

Monitoring/Evaluation of the InvestEU campaign

Annex 3 to the Final Report: Focus Group Report

Monitoring/Evaluation of the InvestEU campaign

Annex 3 to the Final Report: Focus Group Report

technopolis _{group} July 2018

Introduction

In this Annex to the final report of the study Monitoring/Evaluation of the InvestEU campaign we report on the outcomes of the focus group analysis that was conducted by the evaluation team (Ipsos Mori) in May 2018.

The methodology underlying this analysis is described in Annex 1 to the Final Report (Methodology and Data Report).

InvestEU Focus Group findings

Executive summary

This note sets out the findings on public views of the InvestEU campaign. It is based on eighteen focus groups (each lasting 90 minutes) in nine countries: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Finland, Latvia, Greece, Poland and Bulgaria. All groups took place in the capital city of each country in the local language, apart from in Belgium where the first group was held in Brussels in French, and the second group was held in Antwerp in Flemish.

Each group comprised between six and eight participants, recruited to have positive or neutral attitudes towards the EU and low levels of awareness about EU investments. Groups were comprised of working adults aged between 25 and 55 with a mix of genders. Fieldwork was conducted between 10 May and 29 May 2018.

Each focus group started by discussing their attitudes to the EU in general and their initial perceptions of EU investments before they viewed three stimulus materials from the InvestEU campaign in their country.

Attitudes towards the EU

Across the countries, participants spontaneously spoke of the **benefits of free movement** including opportunities for travel, study and employment that being a part of the EU brings. However, participants also highlighted the potential negative consequences of open borders and a shared currency that makes free movement possible, including **fears around terrorism, particularly** in France, and the **impact of the Euro on the local economy** in Italy, and Bulgaria where there are currently public debates around joining the Euro. In contrast, **economic investment** and development was spontaneously raised as a benefit of EU membership in Latvia, Germany and Greece.

"We now have better roads, recreation places, cleaner environment and, above all, travel opportunities - I can take my suitcase to go wherever I want." - Latvia

"The opening of borders is for me the most positive aspect of the EU. I have a family abroad and visiting them is no problem for me now. Nothing will happen if I forget my passport." - Poland

"I know that euro 'saved' the Italian economy, but I don't know why our oil production should be penalized in favour of Tunisian olive oil." - Italy

Being a member of the EU was seen as bringing **regional solidarity**, offering greater global security in a time when international politics is uncertain, and supporting long-term decision making on issues such as climate change which require collective action - something emphasised by participants in Belgium. At the same time, the EU as an entity was viewed as **distant, bureaucratic** and too focused on governments or public institutions rather than being accessible to individuals. Participants in Finland, Bulgaria and Poland felt that EU regulations do not always suit the local context, while those in Italy and Greece described an **inequality in the balance of power** between some member states with countries like Germany being felt to wield a great deal of power, at the expense of other nations.

"How are the Northern issues considered. Life is very different in Middle – and Southern Europe. This requires a special effort from Finnish decision makers that our local specialities are noticed and considered." - Finland

Awareness of EU investments

Participants were broadly aware of EU investments in their country and other member states, but did not know much about the details beyond suggesting sectors where investments are made. Where participants had **personal experience** of a programme, such as the Erasmus programme or applying for cultural grants, they could provide more specific details that were otherwise missing from discussions. Beyond this, participants gained their knowledge of EU investments from **signs next to projects and media coverage**.

"I use the underground and there is a sign that I don't know how many trains were bought thanks to the operative programme." - Bulgaria

"In my neighbourhood, there are two new schools, both were built with the help of the EU." - Greece

In addition to the sectors read out during the discussion (small enterprises, transport infrastructure and education) participants in several countries including France, Germany, Poland and Bulgaria, referred to investments in **agriculture**. In Belgium and Latvia in particular, participants felt that they had little knowledge of the EU's role in smaller projects or the availability of grants for small businesses.

"The small enterprises - I didn't know that. If I want to start my own business then I can ask for a grant within Europe?" - Belgium

InvestEU Campaign

Across all the countries there was very little existing awareness of the InvestEU campaign. Some participants in Belgium, Italy and France could recall seeing a video or advert about the EU, but could not link this to the InvestEU campaign. Others had heard about the campaign in their professional environment, but did not know any specific details.

"I have not heard of the campaign. I would guess it's about investments." - Bulgaria

I have the feeling that I have seen these materials somewhere, they seem familiar but I do not know where and when I have seen them." - Latvia

Three stimulus were tested in each focus group. The summary below provides some themes drawn from discussions across countries and stimulus. We have focused on: the content and overarching message, the execution and communication channel used, and specific feedback on the campaign strapline such as "opportunity starts here".

1. Content and overarching message

Participants were **not always clear on the intended audience** for each stimulus, suggesting materials were targeted at professionals in the featured sector or government officials. In some cases, the focus on a specific location meant participants felt the communications material would **only be relevant for those in the city or local area** and might not work outside of this. For example, in Bulgaria stimulus A on the Sofia metro did not feel applicable to those outside of the capital that would not see investment in public transport in their region, and in Belgium stimulus B and C on technology in Flanders did not feel relevant or credible to those in Brussels. Participants **did not always feel the link to the EU was clear**, and felt that the EU logo should be more prominent on materials.

"If I had not seen the first three seconds of the movie, where the logo of the European Union was shown, I would have thought it was an advertisement for a real estate development company." - Poland

Participants tended to be more positive about stimulus that aligned with **topical issues**. For example, in Greece stimulus B on recycling, in Finland stimulus C on youth unemployment and in Bulgaria stimulus B on rose oil were all well received as they chimed with current debates at the top of people's minds. Telling a **human success story** was also supported by participants who felt this helped to demonstrate the real-life impact of EU investments and overcame the perception that the EU is distant and irrelevant to ordinary people's lives. For example, stimulus B in Finland was regarded as relatable due to the inspiring Finnish characters in the video, depicting local farmers as 'Arctic Warriors'. This video also had a focus on Northern Finland, which gave the message an inclusive feel. Likewise, participants liked the way stimulus C in Greece showed the full process of juice making showing the impact of investment on a community and motivating people to stay and work in the countryside.

"I liked the execution. People were smiling, the product was very appealing, made you want to drink it." - Greece

"The campaign materials are credible because it is a real person. I am convinced that the money will be wisely used." - Latvia

However, focusing on a single sector or individual was thought to make the communications feel **too specific or specialist**, something participants in Belgium felt about stimulus B which focused on the technology sector. Participants in Bulgaria also questioned the credibility of the story told in stimulus B which focused on a small business producing rose oil, asking whether it represented a true story and whether opportunities were really open to all. In some cases, the **accuracy of materials** was also questioned for example placing the pins in the wrong places in the map used in stimulus A in France. This reduced the credibility of the campaign for participants. However, participants in Greece and Italy thought the quality of the stimulus was high, for example, in Italy the image used for stimulus C was seen as powerful and having an instant impact unlike slower moving videos.

"There is something that seems odd on the poster is that we speak "in France the EU invests" and we just see Paris targeted." - France

"I can't say that the storyline is totally plausible." - Bulgaria

Participants felt that the videos often contained **too little information**, reducing their trust in the stimulus due to bold and vague claims with little substantial narrative or evidence supporting them. This left participants with the desire to learn more about the beneficiaries and impact of the investments. Others wanted to see greater detail on how to apply for grants and investments either through hyperlinks to websites with further information or more information in the video itself. In contrast, stimulus C in Italy of a poster of Pompeii included detailed **facts and figures about the project** including reference to the amount of Euros that had been invested. This left participants feeling they were clear about the message of the campaign and understood more about EU investments as a result. Greater use of facts and figures was also something participants in other countries wanted to see in future campaigns.

"That is what I wonder – to whom is this? Opportunities open here, but to whom? Who benefits from these investments? Should I be in contact with this 'programme' if I want to build some block of flats from wood." - Finland

2. Execution and selected communication channel

Participants emphasised the importance of the **images selected in the campaign and the quality of production** of the materials. In France, Germany, Belgium and Finland the photos used were seen as unengaging and not reflective of the message of the campaign. For example, in France the photo used in stimulus A about the digital sector was perceived as old-fashioned and contrasting with the high-tech message of the poster.

In Germany and Belgium, participants recognised the business advertised in the stimuli, while elsewhere, participants were **familiar with the features** presented including: specific local metro stations, airports, hospitals, and world heritage sites (e.g. Riga Airport, Sofia Metro, Torun Hospital, Pompeii).

There were differences in preference for what **channel** the stimulus should be delivered in. In Italy, a poster was seen to have a more direct impact allowing participants to digest all the needed information at once, where a poster provided information on top of an emotive backdrop of Pompeii. Whereas in Germany and Latvia, participants preferred the storytelling format of a video on social media.

"Here, such serious, difficult things are presented in a light, easy-to-understand form. Also the music in the background is light and quiet. Stylish and well-designed." - Latvia

While there were no generalizable views on the best channel for the campaign, participants in most countries felt they would see **posters** in places where they would stop to wait around and read the adverts such as the metro, train stations, and in bus stops. Participants felt the more industry or sector focused adverts would be seen in: magazines (e.g. in Germany where the poster was about a start-up in fashion), in airports (in Latvia, where the poster was focused on the development of Riga airport), in universities and schools (in Greece and Germany) and poster walls.

Participants broadly thought that videos should be shown on social media with several countries suggesting the videos could be improved with a **voice over** or by highlighting the key text in green. This was used in some of the videos shown in Germany, and was felt to help guide the viewer to the key information and make the text more digestible. Similar to the posters, the videos focusing on certain specialised topics (medical research, innovation, technology, leaving school and moving into employment) were also seen as appearing in internet pop-ups, as well as being shown in hospitals, universities, train and metro stations. In Belgium, one participant suggested the video about technology should be shown in schools to inform students about EU investments.

3. Campaign strapline

Groups across countries also wanted to see **greater specificity** in the message of the strapline "opportunity starts here" with participants asking where "here" referred to - is it the local area, the country or the EU as a whole? While in Latvia, France and Greece, the translation of the strapline did not always suit the local language or had multiple meanings.

"Maybe this is to be shown so that the EU supports not only Warsaw as a big centre - the capital, but also other Polish cities. Poland is not just a city of Warsaw, there are other smaller towns. Maybe it's also from this angle." – Poland

In several cases including Germany, Greece and Italy the straplines used were seen as **vague and out-of-touch** with issues affecting participants. For example, words such as 'innovation' and 'opportunity' were often seen as buzzwords that are used to create advertising and rarely reflects the tangible effects of EU investment that participants might benefit from. In Latvia, participants favoured the line "opportunity starts here" as it translated

directly into Latvian in contrast to words like “innovation” and “mobility” which felt foreign and did not have direct translations, increasing the perception of distance from the EU. In addition, the straplines were seen as inaccessible for participants, who did not feel that they had access to ‘opportunities’ or ‘innovations’. The result of slogans that were vague and untargeted left participants with more questions regarding EU investment than they had before viewing stimulus.

“I also would like to know how many jobs it created, I like facts, not just hot air.” – Italy

“These ‘visionaries’ and all – there are so many foreign words here. I don’t know if people will understand this.” - Bulgaria

Overall, a country comparison is not possible as different stimulus were tested in each country. However, as described above there were some themes across countries:

- There were preferences towards the video or short film **format** for the adverts with the exception of Italy, where the poster was considered more engaging due to successfully combining practical information about the project and an emotionally stimulating visual feature (Pompeii).
- Participants seemed to be more positive about the stimulus with **themes linked to topical issues** (in Greece stimulus B on recycling, in Finland stimulus C on youth unemployment and in Bulgaria stimulus B on rose oil) and more **emotional issues of national importance** or benefitting the local community (in Latvia – beekeeping as a national symbol, in Italy – Pompeii as a world heritage site, in Germany – renewable energy, in Greece – production of pomegranate juice production, in Finland – support for local farmers).
- Participants expressed a preference for stimulus based on **personal success stories**, in order to facilitate a connection with the audience.
- For posters and print images the overall preference was for adverts to be shown in metro, train stations and bus stops, while for the videos the preferred channel was social media and internet pop-up adverts.

Attitudes to the EU

Belgium

- Participants had broadly positive attitudes towards the EU. They focused on the **opportunities to travel** to other countries, the lack of frontiers and a sense of solidarity across member states.
- In Antwerp, participants emphasised the importance of being part of a bigger unit that shares knowledge and can **make decisions about macro issues** that Belgium cannot impact on its own e.g. greater power to make foreign policy decisions, act as a buffer against the US, and act on climate change. An example of this was how the EU protects the port in Antwerp by ensuring that the Netherlands looks after the surrounding rivers.
- There was a shared sense of **European identity** particularly in Brussels where the EU institutions are based, with participants describing how this puts Belgium on the map.
- However, participants also described how they have less **influence over decision making** at a supra-national level, how the EU feels **distant**, and that there are negative consequences of the Commission being based in Brussels including extra traffic when there is a summit and increases to the cost of living.

France

- Participants had similar attitudes towards the EU, emphasising the **benefits of free movement**, free trade, and having a single currency. They also felt the EU **offers security and economic stability** in global context, acting as a block against the US and Asia.
- But participants were more critical about the EU **lacking harmonisation** across member states, being **too bureaucratic** and not always focusing their policies on the right things.
- The Euro was also thought to have **increased the cost of living** and led to inflation, while opening the borders has increased the risk of terrorism.
- Participants felt they did not fully understand how the EU works.

Germany

- Participants were very positive about the EU, focusing on the **sense of community** it brings and the shared values held by member states. Cultural diversity, freedom of movement and travel, and the benefits from **economic development** were also mentioned.
- But participants felt the EU was distant, that individual **citizens do not know what is happening** in Brussels and that some of the policies and regulations do not make sense e.g. money is spent without purpose and things take a long time to implement.

Italy

- The groups held more ambivalent views towards the EU compared to France, Germany and Belgium. Discussions largely focused on the Euro and the advantages and disadvantages of this - both freedom of movement but also the **impact of the Euro and EU regulations on the Italian economy**, with a sense that other countries have more power over decision making and are advantaged above Italy.
- The EU was regarded as a bulwark against other nation states, seeing foreign policy benefits. But there was negativity about role of Italy in the EU, with Germany perceived as too dominant: *"countries are required to align to its will."*
- The EU was viewed as distant, and only relevant to institutions rather than individuals.

Latvia

- Groups were very positive about the EU, which was seen as offering **protection against Russia**, bringing economic growth and investment in infrastructure e.g. building insulation, water supply. Participants saw the impact of investment in their region.
- The EU was also seen as bringing **travel options and job opportunities**.
- It was felt that Latvia has gained more than it has lost through economic benefits and the possibility of receiving financial support.

"I like being in the EU, it is a good thing, there are many benefits – both, in trade and in travel, and the standard of living has improved. If there was no support like that, it would be much harder for Latvia."

Poland

- Groups emphasised the **ease of travel**, something which impacts citizens' ability to work in different countries. The lower price of calls and roaming was also mentioned as a benefit, along with sharing common values and cultural backgrounds.

- However, participants felt the EU can impose **inappropriate regulations** that are not always sensible or relevant to Poland. There was also a fear of losing local culture and traditions while being a part of a wider group of countries.
- There was some sense of Poland being a second-tier nation in the EU: *“There is the imposition of certain standards that might not always suit us”*.

Greece

- Participants were very positive towards the EU, acknowledging that they are one of the main beneficiaries when it comes to **financial investment** through schemes like ESPA.
- The EU was associated with peace, safety, economic security and university exchanges like Erasmus.
- Groups also discussed **shared values** such as freedom of speech and the ability to work elsewhere.
- However, they associated the EU with technocrats, an inequality between northern and southern member states, and bureaucracy: *“Inequities, that instead of getting smaller they are growing”*.

Bulgaria

- Participants had positive associations with travel, freedom of movement, and being able to visit new places.
- However, there was also discussion of **lack of control and corruption**, with EU money being spent locally by corrupt officials stopping the investments going where intended.
- **Regulations** were regarded as damaging by pushing out small businesses especially in agriculture.
- There is also some controversy around the introduction of the Euro and expectations that prices will increase.

Finland

- Participants associated the EU with their own country: “we are EU” and held positive views around this. The EU was seen to bring freedom of travel and **opportunities for the country**, giving it a better chance of looking after its own interests. Participants were proud that the EU has based some of its offices in Finland.
- However, the practical results of investments are **not very visible** for people, and there were some doubts about how EU commissioners make decisions.

Awareness of EU investments

Belgium

- Participants were much more familiar with investments they had **personal experience** of e.g. the Erasmus programme or applying for cultural grants and they recognised EU investments in education and infrastructure, where they had noticed signs. They otherwise associated EU investment with funding in other countries and had **no awareness of opportunities for small businesses or individuals** to apply for grants.
- Beyond personal experience, participants got their information from signs on roadsides and information boards with the EU logo.

France

- There was awareness of educational programmes such as universities and exchange programmes and some knowledge of EU investment in start-ups / private companies but participants did not know a lot of detail.

- Groups discussed the **impact of EU investment on farmers**, describing how it takes away their independence. Issues around agriculture have received a substantial amount of media coverage.

Germany

- Participants knew about investment in agriculture, universities (Erasmus) and infrastructure but not in detail.
- There was some awareness about support for **artists and cultural projects**, as well as an understanding that certain organisations can apply for independent funding for projects from the EU.
- There was a positive reaction to hearing that the EU invests in Germany, but a desire to know more concrete details about the balance between EU funding and investments from other stakeholders, where investments were being made and the size of funding, providing greater transparency for citizens.

Poland

- Participants were aware of investments in agriculture, programmes in schools and infrastructure. They held positive perceptions of EU investments with a significant amount being invested in Poland e.g. supporting the restoration of monuments.
- There was a sense that the country would develop at a slower pace if it were not for this support.
- *"I remember Poland before entering the EU and Poland today. It has evolved greatly. These funds have helped us so much in this development. We got money for sewerage, other things that raised the standard of living for people who would not normally be able to do it."*

Italy

- Participants had experience of applying for funding for MA programmes from the EU, and knew about infrastructure funding and support for young entrepreneurs.
- Their awareness came from signs outside of construction sites and personal experience.

Latvia

- Participants had knowledge of the EU's role in large projects but **little awareness of investments in small projects**. Their understanding came from signs, posters, plaques, explaining: "this was created with EU support" as well as some information from the media.
- There was a sense that the funding process for individuals was time consuming and complex, with no information about how to do it properly.
- There was some concern that EU funding was not always spent correctly and could be mismanaged or used fraudulently, although EU funding was also regarded as a marker of quality.

"If I see the sign telling that this has been done with EU support, I clearly know that it has higher standards and that there has been better control."

Bulgaria

- Participants knew a lot about EU investments, so much they felt they did not need to know any more. Groups focused on investments in agriculture, with **less known about education**.
- However, they had doubts about how the money from EU investments is being spent, including whether it is going towards the right causes and the influence of potentially corrupt local officials.

Greece

- Participants were all aware of EU investments through schemes like ESPA. Groups mentioned funding in infrastructure including schools and roads, and special funding for hotels and tourism.
- Their awareness came via the media, street signs and the internet.
- There was some desire to know more about the programmes being funded by the EU including who the beneficiaries are and what the funding criteria is.

Finland

- There was some concern that the EU can be careless with the investments it makes, giving away funding too freely to southern countries.
- But participants recognised EU investments in science and research, although their knowledge seemed superficial e.g. participants could say there was investment in areas but found it difficult to provide specific examples.
- Knowledge came from the media and signs on roadsides.

Invest EU Campaign

Belgium

Stimulus A – Belle Vue OOH advert of a hotel based in Brussels. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The image was not regarded as distinctive or signifying the message of transformation, it was too grey, and showed an indistinct building. *“It could be anywhere, it could be France. There is nothing at all that says this.”*
- In Brussels, the group recognised the messaging around transforming a neighbourhood, but felt the image did not reflect this or link the photo to the wider transformation of the area.
- Participants felt an image of a hotel does not appeal to people that live in Brussels, feeling that it is for tourists rather than residents. *“I don’t see a link with what Europe does. I see a hotel that’s tourism right?”* They suggested focusing on cultural institutions, famous buildings in Brussels or children running in a park instead. This is something that was regarded as effective in Italy, where participants favoured the poster of Pompeii.
- The Antwerp group did not understand the message about transformation, suggesting they did not want the EU to become involved in their area.

Stimulus B – video used on social media, looking at the imec research centre in Leuven in the Flemish region of Belgium. The strapline is “Innovation starts here”.

- Participants in Brussels were unclear about who was being targeted by the campaign, suggesting the video focused on the regional level rather than having a European message and was targeted towards people in Flanders rather than those across Belgium.
- Because of the location, it felt less credible for those in the Brussels group compared to those in the Antwerp group and the link with the EU was not clear. *“They invest but you’re not really sure in what.” - Brussels; “[The message is] Europe invests in high tech sectors, that we have the benefits.” - Antwerp*
- While the message around employment and job creation was important in the Brussels group, participants felt it got lost during the video and they were unclear about where jobs were being created e.g. Flanders,

Belgium or across the EU? *“I heard employment but I didn’t associate it with Belgium or even Flanders. You’ve got research there, that technique has created employment, but not explicitly in Belgium – it’s a bit vague.”*

- The focus on technology was seen as too specific and too technical.
- In Antwerp, participants were more positive about the high-tech message which they felt made them feel proud of the science and technology in their area, recognising the video was based in local industry. They felt the video spoke of reciprocity between the EU and citizens, with local people working hard and the EU giving back to them through investment. This was something that resonated with their initial understanding of the role of the EU as an organisation that can share knowledge and think towards the future such as investing in high tech industries.
- The format of the video was too short and included too much writing. Participants wanted to see a voice over instead of the text.
- It was felt this format was suitable for social media, but would need to be shown multiple times for messages to sink in.
- Participants liked having the map of Belgium, feeling that this avoids the sense of distance from the EU and puts your country in the European context.
- On the strapline, participants questioned *where* opportunities are beginning e.g. in Flanders, Belgium or the EU.
- In Antwerp, the slogan “Innovation starts here” appealed as a call to action, suggesting the EU will support people to innovate and empower people to have a go and try things out. This felt distant to some in the Brussels group who felt that it excluded people without ideas or innovations.

Stimulus C - social media video looking at Flen Pharma company in Antwerp. The strapline is *“innovation starts here”*.

- The Brussels group felt the video was too technical, specialist and specific to a sector meaning participants had to extrapolate to understand that it refers beyond Antwerp or the scientific sector. It felt abstract and not local to them.
- The Antwerp group described how the video made them feel proud of the role local industry has played in changing the lives of burn victims, preferring this human touch. This focus on the impact of the product was seen as telling a more convincing story.
- The Brussels group questioned the small number of jobs being created, and felt it reiterated the perception that Flanders was the economic centre of Belgium rather than Brussels or Wallonia: *“It’s just a cream and 34 jobs. Small, small, small.”*
- The Antwerp group felt the role of Antwerp should be brought to the foreground instead of making it seem like EU has done most of the work. However, the video also triggered their interest in EU investments as they felt it was future looking, positive, made them want to find out more.
- In Flemish, “opportunities start here” can be translated as starts or begins where start is a start of a race i.e. coming from nothing and going fast, whereas begins is a more gradual process. The group preferred the latter as implies being built on what has gone before.

Germany

Stimulus A – *Outfittery & tausendkind poster for billboard. Strapline is “Innovation starts here”.*

- Participants understood the message was about the EU investing in start-ups (one person identified the action business), but felt the connection with the EU was unclear and they wanted to see more information about what the EU is doing including how many companies are being supported through the scheme. This reflected their initial desire to learn more about the specific details of EU funding in Germany, making EU investment more transparent. Participants suggested the advert could include a ‘to find out more, click here’ button or have a phone number to contact.
- Participants did not find the poster visually appealing, describing how they felt the picture was not interesting, the poster was hard to read, had too many fonts in different sizes and the colours were too bright.
- Participants expressed concern as to whether the arrow on the map was pointing to Berlin, raising questions about the overall credibility of the poster. They also felt the word ‘vision’ was vague, and one that implied political messaging undermining the credibility of the message: *“It’s just ad talk, isn’t it?”*
- Both groups suggested the message should be made more personal, tied to someone’s success story, with concrete information about the project. The strapline ‘Innovation starts here’ was difficult to understand and initially missed by some participants when they were first shown the stimulus. They were unclear on where innovation was beginning (e.g. in the EU) and only noticed at second glance that it was referring to Berlin. *“It’s not clear, it’s not straight forward, I only saw it at a second glance and thought ‘Aaaaa, it’s Berlin where innovation starts, I thought it referred to the EU first.”*
- The use of ‘here’ was seen as too localised and vague, with some participants suggesting replacing ‘here’ with ‘you’ e.g. no matter where you are, you’re always in the right spot. *“No, innovation starts with you, that’s better, not here!”*
- The second strapline, ‘Opportunity starts here’ was regarded as unnecessary by participants in the first group, unless there is a clear link between the information the poster is trying to convey and the actual visions, opportunities or innovation the EU is offering funding for (*“I think you should link it together more closely saying it’s about these visions and that’s where those in need of financial support should go. Maybe that’s the idea behind it to show people there are opportunities the EU will fund and subsidise and support, but I don’t think the poster really says that.”*)
- In the second group both straplines were considered unclear and dismissed as marketing speech. There was some preference for adding a phone number or a website to allow people to find out more information, should they wish to.
- Participants felt the target audience was the younger generation, individual and small entrepreneurs, freelancers, and self-employed people. There was a sense that this might be too exclusive and that the poster should be targeted towards wider citizens.
- Appropriate channels were thought to be magazines, IKEA catalogues or universities, poster walls.

Stimulus B – *Magforge, video for social media about medical/cancer research. Strapline is “Innovation starts here”.*

- Participants understood the message about science and cancer research and were positive about these investments. They felt this was something easy to relate to and resonated with the issues people care about: *“We all know someone who has or has had cancer so we can relate.”*
- However, participants felt the video was very fast moving and contained a lot of information making it more difficult to know what they should look at first (images or written messages).
- Participants were not impressed with the quality of the video, considered it looked cheap and it could be improved visually. They also disliked the music and would prefer a narrator on the background.

- Participants felt the intended target for the campaign was students or people who want to work in the medical sector, while they felt that social media, hospitals or train stations would be appropriate channels.

Stimulus C – video for social media about renewable energy. Strapline is “Sustainability starts here”.

- Participants in both groups were the most positive about this stimulus compared to stimulus A and B in terms of the execution of the video and the message.
- The focus on EU investments in renewable energy was a topic participants were interested in so could relate to the campaign. They felt this focus meant the video could be targeted at a broader audience as many people are interested in and use renewable energy.
- It was perceived as being slower than the previous video (although some participants thought it was still fast paced), and the images and music were seen more positively, reminding participants of a holiday.
- The text had highlighted green words, which participants felt guided their attention and helped them to understand the message, something they recommended using in other stimuli.
- Some participants were concerned that the EU should not associate with companies to avoid the idea of lobbying and felt this was inappropriate for this kind of video.
- Appropriate channels were thought to be in the metro – in the Berlin windows and internet pop-ups.

Italy

Stimulus A - social media video about Pompeii, stating that more and more sites of archaeological interest are protected by the EU. The strapline is “opportunity starts here”.

- The message of caring for and investing towards cultural heritage was seen as positive, but the execution of the advert was not clear. Participants supported the use of the example of Pompeii as something which is emotive and nostalgic to Italians.
- Very few participants had been aware of EU contributions towards public heritage sites, and this was something they found informative and supported. However, they felt the concrete impact of job creation and financial returns of these heritage sites for citizens could be clarified.
- Participants were unsure who the advert was aimed at - if it was meant for tourists, local citizens or Italian institutions/ government. *“It seems targeted to the Italian Minister of Culture and Tourism.”*
- Participants felt the message around job creation should come earlier in the video as it otherwise gets lost on the viewer. This message was not fully understood and required explanation and contemplation.
- The lack of clarity around the message impacted on participants grasping the meaning of the slogan ‘Opportunities start here.’ Only when participants linked the restoration of Pompeii with the increase in tourism and job creation, were they able to understand what the slogan was aiming at. *“Now it’s clear, but only because we are spending one hour talking about this ad!”*
- The presentation of the content was felt to be too long, cryptic and text heavy. Participants would prefer more speech, describing how a voiceover would make the messages more personal.
- The approach was felt to be ‘cold’ and confirmed the feeling of distance from the EU described by participants.
- They did not feel that social media was an appropriate channel for this content, describing it as too boring, compared to the light-hearted content shared by Italians on social media.
- They felt television adverts would be more appropriate and is where participants would expect to get information like this from.

Stimulus B - video for social media, about Umbria Legno construction materials build with eco-sustainable techniques. Strapline is “Sustainability starts here”.

- Participants felt favourably towards the link with local employment, a message that felt familiar and relevant to the local context. However, the focus on a ‘sustainable small enterprise’ did not resonate as ‘start ups’ are seen to only be available to an aspirational minority.
- Participants felt the content could be improved if it showed opportunities for all and that the benefits of job creation should have been emphasised more than sustainability.
- The video did not clarify the EU investment process which is already perceived as over-complex. Participants wanted to know more about the application process for applying for EU funding, wanting the video to illustrate how “people like me” can apply for funds and succeed, with testimonials from people with experience of applying. *“They should tell it as a dream that comes true thanks to the support of EU.”*
- The language used was not felt to be colloquial enough. Words such as ‘sustainability’ and ‘opportunity’ gave the impression that it was targeted at institutions rather than individuals, reaffirming participant’s perceptions of the EU as distant. *“Sustainability is good, but it is far from me.”*
- “Opportunity starts here” was seen as a clear and straightforward message but the language was too vague, with participants unclear what was being offered or described.

Stimulus C – poster depicting Pompeii stating that the EU is investing in Italian culture, with the strapline ‘opportunity starts here’.

- The message of investing in cultural and heritage sites was emotive, informative and clear. *“The message is clear and concrete: this project is beneficial for the community.”*
- The link between Italy benefiting economically from cultural investment from the EU was understood and clear to participants, with reference to the amount of Euros invested seen as increasing the clarity of the message.
- The message “investing in future generations” prompted a sense of pride and gratitude towards the EU, building upon the pride of participants in the familiar site of Pompeii. *“There is the hope for future generation and also the pragmatism of the investment: we like this approach.”; “EU says: we are taking care of you, you too are part of the community.”* They emphasised how Pompeii is a powerful image and induces slight sense of nostalgia – e.g. participants made references to visiting on school trips. This connect the EU with and demonstrated how the EU is supporting Italy, breaking down misperceptions that this is not the case.
- The instantaneous impact of photography was preferred to the slower moving videos. Participants felt it was clear where the message had come from due to the EU logo at the top of the poster and the translation was appropriate and clear.
- However, the content did not feel localised or directly relevant to people’s lives. Participants wanted to see a direct link between the EU and individual citizens, making it clear “people like me” can access investments and realise projects thanks to the EU. This would help to tackle the view that the EU is directed towards institutions rather than individuals. *“This message is complete and I like it, but still, I think that is addressed at someone more important than me.”*

Bulgaria

Stimulus A – Poster for a billboard about Sofia Metro. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- There was existing awareness that the Sofia underground was being funded by the EU but the poster did not enhance participants' understanding further. Instead, the poster mainly provided more information about the third section of the underground being constructed but it did not provide detail on the location of stations.
- Participants felt the link with traffic reduction was not clear, and that the campaign should highlight the environmental impact of traffic reduction more. *"I believe that there's another thing they want to say. The air pollution will decrease."*
- The relation between the slogan "Opportunities start here" and the material was unclear, meaning that some participants were not sure if it relates to investments in general, while others associated it with jobs being created and travel options for people in the capital. *"I associate it with Europe investing here, opportunities to develop are created, jobs and improvement in infrastructure so that we can be more European."*
- "Development starts here" was clear and credible as a strapline linked to development in the underground, but did not seem impressive. Participants felt it lacked specificity about *where* developments were taking place.
- They found it difficult to suggest a specific audience for the poster, describing how they felt it was for all citizens and would be shown in metro stations. However, there were concerns that the investment would only benefit Sofia, so it might be offensive to show the advert in other parts of Bulgaria.

Stimulus B - video for social media about investing in the production of Rose Oil. Strapline is "Opportunities start here".

- The advert showed a normal person succeeding, something participants liked as a personal, positive success story showing it is possible for a normal person to apply and succeed. This was seen as a source of inspiration. Participants felt that local producers are often neglected, so they supported the focus of the advert on this.
- The advert triggered the desire to know more although for some the story did not seem plausible. This was because participants felt that the advert provoked questions about the story presented, and wanted to know whether it represented the experiences of people applying for funding or if it was an exceptional story.
- They felt it highlighted an area where they were missing information and wanted to know how to apply, something omitted from the stimulus.
- Participants felt the slogan was clear and relevant for this stimulus, showing the many chances and niches small businesses can thrive in. However, there were concerns that the opportunities featured are not accessible to all Bulgarians, undermining the message of the slogan "opportunities start here".

Stimulus C – Video for social media – Venture Capital Funds. Strapline is "Innovation starts here".

- The video included lots of different cases covered in quite quick succession, which participants felt was chaotic and provided too much information. They felt it would be best suited for places where people are waiting around as it can be difficult to grasp all the messages in one viewing, requiring several views.
- However, the first group preferred this video to the other stimulus as it was commercial and moved away from the typical messages they see about agriculture.
- "Innovation starts here" was not credible for some, with participants describing how they felt innovation started in Germany not Bulgaria where there is funding for new ideas and technology. There was some preference in the second group for the slogan to be replaced with "Opportunities start here", as opportunities sounded more natural and relevant to all. *"I liked 'Opportunities start here' much better."*

Finland

Stimulus A – a poster for a billboard depicting a construction worker, stating ‘sustainable development and energy efficiency’ – Tripla Mall. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The image of a building site was described as uninspiring, vague and generic. “A poster should be eye-catching enough. The first words should get your attention and the following couple of words should explain what is it about. Or a picture that sends the message. This does not deliver.”
- The message was hard to connect to the EU or the text around sustainability and energy efficiency as it did not reflect their understanding of these issues but gave the impression of representing the construction industry and building sites. Others understood it as a wider message of economic growth.
- Participants suggested that an image of a more interesting and EU specific accomplishment would be more engaging. Examples included innovative building solutions, such as energy efficient housing.
- Participants did not feel that they were the target of the poster and were unclear who the poster was trying to aim at e.g. whether it was for the construction industry.
- The reference to Helsinki made it feel local, but participants felt that other parts of Finland might feel that they were being ignored.
- An interactive format of the message would have been preferred. For example, with an option to click on different districts in Finland for examples of EU investment and sustainability.
- The colour felt bland and easy to ignore although some participants thought the use of green had positive connotations.
- The slogan “opportunity starts here” was seen as interesting but not relevant to the poster and participants had questions about who it referred to.
- In the second group discussion, some participants thought the slogan “Sustainability starts here” would be more suited for the ad, although it would still not help the lack of clarity around what is the target audience.

Stimulus B – a social media video about supporting local farmers “Arctic Warriors”. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The message was perceived as positive and relatable. Participants felt it built a more positive image of the EU and encouraged those with business ideas to come forward and find out about the opportunities for receiving help.
- The example of a smaller and more localised undertaking was encouraging and inspiring and the Finnish characters in the video was pleasing and gave a ‘human touch’. The example of Northern Finland also gave the image of inclusivity. “It is a good thing that this is about the northern parts of our country. Not just the capital area – money is given elsewhere as well.”
- The style and quality of the video was good and provided a clear message. Participants felt it was visually beautiful and informative, comparing it to the “postcard” of countries used at the start of Eurovision songs.
- The slogan was seen as appropriate, in line with the video and wider message of seeing an opportunity and crafting it into something significant. In the second group discussion, the slogan “Innovation starts here” was also tested, but participants deemed it unsuited for the subject of the advert – collecting wild herbs was seen as a more traditional activity than anything new or revolutionary.

Stimulus C – a print ad for Kohtaamo depicting a young person working, stating that EU supports Finnish job seekers and school leavers in Finland. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The message was seen as relevant, inclusive and informative. Participants’ knowledge of unemployment among adolescents meant the advert felt relevant and emotive, focusing on a topic that is of current

significance to Finland. *“Very important. Unemployment of the young and patchy employment relationships are a big thing. Countries like Italy and Spain are in an even more challenging situation in this.”*

- It felt the message focused on how EU investment is not only for Helsinki, but the whole of Finland.
- However, some thought it could be more personal and feature a ‘real person’ telling their story.
- Participants felt the message was targeted at young people and their parents. They suggested it should be presented in schools and public transport to ensure the advert reaches the intended audience.
- *“Opportunities open here”* was seen as supporting the message of the print ad as the investments are opening opportunities for young people. Participants felt this was the best slogan in this regard. *“I think that the message is really positive – Finland is not alone with this issue, but tries together with EU.”*; *“‘Opportunities open here’ fits this ad well, because this effort really does open opportunities for adolescents.”*
- Participants felt that there should be more location pins dropped on the country of Finland at the bottom of the poster, especially because part of the text on the poster refers to *“40 different centres of action [for youth employment]”*. Currently there is only one location pin dropped on the south of Finland.
- The headline was not correct Finnish.

Poland

Stimulus A – a poster directed at the subject of improving air quality, depicting a landscape of rural Poland – Malopolska. Strapline is *“Opportunities start here”*.

- The message linking EU investments improving air quality was clear. Links were made with topical health issues and air quality which are major issues in Poland at the moment. In this way, the message was seen as important and urgent.
- However, participants felt that the poster lacked reliable information and facts including how much the EU has invested in the area. *“Here I have more questions than answers.”*
- This lack of information created some suspicion towards the EU, suggesting that there is something to hide. *“They will fight with smog, but how? . . . It looks a bit like they said: we sold you know-how for a lot of money and this is our investment. ”*
- The image was seen as visually attractive and eye-catching, although engagement was reduced as it featured a different area of Poland to where the groups were taking place.

Stimulus B – a social media video looking at affordable housing in Poznan. Strapline is *“Opportunities start here”*.

- Participants understood the message about an EU investment housing program in Poznan, building affordable apartments for citizens. However, there were questions about whether the video was made to advertise the property developer rather than highlight EU investments, with suggestions that EU was not prominent enough.
- The types of buildings shown in the capital were not seen as ‘affordable housing’ due to the low height which tend to be relatively expensive in Warsaw. This may strengthen the assumption that EU regulations and conditions for applying for the funds are very strict, and reinforce the perspective that regulations are not always appropriate in the Polish context.
- Participants were unsure who the video was targeted at and felt it lacked information about the programme, reducing participants’ belief that they would be able to apply for funds. *“Again there are no specifics here in this movie.”*

- The remote location in Poland also lowered interest in content and participants felt similar programmes are already being carried out by the Polish government. *“If I were younger and lived in Poznań, maybe then I would be interested in this, in getting to know more about the project.”*

Stimulus C – a video addressing new medical facilities in the town of Torun “Hospital Torun”. Strapline is *“Opportunities start here”*.

- The message of EU investment in a hospital in Torun was clear and understood. Participants felt the video was convincing that this was beneficial and useful for people, while healthcare is seen as an important issue.
- Although the video was not seen to address the key issues with healthcare as sufficient funding for medical procedures is the problem, not lack of infrastructure. *“There will be more beds, but this will not change the way of financing, so the assumption that we will be taking more patients for the same money we have in the system is doubtful.”*
- The video left an overarching feeling that EU investments were beneficial for local communities, and improved living standards.

In Poland, the slogan “Opportunities start here” was tested for all the three stimuli and it was well received, it translated well in Polish and was easy to understand. The meaning of the slogan was linked with showing the local impact of EU investments (“starts here, so there where I live”), showing that no matter where you live or who you are you have more opportunities because the country is a member of EU. This reinforced the initial perception held by the group that Polish membership of the EU has led to improvements for the country and allowed the country to develop at a faster pace than it otherwise would have.

France

Stimulus A - Poster for billboard – Quadrivium. Strapline is *“Innovation starts here”*.

- Participants understood that the EU invests in the digital sector and new technologies, and considered this positive. However, the message was perceived as vague: *“It is not clear actually. What do they mean by innovations? To help buying equipment to help finance what?”*
- The picture did not look innovative and the poster was perceived as old-fashioned. *“I have trouble making the connection between the digital and what I see. It looks like an exercise in physical sciences”*.
- The EU logo was also not easily visible and was only recognised by the small flag in the top left hand corner.
- There were issues with the placement of the arrow on the map – participants felt it was misplaced and might be pointing to Lille, Beauvais or Compiègne rather than Paris. There was concern about other parts of France being left out and a preference for a map of the EU with arrows pointed at each capital city.
- Two possible targets for the advert were identified:
 - o The participants as part of the general public – message considered unclear for this audience due to a lack of awareness and knowledge of the sector (innovation of what? To whom?), and
 - o Investors – with more awareness of the sector. This triggered distrust in the EU as participants were unsure if the EU was just offering financial aid or was a shareholder/owner of the company.
- There was a preference for the poster to be a mobile poster for a more modern look or be shown in the subway.
- The strapline ‘Innovation starts here’ was not liked as “innovation” was seen as vague and “here” was seen as unclear. Participants felt this should be replaced with “now”.

Stimulus B – video for social media about building energy saving housing – SEM Positif. Strapline is “Sustainability starts here”.

- Participants disliked the video and thought the message was confusing and hard to understand, questioning whether the video was about the EU investing in social housing or in sustainable development. *“The message is not clear at all for me.”*
- The video was too fast which made it difficult to read the text. Participants felt a voice over could support this and make it easier to understand. *“There is far too much information.”*
- The look and music were described as cheap and not worthy of the EU – like something they would see on one of the old-fashioned TV channels. The pictures were seen as very similar to each other, unattractive and boring. *“It looks like the 90’s.”*
- Participants felt the video did not relate to them, increasing their distrust in the EU as they felt their money was being used for projects not relevant to them, reinforcing the perception that the EU does not always focus on the right policies expressed earlier in the discussion.
- The number of 5,800 families being supported was not seen as credible and too small to have an impact.
- The strapline “development starts here” was appreciated due to the timely theme but considered too popular and slightly vague (the word ‘ici’).

Stimulus C – video for social media about E2C and schools for retraining. Strapline is “New skills start here”.

- Initially, participants felt the video had a clear message and reacted positively to the fact that EU is trying to prevent unemployment. *“Unemployment is a pretty hot topic right now, so it appeals to me.”*
- However, they considered the video vague with regards to the selection process around the schools and were disappointed that the EU was investing in things that were not considered essential to them: *“I am under the impression that they do not really know what to do with all their money, but it is our money”.*
- Instead, participants felt it was the French Government’s job to deal with unemployment and described how the video seems to suggest that the French National Education system has failed. Some participants mentioned that the EU seems to be playing the role of the French Government and of Pole Emploi, the governmental agency which helps those out of work into employment and provides financial aid. *“They give money to schools, that’s great, but it implies that the government is not able to do that.”*
- The strapline was not seen as suitable for the message the video is trying to send, as ‘Se former’ does not apply to this video which is about Second Chance Schools. ‘La creation d’emploi’ was considered more suitable.

In France, the slogan “Opportunities start here” was tested with the stimulus and overall, participants noted that it did not translate well in French:

- o The term “opportunities” was considered vague and participants struggled to identify what it was associated with: is it innovation, education?
- o The word ça was deemed not necessary in the sentence and made the slogan less appealing, because it reminded participants about François Holland’s presidential message campaign.
- o The word ici was considered the most problematic in word in the slogan, as it was unclear if here referred to Paris, l’île-de-France or France in general.
- o The association of the words “start” and “here” did not express localisation for participants, but more of a moment in time. To make this more accurate, participants expressed preference for the term now rather than here as a more logical association. *“It starts now’ was already a little better”.*

Greece

Stimulus A – Poster for billboard about Attica schools. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The focus on education was considered important and engaging. The first group saw the poster as innovative, linking the EU’s interests with social issues. *“A new profile of the EU, more social, who is caring for the next generation.”*
- However, the second group considered the execution too modern and distant and not relevant to current Greek reality in schools. *“We have in mind the school with the blackboard, the teacher and the school desks”.*
- Views on the colours and font was also mixed between groups. The first group associated the poster with a political poster and the colours reminded some of the political party SYRIZA. The second group considered the colours irrelevant to the theme, using faded sunset colours.
- There were concerns that the poster only addressed schools in Athens and excluded other areas.
- The strapline “opportunities start here” was not seen as suitable due to linking the word “opportunities” with money and entrepreneurship and less with education. *“Opportunity reminds me of a business opportunity. It could be a hub for start ups. Education is something essential... It is a need.”*
- Participants expected to see the advert in schools, at bus stops, and on the subway as well as on the internet.

Stimulus B – Video for social media about Waste Management. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- The video was considered effective, lively, more engaging and emotional. It was felt it would be more appealing to younger audiences and less so for older participants due to the focus on waste and recycling.
- Waste was thought to be a major issue in Greece, and particularly in Athens, meaning the video felt particularly relevant to the younger members of the groups. However, the factory featured was thought to be too small to make an impact.
- Although participants were positive about the overall theme of recycling (*“The EU is investing in the future concerning the environment, what we are going to leave to our children.”*), there were a few participants who found the execution less appealing when compared to stimulus C.
- There was a preference for more facts and figures to be presented in the stimulus: how many people would be influenced, how much cleaner the city of Thessaloniki would be, how many areas of Macedonia would benefit from it, how many inhabitants, to have more clarity about the impact of investments.
- The strapline “opportunities start here” was received positively and associated with the creation of jobs: *“It’s not only about the environment, it referred to 150 jobs as well.”* Participants thought of it as being interesting, different, less political, hopeful and forward thinking. It was seen as suitable for the campaign as a whole, although it could refer to something temporary, and there was some confusion around what “here” means.
- Appropriate channels were thought to be on social media, TV, and on gov.gr site.

Stimulus C – video for social media about Alfeios Rodi and the production of pomegranate juice. Strapline is “Opportunities start here”.

- This was the preferred stimulus compared to A and B due to the positive message, engaging and compelling execution that was particularly appealing to the younger, more active generation.
- The EU was seen as supporting the agricultural sector, a priority for Greece, through innovations in the production process which participants felt would motivate people to stay and work in the countryside: *“It gives motivation and makes it possible to create a cooperative.”*

- Participants found the video engaging, describing how it told a good story with smiling and friendly protagonists, vivid colours, and good music demonstrating the full juice making process.
- Showing the end result of EU investments (the finished juice product) was seen as boosting trust in the EU, providing concrete examples of the impact of investment.
- Participants suggested the video could be improved by mentioning similar programmes in other parts of the country, pointing out where they might be able to find out more information, and providing more details about how exactly the EU helped the production unit e.g. did they buy the equipment or fund more jobs?
- Some issues were raised with the story being linked with this region, as it was in the past tied with a scandal related to immigrants cultivating strawberries and negative stereotypes.
- There was some preference in the first group for the strapline to be 'Development starts here' as it was seen to be more suitable for primary production. However, both groups agreed that the word 'development' in Greek is mainly associated with political promises, thus making 'Opportunities start here' the overall preferred slogan. *"The word "development is misunderstood in Greece".*

Latvia

Stimulus A – Print ad about Riga Airport development. Strapline is "Mobility starts here".

- Participants were sceptical about the stimulus and highlighted the ambiguity of the message that could be interpreted in many ways e.g. could be associated with mass emigration of the population or non-existent borders.
- The stimulus was considered unclear and impersonal as it was not thought to say anything about development in Latvia.
- The execution was considered poor and unattractive due to the photograph being blurry and at the wrong angle. It was also felt there was not enough emphasis on the airport itself and the background of the word mobility was blurred and unclear. The informative text at the bottom was also thought to be too small and hard to read.
- The strapline 'mobility starts here' was regarded as inappropriate and not clear, potentially encouraging Latvians to leave the country. *"I am confused by the word mobility, because in my understanding, it is not connected to airport infrastructure. I do not understand why the word mobility is used here - the improvement of infrastructure, yes, but why mobility?"*
- Participants felt the target audience was foreign tourists, people going on business trips or representatives of large companies rather than citizens of Latvia.
- They felt the advert would be shown through posters at or near the airport, in the Riga urban environment: bus stops/places where people can stop and read the poster. *"If there was such a poster at the airport – I would have time and I would read it all. In a city environment - at best, I would notice the word mobility, because I would be hurrying somewhere."*

Stimulus B– Video for social media about Primekss. Strapline is "Innovation starts here".

- Participants were positive about the stimulus, acknowledging that it provided valuable information and promoted the achievements of Latvian companies.
- They felt the materials were created in a simple, easy to understand way and emotionally spoke to people, with participants describing their pride in Latvian people's ideas that were successfully implemented. *"Sure, it is clear - a person has invented something super special and can develop it with the help of the EU."*

Innovations - this is a very relevant slogan. In a simple, understandable way, it shows that everything is possible."

- Some participants in group two advised on reducing the written text.
- The strapline 'Innovation starts here' was considered successful, easy to understand for most people and relevant to the campaign, although some issues with the word "innovation" were reported as it was regarded as being used too frequently.
- The target audience was considered too narrow and specific: entrepreneurs, construction industry, 40+ years old, producers and innovators that didn't have enough money.
- Appropriate channels for this communication were thought to be via social media and TV.

Stimulus C – Video for social media about Beekeeping. Strapline is "Opportunities start here".

- Participants were highly positive about the campaign, preferring this stimulus to A and B as they felt it was personal and close to the nation as bees are a Latvian symbol.
- The message that everyone has opportunities was shown in a simple way, emphasising the family as opposed to businesses. *"This is an emotional theme for Latvians, since many grandparents have been beekeepers. And here one can see a young person who has understood what business suites him. It is fantastic."*
- The message was credible and successful, with participants recognising the importance of providing support for people in the countryside, describing how this builds trust and is believable.
- The strapline 'Opportunities start here' was rated as highly relevant and versatile. Participants felt it would be possible to use it in all other campaign materials. The word 'opportunities' directly translates in Latvian as opposed to the 'foreign' words like 'mobility' and 'innovations'.
- The target audience was seen as very wide and more for the individual, ordinary people regardless of place of residence, age or occupation. *"A young bee-keeper – this profession is usually for the elderly, but here it creates the feeling that one can do something impossible or something that others would not do."*
- Appropriate channels were thought to be social networks, pop-up adds on the internet and TV (with some speech on the background).

technopolis |group| Belgium
Avenue de Tervuren 188A
B-1040 Brussels
Belgium
T +32 2 737 74 40
F +32 2 727 74 49
E info.be@technopolis-group.com
www.technopolis-group.com