- “[Change since legalization:] cops will now give you a ticket.” (Winnipeg)

2.2 FEEDBACK ON CREATIVE CONCEPTS

The key focus of the discussions centred around reactions to three creative concepts which were played as 30 second animatics¹. The story board for each of the three animatics can be found in Appendix D. In each session, the general layout of the concept was first described and then the 30 second video was played twice. Participants were then asked to provide ratings of the strength or weakness of the concept in terms of overall approach (including images and tone), as well as to rate the clarity of the message, degree to which the concept would command attention and how relatable it is, as well as providing an overall rating of the concept². These results are presented at the end of the discussion of the three concepts. Readers should note that the order of presenting the three concepts was rotated in order to ensure that there was no systematic bias for or against a particular concept based on presentation order.

¹ Animated are moving sketches/images with audio and some text-based captions describing the intended ad, with the tagline and URL at the end.

² The “relatable” and “overall” measures were not obtained in Moncton and Toronto as these were added following the first two days of the discussions.

Following is a high level summary of the positive and negative themes heard in association with each of the three concepts.

Concept	Positive Reactions	Negative Reactions
W to L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Seen as relatable by some (party). › Does not feel like it is denigrating use of cannabis › More upbeat. No “doom and gloom”. (No one is hurt) › Does not aim for “shock”, which is seen as more realistic for some. › Easier chronology to follow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Partying and use of cannabis not necessarily clear scenario for some (more obvious scenario for drinking). › Too much focus on party and not enough on impairment or (legal) consequence. (“Like a Super Bowl ad”) Connection not made until the end › Consequence not clear. (What happened?) › Too busy. Too much activity, making it hard to follow.
Shattered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Message is clear. More singular focus than W to L › Chronology is good. Tells a story. › High emotion (guilt, anxiety/concern) is helpful for grabbing attention and for conveying message. › It’s relatable (Feels real) › Harming others and guilt are strong consequences. (Wasn’t hurt, but responsible for hurting someone else has even greater impact.) › Combines harm and guilt with legal consequence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Some saw as confusing, but may be clearer once produced. Ensure hints and cues for clarity wherever possible (to driver using cannabis and impairment, to harming a loved one although not personally harmed) › Needs more emphasis on legal consequence (e.g., handcuffs, jail).
Eye Opener	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Clear message. Message conveyed throughout video, not just at the end › Strong emotion and suspense is attention grabbing and conveys message well. (Shock factor. Like a movie) › First person POV also plays into this. › Harming others and wider impact on those around you (girlfriend, parents) is powerful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Flashbacks can be confusing for some, particularly with many forward-backward transitions. Chronology difficult to follow for some › Doesn’t show legal consequences.

a) W to L

Many participants had moderately positive reactions to the W to L concept, particularly because of the group gathering and party element, followed by the consequence of being pulled over by the police when driving after the party. Many appreciated that the ad did not end with a tragic accident, something participants said they have been “desensitized” to because of exposure to MADD advertisements since a young age. Likewise, most participants said that being pulled over, or a legal consequence, is the much more likely scenario to driving high than a rare, but heart-breaking, accident. Some identified that they liked the tone of the concept in going from happy and good times, to an abrupt end.

- “I like when it shows the good times before the bad times.” (Toronto)
- “What I like about this ad is the tone with respect to weed is much more positive and its shows its being accepted and fine, its just a problem of getting in the car after doing it.” (Toronto)
- “It was nicer than the other two ads because no one died. And you don’t have to get into an accident to be in trouble. That’s more relatable because that’s most likely to happen.” (Winnipeg)

Most participants indicated that they can see themselves in the concept, in terms at being in a party with friends, and then potentially going to another place following the party. Even for those who do not watch much sports, the sports themed party was not a barrier to relatability. However, most participants pointed out that a sports viewing gathering, or other high energy party alluded to in the concept, is more likely to involve alcohol than marijuana. The usage of marijuana, according to these participants, is more commonly used to relax or a lower energy gathering.

- “Like that it shows the social aspect of it, it’s relatable because you are just having a good time and not really thinking about if you were high”. (Moncton)
- “I associate smoking marijuana with relaxing, and not high fiving. You don’t mellow out to watch the game, I associate that with alcohol”. (Winnipeg)
- “The beginning was quite relatable. Almost everyone has been in the situation where you watch a game eat a friends house and there's drinking and some guy's probably rolling a joint in a corner or something.” (Vancouver)
- “I can’t imagine a party without alcohol, just with cannabis.” (Montreal, translated)

Some participants felt that the consequence was not clear enough to be effective. When the group was shown pulled over by the police, and the individuals have unhappy faces, it implies that this is the end of their good time. However, it is not clear why they were pulled over or the consequence. A few participants said that the reason for being pulled over should be evident, such as going through a stop sign, driving too slow, or some result of impairment. As this is not portrayed, it could be that the car was pulled over for something like a broken tail light and the police may not notice the driver is impaired. Further, it is not clear that the driver consumed enough marijuana during the party to cause impairment. Finally, when the group was pulled over by the police, it is implied that there is some sort of legal consequence, although most participants do not know what this would be. Most thought the driver would get a ticket (of \$100-\$300, considered substantial for participants in this age group, but not a significant deterrent), while some believed the driver may lose his licence for a few days. According to these participants, stating the penalties would change the impact of this concept dramatically.

- “It didn’t really show what they did wrong like I get that there’s impairment, but I don’t see how that affected the fact that they got pulled over, like what happened on the road? Were they swerving? Or what?” (Toronto)
- “I have no idea what a fine is for driving high. If I saw it, it would probably scare me. I can’t even put gas in my car”. (Moncton)
- “Seems contradictory. ‘Your life can change in an instant’, but yet he just gets a ticket. My life would not be changed forever by just getting a ticket”. (Winnipeg)
- “It’s building to something and then when it finally builds to that thing it’s the pull over and the guys kind of bummed – there was so little time spent with any of the consequence.” (Vancouver)
- “I don’t know what the consequences are of getting caught high at the wheel; under the effects of cannabis, so I think this is important information missing from these ads.” (Montreal, translated)

b) Shattered

The intended message of the Shattered concept was clear, according to most participants, due to the chronology of events. Most stated they felt that the driver, alone in the hallway, would feel a strong sense of guilt and anxiety in hurting another person.

- “[the message is] It’s dangerous to drive high, you can get in an accident, and it’s illegal, because of the police at the end arresting the guy that wasn’t in critical condition.” (Winnipeg)
- “Your usage can have an impact on someone else’s life; it was a very strong message.” (Vancouver)

- “I like this one the most actually out of all of them. It was better because you can focus on the consequence of harming yourself and harming another person in the car i.e. the girlfriend.” (Toronto)
- “It’s even more powerful when it’s someone you care about.” (Montreal, translated)
- “The fact that the guy on the bench, the driver I guess, isn’t as badly hurt really plays to the guilt, feeling of responsibility and the emotional impact. It’s less of a feel bad for yourself but more of a ‘what have I done?’ reflecting thing.” (Vancouver)

Many also felt that Shattered was impactful because it combined consequences of hurting other people, along with the legal consequences of showing police officers approaching the driver.

- “I think there are two primary points; not only is it dangerous but there are legal consequences as demonstrated by the police officers. I really liked that part.” (Toronto)
- “You’ve got the hospital and the police; those are two places I don’t want to be.” (Vancouver)
- “I don’t think [young adults] would want to risk manslaughter and how people would treat them afterwards”. (Winnipeg)

Many participants stated that the concept felt relatable, notably with the individual flipping through social media and having a message from a friend. However, some felt that flipping through social media felt a little “banal” or that the message could be a bit clearer in terms of who it was from or have an alternate text.

- “What stuck with me was him scrolling through his phone at pictures. And the close up on his face with bruises and band aids. I got a sense that he was at a party beforehand.” (Winnipeg)
- “Seeing that ‘where are you’ was out of nowhere. No one is going to ask where did you go, they would say ‘dude, you were so stoned’ or ‘I can’t believe you drove’”. (Moncton)

Although the need to make the use of marijuana, and that specifically the driver used and was impaired, more prominent was noted by most participants for all three concepts, this was more notable in the Shattered concept. Shattered showed someone holding a lit joint in one frame, where as the other two concepts showed slightly more visual information such as a joint was being lit, or a puff a smoke.

- “There was just one picture of the joint, there wasn’t really much emphasis on the fact that he smoked.” (Toronto)
- “The first few [frames] were very quick. I don’t think I saw anyone using cannabis, it passed by too quick for me to really notice.” (Winnipeg)

- “It’s not clear if this is about awareness for driving high, or just about consuming cannabis in general.” (Montreal, translated)

Some participants felt that more emphasis or information on the legal consequences would make the concept more impactful, such as the police arresting the driver.

c) Eye Opener

Most participants felt that the Eye Opener concept was clear and attention getting. Most appreciate that the use of marijuana and a resulting crash was clear throughout the message, rather than waiting to the end. Many stated that the first person point of view evoked strong emotion where you can “put yourself in” the experience of the driver.

- “That one kind of gave me goosebumps just cause its like from the view of the person that was injured.” (Toronto)
- “Makes you tense up a little. Nothing has ever happened before, but one time it could.” (Moncton)
- “I liked the point of view, with the eyes opening and closing. Better than just watching a guy and his girlfriend.” (Winnipeg)
- “The message took up the entire video, not shoved in at the end.” (Vancouver)
- “That time around, the joint was more clear. You don’t just hand someone a smoke to light, usually it’s a joint because you have to light it in a certain way.” (Winnipeg)

Many participants felt that showing others who are affected by the crash to be effective in deterring someone from driving high. While hurting a girlfriend (or imagining their own significant other or friend) would be a dramatic consequence, many stated that the image of the parents enticed a strong emotional reaction because they would not want to let down their parents.

- “A lot of people don’t want to disappoint their parents.” (Toronto)
- “The parents (are) a nice touch. Most parents in that situation would be worried and not even mad at that point.” (Moncton)
- “We are worried about our parents more than anything else right? Like what will they think of us? Every child has the feeling of keeping a good impression on their parents. So I think including the parents is a very good idea.” (Vancouver)

Although most participants stated that the message of Eye Opener was clear, most also said that the quantity of scenes, and flashback style of the concept, was hard to follow at the

pace shown. These participants felt that it was difficult to understand the chronology of events, notably after viewing it for the first time.

- “You blink and you miss it, what it was trying to say”. (Toronto)
- “It took a while to see the flashbacks. The second time watching made it more clear.” (Winnipeg)
- “It’s more emotionally charged so its more impactful but its just very scatterbrained.” (Vancouver)
- “I find that reality-flashback [...] was just a bit confusing. [...] If you so much as blink the moment they show the image of a joint, you have no idea that we’re talking about consumption of cannabis” (Montreal, translated)

Some participants noted that this concept focused on the physical threat of driving high, but adding the legal consequences for the driver as well would leave a stronger impact. Some participants had differing views on whether it is more effective to have the driver hurt, or be unhurt and live with the guilt of hurting others.

- “Personally if I were to drive I would be more concerned about the possible damage to other people than to myself.” (Toronto)
- “Could even take it a step further, saying ‘one of your friends was killed and you are under investigation.’ (Moncton)
- “Definitely nailed who it affects, not just you but your parents.” (Moncton)

2.3 SUMMARY OF OVERALL RESULTS

Following the ratings and detailed discussion of each concept, groups were asked which they preferred. Often when participants are reviewing animatics there is some initial confusion about what they are seeing and how it translates to a fully produced ad. As a result, there can be some ordering effects in how favourably each concept is viewed depending on when in the discussion it is shown. As outlined earlier in the report, the order of presentation of the three concepts was changed from discussion to discussion. The following table suggests that the concept presented first is not typically the one seen positively for this reason. Nonetheless, it outlines, that overall, both Shattered and Eye Opener were seen as the preferred concept far more than W to L was. It also suggests that Eye Opener was seen favourably slightly more often.

Group	Presentation Order	Preferred
Moncton 1 (6)	W to L - Eye Opener - Shattered	Eye Opener (5), Shattered (1)
Moncton 2 (6)	Eye Opener – Shattered - W to L	Shattered (3), inconclusive
Toronto 1 (7)	Eye Opener - W to L - Shattered	Shattered (6), W to L (1)
Toronto 2 (10)	Shattered - W to L - Eye Opener	Eye Opener (8), W to L (2)
Winnipeg 1 (8)	Shattered - Eye Opener - W to L	Eye Opener (7)
Winnipeg 2 (7)	W to L - Eye Opener - Shattered	Shattered (4), W to L (2), Eye Opener (1)
Vancouver 1 (6)	W to L - Eye Opener - Shattered	Eye Opener (6)
Vancouver 2 (9)	W to L – Shattered - Eye Opener	Tied Shattered (4)/Eye Opener (4)
Montreal 1 (5)	Shattered - Eye Opener - W to L	W to L (4), Eye Opener (1)
Montreal 2 (8)	W to L - Eye Opener - Shattered	Tied Shattered (4)/Eye Opener (4)

Following are the results of the ratings for each of the three concepts based on the initial reactions participants had to each concept prior to discussion in the group. In each table below, results are collapsed according to ratings indicating the specific concept to be weak (rating it a 1 or a 2 out of 5), strong (rating it a 4 or a 5), or in between (3 out of 5). Readers should treat all of the numbers as directional, and interpret results with caution given that they are generated on the basis of 77 participants, with fewer (49) for reliability and overall.

The first rating captured overall appeal including approach and tone (see Appendix C for the ratings sheet). Results highlight the appeal of Eye Open with 71 per cent rating its appeal as strong. Shattered was rated as appealing among just over half (58 per cent). Almost as many rated W to L as weak (26 per cent) as rated it strongly in terms of appeal.

Table 2.1: Appeal (approach, tone)

Rating	W to L	Shattered	Eye Opener
Weak (1-2)	26%▲	16%	8%
Middle (3)	38%	29%	21%
Strong (4-5)	36%	56%	71%▲

In terms of clarity of the message, Eye Opener is rated somewhat more strongly than Shattered in terms of strength, rated as strong among 86 per cent compared with 78 per cent for Shattered. Six in ten rated W to L as strong in terms of clarity of message.

Table 2.2: Clarity of Message

Rating	W to L	Shattered	Eye Opener
Weak (1-2)	16%▲	6%	9%
Middle (3)	25%	16%	5%
Strong (4-5)	60%	78%▲	86%▲

Ratings for extent to which the concept grabs one's attention also place Eye Opener as the strongest proposal with 77 per cent rating it as strong. Again, Shattered is seen as moderately strong but less so than Eye Opener. W to L is rated as weaker in terms of grabbing attention with the same proportion giving it a low rating as those giving it a high rating.

Table 2.3: Focus / Draws Attention

Rating	W to L	Shattered	Eye Opener
Weak (1-2)	39%▲	22%	8%
Middle (3)	21%	26%	16%
Strong (4-5)	40%	51%	77%▲

Eye Opener is also seen as somewhat stronger than Shattered in terms of how relatable it is to this audience, although neither are rated strongly on this dimension. Just over four in ten (43 per cent) rated Shattered as strong in terms of relatability. Again, W to L is seen as the weaker of the three.

Table 2.4: Relatable

Rating	W to L	Shattered	Eye Opener
Weak (1-2)	33%▲	22%	18%
Middle (3)	30%	35%	33%
Strong (4-5)	37%	43%	49%▲

Overall, 69 per cent rated Eye Opener as a strong overall concept. Just over half gave the same rating to Shattered and only three in ten said that W to L is a strong overall concept, placing Eye Opener as the stronger concept overall, followed by Shattered and then W to L.

Table 2.5: Overall

Rating	W to L	Shattered	Eye Opener
Weak (1-2)	20%▲	16%	4%
Middle (3)	47%	29%	27%
Strong (4-5)	33%	55%	69%▲

2.4 CURRENT CAMPAIGN VIDEO

Focus group participants were provided with a description of the 2018 ad, In an Instant, where there is a group of friends partying and getting into a car, the girl is using Snap Chat when there is an accident and the glass is shattered. Following this description, a few participants in each discussion said they specifically remember seeing the ad, either at a school presentation, movie theatre, on TV, or YouTube. Some indicated that the concept seemed familiar but they were not sure if they had seen it. After showing the video to participants, some confirmed that they had previously seen the video.

- “I saw this ad during a driving lesson.” (Montreal, translated)
- “I remember it because of the snapchat component in a car.” (Montreal, translated)

When asked to consider the message, clarity and effectiveness of the ad, some felt that the ad was well produced (perhaps influenced by just having seen the sketch form of the new potential three concepts) and has dramatic impact that could stay with youth.

- “It’s quite relatable and I think its the younger generation that needs to be aware of situations like this – I’d say if its trying to speak to the younger generation this would make the cut because this would just connect with them immediately.” (Toronto)

Some did not like the use of Snap Chat, saying that it is for younger people or might look like it’s making fun of youth. Some said that they were focusing on the emojis and not what was happening to the people in the ad. Some participants said that the use of Snap Chat in the car, and the girl showing the phone to the driver, led to confusion that the ad was for distracted driving. Some felt that it was not clear that the driver was high, only noticing that he appeared to be tired.

- “In that scene maybe I would have had someone in the car smoking weed to make it more clear cause it still is a bit confusing.” (Toronto)

- “You see the little clouds and tree emoji, but I didn’t really piece it together”. (Moncton)
- “I was only thinking that he was tired because he smoked because of the context of the [focus groups].” (Winnipeg)
- It seemed like don't Snapchat and drive.” (Vancouver)

One participant, unprompted, noticed that two of the new concepts could be a continuation of the In an Instant ad, particularly if the same actors are used. Once prompted, some participants said that they could infer the connection or continuation of the two concepts with In an Instant. A few, and more in the Toronto sessions, felt that a two part ad had the potential to generate attention and motivation to share or talk about the ad with others. However, many said that if the new concepts were intended to be a sequel, it would have to be done in a very obvious way (such as the same actors and starting where the crash left off) to be noticeable. Regardless, most participants said that In an Instant and the potential new concept could stand on their own and there is a benefit to having multiple ads to be interesting and reach a greater audience.

- “They [Shattered & Eye Opener] could almost be a continuum of this commercial.” (Vancouver)
- “If I saw these two [new] ads, I wouldn’t connect that it’s a sequel.” (Winnipeg)

Most participants felt that the new concepts would have more impact on viewers because of the stronger emotional play of Shattered and Eye Opener. Some participants pointed out that these two concepts show the aftermath of the accident, and more specifically illustrate the consequences of driving high.

- “I think ‘In an Instant’ was significantly weaker than these three. I think it didn’t really carry the point across at all. Both Shattered and Eye opener were emotionally stronger.” (Toronto)
- “It could make it more personal to see the aftermath.” (Winnipeg)

APPENDIX A
RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

APPENDIX A: Recruitment Script

INTRO

Hello, my name is _____ from EKOS Research. We are conducting a series of focus group discussions with Canadians who are 16 to 24 years of age or older on behalf of the Government of Canada. As a member of our research panel, we'd like to know whether you know anyone between the ages of 16-24 who you believe might be interested. Is there anyone aged 16-24 in your household who would be interested in this study?

IF YES: May I speak with this person?

IF NO: Do you know anyone aged 18-24 who might be interested in this study?

INTERVIEWER, WHEN SPEAKING TO 16-24 YEAR OLD :

We are conducting a series of focus group discussions with Canadians who are 16 to 24 years of age on behalf of the Government of Canada. The research is related to safety issues of concern to all Canadians and we think that you'll find the topic interesting.

Your participation in the research is completely voluntary and your decision to participate or not will not affect any dealings that you may have with EKOS Research or the Government of Canada. The purpose of the research is to understand the opinions and experiences of Canadians not to sell any service or product.

The sessions will be video recorded for research purposes. Representatives of the Government of Canada will also be observing the discussions. The information is being collected under the authority of the Privacy Act and other applicable privacy laws. The full names of participants will not be provided to the government or any other third party. Also, the results from the discussions will be grouped together in a report, which will contain non-identifying information. May I continue?

INTERVIEWER: If 16-24 year olds and interested, select "YES".

If 16-24 year old in household, arrange callback.

If no 16-24 year old in household, but know interested 16-24 year old, select "NO - 16-24 year old referral".

If neither, select "NO - Thank & Terminate".

Yes - Continue	1
No – 16-24 year old referral	1
No – Thank & Terminate	2

QMAIL

Phone

Please provide us with your email address.

Email:	77
Refuse	99

REGISTRY_EMAIL

EKOS Discussion Group: Safety Related Focus Groups

Dear sir/madam,

EKOS Research Associates has been commissioned by the Government of Canada to conduct a series of discussion groups with young adults on safety related issues. You were referred to us by a member of our research panel as someone under 25 years of age who might be interested in participating.

The discussion group will last 2 hours, on <date>. Participants will receive \$110 as a “thank you for giving us your time and careful consideration.

If interested, please click the button below to visit our online registry.

<VISIT THE REGISTRY>

If you have any issue with the link above, please copy the following link into your browser:

<link>

It is important to note that all of your responses will remain strictly confidential. Your personal information will not in any way be associated with any of the answers that you provide in the data that we report back to the Government of Canada. Your answers will be combined along with those of thousands of other Canadians. No personally identifying information associated with the survey responses will be shared or stored in any fashion.

Thank you in advance for your participation in the study.

EKOS Research Associates, Inc.

Q1

The session will last an hour and a half and an incentive is offered for participation. May we have your permission to ask you some further questions to see if you fit in our study?

Yes	1
No	2

QGENDR

<ISEX: [{ \$contexte{ip} =~ /192.168.0.?!/ }]Record gender of respondent (DO NOT ASK)[ELSE]Are you...>

Male	1
Female	2

QAGEX

May I have your year of birth, please?

RECORD YEAR :	77
REFUSED	99

QEDUC

What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed to date?

Grade 8 or less	1
Some high school	2
High school diploma or equivalent	3
Registered Apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma	4
College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma	5
University certificate or diploma below bachelors level	6
Bachelor's degree	7
Post graduate degree above bachelor's level	8
Don't know / No answer	9

QINCOME – ASK ONLY OF 19+

Which of the following categories best describes your total household income? That is, the total income of all persons in your household, before taxes?

Under \$20,000	1
\$20,000 to just under \$40,000	2
\$40,000 to just under \$60,000	3
\$60,000 to just under \$80,000	4
\$80,000 to just under \$100,000	5
\$100,000 to just under \$120,000	6
\$120,000 to just under \$150,000	7
\$150,000 and above	8
Don't know / No answer	9

Q2

Are you or is any member of your household or immediate family employed in:

Q2A

Government of Canada

Yes	1
No	2

Q2B

An advertising agency

Yes	1
No	2

Q2C

A market research company

Yes	1
-----	---

No 2

Q2D

The media (Print, Radio, TV, Internet)

Yes 1
No 2

NOTE: If a response of “YES” to any of the above (Q2a-Q2D) Thank and Terminate →THNK2

Q3

Participants in group discussions are asked to voice their opinions and thoughts. How comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others, in English? Are you...

Very Comfortable 1
Comfortable 2
Fairly Comfortable 3
Not Very Comfortable 4
Very Uncomfortable 5

Q4

Have you ever attended a focus group or one to one discussion for which you have received a sum of money?

Yes 1
No 2

Q5

When did you last attend one of these discussions that was sponsored by the Government of Canada?

Please specify : 77
Months 1
Years 2
Never 999

Calculate:

Within last 6 months, thank and terminate 1
Continue 99

Q5B

Have you attended more than 6 of these discussions that were sponsored by the Government of Canada?

Yes 1
No 2

QFOCUS

The focus group is about between an hour and 30 minutes and 2 hours in length, but we are asking that all participants arrive 10 minutes prior to the start time of the session. Are you able to be at the facility 10 minutes prior to the session time?

Yes
No

1
2

QTELE

We are providing each participant with a \$110 cash incentive for their participation, although late arrival (i.e., more than a few minutes) may result in not being able to participate or receive the incentive. Replacements are not permitted and you will need to bring ID, which you may be asked to present on arrival for the discussion. If you usually use reading glasses you should bring those along as well because there may be a few short phrases to read throughout the discussion.

The group will be taking place :

City	FG Date	Facility	Facility contact	Telephone
Moncton	Monday February 04, 2019	Corporate Research Assoc., 68 Highfield Street, Suite 101, Moncton, NB E1C 5N3	Jonathan King - Facility Manager	506.870.4277
Toronto	Tuesday February 05, 2019	Consumer Vision, 2 Bloor Street West, 3rd Floor, Toronto, ON M4W 3E2	Jess Commins - Facility Manager	416.964.4105
Montreal	Wednesday February 06, 2019	SOM Montreal, 1180 rue Drummond, Suite 620, Montreal, QC H3G 2S1	Stéphanie Gagnon - Facility Manager	418-687-8025 ext 255
Winnipeg	Wednesday February 06, 2019	NRG Research Group, 213 Notre Dame Avenue, Suite 804, Winnipeg, MB	Sarah Lazzari - Facility Manager	1-800-301-7655 ext 2
Vancouver	Thursday February 07, 2019	NRG Research Group, 1100 Melville Street, Suite 1380, Vancouver, BC	Sarah Lazzari - Facility Manager	604-676-5651

We will be giving you a reminder telephone call and sent an email or if you prefer, a text, a day or two prior to your group discussion. What is your preferred method of receiving a reminder?

Email

Text

Phone call

If phone/text:

Is this the best number at which to reach you?

If email, please provide your email address

FNAME

Please provide your first and last names.

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Confirm proper spelling. Ensure proper capitalization (IE: not all upper or lowercase).

Name :

1

THNK

<[REFERRAL] In the next few minutes you will receive a registry invitation by e-mail. Please forward the invitation at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your cooperation and time.>

<[RECRUITED]If you have any questions or something comes up and you can no longer participate in the discussions, please let us know by calling us toll-free at 1-800-388-2873 or by sending an e-mail to rzito@ekos.com. Thank you for your cooperation and time.>

End of Interview

Completion

1

THNK2

I am very sorry, but due to the parameters of the study we will not be able to include you in the focus groups.

QFIL2

Thank you for your cooperation! <QFIL2: [QFIL = 1 and QEND is empty]We will contact you should space become available in the group.[ELSE]>

APPENDIX B
DISCUSSION GUIDE

APPENDIX B: Discussion Guide

FOCUS GROUP MODERATORS GUIDE

Introduction (5 minutes)

- I represent EKOS Research and these groups are being conducted for Public Safety Canada to explore perceptions regarding cannabis use and driving under the influence of drugs.
- This research will help the Government of Canada plan communications activities designed to make Canadians aware of various risk factors related to driving after using drugs.
- This group is part of a series of focus groups taking place across Canada. This session will last about an hour and a half and we can start by going over the format and “ground rules”:
 - ◇ Discussion is being audio taped and video recorded so that I can listen closely to what you are saying and not be distracted by having to write things down.
 - ◇ There are observers from the Government of Canada.
 - ◇ All comments are confidential.
 - ◇ Please try to speak one at a time and be respectful of one another’s opinions.
 - ◇ There are no right or wrong answers to the things we’ll be talking about.
 - ◇ It’s okay to disagree. Please speak up even if you think you’re the only one who feels a certain way about an issue. Everyone may have different experiences and different points of view. And we want to hear everyone’s opinions.
- Moderator’s role: raise issues for discussion, watch for time and make sure everyone has a chance to participate. We do not work for the Government of Canada.
- Please make sure that your cell phones, notifications on smart watches, etc. are turned off. We ask for your full attention for this time, without distractions.

Warm-up: Awareness (10 minutes)

1. Let's start by going around the table. Tell me your first name, your age and if you have your drivers' license? Do you generally get around by car? Ride share? By bus, walking? Are you usually a passenger?
2. Do you find that cannabis is used within your social circle? Is it frequent, or occasional use? In what form? Do you find that it is more frequent or about the same as it was before cannabis was legalized last October?
3. Do you or people you know drive high? What do people you know think about driving after consuming?

Creative/Communications Testing (45 minutes)

So, the main focus of what we are going to do today is to look at 3 different ideas for a possible video ad from the Government of Canada and get everyone's reaction to them. Your feedback is important and will feed into developing some new communication material to help inform people your age about the effects of driving under the influence of cannabis.

4. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers here. Everybody has an equally valid opinion.

Show and go through each of the 3 concepts individually. Rotate order each time

Before we start our discussion, take a minute to write down a few words on your initial reaction on the comments line and fill in the ratings.

- a. What is the message the ad is trying to express? Is it clear?
- b. What do you think of it? What is your first impression? What stands out most?
How does it make you feel?
- c. What do you like/not like about it?
- d. How about the tone of the material? Likes/dislikes and why?
- e. What do you think of the images used? Do they tell the right story?
- f. Can you relate to the characters in the ad?
- g. Does this encourage you to think carefully about driving after consuming cannabis (either for yourself or for friends and family)?
- h. Would it change your mind if you were thinking about driving after consuming cannabis?
- i. What about the ad changed your mind?
- j. What would be the top reasons for driving impaired/not impaired?

- k. Other than the consequences outlined in the ad, are there other consequences that would deter you from driving impaired?
5. Which does the best job of getting your attention? Which tells the most compelling story?
6. How likely would you be to share or talk about any of the concepts with your friends?
7. What kind of impact do you think that these ads are likely to have on people under 25?

Awareness and Views About 2018 Ad (20 minutes)

The original ad will be mentioned followed by a show of hands as to who's seen it. The moderator will then play the ad and go into the following topics to provide more detail.

8. Have you seen the ad where there is a group of friends having fun in a car where the girl is posting on social media and doing face filters when there is an accident and glass is shattered?

(discuss and then **show video**)

9. What was the overall message or take away from that ad?
10. What do you think of that ad? Was it clear? Effective?
11. What kind of impact did this ad have on you/your friends?
12. Do you think that the 3 possible ads we just reviewed would have a different impact? How and why?
13. What are your thoughts that the new ad could be a sequel to the first, using many of same actors?

Wrap up (2 minutes)

14. Is there anything that we haven't talked about or that you would like to add before we go?

THANK YOU

APPENDIX C
RATINGS SHEET

APPENDIX C: Ratings Sheet

W to L:

	WEAK	NEITHER WEAK NOR STRONG		STRONG	
	-	-	-	-	
a) Appeal (approach, caption, tone).....	1	2	3	4	5
b) Clarity of the message (what it's trying to tell you).....	1	2	3	4	5
c) Grabs your attention	1	2	3	4	5
d) Relatable	1	2	3	4	5
e) Overall	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Shattered:

	WEAK	NEITHER WEAK NOR STRONG		STRONG	
	-	-	-	-	
a) Appeal (approach, caption, tone).....	1	2	3	4	5
b) Clarity of the message (what it's trying to tell you).....	1	2	3	4	5
c) Grabs your attention	1	2	3	4	5
d) Relatable	1	2	3	4	5
e) Overall	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Eye Opener:

	WEAK	NEITHER WEAK NOR STRONG		STRONG	
	-	-	-	-	
a) Appeal (approach, caption, tone).....	1	2	3	4	5
b) Clarity of the message (what it's trying to tell you).....	1	2	3	4	5
c) Grabs your attention	1	2	3	4	5
d) Relatable	1	2	3	4	5
e) Overall	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

APPENDIX D
CREATIVE CONCEPTS

APPENDIX D: Creative Concepts

Eye opener

- Spot is shot through the POV of the driver of the car.
- Spot opens on the aftermath of a crash inside the vehicle.
- Driver turns to passenger seat and sees his unconscious girlfriend.
- Next, he sees the police and paramedics as someone pulls him out of the car.
- He closes his eyes to escape reality, but is only confronted by scenes leading up to the crash. The images are blurred and sound is muffled. He is unable to avoid what happened.
- He sees his girlfriend taking selfies of them in the car just moments ago.
- His eyes open back to reality. He is inside an ambulance and sees a paramedic putting an oxygen mask on him.
- He falls out of consciousness and is brought back to the scene of him and his friends lighting up a joint.
- When he opens his eyes again, he is being wheeled into the hospital and down the hallway.
- He closes his eyes and sees himself putting the keys into the ignition.
- He opens his eyes. His parents are looking over him with worry-stricken faces.
- He closes his eyes again and he brought back to the impact of the crash.
- He opens his eyes and hears medical alarms going off. When he turns his head, he sees his girlfriend in bad shape on the bed next to him, flatlining.

Shattered

- Spot opens on a darkened hospital hallway at night.
- A young man is sitting alone on a chair with the glow of his cellphone lighting his face.
- The camera pans in towards him and we see that he is injured, bandaged and in a state of despair.
- The camera cuts to the young man's shattered cell phone and we see he is scrolling through social media looking at posts from earlier in the night.
- A text message appears on his screen asking where he and his friends are.
- The young man sees a selfie taken inside the car, which sets off a series of quick flashbacks that reconstruct the events leading up to him being in the hospital.
- We see a joint being lit, a key being put into a car ignition and then the impact of a crash.
- We are brought back to reality by the sound of a gurney being wheeled and we see the man's girlfriend injured and lying on a hospital bed.
- As the bed rolls down the hallway, we see the distraught boyfriend watching it go by.
- The camera moves back to the empty hallway with the boyfriend sitting in the chair. A police officer is walking towards him.

W to L

- Spot opens on a group of young people setting up to watch the big game. The footage feels like it is being shot by someone on their phone, with elements of a social media interface on the screen.
- We see a spread of food being laid out in front of a TV as everyone gathers in the living room.
- We see people eating, cheering and capturing the evening on social media.
- We see someone pass their phone around to show others what they've posted on social media.
- We see someone roll a joint and others partaking as the joint is passed around.
- The energy and frenzy of the party escalates as the night goes on.
- There are team jerseys, painted faces and lots of laughter around the room.
- The room becomes hazy from the smoke.
- The energy mounts, there is a big miss and the crowd groans in disappointment.
- The group goes crazy when their team scores to win the game.
- Someone grabs the car keys and the group heads out to the car to go to their next stop.
- The energy is at its peak in the car. Everyone is excited and cheering, and the car horn is being blown in the celebration.
- Everything comes to an abrupt end as the sirens and lights of a police car go off behind them.
- The group of friends is caught off guard and brought back to reality with the realization that they have all taken it too far.