

# Why Let Good Times Go Bad?

## Campaign Evaluation



---

MILLWARD BROWN  
DECEMBER 2012

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Millward Brown, an independent market research company has been commissioned to evaluate 'Why let good times go bad' since 2009. This paper evaluates the current creative that launched in 2011. The achievements of the 'Why let good times go bad' campaign has been evaluated against the following objectives:

- To decrease the incidence of drunken behaviour by challenging Young Adults desires and motivations to get drunk
- To raise awareness of the harms associated with drunken behaviours
- To increase adoption of tips and tools so that Young Adults can stay more in control of their drinking

The objectives of the research were to evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign in terms of:

- Generating awareness
- Likely impact on attitudes to drinking
- Likely effect on behaviour of the target group

The evaluation did not aim to evaluate actual behavioural effects, such as a reduction in alcohol consumption, or actual adoption of 'tips' to moderate alcohol consumption among those seeing the campaign.

### SURVEY METHOD

In 2011, 1000 18-24 year olds were recruited from Millward Brown's online panel provider, Lightspeed Research, to take part in a computer aided web based interview. This study was repeated again in 2012, recruiting a new sample of 1000 18-24 year olds from the same online panel. The 2012 study recruited different respondents to those who completed the 2011 research.

In both 2011 and 2012 the sample was recruited to be nationally representative of 18-24 year olds in terms of gender, region, income and working status. Furthermore all respondents needed to...

- Live, work or go out regularly in large towns or cities.

- Consume alcohol at least once a month.
- Go out in bars/pubs/clubs at least once a week.

Fieldwork was conducted between 26th September and 15th October 2011, 3 weeks after the main Out Of Home (OOH) campaign burst. At this point in time research participants had had the opportunity to see 60% of the media activity. In 2012, the research was conducted at a similar time in the phasing of the campaign, between 28<sup>th</sup> September and 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012. In the 2012 study research participants had the opportunity to see 100% of the media activity for that burst of advertising.

### MEASURING PERFORMANCE AND TRACKING CHANGE

With consistent sample sizes of 1000 respondents per year, significance (T-tests) were applied at 95% confidence to highlight 'significant' changes year on year. All differences observed in this summary between the 2011 and 2012 study are significant unless otherwise stated.

Where relevant in order to examine meaningful comparisons, responses have been benchmarked against Millward Brown's advertising norms; anonymously compiled from over 84,000 advertising campaigns.

### MAIN SURVEY FINDINGS – CLAIMED DRINKING BEHAVIOURS & RESPONSIBLE DRINKING ATTITUDES

Claimed intentional drunkenness remains highly prevalent amongst research participants, with 48% claiming to go out with the intention of getting drunk 'at least once a week' in 2012. A similar level was observed in 2011 with 50% recording this behaviour (this difference not representing a statistically significant change).

While attitudes to 'irresponsible' drinking remain entrenched amongst a minority of participants, fewer agreed with the statement 'I don't have to get drunk to have a good night out' in 2012 (70%) than seen in 2011 80% (this difference representing a statistically significant change).

These attitudes and behaviours persist despite wider evidence suggesting actual total alcohol consumption

amongst young people is in decline (NHS Lifestyle statistics: England General Lifestyle Survey 2007-2010<sup>i</sup>).

#### CLAIMED TIP ADOPTION

Prior to being exposed to any campaign materials, respondents were asked how often, if at all, they adopted different strategies to control the effects of alcohol when going out drinking.

Amongst all participants, 91% claimed to at least sometimes 'drink at their own pace', whilst 92% 'eat before drinking' at least sometimes.

However, only 44% claimed to 'alternate alcoholic drinks' at least sometimes and similarly 50% claimed to 'turn down an alcoholic drink'. Our interpretation of these observed differences is that strategies such as 'avoiding a round' or 'turning down an alcoholic drink' may have greater potential for negative social judgments amongst peer groups.

In addition to this, Men in our sample were significantly less likely than Women to adopt the control strategies measured.

#### THE 'WHY LET GOOD TIMES GO BAD CAMPAIGN?'

Research participants were exposed to the different stimulus used within the campaign; out of home (posters), online, mobile and Facebook advertising materials. Following claimed recognition questions, respondents were asked a series of diagnostic questions on the campaign materials.

It can be observed that a higher proportion of campaign activity had been aired at the time of research in 2012 (compared with 2011). However, prompted awareness of the campaign posters was at 39% in 2012, increasing significantly from 27% in 2011. Furthermore, awareness of the Drinkaware.co.uk website was at 84%, remaining stable on the 85% observed in 2011.

Respondents were asked to think about all the advertising material together and record everything they 'liked' about the campaign. The response was primarily positive, with 82% 'liking' a feature of the campaign, significantly above the UK Millward Brown benchmark of 72%. Participants spontaneously referenced the 'direct', 'interesting' and 'relevant' aspects of the advertising.

Following exposure to the campaign 82% agreed 'it made the point in an interesting way' and 75% agreed with the statement 'it was very eye catching'.

The intended messaging of the campaign was accessed by the majority of participants, with 66% claiming when prompted, that the advertising gave the impression 'it's easy for a good night to turn bad when you drink too much'. This is similar to the 63% observed in 2011. However, 79% also agreed that 'it reminded me of something I already knew'.

#### OUTCOMES OF CAMPAIGN EXPOSURE

Claimed intention to drink differently remains a considerable challenge. In 2012, 13% of all survey respondents claimed to be 'much more likely' to consider drinking differently, unchanged from 2011 levels of 12%.

Respondents were also asked whether they had adopted any of the tips as a result of seeing the advertising campaign. Amongst those who had recalled seeing the campaign materials, 76% claimed to have adopted at least one of tips, unchanged from 79% in 2011.

'Eating a proper meal before going out drinking' (59%) and 'drinking at your own pace rather than keeping up with others' (58%) were the tips most likely claimed as adopted as a result of seeing the advertising. Less likely were 'making sure I regularly have a water or soft drink' (38%) and 'avoiding being in rounds' (36%).

One quarter (25%) claimed to have visited [www.drinkaware.co.uk](http://www.drinkaware.co.uk) as a result of seeing the advertising.

#### PRIMARY MILLWARD BROWN RECOMMENDATION FOR 2013

The Millward Brown point of view is that future control strategies need to be positioned carefully so as to not simply further behaviours that young people may subjectively or 'easily' feel they already do; for example 'pacing themselves whilst drinking'. However, it is very challenging through advertising to instill behaviour change that could have negative social implications such as 'turning down an alcoholic drink', particularly amongst Young People with entrenched 'irresponsible' attitudes to alcohol. Therefore the control strategies for future

creative evolution need to be realistic, accessible and simple.

There is also a need to not put at risk what currently works well within the campaign; a tone of communication that neither shocks nor is too 'familiar' amongst a difficult to engage audience.

#### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Key Performance Indicators (Question Statements)	2011	2012
Drink with the specific intention to get drunk (at least once a week)	50%	48%
Eat before you start drinking (usually)	71%	64% ↓
Alternate alcoholic drinks with water or soft drinks (usually)	10%	13% ↑
Pace yourself / drink at your own pace (usually)*	31%	59% ↑
<i>*questionnaire wording changed from 2011/2012</i>		
Agree: I don't have to get drunk to have a good night out	80%	70% ↓
Prompted recall of 'Why let good times go bad'?	27%	39% ↑
Agree: Very/quite likely to consider drinking differently	56%	58%
Claim to have adopted a tip* (Amongst Campaign Recognisers)	79%	76%
<i>*More tips included in questionnaire coverage in 2012 study</i>		

#### MILLWARD BROWN CONTACTS

Alex Duckett | Account Insight Manager | Brand & Comms Practice | **Millward Brown** | Olympus Avenue, Tachbrook Park, Warwick CV34 6RJ | t: +44 (0) 1926 826361 | m: +44 (0) 7920295595 | [www.millwardbrown.com](http://www.millwardbrown.com)

Hazel Freeman | Group Account Director | Brand & Comms Practice | **Millward Brown** | Olympus Avenue, Tachbrook Park, Warwick CV34 6RJ t: +44 (0) 1926 826 444 | f: +44 (0) 1926 704 444 | m: +44 (0) 7768 021 971 | [www.millwardbrown.com](http://www.millwardbrown.com)

↑↓ Significant at 95% against previous dip

<sup>i</sup> Statistics on Alcohol (England) 2012  
The NHS Information Centre (Lifestyle statistics)