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Executive Summary

Background and objectives of the campaign
The Central Australian Alcohol Public Awareness Campaign (CAAPAC) began in January 2011. The four key objectives of the campaign were:
- To demonstrate that excessive alcohol consumption is a whole of population issue.
- Demonstrate to the community the impact that excessive alcohol consumption has on family structures.
- Educate the community about the impact of alcohol consumption on the individual’s health and wellbeing.
- Inform the general public that, if excessive alcohol consumption is interfering with their own life or the lives of people close to them, that help is available, to individuals, partners, or families should they want to give up drinking, help someone else give up or learn to drink at safer levels.

The campaign used a web-centric strategy to provide information about alcohol and alcohol consumption targeted at young people, and as a portal for the 115 media entries that were created by young people. A competition selected 11 winners and subsequently the chosen entries were publicised through TV, radio and posters, as well as online and mobile memes May 2011 – January 2012.

The campaign used the tag line ‘Tell ‘em that’s enough’ in all media with five by-lines which could be used to support seven distinct secondary messages around population health, domestic violence, binge drinking and safe drinking.

Evaluation framework
This evaluation was commissioned by the CAAPAC Steering Committee towards the conclusion of the advertising stage of the ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ campaign in November 2011. The evaluation set out to measure:
- Knowledge, attitudes and reported behaviour change in relation to alcohol;
- Campaign reach and brand recognition;
- The strategy of using a web-centric approach, youth created campaign content and the engagement of young people;
- NT ADIS contact;
- Value for money.
**Methodology**

- The surveys were compiled by the evaluation team in consultation with the CAAPAC committee, and allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data collection.
- Between January and May 2012, during and following the final month when the radio and TV advertising was being aired:
  - 176 surveys were undertaken with competition participants, young people who were not competition participants, and adults from the general public in Alice Springs, Tennant Creek, Yuendumu and Docker River (Kaltukatjara).
  - 3 focus groups were carried out with 11 young people who took part in the competition from Centralian Senior College, Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, and with the Youth Committee from Alice Springs who reviewed the website. Individual discussions were also held with 2 young people who took part in the competition from Tennant Creek and Yuendumu.

**Key results**

**Knowledge**

- Young people who took part in the campaign competition, and wider youth, had an increased knowledge of the risks of alcohol consumption in relation to young people, pregnant women and P-plater and Learner drivers; however there was a negative shift in their understanding of who was responsible for the high level of drinking in the NT, with more young people saying that this was due to people drinking in public places post-campaign.
- Youth respondents demonstrated very good knowledge (no baseline data available) with regard to understanding the impact of alcohol on domestic violence offences, and the levels of consumption that increases the risk of harm to adults.
- Almost 70% of youth were able to list at least one place where people can get help about alcohol, with Headspace the most frequently listed (a youth specific mental health service).
- 90% of competition participants, 60% of non-competition youth and 45% of the general public (18+ years) said they agreed slightly or strongly that they knew how to get help for themselves or someone else through the website or phone number.
**Attitudes**

- Three-quarters of the youth respondents thought it should be everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking.
- 70% strongly agreed that drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends, as well as get you into trouble or danger when you’re out.
- Just under 80% of the youth respondents strongly agreed that individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk.

**Behaviour**

- Over one third of all respondents reported that the campaign adverts did make them ‘think or do anything differently’; with young people more likely to report the campaign had this effect. Adult respondents were more likely to list a thought or opinion about ‘others’ who drink, and youth were more likely to list a behaviour change in themselves and encouraging someone else to change behaviour.
- 29% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them/ someone they knew change their drinking habits and a further 15% disagreed slightly. 9% strongly agreed, 13% agreed slightly and 35% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 32% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them talk to their family or friends about alcohol with a further 7% disagreeing slightly; 14% strongly agreed, 19% agreed slightly and 29% neither agreed nor disagreed.

**Reach and brand recognition**

- Over three-quarters of all respondents had seen or heard some advertising about alcohol and the effects of drinking too much, and over 70% reported they had had seen or heard any of the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts, with youth respondents more likely to report having seen the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts than adults.
Just under 80% of all respondents said they had seen the campaign logo or heard the slogan, and again youth respondents were more likely to report having seen the logo or heard the slogan than adults.

75% of all respondents had seen the adverts on TV, over 50% had seen posters, 25% had heard adverts on radio, 7% had seen the website and 6% had seen it through social networking. Youth were more likely to have been exposed to the campaign via radio, website and social networking and adult public were more likely to have seen it on TV.

Focus Group discussions and qualitative responses have shown some confusion over the specific meaning in the campaign slogan. ‘That’s Enough’ was interpreted by some as a call for problem drinkers to stop drinking rather than encouraging family or friends to drink within safe and healthy limits. It is also noted that there was some confusion between the ‘Enough is Enough’ anti-violence campaign with a number of respondents using this wording.

**Strategy of web-centric approach**

- Analysis of the website showed that the majority of activity on the campaign website was around the competition phase of the campaign.
- Over one third of visits to the website were referred from Facebook.
- There were 3,033 unique visitors to the website between 25th January 2011 and 25th January 2012.
- There was a slight increase in unique visitors to the website when the TV and radio commercials began to be aired in September 2011, though website usage dropped between November 2011 and February 2012, covering the school holiday period, and then slightly increased again in March 2012 after the commercials has ceased.
- Increased website use when competition winners were announced which suggests good viewership competition participants and possibly family and friends.
- The top pages visited shows that the video content gained the majority of attention with the Home Page being well visited, but also the factual information page which ranked third overall.
- The Facebook page for the campaign had 44 ‘Likes’ and one comment from a member of the public since it was set up.
Strategy of youth created content

- Just over 45% of all respondents who had seen any of the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts could accurately describe the advert they saw, with the youth respondents slightly more likely to have accurate recall compared with 18+ public.
- Just under 40% of all respondents accurately asserted the campaign message, with a similar rate of accuracy in general public 18+ and youth respondents.
- Over half of all respondents thought the campaign was targeted at ‘young people’, over 20% thought it was targeted at ‘Indigenous people’, 25% thought ‘everybody’ and over 10% thought ‘problem drinkers’. General public 18+ were more likely than youth respondents to say ‘Indigenous’ and young people were more likely than public 18+ to say ‘everybody’ and ‘adults’.

Engagement of young people

- A quarter of youth respondents reported they ‘sometimes’ told someone ‘That’s enough’ when they thought they should not drink anymore alcohol, 16% said they do this ‘very often’ and 16% said they do this ‘always’. All of the competition participants reported that they had said this at least once or twice.
- Focus Group discussions highlighted that the young people enjoyed taking part in the campaign.
- Focus Group participants reported learning more about alcohol and places to get help, though they reported anecdotally that many of the ‘facts’ they had reviewed on the website had been forgotten.

Contact with ADIS

- Activity data from the Alcohol and Drug Information Service (ADIS) telephone helpline did not demonstrate any correlation with the TV and radio commercial placements.
Recommendations

1. Target a specific group of the population
2. Consult and involve the target audience
3. Use one clear slogan that supports one key message
4. Use a strategy suitable for the target audience
5. Highlight information about local services
6. Evaluate efficacy


**Background**

**Campaign goals and objectives**

The Central Australian Alcohol Public Awareness Campaign (CAAPAC) began in January 2011 with three overarching goals:

1. Reduce the incidence of violence, anti-social behaviour, acute injury and chronic illness by increasing public awareness about the impact that excessive alcohol consumption has on individual, family, social, economic and community structures in Central Australia.

2. Increase awareness of the availability of and referral pathways to, support services such as Safe and Sober, ADSCA, DASA, CAAAAPU, BRADAG & Holyoake and provide a reference point for people to seek help.

3. Challenge existing paradigms and commence a process of changing the discourse in Alice Springs and Tennant Creek so that excessive alcohol consumption is considered to be a whole of community problem requiring whole of community commitment and effort.

The campaign had four key objectives:

**Objective 1**

To demonstrate that excessive alcohol consumption is a whole of population issue.

**Strategy 1.1**

Inform the community that per capita alcohol consumption in the NT (specifically Alice Springs and Tennant Creek) is much higher than the National Average and needs to be reduced to improve health outcomes, improve public safety and protect our lifestyle.

**Strategy 1.2**

Demonstrate that despite the overt public drinking by predominantly Indigenous people in and around Alice Springs, non-Indigenous alcohol consumption, albeit more private, is also too high and leads to high rates of alcohol related chronic illness, social dysfunction, employment incapacity and economic hardship.

**Strategy 1.3**

Inform and educate the broader community and visitors to Alice Springs and Tennant Creek that a reduction in alcohol related anti-social behaviour is achieved by reducing demand, reducing supply and reducing harm.
Objective 2
Demonstrate to the community the impact that excessive alcohol consumption has on family structures.

Strategy 2.1
Show that excessive alcohol consumption can lead to family violence, trauma and family break up.

Strategy 2.2
Show that excessive alcohol consumption can lead to poverty and family/child neglect.

Objective 3
Educate the community about the impact of alcohol consumption on the individual’s health and wellbeing

Strategy 3.1
Demonstrate that sustained alcohol consumption and or binge drinking can lead to acute injury, chronic illness, lost time, social dislocation and economic hardship.

Strategy 3.2
Inform the general public about safe levels of alcohol consumption.

Objective 4
Inform the general public that, if excessive alcohol consumption is interfering with their own life or the lives of people close to them, that help is available, to individuals, partners, or families should they want to give up drinking, help someone else give up or learn to drink at safer levels

Strategy 4.1
Link to the 24 hour free call NT Alcohol and Drug Information Service (NT ADIS) and develop referral pathways to Central Australian based AOD service providers.
Campaign approach

“This was the first completely web centred competition and campaign in Central Australia, that gives voice to young people and enables them to influence the way we all think about grog.” John Gaynor- Alcohol and Drug Services of Central Australia

Stage 1 of the campaign began in January 2011 with the development of the campaign website at ‘thatsenough.com.au’, and targeted young people aged 13 to 25 years living in Central Australia, aiming to encourage them to understand through online research the impact of alcohol on our community. The web-centric campaign set out to communicate key alcohol ‘supply, demand and harm reduction’ messages with the consistent theme “Tell ‘Em That’s Enough”. Young people were engaged in creating multimedia entries advocating the campaign’s key message in four categories:

- A HDTV video competition to produce 15 & 30 second TV commercials;
- A mobile phone video competition to produce micro films of up to 30 seconds;
- A poster competition and;
- An audio competition to develop 15 second radio advertisements.

Prize winners were selected in each category in April 2011, and the campaign entered stage 2 in May 2011 to publicise the young people’s creations via website, TV, radio, YouTube, Facebook, advertisement posters and mobile sharing, thus educating and empowering the broader community as a secondary audience.

For the purpose of avoiding message dilution, it was proposed that the campaign focused on the following:

1. Impact on the community:
   a) The disproportionate rate of alcohol consumption in Central Australia compared to national levels and its relationship to anti-social behaviour and family violence in our community;
   b) Acknowledgment that excessive alcohol consumption has a negative impact on all cohorts of the community and is not just a problem contained to those who we see drinking in public places; and
   c) That successful amelioration of excessive alcohol consumption is achieved by an interdependent strategy of supply reduction, demand reduction and harm reduction.
2. Impact on the family:
Damage that excessive alcohol consumption can do to family structures by being an underlying causal factor of 1) family violence and family breakdown and 2) family neglect.

3. Impact on the Individual:
Demonstrate 1) the consequences of excessive alcohol consumption on the health and welfare of the individual, 2) the economic impact and 3) the social impacts.

It was proposed that the approach focussed on a series of scenarios that provide encouragement, enable or give license to individuals to give positive effect or impact upon another’s life, a focus on 'others' rather than 'self'.

**Campaign message**

While attempting to communicate a range of messages there was one singular key message across all media: “tell ’em that’s enough”.

In addition, key contact locations such as the NT ADIS 24 hour phone line and the website address were communicated on all media.

It was anticipated that the following secondary messages would be derived from the competition entries:

- Population health message – “**Responsible Drinking means a healthier and safer town for everyone. Tell your family, tell your friends, tell ’em that’s enough**”
- Population health message – “**Responsible Drinking is everyone’s business. tell your family, tell your friends, tell ’em that’s enough**”.
- Domestic violence message - If family members drink too much it can lead to family violence and family breakdown. “**Keep your family strong, tell ’em that’s enough**”
- Domestic violence message - When your mates or family drink too much it can lead to financial hardship and family neglect. “**Keep your family strong, tell ’em that’s enough**”
- Binge Drinking message - Responsible drinking means a healthier and safer town for everyone. Binge-drinking can have serious negative consequences for them socially, economically and biologically. “**Take control, limit the alcohol. Tell ’em that’s enough**” (‘Take control limit the alcohol’ is a tag line from the NT Early Intervention Pilot Program)
- Safe Drinking message - helping your mates and family members to drink safely is good for your mates and your family's health and finances. **Take control, limit the alcohol, tell ’em that’s enough**
• Safe Drinking message - help your friends drink sensibly and stay out of trouble or they risk being shamed and socially isolated. “if they behave like idiots, they’re on their own, so tell ’em that’s enough (this tag line was included at the request of Alcohol Accords NT and was subsequently excluded by CAAPAC as this message was not consistent with the aims of this campaign).

Campaign media
There were 115 entries to the competition, from young people in Alice Springs, Docker River, and Yuendumu.

HDTV
6 advertisements were aired on Southern Cross TV May 2011- January 2012. In total the TV advertisements were aired 239 times over the entirety of the campaign. These were:
• “Alcohol can effect anyone”
• “Live with alcohol not because of it”
• “Don’t risk it”
• “Pama Yimi”
• “Find the right path”
• “Sensible Drinking is everyone’s business”

Audio/ radio
3 advertisements were played on Sun FM and CAAMA radio May 2011- January 2012. In total 445 radio advertisements were aired on CAAMA and 529 were aired on Sun FM over the entirety of the campaign. These were:
• “That’s Enough”
Posters
2 Posters were printed and distributed in pubs, clubs, bars and youth & health services around central Australia as well as in the Advocate May 2011-January 2012. These were:

- “Keep your Family Strong”
- “Don’t Make headlines for the wrong reasons”

Evaluation framework
The purpose of the evaluation is to independently evaluate:

1. The impact of the campaign on the knowledge of young people aged 13-25 years living in Central Australia (as defined) in relation to Alcohol.
2. Attitudinal change amongst competition participants to alcohol and the impact of alcohol on our community.
3. Any corresponding behaviour change associated with altered attitudes.
4. Recognition of the campaign brand “tell ’em that’s enough” amongst:
   a. Competition participants
   b. Non-competition participants aged 13 – 25 years
c. Consumers of alcohol living in or visiting Central Australia

5. The strategy of using a web-centric approach as the driver for a public awareness campaign rather than the more traditional mass media campaign

6. The strategy of encouraging young people to create the campaign content rather than using more traditional means of creating and producing campaign content.

7. The impact of this website campaign on engagement of young people

8. The impact of the campaign on contact with NT ADIS & subsequent referrals.

9. Campaign value for money
Methodology

We were commissioned by the CAAPAC Steering Committee to carry out an evaluation in November 2011, towards the conclusion of the advertising stage of the ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ campaign.

The evaluation set out to measure the following:

1. The impact of the campaign on the knowledge of young people aged 13-25 years living in Central Australia (as defined) in relation to Alcohol.
   - assess competition participant’s knowledge on alcohol, and the social and physiological impacts of excessive alcohol consumption on individuals and the community, using Google Analytics results from the pre and post quiz on the campaign website, and individual surveys, to establish knowledge prior to and after navigating the website and taking part in the campaign;
   - assess knowledge of non-competition participant youth on alcohol, and the social and physiological impacts of excessive alcohol consumption on individuals and the community, using individual surveys. These young people may or may not have been exposed to campaign media; comparisons can be made between the knowledge of these youth and competition participants.

2. Attitudinal change amongst competition participants to alcohol and the impact of alcohol on our community.
   - consider attitudes and campaign associated attitudinal change around alcohol and the impact of excessive alcohol consumption on individuals and the community, using individual surveys with non-competition participant youth, as well as focus groups with competition participants. Young people will be invited to participate from schools and youth organisations in Alice Springs, Yuendumu, and Docker River.

3. Any corresponding behaviour change associated with altered attitudes.
   - consider self-reported behaviour changes relating to alcohol of young people through individual surveys and focus group discussions.

4. Recognition of the campaign brand “Tell ‘Em That’s Enough” amongst:
   a. Competition participants
      - assess recognition of campaign branding, such as the ‘That’s Enough’ (TE) logo and ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ slogan; and campaign message, using individual surveys.
   b. Non-competition participants aged 13 – 25 years
• assess recognition of campaign branding, such as the TE logo and ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ slogan; and campaign message, using individual surveys. Assessing campaign reach through awareness of TV commercials/ radio advertisements/ mobile phone memes/ YouTube and Facebook hits/ posters/ website.

c. Consumers of alcohol living in or visiting Central Australia
• assess recognition of campaign branding, such as the TE logo and ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ slogan; and campaign message, using individual surveys across four different licensed premises in Alice Springs and Tennant Creek aimed at age 18+ individuals.

5. The strategy of using a web-centric approach as the driver for a public awareness campaign rather than the more traditional mass media campaign.
• carry out a desktop analysis of website usage and competition uptake by age and gender using Google Analytics;
• assess the effectiveness of the campaign (TV commercials/ radio advertisements/ mobile phone memes/ YouTube and Facebook hits/ posters/ website) as perceived by competition participants and wider youth through individual surveys and focus groups;
• assess the reach of the campaign through brand recognition as outlined above;
• assess knowledge, attitudes and behaviour change of youth as a result of the campaign as outlined above;
• perform a literature review to compare outcomes with other more traditional mass media campaigns.

6. The strategy of encouraging young people to create the campaign content rather than using more traditional means of creating and producing campaign content.
• assess the campaign reach through analysis of mobile phone memes, YouTube and Facebook hits, using individual surveys and desktop analysis;
• consider young people’s views on the media content and effectiveness of the campaign through individual surveys and focus groups.

7. The impact of this website campaign on engagement of young people
• carry out a desktop analysis of website usage by age and gender and competition uptake using Google Analytics;
• assess the campaign reach through desktop analysis of mobile phone memes, YouTube and Facebook hits; and assess awareness of TV commercials/ radio advertisements/ posters/ website, using the individual surveys;
• ascertain accessibility and effectiveness of the website campaign, and youth involvement, in educating young people around alcohol and related issues, using focus groups in areas listed in point 2 above, plus Tennant Creek.
8. The impact of the campaign on contact with NT Alcohol and Drug Information Service (ADIS) & subsequent referrals.
   - analyse information collected from ADIS about numbers contacting them and referrals made to central Australian AOD service providers;
   - assess young people’s knowledge of where help can be sought around alcohol, using individual surveys.

9. Campaign value for money
   - assess level of knowledge, attitudes, behavioural change, and campaign reach compiled from the desktop analyses, individual surveys and focus groups and contrast with outcomes of similar campaigns; set against financial impact of alcohol-related health-costs and societal impacts.

**Baseline data**
The evaluation sought to compare data with some information collected through the campaign website when competition entrants submitted entries. The website administered two different quizzes:

The first set of questions was a ‘knowledge quiz’ and asked 7 ‘true/ false’ questions. The participants did not get any feedback about the accuracy of their answers, and the answers to these questions could not be found directly on the website.

The questions were:
1. *Territorians (over 14 years) drink approximately 15 litres of pure alcohol each year compared to 9.02 litres for the rest of Australia.*
2. *The high level of drinking in the NT is due to people who drink in public areas.*
3. *A P-Plater or Learner driver can have a legal blood alcohol content (BAC) of 0.1*
4. *The NT adults are the biggest grog drinkers in the world.*
5. *There is no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant.*
6. *It is safe for young people to drink alcohol in moderation with no risks to their health or safety.*
7. *Almost 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are alcohol-related.*

The second set of questions was an ‘educational quiz’ consisting of 8 questions. All answers could easily be found on the website and respondents weren’t able to continue unless all questions were answered correctly on each page; thus the aim was to prompt participants to read the information on the site. *(See Appendix 1 for this quiz).*
All data was lost during a website crash in June 2011, but fortunately some of this data had been recorded by the website host in their own database. Subsequently we can compare results for 5 of the questions.

The exact number who submitted answers for this baseline quiz is not known, but the website host recalls it was around 300, which approximately matches up to the number of page views to the registration page on the website where the quiz was submitted (264).

**Design**

The campaign website registered at www.thatsenough.com.au was analysed for the period 25 January 2011 – 25 January 2012. Key metrics in terms of activity and usage of the site were gathered from the Google Analytics web interface and compared to the overall campaign activity to look at the effectiveness of the web-centric strategy. Analysing mobile phone memes and YouTube hits had initially been included in the methodology, but on undertaking the desktop analysis it was established there was no way of measuring the forwarding of campaign media on mobile phones, except that Question 17 in the survey asked where people had seen the advert – where they could state mobile phone. Additionally, YouTube hosted the display of TV adverts through the website, and the only advantage of reporting on the hits to the YouTube pages was to differentiate between the numbers of views of each advert; the data was aggregated as a total rather than making this distinction as this information was not relevant to the outcomes being measured in the evaluation.

The evaluation used face to face surveys as opposed to telephone administered and postal surveys, for a higher response rate and more complete population coverage for sampling (Bowling 2005), including people who don’t speak English as a first language, and those with lower levels of literacy. Focus group discussions were held to gather qualitative views from competition participants in a less structured format.

The surveys were compiled by the evaluation team in consultation with the CAAPAC committee, and allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data collection (See Appendix 4 for surveys). They were designed to assess the reach and resultant knowledge and attitudes around the campaign, addressing the four key objectives of the campaign, and were designed with overlapping sections, allowing for wide comparison without introducing bias, for the different participant groups:

- competition participants aged 13-25 years;
- non-competition participants aged 13 – 25 years;
and consumers of alcohol living in or visiting Central Australia aged 18+.
(After discussion with CAAPAC about the adult cohort, we agreed to survey the general population as well in the mall and shopping centres, rather than just consumers of alcohol in licensed premises as set out in the framework).

The survey for competition participants was designed to assess views on the effectiveness of the campaign, campaign reach and brand recognition, and some key knowledge and attitude markers using six of the baseline quiz questions (all but question 1 which was omitted to make the survey more succinct), and was the same for non-competition youth except for the questions pertaining to campaign reach, which were posed differently because the campaign participants were exposed to the campaign material in a different way (i.e. participation in content creation).

The survey for adults, including consumers of alcohol in licensed premises, were specifically relating to campaign reach and brand recognition, and views of the campaign message, excluding questions on knowledge and attitudes to make a shorter survey to increase the response rate. To gain a measure of advertising recognition, respondents were told the slogan, and shown the brand logo. Sample posters and TV adverts were also shown.

It was proposed that the surveys would be administered one to one by the evaluators, with a set of guidelines and alternative explanations for questions used by the evaluators (see Appendix 3.1-3.4 for survey and focus group methodology, survey script and additional or alternative explanations in surveys), in order to standardise the interviews and minimise biases. However in undertaking the surveys some young people would not participate unless they could do so with their friend/friends. As such some of the surveys were self-completed by youth respondents, and due to low literacy levels some were completed by the evaluators with small groups giving their answers verbally. It is acknowledged that this may have some impact on the reliability and validity of the results. The evaluators minimised this as much as possible by giving careful explanation of the surveys to those self-completing, being present throughout the process to explain any questions they did not understand, request that they not confer on their answers, highlight the importance of the respondents giving their own answers and that it did not matter if they got the knowledge questions ‘wrong’, and encouraged them to be honest if they had a different view to their peers. One group conferred throughout and a number of the students indicated they were not taking the survey seriously, and so all the surveys from this group were excluded from the analysis.
Participation was optional and consent was gained after giving information (see Appendix 2.1 and 2.2 for participant and parent information sheets). All questions were optional, and some respondents did not have time to complete the survey in full, or got bored, as such the results do not have the total sample responses to all questions.

The focus groups were conducted with competition participants to establish views on the effectiveness and accessibility of the campaign, youth engagement, and any self-reported attitudinal and behavioural changes as a result of the campaign. A set of questions was set in agreement with CAAPAC to structure the discussion. (See Appendix 5 for the focus group topics).

The aim of the focus groups (as set out by Shanahan and Hewitt 1999) was to provide participants with a relaxed and friendly atmosphere, in which they could discuss their attitudes and opinions in their own terms, allowing them to reveal those aspects of the topic which are of interest or importance to them, and permitting deeper and more thorough exploration of attitudes and reactions. We aimed for the group facilitation to be relatively non-directive and flexible, introducing topics and allowing freedom of discussion; providing the stimulus material in the most appropriate manner for each particular group, and permitting the group facilitator to focus the attention of participants on those specific areas in the evaluation objectives which require more attention.

**Surveys**

Surveys were carried out between January and May 2012, during and following the final month when the radio and TV advertising was being aired.

176 surveys were completed:
- 12 competition youth:
  - 1 from Tennant Creek
  - 2 through the Alice Springs youth program who were involved in the website feedback
  - 5 from Centralian Senior
  - 4 from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College
(Students involved from Yirara College and St Philips College in Alice Springs no longer attended; Centralian Middle School were unable to identify any students who were involved; the young people from Docker River were out of community during our visit; and the young person in Yuendumu gave feedback verbally but did not complete a survey)

- 88 non-competition youth:
  - 26 in the youth programs and mall in Alice Springs

  45 in schools around Alice Springs:
  - 13 at Centralian Middle School
  - 10 at Our Lady of the Scared Heart College
  - 10 at Centralian Senior College
  - 12 at St Philips College

  (Access was sought but not granted to Yirara College in Alice Springs)

- 76 general public 18+:
  - 43 in Alice Springs in the mall, shopping centres and at youth events

  27 at licensed premises in Alice Springs:
  - 13 at the Juicy Rump
  - 14 at the Todd Tavern

  (Access was sought but not granted to Monte’s licensed premises in Alice Springs and YMCA gym in Alice Springs)

  6 in Tennant Creek at the hotel
The small numbers of competition youth surveyed, as outlined above, was due to the difficulty in accessing these young people. In particular, young people living in remote communities are a highly transient population group and it can be very difficult to plan meeting dates as circumstances can change suddenly and impact on the location and availability of these youth. It would be beneficial in future to request the completion of pre and post surveys from all individuals entering, requiring the education and youth service provider supporting those youth to facilitate this via the website. This could be done immediately prior to the project (on registration, by a certain date) and on completion of the project (on submission of the entry, by a certain date), which would make it more likely that those youth involved are around to take part. It would also be really helpful if the outcomes being measured in the evaluation were more succinct so the surveys could be kept short and simple to make them more accessible—especially for those who do not speak English as a first language.

**Focus groups**
Focus groups were conducted with 11 young people who participated in the campaign’s competition; 5 from Centralian Senior College, 4 from Our Lady of the Scared Heart College, and 2 from the Alice Springs Youth Committee who reviewed the website. Individual discussions were also held with 1 young person from Tennant Creek, and 1 young person from Yuendumu.

(These young people also completed a survey before the focus group discussion—included in the numbers above—except the young person from Yuendumu who did not due to English language speaking and literacy levels. It was not feasible to hire an interpreter for this meeting).

**Ethical Considerations**
We aimed to consistently use ethical practice in our research and have reviewed the ‘National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research’, ‘Values and Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research’ and the ‘Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research’ to inform the standards we will apply in designing the evaluation. Our key standards were to:

(a) judge vulnerability and capacity to consent to participate;

(b) inform participants about the research and its effects, at their level of comprehension;
(c) seek appropriate consent from family/guardians/schools before engaging young people under age;

(d) use culturally appropriate interviewing methods;

(e) ensure that respect for the dignity and well-being of the participants takes precedence over the expected benefits to knowledge., and

(f) employ methods that avoid bias and remove pressure to participate

In accordance with the above we:

- Sought ethical approval for the individual survey questions through the NT Department of Education and Training (DET);
- Sought ethical approval for the focus group topics through the NT DET;
- Provided information about the focus groups in a youth friendly way using plain English, informing participants about where they can get help or advice about alcohol if they need it, and obtain verbal consent for participation in the focus groups from the participants and provide an information sheet to parents/carers of those under 18 years old to ‘opt out’ if they do not wish their child to participate;
- Provided background to the campaign and surveys in a youth friendly way using plain English, informing participants about where they can get help or advice about alcohol if they need it, and obtain verbal consent from participants completing the individual surveys;
- Used inclusive language during interactions in the individual surveys and focus group discussions that is respectful of cultural differences;
- Focus group facilitation provided all participants with the opportunity to contribute. Respect and appreciation was shown to all participants for their attendance and contributions;
- Did not ask for any identifiable data about participants through the focus groups and individual surveys, i.e. names and dates of birth will not be recorded so the participants identity is kept confidential;
- No payment or reward was given to participants for completing the survey or focus groups, however the focus group participants were provided with refreshments during the group meetings;
- We did not take any photographs, video recordings, or tape recordings of participants. All data was written, computer data have been kept in a password protected folder and paper copies will be given to ADSCA once the project is complete for them to store securely;
• We have had regular and on-going dialogue with ADSCA to discuss the methodology and discuss any issues; and
• Produced a youth friendly report to provide feedback to participants regarding how their input has been used.

**Sample**

In order to attempt a representative sample, a quota was set for gender of the sample based on statistics for Alice Springs (source: Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) © Commonwealth of Australia, 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total females</th>
<th>Total males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation sample:
The gender of respondents was 86 males and 88 females, and 2 not specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Intersex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An awareness of the proportion of Indigenous people in the Alice Springs area was held (source: Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) © Commonwealth of Australia, 2010); although the surveys did not ask Indigenous status, the researchers aimed for a diverse range of respondents to capture a representative sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non- Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did not set a quota for age because we set out to speak to as many young people involved in the competition as we could, and a sample of non-competition participants in all the schools and youth organisations who were invited to be involved.

Age spread with general public cohort respondents (n = 76):
Age spread with youth targeted cohort respondents (n= 100):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13-15</th>
<th>16-18</th>
<th>19-21</th>
<th>22-24</th>
<th>25+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We aimed to speak to at least as many adults in general public places as in licensed premises.

In addition, to be eligible for interview, all respondents had to be residents in Central Australia.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the estimated population for the Central NT region was 41 272 for 2010, which would mean a total sample size (176) of approximately 0.4% of the target population. Due to the relatively small sample of the population, the results may suffer from selection bias and any relationships quoted cannot be ruled out as having occurred by chance as evidenced through statistic testing such as chi-squared and Mann-Whitney U.

**Data analysis**

The quantitative data was analysed through descriptive statistics, univariate and multivariate analysis. The qualitative data was grouped using thematic content analysis, and this was undertaken by both evaluators to assess intercoder reliability.

The small sample size affects the validity of results in the cross comparison metrics, as the sub groups compared within the cohorts are too small to be statistically significant. They have been included in this report as a point of interest rather than firm conclusions, and as such have been placed in the Appendices.

It also must be acknowledged that any research using surveys may be subject to biases in self-reporting.

Given the small number of focus groups no content analysis has been undertaken on the discussion; a simple summary of the key points raised has been outlined in the results offering additional feedback to add to the results of the surveys.
Results

Consumption of alcohol

Percentage of general public 18+ respondents: “Thinking about the last 7 days, starting with yesterday and working back... How many times over this 7 day period, if any, have you had more than two standard drinks on any one day?” (n = 75):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More females than males reported consuming more than two standard drinks in one day once, twice and not at all over the previous week, and more males than females said they had consumed more than two standard drinks on one day three or more times a week.

This evaluation does not have sizeable groups to draw valid conclusions when the sample is split by age; however it is noteworthy that just under 45% of the 18-24 age group; just under 20% of the 25-34 age group; over 1/3 of the 35-44 age group; and 1 in 5 of the 45 + age groups had consumed more than two drinks on one day, once in the preceding week. Just under 30% of the 25-34 age group had more than two drinks on one day, twice in the previous week. Just under 1/3 of the 55-64 age group surveyed had consumed more than two standard drinks every day. (See Appendix 6.1 and 6.2 for graphs).
Knowledge around alcohol

Summary:

- Increase in knowledge comparing the baseline survey responses to the evaluation responses of youth in the following questions:
  - ‘NT adults are the biggest grog drinkers in the world’;
  - ‘It is safe for young people to drink alcohol in moderation with no risk to their health or safety’;
  - ‘P-Plater or Leaner driver can have a legal BAC of 0.1’;
  - ‘There is no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant’.

- Negative shift in knowledge comparing baseline survey responses to the evaluation responses of youth in the following question:
  - ‘The high level of drinking in the NT not being due to people who drink in public areas’.

- Very good knowledge (no baseline data available) amongst the youth respondents that:
  - ‘7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are related to alcohol’;
  - ‘Drinking more than two standard drinks on one day puts adult men and women at risk of harm’.

- Over 60% of youth respondents thought that problem drinkers were people who cause harm to themselves or others.

- Almost 70% of the youth respondents were able to list at least one place people can get help about alcohol. ‘Headspace’ was the most frequently listed, with almost 40% of those listing anywhere saying ‘Headspace’.

- Over half of the youth respondents agreed slightly or strongly that they felt more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much after seeing the adverts.

- 90% competition participants, 60% non-competition youth and 45% general public 18+ said they agreed slightly or strongly that they knew how to get help for themselves or someone else through the website or phone number.
Percentage of youth respondents: “The NT adults are the biggest grog drinkers in the world”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (10 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (48 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (58 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant shift in responses with just under 90% of the competition respondents thinking the NT adults were the biggest grog drinkers in the world prior to the campaign, and 90% then accurately stating this as false in the evaluation survey. Just under 70% non-competition participants thought this statement to be false.
Percentage of youth respondents: “The high level of drinking in the NT is due to people who drink in public areas”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (10 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (48 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (58 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 80% of competition participants thought that the high level of drinking in the NT was not due to people who drink in public areas in the baseline quiz, this changed in the evaluation responses with 60% thinking this to be true. Over half of the non-competition participants accurately answered false; overall the respondents were equally split on this question.
Percentage of youth respondents: “It is safe for young people to drink grog in moderation with no risks to their health or safety”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (10 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (50 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (60 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 90% of the respondents in the baseline quiz thought that it would be safe for young people to drink alcohol in moderation with no risks to their health or safety. This changed significantly in the evaluation with 90% accurately stating this to be false. 80% of the non-competition participants thought this was false.
Percentage of youth respondents: “A P-Plater or Learner driver can have a legal blood alcohol content of 0.1”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (10 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (49 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (59 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRUE</strong></td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALSE</strong></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 60% of respondents in the baseline quiz thought that a P-Plater or Learner driver could have a legal blood alcohol content (BAC) of 0.1, this changed in the evaluation survey with 80% accurately stating this to be false. Over 90% of the non-competition participants answered this correctly.
Percentage of respondents: “Almost 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are grog related”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (9 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (49 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (58 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 80% competition participants accurately thought that 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are grog related, and almost 100% of the non-competition participants answered correctly.
**Percentage of respondents: “There is no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (10 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (50 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (60 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The baseline quiz showed that only 1 in 5 of the respondents accurately thought that there was no safe drinking level for pregnant women. In the evaluation survey this improved drastically, with 100% of competition participants stating it was true; over 90% of the non-competition participants answered correctly.
Percentage of respondents: “For adult men and women drinking more than two standard drinks on one day puts them at risk of harm”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline quiz: Competition participants only (around 300 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Competition participants (9 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Non-Competition participants (49 respondents)</th>
<th>Evaluation survey: Total participants (58 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/3 of the competition participants accurately stated that drinking more than 2 standard drinks on one day puts adult men and women at risk of harm, and just under 80% of non-competition participants answered correctly.
Percentage of youth respondents: “Problem drinkers are people who…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cause harm to themselves or others</th>
<th>Are not involved in anti-social behaviour</th>
<th>Only ever cause harm to themselves, never harm to others</th>
<th>All of these</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 56)</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 9)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n= 47)</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both groups, the respondents mostly accurately answered that problem drinkers are people who cause harm to themselves or others, with a greater proportion of competition respondents answering correctly.
Percentage of youth respondents: “List everywhere you know that people can get help for themselves or their family/ friends about grog?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Listed at least one place to get help</th>
<th>Did not list any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n = 62)</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n = 11)</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n = 51)</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was not a significant difference between the different groups in their knowledge of places people can get help about alcohol, with around 70% of the youth respondents being able to list at least one place.
Headspace was the most frequently listed place for all youth respondents. Competition participants were significantly more likely to list ‘Alcoholics Anonymous’ or ‘rehab’, and ‘Alcohol and drug services’ than non-competition participants.

For the non-competition group- ‘Other health setting’ included hospital or clinic, Congress or community health worker; ‘School’ also included school counsellor; and ‘Online or helplines’ also included ‘That’s Enough’, website-on TV, phone call, hotlines, and website. For the competition respondents- ‘Alcohol and Drug services’ included DAASA, Bushmob; ‘online or helplines’ also included internet; and ‘AA or rehab’ also included sobering shelter.
Self-reported impact on knowledge

Percentage of youth respondents: “I feel more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much after this/ these adverts”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong> (n=59)</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n=10)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Competition participants</strong> (n=49)</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 60% of youth respondents agreed strongly or slightly that they felt more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much after seeing the adverts. None of the competition participants disagreed with this statement.
Percentage of all respondents: “I know how to get help for myself or someone else through the website or phone number”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 130)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition participants (n=9)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competition participants (n= 49)</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public 18+</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half of all respondents said they agreed slightly or strongly that they knew how to get help for themselves or someone else through the website or phone number.

A higher proportion of competition participants agreed slightly or strongly (almost 90%) compared to non-competition participants (just over 60%) and adults (just under 45%)
**Attitudes to alcohol and alcohol consumption**

*Summary:*

- Three-quarters of the youth respondents thought it should be everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking. Just under 20% thought it’s up to individuals, and 6% thought this responsibility lay with police and government.

- Almost 70% of youth respondents strongly agreed that drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends and a further 18% agreed slightly.

- Almost 70% of youth respondents agreed strongly that drinking too much when you’re out can get you into trouble or danger and a further 27% agreed slightly.

- Just under 80% of the youth respondents strongly agree that individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk and a further 18% agree slightly.
Percentage of youth respondents: “In your view, who should encourage responsible drinking?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>It’s up to the individuals who drink to encourage responsible drinking</th>
<th>The police and government should encourage responsible drinking</th>
<th>It’s everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong> (n= 67)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n= 56)</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% competition participants thought that it’s everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking compared to just over 70% of non-competition participants. 1 in 5 of the non-competition participants thought it was up to individuals.
Percentage of youth respondents: “Drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 66)</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition</strong></td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>participants</strong> (n= 11)</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition</strong></td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>participants</strong> (n= 55)</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 70% of the respondents strongly agreed that drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends. No competition participants disagreed with this statement.
Percentage of youth respondents: “Drinking too much when you are out can get you into trouble or danger”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 67)</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 11)</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n= 56)</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 2/3 of the respondents strongly agreed that drinking too much when you’re out can get you in trouble or danger, and a further quarter of them agreed slightly.
Percentage of youth respondents: “**Individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk**”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 67)</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 11)</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n= 56)</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 80% of the respondents strongly agreed that individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk, and a further 18% of them agreed slightly, with no significant difference between competition and non-competition participants.
· Over one third of all respondents reported that the campaign/ adverts did make them ‘think or do anything differently’, 42% of the youth respondents compared with 28% of the 18+ general public.

· Of those who said the campaign/ adverts would make them think or do anything differently:
  
  ➢ Over 20% stated that it prompted a thought or opinion relating to alcohol;
  
  ➢ Just under 20% listed a thought or opinion relating to ‘others’ who drink:
    Significantly more adult respondents (40%) than youth (8%) expressed a thought or opinion about ‘others’ who drink such as:
    Young person: ‘People stop drinking too much. Young kids drinking- pretty bad.’
    Public 18+: ‘what some of these kids have to put up with’;
  
  ➢ Almost 15% reported a behaviour change in themselves such as not drinking or drinking responsibly:
    Significantly more youth respondents (20%) than adult respondents (10%) stated that they would change behaviour such as:
    Young person: ‘think differently- not to be like that... not to drink’
    Public 18+: ‘Think you might make a fool of yourself; stop me getting in a car and drink driving’;
  
  ➢ Just under 10% listed encouraging someone else to change behaviour:
    Significantly more youth respondents (15%) than adult respondents (0) indicated that they would encourage someone else to change such as:
    Young person: ‘my dad when he drinks too much tell him to stop- time to ease off’

· Almost 30% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them/ someone they knew change their drinking habits, and a further 15% disagreed slightly. Just under 10% strongly agreed and under 15% agreed slightly.

· Over 30% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them talk to their family or friends about alcohol; just under 15% strongly agreed and just under 20% agreed slightly.

**Behaviour change**

**Summary:**

- Over one third of all respondents reported that the campaign/ adverts did make them ‘think or do anything differently’, 42% of the youth respondents compared with 28% of the 18+ general public.

- Of those who said the campaign/ adverts would make them think or do anything differently:
  
  ➢ Over 20% stated that it prompted a thought or opinion relating to alcohol;
  
  ➢ Just under 20% listed a thought or opinion relating to ‘others’ who drink:
    Significantly more adult respondents (40%) than youth (8%) expressed a thought or opinion about ‘others’ who drink such as:
    Young person: ‘People stop drinking too much. Young kids drinking- pretty bad.’
    Public 18+: ‘what some of these kids have to put up with’;
  
  ➢ Almost 15% reported a behaviour change in themselves such as not drinking or drinking responsibly:
    Significantly more youth respondents (20%) than adult respondents (10%) stated that they would change behaviour such as:
    Young person: ‘think differently- not to be like that... not to drink’
    Public 18+: ‘Think you might make a fool of yourself; stop me getting in a car and drink driving’;
  
  ➢ Just under 10% listed encouraging someone else to change behaviour:
    Significantly more youth respondents (15%) than adult respondents (0) indicated that they would encourage someone else to change such as:
    Young person: ‘my dad when he drinks too much tell him to stop- time to ease off’

- Almost 30% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them/ someone they knew change their drinking habits, and a further 15% disagreed slightly. Just under 10% strongly agreed and under 15% agreed slightly.

- Over 30% of youth respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them talk to their family or friends about alcohol; just under 15% strongly agreed and just under 20% agreed slightly.
Percentage of all respondents: “Did the commercial/advert/poster make you think or do anything differently?” (For competition participants- ‘When you took part in the campaign, and afterwards, did it make you think or do anything differently?’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n= 172)</th>
<th>Competition youth (n= 11)</th>
<th>Non-competition youth (n=87)</th>
<th>General public 18+ (n= 74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 50% of people reported they did not/would not think or do anything differently after seeing the advert. Youth respondents were significantly more likely to say they did/would think or do anything differently, with 42% answering yes, compared with 28% of the general 18+ public.

Although the groups are too small to compare and draw valid conclusions, the campaign appears to have been most effective with 13-15 year olds, with 48% saying that the campaign would make them ‘think or do anything differently’, and least effective with the 55-64 and 65+ age groups (13% and 0 respectively). Overall, 46% of females said the adverts made them ’think or do anything differently’ compared to 25% of males. (See Appendix 6.3 and 6.4 for graphs).
Percentage of all respondents: “If yes, what”

The free text answers to this question could be grouped into four broad themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behaviour change themselves (most commonly not to drink or to drink responsibly)</th>
<th>Encouraging someone else to change behaviour</th>
<th>Prompted thought or opinion by respondent, relating to alcohol</th>
<th>Thought or opinion relating to ‘others’ who drink (this mostly came across as negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (n= 62)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition respondents (n= 5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-competition respondents (n= 36)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public 18+ (n= 21)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly more youth respondents than adult respondents indicated that they would encourage someone else to change and take action themselves, and significantly more adult respondents expressed a thought or opinion about ‘others’ who drink.
Percentage youth respondents: “The adverts made me change my drinking habits/ someone I know change their drinking habits”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants (n= 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition</strong></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants (n= 46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total almost 45% respondents reported that they disagreed strongly or slightly that the adverts made them or someone they knew change their drinking habits. 22% of the competition participants agreed slightly, 11% of the non-competitions strongly agreed and another 11% of them agreed slightly.
Percentage youth respondents: “The advert/s made me talk to my family/ friends about grog”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 59)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 30% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the adverts made them talk to family/ friends about grog. Competition participants were more likely to report that they strongly or slightly agreed with this statement, and were less likely to disagree compared to non-competition participants.
Reach and recognition of campaign brand in advertising

**Summary:**

- Over ¾ of all respondents had seen or heard some advertising about alcohol and the effects of drinking too much, and over 70% reported they had had seen or heard any of the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts, with youth respondents more likely to report having seen the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts than adults (74% compared to 63%).

- Just under 80% of all respondents said they had seen the campaign logo or heard the slogan, and again youth respondents were more likely to report having seen the logo or slogan than adults (84% compared to 72%).

- Focus Group discussions and qualitative responses have shown some confusion over the specific meaning in the campaign slogan. ‘That’s Enough’ has been interpreted by some as a call for problem drinkers to stop drinking rather than encouraging a friend or family member to drink within safe and healthy limits.

- It is also noted that there was some confusion between the ‘Enough is Enough’ anti-violence campaign with a number of respondents using this wording.

- Almost ¾ of all respondents had seen the adverts on TV, over ½ had seen posters, and ¼ had heard adverts on radio, 7% had seen the website and 6% had seen it through social networking. Youth were more likely to have been exposed to the campaign via radio, website and social networking and adult public were more likely to see it on TV.
Percentage of all respondents: “Have you seen or heard any advertising in the last few months about grog and the effects of drinking too much?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n= 164)</th>
<th>Non-competition respondents (n= 88)</th>
<th>General public 18+ respondents (n= 76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 80% of the respondents had seen some advertising about alcohol and the effects of drinking too much with similar levels of youth and general public 18+ respondents reporting to have seen some advertising.
Percentage of all respondents: “Have you seen or heard any of the ‘That’s Enough’ advertising in the last few months?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n= 173)</th>
<th>Competition respondents (n= 12)</th>
<th>Non- competition respondents (n= 88)</th>
<th>General public 18+ respondents (n= 73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over 70% of the respondents reported they had seen or heard the ‘That’s Enough’ advertisements. Competition participants were more likely to have seen some of the ‘That’s’ Enough’ advertising than both the non-competition participants and the general public 18+. The non-competition youth were also more likely than the general public 18+ to report seeing any ‘That’s Enough’ advertising.

The groups are too small to draw valid conclusions in this cross-comparison, but it is noted that over 80% of 13-15 year olds reported having seen the ‘That’s Enough’ advertising, compared to just over 60% 16-18 year olds; around 70% of the 18-24 and 25-34 groups; just under 60% of the 35-44 group; 70% of the 45-54 group and 40% of the 55-64 and 65+ groups. (See Appendix 6.5 for graph).
Percentage of all respondents: “Have you seen this logo or heard this slogan (‘That’s Enough’)?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n= 162)</th>
<th>Non-competition respondents (n= 88)</th>
<th>General public 18+ respondents (n= 74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When prompted by being shown the logo and slogan on a T-shirt and poster, just under 80% of the respondents said that they had seen this. Youth respondents were significantly more likely than general public 18+ to have seen the logo or heard the slogan.
Percentage of all respondents (n= 106): “Where have you seen or heard about it?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n= 141)</th>
<th>Competition respondents (n= 12)</th>
<th>Non-competition respondents (n= 74)</th>
<th>General public 18+ respondents (n= 55)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 75% of all the respondents who had seen or heard the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts had seen them on TV, which was the most cited medium to have seen the commercials; over ½ had seen posters, and ¼ had heard adverts on radio, 7% had seen the website and 6% had seen it through social networking. Youth were more likely to have been exposed to the campaign via radio, website and social networking and adult public were more likely to see it on TV. No general public 18+ had accessed any online content.

‘Other’ included at school (4 respondents); other settings such as clinics and the hospital (3 respondents), T-shirts (5 respondents), one person said wristband; and one person said mobile phone.
Using a web-centric strategy

Summary:

- Data sourced from Google Analytics showed that the majority of activity on the campaign website was around the competition phase of the campaign.

- The highest source of referrals to the website, over one third, was from Facebook.

- There was a slight increase in unique visitors to the website when the TV and radio commercials began to be aired in September 2011, though website usage dropped between November 2011 and February 2012, covering the school holiday period, and then slightly increased again in March 2012 after the commercials has ceased. Website traffic has remained relatively low compared to the competition phase, but the site still gains consistent low numbers of visitors.

- Increased website use when competition winners were announced which suggests good viewership of competition participants and possibly family and friends.

- The top pages visited shows that the video content gained the majority of attention with the Home Page being well visited, but also the factual information page which ranked third overall.

- The Facebook page for the campaign had 44 ‘Likes’ and one comment from a member of the public since it was set up.
12 Month Snapshot (25 Jan 2011 – 25 Jan 2012)

ALL VISITORS FROM AUSTRALIA (94.7% OF ALL VISITS):

- 6,214 Visits
- 3,033 Unique Visitors
- 35,914 Page views
- 5.78 Pages/Visit
- 00:04:52 Avg. Time on Site
- 43.98% Bounce Rate
- 48.02% New Visits
- 32.23% Exits for the Home Page

The majority of site activity is chronologically centred on the competition phase with social media being the highest referrer over the site lifetime (~38%).

The highest source of visits was social media referrals (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, etc.) Facebook alone representing ~37% of all traffic generated.

The average time spent on the home page was 1 minute, 23 seconds. The average time spent on the ‘Get In The Know’ page was 2 minutes, 15 seconds with 857 unique page views which demonstrates that visitors did spend time reading the alcohol awareness information.

The homepage click breakdown shows that 30% (1174) clicks went on from the homepage to view the media entries, 5.2% (202 clicks) were for the ‘Get In The Know’ section. A further breakdown is below.

The competition stage (Jan – April 2011) attracted a significant amount of traffic (avg. 39.3 visitors/day). The mass media campaign stage (after April) has generated consistent but low traffic (avg. 3.4 visitors/day).

From September, the data shows slight peaks on Thursdays and some Fridays. The source of these traffic peaks has not been identified.

Glossary

Unique Visitors - this represents the true audience size. A unique visitor is counted only once over the reporting period, and is determined using website cookies which are automatically assigned on the first site visit.

Visits - Visits represent the number of individual sessions begun by all the visitors to your site. If a user is inactive on your site for 30 minutes or more, any future activity is counted towards a new session. Users that leave your site and return within 30 minutes are counted as part of the original session. Therefore a single visitor can make multiple visits over a given period.

Bounce Rate - The percentage of single-page visits (i.e. visits in which the person left your site from their entrance page without browsing the site further).

Page Views - The number of site pages viewed over the time period.

Unique Page Views – The number of 30 minute sessions in which a page was viewed.

Exits – The number of visitors exiting the site from a page divided by the total number of page views for that site page.
Google Analytics shows that site usage has had two phases of varying activity marked by differing levels of bounce rate and daily unique visitors - the competition phase (campaign launch to 12 April) and post-competition phase (13 April to present). The average number of page views has fallen over the site's lifetime as illustrated by the bounce rate (number of visitors leaving the site from their entrance page / total visitors).

- The competition phase had 2,161 Unique Visitors, with a bounce rate of 36.06% and 6.96 pages/visit. This demonstrates a high interest in site content from site visitors.

- The most hits (241) the site received were on 31 March 2011 which was the final date for competition entrants and activity approximately follows a Gaussian distribution around this date.

- Site traffic fell from April – after the hosting servers were attacked and the data lost (11 June – 4 July) – following this site traffic has averaged around 3.75 visits/day with an average bounce rate of 61.4%, and 3 pages/visit.
## Analytics Dashboard

**thatsenough.com.au**

### 12 months (25/01/2011 to 25/01/2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Month (January 12)</th>
<th>Previous Month (December 11)</th>
<th>Monthly Average over Previous 12 Months</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Visitors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits/Visitor</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Visits</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments
- The 3 numbers beside the sparkline are the upper and lower limits (+/- 1xStandard Deviation) and the middle number is the average.

### General site statistics.
- General site statistic. In most cases, an increase in visits will correlate directly with higher outcomes.
- Degree of fidelity/loyalty toward the site. Did visitors often return?
- Are you bringing quality traffic? Do visitors visit other pages?
- A rough indicator of engagement.
- Depending on the context, this can indicate interest in your content.

### Glossary
- **Unique Visitors** - this represents the true audience size. A unique visitor is counted only once over the reporting period, and is determined using website cookies which are automatically assigned on the first site visit.
- **Visits** - visits represent the number of individual sessions begun by all the visitors to your site. If a user is inactive on your site for 30 minutes or more, any future activity is counted towards a new session. Users that leave your site and return within 30 minutes are counted as part of the original session. Therefore a single visitor can make multiple visits over a given period.
- **Bounce Rate** - The percentage of single-page visits (i.e., visits in which the person left your site from their entrance page without browsing the site further).
- **Page Views** - The number of site pages viewed over the time period.

### Top Statistics

#### Top Pages (by Pageviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Video Entries&quot; /submitted-entries/</th>
<th>&quot;Home Page&quot; /enter/</th>
<th>&quot;Competition Entry Page&quot; /get-in-the-know/</th>
<th>/prizes/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21,483</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language (by Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Territory (by Visits)</th>
<th>Language (by Visits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australia</td>
<td>1. en-us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. United States</td>
<td>2. en-gb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Philippines</td>
<td>3. en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,214 (94.4%)</td>
<td>5,679 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 (1%)</td>
<td>376 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (0.5%)</td>
<td>124 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Country/Territory (by Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating System (by Visits)</th>
<th>Country/Territory (by Visits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Windows</td>
<td>1. Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Macintosh</td>
<td>2. United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. iPhone</td>
<td>3. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,016 (64.6%)</td>
<td>6,214 (94.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 (30.2%)</td>
<td>63 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 (2.1%)</td>
<td>36 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating System (by Visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Keywords through Search Engines (excluding direct or referral traffic 70.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tell em that's enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 (3.84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From campaign launch uniquely identified visitors to the site were high and remained consistently so, rising until a peak at the competition deadline on 31 March 2011. Activity around the site remained significant through until Youth Week 2011 and then tapered off up to June 2011. A web attack on the hosting server resulted in a significant loss of data and website downtime for 24 days after which activity remained around an average of 2.8 unique visitors/day.
Page-views give a raw look at the popularity of webpages within the website. Page-views do not identify unique visitors but do show how often a page is accessed in total.

The data on the left shows that the video entries page was, significantly the most popular page, more so than the homepage which demonstrates users going directly to that page.

Also of note is the number of page-views the competition entry (2029), “Get In The Know”(1170) and “Grog Help”(559) pages received.
### Visitors from Australia – Referral Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Source</th>
<th>Sum of Visits</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Referral Source</th>
<th>Sum of Visits</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(direct)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>google.com</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au.mg4.mail.yahoo.com</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>google.com.au</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au.mg6.mail.yahoo.com</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>search</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bl163w.blu163.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>search.mywebsearch.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by149w.bay149.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>yahoo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by158w.bay158.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>0.facebook.com</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co120w.co120.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>alicespringstweets.com.au</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link.smartscreen.live.com</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>apps.facebook.com</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn115w.snt115.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>desertgirl2.wordpress.com</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn119w.snt119.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>facebook.com</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn128w.snt128.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>forums.offtopic.com</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn129w.snt129.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>m.facebook.com</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn134w.snt134.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>macromedia.com</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn142w.snt142.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>t.co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sn144w.snt144.mail.live.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>touch.facebook.com</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webmail.barklyarts.com.au</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>twitter.com</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>webmail.optuszoo.com.au</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>youtube.com</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.92.69:15871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>247webdesign.com.au</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.168.0.207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>abc.net.au</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driverwebdesign.com.au</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>inguides.com.au</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff.det.nt.gov.au</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>matbluecoat1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>musicnt.ning.com</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bigpondsitehelp.com</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>ntyan.com.au</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>prezi.com</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecosia.org</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>roozdesign.ir</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>google</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>sites.glazy.com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stevedavis.com.au</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:** 6161

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of All Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
<td>2359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARCH ENGINES</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBSITE</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:** 6161
This graph shows the placement of advertisements vs the website usage:

- **Axes:**
  - Y-axis: Acts/Day
  - X-axis: Date

- **Measure Names:**
  - CENTRAL7
  - CAAMA
  - SUN-FM
  - Moving Average of website UNIQUE VISITORS for previous 30 days
Using youth-created campaign content

Summary:

- Just over 45% of all respondents who had seen any of the ‘That’s Enough’ adverts could accurately describe the advert they saw, with the youth respondents slightly more likely to have accurate recall compared with 18+ public.

- Just under 40% of all respondents accurately asserted the campaign message, with a similar rate of accuracy in general public adults and youth respondents.

- Over 20% of youth respondents strongly agreed that the adverts were really effective in getting the message across, and a further 45% agreed slightly.

- Focus groups:
  - gave mixed responses about whether people would have understood the message with some thinking the adverts were not clear enough;
  - some of them reflected that the adverts would not change behaviour as they may not have engaged people enough, one participant said: ‘no one took notice.. They are still going to drink- they don’t care’.
  - they were unsure how effective the adverts would be due to how strongly the adverts put the message across, how much the adverts were aired, and people’s understanding of how the adverts were produced.
  - gave mixed responses as to the message of the campaign including stopping drinking, how much people drink and this this affects others, and responsible drinking;
  - gave mixed responses about who the target audience was: youth/ Indigenous people/ everybody; some suggested that stories that had direct relevance to people would have more impact on them.

- Over half of all respondents thought the campaign was targeted at ‘young people’, over 20% thought it was targeted at ‘Indigenous people’, ¼ thought ‘everybody’ and over 10% thought ‘problem drinkers’. General public 18+ more likely than young people to say ‘Indigenous’ (42% compared to 6%) and young people more likely than public 18+ to say everybody (33% vs. 20%) and adults (12% vs. 7%).

- A couple of parents commented that they were affected by children saying That’s Enough- made them feel guilty. On the other hand some people commented that they thought the message was encouraging youth to tell adults That’s Enough and were worried this was a potentially dangerous activity.

- It was observed that people were more interested and excited if they knew someone who was in the adverts or made it- and they reported they liked watching people they knew. As one focus group participants said: ‘knowing people in ad- watch and pay attention, helps people to relate...’
Recall of adverts

Percentage of all respondents: “Please could you describe the commercial/advert/poster that you saw?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accurately answered</th>
<th>Not accurately answered (including those who did not remember)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-competition participants</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public 18+ respondents</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n= 53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under half of the respondents accurately described an aspect of the advert they saw, with slightly more youth respondents providing an accurate answer compared with the general public 18+.
Understanding of message

Percentage of respondents: "What message do you think the ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ campaign is giving?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accurately answered</th>
<th>Not accurately answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n= 173)</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 11)</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n= 86)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General public 18+ respondents</strong> (n= 76)</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall just over 1/3 of the respondents could accurately describe any of the key messages of the campaign. The general public adults and youth respondents had comparable rates of accuracy. A greater proportion of the competition participants accurately described the campaign message.

Responses were counted as accurate if they contained wording from the campaign messages about responsible drinking, limiting consumption, responsible drinking being everyone’s responsibility, telling others to not drink too much, or the effects on the individual and family of too much alcohol such as violence, neglect, financial hardship or social stigma.
**Perception of target audience**

Percentage of all respondents:  
"**Who is the campaign targeted at?**" (free text answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young people</th>
<th>Indigenous people</th>
<th>Everybody</th>
<th>Problem drinkers</th>
<th>Adults/ Parents</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> <em>(n= 170)</em></td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> <em>(n= 11)</em></td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non- competition participants</strong> <em>(n = 83)</em></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General public 18+ respondents</strong> <em>(n= 76)</em></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half of the respondents said that the campaign was targeted at young people, a quarter thought it was targeted at everybody and just under a quarter thought it was targeted at Indigenous people. Over 40% of adult and 6% of youth respondents said it was aimed at Indigenous people. A higher number of youth stated that they thought the campaign was targeted at everybody, and also a higher number thought it was targeted at adults/ parents than the adult respondents stated.
[Image of a bar chart showing the percentage of young people, Indigenous people, everybody, problem drinkers, adults/parents, and those who 'don’t know' regarding competition and non-competition among the general public 18+.]
Perception of effectiveness

Percentage of all youth respondents: “The advert/s I saw was/were really effective in getting the message across”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong> (n= 58)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition participants</strong> (n= 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-competition participants</strong> (n = 49)</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this question responses were based on what the respondent thought the message was, not on what the stated campaign messages were as outlined by CAAPAC.

Just over ¼ of the non-competition respondents strongly agreed that the adverts were really effective at getting the message across, and just under 40% agreed slightly. Over ¾ of the competition participants agreed slightly with this statement.
Engagement of young people

Summary:

- 115 entries to the competition

- A quarter of youth respondents reported they ‘sometimes’ told someone ‘That’s enough’ when they thought they should not drink anymore alcohol, 16% said they do this ‘very often’ and 16% said they do this ‘always’. All of the competition participants reported they said this at least once or twice.

- Focus groups: highlighted the young people enjoyed taking part, though reported they would have liked clearer guidelines and easier to understand terms and conditions (disappointing when had to make changes after submission as did not comply);

- Focus groups: reported learning more about alcohol and places to get help, though many of the ‘facts’ they had reviewed on the website had been forgotten.
Self-reported use of campaign tag line

Percentage of all youth respondents: “I have told someone ‘That’s enough’ when I thought they should not drink anymore grog…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total youth</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondents (n= 57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants (n= 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-competition</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants (n= 49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under 80% of the youth respondents reported they told someone ‘that’s enough’ at least once or twice. ¼ of the non-competition participants reported they had ‘never’ told someone ‘that’s enough’ compared to 0 competition participants. ¼ of the competition participants said they ‘always’ told someone ‘that’s enough’ compared to just under 15% of the non-competition participants.
Focus group discussion with competition participants

Taking part

- Most of the participants reported that they enjoyed taking part, through the process of making their entries and they said they liked watching people they knew in the adverts and looked out for them, and one person commented that they liked the prizes.
- Mostly said that they would take part again if they were given the option.
- Main difficulties were relating to process of producing and submitting suitable material- in particular with regard to resources, and guidelines for content which was a source of disappointment to some when things had to be changed after submission as they did not comply with specifications that they did not know about prior to submission. Found terms and conditions difficult to understand. More involvement and support from the campaign committee was requested for future projects.
- Mixed feedback about website. Most reported they found it easy to use and navigate, though some said they found the terminology in the terms and conditions difficult and confusing. Some reported their supervisor accessed the website and submitted entries on their behalf.

The campaign

- Mixed feedback about message the campaign was giving; with some young people thinking it was about stopping drinking, others stating it was about how much people drink and how this affects others, and others asserting it was about drinking responsibly and in moderation.
- Regarding how well they thought the campaign put the message across, the young people asserted that the adverts did not all perhaps put the message across strongly enough, that they needed to be aired more, and that the competition and the knowledge that the adverts came from a competition should have been more widely publicised.
- On using Jessica Mauboy to publicise the competition, they mostly thought that it was good to use someone famous and cool to get people interested that young people look up to such individuals as role models.
- Mixed response regarding who target audience was, with some believing it to be youth and Indigenous people, and others thought it was aimed at everybody.
- Mixed response regarding whether people would have understood the message of the campaign, some thought that some of the adverts may not have been clear enough- especially radio adverts, it may not have been clear they related to alcohol, others thought it made people think and talk; there was also a suggestion from some that people may have understood the message but would not change behaviour ‘no one took notice. They are still going to drink- they don’t care’.
• Articulated that the campaign might not have ‘engaged’ people enough to impact on behaviour change.
• It was raised that stories that had direct relevance to people had more impact on them, that adverts shown/ played locally with local story and local language might be more effective, and that face to face discussions were more likely to be remembered and recalled than adverts.

Their views
• Regarding whether drinking alcohol was ok, most thought it was in moderation- ‘sometimes- at special events’; ‘Don’t get horris’; one person thought drinking alcohol was not ok.
• All were able to identify a number of risks of drinking alcohol including affecting the mind, behaviour and violence, and liver damage, though when asked about how they would know when someone had ‘enough’, they were not sure how to assess this before it was ‘too much’.
• Regarding who is responsible for stopping problem drinking, there were mixed views- some thought parents, elders and family, some thought yourselves in your choices, some thought everybody.
• Some young people were surprised at the costs related to problem drinking, others were not. They suggested there were better things this money could be spent on; one person thought taxes could even be reduced.

How campaign affected them
• Reported the most important thing they learnt were effects of alcohol and the bigger picture, being involved in getting a message ‘out there’, and what help is available. It was raised that many of the facts reviewed at the start had been forgotten, and that more discussion around this may have been more effective
• When asked if the campaign made them think or do anything differently, some said no, others said it made them think about the effects of alcohol, some said it made them talk about it with friends, and two people said it would make them drink less.
Talking to youth service and education providers working with competition participants

In undertaking the evaluation, discussions with two youth service providers in Tennant Creek and Yuendumu, and a teacher from Centralian Senior provided some valuable feedback which is noteworthy. These can be summarised in the following points:

Yuendumu:

- They would not have been able to take part if they did not already have an existent media project running, as the cost of producing a good quality advert is too high
- The community was really proud when the advert won in the competition and was shown on TV
- Great for young people to be involved in the process
- Young people should be paid for their participation in such projects
- Campaigns need to take care adverts do not stereotype ‘drinkers’

Tennant Creek:

- More support and direction from the campaign committee in the production of the advert would have helped- timeframe was too short and resources were limited so could not submit entry that was satisfactory quality
- Concerned that the logo being similar to VB brand logo is confusing message and too easily turned to humour
- Observed some people wearing T-shirts drunk
- Encouraging young people to tell adults ‘That’s Enough’ is potentially escalatory in volatile situations around alcohol, more appropriate for peer relationships
- Message needs to be less cheesy and simplistic and more visual
- That the message is reactive and not proactive and needs to gain interest from wider community but in particular those at risk.
- Would be good if the campaign could bring the police and other services together with young people to build relationships and provide mentoring- more community development
**Centralian Senior:**

- Timeframe was good - long enough to allow preparation for students within school activities/timetable. Term time is ideal to fit in curriculum.
- Prizes were good and were a strong motivation as the reward was direct and significant.
- Online quiz worked well but only one person needed to register for the submission, perhaps in future every participant should be required to register and therefore complete quiz.
- Website provided good direction of themes for content.
- Students needed to process the issues and repeat messages during production of media.
- Need clearer guidelines about message and the competition process, judging criteria - there seemed to be some good entries which were declined due to violation of guidelines, the guidelines were a bit fuzzy.
- Content created by youth could be effective due to ‘two degrees of separation’ and recognition of message coming from youth - young people may have avoided youth alcohol-related issues as too close to home.
- ‘That’s Enough’ Message needs continual reinforcement - too many bylines and statistics can be lost with so many messages.
Impact on NT ADIS demand

Summary:

- Activity data from the Alcohol and Drug Information Service (ADIS) telephone helpline did not correlate with the TV and radio commercial placements, though it must be noted that the activity is too low for accurate statistical testing.
Data for calls made to the NT ADIS line was obtained and overlayed with the advertising schedules for CAAMA and SunFM radio as well as TV advertising on 7Central. The graph below sets out the pattern of activity:

The trends of ADIS, ADIS, CENTRAL7, CAAMA and SUN-FM for Date. Color shows details about ADIS, CENTRAL7, CAAMA and SUN-FM.
Discussion and literature review

Alcohol consumption

Current guidelines recommend that drinking no more than two standard drinks on any day reduces the lifetime risk of harm from alcohol related disease or injury (National Health and Medical Research Council 2009). This evaluation found that 1 in 10 respondents reported consuming more than two standard drinks on one day every day over the previous week. The 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2011) reported that 20% of the population drink alcohol at levels that puts them at risk of harm over their lifetime (more than two standard drinks a day on average).

The most recent Annual Alcohol Poll (Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education (FARE) 2012) found that 36% 45-64 years consumed alcohol on three days or more compared to 26% 30-44 years, and 18% of 18-29 years. They report that 51% of Australian drinkers drink one to two standard drinks on a typical occasion, 46% will drink three or more, and a further 3% cannot state with certainty how much they typically consume. More than one quarter of 18-24 year olds consume more than six standard drinks in one sitting.

This evaluation did not measure how many days respondents had consumed any alcohol, or how many more than two standard drinks respondents were consuming on those occasions, but 31% of all the general public 18+ respondents reported consuming more than two standard drinks on three or more days in the previous week, indicating higher levels of drinking than the national figures (as stated by the NT Government 2010). The 2006 NT Alcohol Consumption and Related Attitudes Household Survey reported that 55% of the urban NT population aged 18 and over drank regularly or recently in the preceding week, and on drinking days, the level of consumption was more than five standard drinks per day (NT Government 2010).

Male respondents reported drinking more than two standard drinks on one day more frequently than female respondents which is also in line with the 2010 National Drug Strategy Household Survey which suggests males were more likely than females to drink alcohol daily and at levels that place them at risk of harm (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2011).
Knowledge, attitudes and behaviour

The knowledge levels around alcohol and excessive drinking for the youth cohort as a whole were very good, and there was a huge shift in accurate answers for most of the questions between the baseline and evaluation surveys which may have been related to the campaign.

The youth respondents had very high knowledge about drinking during pregnancy, with 95% of them stating there was no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant; compared to the Annual Alcohol Poll in which 67% stated that women should not consume any alcohol to avoid harm to foetus (FARE 2012). Overall 82% of the youth respondents thought it was not safe for young people to drink alcohol in moderation with no risks to their health or safety, which is in line with the Annual Alcohol Poll (FARE 2012) which reports 80% of respondents thought it was harmful to give alcohol to under 18 year olds. They also did very well in knowing about levels of drinking that put adults at risk of harm, with three-quarters of them stating drinking more than two standard rinks on one day puts them at risk of harm. The Annual Alcohol Poll found that only 37% knew this (FARE 2012).

The sample size of the competition group was too small to draw any valid conclusions, but it is noteworthy that accuracy on the knowledge questions was high for non-competition as well as competition participants, and for some questions it was higher: 1 in 5 competition participants thought a P-plater or Learner could legally have some alcohol, compared to less than 1 in 10 non-competition respondents. 1 in 5 competition participants did not know that 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are alcohol related compared with just 2% of non-competition participants. One-third thought that for adults, drinking more than two standard drinks on one day did not put them at risk of harm compared with 1 in 5 of the non-competition participants.

Additionally, knowledge of places to get help for themselves or their family/ friends about alcohol did not differ significantly between competition and non-competition groups with around 70% of both groups being able to list at least one place to go for help, and non-competition participants identifying a wider range of places. This indicates being involved in the competition did not increase awareness of the range of services available. A greater proportion of competition participants listed an Alcohol and Drug Service compared with non-competition participants, which suggests that they may have gained an awareness of these services through their involvement in the campaign.
Only 14% of all the respondents listed an Alcohol and Drugs Service; under one-quarter listed online help or helplines; and just 7% listed school- which is the only place they could get help from someone without needing to access a separate service; Rickwood et al (2006) highlight that young people are more likely to seek help from informal supports than professional services. This indicates a lack of awareness of the full range of services available to provide help if they want to give up drinking, help someone else give up, or learn to drink at safer levels which was one of the key objectives of the campaign. Almost 30% listed AA or rehab which might be linked to the media attention these services gain; the higher listing of AA or rehab, and health services may also suggest that it is perceived only those who are alcohol dependant have a ‘problem’ requiring them to get help, rather than those who are drinking at high risk levels of consumption.

The most frequently listed place was Headspace, which is a youth specific mental health service, not an Alcohol and Drug Service, but the fact almost 40% of the respondents listed this suggests they were more aware of services that were youth targeted. The New South Wales Association for Adolescent Health (2006) highlights that health services that incorporate a client centred approach and offer a diverse range of interventions are more likely to be perceived as friendly by youth. The evaluation did not assess the respondent’s knowledge of what these services did or how to access them, but it was observed that a number of the young people were very vague in their descriptions.

The above findings have implications for the way information was given to the competition entrants via the website. Indeed a number of focus group participants commented that facts and statistics were not retained, and a number of young people commented that personal stories that had direct relevance and discussion were remembered more. It might be beneficial to use the website to share stories and scenarios about alcohol and alcohol consumption, for example situations that have put people at risk of harm and how these could be prevented, and this could be made interactive with the function of website users being able to add their own comments or suggestions. With regard to providing information on services it might be beneficial to include information about where these services are located, when and how to access them, and what they can provide; the National Youth Affairs Research Scheme (2004) point out that young people are more likely to access services when they have a trusting relationship with the practitioners, it may therefore be helpful to include a photo and/ or name of the practitioners they will meet when they access that service to pre-empt that trust.

The lack of knowledge of the youth respondents pertaining to the high level of drinking in the NT not being due to people who drink in public areas suggests that blame may be disproportionately placed on visible drinkers, namely Indigenous people. The negative shift in accurate answers between the baseline and evaluation surveys, and the greater proportion of competition participants answering this incorrectly,
suggests that being involved in the campaign competition did not dispel this stereotype. This also has implications for excessive consumption as holding a belief that ‘problem’ or harmful drinking levels are only those who are visibly drunk in public may dissociate some people from making any change themselves.

Anecdotally there also appeared to be a lack of understanding of ‘when’ is enough. As one participant asserted as the message of the campaign ‘when you’re drunk enough you should stop’. In the discussions held with young people through the course of the evaluation, there was much uncertainty about at what point someone has had enough to drink, as many people highlighted behaviour associated with being drunk (falling over, unclear thinking, throwing up etc.) past the point that person should have stopped. This has implications for raising awareness about the recommendation that consuming no more than four standard drinks on a single occasion reduces the risk of alcohol related injury from that occasion (National Health and Medical Research Council 2009).

Nearly three-quarters of the youth respondents knew that the NT adults were not the biggest alcohol drinkers in the world, also a massive shift in accurate answers from the baseline survey; it was pointed out by the evaluators that, however, if the NT were a country it would rank at number two in the world. No evidence has been found on the impact of using such broad statistics in changing health attitudes and behaviour. Robertson (2008) highlights that simply giving people information has limited impact on behaviour change. It has been found that knowledge levels alone do not reduce alcohol consumption; however, some research suggests that low levels of alcohol knowledge among teenagers are associated with subsequent heavy drinking so it is possible that knowledge levels may have some influence over alcohol consumption behaviours, although it is likely that this is influenced by other factors such as context and drinking history (Pettigrew and Donovan 2003).

Knowledge of the website and Alcohol and Drug Information Service (ADIS) phone number associated with the campaign was limited, with under 30% strongly agreeing that they knew how to get help through the website or phone number, and a further ¼ agreeing slightly. It was noted that a number of these respondents indicated or overtly stated that they ‘would’ know how to find these services, rather than already knowing they existed. Considering the low website usage by those not involved in the campaign competition, and no increase in calls to ADIS during the campaign advertising, it appears very few people were prompted to access these by the commercials. It would have been more helpful to ask respondents the likelihood of them accessing these services to establish the appropriateness of highlighting them in the commercials; anecdotally a number of adult respondents did say that they would be unlikely to use the internet or phone to gain help.
Over three-quarters of respondents stated that they thought it was everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking, with 100% of the competition respondent’s and just over 70% of non-competition respondents saying it is everybody’s business, indicating that being involved in the competition may have influenced an increased understanding that excessive alcohol consumption is a whole of population issue which was one of the key objectives of the campaign. In the Annual Alcohol Poll 54% said that governments are not doing enough to address alcohol related harms in Australia (FARE 2012) indicating that the majority of the general population place a large amount of the responsibility on the Government to address this issue. Just under 80% of the youth respondents, however, also thought that individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk suggesting they believe individuals should exercise more control over their consumption and are accountable for their behaviour when they are drunk. This has implications for future approaches in that most young people will readily accept a role in encouraging others to drink responsibly, but there is a social expectation that people make their own choices; it may be appropriate to highlight positive outcomes in limiting consumption. Robertson (2008) points to evidence which suggests low risk behaviours, such as preventative behaviours, may be more effective if promoted using ‘gain frame’, so describing the benefits of the desired action.

Young people, and females, were more likely to say the adverts made them think or do something different. 54% of respondents thought that the campaign was targeted at young people and 22% thought it was targeted at Indigenous people which may have influenced receptiveness of the campaign messages. It was noted anecdotally that a number of the adult respondents stated this campaign was not aimed at them because they did not have a ‘problem’ with alcohol in answer to this question, suggesting they thought the campaign was only aimed at those who did. A greater proportion of young people thought the campaign was targeted at youth compared with the proportion of general public 18+ who thought the campaign was targeted at adults/parents. This indicates that the campaign has more impact if the target population segment understands the campaign is aimed at them. It is also possible that, given that males were more likely than females to report levels of consumption that put them at risk of harm, they were more defensive and resisted the idea the message might be aimed at them. It is also possible that the campaign slogan ‘tell ‘em that’s enough’ which puts emphasis on ‘them’, may have been interpreted by some people as ‘others’ who are ‘the problem’ and this brought up stereotypes that some individuals hold about this.

As pointed out in the National Binge Drinking Evaluation Report, there have been several short-term campaigns in the past twenty years aimed at reducing the levels of harm associated with alcohol use among the population, and young people in particular. The report asserts that while
awareness of these campaigns has been high, and young people have understood and thought about the messages, the level and frequency of risky alcohol consumption have remained high (Department of Health and Ageing 2009). Therefore whilst the campaigns have had success in reaching their target audiences, they have not been effective in impacting significantly on high risk consumption. It is suggested in the National Alcohol Strategy 2006-2009 that “alcohol retains deep-rooted cultural significance” (Commonwealth of Australia 2006). The Department of Health and Ageing (2009) argue that this does not mean campaigns aimed at addressing drinking behaviour are unsuccessful per se, but suggest a long-term adequately funded campaign is likely to be an effective way of maximising gradual behaviour change in alcohol consumption, in addition to positively building on the effects of previous campaigns.

**Campaign reach and message**

Campaign reach was high: just under 80% of respondents reported to have seen some advertising about alcohol over the past few months, and just over 70% of respondents reported they had seen or heard the ‘That’s’ Enough’ advertising. The evaluation of the National Drugs Campaign found 70% of parents and 89% youth had been exposed to any advertising about illegal drugs (Department of Health and Ageing 2006); the National Binge Drinking Campaign evaluation reported an 84-86% reach (Department of Health and Ageing 2009).

Just under 80% reported they had seen the campaign logo or heard the slogan when prompted; the National Drugs Campaign evaluation found that 90% parents and 99% youth recognised at least one element of the campaign (Department of Health and Ageing 2006); and an evaluation of the Alcohol Misuse Campaign in Scotland (Scottish Executive 2007) found 84% claimed to have seen the TV advert when played, and 94% claimed to have seen or heard advertising on TV, radio and posters when prompted.

Brand awareness does not equate to remembering and understanding the content and message of the campaign, however, with 46% of those who said they had seen the ‘That’s Enough’ campaign being able to accurately describe a feature of the advert they saw, and 38% being able to accurately describe an aspect of the campaign message. This increased in the competition participant cohort, with 55% able to accurately describe an aspect of the campaign message, which suggests that being engaged in the competition phase of the campaign may have increased their understanding of the key message. Messages that were not consistent with the campaign included: “That when you’re drunk enough you should stop”; “Grog is bad”; “If you can’t handle it don’t drink”; “Enough is enough pull your head in”. To put this into context, the
evaluation of the Alcohol Misuse Campaign in Scotland (Scottish Executive 2007) found 39% of respondents could describe a specific aspect of the campaign; the National Drugs Campaign evaluation reports 54% of parents and 83% youth mentioned messages and images consistent with the campaign (Department of Health and Ageing 2006).

It was noted by the evaluators that a number of people asserted they took no notice of TV adverts because ‘there are so many’, however TV was the most commonly cited medium respondents had seen the campaign. Moreover, Robertson (2008) argues that consistent messages from multiple sources may have more impact. The desktop analysis of the campaign website shows that internet social media such as Facebook increased use during the competition phase of the campaign, however recall of seeing the adverts through social networking sites was low among competition participants, and non-competition participants, and was not cited at all among adults in the general public. It is possible that the high reporting of seeing the campaign through TV adverts could have been respondents confusing it with the ‘Enough is Enough’ anti-violence campaign; it is also possible that respondents were assuming they must have seen the adverts on TV and their memory was inaccurate. The reporting of seeing the adverts on posters may also have been affected by the posters being shown to the respondents before asking this question, to ascertain whether they recognised the logo; had the radio adverts been played during the survey it is possible higher numbers of respondents would have agreed that they had heard these adverts.

The campaign was targeted at the wider population, but only one quarter of the respondents stated that the campaign was targeted at everybody, which indicates that the commercial content did not speak to the wider population, possibly due to young people, and young Indigenous people featuring in the adverts; a number of people did say, in answer to this question, ‘It’s young people so must be aimed at youth’, and possibly linked to stereotypes held about who is responsible for problem drinking in the population. This indicates that targeting adverts at the wider population is not as effective, and it would be more appropriate to target the campaign at a particular segment of the population. One of the strategic priorities outlined by FARE (2011) is to target priority groups in the population who experience higher levels and disproportionate effects of alcohol misuse, with young people being one such group; so it would be beneficial to aim future campaigns at young people.

Focus group discussion included asking what the competition participants thought of using Jessica Mauboy in promoting the competition. Most of them thought it was good to use someone famous and ‘cool’ to get people interested and that young people look up to such role
models. To achieve behaviour change, however, Robertson (2008) highlights the importance of the advertising provoking deeper thinking, or ‘central processing’ of the message to engage the individual in examining the argument closely rather than just understanding the message.

*Strategy: web-centric and youth created content*

Young people enjoyed taking part in the competition on the whole. Only one respondent commented that they liked the prizes; other young people talked about enjoying the process of creating the media and then hearing or seeing it as part of the campaign. Having local people in the adverts increased wider public engagement, particularly with family and friends of those involved, in playing the adverts as part of the surveys the evaluators observed excitement when people knew those featuring in them. There was feedback from the youth involved that they liked to give their views and to feel they were contributing to making a difference. Young people reported it increased interest in the adverts and was a talking point; they would look out for the adverts as they liked watching people they knew.

Most of the youth respondents agreed slightly or strongly that the adverts were really effective in getting the message across. None of the competition participants agreed strongly which may be because they didn’t want to report highly of themselves; or it could be because they had better understanding of the message and therefore did not think the adverts reflected this message well enough.

The main difficulties reported by participants and supporting service providers in taking part were support for high quality production, and unclear guidelines for submitting acceptable entries to the website. It was noted by the evaluators that sometimes the contribution from youth may have been tokenistic or coincidental because the aim was to achieve outcomes for a film project rather than the health promotion and education outcomes relating to alcohol awareness, one young person involved in the campaign for example, had not even accessed and viewed the campaign website. The media creation was not necessarily done as part of a learning experience in which the message and impact of the media content was deeply thought about and discussed.

The use of the website around the competition phase of the campaign shows it was being used to view the youth created media, so the website was not just used to submit competition entries. The website did not seem to create enough interest to continue to attract visitors after this phase of the campaign. The use of Facebook could have been utilised to a greater extent; the campaign Facebook page had just 44
‘likes’, to put this into context against a National Campaign, the Facebook page for ‘Don’t Turn a Night Out into a Nightmare’ which ran from 2008-2010 had 199,000 ‘likes’; but one-third of the referrals to the website came through Facebook indicating the social networking site was being used by youth in relation to the competition. Use of the internet in the field of public health is increasing, as discussed in the presentation on the ‘Utilisation of social media in health communications targeting youth’ at the Youth Health 2011 conference: content should preferably be made for youth by youth and be locally produced, that consistent posting on Facebook essential providing steady flow of information; this strategy could be a means of encouraging youth to ask questions and get accurate information about alcohol and safer drinking.

If the future campaign is to engage young people in deeper thinking about drinking behaviour, as suggested by Robertson (2008), it would be beneficial to engage education and youth service providers so that the youth could be involved in a wider learning experience than merely creating content. Whilst media production is used regularly to engage young people in both youth and education settings, there is certainly opportunity to link with other community organisations and use the project to teach about the impact that excessive alcohol consumption has on family structures and the individual’s health and wellbeing which were two of the key objectives of the campaign, and psychology in terms of behaviour change so that the young people are creating media that has evidence base for effectiveness. This could be done even with limited funding through partnership with a range of organisations who seek such outcomes (i.e. schools, colleges, health promotion and health education teams, police, youth services). The World Health Organisation (2009) highlight the evidence however, that classroom based education programmes do not lead to sustained behaviour changes, and there is a lack of evidence of the effect of public education campaigns on behaviour, although it is acknowledged that it is not known the extent to which education and information campaigns can be made more effective. Moreover, it is asserted that education is needed, and it is suggested that education should shift from influencing attitudes to effect behaviour, to looking at the influence of behaviour on attitudes, and that education activities should encourage and support consumer advocacy by providing information on how the public can influence alcohol policy (World Health Organisation 2009).
Value for money

It is clear that as a whole the campaign had very good reach and engaged a significant number of young people in the process of media content creation. Use of TV to air commercials is high cost, but TV gained high reach of the campaign. Radio advertising is also high cost and achieved relatively low reach. Posters are comparably low cost and achieved high reach. Finally, the website gained very low reach and was also high cost, though it served its purpose as a portal for competition entries and did gain considerable traffic around the competition phase, indicating its potential to attract visitors if interest is maintained. The website also offers an opportunity for interactive involvement; serves as a learning resource; and allows for data collection to assess the effectiveness of the campaign. The achievement of good campaign reach must be set against impact of the campaign on attitudinal and behaviour change in the population, and this should be measured pre and post campaign to make comparisons.

In terms of overall value for money, the World Health Organisation (2009) highlights that public information campaigns alone have been found to be ineffective in reducing alcohol-related harm. As concluded by Hill (2004), mass media alcohol health promotion campaigns on their own or as a main strategy show poor cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit; the policy evaluation research shows clearly that availability restrictions, taxation and enforcement of alcohol laws are much stronger strategies. That said, there is still benefit to be gained from engaging the community in conversations about alcohol and excessive consumption, it undoubtedly impacts on the development of ‘individual capital’ as stated by the World Health Organisation (2009); moreover it is arguable that effective, evidence based teaching and learning strategies employed through well-funded, long term public awareness campaigns would impact significantly on drinking behaviour.
Conclusions

**Knowledge**

There was a positive shift towards feeling more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much for most youth respondents on seeing the adverts, and knowledge levels around alcohol increased in most areas after the campaign.

The increase in youth perceiving high alcohol consumption to lie with the visible drinkers in the area, suggests the campaign and being involved in creating campaign content did not help to dispel stereotypes about problem drinking being mainly people in public view.

Knowledge of places to get help reflected services relevant to that population group and they did not know the full range of services.

The lack of awareness amongst the general public of the ‘That’s Enough’ website and Alcohol and Drug Information Service phone number may have been because this information was not prominent enough in the campaign or because these sources of help were not relevant to this cohort.

**Attitudes**

The majority of young people indicated that excessive consumption of alcohol and encouraging responsible drinking is a whole of population issue, but there still remained an expectation that individuals should be responsible for their behaviour when they are drunk.

Youth seem to have a good understanding of the social harms that can be caused by excessive drinking.
**Behaviour**

The campaign had a significant impact on making the respondents ‘think or do anything differently’, particularly amongst young people.

People seemed to be more likely to say they would ‘think or do something different’ if they felt the advert was targeted at them.

The campaign also had some impact on youth who reported it made them or someone they know change their drinking habits, and that it made them talk to friends or family about alcohol.

**Reach**

High reach and very good brand recognition- higher amongst youth respondents.

TV advertising was the most effective advertising medium for increasing reach.

It is noted that there was some confusion between the ‘Enough is Enough’ anti-violence campaign, and there was a misinterpretation of what the ‘Tell ’em That’s Enough’ slogan means: suggesting the campaign message was unclear and ambiguous.

Some negative feedback about logo and colour of T-shirts.
**Web-centric strategy**

Most activity on the website was around the competition phase so the website was not utilised fully. The website was used more by young people related to the competition suggesting adults either did not know about it or did not want to use the website.

One third of the website referrals came from Facebook so people were using the social networking site to link to the website, this could have been utilised more as a free and popular medium for sharing campaign information and adverts this was another opportunity to spark on going interest and discussion.

Competition participants reported that they didn’t remember the facts from the website and they did not consistently outperform non-competition participants in the knowledge questions suggesting facts and statistics on the website were not the most effective way of improving knowledge around alcohol and excessive drinking.

**Youth created content**

Recall of adverts was good, with slightly more youth accurately describing content which could be because they related to the adverts more, but most respondents had misconstrued the message of the campaign suggesting the message was not conveyed clearly enough.

Over half of the respondents thought the campaign was targeted at young people which could be due to young people featuring in the adverts, which disassociated the message from addressing adults, therefore having young people in adverts to target older people is not effective.

Over 40% general public 18+ thought the campaign was targeted at Indigenous people suggesting the adverts need more representation from non-Indigenous people if they are to target everyone.
Youth engagement

The campaign attracted a high number of entries to the competition. Being involved in the campaign was positive for the youth involved in creating media. Competition participants reported an increased awareness of alcohol and effects of drinking more than non-competition participants, and were more likely to report that the adverts made them talk to family or friends about alcohol.

Having local people in the adverts positively impacted on wider public engagement. There was a high use of the slogan amongst youth; this was more likely amongst competition participants.

Value for money

TV advertising was high cost, and gained high reach of campaign. Radio advertising was also high cost and achieved relatively low reach. Posters were low cost and achieved relatively high reach. Website was high cost and very low reach but served purpose for campaign competition and allowed for interactive involvement in the campaign, collation of data, and served as a learning resource.
Recommendations

Target a specific group of the population.

- The campaign will have more impact on attitude and behaviour change if the adverts are geared around a message that is relevant and targeted at a specific cohort.

Consult and involve target audience.

- Involving young people in the campaign competition was effective in engaging the youth who took part and also their friends and family—who were more interested in the adverts because someone they knew was in it.
- It is recommended that the target audience are consulted and surveyed about their attitudes and behaviour relating to alcohol and impact of alcohol to develop the most appropriate campaign message and achieve increased engagement with the campaign content.
- If the campaign continues to engage the public in creating campaign content, it is recommended that precise guidelines are given with regard to one clear and consistent theme for any created campaign material, along with support in developing this material, so it is of high quality and promoting the one key message.
One clear slogan that supports one key message

- If ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ continues as the main slogan, the campaign content needs to give a strong message of responsible drinking for the benefit of health, personal relationships and wider society as this slogan is ambiguous in its message and can be misinterpreted.
- It is suggested that CAAPAC engages the target audience in thinking of a new slogan and logo that promotes the responsible drinking message, or the ‘Take control Limit the alcohol’ tag line could continue to be used as this is unambiguous and is already known.
- It is suggested that the campaign message be centred around positive psychology to ensure no further stigmatisation of problem-drinkers.
- Campaign content should be more representative of the general population to avoid promoting any stereotypes around alcohol use, and therefore disassociating some groups from the campaign message.

Use a strategy suitable for the target audience

- If a web based strategy is used— which is more suitable for youth, the website needs to have more to interest and engage them for longer: a quiz, games, stories rather than facts and statistics. It is suggested that it be used by youth and education services as a learning tool and resource which would increase its use and engage people in active learning.
- If a campaign competition is undertaken it is suggested that the judging be done by the public through Facebook 'likes' to generate interest and engagement from the community and achieve community ownership of the campaign.
- Access to the internet may be limited, thus the reach of a web-only campaign would be smaller. It is suggested that the campaign engages young people, if this is the target audience, through a wider health promotion and education project through schools and youth organisations, engaging them in face to face discussions around alcohol.
- Adverts should show people representative of the target audience.
Highlight information about local services

- Highlight information about local services available for help relevant to the target audience, not just the website and phone number.
- Provide details about services and how to access them.

Evaluate efficacy

- Survey the population about their knowledge, attitudes and behaviour.
- This data can be compared pre and post campaign to measure impact, and with national research for benchmarking.
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Appendix 1 - Baseline quiz:

1. Fill-in the blank: If $108 million dollars was saved through the reducing the amount of grog being drunk in the NT, it could pay for ...... for our community.
   
   => 5 Indoor aquatic centres
   => 4 Recreational Centres
   => 15 Big Day Out Events
   => All of the above

2. The Government is introducing Alcohol Management Plans in the NT which aim to ....
   
   => Reduce alcohol related problems
   => Limit the supply of cheap high alcohol grog like cask wines & ports.
   => Limit the times that take away grog can be bought.
   => All of the above

3. What is the legal blood alcohol content (BAC) for a Learner or P-plate driver?
   
   => 0.05%
   => 0.02%
   => 0.0%

4. How many alcohol-related incidents do police attend to each day (at a minimum)?
   
   => 39
   => 146
   => 212
   => 273

5. Over two thirds of domestic violence incidents in the NT are alcohol related.
   
   => True/ False

6. Problem-drinkers are people who ........
   
   => cause harm to themselves or others
   => are not involved in anti-social behaviour
   => only ever cause harm to themselves, never harm to others
   => all of the above

7. There is no safe level of grog consumption for young people.
   
   => True/ False

8. The alcohol-related cost per individual in the territory could buy:
   
   => 6 brand new Apple Ipads
   => 165 basketballs
   => Wii console with all the accessories plus 47 games
   => Either a, b or c
Appendix 2.1 - Participant Information Sheet:

Some questions you might have...

1. ‘Why have I been invited to join in this survey/ focus group?’
   • We are asking adults and young people in Central Australia if they would like to help us work out how well a recent, locally driven, alcohol awareness campaign was done.
   • We are finding out what people know and how they feel about alcohol and related harms, and what they think about the campaign.
   • You don’t have to take part unless you want to - if you don’t want to just tell us no thanks!
   • While we would be pleased to have you take part, we respect your right to not take part. There will be no consequences to you if you decide not to take part.

2. ‘What does this survey/ focus group involve?’
   • The survey will be done once, and will take about 10 minutes of your time. You will be asked questions by the evaluator, but you will not be asked for your name or any information that identifies you, so it is anonymous.
   • The focus groups are only for the young people who took part in making adverts for the campaign; the group will meet once and will take around 40 minutes to 1 hour of your time. This will be a friendly and relaxed talk with the evaluators, you and other students who took part.
   • You can choose which questions you want to answer, and don’t have to answer if you don’t want to.
   • If you decide to stop taking part at any time, you may do so without providing an explanation.
   • The information will be used to make a report for the committee who ran the campaign; it will be used to make campaigns like this better in future and will be kept on file by the committee. A summary of the report may be shared publicly by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education.
   • The report will also be available to anyone who took part in the evaluation at their request (see number 6).

IF YOU ARE UNDER 18
   • The things we talk about will not be discussed with any teachers or parents; and we will only put information in our report relating to your answers to the survey or focus group questions.
   • However, we may have to share information if we think you are at risk of any harm. We would tell you first if we needed to do this and explain what would happen. This is because we have to keep you safe.

3. ‘Are there any possible benefits from taking part?’
   • Taking part may give you some information that could be useful for you or friends/ family.
   • Taking part will help make alcohol awareness campaigns like this better in the future.

4. ‘Are there any possible risks from taking part?’
   • There are no anticipated risks in taking part in this evaluation.
   • However, if you have any worries at any point we can discuss with you the best place for you to get support, and if you want, we can help you get that support.

5. ‘What if I have questions or concerns about this survey/ focus group?’
   • This evaluation has been reviewed by the Department of Education and Training.
   • You can ask the evaluators any questions at any time.
   • You can contact John Gaynor at Alcohol and Drugs Services Central Australia, on 08 8981 4199.

6. ‘What if I want a copy of the report?’
   • We would be happy to send you a copy. Please give your name and contact number and/ or email address to the evaluator and they will send you a copy of the report when it is finished.
Appendix 2.2 - Parent Information Sheet:

Dear Parent/ Carer,

We are asking some young people in schools in Central Australia to help us work out how well a recent, locally driven alcohol awareness campaign was done. We are finding out what people know and how they feel about alcohol and related harms, and what they think about the campaign. They don’t have to take part unless they want to. While we would be pleased to have your child take part, we respect the right to not take part.

Please sign and return this form only if you do NOT want your child to participate.

1. ‘What does this survey/ focus group involve?’
   • The survey will be done once, in school and takes about 10 minutes. It is a verbal questionnaire and does not ask names or any information that identifies the young person, so it is anonymous. Not all students will be asked to do the survey- the evaluation team will ask a small number (around 20) at random.
   • The focus groups are only for the young people who took part in making adverts for the campaign. The group will meet once, in school, and will take around 40 minutes to 1 hour. This will be a friendly relaxed talk with the evaluators, your child and other students in school.
   • They can choose which questions they want to answer, and do not have to answer if they don’t want to.
   • If they decide to stop taking part at any time, they may do so without providing an explanation.
   • The information will be used to make a report for the committee who ran the campaign; it will be used to make campaigns like this better in future and will be kept on file by the committee. A summary of the report may be shared publicly by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education.
   • The report will also be available to anyone who took part in the evaluation at their request (see number 5).

2. ‘Are there any possible benefits from taking part?’
   • Taking part may give them some information that could be useful for friends/ family.
   • Taking part will help make alcohol awareness campaigns like this better in the future.

3. ‘Are there any possible risks from taking part?’
   • There are no anticipated risks in taking part in this evaluation.
   • However, if anyone has any worries at any point we can discuss with them the best place to get support, and if they want, we can help them get that support.

4. ‘What if I have questions or concerns about this evaluation?’
   • This evaluation has been approved by the school Principal and staff involved.
   • You can ask the evaluators any questions and can contact us through the school.
   • You can contact John Gaynor at Alcohol and Drugs Services Central Australia, on 08 8981 4199.

5. ‘What if I want a copy of the evaluation report?’
   We would be happy to send you a copy. Please ask your child to give your name and contact number and/ or email address to the evaluators and they will send you a copy of the report when it is finished.

6. ‘What if I don’t want my child to take part?’
   There will be no consequences if you decide you do not want your child to take part. Please let us know if you do not want your child to take part by filling in the slip below and returning it to school by 5th March 2012.

Thank you,
Yours Sincerely,
Olivia Henry and Peter Stephens - Independent Evaluation team

____________________________________________________________________________________

Dear Independent Evaluation team,
I do NOT wish my child to participate in the survey/ focus group
Child’s name:..................................................Date of Birth:..................
Signed:..........................................................
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Appendix 3.1 - Survey methodology

- Evaluators will introduce themselves and explain they are doing some surveys asking people what they thought about a recent locally driven campaign about alcohol awareness. It will take around 10 minutes of their time if they give permission.

- In licensed premises anyone who is visibly intoxicated will not be approached and invited to participate. In talking to participants if the evaluators have any reason to believe they do not understand the information being given to them, they will not be surveyed.

- For school cohort parents of under 18 year olds will be sent home an information sheet explaining the survey and they can decline participation of their child if they wish.

- Participants who agree will be given an information sheet in easy to understand English to take away, and will receive an oral explanation of what the survey is for and what will be done with the information, and that if they want a copy of the report they are to give their name and contact number/ email address.

- Participants will be asked to stand or sit aside if with a group of people, so survey can be done confidentially and away from noise/ interruptions. If participant is not comfortable being apart from the group the survey may be completed there, but will not be included in the results if the participant is not able to answer independently.

- Evaluators will explain verbally that every question is optional and that all information will be anonymous, we are not asking for names or dates of birth.

- Each question to be read out by the evaluator verbatim- using exact wording in survey, repeating if necessary. For participants who speak English as a second language or have a short attention span the survey may be started at the campaign section, with the quiz asked at the end if they are still attentive.

- If participant does not understand a question, different wording may be used to explain the word or concept and this will be recorded on the survey sheet. Alternative explanations that have been pre-empted are listed in ‘alternative explanations’ sheet- evaluators will liaise after each session and add to this list if necessary.

- Evaluators will show participant the survey as they are filling it out, to point to answers as they say them (ie yes/ no/ don’t know etc…) and will use visual aids to explain and elaborate questions.

- After knowledge section in ‘competition and non-competition’ surveys, evaluators will read out correct answers to participant.

- In showing the campaign content- two posters will be shown, two tv commercials, and two radio ads will be played each time to show the range of content.

- At the end of the survey the evaluator will thank the participant for their time and give a service provider leaflet to the participant to take away.
Appendix 3.2 - Focus group methodology

- Evaluators will introduce themselves and explain they are doing the focus groups asking people what they thought about the campaign they took part in. It will take around 40 minutes- 1 hour of their time if they give permission.

- Parents of under 18 year olds will be sent home (via school/ youth worker) an information sheet explaining the focus group and they can decline participation of their child if they wish.

- Participants who agree will be given an information sheet in easy to understand English to take away, and will receive an oral explanation of what the survey is for and what will be done with the information, and that if they want a copy of the report they are to give their name and contact number/ email address.

- Participants will be seated in a circle in the group facing each other and the evaluators.

- Evaluators will explain that they will record notes during the discussions, and run through a Group Agreement: confidentiality, equal airspace, respect (including everyone can give different answers-= no right and wrong!), responsibility.

- Evaluators will explain verbally that every question is optional and that everyone may take part in the discussion or not, at any time. Also that all information will be anonymous, we are not asking for names or dates of birth.

- Each question to be read out by the evaluator verbatim- using exact wording in prompt sheet, repeating if necessary. Alternative explanations are included on the prompt sheet if questions appear not to have been clearly understood.

- Discussions will be open and led by the participants, with the next question being asked as the previous discussion draws to a close or to prompt elaboration of topics raised by participants. Once each new question or topic is introduced, evaluators will remain silent to wait for participants input.

- Evaluators will give encouraging and supportive body language and verbal prompts to all participants for taking part. If it appears that some participants are trying to contribute and are not getting a chance, evaluators may intervene to remind the group of the Group Agreement.
Appendix 3.3 – Survey Script

- Hi I'm.....
- We are just doing some surveys to find out what people think about a local alcohol awareness campaign that was done recently.
- It will take around 10 to 15 minutes.
- Do you mind if I ask you a few questions?

[Information sheet given]
- This gives some information about the survey.
- We do not ask your name so it is anonymous.
- We will use the information we get to make a report for the committee who ran the campaign.
- If you want a copy of the report you can give me your number/ email address and we will send it to you once it is finished.

[If noisy or lots of people around- ask them to step aside, if participant is not comfortable being apart from the group the survey may be completed there]
- Do you mind coming over here so it is a bit quieter...

- Every question is optional
- If you don’t understand any question let me know.

DO SURVEY-
- [for participants who speak English as a second language or have a short attention span the survey may be started at the campaign section, with the quiz asked at the end if they are still attentive.]
- [In views section emphasise this is about their opinions- no right or wrong]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE SECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 a) cause harm to themselves or others  
  4 False  
  5 False  
  6 False  
  7 False  
  8 True  
  9 True  
  10 True |
| 11 Here is a list of places that you could get help for yourself or friends/ family  
[can give leaflet at this point] |

- Thank you for your time, please take a leaflet about the services if you or family/ friends want to know more about alcohol
Appendix 3.4 - Additional or alternative explanations in survey

Non-Competition entrants surveys

2. May need to provide definition of trans and intersex
Trans: is an term for transgender and transsexual: people whose sex at birth does not describe or does not completely describe their (identified) gender or sex.
Intersex: many people do not have a binary sex: they might show or have shown a combination of physical characteristics usually attributed to only one of men or women. Intersex people are affected by many of the same issues as non-binary-gendered people

3. What do you think a ‘problem drinker’ means? Anti social behaviour= things that might bring problems to rest of the community.

4. Do you think the adults in NT drink the most out of everyone in the world?

5. The high drinking is because of people who drink outside/ on the streets/ in parks

6. Young people can drink a little bit without causing problems for themselves, keep strong and not get sick.

7. The amount of alcohol in someone’s blood can be measured, for example, if the police stopped them. For someone with P plates or a learner, do you think the police would be ok with them having 10% grog in their blood [illustration]

8. DV- violence from someone you are living with, because of grog

9. It’s not safe for someone who is pregnant to drink grog

10. Drinking more than two of these (show chart) can cause problems.

11. How might someone get help/ where might they go/ who could they contact?

12. Responsible drinking = not drinking too much that it makes trouble/causes problems. not problem drinking

13. Drinking too much= problem drinking Harm = problems

14. Drinking too much= problem drinking

15. People should sort themselves out and not behave wrong way/ cause problems.

16. Have you seen anything on TV/ heard anything on radio about grog or how grog affects people?

17. Have you seen ‘That’s Enough’ on TV/ heard it on radio?

18. Can you remember what it was about/ what it was saying?

19. After you saw this did you make any change in your life or learn anything new?

20. Would this make you change anything/ learn anything new?

21. Who did did the campaign/That’s Enough mob want to listen to these adverts/ commercials/ posters? Which people did they think needed to listen?

22. (message given above in Q. 22) do you think the ad did that well?

23. I understand more about grog...

30. Website and number that the campaign/TE mob set up Slightly= a bit Neither= don’t
Competition entrants surveys

2. May need to provide definition of trans and intersex.
   Trans: is an term for transgender and transsexual: people whose sex at birth does not describe or does not completely describe their (identified) gender or sex.
   Intersex: many people do not have a binary sex: they might show or have shown a combination of physical characteristics usually attributed to only one of men or women. Intersex people are affected by many of the same issues as non-binary-gendered people.

3. What do you think a ‘problem drinker’ means? Anti social behaviour= things that might bring problems to rest of the community.

4. Do you think the adults in NT drink the most out of everyone in the world?

5. The high drinking is because of people who drink outside/ on the streets/ in parks.

6. Young people can drink a little bit without causing problems for themselves, keep strong and not get sick.

7. The amount of alcohol in someone’s blood can be measured, for example, if the police stopped them. For someone with P plates or a learner, do you think the police would be ok with them having 10% alcohol in their blood [illustration]

8. DV- violence from someone you are living with, because of grog.

9. It’s not safe for someone who is pregnant to drink grog.

10. Drinking more than two of these (show chart) can cause problems.

11. How might someone get help/ where might they go/ who could they contact?

12. Responsible drinking = not drinking too much that it makes trouble/causes problems. not problem drinking.

13. Drinking too much = problem drinking
   Harm = problems


15. People should sort themselves out and not behave wrong way/ cause problems.

16. Have you seen ‘That’s Enough’ on TV/ heard it on radio?

18. What are the advert/ commercial/ posters saying to us?

19. Who did the campaign/That’s Enough mob want to listen to these adverts/ commercials/ posters? Which people did they think needed to listen?

20. Taking part in the campaign did you make any change in your life or learn anything new?

21. (message they gave above in Q. 18) do you think the ad did that well?

22. I understand more about grog...

26. Website and number that the campaign/TE mob set up

Slightly= a bit    Neither= don’t
Licensed Premises surveys

2. May need to provide definition of trans and intersex
   Trans: is an term for transgender and transsexual: people whose sex at birth does not describe or does not completely describe their (identified) gender or sex.
   Intersex: many people do not have a binary sex: they might show or have shown a combination of physical characteristics usually attributed to only one of men or women. Intersex people are affected by many of the same issues as non-binary-gendered people

3. The past week, have you had more than two of these (showing picture) in one day? How many days have you had two or more in one day?

4. Have you seen anything on TV/ heard anything on radio about grog or how grog affects people?

5. Slogan: heard anyone say this?

8. Can you remember what it was about/what it was saying?

9. After you saw this did you make any change in your life or learn anything new?

10. Would this make you change anything/learn anything new?

11. What are the advert/commercial/posters saying to us?

12. Who did the campaign/TE MOB want to listen to these adverts/commercials/posters? Which people did they think needed to listen?

13. Website and number that the campaign/TE mob set up

   Slightly= a bit
   Neither= don’t
Appendix 4 - Surveys

'TE' QUESTIONNAIRE NON COMPETITION PARTICIPANTS
ALL QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ARE OPTIONAL AND WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY ANONYMOUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUST A BIT ABOUT YOU FIRST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT GROG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. COMPLETE THE SENTENCE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem drinkers are people who..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) cause harm to themselves or others □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) are not involved in anti-social behaviour □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) only ever cause harm to themselves, never harm to others □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) all of these □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE SAY IF YOU THINK THEY ARE TRUE OR FALSE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The NT adults are the biggest grog drinkers in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The high level of drinking in the NT is due to people who drink in public areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is safe for young people to drink grog in moderation with no risks to their health or safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A P-Plater or Learner driver can have a legal blood alcohol content (BAC) of 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Almost 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are grog-related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. For adult men and women drinking more than two standard drinks on one day puts them at risk of harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. List every where you know that people can get help for themselves or their family/ friends about grog?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELL PARTICIPANT CORRECT ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHAT'S YOUR VIEW?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In your view, who should encourage responsible drinking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) It’s up to the individuals who drink to encourage responsible drinking □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The police and government should encourage responsible drinking □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) It’s everybody’s business to encourage responsible drinking □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinking too much when you are out can get you into trouble or danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when drunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE WANT TO ASK ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Have you seen or heard any advertising in the last few months about grog and the effects of drinking too much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have you seen or heard any of the ‘That’s enough’ advertising in the last few months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

◊ SHOW THE TELL 'EM THAT'S ENOUGH POSTER/ TSHIRT ◊

Please turn to next page...
18. Have you seen this logo or heard this slogan ('That's enough')?
   Yes □ No □ Don't know □ (IF 'NO' OR 'DON'T KNOW' GO TO SECTION B)

19. Where have you seen or heard about it?
   Any of these...? (For social networking list: 'such as Facebook/ YouTube/ Twitter') N/A □
   TV □ Radio □ Newspaper □ Posters □ Website □ Social Networking □ Other □ Please Specify... Don't know □

20. Please could you describe the commercial/ advert/ poster that you saw? N/A □

21. Did the commercial/advert/ poster make you think or do anything differently? Y/N □ Yes □ No □ Don't know □
   If yes, what?

SECTION B

COULD I SHOW YOU ONE OF THE 30 SECOND 'TELL EM THAT'S ENOUGH' COMMERCIALS? (IF NOT AND NO TO Q. 17 END SURVEY)
(SKIP THIS QUESTION IF THEY HAD SEEN CAMPAIGN CONTENT)

22. Do you think this would make you think or do anything differently? Y/N □ Yes □ No □ Don't know □
   If yes, what?

23. What message do you think the 'Tell 'Em That's Enough' campaign is giving? Don't know □

24. Who do you think this campaign was targeted at? Don't know □

PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

25. 'The advert/s I saw were really effective in getting the message across'
   Strongly agree □ Agree slightly □ Neither agree nor disagree □ Disagree slightly □ Strongly disagree □

26. 'I feel more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much after this/ these advert/s'
   Strongly agree □ Agree slightly □ Neither agree nor disagree □ Disagree slightly □ Strongly disagree □

27. FOR 18+ 'The advert/s made me change my drinking habits'
   FOR UNDER18 'The advert/s made someone I know change their drinking habits'
   Strongly agree □ Agree slightly □ Neither agree nor disagree □ Disagree slightly □ Strongly disagree □

28. 'The advert/s made me talk to my family/ friends about grog'
   Strongly agree □ Agree slightly □ Neither agree nor disagree □ Disagree slightly □ Strongly disagree □

29. I have told someone 'That's enough' when I thought they should not drink anymore grog...
   Never □ Once or 'Twice' □ Sometimes □ Very Often □ Always □

30. 'I know how to get help for myself or someone else through the website or phone number'
   Strongly agree □ Agree slightly □ Neither agree nor disagree □ Disagree slightly □ Strongly disagree □

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME! WE JUST WANT TO TELL YOU ABOUT SOME LOCAL SERVICES...
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### ‘TE’ QUESTIONNAIRE COMPETITION PARTICIPANTS

ALL QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ARE OPTIONAL AND WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY ANONYMOUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUST A BIT ABOUT YOU FIRST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. What is your age group?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. What is your gender?** |
| Male ☐ | Female ☐ | Trans ☐ | Intersex ☐ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT GROG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. COMPLETE THE SENTENCE:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-drinkers are people who...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) cause harm to themselves or others ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE SAY IF YOU THINK THEY ARE TRUE OR FALSE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The NT adults are the biggest grog drinkers in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The high level of drinking in the NT is due to people who drink in public areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is safe for young people to drink grog in moderation with no risks to their health or safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A P-Plater or Learner driver can have a legal blood alcohol content (BAC) of 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Almost 7 out of 10 domestic violence offences in the NT are grog-related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is no safe drinking level for women who are pregnant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. For adult men and women drinking more than two standard drinks on one day puts them at risk of harm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHOW STANDARD DRINK ILLUSTRATION CARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. List every where you know that people can get help for themselves or their family/ friends about grog?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELL PARTICIPANT CORRECT ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. In your view, who should encourage responsible drinking?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) It’s up to the individuals who drink to encourage responsible drinking ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinking too much can harm relationships with family and friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinking too much when you are out can get you into trouble or danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Individuals should take more responsibility for their behaviour when they are drunk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE WANT TO ASK ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Have you seen or heard any of the ‘That’s Enough!’ advertising in the last few months about grog and the effects of drinking too much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17. IF YES, Where have you seen or heard about it? |
| Any of these...? (For social networking list: such as Facebook/ YouTube/ Twitter) |
| TV ☐ | Radio ☐ | Newspaper ☐ | Posters ☐ | Website ☐ | Social networking ☐ | Other ☐ | Please Specify... | Don’t know ☐ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COULD I SHOW YOU ONE OF THE COMMERCIALS/ POSTERS TO REMIND YOU?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please turn to next page...*
18. What message do you think the ‘Tell ’Em That’s Enough’ campaign is giving?  
Don’t know □

19. Who do you think this campaign was targeted at?  
Don’t know □

20. When you took part in the campaign, and afterwards, did it make you think or do anything differently?  
Yes □  No □  Don’t know □
If yes, what?

PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

21. ‘The campaign was really effective in getting the message across’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree □</th>
<th>Agree slightly □</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree □</th>
<th>Disagree slightly □</th>
<th>Strongly disagree □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. ‘I feel more aware of alcohol and the effects of drinking too much after this campaign’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree □</th>
<th>Agree slightly □</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree □</th>
<th>Disagree slightly □</th>
<th>Strongly disagree □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. FOR 18+ ‘The campaign made me change my drinking habits’ / FOR UNDER 18 ‘The campaign made someone I know change their drinking habits’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree □</th>
<th>Agree slightly □</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree □</th>
<th>Disagree slightly □</th>
<th>Strongly disagree □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. ‘The campaign made me talk to my family/ friends about grog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree □</th>
<th>Agree slightly □</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree □</th>
<th>Disagree slightly □</th>
<th>Strongly disagree □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. I have told someone ‘That’s enough’ when I thought they should not drink anymore grog...

Rever □  Once or Twice □  Sometimes □  Very Often □  Always □

26. ‘I know how to get help for myself or someone else through the website or phone number’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree □</th>
<th>Agree slightly □</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree □</th>
<th>Disagree slightly □</th>
<th>Strongly disagree □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME! WE JUST WANT TO TELL YOU ABOUT SOME LOCAL SERVICES...
`TE` QUESTIONNAIRE AT LICENSED PREMISES

ALL QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ARE OPTIONAL AND WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY ANONYMOUS.

**JUST A BIT ABOUT YOU FIRST**

1. **What is your age group?**
   - 18-24 □
   - 25-34 □
   - 35-44 □
   - 45-54 □
   - 55-64 □
   - 65+ □

2. **What is your gender?**
   - Male □
   - Female □
   - Trans □
   - Intersex □

3. **Thinking about the last 7 days, starting with yesterday and working back,**
   How many times over this 7 day period, if any, have you had more than two standard drinks on any one day?

   SHOW STANDARD DRINK ILLUSTRATION CARD
   - 0 days □
   - 1 day □
   - 2 days □
   - 3 days □
   - 4 days □
   - 5 days □
   - 6 days □
   - 7 days □

**WE WANT TO ASK ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN...**

4. **Have you seen or heard any advertising in the last few months about grog and the effects of drinking too much?**
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - Don’t know □

5. **Have you seen or heard any of the ‘That’s enough’ advertising in the last few months?**
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - Don’t know □

6. **SHOW THE TELL ‘EM THAT’S ENOUGH POSTER/ T-SHIRT**

   **Have you seen this logo or heard this slogan (‘That’s enough’)?**
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - Don’t know □
   - (If ‘No’ or ‘Don’t know’ go to section B)

7. **Where have you seen or heard about it?**
   - Any of these...? (For social networking list: such as Facebook/ YouTube/ Twitter)
   - TV □
   - Radio □
   - Newspaper □
   - Posters □
   - Website □
   - Social networking □
   - Other □ Please Specify... □
   - Don’t know □

8. **Please could you describe the commercial/ advert/ poster that you saw?**
   - N/A □

9. **Did the commercial/advert/ poster make you think or do anything differently?**
   - If yes, what?
   - N/A □
   - Yes □
   - No □
   - Don’t know □

**SECTION B**

**COULD I SHOW YOU ONE OF THE 30 SECOND ‘TELL EM THAT’S ENOUGH’ COMMERCIALS?**
   - (IF NOT AND NO TO Q; 5 END SURVEY)
   - SKIP THIS QUESTION IF THEY HAD SEEN CAMPAIGN CONTENT)

10. **Do you think this would make you think or do anything differently?**
    - If yes, what?
    - N/A □
    - Yes □
    - No □
    - Don’t know □

11. **What message do you think the ‘Tell ‘Em That’s Enough’ campaign is giving?**

12. **Who do you think this campaign was targeted at?**

13. **PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:**
   - ‘I know how to get help for myself or someone else through the website or phone number’
     - Strongly agree □
     - Agree slightly □
     - Neither agree nor disagree □
     - Disagree slightly □
     - Strongly disagree □

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME! WE JUST WANT TO TELL YOU ABOUT SOME LOCAL SERVICES...
## Appendix 5 - Focus Group topics

- Firstly, did you enjoy taking part in this campaign?
- What did you enjoy most?
- Would you do it again?
- Was there anything that was difficult about taking part?
- Did you find the website easy to use?

- What was the main message of the campaign? (small group brainstorm) What do you think the Government wanted to change with this campaign?
- How well do you think the adverts/ posters you came up with put across this message? What in particular in your advert/ poster was giving the message?
- What did you think about using Jessica Mauboy in the campaign?

- Who did you think the campaign was aimed at? Who did the Government want to listen to these adverts/ commercials?
- Do you think people seeing the ads on TV/ posters/ hearing the ads on radio/ would have got the message you just came up with?

- Is drinking alcohol ok?
- If there are any-what are the risks of drinking alcohol? Were any of these new to you- did they surprise you?
- With problem drinking, who do you think is responsible for stopping it?
- Were you surprised by how much alcohol related health and social problems cost the Government?

- What was the most important thing you learnt in this campaign?
- Did you do anything differently during/ after taking part in this campaign?
Appendix 6.1 – Cross-Sectional Comparative Data

“Thinking about the last 7 days, starting with yesterday and working back... How many times over this 7 day period, if any, have you had more than two standard drinks on any one day?” across gender groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female (n= 29)</th>
<th>Male (n= 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.2 – Cross-Sectional Comparative Data

“Thinking about the last 7 days, starting with yesterday and working back... How many times over this 7 day period, if any, have you had more than two standard drinks on any one day?” across the age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24 (n=14)</th>
<th>25-34 (n=17)</th>
<th>35-44 (n=14)</th>
<th>45-54 (n=15)</th>
<th>55-64 (n=10)</th>
<th>65+ (n=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.3 – Cross-Sectional Comparative Data

“Did the commercial/ advert/ poster make you think or do anything differently?” across the age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Public 18+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-15 (n=50)</td>
<td>16-18 (n=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>44.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>34.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing responses across age groups](image)
Appendix 6.4 – Cross-Sectional Comparative Data

“Did the commercial/ advert/ poster make you think or do anything differently?” across gender groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female (n=87)</th>
<th>Male (n=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.5 – Cross-Sectional Comparative Data

“Have you seen or heard any of the ‘That’s Enough’ advertising in the last few months?” across the age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Youth (n)</th>
<th>Public 18+ (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>83% (47)</td>
<td>63% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>67% (15)</td>
<td>27% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>71% (17)</td>
<td>29% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>57% (14)</td>
<td>43% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>69% (14)</td>
<td>19% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>40% (16)</td>
<td>40% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>40% (14)</td>
<td>20% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Don't know* | 6% (6) | 8% (8) | 7% (7) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13% (13) | 20% (20) | 20% (20)