

FINAL
REPORT

**Focus Testing of Foreign Anti-Drug
Television Advertisements with
Canadian Youth**

HC-POR-08-04

Contract number: H1011-070019/001/CY

Task Authorization Number: HC-TA-008

Task Authorization Date: July 3, 2008

Prepared for:

Health Canada

por-rop@hc-sc.gc.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français sur
demande.

November 2008

pn 6348

Prepared by:



33 Bloor St East
Suite 1020
Toronto, ON M4W 3H1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Résumé	8
Introduction.....	17
Detailed Findings	22
Aggregate responses to closed-end questions	22
Ad # 1: Girl.....	24
Ad # 2: Speed.....	25
Ad # 3: Ecstasy.....	27
Ad # 4: Rage	29
Ad # 5: Tic Tic.....	31
Ad # 6: Lost Dreams	32
Ad # 7: For Sale.....	34
Ad # 8: Sent	36
Ad # 9: Joint.....	37
Ad # 10: Kitchen.....	39
Overall Impact	41
Conclusions.....	43

Appendices

Discussion Agenda

Recruitment Screener

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Health Canada is leading a national youth drug prevention social marketing strategy to help decrease the prevalence of illicit drug use among youth through prevention. This social marketing strategy will be implemented over multiple years and will comprise a campaign with two target audiences: youth ages 13-15 and their parents. The first component of the strategy focused on the parents of youth ages 13 to 15. The second component of the strategy will focus on youth ages 13 to 15 and will include a mass media campaign.

In order to gain a better understanding of Canadian youth and their reaction to anti-drug messages, Health Canada contracted Environics Research Group to conduct focus testing of drug prevention television ads from non-Canadian jurisdictions. Results gathered through focus testing would then be used to create a final television ad aimed at youth ages 13 to 15.

The objectives of this research were to:

- Determine what elements or features of these ads from other jurisdictions would resonate with Canadian youth;
- Determine the perceptions of the language used in the anti-drug advertisements, specifically whether it is appropriate and believable;
- Evaluate components of the advertisements for appeal, clarity, credibility, tone and level, understanding and usefulness/relevance; and,
- Provide guidance for the creation of a Canadian television ad aimed at youth that would be attention grabbing and help to discourage drug use.

METHODOLOGY

Twelve (12) focus group sessions were conducted between July 9 and July 29, 2008, with youth aged 13 to 15 years. The groups were segmented by language (English and French) and gender (boys and girls) and consisted of twelve (12) focus groups in three cities: Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. Four sessions were held in each location: two with girls and two with boys.

The research involved testing 10 ads (each ad was between 30 seconds to 1 minute long) using Perception Analyzer (PA) technology. The PA technology included a key pad system whereby participants rated elements of an ad on a continuous scale (one to five). A moment-to-moment analysis, indicated by a line graph, was generated for every ad in each session. The PA was also used to record answers to seven discrete-choice (closed-ended) statements. The PA results were then used as a starting point for discussion among participating youth. In each session, participants were

shown one set of five ads out of the 10 ads being tested, such that each set was seen by one group of boys and one group of girls in each city.

The ads were divided into the following two sets:

Ad Set A	Ad Set B
Ad 1 - Girl	Ad 6 – Lost Dreams
Ad 2 - Speed	Ad 7 – For Sale
Ad 3 - Ecstasy	Ad 8 - Sent
Ad 4 - Rage	Ad 9 - Joint
Ad 5 – Tic Tic	Ad 10 - Kitchen

Dr. Donna Dasko, Senior Vice President, Environics, acted as project director; all sessions in both French and English were moderated by Derek Leebosh, Senior Associate, Environics. Tim Mclinden of Standpoint Research conducted the Perception Analyzer section of the research. All qualitative research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA).

KEY FINDINGS

Overall response: Two ads received strong ratings on most of the closed-ended statements tested – For Sale and Joint. The ads, Speed and Kitchen, also received strong ratings on more than half of the statements. Three ads received low ratings on many of the statements – Ecstasy, Tic Tic and Sent. Boys gave high ratings on more than half of the statements to the ads Speed and Joint, while girls gave multiple high ratings to the ads For Sale and Kitchen. In Toronto the ads that received high scores on more than half of the statements were Speed, For Sale and Joint; ads that received low scores on more than half of the statements were Tic Tic and Sent. In Vancouver, the high scoring ads were For Sale, Joint and Kitchen, and the low-scoring ads were Ecstasy and Tic Tic. High-scoring ads in Montreal were Speed and Joint; low-scoring ads were Tic Tic and Sent.

In the discussions that followed, Girl and Rage were most frequently mentioned as the ads from Set A that were the most effective at showing the dangers of drug use in addition to having a strong impact on the groups. In the groups that saw Set B, the ads most frequently mentioned were For Sale, Joint and Lost Dreams; in addition to having a strong impact, all three ads were seen as showing a range of negative consequences in a convincing manner and being informative. The idea of an ad that tells a story emerged as being important as well. The kinds of elements that appeared to

have a strong impact were generally those that showed some aggression, were shocking, or had a powerful emotional component, including loss or a disruption of social networks.

There was a high level of agreement among all groups that the Government of Canada should sponsor ads like these with a drug avoidance message; the general response was that if such ads were able to inform and dissuade even a few people who might be considering taking drugs, then the ads would be of benefit: “it can help, even if it doesn’t stop everyone.”

Ad # 1: Girl. Girl was rated in the midrange on most of the statements tested, but scored poorly on believability. The response line trended down during the opening scene, and then rose as the girl was taken out of the car and “dumped” on the curb and continued until the end of the ad.

In discussion, the ad received a mixed response, with girls and Montreal youth reporting the strongest impact due to a storyline featuring a failure of social networks. Boys in Toronto and Vancouver tended to identify more with the girl’s friends than with the girl. Some saw the message as precautionary – choosing one’s friends wisely or only doing drugs with people who can be trusted – while others saw a message about avoiding substance abuse in general, including alcohol. There was no explicit link to drug avoidance in the ad, which led to confusion among group participants about what was wrong with the girl and why her friends “dumped” her. The ad would benefit from an explanatory tag making the drug connection clear.

Ad # 2: Speed. This ad scored highly in terms of making viewers aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs and making them want to avoid drugs; however, it received one of the lowest scores in terms of ability to relate to the main actor. The response line trended down slightly during the opening scene in the mall, then began to rise during the scene with the girls in the bathroom, and continued rising throughout the scene with the angry boy and his girlfriend. It declined during the scene in the kitchen, then levelled off during the final hospital scene, ending at about the same level as the beginning of the ad.

This ad had strong individual elements, but youth felt that there were too many disconnected vignettes and no “story” involving one main character. Some found the ad difficult to follow because the quick cuts and the subtitles were distracting. The scenes in the bathroom and with the angry boy had strong impact, but the kitchen scene was seen as confusing for many and the opening scene in the mall did not capture attention. The ad presented a variety of drug avoidance messages, as well as information about a variety of negative consequences and potential side effects of drug use; this was well received and understood by most participants.

Ad # 3: Ecstasy. This ad ranked poorly on grabbing attention, believability, realistic relationships, and making viewers aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs; relatively few participants thought this ad should be on TV. The response line trended down during the introductory scene, and continued to decline during the first part of the party scene. It began to rise as the music established a strong beat and the girl began to show signs of distress, and trended up slightly during the final scene, ending at a point slightly higher than the beginning level.

Many youth in this age group were familiar enough with ecstasy to question the realism of this ad. Because some participants did know people who used ecstasy and did have “fun,” the message “my friends said E would be fun; they lied” was problematic. The ad was seen to be about one person having a bad reaction, not about lying. It was not seen as attention-grabbing and did not have any significant impact; it is unlikely that this ad would dissuade youth from experimenting with the drug.

Ad # 4: Rage. Rage received mid-range scores on most statements, and scored poorly on portraying realistic relationships and ability to relate to the main actor, but it received one of the highest scores for being attention-grabbing. The response line dipped slightly at the beginning but began to rise when the boy entered the scene and attacked the older man, and continued to rise throughout the remainder of the ad, with the line levelling off as the boy confronts his other self, and ending at a higher point than the beginning.

This ad resonated strongly in all the English-speaking youth, who found it arresting, even shocking, and responded to the violence and the “surprise” ending. But it did not have much impact on Montreal participants, possibly as a result of translation issues. The ad sent a strong message about the consequences of making the wrong choices, the power of addiction and the lengths an addict will go to get drug money. The main weakness of the ad was the lack of an explicit link between the behaviour of the main character and drug use; the addition of a tag line or call-to-action would clarify the message.

Ad # 5: Tic Tic. This ad scored poorly on most statements, although it scored highly in terms of viewers being able to relate to the main actor. The response line dropped throughout the opening voiceover and close-up of the guard dog then began to climb when the dog started chasing the boy, and by the time the boy jumped the fence the line had returned to the starting level.

This ad was not well received in any of the groups. Most participants did not see any logical connection between smoking “weed” one day and trying to outrun a guard dog the next. The messages of the ad were seen as being about resisting peer pressure and making good choices, which

were not necessarily drug-related messages. Youth in this age group are familiar with marijuana and do not consider its use as serious in comparison with “harder” drugs; they did not find the ad believable nor did it have much of an impact. Some thought that a humorous ad trivialized the issue of drug use while others found the music juvenile and believed the target audience might be much younger children.

Ad # 6: Lost Dreams. This ad received mid-range ratings on most of the statements examined, but was assessed highly for its believability and its ability to make viewers avoid taking drugs. The response line remained fairly level during the first two scenes (girl in prostitution and boy stealing), then began to climb during a fight between parent and child. The line dropped slightly during the first seconds of the fourth scene (boy in body-bag), then climbed again, ending slightly higher than the starting point.

The overall theme – that young children have dreams that can be shattered by making wrong choices about drugs – resonated with many. Most thought the ad began slowly and with a scene that many boys, in particular, did not find interesting or related to drug use. The final image, of a dead boy in a body bag, did have a strong impact, but left some curious about how he died. Due to the lack of explicit references to drug use, some did not make the connections until the end; others were not able to identify a message. Some appreciated the escalation of consequences; others thought that death from drug use is rare and an extreme example of what can happen.

Ad # 7: For Sale. This ad scored highly on six out of the seven statements, but received a low rating in terms of ability to relate to the main actor. The response line for this ad showed a gradual but steady climb throughout the ad.

This ad resonated most strongly with girls in the English-language sessions. Its strength was that it showed the impact of drug use on those around the drug user – the idea expressed by many, that older siblings should be role models, made the impact more powerful, as did the participants’ perception of methamphetamine as a “hard,” more serious drug. The serious behaviours depicted, the progression to addiction, and the physical deterioration of the main character (of particular impact among English-speaking youth) was a strong underlying message. Some questioned the realism of the ad – they did not believe that a youth would ever let their younger sibling see them doing drugs, or that the younger sibling, after seeing the older sibling’s appearance and behaviour getting worse, would then try drugs.

Ad # 8: Sent. This ad received low scores on most of the statements, although it was rated in the mid-range on the realistic nature of the relationships portrayed, and highly in terms of whether viewers related to the main actor. The response line declined steadily throughout the first part of the ad until the point where the girl asked her friend to send her the picture. It then climbed while the people around her appeared to be looking at the photo their cellphones and ended just below the level at which it started.

This ad did not have much impact, particularly among boys who dismissed it as “girl talk.” Most thought it had little to do with drugs, and more to do with gossip and being careful about doing things that others might photograph and send around to others. There was no mention of health or behavioural impacts from drug use in the ad, or even what she was “high” on. The girl appeared happy and healthy, and any social consequences she faced could just as easily be the result of alcohol or just “goofing around” with friends – her drug use, if any, was not presented as being a serious matter. Participants saw nothing in this ad that would dissuade them from experimenting with drugs.

Ad # 9: Joint. This ad was rated highly on six out of the seven statements; however, it only received a mid-range score on its ability to grab attention. The response line remained more-or-less level during the opening scene, and then began to climb when the boy had a fight with his mother. It remained high, but levels during the scene where the boy interacts with his friends, and then climbed gradually until the final monologue where it then ended at a level higher than when it began.

This ad was well received, particularly by boys and all Montreal youth. It showed serious impacts of drug use, without going “over the top” in areas of great importance to teenagers – family, friends and school. The irony of doing drugs to be “cool” and ending up alone was appreciated. The ad was seen as being about drugs in general, not just marijuana. The fast-paced montage and the music attracted attention, especially among boys. Girls were more likely to find the quick cuts and scene jumps confusing and hard to follow. Having a call-to-action helped tie all the elements together. Boys found the main character easy to identify with and although some girls thought behaviours in the ad were more typical of boys, they felt the ad told a story that could apply to them as well.

Ad # 10: Kitchen. This ad was rated highly for portraying realistic relationships, being attention-grabbing, making them want to avoid drugs, and in terms of their ability to relate to the main actor; it received mid-range scores on the remaining statements. The response line dropped during the first part of the ad while the boy searched for money, but began to climb when the mother confronted him and rose sharply when he struck his mother. The line remained high until the end of the ad.

The images of a young man hitting his mother and his mother's desperate struggle to reach out to him had high impact, but there was no explicit connection to any drug avoidance message. While the violence was attention-grabbing, the abuse of a parent was seen as an extreme and uncommon consequence of drug use. The underlying messages – that drug use can hurt those around the user and that addiction can make people go to extreme lengths to get drug money – resonated, although some felt that the ad could be about theft, domestic violence or dysfunctional families just as easily. The presence of a tagline or call-to-action could have clarified this.

CONCLUSIONS

- Strike a balance between showing trivial consequences of drug use and consequences that are too extreme for contemplators to relate to.
- Show serious, but common and realistic consequences of drug use.
- Messages about the progression/escalation of drugs, addiction, a loss of social networks and/or a loss of control work well with youth.
- Francophones and girls react more strongly to messages about impact on social circles and how drug use affects others.
- Anglophones are more influenced by evidence of physical signs of drug use and addiction.
- Focus on one actor in a variety of situations and tell a coherent and consistent story.
- A fast-paced montage style and appropriate music help attract attention as long as they are not so pronounced as to be distracting.
- Mentions of a specific drug in an ad can be effective, but ads that are explicitly about one drug only are not.
- Ads require a clear explanation of how situations in an ad relate to drugs, either in the body of the ad or in a tagline or call-to-action.
- The use of violence can be attention-grabbing if used judiciously and realistically.
- If specific drugs are mentioned, use marijuana or ecstasy—drugs that 13 to 15 year olds are most likely to be exposed to.

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

Qualitative research provides insight into the range of opinions held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held, as would be measured in a quantitative study. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projective.

RÉSUMÉ

Santé Canada pilote une stratégie nationale de marketing social sur la prévention de la toxicomanie chez les jeunes qui vise à réduire la consommation de drogues chez les jeunes par le truchement de la prévention. Cette stratégie de marketing social sera mise en œuvre sur une période de plusieurs années et elle comprendra une campagne s'adressant à deux publics cibles : les jeunes âgés de 13-15 ans et leurs parents. La première composante de la stratégie est centrée sur les parents d'adolescents âgés de 13-15 ans. La deuxième composante de la stratégie sera centrée sur les jeunes âgés de 13-15 ans et comprendra une campagne médiatique.

Dans le but de mieux comprendre les jeunes Canadiens et leurs réactions aux messages antidrogues, Santé Canada a retenu les services d'Environics Research Group pour la réalisation de séances de groupe de discussion visant à évaluer des publicités télévisées non canadiennes sur le thème de la prévention de la consommation de drogues. Les résultats recueillis au cours des séances de groupe devraient servir à l'élaboration d'une publicité télévisée définitive s'adressant aux jeunes âgés de 13-15 ans.

Les objectifs de cette recherche consistaient à :

- Déterminer quels sont les éléments ou les caractéristiques de ces publicités provenant d'autres pays qui seraient porteurs chez les jeunes Canadiens;
- Déterminer quelles sont les perceptions relatives au langage utilisé dans les publicités antidrogues, en particulier s'il est approprié et crédible;
- Évaluer les composantes des publicités au chapitre de l'attrait, de la clarté, de la crédibilité, du ton et du niveau de langage, ainsi que de leur utilité et de leur pertinence; et,
- Guider la création d'une publicité télévisée canadienne s'adressant aux jeunes qui capterait l'attention et contribuerait à dissuader la consommation de drogues.

MÉTHODOLOGIE

Douze (12) séances de groupe de discussion ont été réalisées entre le 9 juillet et le 29 juillet 2008 avec des jeunes âgés de 13-15 ans. Les groupes ont été segmentés en fonction de la langue (anglais et français) et du sexe (garçons et filles); les 12 séances de groupe de discussion se sont déroulées dans trois villes : Toronto, Vancouver et Montréal. Quatre séances ont eu lieu à chaque endroit : deux avec des filles et deux avec des garçons.

La recherche comprenait une évaluation de dix publicités (chaque publicité était d'une durée variant de 30 secondes à une minute) à l'aide d'un Analyseur de perceptions (AP). La technologie de l'AP comprenait un clavier numérique à l'aide duquel les participants cotaient des aspects d'une publicité sur une échelle continue (d'un à cinq). Une analyse de chaque instant, indiquée par un graphique linéaire simple, a été produite pour chaque publicité présentée dans chaque séance. L'AP servit aussi à enregistrer les réponses à sept affirmations (fermées) à choix discret. Les résultats obtenus par l'AP servirent ensuite de point de départ à une discussion avec les jeunes participants. Dans chaque séance, une série de cinq publicités choisies parmi les dix publicités étudiées a été présentée aux participants, de telle sorte que chaque série de publicités soit vue par un groupe de garçons et un groupe de filles, dans chaque ville.

Les publicités ont été réparties dans les deux séries suivantes :

Série de publicités A	Série de publicités B
Publicité 1 – Fille	Publicité 6 – Rêves brisés
Publicité 2 – Speed	Publicité 7 – À vendre
Publicité 3 – Ecstasy	Publicité 8 – Envoyé
Publicité 4 – Rage	Publicité 9 – Joints
Publicité 5 – Tic Tic	Publicité 10 – Cuisine

Donna Dasko, vice-présidente directrice, Environics, a agi à titre de directrice de projet; toutes les séances, aussi bien celles en français qu'en anglais, ont été animées par Derek Leebosh, associé principal, Environics. Tim McInden, de la société Standpoint Research, a réalisé la partie de la recherche faisant appel à l'Analyseur de perceptions. Tous les travaux de recherche qualitative ont été réalisés conformément aux normes professionnelles établies par l'Association de la recherche et de l'intelligence marketing (ARIM).

PRINCIPAUX CONSTATS

Réaction générale : Les deux publicités qui ont recueilli les notes les plus élevées pour la plupart des affirmations fermées qui étaient étudiées – À vendre et Joints. Les publicités Speed et Cuisine ont recueilli elles aussi des cotes élevées pour plus de la moitié des affirmations. Trois publicités ont recueilli des notes faibles pour un grand nombre d'affirmations - Ecstasy, Tic Tic et Envoyé. Les garçons ont donné des notes élevées pour plus de la moitié des affirmations pour les publicités Speed et Joints, alors que les filles ont accordé plusieurs notes élevées pour les publicités À vendre et

Cuisine. À Toronto, les publicités qui ont recueilli les notes les plus élevées pour plus de la moitié des affirmations ont été Speed, À vendre et Joints; les publicités qui ont reçu des notes faibles pour plus de la moitié des affirmations ont été Tic Tic et Envoyé. À Vancouver les publicités ayant recueilli des notes élevées ont été À vendre, Joints et Cuisine, alors que les publicités ayant recueilli des notes faibles ont été Ecstasy et Tic Tic. Les publicités ayant recueilli des notes élevées à Montréal ont été Speed et Joints; les publicités ayant recueilli des notes faibles ont été Tic Tic et Envoyé.

Pendant les discussions qui ont suivi, Fille et Rage ont été les publicités de la Série A qui ont été mentionnées le plus souvent comme les plus efficaces pour illustrer les dangers liés aux drogues, en plus d'avoir un impact fort sur les groupes. Pour les groupes qui ont vu la Série B, les publicités mentionnées le plus souvent ont été À vendre, Joints et Rêves brisés; en plus d'avoir un impact fort, les trois publicités ont été perçues comme illustrant une foule de conséquences négatives de façon convaincante tout en apportant de l'information. L'idée de présenter une publicité qui raconte une histoire s'est aussi avérée être un facteur important. Les genres d'éléments qui ont semblé avoir un impact fort affichaient généralement une dimension d'agression, choquaient ou possédaient une forte composante affective, y compris la perte ou la perturbation des réseaux sociaux.

Au sein de tous les groupes, le niveau d'accord était élevé pour dire que le gouvernement du Canada devrait commanditer des publicités de même nature que celles présentant le message de se tenir loin des drogues; la réponse généralement observée a été que si ces publicités parvenaient à informer et à dissuader seulement quelques personnes envisageant de consommer des drogues, ces publicités seraient utiles : « cela peut aider, même si cela ne parvient pas à les dissuader tous. »

Publicité n° 1: Fille. La publicité Fille a recueilli des notes de milieu de gamme pour la plupart des affirmations étudiées, mais elle a recueilli des notes faibles au chapitre de la crédibilité. La courbe de réponse s'est dirigée vers les bas pendant la scène initiale pour ensuite s'élever pendant que la fille était sortie de l'automobile et « abandonnée » sur le bord du trottoir; cette tendance s'est maintenue jusqu'à la fin de la publicité.

Lors de la discussion, la publicité a suscité une réaction mitigée, les filles et les jeunes de Montréal rapportant l'impact le plus fort en raison du scénario illustrant l'échec des réseaux sociaux. Les garçons de Toronto et de Vancouver ont eu tendance à s'identifier davantage avec les amis de la jeune fille qu'à la jeune fille elle-même. Certains y ont vu un message préventif – choisir ses amis avec précautions ou ne consommer des drogues qu'avec des gens à qui on peut faire confiance – alors que d'autres y ont vu un message sur le fait d'éviter les abus de consommation en général, y

compris l'alcool. Cette publicité ne présente aucun message explicite sur le fait de se tenir loin des drogues, ce qui a suscité une certaine confusion chez les participants sur ce qui n'allait pas avec la jeune fille et sur la raison pour laquelle ses amis l'avaient « abandonnée. » La publicité gagnerait à l'ajout d'une citation établissant clairement le lien avec les drogues.

Publicité n° 2 : Speed. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes élevées pour ce qui est de sensibiliser les téléspectateurs aux dangers et aux conséquences de la consommation de drogues et de les inciter à se tenir loin des drogues; cependant, elle a reçu une des notes les plus faibles au chapitre de sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal. La courbe de réponse s'est dirigée légèrement vers les bas pendant la scène initiale tournée dans un centre commercial pour commencer à se relever pendant la scène où les filles sont dans la salle de bains, une tendance qui s'est poursuivie pendant la durée de la scène présentant un garçon fâché et sa petite amie. La courbe a baissé pendant la scène de la cuisine pour se stabiliser pendant la scène finale à l'hôpital, terminant à peu près au même niveau que ce qui avait été observé au début de la publicité.

Cette publicité comportait des éléments individuels forts, mais les jeunes ont été d'avis qu'elle comprenait trop de vignettes décousues et qu'elle ne racontait pas une « histoire » présentant un personnage central. Certains ont trouvé la publicité difficile à suivre en raison des coupures brusques et de la distraction engendrée par les sous-titres. Les scènes de la salle de bains et du garçon fâché ont eu un impact fort, mais la scène de la cuisine a prêté à confusion pour un grand nombre de participants et la scène initiale n'a pas capté leur attention. La publicité a présenté une diversité de messages sur le fait de se tenir loin des drogues, de même que des renseignements au sujet d'une diversité de conséquences négatives et d'effets secondaires possibles liés à la consommation de drogues; cela a été bien accueilli et compris par la plupart des participants.

Publicité n° 3 : Ecstasy. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes faibles au chapitre de capter l'attention, de la crédibilité, des relations réalistes entre les personnes et d'éveiller les téléspectateurs aux dangers et aux conséquences de la consommation de drogues; un nombre relativement faible de participants ont été d'avis que cette publicité devrait être télédiffusée. La courbe de réponse s'est dirigée vers le bas pendant la scène initiale et elle a poursuivi sa trajectoire descendante pendant la première partie de la scène de la fête. Elle a commencé à se relever quand la musique a établi un rythme fort et que la fille a commencé à afficher des signes de détresse, pour ensuite s'accroître légèrement pendant la dernière scène et terminer à un niveau légèrement plus élevé que son niveau initial.

Un grand nombre de jeunes de ce groupe d'âge connaissaient suffisamment bien l'ecstasy pour mettre en doute le réalisme de cette publicité. Parce que certains participants connaissaient des

personnes qui ont consommé de l'ecstasy et se sont « amusées, » le message affirmant que « mes amis ont dit que l'ecstasy serait amusante; ils mentaient » a fait problème. La publicité a été perçue comme relatant l'histoire d'un individu ayant eu une mauvaise réaction, non pas le fait d'avoir menti. Elle n'a pas été perçue comme réussissant à capter l'attention et n'a pas eu un impact suffisamment fort; il est improbable que cette publicité dissuade les jeunes de faire l'essai de cette drogue.

Publicité n° 4 : Rage. La publicité Rage a recueilli des notes de milieu de gamme pour la plupart des affirmations et des notes faibles pour ce qui est d'illustrer des relations réalistes entre les personnes et pour sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal, mais elle a reçu une des notes les plus élevées pour sa capacité à capter l'attention. La courbe de réponse a légèrement fléchi au début, mais elle a commencé à s'élever quand le garçon est entré en scène et a agressé l'homme âgé; elle a continué à s'élever pendant le reste de la publicité, pour plafonner lorsque le garçon est confronté à sa conscience et pour se terminer à un niveau plus élevé que celui du début.

Cette publicité a fortement interpellé les jeunes d'expression anglaise qui l'ont trouvée saisissante, voire choquante, et ils ont réagi à la violence et à « l'effet de surprise » de la fin. Elle n'a toutefois pas eu beaucoup d'impact chez les participants de Montréal, peut-être en raison de problèmes de traduction. La publicité a lancé un message fort sur les conséquences liées au fait de faire les mauvais choix, sur la force de la dépendance et jusqu'où un toxicomane ira pour avoir de l'argent pour acheter de la drogue. La grande faiblesse de la publicité a été l'absence d'un lien explicite entre le comportement du personnage principal et la consommation de drogues; l'ajout d'une réplique ou d'une incitation à agir préciserait le message.

Publicité n° 5 : Tic Tic. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes faibles pour la plupart des affirmations, même si elle a recueilli des notes élevées pour sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal. La courbe de réponse a baissé pendant toute la durée de la voix hors champ initiale et du gros plan sur le chien de garde, pour ensuite commencer à s'élever quand le chien s'est mis à poursuivre le garçon et, le temps que le garçon saute la clôture, elle est revenue à son niveau initial.

Cette publicité n'a pas été bien accueillie par aucun des groupes. La plupart des participants n'ont pu établir aucun lien de causalité entre le fait de fumer de « l'herbe » un jour et de s'efforcer à semer un chien de garde le lendemain. Les messages présentés dans la publicité ont été perçus comme étant de résister à l'influence des camarades et de faire les bons choix, deux messages qui ne sont pas nécessairement liés aux drogues. Les jeunes appartenant à ce groupe d'âge connaissent la marijuana et ils ne croient pas que sa consommation soit aussi grave que la consommation de drogues plus « dures; » ils n'ont pas été d'avis que la publicité était crédible ou qu'elle avait beaucoup d'impact.

Certains ont pensé qu'une publicité humoristique banalisait le problème de la consommation de drogues, alors que d'autres ont jugé que la musique était puérile et cru que le groupe cible pouvait représenter des enfants beaucoup plus jeunes.

Publicité n° 6 : Rêves brisés. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes de milieu de gamme pour la plupart des affirmations étudiées, mais des cotes élevées au chapitre de la crédibilité et de sa capacité à inciter les téléspectateurs à éviter la consommation de drogues. La courbe de réponse est demeurée passablement stable pendant les deux premières scènes (la jeune fille se prostituant et le garçon commettant un vol), pour ensuite s'élever pendant la dispute entre le parent et son enfant. La courbe a légèrement fléchi pendant les premières secondes de la quatrième scène (un garçon dans une housse de transport mortuaire), pour s'élever de nouveau et terminer à un niveau légèrement plus élevé qu'au début.

Le thème général – que les jeunes enfants ont des rêves qui peuvent être brisés s'ils font les mauvais choix relatifs aux drogues – a interpellé un grand nombre de participants. La plupart ont pensé que la publicité débutait tranquillement et qu'elle présentait une scène qu'un grand nombre de garçons, en particulier, ne trouvaient pas intéressante ou liée à la consommation de drogues. La dernière image, soit celle d'un garçon mort dans une housse de transport mortuaire, a eu un impact fort, mais elle en a laissé certains curieux de savoir de quelle façon il était mort. En raison de l'absence de références précises à la consommation de drogues, certains n'ont pas établi le lien avant la fin; d'autres ont été incapables de reconnaître un message. Certains ont bien compris la progression des conséquences; d'autres ont pensé que la mort causée par la consommation de drogues est un phénomène rare et un exemple extrême de ce qui peut arriver.

Publicité n° 7 : À vendre. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes élevées pour six des sept affirmations, mais elle a reçu une note faible pour sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal. La courbe de réponse à cette publicité a affiché une montée graduelle et soutenue pendant la durée de la publicité.

Cette publicité a suscité le plus de réactions chez les filles, lors des séances en anglais. Sa force a été qu'elle montrait l'impact de la consommation de drogues sur l'entourage du consommateur de drogues – l'idée exprimée par un grand nombre de participants, soit que les frères et sœurs plus âgés doivent être des modèles de rôle, a accru la puissance de l'impact, tout comme la perception selon laquelle la méthamphétamine est une drogue « dure » ayant des conséquences plus graves. Les comportements graves qui ont été dépeints, soit la progression vers la dépendance et la détérioration de l'apparence physique du personnage principal (ce qui a eu un grand impact tout particulièrement

chez les jeunes d'expression anglaise), ont apporté un important message sous-jacent. Certains ont remis en question le réalisme de la publicité – ils ne croyaient pas qu'un jeune laisse sa sœur ou son frère cadet le voir en train de consommer des drogues ou, encore, que le cadet fasse l'essai des drogues après avoir vu l'apparence et le comportement de son aîné se détériorer.

Publicité n° 8 : Envoyé. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes faibles pour la plupart des affirmations, même si elle a été cotée en milieu de gamme pour le réalisme des relations entre les personnes qui sont illustrées et qu'elle a reçu des notes élevées pour sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal. La courbe de réponse a fléchi sans interruption pendant la première partie de la publicité, soit jusqu'au moment où la jeune fille demande à son amie de lui envoyer la photo. Elle s'est ensuite relevée pendant que les personnes l'entourant ont semblé regarder la photo sur leurs téléphones cellulaires, pour terminer à un niveau très légèrement inférieur à son niveau de départ.

Cette publicité n'a pas eu beaucoup d'impact, en particulier chez les garçons qui l'ont assimilée à du verbiage entre filles. La plupart ont pensé qu'elle se rapportait peu au thème des drogues et davantage à celui des ragots et à l'importance de faire preuve de prudence avant de faire quelque chose que d'autres pourraient prendre en photo et envoyer à d'autres personnes. Il n'y a eu aucune mention des répercussions sur la santé ou le comportement causées par la consommation de drogues dans la publicité ni aucune mention de la drogue dont elle était sous l'effet. La fille semblait être heureuse et en bonne santé et les quelconques répercussions sociales auxquelles elle a du faire face pourraient tout aussi bien avoir été le résultat de la consommation d'alcool ou d'avoir « fait l'imbécile » avec des amies – sa consommation de drogues, s'il y a lieu, n'a pas été présentée comme étant quelque chose d'important. Les participants n'ont rien vu dans cette publicité qui serait de nature à les dissuader de faire l'essai des drogues.

Publicité n° 9 : Joints. Cette publicité a reçu des notes élevées pour six des sept affirmations; cependant, elle n'a recueilli qu'une note de milieu de gamme pour sa capacité à capter l'attention. La courbe de réponse est demeurée plus ou moins au même point pendant la scène initiale, pour ensuite s'élever quand le garçon s'est querellé avec sa mère. Elle est demeurée élevée, mais s'est stabilisée pendant la scène où le garçon dialogue avec ses amis; par la suite elle s'est graduellement élevée jusqu'au monologue de la fin pour terminer à un niveau plus élevé que son niveau de départ.

Cette publicité a été bien accueillie, en particulier par les garçons et par tous les jeunes de Montréal. Elle a illustré les répercussions graves de la consommation de drogues, sans exagérer dans des domaines qui sont d'une grande importance pour les jeunes – la famille, les amis et l'école. L'ironie de consommer des drogues pour être « cool » et d'aboutir seul a été bien comprise. La publicité a été

perçue comme se rapportant aux drogues en général, pas seulement à la marijuana. Le montage en accéléré et la musique ont attiré l'attention, en particulier chez les garçons. Les filles ont eu plus tendance à trouver que les coupures brusques et le fait de sauter d'une scène à l'autre prêtaient à confusion et la rendaient difficile à suivre. La présence d'une incitation à poser un geste a aidé à réunir tous les éléments. Les garçons ont trouvé facile de s'identifier au personnage principal et même si certaines filles ont jugé que les comportements dépeints dans la publicité étaient plus habituels chez les garçons, elles ont été d'avis que la publicité racontait une histoire qui pourrait tout aussi bien être la leur.

Publicité n° 10 : Cuisine. Cette publicité a recueilli des notes élevées pour ce qui est de présenter des relations réalistes entre les personnes, de capter l'attention, de les inciter à vouloir éviter les drogues et pour sa capacité à établir un rapport avec l'acteur principal; elle a reçu des notes de milieu de gamme pour les autres affirmations. La courbe de réponse a fléchi pendant la première partie de la publicité, alors que le garçon cherchait de l'argent, mais elle a commencé à s'élever quand sa mère l'a confronté, pour s'élever brusquement quand il a frappé sa mère. La courbe est demeurée élevée jusqu'à la fin de la publicité.

Les images d'un jeune homme frappant sa mère et les efforts désespérés de sa mère pour communiquer avec lui ont eu un impact fort, mais il n'y avait aucun lien explicite à un quelconque message incitant à se tenir loin des drogues. Si la violence a capté l'attention, la violence à l'égard d'un parent a été perçue comme une manifestation extrême et rare de la consommation de drogues. Les messages sous-jacents – soit que les drogues peuvent faire mal à ceux qui entourent ceux qui en consomment et que la dépendance peut pousser les gens à des extrêmes pour se procurer de l'argent – ont été saisis, même si certains ont été d'avis que le thème de la publicité aurait tout aussi bien pu être le vol, la violence familiale et les familles dysfonctionnelles. La présence d'un titre d'appel ou d'une incitation à poser un geste aurait pu préciser le thème.

CONCLUSIONS

- Établir un équilibre entre l'illustration de conséquences banales de la consommation de drogues et l'illustration de conséquences trop extrêmes pour que les téléspectateurs puissent s'y identifier.
- Montrer des conséquences graves, mais courantes et réalistes, de la consommation de drogues.
- Les messages se rapportant à la progression/l'escalade des drogues, la dépendance, la perte des réseaux sociaux et/ou la perte de contrôle fonctionnent bien auprès des jeunes.

- Les francophones et les filles réagissent plus fortement aux messages qui portent sur l'impact sur les réseaux sociaux et sur la façon dont la consommation de drogues a des conséquences sur les autres.
- Les anglophones sont plus influencés par la preuve évidente des conséquences des effets de la consommation de drogues et de la dépendance sur le corps et l'apparence physique.
- Centrer l'action sur un seul acteur dans une diversité de situations et raconter un récit cohérent.
- Un style de montage en accéléré et une musique appropriée aident à capter l'attention, tant et aussi longtemps qu'ils ne sont pas prononcés au point de devenir une distraction.
- La mention d'une drogue précise dans une publicité peut s'avérer efficace, mais les publicités qui se rapportent explicitement à une seule drogue ne le sont pas.
- Il est nécessaire que les publicités donnent une explication claire du rapport qui existe entre les situations présentées dans la publicité et les drogues, soit dans la construction de la publicité ou dans un titre d'appel ou une incitation à poser un geste.
- Faire appel à la violence peut réussir à capter l'attention si cela est utilisé judicieusement et de façon réaliste.
- Si des drogues précises sont mentionnées, utiliser la marijuana ou l'ecstasy – soit les drogues auxquelles les jeunes âgés de 13-15 ans ont le plus tendance à être exposés.

LIMITES

La recherche qualitative jette un regard sur la diversité des opinions présentes au sein d'une population, plutôt que sur la pondération de ces opinions, ce que mesurerait une étude quantitative. Les résultats d'une recherche de ce type doivent être considérés comme des indications, mais ils ne peuvent pas s'extrapoler à l'ensemble de la population cible.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Health Canada is leading a national youth drug prevention social marketing strategy to help decrease the prevalence of illicit drug use among youth through prevention. This social marketing strategy will be implemented over multiple years and will comprise a campaign with two target audiences: youth ages 13-15 and their parents. The first component of the strategy focused on the parents of youth ages 13 to 15. The second component of the strategy will focus on youth ages 13 to 15 and will include a mass media campaign.

In order to gain a better understanding of Canadian youth and their reaction to anti-drug messages, Health Canada contracted Environics Research Group to conduct focus testing of drug prevention television ads from non-Canadian jurisdictions. Results gathered through focus testing would then be used to create a final television ad aimed at youth ages 13 to 15.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

Environics Research Group was contracted by Health Canada to conduct qualitative research (focus group testing) to test 10 existing anti-drug television ads from other countries with Canadian youth, for clarity, credibility and impact.

The objectives of this research were to:

- Determine what elements or features of these ads from other jurisdictions would resonate with Canadian youth;
- Determine the perceptions of the language used in the anti-drug advertisements, specifically whether it is appropriate and believable;
- Evaluate components of the advertisements for appeal, clarity, credibility, tone and level, understanding and usefulness/relevance; and,
- Provide guidance for the creation of a Canadian television ad aimed at youth that would be attention grabbing and help to discourage drug use.

METHODOLOGY

Twelve (12) focus group sessions were conducted between July 9 and July 29, 2008, with youth aged 13 to 15 years. Four sessions were held in each of three locations: Toronto, Montreal and

Vancouver; the Montreal sessions were held in French; the others in English. Two sessions with boys and two sessions with girls were conducted in each location. In each session, five of the ten ads were tested: Ad Set A or Ad Set B. The ads, all produced in English, were prepared with French sub-titles for the French language sessions.

Ten participants for each group were recruited through a database which had been derived primarily through quantitative survey respondents who had agreed to be re-contacted. Recruitment from this list included calling the list on a random basis and screening for households who had eligible youth. (Screening documents outlining recruiting specifications are included in the Appendix.). According to MRIA standards, a parent of each participant was provided with sufficient information about the research subject matter in order to make an informed decision about their child’s participation, and asked for permission for their child to participate in qualitative research. Each group lasted approximately two hours. Participants were paid an incentive of \$50.00 following each session. The schedule and composition of the groups was as follows:

Date	Time	Location	Stimuli shown	Group composition
July 9 2008	5:30 pm	Toronto	Ad Set A	Boys
July 9 2008	8:00 pm	Toronto	Ad Set B	Boys
July 10 2008	5:30 pm	Toronto	Ad Set A	Girls
July 10 2008	8:00 pm	Toronto	Ad Set B	Girls
July 16 2008	5:30 pm	Vancouver	Ad Set A	Boys
July 16 2008	8:00 pm	Vancouver	Ad Set B	Boys
July 17 2008	5:30 pm	Vancouver	Ad Set A	Girls
July 17 2008	8:00 pm	Vancouver	Ad Set B	Girls
July 28 2008	5:30 pm	Montreal	Ad Set B	Boys
July 28 2008	8:00 pm	Montreal	Ad Set A	Boys
July 29 2008	5:30 pm	Montreal	Ad Set B	Girls
July 29 2008	8:00 pm	Montreal	Ad Set A	Girls

The research involved testing 10 ads (each ad between 30 seconds to 1 minute) using Perception Analyzer (PA) technology, followed by a discussion of the ads. In each session, participants were shown five out of the 10 ads being tested.

Ad Set A	Description	Ad Set B	Description
Ad 1 - Girl	Friends dump an unconscious youth from a car at a hospital and drive away.	Ad 6 – Lost Dreams	Would-be future “hopefuls” are shown in opposing, situations involving drug experimentation.
Ad 2 - Speed	A series of vignettes where various physical consequences of drugs are shown impacting teens.	Ad 7 – For Sale	An older youth is seen experimenting with drugs and enters a downward spiral while their young sibling observes.
Ad 3 - Ecstasy	A girl takes ecstasy at a rave and encounters various reactions.	Ad 8 - Sent	An embarrassing photo of a teen under the influence of drugs is passed around.
Ad 4 - Rage	An aggressive youth is shown robbing a public area—possibly for drug money.	Ad 9 - Joint	One youth experiences a series of negative consequences of doing drugs.
Ad 5 – Tic Tic	A boy tries to outrun a dog as a result of answering a dare from his friends.	Ad 10 - Kitchen	A youth steals from family—possibly for drug money.

Perception Analyzer (PA) technology was used as part of this research study. This technology included a key pad system where participants rated the elements of an ad on a continuous scale (one to five) as they were viewed. A moment-to-moment (line graph) analysis was generated for each ad in all sessions (with mean scores on display in real time for observers watching in the viewing room). The PA was also used to record answers to discrete-choice (closed-ended) statements.

The PA technology was used during the first part of each focus group session. The PA process began with participants viewing an unrelated test ad in order to familiarize themselves with the PA technology. They were then shown five ads (either Set A or Set B) and asked to record their “moment-to-moment” reactions—whether the scene they were watching had an impact on them, either positive or negative—on the PA keypad provided. The scale used was as follows:

5=Very strong impact

4=Strong impact

3=Moderate impact

2=Low impact

1=No impact

Following the viewing of all ads, a series of seven discrete-choice statements were read by the moderator and participants were asked to rate each statement using a scale of 1 to 5 as follows:

5=Strongly agree

4=Somewhat agree

3=Neither agree nor disagree

2=Somewhat disagree

1=Strongly disagree

The discrete-choice statements were:

1. This ad grabs your attention.
2. You believe this ad.
3. You relate to the main actor in this ad.
4. The relationships between people in this ad are realistic.
5. This ad makes you aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs.
6. This ad makes you want to avoid drugs.
7. This ad should be on TV.

During the second part of the focus testing sessions, participants were asked to discuss each of the five ads. The discussion sections included a replay of the “moment-to-moment” results of the five ads to the participants and acted as a launch pad for the discussion.

Dr. Donna Dasko, Senior Vice President, Environics, acted as project director; all sessions in both French and English were moderated by Derek Leebosh, Senior Associate, Environics. Tim Mclinden of Standpoint Research conducted the Perception Analyzer section of the research. All qualitative research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA).

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

Qualitative research provides insight into the range of opinions held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held, as would be measured in a quantitative study. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projective.

DETAILED FINDINGS

In the course of this research, each of the 10 ads tested was shown in two sessions in each city (Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal), one session comprised of boys aged 13 to 15 and one session composed of girls aged 13 to 15. During each session, participants used the Perception Analyzer (PA) technology to assess the ads, and this was followed by a discussion of each ad. This section presents the detailed findings of the research.

For the PA analysis, participants indicated their moment-to-moment responses during the showing of each ad and then answered a series of closed ended questions about each ad. All responses were recorded using touch-pad technology. The moment-to-moment responses to the ads were presented as a line graph viewed in real-time as the ad was played. This line represented the aggregate of all responses from all participants in all sessions, and was described briefly along with a summary of participants' comments on why they altered their response levels at specific points in each ad. All the line graphs began at an intermediate value of three on the one-to-five scale, which was interpreted as neutral (neither agree nor disagree); descriptions of the response lines for the ads were based on movement upward or downward from that initial value.

AGGREGATE RESPONSES TO CLOSED-END QUESTIONS

When the mean scores of the aggregates of all closed-end responses from the PA are compared for overall differences of response between ads, some interesting differences can be observed. In general, participants tended to rate the ads above the initial neutral value on all statements tested (i.e., the mean scores were above that value for all the ads), with the exception of the statement "You relate to the main actor in the ad," where the mean scores were consistently below the initial value.

Two ads received ratings for most of the statements tested that were among the highest across all the ads tested – For Sale and Joint. Speed and Kitchen also received strong ratings on more than half of the statements tested. Three ads received low ratings on many of the statements – Ecstasy, Tic Tic and Sent. For Sale received predominantly high ratings despite the fact that it was rated poorly on the statement of relating to the main actor, and both Tic Tic and Sent received predominantly low ratings despite being rated highly in terms of being able to relate to the main actor.

There were some variations in overall response by gender and location. Boys gave high ratings on more than half of the statement to the ads Speed and Joint, while girls gave high ratings on more than half of the statements to the ads For Sale and Kitchen. In Toronto, the ads that received high scores on more than half of the statements were Speed, For Sale and Joint; ads that received low scores on more than half of the statements were Tic Tic and Sent. In Vancouver, the high scoring ads were For Sale, Joint and Kitchen, and the low-scoring ads were Ecstasy and Tic Tic. High-scoring ads in Montreal were Speed and Joint; low-scoring ads were Tic Tic and Sent.

In response to the statement “The ad grabs your attention,” the ads most highly rated overall were Rage, For Sale and Kitchen. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Ecstasy and Sent.

In response to the statement “You believe the ad,” the ads most highly rated overall were Lost Dreams, For Sale and Joint. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Girl, Ecstasy and Sent.

In response to the statement “You related to the main actor in the ad,” the ads most highly rated were Tic Tic, Sent, Joint and Kitchen. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Speed, Rage and For Sale.

In response to the statement “The relationships between people in the ad are realistic,” the ads most highly rated were For Sale, Joint and Kitchen. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Ecstasy, Rage and Tic Tic.

In response to the statement “The ad makes you aware of dangers and consequences of drugs,” the ads most highly rated were Speed, For Sale and Joint, but Girl, Lost Dreams and Kitchen also received strong scores. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Ecstasy, Tic Tic, and Sent.

In response to the statement “The ad makes you want to avoid drugs,” a number of ads received ratings at the upper end of the scale – Speed, Lost Dreams, For Sale, Joint and Kitchen were the most highly rated. Two ads were given lower ratings than all the other ads – Tic Tic and Sent.

In response to the statement “The ad should be on TV,” the highest rated ads were For Sale and Joint, but Girl, Speed and Lost Dreams also received strong scores. The ads with the lowest overall ratings were Ecstasy, Tic Tic and Sent.

AD # 1: GIRL

Girl was rated in the midrange on most of the statements tested, but was scored poorly on believability.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line trended down during the opening scene in the car; participants indicated they were unclear about what was going on in this scene. The response line rose when the girl was taken out of the car and “dumped” on the curb; at this point, participants said they were worried about the girl, and struck by the contrast between what she is saying about her friends, and what they are doing. The line continued to rise on the voiceover and ended at a level higher than the initial value.

Variations in closed-end responses. More boys than girls found the relationships between people in this ad to be realistic, but they were less inclined than girls to relate to the main actor in the ad. More girls than boys agreed the ad made them want to avoid drugs. Toronto youth were the most inclined to agree the relationships portrayed in the ad were realistic, while Vancouver youth were the most inclined to think the ad grabbed their attention and was believable. Montreal youth felt very strongly that this ad made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, that it made them want to avoid drugs, and that the ad should be on TV, but they were much less inclined than youth in the other locations to agree that the ad was believable and that the relationships were realistic.

Discussion. Participants’ reactions to this ad were mixed. Some, particularly girls and Montreal youth, had a strong reaction to the ad; these participants tended to focus on the irresponsible behaviour of the main character’s friends and the contrast of the voiceover comments: “She trusted her friends and they just dump her and drive off – what kind of friends are those?” Others – particularly boys in Toronto and Vancouver – identified more with the other characters in the ad, and felt that their actions were appropriate in that they made sure she would receive medical care without running the risk of being caught themselves.

Some saw the message of the ad as a precautionary one, while for others the message was one of drug avoidance, that taking drugs or drinking is dangerous and could have serious consequences. A few felt the message had something to do with peer pressure. When asked to discuss the message of the ad, responses included:

- choose your friends wisely;
- be careful who you trust – people can be two-faced;

- if you are going to do drugs – do it with the right people; and
- stay in control when you take drugs so something like this doesn't happen to you.

For some participants, there was no clear message because the ad did not contain an explicit link to drug avoidance. Particularly at the beginning of the ad, participants were confused about what was happening to the main character; some thought she was drunk, some thought she was sick or had been in an accident, and some thought she had taken an overdose of drugs. By the end of the ad, most had concluded that she had been drinking or taking drugs, because otherwise there would be no need to take her to the hospital in such a stealthy manner. The presence of a tag addressing the drug avoidance message directly could have made the message clearer.

Participants were divided on the believability of the ad. Some felt that it was reasonable to believe that this scenario could happen to anyone taking drugs or drinking with a group of friends – in fact, a few said that they knew of such an occurrence. Others felt it could happen, but that it would be a rare event. Others thought that it was not believable for a variety of reasons – that teenagers don't usually have cars, that they would be more likely to panic rather than take someone who was unconscious to the hospital, or that if everyone was drinking or taking drugs together, there might not be anyone capable of taking the girl to the hospital.

While many participants felt that the ad did not initially capture their attention, some did find it to be of interest once the contrast between the voiceover and the action became clear to them, and they understood what was happening to the girl. However, not many felt a strong call-to-action. Some felt that they might talk to others about it, and a few felt that they might exercise more caution to ensure that they did not end up in a similar situation.

Most agreed that the ad was aimed at young teenagers their own age or slightly older, particularly those who might be considering experimenting with drugs or at risk of succumbing to peer pressure.

AD # 2: SPEED

Participants rated this ad highly in terms of making them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs and making them want to avoid drugs; however, it received one of the lowest scores in terms of the participants' ability to relate to the main actor.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line trended down slightly during the opening scene in the mall; participants said at first they were unsure as to what was happening. The line

began to rise during the scene with the girls in the bathroom and continued rising throughout the scene with the angry boy and his girlfriend. Participants indicated that they became aware of the meaning of the ad during these scenes, and that their attentions were strongly engaged by the emotional intensity and violence in these scenes. The response line declined during the scene in the kitchen. Participants were not always aware that the characters in this scene were “cooking” meth and their attention wavered. The line levelled off during the final hospital scene and ending voiceover, ending at about the same level as the beginning of the ad.

Variations in closed-end responses. More boys than girls found the ad believable, but they were less inclined to relate to the main actor in the ad; girls were more inclined to think the relationships were realistic and to say the ad made them aware of dangers and consequences of drugs. Toronto youth scored the ad highest in terms of grabbing their attention, while Montreal youth were most inclined to believe the ad, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, and to agree that the ad should be on TV.

Discussion. Participants had strong reactions to a number of the elements of this ad, but overall, most found the ad to be composed of too many disconnected vignettes to tell a clear story. They found it was hard to understand because the cuts were too quick and they found the ad difficult to identify with because it featured too many actors. It should be noted that the sub-titles also distracted from the images and may have added to the participants’ confusion.

Some of the scenes in the ad – the girl madly scratching herself and the boy punching the door – had a strong impact. The opening scene in the mall, however, did not arouse much interest and the scene of the makeshift lab in the kitchen was confusing to those who did not realise what was going on. Some participants suggested that the ad should begin with a more dramatic situation and tell a more focused story about a single character. There was, however, an appreciation of the way that this ad informed viewers about a variety of possible side effects of drug use.

The ad was seen to have several strong drug avoidance messages drawn from the different vignettes, including:

- different people can react differently to drugs – you don’t know what they will do to you;
- drugs can turn you against people you care about;
- speed makes you lose control, can “put you in a bad place,” can change your personality;
- speed has many different side effects;
- speed isn’t natural like weed, it’s made in a lab; and

- you don't know what might be in the drugs you're taking.

Most participants felt that at least some of the vignettes, if not all, were believable, and some said that they had known people who had behaved in similar fashions after taking drugs. Because most participants thought of speed as a “hard” drug compared to those they are more likely to be familiar with (marijuana, ecstasy), the more dramatic scenes were considered to be realistic rather than unusual responses.

The dramatic and even violent scenes in the ad were the most likely to capture participant's attention and make an impact. While most agreed that the ad was explicitly about speed, some felt that it had an impact on how they felt about all drugs. Some said that after seeing this ad, they felt more strongly about wanting to stay away from drugs. There were comments about not wanting to become paranoid or risk taking drugs that could “damage your brain.” Several volunteered that as a result of seeing this ad, they would try to dissuade anyone they knew from taking drugs, especially speed.

Participants thought that the ad was targeted at a wide range of people – some thought it was aimed at young teenagers, others at older teenagers or young adults, some thought it was aimed at everyone. A few believed the target audience was parents and that its intent was to show them what to watch for when their children take drugs.

AD # 3: ECSTASY

This ad was ranked poorly by the participants on most statements, including grabbing their attention, believability, realistic relationships, and making them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs; relatively few participants thought this ad should be on TV.

Moment to moment responses. The response line trended down during the introductory scene, and continued to decline during the first part of the party scene; participants either felt that nothing particularly interesting was happening or were confused by the quick cuts in the party scene. Some felt that there was nothing unusual happening – “she took some drugs and now she is high – so what?” The response line began to rise as the music established a strong beat and the girl began to show signs of distress; at this point, some participants were reacting to the music, while others were beginning to wonder what was happening to the girl, and realize that her distress is a consequence of the drugs she has taken. The response line trended up slightly during the scene showing the girl in

bed and the final scene, ending at a point slightly higher than the beginning level. A number of participants described the end of the ad as “weak” and said it was “just another drug ad.”

Variations in closed-end responses. More boys than girls agreed that the ad made them want to avoid drugs, but fewer boys than girls related to the main actor in the ad. Girls were more inclined to find the ad attention-grabbing, to agree the relationships were realistic and to think the ad should be on TV. Toronto youth were most inclined to find the ad attention-grabbing and to agree that it made them want to avoid drugs. Vancouver youth were least inclined to agree that it was believable, that the relationships were realistic, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, that it made them want to avoid drugs and that it should be on TV.

Discussion. This ad did not resonate well with most participants, at least in part because, for many, ecstasy is a well-known drug in their age group and they are familiar with its effects and negative consequences. This caused some to question the realism of the ad, as they associated “E” with thirst, teeth-grinding and a tendency to engage in promiscuous behaviour, and perceived it as a drug that really is “fun” for those who use it – if they take proper care of themselves. Some found the ad hard to understand because of the flashing lights, distracting music and quick cuts – although others, especially in Montreal, enjoyed this. Some did not initially realise that the main character was having a bad reaction to drugs; they thought that she might just be sick or hurt in some way. Some participants felt there was no real substance to the ad, or that it should have focused on a clearer and more accurate depiction of what can go wrong when a person takes ecstasy.

The repeated line “My friends said E would be fun. They lied” – was a problematic one because of the participants’ familiarity with the drug. While most identified this as part of what the ad intended to communicate, the general reaction was that the story told in the ad was not actually about anyone lying. Rather, it was about one person having a bad reaction, while others, including her friends who presumably also took ecstasy, were having fun – “People wouldn’t keep doing it if it wasn’t fun.” When asked to identify the message of the ad, responses included:

- taking drugs isn’t always fun;
- some people can’t take drugs because they react badly to them;
- don’t believe everything you’re told about drugs because some people lie;
- don’t let friends influence you to take drugs – you don’t have to do everything your friends do.

While many agreed that people do take ecstasy at raves, parties and clubs, and that there can be peer pressure to take the drug, many said that the portrayal of a person who has taken E was not realistic.

A few have heard of people having bad reactions to the drug, but most felt that this was not a typical experience. Few found the ad to be attention-grabbing, although some were attracted by the music and the portrayal of “the club scene.” The story itself was not particularly compelling for most. The ad did not appear to have any significant impact on most participants’ feelings about drugs, nor did it inspire most participants to do anything in response to seeing it, although a few thought they might urge people they know who take ecstasy to watch the ad. Because their sense of what ecstasy is and does was at variance with the message of the ad, it is unlikely that it would dissuade youth from experimenting with the drug.

Most felt that the ad was directed at older teenagers, particularly “ravers” or those who like to go to clubs; they saw the main actor in the ad as someone older than themselves, who would be old enough to get into a club.

AD # 4: RAGE

Rage received mid-range scores on most statements tested; however, it received one of the highest scores for being attention-grabbing; however it scored poorly by participants for portraying realistic relationships and on their ability to relate to the main actor.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line dipped slightly at the beginning, but began to rise when the boy entered the laundromat and attacked the older man. Participants said that they found the violence attention-grabbing and that the intensity of the ad from this point on kept them focused on the ad; they also expressed concern over what the boy might do, particularly when he threatened the mother and her baby. The line levelled off as the boy confronted his other self, ending at a higher point than the beginning; participants found this ad held their attention to the end and the awareness of the “twist” in this ad’s storyline.

Variations in closed-end responses. More boys than girls agreed that they believed this ad, that it made them want to avoid drugs, and that it should be on TV; however, slightly more boys than girls felt the did not relate to the main actor in the ad. More youths in Toronto than in Montreal or Vancouver agreed that the relationships were realistic. More Vancouver youths agreed that they believed the ad even though all the participants in this location felt that they did not relate to the main actor. Montreal youths were least inclined to believe this ad.

Discussion. This ad resonated very strongly in all the English sessions; participants in Toronto and Vancouver found the ad arresting, intense, and even shocking. The violence attracted their attention

and created an atmosphere of suspense – they wanted to know how the story ended. Many participants remarked on the effectiveness of the “surprise” ending; the concept of having the main character’s future self communicate the long-term consequences of drug use had a powerful impact in the English-language sessions. These participants also reacted strongly to the physical deteriorations brought about by drug use. Montreal participants did not find this ad as interesting or compelling. This may be due to a loss in translation of the key concept, or a lack of resonance among Montreal youth.

For those participants that found this ad to have a strong impact, the ad illustrated the element of choice in using drugs, and how “bad” choices can send a person down the wrong path. It also conveyed a powerful message of the desperations of addiction. Participants described the message of the ad in various ways:

- don’t do drugs because you won’t be able to stop;
- if you become addicted to drugs, you’ll do anything to get money to pay for them;
- drugs can turn you into a different person;
- you don’t know what will happen if you try drugs;
- if you become addicted, your whole life will be about doing whatever you have to do to get more drugs;
- drugs can make you hurt innocent people.

Some participants noted that there is no clear indication that the ad is about drugs, although most youth in Toronto and Vancouver assumed that it must be, because they could not think of many other reasons for the main character to be so desperate and to behave so violently. The ad would have been clearer if an explanatory tag-line or call-to-action had been present.

Most participants found the ad believable, particularly in its portrayal of addiction. Some, however, questioned whether it was realistic for someone to hold up a laundromat, especially one with so many people in it. Participants felt that this ad had some impact on their feelings about drugs, particularly with respect to addiction and the kinds of things that would change in their lives if they were to become addicted to drugs. Some said that seeing the ad would make them think twice if they were considering taking drugs, and some thought they would talk to others about this ad.

Most participants felt that this ad was aimed at “anyone.” Others suggested that it was particularly targeted at people who might be considering experimenting with drugs, especially teenagers and young adults. Girls felt that they could identify with the idea of the ad even though they felt that

female addicts were more likely to turn to prostitution than to robbery in order to get money for drugs; the concept was applicable to both genders.

AD # 5: TIC TIC

This ad scored poorly on a number of statements, including portraying realistic relationships, making participants aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs and making them want to avoid drugs. While participants did rate the ad highly in terms of being able to relate to the main actor, it was rated poorly in terms of whether it should be on TV.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line dropped throughout the opening voiceover and close-up of the guard dog; some participants found this portion of the ad boring because “nothing is going on” while others found the juxtaposition of a voiceover about smoking marijuana and the image of a sleeping dog confusing. The line began to climb when the dog started chasing the boy and by the time the boy jumped the fence it had returned to the starting level; participants were engaged by the action of the chase and the suspense of wondering if he would outrun the dog.

Variations in closed-end responses. More boys than girls agreed that the ad grabbed their attention, made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, and made them want to avoid drugs. More girls than boys agreed that they believed the ad, that the relationships were realistic, and that the ad should be on TV. More Montreal youth related to the main actor, although most youth in all locations did not; at the same time, fewer youth in Montreal agreed the ad should be on TV. Fewer Vancouver youth agreed that the ad grabbed their attention, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, and that it made them want to avoid drugs. More youth in Toronto agreed that the relationships in this ad were realistic.

Discussion. This ad was not well-received in any of the groups. Most did not see how there could be any logical connection between smoking “weed” one day and trying to out-run a guard dog the next. Others pointed out that the effects of marijuana do not last that long. Some felt that the ad started out too slowly and were confused by the juxtaposition of the voiceover and the image of a sleeping dog. For many participants, marijuana use was not seen as serious compared to the use of harder drugs; for these participants, the ad lacked impact.

For many, the message of this ad was only incidentally about drugs; the main message was about resisting peer pressure and making good choices – which could encompass many other issues in addiction to drug use. When asked to describe the message of the ad, responses included:

- if you're stupid enough to take drugs, you'll do anything;
- drugs can mess up the way you think and make you do stupid things;
- don't give in to peer pressure;
- be aware of the consequences of your choices;
- say no to your friends if they want you to do something stupid.

Some also had concerns about the tone of the ad – the use of humour was seen as trivializing the serious issue of drug use. Others, however, noted that “not everyone wants to see something totally intense” and thought that the humour helped to hold their attention. Opinion also varied on the use of music; some liked the “happy music” while others found it juvenile.

The ad was not seen as believable except in the broadest sense of a “boys will be boys” story in which someone succumbs to peer pressure or a “dare” and does something ill-advised. No one believed that smoking marijuana would cause someone to do something like this. In general, participants did not think this ad was very attention-grabbing, although some thought the “chase scene” was interesting and suspenseful. The ad did not have any significant impact on how participants felt about drugs, and participants were not able to identify anything that they might do in response to seeing the ad.

Some thought that the ad was targeted to younger teenagers; others were not sure who might be the intended audience. Girls were less likely to think that it would be aimed directly at them, as this seemed to them to be the kind of thing that boys were more likely to do.

AD # 6: LOST DREAMS

This ad received mid-range ratings on most of the statements examined, but was assessed highly for its believability and its ability to make the participants want to avoid taking drugs.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line remained fairly level during the first two scenes (girl in prostitution and boy stealing); participants said that at first they did not understand the ad and could not make a connection between the voiceovers and the images. The response line began to climb during the third scene in which the girl and her mother were fighting; as in other ads, participants acknowledged that they tended to respond to tense situations and violence, but many also said that by the end of the second scene (stealing) or the middle of the third scene (girl and mother fighting), they had realized that the ad was contrasting childhood dreams with adolescent realities. The line dropped slightly during the first seconds of the fourth scene (boy in body-bag);

some participants said that they were confused initially and did not realize the boy was dead until the body-bag was zipped closed. During this scene, the response line climbed again, ending slightly higher than the starting point, as participants registered the meaning of the body-bag image and the closing voiceover.

Variations in closed-end responses. Boys and girls had similar responses to this ad. Youth in Vancouver agreed more strongly than youth in other locations that the ad grabbed their attention, that they related to the main actors, and that the ad made them want to avoid drugs. Youth in Toronto were more inclined to agree that the relationships between people in the ad were realistic.

Discussion. The overall theme of this ad – how young children have all kinds of dreams that can be shattered – resonated with many participants, but the execution of the theme was not successful. The ad had low impact at first, and many – especially boys – lost interest. Many participants said that they did not understand that they were being shown a contrast between childhood dreams and bitter realities until the second or third vignette, and did not necessarily link this with the consequences of drug use until the final moments of the ad: “the ad means nothing without the end.”

The final image – that of a dead boy in a body-bag – had the strongest impact on most participants, but some wanted to know what had happened, and what drugs he had taken. Some remarked on what they considered an escalation of consequences from less serious to fatal, noting that this contributed to a build-up of interest and suspense for them.

Due to the lack of an explicit reference to drug use, the use of multiple actors and the seeming unconnected voiceovers, a few participants were not able to identify a message for this ad. Most, however suggested variations on the overall theme:

- when you’re younger you have big dreams, but if you choose the wrong path, your life can be very bad;
- if you take drugs, they can ruin your future;
- drugs can ruin your dreams, everything you wanted to be for the rest of your life;
- drugs can turn your life upside down.

Most participants thought that the ad was believable and the relationships portrayed in the ad were realistic. A few said that while the lesser consequences– prostitution, theft, family discord – were believable, death from drug use is relatively rare and the use of it in the ad was an extreme example.

Most participants said the ad did not really hold their attention until mid-way through or later; they variously described the first part of the ad as slow, boring, confusing, hard to understand or uninteresting due to subject matter (prostitution). For some, the strong Australian accents and the sub-titles were distracting. Others thought the lighting was too dark, making it difficult to see details of the scenes. Most agreed that if they saw it on TV, they would not be inclined to watch or pay attention. However, having seen the ad, some felt that their feelings about drugs had become more negative and that the “disturbing images” would make them think about the consequences of taking drugs.

There was some difference of opinion about the intended audience of the ad. Some felt that the focus on childhood dreams meant that the ad was designed to be shown to pre-teens. Others felt that it was aimed at teenagers their own age, who might be on the verge of making choices about drug use, and a few thought it was intended for older teenagers.

AD # 7: FOR SALE

This ad was scored highly on six out of seven statements; however, participants gave it a low rating in terms of their ability to relate to the main actor.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line for this ad showed a gradual but essentially steady climb throughout the ad. Most found the “story” of the ad to be attention-grabbing; participants used the word “escalation” to describe both the increasing seriousness of the older sister’s drug involvement and various elements of the ad.

Variations in closed-end responses. More girls than boys agreed that they believed this ad, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, that it made them want to avoid drugs and that it should be on TV; boys did not relate to the main actor as much as girls did, although overall, few girls or boys agreed that they did relate to the actor. Agreement that the ad grabbed attention and that it should be on TV was lowest in Toronto. Most, if not all, Vancouver youth agreed that they believed the ad, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, and that it made them want to avoid drugs. Agreement that the relationships between people in the ad were realistic and that the ad made them want to avoid drugs was lowest in Montreal.

Discussion. This ad resonated most strongly with girls in the English-language sessions; responses were more muted among boys and among all the participants in Montreal. The strength of this ad is that it shows the impact of drug use on those around the drug user; for many participants, the idea

that an older sibling should be a role model to younger siblings made this particularly poignant. Because participants viewed meth as a harder drug used by people with more serious drug habits, they tended to be shocked, distressed, or “creeped out” when the younger sibling followed her sister into the cycle of drug use.

The juxtaposition of a phrase suggesting experimentation with the portrayal of a progression of increasingly serious behaviours struck a chord and was seen as a positive element by many. Many participants felt that the ad told a straight forward story of how a downward spiral can occur once someone crosses the line and begins to use drugs. The corresponding physical deterioration of the main character as a consequence of drug use also had an impact, particularly on participants in Toronto and Vancouver. The message of this ad was variously described as:

- trying drugs one time can turn into many times.
- taking drugs has a big effect on people around you.
- everyone says they’ll just try drugs one time but few people can stop once they start.
- set a good example for younger siblings – don’t do drugs.

Despite the strong impact of the ad on some participants, many found the most powerful aspect of the ad – the young sister’s imitation of the older sister’s drug use – unrealistic. For some, it was not believable that the older sister would actually be doing these things where her younger sister could watch. Others doubted that the little sister would really try drugs after seeing her older sister’s behaviour and deteriorating appearance. Some noted that much of the ad seemed to be happening in the sister’s home and wondered where their parents were. Most participants, however, agreed that the portrayal of the older sister’s behaviour was believable. Many, particularly girls, saw the older sister as a “typical” teenager who could be one of their classmates.

A number of participants reported that viewing the ad had made an impact on their feelings about drugs. In particular, they said that it made them more aware of how addictive drugs can be, of the lengths that people will go to in order to get drugs once they are addicted, and how much taking drugs can affect the people around the drug user. While everyone agreed that the ad was specifically about using meth, some felt that it was also an example of what could happen with any drug – particularly with respect to the influence the user’s behaviour can have on others.

Most participants felt that the ad was directed either at them, or at teenagers who were slightly older, and particularly teens who have younger siblings. Boys thought that, with the exception of having sex for drugs, the ad could apply to them.

AD # 8: SENT

This ad received low scores on most of the statements tested, although it was rated in the mid-range on the realistic nature of the relationships portrayed, and highly in terms of whether the participants related to the main actor.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line declined steadily throughout the first part of the ad until the point where the girl asked her friend to send her the picture; participants described this portion of the ad as boring, “just girls talking on the phone.” The line then climbed while the people around her appeared to be looking at something on their cellphones, and ended just below the level at which it started. Some participants were intrigued by the gossip, others responded to the girl’s statement that she had been “high” and a few acknowledged paying attention in order to see what was in the picture.

Variations in closed-end results. More boys than girls agreed that they believed the ad, that it made them want to avoid drugs, and that it should be on TV. Vancouver youth were more inclined than youth in other locations to agree that they believed this ad, that the relationships between people were realistic, that the ad made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs, and that it makes them want to avoid drugs. As well, more Vancouver youth agreed that they related to the main actor. Montreal youth were least inclined to agree that the ad makes them want to avoid drugs; Toronto youth were least inclined to agree that the ad should be on TV.

Discussion. This ad did not have much of an impact on the participants: “it’s just some girl walking and talking on the phone.” Boys in particular did not relate at all to the ad because it was just “girl talk.” Most felt that it had very little to do with drugs, but was rather a story about how gossip spreads among teenagers; they observed that there was no mention of any health or behavioural impacts from drug use and we are never told what drug she did, if indeed she was “high” on drugs rather than alcohol or excitement. Participants noted that there are many reasons why someone might do something embarrassing at a party that they would not want people to know about, from drinking to a momentary act of clumsiness to simply being exuberant and “goofing around” with friends. Also, the girl seems to be happy and healthy – obviously if she was “high” on Saturday night, she had completely recovered by Monday (most assumed that she was on her way to school) without any “real” consequences, which implies that doing drugs is “not that big a deal.”

Most felt that the message was at best loosely about drug avoidance, and some described it as “weak.” Rather, the message seemed to be about being careful about letting yourself be photographed, or possibly about cyber-bullying. The main message was variously described as:

- if you have a wild party, do it with people you trust;
- people spread gossip, so be careful what you do;
- don’t get high at parties, you could do something stupid that would make people gossip about you;
- taking drugs might make you do embarrassing things.

There was a mixed response in terms of whether the ad was believable; some, particularly girls, found the “girl talk” and the possibility that an embarrassing photo might be spread around to be realistic situations, but did not find it believable that this girl could be so “high” that she would forget doing whatever it was that was in the photo. Many participants, particularly in Toronto and Vancouver, felt that the main actor seemed somehow fake or that the acting was poor– the situations might be believable and realistic, but the acting made it appear not to be.

This ad was not an attention-grabber for any of the participants. Most found the opening conversation boring and would be unlikely to watch further if they saw it on TV. Most agreed that the ad had little to no impact on how they felt about drugs, unless to make them think that taking drugs at a party sounded like fun. They said that there is nothing in this ad that would move them away from experimenting with drugs. Of all the reasons not to try drugs, fear of being photographed is not on the radar screen.

Most participants felt that this ad was aimed at teenagers, and particularly teenaged girls. Boys tended to think that it was not something that they would identify with, and that it was likely not aimed at them.

AD # 9: JOINT

This ad was rated highly on six out of seven statements; however, it only received a mid-range score on its ability to grab the attention of participants.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line remained more-or-less level during the introductory scene, then began to climb during the scene in which the boy had a fight with his mother; participants were not engaged by the opening monologue, but responded to the intensity

and conflict of the fight scene with the mother. The line stayed high but level during the scene where the boy interacts with his friends, and then climbed gradually to the final monologue, ending at a level higher than when it began. Some participants were drawn in by the music, while others mentioned the increasing isolation of the boy as his drug involvement threatens family, friendships and school.

Variations on closed-end responses. More boys than girls agreed that the ad made them want to avoid drugs; girls were more likely to agree the ad should be on TV. Toronto youth were more inclined to agree the ad made them want to avoid drugs, but less inclined to agree that the ad grabbed their attention and that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs. Vancouver youth were more inclined to relate to the main actor and agreed that the relationships between people are realistic, but least inclined to say the ad should be on TV; Montreal youth were most inclined to agree that the ad should be on TV.

Discussion. This ad was very well received by participants in Montreal and by the boys in the English language sessions. The fast-paced montage attracted attention, especially with boys, who thought it was exciting: “almost like a movie trailer.” Girls were more inclined to say that the fast cuts and scene jumps made it confusing and hard to follow. Many – again, more boys than girls – spontaneously mentioned that the music was also very effective in capturing their attention. Part of the impact of the ad on participants was in the way that taking drugs affects all aspects of the main character’s life – friends, school and family: “at the beginning he has friends, at the end he has no one.” Participants also appreciated that the ad showed multiple and serious impacts of drugs, without being “over the top”; they felt that it gave a strong, but not overly drastic picture of what can happen to someone who takes drugs over a period of time. Having a call-to-action to “find out the truth about drugs” ties the ad together well.

Though a joint is shown, the ad was seen to be a message about drug use in general and not just about marijuana; participants felt that these are the kinds of consequences that are associated with almost any drug – not just one specific kind. The message about doing drugs to be “cool” and ending up alone was also appreciated, although some participants felt that peer pressure is generally more subtle than simply being told that taking drugs will make you cool. When asked to describe the overall message, participants’ responses included:

- you shouldn’t give in to peer pressure;
- don’t take drugs just because your friends tell you to;
- drugs won’t make you cool;

- drug use affects everyone around you – you could lose everyone you care about.

Most found the ad to be believable and realistic in its portrayal of the consequences of taking drugs. It was very credible to them that drugs could lead to trouble with family, friends and at school – three areas that are very important in the lives of teens. A few criticisms were raised, however. Some wondered why the boy was getting into fights with his friends if they were the ones who had encouraged him to try drugs. Other felt that the scene in the classroom was not very realistic, either because they did not associate taking drugs with falling asleep in class, or because they felt the teacher’s response was too “motherly.”

Most participants said the ad captured and held their attention – the music, fast pace, quick scene cuts and violence all combined kept them watching and created a sense of tension and suspense. While many did agree that it made them think more seriously about the consequences of trying drugs, few thought that they would do anything in response to seeing the ad.

Most felt that the ad was directed at teenagers, either their age or a few years older. Some thought that it might be more aimed at boys than at girls, because of the degree of physical violence in the ad. Certainly, boys found the main character easy to identify with. Even though some girls did think that the ad was more typical of the behaviour of boys when taking drugs, most were not troubled by his gender – they felt that it told a story that could apply to them as well, although their specific behaviours might be different.

AD # 10: KITCHEN

Participants rated this ad highly for portraying realistic relationships, being attention-grabbing, making them want to avoid drugs, and in terms of their ability to relate to the main actor; it received mid-range scores on the remaining statements.

Moment-to-moment responses. The response line dropped during the first part of the ad, while the boy was searching for money, but began to rise when the mother confronted him, rising sharply when he struck his mother and staying high until the end of the ad. Participants said that they were confused by the disconnect between the voiceover and the boy’s actions, and did not realise that he was planning to steal from his mother. As in other ads, the intense emotion and violence of his interaction with his mother captured the participants’ attention and held it for the rest of the ad.

Variation on closed-end responses. More girls than boys agreed that the ad grabbed their attention and that they believed the ad; girls were less inclined than boys to disagree that they related to the main actor. Toronto youth were less inclined to agree that the ad grabbed their attention, that they believed the ad, that it made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs and that the ad should be on TV. Vancouver youth were more inclined to agree the relationships between people were realistic and less inclined to disagree that they related to the main actor. Montreal youth were more inclined to agree that the ad made them aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs.

Discussion. This ad elicited very powerful responses – the image of a young man (seen to be in his late teens) punching his mother has high impact – but ones that were disconnected from any message about drug avoidance. Participants were shocked and profoundly affected both by the main character’s violence toward his mother and by her desperate struggle to keep reaching out to him despite what he had done to her. Some found the contrast between the on-screen action and the voiceover poignant, while others were initially confused by the voiceover because they did not realize that the young man was intending to steal from his mother. Despite the powerful emotional reaction to this ad, most participants found it dissatisfying because they did not have any clear indication of what the ad was saying. Drugs were not mentioned or seen in the ad, and some thought that the ad was about theft, domestic violence (parental abuse) or a dysfunctional family; there was no clear indication that this story is about drugs at all – there could be others reasons why a boy might steal money from his mother or fight with her. Participants noted that the ad would have been less confusing and possibly more powerful if there had been some kind of tagline or call-to-action.

The underlying message of how addiction can make people go to extraordinary lengths does resonate with youth to some degree. Youth identified the message in the ad as drug avoidance. Participants also thought that had they seen this ad on TV. The message that did come across to them was said to be:

- addicts will do anything for drugs;
- drugs can ruin the most important things in your life, like your family;
- how much your parents are hurt when you take drugs.

Most thought that the ad was believable in the way that it showed that drug use can hurt the people around you, as well as lead you into shocking and desperate behaviours, although some added that committing a violent act against one’s mother was a very extreme and uncommon consequence of

drug use. Many felt that the mother's desperate actions were a realistic portrayal of how far a parent would go to save their child.

Most thought that the first few seconds of the ad were somewhat boring, even confusing, although others said that they could tell right away that the main character was “doing something he shouldn't be doing” and that this made them curious. However, as soon as the violent exchange between mother and son began, they found it compelling and wanted to watch to see what would happen. Despite the strong emotional reaction, most felt that the ad did not have much of an impact on their feelings about drugs, partly because the drug message was not clear, and partly because they could not see themselves acting in such a fashion toward their mother even if they were to do drugs. This made it easy for them to dismiss the impact of the ad as something not really relevant to them.

Some felt that the ad was directed at anyone, or at anyone who is thinking about taking drugs. Others felt that the target was older teenagers or young adults – people young enough that they might still live at home, but who were older than themselves – just as many thought the main character was older than they were.

OVERALL IMPACT

Following the group discussions, participants were asked to identify the ad that seemed to have the most impact. In the groups that saw Set A, *Girl* and *Rage* were most frequently mentioned as the ads that were the most effective at showing the dangers of drug use in addition to having a strong impact. In the groups that saw Set B, the ads most frequently mentioned were *For Sale*, *Joint* and *Lost Dreams*; in addition to having a strong impact, all three ads were seen as showing a range of consequences in a convincing manner and being informative. The idea of an ad that tells a story emerged as being important as well.

The kinds of elements that appear to have a strong impact are generally those that are shocking, violent, or have a powerful emotional component, including loss or disruption of social networks. Specific scenes or images mentioned as examples of these elements included:

- *Kitchen* – when the young man hits his mother.
- *Rage* – when the main character confronts himself.
- *For Sale* – when the younger sibling goes to try drugs herself.
- *Girl* – when the girl is “dumped” at the hospital.
- *Lost Dreams* – the boy in the body-bag.

- Speed – when the young man punches a hole in the door and when the young woman is scratching herself.

There was a high level of agreement that the Government of Canada should sponsor ads like these with a drug avoidance message. Some participants wondered whether ads would make much of a difference, and a few raised the issue of cost effectiveness, but the general response was that if such ads were able to inform and dissuade even a few people who might be considering taking drugs, then the ads would have been beneficial: “it can help, even if it doesn’t stop everyone.”

CONCLUSIONS

Participants' responses to these drug avoidance ads from other countries provided valuable information about what kinds of themes, elements and approaches will be successful with youth 13 to 15 years old in the Canadian cultural environment. The key considerations for developing an advertising campaign aimed at youth in this age group that emerge from this research are:

- Strike a balance between showing trivial consequences of drug use (i.e., embarrassing photos and racing against a dog) and consequences that are too extreme for youth to relate to (i.e., boy punching his mother/death). When an ad focuses on extreme consequences, youth who have any knowledge of drugs are likely to assume that the ad's message is overstated; portraying consequences that are unpleasant, but not uncommon enhances the believability of the entire message.
- Show serious, but common and realistic consequences. Youth are sufficiently knowledgeable about most common street drugs to realize when a message about consequences of drug use is exaggerated or focused on unusual effects of using that drug.
- Messages about drug progression/escalation, addiction, a loss of social networks and a loss of control work well. Francophones react more strongly to messages about impact on social circles. Anglophones are more influenced by evidence of physical signs of drug use and addiction. Combining both in a single ad along with themes and images of addiction and drug progression can be highly effective.
- It is preferable for an ad to focus on one actor in a variety of situations, than to have too many actors in too many settings in a 30 second ad – an ad that tells a coherent and consistent story is easier for youth to understand and relate to.
- A fast-paced, montage style helps attract attention, as does the proper use of music, but the cuts and the music should not interrupt the story or be overtly distracting. Overly sophisticated production techniques are not necessarily more effective, although good performance and production value are expected from a media-savvy generation. Lighting should be bright enough, so that the details of scenes and actions are not obscured.

- It is acceptable to mention a specific drug in an ad, but not to the point where the ad appears to be only about that specific drug (e.g., speed, ecstasy). Youth are able to recognize that a specific drug casually mentioned can be symbolic of all drugs.
- There should be a clear explanation of how situations in an ad relate to drugs, as most behaviours and consequences of drug use can also be associated with other kinds of situations. Youth in this age group want to be told the context of the ad, not left to draw conclusions. Any explicit connections made in the body of the ad can also be part of a tagline at the end of the ad. It should be noted that most of the ads that received a strong overall response contained either a tagline (Speed, Joint, Lost Dreams) or explicit and repeated references to drug use (For Sale, Speed).
- Violence is attention-grabbing, particularly for boys, but also for girls. Violent images have to be used judiciously and realistically. Girls and francophones are more affected by how drug use can affect the relationships between people close to them, particularly if there is a high emotional value placed on the relationship (mother/child, younger sibling).
- The drugs that 13 to 15 year olds are most likely to be exposed to are marijuana and ecstasy. Ads will seem more relevant if these are mentioned as opposed to much harder drugs – but the impacts have to be believable.

APPENDICES

July 15, 2008

**HEALTH CANADA POR 08-04
DISCUSSION AGENDA- Final
PN 6348
Focus Testing of TV Ads with Youth –Perception Analyzer**

NOT TO MODERATOR: No mention of Government of Canada or Health Canada.

1.0 INTRODUCTION (8 MINUTES)

- Introduction to focus group procedures.
- Moderator's name and role.
- We want your opinion – this is a discussion group.
- Feel free to agree or disagree and express your views freely/there is no wrong answer.
- Session is being taped and observed for research purposes.
- Your individual comments will not be linked to you / names will not appear.
- The session will be approximately 2 hours.
- Please turn off cell phones, pagers.
- The receptionist will pay you your cash gift at the end of the session.
- You are all between the ages of 13 to 15. Let's go around the table so that each one of you can tell me your first name and something about yourself.

2.0 AD TESTING – PERCEPTION ANALYZER (40 MINUTES)

Today we are going to be looking at a number of TV ads and we want to get your response to these ads. I will tell you more about them as we move along.

We are going to be using a keypad to rate these ads. The keypad is numbered with buttons from one to ten but we are only going to be using the numbers one to five in everything we do with the keypad today.

Part 1 – Moment-to-moment

We will be rating every moment of every ad as you watch it. We will be using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means that what you are seeing has no impact on you and at the other end of the scale 5 means what you are seeing has a very strong impact on you. A very strong impact means “a strong effect on you”. A very strong impact can be either negative or positive. Remember, there is no wrong number.

Here is the scale on the flip chart.

- 5 = Very strong impact
- 4 = Strong impact
- 3 = Moderate impact
- 2 = Low impact
- 1 = No impact

Before we look at the ads for this study, let's start with a test ad so that you can get used to the keypad and how it works. So as you watch this ad throughout, please press the keyboard buttons from 1 to 5 where 1 means what you are seeing has no impact on you and 5 means what you are seeing has a very strong impact on you. A very strong impact can be either negative or positive.

CONDUCT MOMENT TO MOMENT WITH TEST AD,

Does everyone understand how to use the keyboard? Are there any questions?

Now we are going to look at 5 ads that are part of this study. The ads will be shown one right after the other, with only a few seconds in between.

CONDUCT MOMENT TO MOMENT WITH THE ADS.

Part 2 – Closed-Ended questions

Now we are going to look at all **five** ads again one-by-one and I am going to ask you some questions about each ad. The scale we are going to use for each question is on the flip chart.

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Somewhat agree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 2 = Somewhat disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree

I have some questions to ask about each ad:

1. This ad grabs your attention.
2. You believe this ad.
3. You relate to the main actor in this ad.
4. The relationships between people in this ad are realistic.
5. This ad makes you aware of the dangers and consequences of drugs.
6. This ad makes you want to avoid drugs.
7. This ad should be on TV.

FOR MODERATOR/TECHNICIAN:

Reel A

- Q 1-7 – Ad 1 - Girl
- Q 8-14 – Ad 2 - Speed
- Q 15-21 – Ad 3 - Ecstasy
- Q 22-28 – Ad 4 - Rage
- Q 29-35 – Ad 5 – Tic Tic

Reel B

- Q 1-7 – Ad 6 – Lost Dreams
- Q 8-14 – Ad 7 – For Sale
- Q 15-21 – Ad 8 - Sent
- Q 22-28 – Ad 9 - Joint
- Q 29-35 – Ad 10 - Kitchen

Q 36 Gender

- 1= Female
- 2 =Male



Q 37 Age

- 1=13
- 2=14
- 3=15



Q 38 City

- 1=Toronto
- 2=Vancouver
- 3=Montreal



SHOW EACH AD, CONDUCT EXERCISE AFTER EACH AD.

And now there are just three more questions. ASK DEMO QUESTIONS USING KEYPAD.

BREAK –MODERATOR GETS VIDEOS OF MOMENT TO MOMENT RESULTS.

3.0 GROUP DISCUSSION OF ADS (70 MINUTES)

Let's now discuss each of the ads. First we will look at how the group rated each ad and then we will discuss each ad.

Ad 1 (Ad 6)

(6 MINUTES) Here is the graph showing how the group responded. When we look at each line, remember that it is the average of the whole group – some of you may have reacted differently than other people in the group to any section of the ad. SHOW LINE GRAPH.

Let's go through this again stopping at points where the line went up, down, or stayed the same. SHOW LINE GRAPH AGAIN STOPPING TO ASK: Why did some people move the line up here? Down there? Stay the same here? Why did you respond this way? Why was the impact high/low? Was it a negative impact or positive? 

(8 MINUTES) Discussion questions (DISCUSS IN ORDER):

1. What was the main message of the ad? 
2. What did you like the most about this ad? What did you like the least? 
3. Did the ad get your attention? Why/why not? 
4. Did you believe this ad? Why/why not? 
5. Do you feel this ad is aimed at you? Why or why not? Who do you think it is aimed at? 
6. How did the ad make you feel about drugs? What kind of impact did it have on you? 
7. Would you do anything after seeing this ad? What would you do? (Probe: discuss with parents/friends, stay away from drugs, experiment with drugs, look for more information.) 

8. What are your impressions of the types of drugs shown in the ad (meth, marijuana, etc)? Does the ad make you feel differently about other drugs? 
9. Were the relationships among the people in the ad realistic? Why do you think so (why not)? 
10. Do you relate to the main actor in the ad? (Probe: clothes, hair, language) Why or why not? 
11. What did you think of the music? 

Ad 2 to 5 (7 to 10)



REPEAT QUESTIONS FOR ALL ADS

4.0 CLOSING DISCUSSION (2 MINUTES OR REMAINING TIME)

1. Did one entire ad stand out for you with a message to stay away from drugs? Which one? Why? 
2. Did any one thing from any of these ads stand out as a message to stay away from drugs? 
3. Do you think the Government of Canada should be talking to you about drugs? 

We would like to thank you for your participation in this research study.

THANK AND TERMINATE

Le 15 juillet 2008

**SANTÉ CANADA ROP 08-04
PROGRAMME DE DISCUSSION - Définitif
PN 6348**

**Évaluation en séance de groupe d'adolescents de publicités télévisées –
Analyseur de perceptions**

NOTE À L'INTENTION DU/DE LA MODÉRATEUR : Ne faites aucune mention du gouvernement du Canada ou de Santé Canada.

4.0 INTRODUCTION (8 MINUTES)

- Introduction à la procédure à suivre en séance de groupe.
- Nom et rôle du/de la modérateur.
- Nous voulons connaître votre opinion – il s'agit d'un groupe de discussion.
- Soyez bien libres d'être d'accord ou en désaccord et exprimer vos points de vue librement. Il n'y a ni bonne ni mauvaise réponse.
- La séance est enregistrée sur bande audio et observée aux fins de recherche.
- Vos commentaires individuels ne seront pas liés à vous/les noms n'apparaîtront pas.
- La séance durera environ 2 heures.
- Veuillez s'il vous plaît éteindre vos téléphones cellulaires et téléavertisseurs.
- La/le réceptionniste vous remettra la mesure incitative à la fin de la séance.
- Vous êtes tous âgés de 13 à 15 ans. Faisons un tour de table pour que chacun et chacune d'entre vous puissiez nous dire votre prénom ainsi que quelque chose à votre sujet.

**5.0 ÉVALUATION DE LA PUBLICITÉ – ANALYSEUR DE PERCEPTIONS
(40 MINUTES)**

Aujourd'hui, nous regarderons bon nombre de publicités télévisées et nous voulons recueillir votre réaction à ces publicités. Je vous en dirai plus à ce sujet à mesure que nous avancerons.

Nous utiliserons un clavier pour coter ces publicités. Le clavier possède des touches numérotées de « 1 » à « 10, » mais pour tout ce que nous ferons avec le clavier aujourd'hui, nous n'utiliserons que les touches « 1 » à « 5 ».

Partie 1 – Chaque instant

Nous coterons chaque instant de chaque publicité à mesure que vous la regardez. Nous utiliserons une échelle variant de « 1 » à « 5 » où « 1 » signifie

que ce que vous êtes en train de regarder n'a aucun impact sur vous et, à l'autre bout de l'échelle, « 5 » signifie que ce que vous êtes en train de regarder a un impact très fort sur vous. Par impact très fort, nous voulons dire que cela « a beaucoup d'effet sur vous. » Un impact très fort peut être soit positif ou négatif. N'oubliez pas, il n'y a pas de mauvais chiffre.

Voici l'échelle sur le tableau.

- 5 = Impact très fort
- 4 = Impact fort
- 3 = Impact modéré
- 2 = Faible impact
- 1 = Aucun impact

Avant que nous regardions les publicités qui sont au programme de cette étude, faisons d'abord un test, afin de vous familiariser avec le clavier et son fonctionnement. Ainsi, pendant que vous regardez cette publicité en entier, veuillez s'il vous plaît appuyer sur les touches de « 1 » à « 5 » où « 1 » signifie que ce que vous êtes en train de regarder n'a aucun impact sur vous et où « 5 » signifie que ce que vous êtes en train de regarder a un impact très fort sur vous. Un impact très fort peut être soit positif ou négatif.

EFFECTUEZ L'ANALYSE À CHAQUE INSTANT AVEC LA PUBLICITÉ CHOISIE POUR LE TEST.

Est-ce que tout le monde comprend bien comment utiliser le clavier ? Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ?

Maintenant, nous allons regarder 5 publicités qui font partie de cette étude. Ces publicités vous seront montrées les unes à la suite des autres, avec seulement quelques secondes les séparant.

EFFECTUEZ L'ANALYSE À CHAQUE INSTANT AVEC LES PUBLICITÉS.

Partie 2 – Questions à réponses fermées

À présent, vous allez regarder ces cinq publicités une fois de plus, une à la fois, et je vais vous lire des affirmations au sujet de chaque publicité. L'échelle que nous utiliserons pour chaque affirmation est affichée sur le tableau.

- 5 = Fortement d'accord
- 4 = Plutôt d'accord
- 3 = Ni d'accord ni en désaccord
- 2 = Plutôt en désaccord
- 1 = Fortement en désaccord

J'ai quelques affirmations à vous lire au sujet de chaque publicité :

1. Cette publicité capte votre attention.
2. Vous croyez cette publicité.
3. Vous vous reconnaissez dans l'acteur(rice) principal de cette publicité.
4. Les relations entre les personnes figurant dans cette publicité sont réalistes.
5. Cette publicité vous éveille aux dangers et aux conséquences de la consommation de drogues.
6. Cette publicité vous incite à éviter les drogues.
7. Cette publicité devrait être diffusée à la télévision.

POUR LE/LA MODÉRATEUR/TECHNICIEN:

Bande A

- Q 1-7 – Publicité 1 – Fille
- Q 8-14 – Publicité 2 – Speed
- Q 15-21 – Publicité 3 – Ecstasy
- Q 22-28 – Publicité 4 – Rage
- Q 29-35 – Publicité 5 – Tic Tic

Bande B

- Q 1-7 – Publicité 6 – Rêves brisés
- Q 8-14 – Publicité 7 – À vendre
- Q 15-21 – Publicité 8 – Envoyé
- Q 22-28 – Publicité 9 – Joints
- Q 29-35 – Publicité 10 – Cuisine

Q 36 Sexe

- 1= Féminin
- 2 =Masculin

Q 37 Âge

- 1=13
- 2=14
- 3=15

Q 38 Ville

- 1=Toronto
- 2=Vancouver
- 3=Montréal

MONTREZ CHAQUE PUBLICITÉ, FAITES L'EXERCICE APRÈS CHAQUE PUBLICITÉ.

Et, maintenant, il ne me reste que trois questions. POSEZ LES QUESTIONS DE DÉMONSTRATION AUXQUELLES RÉPONDRE À L'AIDE DU CLAVIER.

PAUSE – LE MODÉRATEUR OBTIENT LES VIDÉOS DES RÉSULTATS DE L'ANALYSE À CHAQUE INSTANT.

6.0 DISCUSSION EN GROUPE AU SUJET DES PUBLICITÉS (70 MINUTES)

À présent, discutons de chacune de ces publicités. Premièrement, nous regarderons de quelle façon le groupe a coté chaque publicité et, ensuite, nous discuterons de chaque publicité.

Publicité 1 (Publicité 6)

(6 MINUTES) Voici le graphique montrant de quelle façon le groupe a réagi. Quand nous regardons chaque ligne, rappelez-vous qu'il s'agit de la moyenne pour l'ensemble du groupe – certains d'entre vous avez peut-être réagi différemment des autres membres du groupe à une ou l'autre des parties de la publicité. MONTREZ LE GRAPHIQUE LINÉAIRE.

Examinons-le une fois de plus en nous arrêtant sur les points où la ligne monte, descend ou ne change pas. MONTREZ LE GRAPHIQUE LINÉAIRE UNE FOIS DE PLUS, EN VOUS ARRÊTANT POUR DEMANDER : Pourquoi est-ce que certaines personnes font-elles que la ligne monte ici ? Descende ici ? Ne change pas ici ? Pourquoi avez-vous réagi de cette façon ? Pourquoi l'impact a-t-il été fort/faible ? S'agissait-il d'un impact négatif ou positif ?

(8 MINUTES) Questions de discussion (DISCUTER DANS L'ORDRE) :

12. Quel était le message principal dans cette publicité ?
13. Qu'est-ce qui vous a plu le plus ? Qu'est-ce qui vous a le moins plu ?
14. La publicité a-t-elle capté votre attention ? Pourquoi/Pourquoi pas ?
15. Avez-vous cru cette publicité ? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas ?
16. Êtes-vous d'avis que cette publicité s'adresse à vous ? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas ? À qui pensez-vous qu'elle s'adresse ?
17. Qu'est-ce que cette publicité vous a fait ressentir à propos des drogues ? Quel type d'impact a-t-elle eu sur vous ?

18. Feriez-vous quelque chose après avoir vu cette publicité ? Que feriez-vous ? (Sonder : discuter avec vos parents/amis, vous tenir loin des drogues, faire l'essai des drogues, chercher à obtenir plus d'information.)
19. Quelles sont vos impressions au sujet des types de drogues présentées dans la publicité (méthamphétamine, marijuana, etc.)? La publicité vous incite-t-elle à penser différemment à propos d'autres drogues ?
20. Les relations entre les personnes figurant dans cette publicité étaient-elles réalistes ? Pourquoi le pensez-vous (pourquoi ne le pensez-vous pas) ?
21. Vous reconnaissez-vous dans l'acteur(rice) principal de cette publicité ? (Sonder : vêtements, cheveux, façon de parler) Pourquoi/pourquoi pas ?
22. Qu'avez-vous pensé de la musique ?

Publicité 2 à 5 (7 à 10)

RÉPÉTER LES QUESTIONS POUR TOUTES LES PUBLICITÉS

4.0 MOT DE LA FIN (2 MINUTES OU LE TEMPS QUI RESTE)

4. Est-ce que dans sa totalité, une des publicités se démarque pour vous en ce qu'elle vous communique le message de vous tenir loin des drogues ? Laquelle ? Pourquoi ?
5. Dans une ou l'autre de ces publicités, est-ce que quelque chose se démarque comme étant le message de se tenir loin des drogues ?
6. Pensez-vous que le gouvernement du Canada devrait aborder le sujet des drogues avec vous ?

Nous aimerions vous remercier de votre participation à cette étude.

REMERCIER ET TERMINER

POR 08-04

Pn 6348 – YOUTH
PA Creative Testing
Draft 3 - Final

Respondent Name: _____

Home Phone #: _____

Business Phone #: _____

E-Mail: _____

Group #: _____ Recruiter: _____

RECRUIT 10 PER GROUP

TORONTO

GROUP 1- boys
Wednesday
July 9
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 2- boys
Wednesday
July 9
AT 8:00 pm

GROUP 3- girls
Thursday
July 10^H
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 4 -girls
Thursday
July 10
AT 8:00pm

VANCOUVER

GROUP 5- boys
Wednesday
July 16
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 6- boys
Wednesday
July 16
AT 8:00 pm

GROUP 7- girls
Thursday
July 17th,
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 8- girls
Thursday
July 17th,
AT 8:00 pm

MONTREAL

GROUP 9- boys
Monday
July 28
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 10 - boys
Monday
July 28
AT 8:00 pm

GROUP 11 -girls
Tuesday
July 29
AT 5:30 pm

GROUP 12- girls
Tuesday
July 29
AT 8:00 pm

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from Environics Research Group, a national marketing research firm. We're conducting discussion groups on behalf of Health Canada. Up to ten youth participants will be taking part and for their time, participants will receive an honorarium of \$50.00. May we have your permission to ask you some questions to see if you fit in our study?

Yes 1 - CONTINUE
No 2 - **THANK AND TERMINATE**

1) For this project, we need to ensure that we are speaking with a parent or guardian of a child between the ages of 13 and 15 years. Do you have any children living with you in your home who is age 13, 14 or 15?

Yes 1 - CONTINUE
No 2 - **THANK AND TERMINATE**

2) The youth groups will be viewing advertisements about the risks of drugs. Your child's participation in the research is completely voluntary and your decision to allow your child to participate or not will not affect any dealings you or your child may have with Environics or with Health Canada. All the information collected, used and/or disclosed will be used for research purposes only and administered according to the requirements of the Privacy Act. You will also be asked to sign a form to give permission for your child to participate and a waiver to acknowledge that your child may be audio and/or video taped during the session. The session will last a maximum of 2hours. May we ask you and your child some further questions to see if he or she fits in our study?

Yes 1
No 2 - **THANK AND TERMINATE**

3) Do you or does anyone in your household work in any of the following areas:

(READ LIST)...

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
Marketing Research/Marketing Department	1	1
Marketing	2	2
Government of Canada	3	3

IF YES TO ANY THANK AND TERMINATE

4) Could you please tell me what is the last level of education that you have completed? **DO NOT READ**

Elementary school or less (no schooling to grade 7).....	1	MIX OF PARENT EDUCATION LEVELS IN ALL GROUPS
Some high school (grades 8 - 11).....	2	
Completed high school (grades 12 or 13 or OAC).....	3	
Some community college, vocational or trade school (or some CEGEP).....	4	
Completed community college, vocational or trade school (or complete CEGEP) ..	5	
Some university (no degree).....	6	
Completed university (Bachelor's degree).....	7	
Post graduate university (Master's, Ph.D., completed or not).....	8	
DK/NA.....	9	TERMINATE

5) Is the child who would be participating a boy or a girl?

Male	1 – GROUPS 1,2, 5,6, 9,10
Female	2 – GROUPS 3,4,7,8,11,12

6) How old is the child who would be participating?

Under 13 years	1 – TERMINATE
13 years	2
14 years	3
15 years	4
16 years +	5 – TERMINATE

CHILD MUST BE 13,14 OR 15

7) With your permission, would your child be available to attend a discussion on [INSERT DATE] at [Time]? It will last about 2 hours and your child will receive \$50.00 for their time. As I mentioned earlier, these discussions are related to advertising about the risks of drugs. Please note that participants will not be asked any questions about their own possible drug use.

YES	1	CONTINUE
NO	2	THANK & TERMINATE

8) In order to ensure we have a mix of participants in the room, we need to ask them some qualifying questions. May we speak with your son or daughter if it is convenient to speak with them now?

Yes	1	WAIT TO SPEAK TO THE YOUTH
No	2	THANK & TERMINATE
Yes but they are not available	3	RESCHEDULE

ASK ALL YOUTH:

9) Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from Environics Research Group, a national marketing research firm. We're conducting discussion groups on issues related to a Health Canada advertising campaign. Up to ten youths will be taking part and for their time,

participants will receive an honorarium of \$50.00. But before we invite you to attend, we need to ask you a few questions to ensure that we get a good mix and variety of people. May I ask you a few questions?

- Yes **CONTINUE**
- No **THANK AND TERMINATE**

Your participation in the research is voluntary and all your answers will be kept confidential and will be used for research purposes only. We are simply interested in hearing your opinions, no attempt will be made to sell you anything.

10) For the purposes of this project, can you tell me your exact age?

SPECIFY

- _____
- Under 13 years 1 – **TERMINATE**
- 13 years 2
- 14 years 3 - **MIX OF AGE 13, 14 AND 15 IN ALL GROUPS**
- 15 years 4
- 16 years + 5 – **TERMINATE**

It is important that you understand that all of your answers will be kept confidential, including from your parents. Your answers will be used for research purposes only and will help ensure we have a mix of participants in the room.

11) I am going to read a list of statements. For each one I would like you to tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree that the statement describes you. Please remember there are no right or wrong answers. **ROTATE ORDER**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/NR
10a. I believe marijuana is dangerous					
10b. My close friends don't take drugs					
10c. I would lose respect for someone who tries drugs					
10d. My parents know where I am most of the time					
10e. I believe marijuana is more dangerous than smoking cigarettes					
10f. I prefer to be with people who don't take drugs					

TERMINATE IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "STRONGLY AGREE" TO THREE OR MORE ITEMS. OTHERWISE CONTINUE

12a. Could you please tell me, beginning this September, will you be in..?

- Middle school.....1
- High school.....2
- College.....2– **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- University.....3– **THANK AND TERMINATE**

12b. What school are you attending in September?

_____ - **SPECIFY – ONE PER SCHOOL**

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

- Very Comfortable.....1 – **MIN 50% PER GROUP**
- Comfortable.....2
- Fairly Comfortable.....3
- Not Very Comfortable.....4 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- Very Uncomfortable.....5 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**

14a. Have you ever attended a focus group or one to one discussion for which you have received a sum of money, here or elsewhere?

- Yes.....1 – **MAX (50%) PER GROUP**
- No.....2 – **SKIP TO Q. 15**

14b. When did you last attend one of these discussions?

TERMINATE IF IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS

14c. How many focus group or one –to-one discussions have you attended in the past 5 years?

(SPECIFY) IF MORE THAN 5 – THANK AND TERMINATE

14d. Would you please tell me the topics discussed?

IF TOPIC RELATED -THANK AND TERMINATE

15. Have you been invited to another of these focus groups or interviews in the near future?

- Yes.....1 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- No.....2

16 **Confirm gender:**

- Male..... 1 – **GROUPS 1,2, 5,6, 9,10**
- Female..... 2 – **GROUPS 3,4,7,8,11,12**

17 Participants will be asked to watch advertising during the discussion group and use a small keyboard to rate the ads . Is there any reason why you could not participate in this way?

- Yes.....1 – **THANK AND TERMINATE**
- No.....2

NOTE: IF RESPONDENT OFFERS ANY REASON SUCH AS SIGHT OR HEARING PROBLEM, A WRITTEN OR VERBAL LANGUAGE PROBLEM, A CONCERN WITH NOT BEING ABLE TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY – THANK AND TERMINATE

IMPORTANT:

() ASK PARENTS OF CHILDREN 13-15 YEARS

We need you to sign a parental consent document prior to your child's attendance at his or her focus group In this document you will be asked to give your permission for your child to participate. As well, you will be asked to agree that the session will be audio and/or video taped. The tape is produced for research purposes and will be used only by the research firm and will be kept strictly confidential and will be destroyed after the research study is complete.

Where may we send this document? We will have to have this document either brought to the facility with your child or faxed to us prior to the group, if we do not have this consent form your child will NOT be permitted to attend and will NOT be paid.

Fax: _____

Email: _____

Parents Name: _____

INVITATION - IMPORTANT:

The session is 2 hours in length, but we are asking that all participants arrive 10 minutes prior to the start time of the session. Can you able to be at the research facility 10 minutes prior to the session time?

Yes.....1

No.....2 – THANK AND TERMINATE

All participants in this study are asked to bring to the group PICTURE IDENTIFICATION. If you do not bring your personal identification then you will not be able to participate in the session and you will not receive the incentive fee. Will you bring along your ID?

Yes.....1

No.....2 –THANK AND TERMINATE

The group discussion will last approximately 2 hours and we offer each participant a \$50.00 cash gift as a token of our appreciation. I should also tell you that the groups will be audio and - taped for research purposes and members of the research team will be observing the discussion from an adjoining room. Everything you say will be kept confidential.

[] CHECK TO INDICATE YOU HAVE READ THE STATEMENT TO THE RESPONDENT.

INCENTIVE: \$50

LENGTH OF GROUP: 2 hours

LOCATIONS:

TORONTO

Toronto – July 9th
Research House
1867 Yonge Street,
2nd Floor,
416.488.2328

Toronto – July 10th
OSI Focus Search
2345 Yonge Street,
Suite 704,
Toronto
416.962.9109

VANCOUVER

July 16th, July 17th
Vancouver Focus (JMI)
1156 Hornby St
Main Floor
604.682-4292

MONTREAL

July 28th, July 29th
Ad Hoc Research
1250 Guy Street
Suite 900
514.937.4040

POR 08-04/ 6348

15897 – YOUTH
PA Creative Testing

Nom du répondant: _____

à la maison: _____

au travail: _____

Courriel: _____

Groupe #: _____ Recruteur: _____

RECRUTER 10 PAR GROUPE

MONTRÉAL

GROUPE 9 - garçons
Lundi
28 juillet
À 17H30

GROUPE 10- garçons
Lundi
28 juillet
À 20H00

GROUPE 11 - filles
Mardi
29 juillet
À 17H30

GROUPE 12 - filles
Mardi
29 juillet
À 20H00

Bonjour, mon nom est _____. Je vous appelle de Environics Research Group, une firme nationale de recherche en marketing. Nous menons des groupes de discussions sur des questions liées à une campagne publicitaire de Santé Canada. Jusqu'à dix jeunes participants y prendront part et les participants recevront un honoraire de 50.00 \$ pour leur temps, Puis-je avoir votre permission pour vous poser quelques questions afin de voir si vous vous qualifiez pour notre étude ?

Oui 1 - CONTINUER
Non 2 - **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

1) Pour ce projet, nous devons nous assurer de parler avec un parent ou un tuteur d'un enfant âgé entre 13 et 15 ans. Avez-vous des enfants qui vivent avec vous dans votre foyer âgés de 13, 14 ou 15 ans ?

Oui 1 - CONTINUER
Non 2 - **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

2) Les groupes de jeunes visionneront des publicités sur les risques de la drogue. La participation de votre enfant à cette recherche est entièrement volontaire et votre décision de permettre à votre enfant d'y participer ou non n'affectera en rien les interactions que vous ou votre enfant pourriez avoir avec Environics ou avec Santé Canada. Toute information recueillie, utilisée et/ou dévoilée sera utilisée qu'à des fins de recherche seulement et seront traitées conformément aux exigences de la Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels. On vous demandera aussi de signer un formulaire donnant la permission à votre enfant de participer et un formulaire de consentement stipulant que votre enfant pourrait être enregistré sur bande audio et /ou vidéo pendant la session. La session durera un maximum de 2 heures. Puis-je avoir votre permission pour vous poser quelques questions ainsi qu'à votre enfant afin de voir s'il/elle qualifie pour cette étude?

Oui 1
Non 2 - **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

3) Est-ce que vous ou une personne de votre foyer travaillez dans l'un des domaines suivants:

(LIRE LA LISTE)...

	<u>OUI</u>	<u>NON</u>
Recherche en marketing/Département en marketing	1	1
Marketing	2	2
Gouvernement du Canada	3	3

SI OUI À UNE DES MENTIONS CI-DESSUS REMERCIER ET TERMINER

10) Aux fins de ce projet, pouvez-vous me dire votre âge exact ?

PRÉCISER

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Moins de 13 ans | 1 – TERMINER |
| 13 ans | 2 |
| 14 ans | 3 - MIXTE D'ÂGES 13, 14 ET 15 ANS DANS TOUS LES GROUPES |
| 15 ans | 4 |
| 16 ans + | 5 – TERMINER |

Il est important que vous compreniez que toutes vos réponses seront gardées confidentielles, y compris de vos parents. Vos réponses seront utilisées qu'à des fins de recherches seulement et permettra d'assurer un bon partage de participants dans la salle.

11) Je vais vous lire une liste d'énoncés. Pour chacun, je voudrais que vous me disiez si vous êtes fortement d'accord, d'accord, en désaccord ou fortement en désaccord avec l'énoncé. Veuillez vous rappeler qu'il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses. **ROTATION DE L'ORDRE**

	Fortement d'accord	D'accord	En désaccord	Fortement en désaccord	NSP/PDR
11a. Je crois que la marijuana est dangereuse					
11b. Mes amis proches ne prennent pas de drogues					
11c. Je perdrais le respect pour quelqu'un qui essaye de la drogue					
11d. Mes parents savent où je suis la plupart du temps					
11e. Je crois que la marijuana est plus dangereuse que de fumer des cigarettes					
11f. Je préfère être avec des gens qui ne prennent pas de drogues					

TERMINER SI LE RÉPONDANT EST "FORTEMENT D'ACCORD" À TROIS OU PLUS DES ÉNONCÉS. SINON CONTINUER

12a. Pourriez-vous s'il vous plaît me dire, au début de septembre, serez-vous en ...?

- École Secondaire..... 1
- Cejep 2
- Collège..... 3 – **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**
- Université..... 4 – **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

12b. Quelle école allez-vous fréquenter en septembre?

_____ - **PRÉCISER – UN PAR ÉCOLE**

13. On demande aux participants dans un groupe de discussion d'exprimer leurs opinions et leurs pensées. À quel point êtes-vous confortable d'exprimer votre opinion devant les autres? Êtes-vous....

- Très confortable..... 1 – **MIN 50% PAR GROUPE**
- Confortable..... 2
- Assez confortable..... 3
- Pas très confortable..... 4 - **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**
- Très inconfortable..... 5 - **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**

14a. Avez-vous déjà participé à un groupe de discussion ou à une entrevue face-à-face pour lequel vous avez reçu une somme d'argent, ici ou ailleurs?

Oui.....1 – **MAX (50%) PAR GROUPE**
Non.....2 – **PASSER À LA Q. 15**

14b. À quand remonte votre dernière participation à une de ces discussions?

TERMINER SI AU COURS DES 6 DERNIERS MOIS

14c. À combien de groupes ou d'entrevues face-à-face avez-vous participé au cours des 5 dernières années?

(PRÉCISER) SI PLUS DE 5 – REMERCIER ET TERMINER

14d. De quels sujets avez-vous discuté?

SI SUJET RELIÉ – REMERCIER ET TERMINER

15. Avez-vous été invité à participer à un de ces groupes de discussion ou entrevues face-à-face prochainement?

Oui.....1 – **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**
Non.....2

16 **Confirmer le sexe:**

Homme..... 1 – **GROUPE 9,10**
Femme..... 2 – **GROUPE 11,12**

17 Les participants seront invités à regarder des publicités pendant le groupe de discussion et à utiliser un petit clavier pour évaluer les annonces. Y a-t-il une raison quelconque pour laquelle vous ne pourriez pas participer de cette façon?

Oui.....1 – **REMERCIER ET TERMINER**
Non.....2

NOTE: SI LE RÉPONDANT MENTIONNE UN PROBLÈME VISUEL OU AUDITIF, UN PROBLÈME À ÉCRIRE OU À S'EXPRIMER, UN PROBLÈME À COMMUNIQUER DE FAÇON EFFICACE, REMERCIER ET TERMINER

IMPORTANT:

() DEMANDER AUX PARENTS D'ENFANTS DE 13-15 ANS

Nous devons vous faire signer un document de consentement parental avant la participation de votre enfant à son groupe de discussion. Dans ce document, on vous demandera de donner votre permission pour que votre enfant participe. En plus, on vous demandera d'accepter que la session soit enregistrée sur bande audio et /ou vidéo. La bande est produite à des fins de recherche et ne sera utilisée que par la firme de recherche et sera gardée strictement confidentielle et sera détruite après que l'étude de recherche soit terminée.

Où pouvons-nous vous faire parvenir ce document? Nous devons récupérer ce document, soit apporté à la salle de recherche par votre enfant ou soit télécopié avant le groupe de discussion. Si nous n'avons pas ce formulaire de consentement, votre enfant ne sera PAS autorisé à participer au groupe de discussion et ne sera PAS payé.

Télécopieur: _____

Courriel: _____

Nom du parent: _____

INVITATION - IMPORTANT:

La session durera 2 heures mais nous demandons à tous les participants d'arriver 10 minutes avant le début de la session. Est- il possible pour vous d'être présent 10 minutes avant le début de la session?

Oui.....1

Non.....2 – REMERCIER ET TERMINER

On demande à tous les participants de cette étude de montrer une pièce D'IDENTITÉ AVEC PHOTO. Si vous n'apportez pas votre pièce d'identité, vous ne pourrez pas participer à ce groupe et vous ne serez pas rémunéré. Êtes-vous en mesure d'avoir une pièce d'identité avec vous?

Oui.....1

Non.....2 – REMERCIER ET TERMINER

Le groupe de discussion durera environ 2 heures et nous remettrons à chaque répondant la somme de **50.00 \$** en argent en guise de remerciement. Je dois aussi mentionner que les groupes seront enregistrés sur bande audio pour des fins de recherche et que des membres de l'équipe de recherche observeront la discussion d'une salle voisine. Tout ce que vous direz restera confidentiel.

[] **COCHEZ POUR INDIQUER QUE VOUS AVEZ LU L'ÉNONCÉ AU RÉPONDANT.**

INCITATIF: 50\$

DURÉE DU GROUPE: 2 heures

ENDROIT:

MONTRÉAL

28 et 29 juillet

Ad Hoc Recherche

1250, rue Guy

Bureau 900

514.937.4040