



# **Evaluation of the European Commission corporate communication campaign**

COMM-A1/20/2014-LOT1

Final Report – Annexes Part 2

31 May 2015

Written by

**coffey** 

**Deloitte.**



## Table of Contents

1. Annex 2A: Focus Groups report – Germany .....	4
1.1 Introduction .....	4
1.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34.....	5
1.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55.....	10
1.4 Summary of key findings .....	15
2. Annex 2B: Focus Groups report – Spain .....	17
2.1 Introduction .....	17
2.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20 – 34 .....	18
2.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55.....	23
2.4 Summary of key findings and observations .....	25
3. Annex 2C: Focus Groups report – Finland .....	28
3.1 Introduction .....	28
3.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20 - 34.....	30
3.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 60.....	35
3.4 Summary of key findings and observations .....	39
4. Annex 2D: Focus Groups report – Latvia.....	41
4.1 Introduction .....	41
4.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34.....	42
4.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55.....	48
5. Annex 2E: Focus Groups report - Poland.....	53
5.1 Introduction .....	53
5.2 Discussion with individuals aged 20-34.....	54
5.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55.....	58
5.4 Summary of key findings and observations .....	62
6. Annex 2F: Focus Groups report - Portugal .....	64
6.1 Introduction .....	64
6.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34.....	65
6.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35-55 (Group 2) .....	73
6.4 Summary of key findings and observations .....	78

## List of figures

Figure 1 - Communication campaign in Madrid – Image 1.....	22
Figure 2 - Communication campaign in Madrid – Image 2.....	22

## 1. Annex 2A: Focus Groups report – Germany

### 1.1 Introduction

Date: 24 February 2015

Location: Cologne, Germany

The TV and print adverts were presented to both groups in the following order:

1. **TV/print advert N° 1 on Green jobs** (project N° 78): "Nurturing the growth of small green companies to build a sustainable economy" ("*Schub für grüne Arbeitsplätze*");
2. **TV/print advert N° 2 on On-line consumer protection**(project N° 41): "EU works together to protect online shoppers" ("*Schutz für Internet-Nutzer*");
3. **TV/print advert N° 3 on Erasmus +** (project N° 18): "Blazing the trail into the world of work for young Europeans" ("*Investitionen in die Jugend*").

#### 1.1.1 Profiles of participants

There were eight participants in each of the two groups. Group 1 consisted of four females and 4 males, all aged between 20 and 34. Group 2 consisted also of 4 females and 8 males, all aged between 35 and 55.

#### 1.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (group 20-34)

The majority of participants watches TV on a daily basis (e.g. series, documentaries, news and sports events), watches adverts passively and switches channels/carries out other activities while adverts are shown on TV. The majority of participants is social media savvy and uses Facebook on a regular basis (the majority use their Facebook account on a daily basis to read news about their friends and family). All participants remember a TV advert that they have seen lately and that they consider particularly memorable (e.g. adverts for insurance, Check24.de, Sky paid TV and Snickers).

#### 1.1.3 Media consumption habits of participants (group 35-55)

The majority of participants watch TV on a daily basis (mostly news channels and documentaries on e.g. ZDF, ARTE, NtV, RTL and PHOENIX) and use Facebook on a regular basis. All participants remember a TV advert that they have seen recently and that they considered particularly memorable (e.g. McDonald's, Opel, Fiat and Mercedes).

## 1.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34

### 1.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

**None of the participants has seen the TV adverts before.** When shown the ads, **most participants like TV advert N° 3 (Erasmus+) the most**, followed to a lesser extent by TV advert N° 2 (Consumer protection). None of the participants like TV advert N° 1 the most (Green jobs).

The majority of participants identify most with the images/message presented in **TV advert N° 3 (Erasmus+)**. According to the participants, there is a clear link between the images shown ("airplane", "lightness", "young people" and "friends") and the message (Erasmus+). One participant likes the idea that the EU supports young people in their career and their studies.

The message of the two other TV adverts appears to be **"too forced"** and **"unnecessarily modern and hip"**. Also, the participants **like the "neutral" colours used in the TV advert N° 3**. According to one participant, TV advert N° 3 "has the best colours, the best story and the best images".

A number of participants identify most with the images/message presented in the TV advert N° 2. One participant identifies herself most with that video, because she is neither a student nor self-employed. Most participants cannot identify with the message/person presented in the TV advert N° 1. None of the participants is self-employed or is considering launching their own business in the near future. Participants have the impression that the advert has "too much colour".

Comments included:

- *"it could have been a Lady Gaga video clip. She is selling 'green' products and is walking through a room with unidentified objects lying around – the message is simply not credible";*
- the music is generally *"annoying"* and *"over the top"*;
- the messages portrayed in the TV adverts are not abstract enough: *"The recipient of the message has no opportunity to interpret the message – the messages in the videos are too explicit"*.

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. The majority of participants liked the TV advert N° 1 the least, followed by TV advert N° 2 and then TV advert N° 3.

Most have the impression that the message presented in **TV advert N° 1 is the least credible**; they cannot identify with the person or the story presented in the advert. One participant states "What sticks in my head is a female running around in a short skirt and everything is pink".

Others liked TV advert N° 2 the least suggesting that there appears to be a **mismatch between the images shown and the (intended) message**. Some participants face difficulties concentrating on the content of the message because the images are "too crowded" and there are *"strange men jumping around"*. According to another participant, the images and colours do not match the context/story (banking). It is suggested that the information should be presented more conservatively.

With regards to TV advert N° 3, comments include that the message does not address what happens before and after an Erasmus+ programme – the message is **not comprehensive enough / more information is required**. There is some irritation that the adverts are financed with taxpayers' money and that they are of relatively low quality: **"The adverts are financed by our tax money, so I expect the videos to be of high quality"**.

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV. Most **participants think that the adverts stand out compared to other TV adverts**. They also suggest that the adverts have a **uniform corporate identity**: they are equally long, have the same music and use bright colours.

### Understanding

We asked the participants to write down three top-of-mind key words for **what they think each advert is about**. The table below presents an overview of key words that the participants associate with each of the three adverts.

<b>Clip 1: Green jobs</b> ( <i>"Schub für grüne Arbeitsplätze"</i> )	<b>Clip 2: On-line consumer protection</b> ( <i>"Schutz für Internet-Nutzer"</i> )	<b>Clip 3: Erasmus+</b> ( <i>"Investitionen in die Jugend"</i> )
make-up, cosmetics colour red platform	anonymity bank Alicia	setting/scene many impressions colour blue
men in suits Titanic support/aid	men in suits money holidays	men in suits airplane Erasmus
colour pink self-employment support	gold family holidays	education young people students
Spain cosmetics support for 'green' jobs	secure online-transfer Germany no bank charges	scholarship Estonia support for young people
too many messages no match between images and the message video is too upbeat/ lively	too many images no match between images and the message video is too upbeat/lively	good match between images and the message there should be more emphasis on Erasmus +
support	support simplification	support new opportunities
support for small businesses 'green' economy start-up companies	consumer safety EU-wide bank transfers EU economy (online trade)	support for intra-EU exchange education support for scholarships
independence fun	ease fun	student freedom fun

We asked the participants what they think about the themes/topics of these adverts and whether or not they interest them. **Most are broadly interested in the different themes/topics presented** and some of the participants have a more specific interest for

example in support for small businesses, cosmetics, natural products and animal experiments).

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the slogan of the information campaign ("FÜR SIE DA") interests them and whether or not they considered it credible.

**Most are interested in the slogan** and generally support its objective. There are, however, different opinions regarding the wording of the slogan. Some participants perceive the slogan "FÜR SIE DA" as **"too personal"**, especially because the EU is such a broad concept. According to one participant, **"the EU is intangible; the slogan does not change my image about the EU as a distant intangible concept"**.

A number of participants state that the slogan (German translation of "Working for you") is not credible; it is more suitable for a bank and/or an insurance company. According to one participant, the slogan "WIR KÜMMERN UNS" (we take care) is more suitable. Another participant states that the slogan "FÜR SIE DA" is "irritating" and "not credible", especially in the context of the current problems related to refugees coming to Europe from Africa – the slogan/message can be perceived as being sarcastic. It can be perceived that the "EU is there for them (*sie* – third person plural), but not for you (*du* – second person singular)".

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, we asked the participants what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why. Comments include the stark **discrepancy between the abstract concept of the EU and the direct/personal messages portrayed** in the TV adverts ("EU is working for you"). This contrast **makes it difficult to comprehend the message** presented in the adverts; ideally, the messages should be somewhere in between. According to another participant, the messages/projects **do not target the 'average' citizen** they target large/successful stakeholders (such as big companies).

Next, we asked the participants whether the TV adverts have changed their view on the EU in any way and why. Most state that **the TV adverts did not change their view on the EU, but they perceive the different projects portrayed in the adverts positively**. The information campaign offers a good overview of the different projects supported by the EU.

A number of participants think that there is a 'disconnect' between the (young) people presented in the TV adverts and their current image/opinion of the EU. They think of people working for the EU (European Parliament) as wearing *"grey suits and having grey hair"*. This is in contrast to the bright and lively colours presented in the TV adverts.

**Participants agree that the messages must be more realistic**. According to the participants, the **themes** presented in the TV adverts address essential topics, such as money, self-employment and education and **must be treated seriously**. Comments include: *"It is annoying that the EU portrays itself as hip and fun bunch of people", as well as "Where are those cool guys dancing around in morph suits? Those who are dealing with bank transfers, doing an Erasmus programme or want to become self-employed are not running around like crazy in a morph suit"*.

Some focus on the tone of the adverts. They feel the adverts should be more serious; especially young people have sufficient knowledge about the EU (via their education). The adverts which address serious issues should be also presented in a serious manner.

## 1.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints

### Recall and appreciation

**None of the participants have seen the print adverts before.** When we asked what they think of the adverts and why most see **alignment between the themes in the print adverts and the themes in the TV adverts.** They recognise the context of the information campaign, but would **not be naturally inclined to read the messages presented in the print ads.** A number of participants state that the **font is either too small or that there is too much text in the print ads.** The majority of participants think that there is no clear/direct link between the information presented in the print advert and the (intended) message of the advert.

Re. print advert N° 1, there is no direct link between the image of the print ad (a female taking a shower) and the print ad stating the EU is working for her to support the local economy. According to one participant, ***"the only thing I see is that she's taking a shower and apparently the scene is under water – I only see red. You do not see that she's about to set up a business"***.

Re. print advert N° 2, one participant is surprised about the message portrayed in the print ad: ***"It surprises me that this is supposed to be the message. It is a pity that the message was not portrayed clearly enough"***. Another comment is that there is no direct link between the golden safe in the middle of the room and online security.

Most agree that the **print ad N° 3 (Erasmus+) is best suited for carrying the intended message.**

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the print ads contribute to making the campaign more visible/understandable. Most think that the content (text) makes the campaign more understandable. The presentation, however, does not support this positive image.

## 1.2.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

### Digital promotion

Next, we asked the participants if they have seen any similar adverts on the internet and where. **None of the participants has seen the adverts online.**

We asked the participants, based on what they have seen, so far, how likely they would be to look for more information and why. **Most would look for more information,** e.g. additional/other projects (based on the project number).

### The website

Next, we showed the website to the participants and asked them to navigate us on the website (to tell us which information/links to access) and asked them what they think of it.

The participants agree that there is **no (apparent) link between the information campaign and the website.** There is a stark contrast between the style, design and content between the TV and print ads and the website. The participants **expect a website of higher quality,** especially as it is managed by the EU. The overall impression is that the website is unprofessional.

Comments included: *"it seems like two different agencies have prepared the content and*



*design of the adverts and the website – there is a different corporate identify”, and “the quality of the website does not do justice to the EU’s standards – the website is dowdy and not appealing”.*

On the presentation of different projects, the participants prefer a full overview of projects that is easily accessible. Also, they note that not all projects present the EUR value of the project and **would like to see more information about the size of the budget for each project**. The font of the slogan “FÜR SIE DA” (on the website) differs from the one used in the TV and print ads. It is positive that one directly can change the font of the website.

Most think that **there should be references/links to additional official information** (e.g. reports in PDF version) which can be retrieved from the website – the website is the source for information and people are directed to the website to get more information about the different projects.

#### 1.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

There are **mixed opinions in the group about the campaign** as a whole. **Some appreciate the information offered** by the information campaign, and that this includes projects outside their own country (Germany) and across Europe. **Others are less convinced** that the campaign is useful, for example: **“the information provided on the website produces superficial knowledge and this is dangerous”**. Some want access to more information about the different projects accessible via the website (e.g. via links to official sources and EC documents).

**Most think that the campaign as a whole is not memorable.**

Next, we asked participants if they would like to see a continuous/frequent campaign, which shows other examples of what the EU does. **Most would not like to see a continued campaign (unless there are substantial improvements** in line with the discussion during the focus group). The participants reiterate the fact that “it is strange that no one has noticed the campaign until now”.

One participant thinks that it does not make sense to continue a campaign, which apparently has not reached its target audience: **“The whole campaign seems not well thought-through. There is no link between the image of the EU (European Parliament) and the ‘hip’ and colourful images portrayed in the adverts”**. A number of participants suggests to use YouTube as a channel for the campaign. Others suggest to foster/launch the campaign in schools where they could reach the target audience.

#### 1.2.5 Views on the EU

Next, we asked the participants to name three things that the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

Euro
Open borders
Freedom to travel
Solidarity
Support for different projects
EU as a global player and its role as a counterpart to the US
Refugee policy

Next, we asked the participants whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. The majority of participants has not changed its opinion about the EU. However, the participants consider the following developments as having an impact on their opinion about the EU: EU's refugee policy, TTIP negotiations with the US, and 'fortress Europe'.

### 1.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55

#### 1.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

##### Recall and appreciation

A few have seen the TV adverts before. Most like TV advert N° 3 the most, followed by TV advert N° 2 and then TV advert N° 1.

Most can identify themselves most with the images/message presented in TV advert N° 3 (**Erasmus+**). **They agree that it is the most "realistic" and "most credible" of the three adverts** presented. According to the participants, the TV advert addresses both young people (students) and 'older' people offering support during an Erasmus+ programme (e.g. teachers and supervisors). One participant supports the idea of offering support to young people (the advert is **"dynamic", "young" and "fresh"**).

Re TV advert N° 2, some can identify themselves with the situation (online banking / consumer protection). However, there are concerns about the message presented in the advert, for example the **"unnecessary link to holidays"** in this clip and the lack of (direct) link with secure online banking. A number of participants think that the **images portrayed in the TV adverts do not match their image of the EU** (European Parliament); they associate the EU with "grey suits and grey hair".

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. TV advert N° 1 is the least popular, followed by the TV advert N° 3 TV advert N° 2 is not singled out as a least favourite ad.

Most think that the message presented in the TV advert N° 1 (**Green jobs**) is the least credible; they cannot identify themselves with the person and/or story presented in the advert. Comments include that the TV advert *"tries to portray an ideal world, showing a young, successful, pretty, Spanish girl running around in a short skirt. It does not really appeal to me. It's great that someone has had success, but that does not mean anything to me. It does not suggest that I can be a part of that, neither do I have a pink ballet tutu, nor am I a successful entrepreneur with long, black hair"*. Other remarks related to the relatively short red skirt: *"Why does she have to run around half naked if she is manufacturing natural cosmetic products?"*

Another view is that the TV advert N° 1 is unrealistic. It addresses one person only ("Maria") – it does not relate to a wider audience/public, it is individual-related. The TV advert of a successful, pretty female entrepreneur is in stark contrast to the (economic) reality in Spain, with high levels of youth unemployment. Another participant thinks that the clip suggests that you can be successful in Spain, despite the economic crisis.

For some TV advert N° 3 the least favourite because the Erasmus programme has been around for many years and does not present any interesting (additional) information.

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV. **Most thinks that the adverts stand out compared to other TV adverts.** The reasons given include **the bright colours**, which are viewed both positively and negatively. They **“create a good mood”** and **“it is interesting that the EU is doing the advertisement and not McDonald’s, something that has not been there before”**. One participant stated that **“it is strange that the first clip shows Spain, the second one Köln (Cologne – the city) and the third one Latvia”**.

### Understanding

Next, we asked participants to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they think each advert is about. The table below presents an overview of key words that the participants associate with each of the three adverts.

<b>Clip 1: Green jobs</b> (“Schub für grüne Arbeitsplätze”)	<b>Clip 2: On-line consumer protection</b> (“Schutz für Internet-Nutzer”)	<b>Clip 3: Erasmus+</b> (“Investitionen in die Jugend”)
pleasant	good	young
Spain young women/entrepreneur many possibilities supported by the EU	Cologne bank transfer security	Latvia Erasmus support/aid
colour red modern	open creative	open
non-credible self-portrayal FÜR SIE DA	non-credible TTIP exaggeration	non-credible escapist not realistic
FÜR SIE DA support for businesses Spain	online-shopping online-banking Cologne	Erasmus + diverse projects Latvia
young financial support future	money security money transfer	young dynamic future
colourful Spain natural cosmetics	bright colours yellow Cologne, Germany	Latvia friends social engagement
fresh bright colours unrealistic	friendly unimportant unclear message	friendly bright colours modern

Next, we asked the participants what they think about the themes/topics of these adverts and whether or not they interest them. Most are interested in the different themes/topics presented in the adverts, but some concerns are expressed, including that:

- **the TV adverts are “too fast” and present too much information at the same time;**
- **It is difficult to capture the information;**
- **the clips address mostly young people;**
- **the target audience is not sufficiently clear.**

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the slogan of the information campaign (“FÜR SIE DA”) interests them and whether or not they consider it credible. Most are

interested in the slogan and generally supports its objective, but they think that the slogan is not credible, as highlighted by this comment: **"the messages portrayed in the spots and the overall presentation of the advertisements are not in line with the general perception of the EU which is overly bureaucratic and slow"**.

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, we asked the participants what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why. According to one participant, the TV adverts change the image of the EU (associated with the colours blue and white) by portraying it in different bright colours. Another participant feels secluded (not part of the picture): "The slogan *"FÜR SIE DA"* gives the impression that others are looking down on you, they are watching you. This is in contrast to the EU's objective of unity".

We asked the participants whether the TV adverts have changed their view on the EU in any way and why. For most the **TV adverts do not change their view** on the EU. They **perceive the different projects supported by the EU positively and think that the EU should invest more resources to make the messages more comprehensive**. Comments include: *"it is rather difficult to portray the EU in a positive light in less than two minutes. The clips should be longer, starting with a general image of the EU and focusing on one particular subject – e.g. the Spanish example showing that you can set up your own business despite a difficult economic situation in your country. The EU should invest more resources in making the clips longer, it is an important institution"*. Also, *"There are many problems out there in the world right now these colourful and happy spots are not suitable in this context"*.

## **1.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

### **Recall and appreciation**

Next, we have handed out copies of advertising material supporting the TV adverts to each of the participants and asked the participants to raise their hand if they have already seen one or more of the print adverts. **None of the participants have seen the print adverts.**

Next, we asked the participants what they think of the adverts and why. Most agree that the print adverts present the same themes as the TV adverts. They consider the information more useful and more memorable compared to the TV adverts. According to one participant explained the print adverts are better (than the TV adverts) because they provide more factual information about a specific topic – they do not address a particular situation (e.g. holiday planning). **The print ads are considered as more compact and more memorable – e.g. there is an internet link for accessing more information**. Next, we asked the participants whether or not the ads contribute to making the campaign more visible/understandable. The majority of respondents think that the adverts contribute to making the campaign more visible/understandable. Comments include that the content (text) makes the campaign more understandable. The presentation, however, does not support this positive image: **"The message is not clear from the outset – you have to spend time and effort to understand the message"**. Also that the **pictures are appealing, but the images do not support the text**. It is suggested that the user-friendliness of the prints could be improved: "There should be a direct internet link to the project which is advertised – now you are directed to a central website – this is too difficult".

### 1.3.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

#### Digital promotion

Next, we asked the participants to raise their hand if they have seen any adverts related to this campaign on the internet and where. **None of the participants has seen the adverts online.**

Next, we asked the participants, based on what they have seen, so far, how likely they would be to look for more information and why. **A few would look for more information online**, e.g. if they would be interested in starting their own business. Others think that the target audience (of the information campaign) is inappropriate. In particular the 'older' participants are not interested in e.g. setting-up their own business or applying for an Erasmus+ programme.

#### The website

Next, we showed the website to the participants and asked them to navigate us on the website (to tell us which information/links to access) and asked them what they think of it.

Most think that **there is no (apparent) link between the communication campaign and the website**. According to the participants, there is a stark contrast between the advertisements and the presentation of the website (e.g. less/no colours used on the website). Some of the participants perceive the website as "boring", "confusing" and "not intuitive".

Comments include that the information on the website should be presented in natural colours, it should not be too bright; **that images (of the TV and print ads) are expected to feature on the website** and that it is difficult to find the projects, which were presented in the adverts. Most appreciate that the EU is investing money in programmes portraying a positive image of the EU.

The information (e.g. the movies) should be presented in the national language (e.g. German). When selecting the language (not the country), **participants expect to find videos in German.**

### 1.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

Next, we asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why. There are **mixed views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**. Some appreciate the information offered by the information campaign and the fact that the EU tries to portray a positive image of role of the EU (solidarity, support for the people of all backgrounds, etc., especially in times of economic crisis and international crises such as the Ukraine). One participant thinks that **"the EU is doing good things, even for small people. It is not only about multi-billion bailouts of banks or the Greek crisis"**.

Others are more sceptical about the information campaign, and think that the EU is trying to brush up its image, especially after the 2014 European Parliament elections: **"Everything that has happened around President Juncker's election did not shed a good light on the EU"**.

Most think that **the campaign as a whole is memorable and would like to see a**

**continued campaign.**

Most think that **it is a good way of presenting information about the EU**. It provides a **good overview of the positive things that EU does for its citizens** (e.g. support for the elderly). The campaign should **also entail messages about unsuccessful EU projects in order to be more comprehensive and more credible**. According to one participant, *“when the EU offers a source of information, I would expect this source to be comprehensive and complete; it should not only be cherry-picking of positive stories. I would expect to see some unsuccessful stories as well and information what the EU has learnt from that, at least on the website”*.

**1.3.5 Views on the EU**

We asked the participants to name three things what the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

The EU should be more present internationally
Borderless travel
One currency
Support for different projects
Trans-border activities
Peacekeeping-mission
Freedom and peace
Security
'Fortress Europe'
Bureaucratic monster

Next, we asked the participants whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. Most has not changed its opinion about the EU recently.

## 1.4 Summary of key findings

### **Views and perceptions of the TV adverts**

#### Recall and appreciation

Out of the total study population, only a few have seen the TV adverts before.

There is **consensus on the effectiveness of the three adverts** across both age groups. **TV advert on Erasmus+ (N°3) seems to work best.** It is most the popular because people can identify with the messages and images presented. Next is the TV advert on on-line consumer protection (N° 2) and last is the TV advert on green jobs (N° 1). Most find it difficult to identify with the images/message presented in the TV advert on the green jobs (N° 1) and the **message presented in this advert is the least credible**; participants cannot identify themselves with the person and/or story presented.

The majority of participants think that **the adverts stand out compared to other TV adverts**, mostly because of their bright colours and vivid images, which annoy some. There is also a **uniformity of approach** and a sense that the ads belong to the same campaign. However, there are concerns because of a perceived mismatch between pre-conceived ideas about the 'greyness' of EU and the bright colours shown and symbolism of people in suits. Questions are raised with regards to the information value and disconnect between images and messages.

#### Understanding

There is **interest in the different themes/topics presented in the adverts** and participants generally support the objective of the slogan. There are, however, different opinions regarding the wording of the slogan ("FÜR SIE DA"). The slogan is not considered to be credible.

#### Potential impact/influence of the TV adverts

For most **the TV adverts do not change their view on the EU, but they perceive the different projects portrayed in the adverts positively** and think that the messages should be more comprehensive and understandable.

### **Views and perceptions of the prints**

#### Recall and appreciation

None of the participants have seen the print adverts.

There is perceived **alignment between the content of the print adverts and the TV adverts**. However, the link between the information/image presented in the print advert and the message is not sufficiently clear.

The two age groups have **similar opinions about the print ads**. The younger group tend to think that the content (text) makes the campaign more understandable and informative, but point to the small font of the text and suggest that they would probably not take the time to read the print ad if they came across it. The older group think that the print ads contribute to making the campaign more visible/understandable. The presentation, however, does not support this positive image.

### **Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line**

#### Digital promotion

None of the participants has seen the adverts online.

The different age groups have different opinions about digital promotion. Most in **the younger group would look for more information**, e.g. additional/other projects (based on the project number). The view is different in **the older group, which would be less likely to look for more information online**, unless they had a specific need, for example starting their own business.

#### The website

There is no (immediately apparent) **visual or content link between the communication campaign and the website**. People expect to see the adverts clearly displayed on the website and for all information, including videos to be in German. The quality of the website is questioned.

#### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole***

There are mixed views and perceptions on the campaign as a whole. **Younger people are less impressed** with the campaign. Although the adverts are 'different' to those they typically see, this group do not find the campaign memorable and would not like to see it continued unless there are improvements. **The older age group has a greater appreciation of the campaign**, thinks it is memorable and would like to see a continued campaign. In both age groups the approach of highlighting projects is considered to be interesting.



## 2. Annex 2B: Focus Groups report – Spain

### 2.1 Introduction

Date: 5 March 2015

Location: Madrid, Spain

The TV and print adverts were presented to both groups in the following order:

1. **TV/print advert N° 1:** "Supporting Green Jobs" ("*Apoyo a los trabajados verdes*");
2. **TV/print advert N° 2:** "EU works together to protect online shoppers" ("*Protección de los compradores en línea*");
3. **TV/print advert N° 3:** "Investing in Innovation" ("*Inversión en la innovación*").

#### 2.1.1 Profiles of participants

Group 1 comprised of 10 participants, half of which were male, and the other half of which were female, aged between 20-34 years.

Group 2 comprised of 10 participants, eight of which were male, and two of which were female, aged 35-55 years.

#### 2.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (20-34 years)

The media consumption habits of participants were very much geared towards social media, such as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and to some extent Twitter and LinkedIn, which participants indicated that they use at all times. Participants also indicated that they tend to watch TV, albeit more sporadically, and often online, via streaming or on demand. All the participants indicated that they tend to avoid adverts as much as possible. This is particularly the case when they watch TV, as they tend to immediately connect on social media when an advert is shown. It is however worth mentioning that one participant indicated that she tends to watch adverts which are shown online, for instance prior to watching a video, as she indicated that it was not worth doing something else for those 10 seconds before the video started. Only one participant indicated that he liked adverts when they were about something he was interested by. Participants did however mentioned that they recalled a number of adverts, particularly from car manufactures, IKEA, and adverts for specific regions, such as Andalucía, for which the images were particularly appealing.

#### 2.1.3 Media consumption habits of participants (group 35-55)

The majority of participants watches TV regularly (*la sexta, la cuatro*) and use social media (mostly YouTube and Facebook). All the participants mentioned that they do not pay attention to adverts, although they recalled specific ones, from car manufacturers or large insurance companies.

## 2.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20 – 34

### 2.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Eight out of ten participants indicated that they had seen the first advert. **Most liked the red background, the overall animation, and the originality of the advert.** Participants agreed that the advert was targeted towards young entrepreneurs, particularly ones developing eco-friendly products and services, and some indicated that they recognised that “a lot of work had been put into making (the adverts)”. However, a number of participants pointed out that a green colour background should have been selected to convey the idea of green jobs.

The content of the advert was assessed as:

- Difficult to understand, due to the quantity of visual and spoken information which is provided during the advert. As one participant mentioned: “There is **a lot of going on which makes it difficult to follow**”.
- Providing **insufficient information** as to how exactly the EU supports young entrepreneurs.
- Unrealistic, as the idea which was conveyed was that the EU would help you “in everything you do”: from the shower, to the romantic ending. Participants did not understand why the main character, Elena, had not been shown in her cosmetics company. The words ‘not credible’, ‘idyllic’ and ‘too optimistic’ were mentioned by a number of participants, which did not believe in the story which was being told.
- **Not relevant for them**, as participants did not relate to the story which was being told. The idea of creating a cosmetics company seemed very distant, and as one participant concluded: “This is not for me”. One participant, who is an entrepreneur, indicated that he associated the advert with the idea of obtaining financing. However, having described the **process of obtaining EU funding as cumbersome** and bureaucratic, he indicated that he the advert was not credible.

Three participants indicated that they had seen the second advert. The majority of participants indicated that **the yellow background of this advert was less appealing** than the red background in the first video. However, **participants viewed the message conveyed in this advert much more positively**, as they could directly relate to making online purchases, because they “believe(d) it more”, and found it more “simple”, except for one participant that indicated that she had not understood much of what had been said. She indicated: “What does the EU have to do with online payments?” Other participants described the scene as much more familiar, and indicated that they could associate themselves with the couple purchasing plane tickets online. Although participants mentioned that it is **not clear from the advert how the EU was protecting online shoppers, they fact that the EU is doing something in this area was viewed positively**.

Only one participant had seen the third advert. He saw the advert online, while looking for additional information after having seen the first advert. Similar to the first advert, participants that this advert “seems more like a dream than reality”.

Overall, most participants agreed that they had **preferred the content of the second advert**, relating to online shopping, and the colour/background of the first advert (red

background). Finally, two participants signalled out that the music was quite appealing, and had been key in helping them recall the adverts, whereas only one participant had understood that the “hidden hands” represented what the EU is doing for citizens.

### **Understanding**

Participants were asked to write down key words which they associated with the first advert (this exercise was not repeated for the second and third advert due to time constraints).

<b>TV Advert N° 1</b>
Exciting Communicative Positive
Financing Bureaucracy Loans (but I need to know where to find them)
It is not credible Does not inform properly Should be shown at adequate hours
Aesthetically attractive: I want to see it until the end Too optimistic: it looks like the EU is going to solve everything in your life Other examples?
Red Very attractive and dynamic, but there are too many elements I did not hear the audio message because there were too many visual elements
Red Idyllic Quick
Fake Marketing Not credible
Does not reflect reality Unreal The audio is ok
Not credible story Does not show much
Visually interesting Appealing music Don't believe it

On seeing the advert, **most participants understood and remembered the slogan ‘EU working for you’**, and the message that the EU was supporting youth. Participants indicated that **this type of message was very relevant, although you “could not notice this based on the advert”**, as these are “not convincing”. Indeed, participants emphasized that the examples which were provided in these adverts were not relevant to show them how the EU is working for them. They would **prefer much more concrete projects**, such as how a person managed to open a bar or a bicycle store thanks to EU support. They would **rather a “real case”**. One participant however indicated that this advert shows that the EU is supporting youth more than the government in Spain is, but she expressed doubts that either the EU or Spain are really doing so.

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Participants had a neutral or leaning towards negative image of the EU, with many participants showing resentment towards the way they perceive it is run today. As such, a number of participants associated Europe with Mrs Merkel, and felt that Spain was excluded from Europe. In a way, some viewed that these **adverts helped them to remember that they were part of the Union.**

Overall, all the respondents indicated that the adverts had **to some (quite limited) extent has a positive impact on their views on the EU, except for one participant that indicated that it had had a negative effect.** This participant believes that the money used for these adverts could have been spent on other projects, and that it reinforces the distance between the EU and its citizens. Most citizens agreed that the adverts were **over-ambitious**, particularly the first one, and that it would have been preferable **to focus on a simpler, more tangible message.** However, some participants also mentioned that if they were to open a business in the future, they **would consider looking more into how the EU can help them, having seen these ads.**

#### **2.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

None of the participants had seen any of the prints.

Most participants indicated that they understood that it was a campaign for the EU, because of the presence of the EU flag, although it is more difficult to distinguish in the third print because of the blue background. However, participants also indicated that they would **not immediately associate these prints with the EU**, but more with a theatre play for the first print, and a telecommunication print for the third.

The second advert (on-line consumer protection) was viewed as **very difficult to understand as there was too much information** on the same page. As one participant pointed out: "which ones are Anna and Lukas"? Another participant also **questioned the use of words** such as "digital life", instead of more simple terms such as online purchases.

Although one participant indicated that **mentioned the number of the project** which had been supported (e.g. Project N°41) added to the complexity of the prints, other participants emphasized that this gave credibility to the campaign and "made it more real".

Overall, participants indicated that the prints could not be stand-alone products, as it would be very **difficult to understand them without having seen the videos**, but that they were a **useful complementary tool** to the videos to obtain additional information, if one had already these. Participants preferred the first and the third print (**green jobs and innovation**) because of the **attractive red background and image**, for the former, and **the simplicity of the image of the latter.**

#### **2.2.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line**

##### **Digital promotion**

Only one participant had seen the campaign online, but could not remember where. However, **only one of the participants indicated that they would look for additional**

**information** based on what they had seen, as: "if you do not need the EU, you don't look for more information about it". Even in the case of the second advert, even though participants indicated that they relate more to online shopping, only one participant would want to look for additional information, as the rest would just trust the system in place. The participant who did want to look for additional information would have liked to have seen who, or where, she should contact in case she has an issue when making an online payment.

### **The website**

Only one person had seen the website before, because he discovered it while looking for EU financing solutions, after having **seen an article about the campaign launch event**. Participants assessed the website as **user-friendly and easy to navigate**, although it "seemed a little old". Participants however questioned the **lack of coherence between the adverts and the website** as they could not see similar colours, logos, identity.

#### **2.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**

Participants indicated that **the campaign had been a good idea**, and was **very much needed**. Furthermore, they indicated that the campaign was quite memorable, particularly because of the music.

However, participants did **not believe in the stories** which were presented, as they seemed unreal, and estimated that the campaign had been "over-ambitious". One participant concluded that: "it is as if you ask for support one day, and then the next day you get the money and can create your company". Participants indicated that this type of campaign **creates expectations, so it was important that it be about "real cases"**. One participant did however question: "I wonder how much money they have spent on this campaign".

Looking forward, most participants agreed that **more of these campaigns would be beneficial** if they were to illustrate concrete examples of how the EU is working for you. Participants also stressed that the campaign be better targeted. The types of adverts shown in this campaign are targeting entrepreneurs and not the general public, and should be shown in specific media that entrepreneurs are particularly interested by. However, other participants also indicated that if they were to set-up their own companies in the future, then they would now think about EU support.

Following the focus group, one participant sent us a picture of adverts, which can currently be seen in the Madrid. This participant indicated that they show something similar to the EC campaign, but with "more credible people". The posters show two entrepreneurs, one which created a brewery (Image 1) and another which created an electric bicycle company (Image 2), with the following message: If you have a dream, #makeitreal.

Figure 1 - Communication campaign in Madrid – Image 1



Figure 2 - Communication campaign in Madrid – Image 2



Participants also indicated that they would be interested in seeing local establishments put up EU stickers showing, and demonstrating, that they had been supported by the EU. When asked how they perceived the EU flags on large infrastructure projects, they indicated that they tended to phase these out.

### 2.2.5 Views on the EU

The EU was very often associated with politics, the euro, Mrs Merkel and the free movement of people, and participants **regretted that there was not more sharing of best practices**. However, only one participant indicated that he felt European, because he had moved to Germany. As he did not “feel German”, he indicated that he feels “by default” European.

## 2.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55

### 2.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Half of the participants had seen the first video. Participants indicated that they liked the **red background and the overall animation**, but also questioned **why green had not been used to promote green jobs**. Most participants agreed that the advert was a **"political message", not credible and "very Disney"**. Similarly as with the first group, participants also questioned why Elena was not shown in her company, but instead, she *"wakes up looking fantastic, which is not reality"*. Finally, one (female) participant indicated that they she did not see why Elena's boyfriend had been shown holding her hand *"as if women could not make it on their own"*.

Participants indicated that the second advert was "less aggressive" and was easier to assimilate to. However, one participant indicated that "it is not clear how the EU better protects online purchases". Half of participants indicated that **they would likely go online to find information about this specific issue**, how the EU is protecting online shoppers, after having seen this advert. To obtain additional information, they would search for 'EU is working for you' in their search engines.

Finally, participants indicated that **the third advert (Innovation) "does not look real"**, and the blue background was associated with technology, something which they could not relate to. Although the advert "looks nice", it is more targeted towards large companies.

#### Understanding

Participants were asked to write down key words which they associated with the first advert (given the time which this took for the first advert, this exercise was not repeated for the second and third advert).

TV Advert N° 1
I do not like the red background, green would be better It suggests a certain state corporatism I know that it is only an advert, but I would like to see something more real
For young people Helps entrepreneurs European Union
Helps SMEs Positive Not concrete
It is not real Women is supported by man
Dynamic Frivolous Fictive Does the EU really help that much at the individual level? Not credible
Original Nice colours They explain well what the EU is doing

Even more neutral Very coloured Political campaign
Neutral Attracts your attention as if they helped you Too much colour
Young people This does not apply to me
For entrepreneurs Not real

In line with what was said during the first focus group, participants indicated that **the slogan was a good idea, but that they could not relate to the stories which had been selected.**

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

**All the participants agreed that the adverts had had either a neutral or a positive impact on their views** about the EU. Some participants, however, expressed **doubts that entrepreneurs had benefited from such support**, indicating that although funding had been distributed to national administrations, this had never trickled down to citizens. Participants would want to see **more tangible proofs** that people had benefited from EU support, while some suggested that funds should be given directly to citizens, bypassing national administrations.

### **2.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

None of the participants had seen any of the prints.

Most participants indicated that they **liked the prints**, and particularly the third one, as it was viewed as more **"realistic"**. Participants also pointed out that they are very **useful to support the videos** as they provide additional information, such as facts, figures and the address of the website.

### **2.3.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line**

#### **Digital promotion**

None of the participants had seen the campaign online.

#### **The website**

Having seen the videos and prints, half of the participants indicated that they would be **interested in obtaining additional information about how the EU is working for them**. Given that none of the participants had seen the website, they asked:

- If it would be possible to find out exactly how the EU is protecting online shoppers?
- If they could select their business activity to find out what financial support they could receive from the EU?



There was, therefore, **a strong demand for a website to act as an entry-point to further information** about how the EU is working for them, **and how they could benefit from financial support**.

However, after analysing the website, participants indicated that it was not linked to their daily work, and that it was **more targeted to public administrations** looking to replicate best practices from other countries.

The website was, however, assessed as **user-friendly and well designed**. The fact that the **contact details of beneficiaries of EU funding were displayed was particularly appreciated**. However, participants questioned the **coherence between the website, and the TV adverts and prints**, as they pointed out that the overall design (colour, style, logos) differs considerably.

### 2.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

Overall, the **campaign was viewed positively**, especially given the lack of available information about what the EU does, although participants quasi-unanimously **described the campaign as not credible**. Participants recommended **further targeting the campaign for specific groups**, and then defining concrete messages which appeal to these target groups.

Participants insisted on the importance of showing **concrete cases of people** having received EU funding, proofs that this had helped them, and that applying for this type of support was realistic. As one participant indicated: "I want to see that that a specific person has received x euros and that this helped him to develop his project. I and also want to see his phone number so that I can call him to confirm this and ask for advice". Another participant indicated that he would like to see: "the business of an entrepreneur before the EU support, and after he received EU funding", showing that **the EU has worked for you**".

### 2.3.5 Views on the EU

Participants associated the EU with politics and economics, and expressed less distrust about the EU than they did of their national government.

## 2.4 Summary of key findings and observations

### ***Views and perceptions of the TV adverts***

#### Recall and appreciation

Out of the total study population, **a majority has seen the TV adverts before**.

The two groups had different views on the different adverts. The younger age group (20 – 34) preferred the colour and animation of the first advert (Green jobs), but preferred the content of the second advert (protecting consumers online), which was seen as more tangible. The older age group preferred the second advert, both aesthetically and in terms of content. The third advert (Innovation) was not as highly rated by either age group.

## Understanding

Most are **interested in the different themes/topics** presented in the adverts and **generally support their objectives**. However, participants indicated that the adverts either contained **too much visual and audio information, which rendered the message difficult to understand**, or that the message was **not credible**. Participants in both groups emphasized the need to showcase **more concrete projects**, which they could relate to; the highly stylised presentation of the projects led people to believe that they were not real projects. Participants in both groups highlighted that the examples had not helped them understand how the EU is working for them, and agreed that the adverts were over-ambitious. Participants often **felt that they were not the targets** of these campaigns, which more geared towards young technology entrepreneurs or large companies.

## Potential impact/influence of the TV adverts

The majority of participants indicated that **the TV adverts had a neutral or positive influence** in their view on the EU, except for one participant in the first focus group which indicated that they had had a negative influence. For most participants, the adverts helped to show that **Spain had not been “forgotten”** by the EU, and there was more to the EU than just macroeconomic considerations and politics. However, the projects shown in the adverts were “not for (them)”, and more concrete projects, associated with **a simpler message** would have had a greater impact. One participant indicated that the complexity of the projects reinforced the idea that the EU was very **distant from considerations** of citizens.

## ***Views and perceptions of the prints***

### Recall and appreciation

None of the participants has seen the print adverts.

Most of the younger group indicated that they would **not immediately associate these prints with the EU**, and that the prints contained **too much information**. As such, they indicated that these adverts provide **additional useful information** for people that have already seen the adverts, but that they could not be stand-alone adverts. Participants in the Group 2 indicated that the prints were very **complementary** with the videos as they provided additional information about the projects, which made them more tangible. They also **welcomed the link to a website**, where they could find additional information. Indeed, half of the older age group (35 – 55) pointed out that they would be **interested in obtaining additional information** as to how they could benefit from what the EU is doing.

## ***Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line***

### Digital promotion

Only one participant in the first focus group had seen the adverts online.

The two age groups had diverse opinions about digital promotion, with no participants from the younger age group indicating that they would be interested in obtaining additional information after having seen the TV adverts and prints, and half of older age group indicating that they would be.

### The website

Most found that **the website was user-friendly, in terms of navigation and layout**. However, younger participants felt that the design was “old”. Participants also lamented the **lack of aesthetic coherence** between the adverts and the website. Finally, the website reinforced, and particularly for the older age group, the idea that the campaign was “not for (them)” as the projects which were displayed seemed more targeted towards other types of stakeholders, such as large companies or public administrations. Instead, participants **would have liked to see this website as a gateway to understanding what the EU is doing**, and how they could benefit from this. Additional information about financing possibilities or potential business partner contacts would, for instance, have been welcome.

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole***

The majority of participants in both groups agreed that **this type of campaign is a good idea**, but they unanimously criticized the fact that **they could not relate to the stories** which had been selected. Participants did **not see how they personally benefit** from what the EU is doing, based on the cases which were profiled. Some participants indicated that this type of campaign creates expectations, so it was important to present “real cases”. In terms of content, the second advert (on-line consumer protection) was most liked by participants, as they could relate to the story of the young couple purchasing online plane tickets. Although participants in the younger age group were satisfied knowing that the EU was doing something in this area, participants in the **older age group expressed the interest in finding additional information** about what the EU is doing precisely, and they would expect to find this on the campaign’s website, as well as information about how they could also obtain funding to develop their projects.

## 3. Annex 2C: Focus Groups report – Finland

### 3.1 Introduction

Date: 3 March 2015

Location: Helsinki, Finland

The TV adverts were presented to both groups in the following order:

1. **TV N° 1** (project N° 68): Huolenpitoa ikaantyyville / Caring for the elderly
2. **TV/print advert N° 2** (project N° 23): Tukea innovaatiolle / Supporting innovation
3. **TV/print advert N° 3** (project N° 41): Luotettavuutta verkko-ostoksiin / Reliable online purchases

The print adverts were presented in the same order separately after the video clips discussion had ended. All three were shown on PPT quickly and then few copies (A3) were left on the table for the participants to study while discussing.

#### 3.1.1 Profiles of participants

Age group 20 - 34

- There were 10 participants in this group, 5 male and 5 female whose ages spanned the 20 – 34 age spectrum
- These were students, unemployed, maternity leave and young professionals. All declared to have a neutral opinion about the EU.

Age group 35 – 55

- There were 9 participants in this group. Four participants were female and five were male. Their ages spanned the 35 – 55 age range.
- These were unemployed, white collar professional and small business owners. All declared to have a neutral opinion about the EU.

#### 3.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (20-34 years)

There was a divide among the group; around **half are selective in their media consumption** and choose to watch programmes on online platforms from main channels, as well as Netflix whereas **other half in addition to social media watches main channels with more or less focus on daily basis**.

All participants used **social media with Facebook more or less daily** and other platforms such as Spotify (2 participants), YouTube (7 people), news sites, LinkedIn and Pinterest, Viaplay, Vimeo, Instagram

Everyone said they **do not pay much attention to adverts** and often they stick in their mind because they are annoying. Four participants said they **use ad blocker** when surfing online to avoid the adverts and all apart from one said they **try to block out the adverts** from their consciousness or find them as fog in the background if they even see them. One participant said they were not using ad blocker to support the websites they visit and another one found adverts relaxing.

Most participants **didn't want to or couldn't recite a recent advert** but few comments/examples were: TriVaGo travel advert that the participant noticed because it was annoying. However he found himself on the website looking at travel deals a week later.

Another male couldn't remember a specific advert but thought that adverts have started to sell products based on lifestyle and imagery than any inherent elements of the product itself. Other adverts quoted were Pirkka (Finnish grocery chain's own brand), toilet paper and breast enlargement pop-ups on social media. Another participant quoted a short interview that was shown to advertise a talk show that had been filmed in a tram in the middle of the day; the unusual set-up for a political interview stuck to mind.

### **3.1.3 Media consumption habits of participants (35-55 years)**

The **older focus group watched more main channels and TV in general compared to the younger group**. One participant said they never use social media, most others used Facebook actively and four people said they use LinkedIn. Other social media channels mentioned were YouTube, Spotify, iPlayer functions of main channels, news sites and comments sections (if they are considered as social media). **Many participants said they do not notice adverts, and if they do the reason is that they are annoying**. Few said that the funny ones stick to mind; one even remembered a crisp bread advert in the 90s. TV adverts were more pervasive than online ones. Participants said that they could remember a Snickers advert and a tiling company advert (because the lady had a crush on the builder on it). Another advert mentioned was a Grocery store advert with a lady with a very distinct voice.

## 3.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20 - 34

### 3.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

The three adverts were shown one after another. After the second people requested to see them again as they felt they went too quickly. The adverts were shown again later on in the discussion.

Seven of the participants remember seeing the adverts before. Two admitted they only saw the adverts as part of looking them up or watching them as part of the questionnaire before the focus group. The **Finnish advert was the most memorable** to all participants and majority liked it the best.

The opinions were evenly divided on whether the second or the third advert was liked the least. The second one was disliked because it was unclear and **difficult to know what was being advertised**. The third one stood out with its vividly golden colours but it was also **too busy**. One male liked the third one because he was interested in the topic area, which he interpreted as online cash transfers.

We then asked the participants whether the adverts stood out from other adverts they'd seen or if they look/feel different to main stream advertising.

The participants agreed that the adverts do **look quite different from mainstream adverts**. One of the participants said that the main differentiator was that "they were not trying to sell anything". However he then reflected that maybe this wasn't just about information, but he was being sold something [the EU] in the end. The **colours and visuals also stood out** from the mainstream; the adverts didn't look like anything that was running at the moment related to products or services.

Two participants said that the second advert reminded them of 90s advertisement from Finnish telecoms operator Elisa. They didn't think the advert felt dated because of it but just made them think of Elisa.

One participant felt that the adverts were slower paced than most modern adverts, but most of other participants were quick to disagree. They said there was a **lot of action in all of the ads**, they were fast, and there were lots of moving parts and images, pumping music and movement to the extent that two of the participants said they started to feel "anxious" and "annoyed". The adverts were packed with a lot of content to a very short video clips.

One participant said they adverts also stood out because they were **all filmed with one long shot** with no cuts that **created flow and unity**. "It's quite a clever effect that you don't see often in adverts."

One participant said that there was so much going on in the adverts, that you might pay attention to different things every time you see them making them maybe more interesting to see several times.

Another participant said that the adverts' environments' felt really weird, almost **magical or "fantastical"**. The white characters didn't open up and gave this anonymous feel. However the anonymity also emphasised the fact that they were not trying to sell anything or anyone as such on the advert.

## Understanding

The participants were requested to write down the three first words that come to mind from the adverts. The **first advert brought out the elderly theme clearly**; the second was thought to relate to **technology and business**; the third was more varied with majority associating it with **travel and/or gold**. The third also evoked more emotional responses people either quoting it as cool/fun or horrible/annoying.

<b>Advert 1</b> (Caring for the elderly)	<b>Advert 2</b> (Supporting innovation)	<b>Advert 3</b> (Reliable online purchases)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elderly; Health Care; Fishing</li> <li>• Old age; coping; support</li> <li>• Becoming older; wellbeing; services</li> <li>• Disco; elderly; blue</li> <li>• Old; elevator; Finland</li> <li>• Cool; incomprehensible; courting (someone trying to get you on their side)</li> <li>• Empathy; funniness; life</li> <li>• Appropriate; in Finnish; clear</li> <li>• Retiree; Old age</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portugal's crisis; technology; morph suits</li> <li>• Job prospects; enthusiasm; progressing</li> <li>• Success; career; work/job</li> <li>• British English; technology</li> <li>• Start-up; business; language</li> <li>• Cool; incomprehensible; courting (someone trying to get you on their side)</li> <li>• Fake; colourful; swaying</li> <li>• Business; technology; glamour</li> <li>• Different; English; phone</li> <li>• International</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge; travel; gold</li> <li>• Internationalism; journey; ideas</li> <li>• Freedom; time off/free time; money</li> <li>• Safety vault; gold; journey</li> <li>• Meaningless; money; couple</li> <li>• Cool; incomprehensible; courting (someone trying to get you on their side)</li> <li>• Stupid; pushy; too happy</li> <li>• Holiday; cool; the Oscars</li> <li>• Kind of new; internet; paying</li> <li>• Sci-fi; horrible; confused</li> </ul>

We then asked the participants what they thought of the themes and topics of the adverts including what they thought they were and whether they were interesting to them. The three themes were interpreted as aging and/or old age (Finland), careers and/or business (Portugal) and money transfers and/or travel (Germany). Few of the panel members felt that these were targeted to three different target groups; however **the Finnish advert had appeal to many because it reminded them of their own parents or grandparent**. The **second advert's theme was interesting** as the group started thinking about their own career possibilities.

One participant though it was great that EU was telling more about possible start-up funding available; however some felt it irrelevant as **the advert didn't explain what the start up support and business incubators really mean** in practice. Third one was the least popular and the theme wasn't interesting to many and the business of the advert was distracting from the theme; few active social media users and person with interest in online applications and platforms found it engaging.

## Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts

**None of the participants felt the adverts made it clearer or more concrete or clear what the EU does** and what EUs role was in the adverts. When probed, few admitted that at least the adverts created a link between topic areas they hadn't thought there might have been a direct link with EU, such as elderly care. One participant said that the look and feel of the adverts was **playful and "fun"** and gave him a more fun picture of the EU.

The use of anonymous morph suited characters to represent the EU **made the EU**

### **bureaucracy feel faceless (or confirmed the existing feeling).**

The adverts didn't impact the participants' opinion of the EU, but raised questions with a third of them on "**why this advertising is done now**". They questioned "whether the public opinion of the EU was so low that they had to advertise to boost it" and "why is EU doing this kind of communications campaign". One of the participants said they felt EU was "buying good reputation" but the adverts did leave him with "good feeling". One added that it felt like waste of money that **didn't deliver that much additional information**.

What it came to the slogan **EU Working for you, the participants thought it was memorable**. However when it came to the question whether it was credible, the participants were hesitant. Few said that they would believe it and that it felt genuine. However one participant said it was wrong way round in a way as they as the EU citizens were working and paying for the EU, not the other way round. Other participant said it worked both ways but that the slogan did feel like it was 'courting' (trying to get you on their side).

### **3.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

**None of the participants had seen the print adverts.** We asked them what their first reactions were after seeing the adverts and two of the participants said that the adverts were **too full of images and information** to be able to make anything out of it. One participant said the adverts were "packed too full". They would not stop to look at the ads in a newspaper; they might only if they were **on a bus stop or rolling in the tram or tube**. The visual language was "**confused**" and it took a while to figure out what was going on in the advert. One participant said they felt "bored" looking at the adverts. The third one especially was very **unclear** as the colours just make the text and imaged "blur into one".

We then asked if there was a message that came across and whether the theme was obvious. The participants agreed that you **can't see the 'Working for you' slogan on the print advert No 3** as it's in yellow/orange on a golden background. Adverts no 1 and 2 were better as they were more "minimalistic". One participant said that it wasn't straight away obvious that the adverts were about the EU or by the EU; you can see the Working for you slogan clearly, but the EU logo on the bottom left and the 'EUROPEAN UNION' written at the top left did not jump out immediately. Also the message wasn't clear; once you figured out the advert was linked to the EU **it wasn't clear what the EU is actually doing for you**.

However once the participants had time to study the adverts a bit more they said that the text did open up the print [and video] advert and the projects. The issue is that they **would never had read them if they were not in the discussion situation, maybe if they were standing next to the advert at a bus stop**. The problem was that the text wasn't in an easily readable font and there was too much of it. Also three participants discussed the fact that the business of the adverts distracted from the message and attracted attention to detail not linked to the message: on advert no 1 participants thought the disco balls were strange. **Advert No 3** attracted the most conversation: participants thought it was the **most annoying one or the funniest one**. It was annoying because it was so full of movement and content and the golden colour was strange and distracting. Participants who thought it was funny said that the morph suited characters reminded them of Oscar statues and that the arrows pointing from the couple to the travel destination were quite "phallic" and the gold made it feel like a glamor or science fiction scene, even felt a bit pornographic.



We asked the participants whether the video clips and print adverts look like part of the same campaign and if the two formats support each other in delivering the message. The participants thought the **visual language and look was similar to the video clips** and most said they could see the link between the two. The print adverts' text explained a bit more what the project was there to do, but the message or the purpose of the advert was left unclear. One participant said that they were not sure "what the advert wanted them to think". The numbering of the projects gave an impression that the EU is funding lots of projects.

### 3.2.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

#### Digital promotion

None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Next we asked the participants whether the adverts made them want to find out more information about EU work or the projects. The **adverts didn't make the group feel like looking for more information**. One participant said that the start-up advert No 2 made them think about looking up funding opportunities that exist with the EU. The **web link is not clear** and most participants hadn't even noticed it until someone pointed it out. One participant said that the lack of clarity on where more information might be available made them feel that EU doesn't even want people to find out more which then emphasised the questions about why the advertising campaign had been launched in the first place.

#### The website

Next we showed the participants the website. In summary, the look and feel of the website **wasn't appealing** and it was **not user friendly to navigate or find information** from. The **search function missed the point** as it took the search to the overall EU website. However the **projects themselves aroused interest** as they were seen to **make the EU more concrete and demonstrate what the EU really does** on the citizen level.

In more detail, the website brought about few chuckles as these participants thought that the website **looked like a high school project**. They said that the website **did not match the look of the adverts** and few said they would have thought they were on the wrong website if they were trying to find information from or related to the adverts. **Opinions were divided** though whether they would bother spending more time on the website. Three people said they found it boring at a first glance, two said that the content and the titles of projects looked interesting and they would like to find out more. One participant said that they rather look at the website than the adverts. One participant said that the contrast between the website and the look of the adverts makes the campaign confusing and emphasises their perception that EU is "trying to create images". One participant recognised that the website follows the generic EU website's format and look.

The participants wanted to look at the categories for sorting the project. They found the categories "safe" (the categories were so generic that you can't have negative connotations of any of them) and "quite meaningless". One participant said that the categories were in contrast to recent news about the EU and the EU region (security situation and the economic troubles related to Greece and quantitative easing). One participant felt they made them like the website less as the categories were so abstract. **"Graphic look of the website was poor but the topics were good"** one participant said. The website felt "institutional" and "office-like". All agreed that they were interested in one of the projects displayed on the website on the detailed level as they **would like to understand better how the EU money has been spent**.

The participants wanted to have a look at a particular project (Finnish project on swamps and another one transforming a rubbish dump to a heritage park). They felt the project profile gave more information to some of the questions that popped up such as how big they were who the implementers were and what the budget was. It was **nice to see the contact details** of the project manager as well in case they wanted to follow up on anything. However they hoped to see how the projects started, as in what the process and timelines were for the projects to get the funding.

The participants then wanted to find 'About' tab to better understand the purpose of the website and information such as the cost of the communications campaign. They were disappointed not to find it. We ran a search with a name of Finnish anti-EU politician as one participant wanted to find out if they had been involved in anything. They found out that the search is linked to the overall EU website which the participants also found disappointing as they would not be able to find information about a specific topic area among projects.

We asked how they would make the website better. Suggestions included **adding an 'About' tab**, making the categories more relevant and improving the search button. One participant suggested that they **would engage more with the website if it was in an app format**. The categories and country-specific filters should be better: at the moment filtering the projects by Finland many multi-country ones come up that don't seem relevant to Finland immediately.

### 3.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

We asked the participants to summarise what they thought of the campaign. One participant said that the advert **tries to convince you that the EU is doing something good at a time when EU criticism is on the rise**. Another said that the campaign might be quite successful in attracting attention as it is so image focussed [trying to improve EU's image in Finland]. One participant said that the campaign made him concerned about how bad the EU's situation is at the moment because the **advert felt a bit "desperate"**. Another one added that the **adverts don't really fit EU's style**; it felt more American style advertising where this type of campaigning is normal.

We asked if this type of campaign is a good way to tell people more about the EU and whether the participants would like to know more about the EU. They said that the video clips and print adverts could encourage the reader to find out more and make it easier. Three people thought **the campaign was a good way to get more information about the EU**. Another participant said that **the campaign itself is a good idea but this particular one they didn't see as being successful**. Another one added that it felt like a lot of money had been spent on it and it looked expensive.

### 3.2.5 Views on the EU

We asked the participants if the campaign had changed their views about the EU. All said that it hadn't, but a few participants said it raised questions as they were reflecting the timing to the current situation on the EU.

### 3.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55

#### 3.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

##### Recall and appreciation

The formal focus group started with watching the video clips. **Eight of the participants said they had seen some of them before**, one was unsure. When asked which one was liked best, **the first (Finland) advert** was liked most. It left a positive feeling and the fact that it was in Finnish made it more memorable. One of the participants said that the first one was well executed in terms of staging. Another one commented that it was **clear that the characters were there to help people** although they did find them lying within the stairs **terrifying**. Many other participants agreed on this.

Few people liked the second (Portugal advert) but the **third (Germany) advert was the worst** according to everyone. One participant said that the advert made them feel distressed / anxious. The two latter adverts also were not memorable as they felt vague in terms of what they were about.

The white morph characters made two of the participants think that **EU is working secretly**. The morph suited characters were described as **shady, scary and incomprehensible**, but they were visible in all three adverts.

Next we asked if the adverts stand out compared to the mainstream adverts. Participants did think they stood out because they were different to generic advertising; for example they did not try to sell a product. One participant felt that surely there would be better use for the funds that were used to produce these adverts. Another said they stood out as they "left them with a restless feeling": first one wasn't that "disturbing" but there was **so much action in a short timeframe** in the **second and third that the message was really muddled**. They also felt that the adverts **looked expensive**.

##### Understanding

We watched the video clips again and after the participants were asked to write down the three first words that came to mind.

Advert 1 (Caring for the elderly)	Advert 2 (Supporting innovation)	Advert 3 (Reliable online purchases)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kai (name of the person on the advert): Targeted to elderly: preppy/happy</li> <li>• Finland; chavvy (chav/redneck like)</li> <li>• Fast tempo: strange environment for elderly person</li> <li>• Elderly: caring: how?</li> <li>• Elderly: employment</li> <li>• An elevator: tool for the elderly: happy retiree</li> <li>• Getting older: helping: living at home</li> <li>• Why?: nice: is this real?</li> <li>• Coffin: partying: marionettes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EU: a bit boring: what did that one word mean again?</li> <li>• Of this time/modern: efficiency: coldness</li> <li>• Confused: what's the idea?</li> <li>• Entrepreneurs: nice?: unclear</li> <li>• @ - life: internationalism</li> <li>• Pretty lady: Sky/heaven (same word not sure which one was meant): clouds</li> <li>• Why?: in Portugal: entrepreneurship</li> <li>• Cloud: blue: circumspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Money: it was ok: a couple</li> <li>• Metropolis film: supposedly technology: supposedly good feeling</li> <li>• Space station: UFOs; cave</li> <li>• Couple: euros: travelling</li> <li>• Bank; youth</li> <li>• Sci-fi film: humanoids: robots</li> <li>• Why?; in Germany: safety</li> <li>• Teenagers: taxi: golf</li> </ul>

Next we asked the participants what they thought of the themes and the topics were and if they found them interesting. One participant said that **the topics felt clear**, but they should have been made more prominent and taken further; they felt the adverts only half scratched the surface on big issues. The participants the topics were elderly care, business support and online purchasing. The participants thought the topic was clearest on the first advert. One participant said that they were describing **"the invisible EU guys supporting citizen's everyday life"**. Another commented that the message of the third advert was conflicting because the couple in the advert was using a very old school table laptop when the message was about services enabled by modern technology. Another one added that the **safe and easy online transfer message contradicts what EU regulation has done** to direct debit type of services in Finland (they had to be stopped that has made paying harder. Also the fact that the **older man in the first advert needed help getting up the stairs and was then disco dancing was annoying**. One participant said that the adverts made them wonder what he adverts really were there to try to do as after seeing them his first thought was 'so what'? Also, **"the second advert did not go far enough in explaining how the EU is helping entrepreneurs"**.

We then questioned whether the slogan was memorable and credible. **Five of the participants said that the slogan was credible** few of them qualifying that there are areas where EU is working for you and others were it isn't. **The rest thought that the slogan was suspicious or not credible at all**; "reality is so different to what the adverts are trying to depict". One participant thought "working for you is not accurate as I don't see it in any way in my day to day life". Another one said that the slogan made them think that "EU is doing so badly that they need to advertise". One of the participants thought the adverts are credible and "a good try as I can't remember that EU would have done this ever before so considering that the adverts are not bad at all in trying to convey the message". Another one said that they believed EU has truly helped them and reflected back to the depression of the 90s in Finland and the fast recovery that was in their view partly attributed to the EU.

Overall the participants felt that the **messages came across somewhat, but thought that EU working for you message was not concrete. The adverts still left unclear** what EU is really doing to ordinary citizens.

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

The participants said that the adverts **haven't changed their views of EU**. One participant said that it made them think about finding out about potential EU funding. Another one said they knew lot of people who had benefitted EU funding and projects, but many people do not know how to find it and apply for it and the adverts didn't help to open this up.

One of the participants felt that their view hadn't changed, but the roles had turned over the past 20 years: "I feel that we have received a lot of help from the EU in the past, and now it's our turn to help the EU". Another participant said they felt confused by the adverts as "the EU is advertising about the support it provides, but **doesn't actually explain how I could become part of it.**"

### 3.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints

None of the participants had seen the print adverts before. When asked what the participants thought of the print adverts they said that overall the **prints are not very memorable** as they are so busy that nothing specific sticks to mind immediately. Overall the print adverts **did provide some more information, but the message did not come across** as the execution failed.

One participant said that the adverts felt institutional or official. One participant said that the adverts "didn't speak to them" and that the only thing that made them to look at them were the disco balls in advert no 1. Another one said that the **gold colour and money theme were "nice", but not very interesting**. "I don't think the print adverts work as well as the video clips as I find it unlikely that people would stop and study and read the print advert. The fonts are badly executed but the print advert does support the message of the video (if read)."

One participant said they thought of an Elisa advert in relation to the advert no 2 (Finnish telecoms provider with similar blue colour theme). Another one added that in the second advert the message is in contradiction with the visual image of an empty office with empty paper trays. This made him think of the Portugal crisis and the possible looming fall of the EU.

Participant agreed that if you read the project descriptions they do clarify what it going on. However you **don't think of EU immediately when seeing the adverts as the logo is no that visible**. "Even if you see the logo you don't immediately think this is EU advertising something (EU may have co tribute to funding of the thing that is being advertised)."

In terms of the text and the descriptions of the projects the participants **noticed the amount of money quoted** in each and felt that the text didn't quote clarify what the billions of euros really were used on/how they were spent. "There are **four different size fonts and sizing makes me read irrelevant information first** [such as project 68, this doesn't tell me anything]. The descriptions of the projects are in such small font it is very hard to read." Especially the advert no 3 was thought to be poor as the **text melted into the background**.

### 3.3.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

#### Digital promotion

None of the participants had seen the campaign online. Two of the participants said they **might visit the campaign website** after seeing the adverts to find out more information about the funding opportunities for small business for example. "The adverts **didn't make me think I was supposed to follow up** with an action". Participants agreed that there was no call to action attached. "These felt like a **one-way information blast**." Three of the participants also felt the adverts emphasized the feeling that the EU is going on about its own business separate to citizens.

#### The website

We then followed to visit the website and the participants were told to point to the parts of the website they wanted to visit. Overall the **website was thought not to link to the campaign** as it had such a different visual look and no information about the campaign itself. **User-friendliness divided opinions**. The search function was poor as you couldn't find a project based on number in any other way than scrolling down and it took you to

EU's main website. The website is also hard to find: the **web link is tiny in the adverts** and if you Google EU communications campaign or advertising campaign (in Finnish), the website does not come up. The website itself still doesn't give any further information about the campaign.

When asked about where they would like to go have a look, one participant wanted to look at the Erasmus project as they thought Erasmus was just about student exchanges. The participants thought that the website **looked official** and reminded them of a university website or the Finnish government's jobseeker's website. Few thought the official look was a good thing as it is EU in question to give the website credibility. However other said that they would **not link this website to the campaign** and it's creating a mixed image. One participant said that they found the website **informative** and would probably **spend a bit of time looking at the different projects**.

When looking at the Erasmus project profile one participant said that her first thoughts were **"age discrimination"** as they felt that EU is offering lots of the training perks to young people only (had a bad personal experience applying for a traineeship). One person thought that the link through which you can find more information was annoying as they felt that surely the project profile should include all the information they need.

When returning to the main page the project titles further interested people. "It feels like you need to know what you're looking for already when you go the website. It is not making discovery easy". Few of the participants felt they started to warm up to the website saying that "the **website is actually quite clean but could be made clearer** in terms of where to find what kind of information as you will soon lose interest in trying to make sense of it." Another participant noted that the word "project" (hanke) was mentioned six times in the first part of the page. Word project just didn't tell them anything and made it feel repetitive and vague. Another participant said that the **website did give them "a better idea what the EU actually does"** give how patchy their understanding of the EU had been. The more local level it can be brought, the better. However they still agreed that they would not link the website and the campaign together.

When asked if they would suggest any improvement the participants thought the website could include a map that would allow you to look at what EU has funded on a more country-specific and local level. This would make the navigation easier. A better search function would also be needed for example to find project according to the number since these project numbers were quoted in the adverts. An option to share the project profile on LinkedIn could be added (now there is only Facebook and Twitter). Another participant suggested that this could be made into an application.

### 3.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

We then asked the participants to summarise their views of the campaign as a whole. We asked if this kind of **campaign was needed to provide people more information about the EU and five people thought it was**. One person thought the campaign was **quite effective in raising interest**. Others thought the execution failed on what could have been an effective way/format of informing people about EU's work. "The campaign had **too much action and information fitted into too small spaces** (video clip duration and the print advert). You could have done less [projects] but done them bigger". Others hoped that the campaign had made the projects and the EU assistance more concrete, for example how to apply for the start-up support presented in advert no 2.

When asked if **participants would like to see more information, eight of the participants said they would**. One said that they hoped that their response wouldn't

mean that they start seeing more of these adverts in two months as that would feel excessive. One who didn't said that the campaign didn't impress, the website was way too clumsy and made him feel anguished. The participants **agreed that the website was the poorest part** of the campaign and would need a lot of work in the future. "It also contradicts the campaign message of EU making life easier for you as the citizen."

### 3.3.5 Views on the EU

When asked if the participants felt they understood and connected better with the EU as a result of the campaign only one participant agreed. **The majority, however, felt they were a bit better informed**, but said that would be more to do with the time spent looking at the activities and discussing them within the focus group. **No one had changed their opinion as such because of the campaign.**

## 3.4 Summary of key findings and observations

### *Views and perceptions of the TV adverts*

#### Recall and appreciation

Out of the total study population, only a small minority has seen the TV adverts before.

The **majority of participants like the TV advert N° 1** (elderly) the most, followed by TV advert N° 2 and TV advert N° 3. Advert No 1 was liked the most as it was in Finnish and the message in it was the clearest. **Advert No 3 (consumer protection on-line) was the least clear** in terms of the message and participants' understanding what the project was about. The visual look of that one was also thought to be the poorest and the most confused. Attention was paid more to the details than the message and the project; especially the **white morph-suited men produced more negative images than positive** ones with participants finding them odd and scary or projecting the anonymous image of the EU that contradicts the campaign message.

The majority of participants think that the **adverts stand out compared to other TV adverts**, mostly because of their visuals such as **colours** and the fact that they are **not blatantly trying to sell** the viewer something.

#### Understanding

The participants found the **theme in advert no 1 and 2 most interesting**. **The slogan divided opinions** in both groups in terms of whether it was credible many saying that it was credible in some occasions more than others. Small majority did not find it credible with both groups saying that the slogan is somewhat backwards as citizens also work for the EU. Many pointed out inconsistencies in the message and the adverts themselves; aka promoting technologies that are old.

#### Potential impact/influence of the TV adverts

The participants stated that the TV adverts did not change their view on the EU. They **perceive the different projects portrayed in the adverts positively** and think that the **messages must be more comprehensive** and understandable. About a quarter across both groups said that the adverts made them question about what is behind the adverts i.e. **the real state of the EU is since they have felt the need to advertise.**

### ***Views and perceptions of the prints***

#### Recall and appreciation

None of the participants had seen the print adverts.

The majority of participants think that the **print adverts present the same themes** as in the TV adverts. However they were not well executed as there was **too much information** crammed in. The information about the project was thought to be interesting and make the campaign more understandable but there were doubts on how many people would read it. Both groups thought the print **did not make EU's role clear**.

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line***

#### Digital promotion

None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Most participants would **not be looking for more information**. Few would look for more information in order to discover EU funding relevant to them for example business related funding and services. The lack of information (or the **low visibility**) of where to go for **more information was frustrating for both groups** (the website link is not clear in both print and video).

#### The website

The majority of participants think that there is **no (apparent) link between the communication campaign and the website**. The look and layout were so different that the website didn't seem to be part of the same campaign. The search function was poor and **navigation difficult**. Both groups thought the execution of the website was not successful, but were **interested in the project titles and finding out more about projects** themselves. Navigation and user-friendliness were not good and the website **lacked information on what it was 'about'**.

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole***

The format of TV advertising, print and website was thought to be good, but both groups mainly agreed that the execution had failed. The adverts were too full of information and the **role of the EU in them was left vague**. The **adverts do stand out** from the mainstream advertising though. Majority of both groups **would like to find out more information** about the EU and **see more proactive communications** from the EU; those who didn't were often concerned about the cost and priorities.



## 4. Annex 2D: Focus Groups report – Latvia

### 4.1 Introduction

Date: 11 March 2015

Location: Riga, Latvia

#### 4.1.1 Profile of participants

Nine participants attended each of the two focus groups. In the first focus group (20-34) 4 participants were female and 5 were male. In the second focus group (35-55), 5 participants were female and 4 were male. The participants were recruited by Coffey and Ipsos – MORI. All of the recruited participants had neutral stance to the EU.

#### 4.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (group 20-34)

The **majority of participants don't watch TV**, but watch playbacks of news online. The ones who do watch TV are watching news, cartoons with kids on LNT, LTV1. All of the participants are ignoring adverts, have advert blocking applications on their computers, but some participants, if they see something interesting on the website, tend to open and have a look on what's being advertised. All of participants are actively using social media; most popular are Facebook, Delfi, Appolo, Tvnet. Not **all of the participants remembered an advert that they had seen lately** and consider particularly memorable. The majority of participants remembered a Tele2 advert, as it was considered to be funny and interesting to watch. The other adverts mentioned were lattelecom, airbaltic, and the save driving advert. Many participants mentioned adverts that are being sent by email (e.g. adverts for 220.lv (internet shop), and airbaltic).

#### 4.1.3 Media consumption habits of participants (group 35-55)

**The majority of participants watch TV on a daily basis** (mostly news channels, documentaries, sports on e.g. LTV1, LTV7, TV3, LNT, TV5) and use Facebook on a regular basis, read news on Delfi, Tvnet, Appolo, use Twitter and Draugiem.lv. The majority of participants remembered a TV advert that they had seen recently and that they considered to be particularly memorable (e.g. Tele2, Dormeo, EU advert (two participants named EU advert about Karina, klip Nr1 in our FG)). The **majority of participants do not trust adverts** and try to avoid seeing them.

The TV and print adverts were presented in the following order:

1st group 20-34

1. TV advert about Anna and Lucas from Germany (On-line consumer protection)
  2. TV advert about Marta from Portugal (Green jobs)
  3. TV advert about Karina from Latvia (Erasmus+)
- 
1. Print advert about Karina from Latvia
  2. Print advert about Anna and Lucas from Germany
  3. Print advert Marta from Portugal

2nd group 35-55

1. TV and print advert about Karina from Latvia
2. TV and print advert about Anna and Lucas from Germany
3. TV and print advert Marta from Portugal

## 4.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34

### 4.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Five participants had seen the advert before. The majority of participants (6 participants) liked TV advert N° 3 the most (Karina from Latvia), followed by TV advert N° 2 (3 participants). None of the participants liked TV advert N° 1 the most (on-line consumer protection).

The majority of participants liked the visual presentation of the advert and that the message was clear and easy to understand. The content was straight forward. They liked that Erasmus+ was mentioned because **all of the participants knew about Erasmus** and how it works. The advert was thought to have very good story. Many participants said they liked this advertisement, as it was dynamic and light, and they liked the airplane and young people. One participant liked the fact that the advert talked about *"interesting work"* instead of *"well paid work"*. One participant said this advert Nr 3 was too bright and childish.

Three participants liked advert Nr 2 (Green jobs) the most. The reason that they gave was that as they are not students and this advert was about business and it appealed to them more than the ad on Erasmus+. Also, they liked the visual presentation of this advert the most because they thought that it was dynamic. They liked this advert because it is **more serious**. One participant liked the idea that any person can be in any part of the world and organize worldwide business.

One participant said that slogan is annoying after hearing it for several times.

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. The majority of participants (8 participants) liked the TV advert N° 1 the least (on-line consumer protection), followed by TV advert N° 3 (Erasmus+) (1 participant).

Most participants couldn't remember the first advert and what was it about. The message was unclear as highlighted by the comments made. Safe shopping online was not thought to be important for participants, nor was cheaper roaming in EU, as everyone uses internet. One comment was that this advert was for people who had relatives working and living abroad, so that they could call them cheaply. One other comment was that this advert was done at the last minute, as *"being able to call cheaper abroad is new project, not like Erasmus, that's been there for a long time"*. One participant said that he only travels once a year and that this advert would annoy him by reminding of holidays he couldn't afford.

One participant liked the advert Nr 3 the least because of its message – she didn't believe that someone will get a good job after the Erasmus programme, *"That's not true- this message doesn't apply to real life."*

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV. The majority of participants think that **the adverts stand out compared to other TV adverts**. Participants think that the adverts stand out, are distinctive, don't sell anything, and that it's clear straight away they are political adverts. As Latvia is a Presidency country of the EU, one participant thinks it's connected to that.

One participant thinks these adverts are a bit like Swedbank or lattelekom adverts, as these companies *"usually show us well happy people that are flying"*.

Some participants said these adverts didn't stand out-*"They are a bit brighter, but nothing special"*

Some participants mentioned that the adverts are more dynamic and fast-*"they look like a mini theatre play"*.

### **Understanding**

We asked the participants to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they think each advert is about. The table below presents an overview of key words that the participants associate with each of the three adverts.

<b>TV Advert N° 1</b>	<b>TV Advert N° 2</b>	<b>TV Advert N° 3</b>
Erasmus+	On-line consumer protection	Green jobs
Friendly		Modern Suitable for young people Compelling
Talk Money Development	Money Business	Education Career Office
This information doesn't appeal to me Cheaper international calls	Money of the Europa Support International recognition	Studies in the EU International work experience That doesn't mean that you will get well paid job
EU Positive changes Easier communication	Regional development Private business New growth opportunities	Studying abroad Opportunities for young people at home country Opportunities on work market
Joyful Advert of the EU Useless for me	Something far away Why is it shown in Latvia?	Cool mood Clear message Clear audience
Friendly Simple About EU	Technology Regions EU is working	Young people Erasmus Studies
Closeness of EU Big opportunities Easiness of researching them	Opportunities for business and self-employed to start off expand	Getting education in its best form thru the EU
EU works for us Easy communication with friends Roaming	Helping business Regional development EU works for us	Education abroad Promote employment EU works for us
Trip Family Social programmes money	Regions Career Offices	Education Career Trip

The participants were asked what they think about the themes/topics of the adverts and whether or not they are interested in them.

The majority of participants are interested in the different themes/topics presented in the adverts. Some of the participants are especially interested by the different themes associated with the adverts (e.g. support for small businesses, education, Erasmus, save shopping online). Some participants find all three topics appealing, but two participants said none of the topics were appealing. Another said she couldn't understand why the 3<sup>rd</sup> advert (Erasmus+) is so clear and straight forward, when the others are so difficult to understand and follow.

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the slogan of the information campaign ("*Eiropa strādā mūsu labā*") interests them and whether or not they considered it to be credible; did they believe in it?

The majority of participants laughed at this question- one said- "*They really want us to believe it? It's the same as believing in Santa Claus*". One participant said the slogan made her think- "*is it really so?*" Other added that obviously for some people these adverts are more useful than to usual consumers (meaning that people who created adverts invested good money in this campaign and got a good return from it).

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

The participants were asked what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why.

Participants agreed with the first comment that came out: "*Why does the EU have to remind us of itself? Maybe there are now more people who are sceptical about the EU and with these adverts the EU is trying to make them more optimistic*"

Next, we asked the participants whether the TV adverts have changed their view on the EU in any way and why. All of participants stated that **the TV adverts did not change their view on the EU.**

However, they **perceived the different projects portrayed in the adverts rather positively.** The information campaign offers a good overview of the different projects supported by the EU. One participant said: "adverts are not really seen as something serious". Another ironically said: "*Does your opinion of ice cream change over the year?*"

### **4.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

#### **Recall and appreciation**

The participants were presented the printed versions of the advertising material supporting the TV adverts and asked if they had already seen one or more of the print adverts. None of the participants had seen the print adverts.

Next, we asked the participants what they think of the adverts and why.

The majority of participants think that the **print adverts present the same themes as in the TV adverts.**

The below highlights the comments made on the print ad:

- Are they going to produce Barbies?
- It's a modern advert showing material, silhouettes, drawings of dresses on the blackboard
- Pink glasses: they will break and the girl will hit reality
- It's not a good poster: the girl looks more like a Jesus at the cross
- It looks like a surgery table with Paris in the background
- Without seeing the video, it is difficult to get the message that they are trying to convey.
- The heading is not good, doesn't get your attention
- Too pink!
- The clip was about studies, but the print has no message at all about the studies
- Probably the people who made it knew what they are doing: trying to attract attention (that's why it's so pink)
- It's a good composition, but it could be more informative

They **recognised the context** of the information campaign, but would **not be naturally inclined to read** the messages presented in the print ads.

All of participants think that there is **no clear/direct link between the information presented in the print advert and the message**. All participants said this advert doesn't support the TV advert, and makes it **even less understandable**. One participant said *"This advert is orientated to young people and there would be a better chance that they would look at it if they were waiting for a bus"*.

Participants then gave their views on Print ad N° 2 (protecting consumers on-line). The various comments that were made were as follows:

- OMG this one is even worse!
- The first thing I saw was the mens' genitals in the centre
- There is no central object, nothing to look at
- I like this one better than first one
- This is bad taste
- If you read the text- yes, shopping online, but nothing on the poster gives that message
- The Euro sign is too small, it doesn't get your attention
- Tried to show action
- The golden safe probably wants to show security, that the money you are save is in EU
- The text in this ad is better that in Nr1, there's more information, a better message
- It's a really bad visual image, *"Is it Bond movie?"*

Most said that this print advert made the video clip even less understandable. However, one said the opposite: *"At least here you can read the text and understand what they are trying to say"*.

The majority of participants agreed that the **print ad N° 3 (Green jobs) was the best**. This was perceived to be the **best suited at carrying the intended message**. They liked the colour of the poster. No one had seen this advert before. There was one opposite view; one female participant preferred the 'golden one'. (Nr2). One participant particularly liked the idea of presenting the EU as blue, pink and gold men.

### 4.2.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

#### Digital promotion

Next, we asked the participants to raise their hand if they have seen any adverts related to this campaign on the internet and where. One participant had seen something on Facebook.

The participants were asked how likely they would be to look for more information and why, based on what they have seen so far. **Most participants would not look for more information**; they didn't see these adverts as anything more than just **an informative advert on the EU** saying: **"We are here, we are doing something"**.

#### The website

Next, we showed the website to participants and asked them to navigate us on the website (to tell us which information/links to access) and asked them what they think of it.

The participants agreed that there is no (apparent) link between the information campaign and the website. They suggested that there is a contrast in terms of style, design and content between the TV and print ads, and the website. They would want to see some icons from the TV adverts to click on and read more about them.

The design was suggested to be classic and simple. Overall, participants felt that the content was presented well and they liked the logic of first finding basic information about a project and that if you are interested you can then read deeper and get more information. Some said they liked it and found it easy to read, because nothing distracted them.

A number of suggestions for improvements were made:

- Putting the drop down menu at the top so that you don't need to scroll down to the bottom of the page.
- Making website more compact, using bigger categories for the first level of search;
- Adding options for colour-blind people.

A mixture of other comments followed, as different participants gave their views:

- It looks like a newspaper
- "Boring!"
- "This website is just for people who are looking for it."
- The information on the website is interesting, it would be interesting to read more.

### 4.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

Next, we asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why. There were mixed opinions in the group about the views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole.

- It's a reminder from the EU that they are here
- Information about what tools and opportunities EU give to people
- It's not effective, not reaching the audience, just spending budget / money on it
- It could get more popular and useful over time
- It would be more useful if real people would tell us about their experiences, and not these abstract people;
- The campaign is too neutral / not targeted, it is probably to suit all countries and in

the end it doesn't appeal to anyone, as we all have different mentalities.

**The majority of participants thought that the campaign, as a whole, was memorable if it is seen.**

The participants were asked whether or not they would like to see a continuous/frequent campaign, which shows other examples of what the EU does. The **majority of participants would like to see a continued campaign.** They wanted to see more information about what EU does.

#### 4.2.5 Views on the EU

Next, we asked the participants to name three things what the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

**Table 1: Views on the EU**

Euro
Open borders
Freedom of travel
Less time on borders
Opportunities, EU projects
Recognition of Latvia
Support for different projects

The participants were asked whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. The majority of participants had not changed its opinion about the EU. Two participants changed their opinion to slightly more positive.

## 4.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55

### 4.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Most participants (8 from 9) had seen the TV adverts before. The majority of participants either TV advert N° 1 the most (Erasmus+, Karina from Latvia) (4 participants) or TV advert N° 3 (Green jobs) (4 participants) the most. Nobody chose TV advert N° 2 (online consumer protection) as their favourite advert, in fact everyone said they liked this on the least. One participant said she liked them all equally.

Views of advert Nr1 (Erasmus+)

- Attractive, easy to understand
- Reminds me of *The Sounds of Music*, the musical
- It's not believable that a girl with a good education would return to Latvia
- It's a bit too long
- It gets your attention
- This one seems to be filmed slower than the other adverts, it makes it easier to follow
- I think it's positive that the girl came back to Latvia

Views of advert Nr2 (on-line consumer protection)

- **Difficult to understand (all of the participants)**
- Communication and robots come into my mind
- It reminds me of the cosmos
- It's too fast, it's difficult to get the message

Views of advert Nr3 (green jobs)

- Interested in the advert as business in the **most topical subject** from all 3 themes (3 participants)

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. All participants liked the TV advert N° 2 the least (on-line consumer protection). They didn't understand this advert because they feel that it was too fast and without a clear message.

The participants were also asked whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV. The majority of participants thought that the adverts stood out compared to other TV adverts.

- They are more colourful than other adverts
- More dynamic, faster compared to other TV ads
- These are optimistic and happy adverts
- They don't sell anything
- Too fast for older people, they are probably good for young people, or if they are seen many times then you will get the idea

The adverts **stand out because of their bright colours**. However, this is thought to be a positive and negative aspect.



## Understanding

The participants were asked to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they think each advert is about. The table below presents an overview of key words that the participants associated with each of the three adverts.

**Table 2: Understanding – key words**

<b>Clip 1</b>	<b>Clip 2</b>	<b>Clip 3</b>
Erasmus+	Protecting consumers online	Green jobs
Good education Free education Won't return to Latvia	Cheaper, easier, happier shopping	Regional development EU funding Growth
Education in the EU	EU Cards Communication	Investments using EU
Education Returning Getting new knowledge	Breadth Young people Opportunities	Business Help Ease of use
Youth Education Future	Traveling Communication Freedom	Technology Business Growth
Fabrics The Sound of Music (musical)	Gold Strange Robots	Blue Attractive Clouds
New skills Europa works for us Young people	Safer shopping Cheaper roaming	Technology Business incubators Regional development
Studies in France Return to Latvia Good job	Happy couple Communicate Help from EU	Own business Internet incubator EU helps to develop business in any country
Studies in the EU Return to Latvia Good perspective to find good job	Anna and Lucas in Germany Profitable shopping in internet Good holiday	Marta from Portugal Internet business in EU Good perspectives in the future
EU Studying Latvia	EU Roaming Opportunities	EU Business Opportunities

Next, we asked participants what they think about the themes/topics of these adverts and whether or not they are interested in them. The **majority of participants were interested in the different themes/topics** presented in the adverts. One participant said that none of the topics appealed to her. As they don't study, these participants felt that the first advert might be interesting for their children or relatives. One participant had to change jobs recently so she was interested in the first advert's theme, because young people are her competitors. The majority of participants are more interested in topics Nr 3 and 2.

Participants were asked whether or not the slogan of the information campaign ("*ES strādā mūsu labā*") interests them and whether or not they consider it to be credible.

The replies were as follows:

- It is too direct, it should be more neutral
- It sounds believable, but it is **more for people who know more about EU, its regulations and rules**, it doesn't appeal to me
- The slogan **goes well with the visual presentation** of campaign
- I **don't like the word- WORKING**, as people have to work and not the EU is working for them
- **The slogan is good, but not credible**

The majority of participants **are interested in the slogan** and overall they think that the objective is good. However, they think that **the slogan is not credible**.

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, we asked the participants what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why. The replies could be summed as follows:

- Positive thoughts on EU (most of participants)
- Suspicion, why the EU is advertising itself? What they will want from us?
- Good opportunities in EU
- Participants like that the EU is trying to show ordinary people that there are opportunities for everyone

The next question was whether the TV adverts had changed their view on the EU in any way and why. The majority of participants said that the **TV adverts did not change their view on the EU**. They **liked seeing about different projects** in the adverts. They need a clearer message and more information. They also indicated that they would like it to be more obvious where to find more information.

### **4.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

#### **Recall and appreciation**

Next, we have showed printed advertising material supporting the TV adverts. None of the participants had seen the print adverts. We then asked participants what they thought of the adverts and why.

Advert Nr1 (Erasmus+):

- Too pink, horrible!
- Before you go through the text, it looks like a sewing workshop

It is felt that the print doesn't make campaign more understandable. However, one participant explained that: *"If someone has seen a TV clip, then this advert is a good chance to read more about it"*.

Advert Nr2 (Protecting consumers on-line):

- Horrible robots
- Did someone get paid for this?
- It doesn't look like the poster
- Reminds me of the bureaucracy of the EU
- What is the connection between gold rods and communication?
- I don't get the message at all from the poster.
- Bad taste!
- Robots looks like they've just come from the sauna

All participants said that it was a bad poster, without any message to the public.

Advert Nr3 (green jobs):

- I like this the most, it's easiest to understand
- Clear message
- I like it because it seems more real
- All the adverts look like movie adverts
- All the adverts are not beautiful, they are not pleasant
- The face of the girl is too dark
- Ugly adverts!

All participants liked the 3<sup>rd</sup> poster the most. They found it easier to get the message and they liked the colours better than in the previous posters.

### **4.3.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line**

#### **Digital promotion**

The participants were asked if they have seen any adverts related to this campaign on the internet and where. Some of the participants had **seen the pictures of the pink advert**. One participant recalled it was on appolo website, one thought it might be on inbox.lv.

Next, we asked the participants, based on what they had seen, so far, how likely they would be to look for more information and why. The majority of participants felt that they got interested about campaign because of the focus group, but not after seeing adverts on TV. One participant did indicate that his interest was aroused by seeing the advert on TV, but he said that he quickly forgot about it and thought about other things.

#### **The website**

Next, we showed the website to the participants and asked them to navigate us on the website (to tell us which information/links to access) and asked them what they think of it.

- Easy to look through
- Like all websites
- I couldn't comment on the content as I need to read more
- Not a bad website
- Primitive design, too simple
- It should be less on completed projects and more on on-going projects where people can apply, otherwise it's not interesting

#### 4.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

We asked the participants what they think about this campaign as a whole and why. There are mixed views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole.

- It is not popular, not many people know about it. Even seeing the adverts on TV, it's not clear it's a campaign
- Makes a positive image of the EU, but it's more meant for young people
- I would like to have better information, not a clip advert but some articles on news platforms, so that it gets my attention and then I can read about it
- I think the campaign is quite successful (a participant)
- I would like more real examples about projects
- The adverts don't get the meaning across that it's a campaign
- It's not memorable as it was on TV as a campaign

The majority of participants would **like to see more on the campaign**, but not the “pink girl”. They indicated that they are looking for more *real people*, for example a real farmer who would tell about his experience with an EU project and tell how he applied to it, how he got funding and what was achieved”. Four participants would be interested to know how and where to get information on existing projects, how they can benefit and apply.

The majority of participants thought that this was a good way to be informed about the EU's work, **but not in this PINK BARBIE style**, they felt that the approach should be **more serious**. Otherwise people don't take it seriously. It was suggested that the adverts were more orientated towards young people. In Latvia, the adverts should be **about Latvia, orientated to Latvians**.

#### 4.3.5 Views on the EU

Next, we asked the participants to name three things what the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

**Table 3: Views on the EU**

EU made Latvian rules more accurate
Opportunities to participate in educational projects
Opportunities for cooperation
Borderless travel
Security
Traveling
Freedom
Negative thing-people going away
Opportunities to work abroad

The participants were asked whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. The majority of participants had not changed their opinion about the EU recently.

## 5. Annex 2E: Focus Groups report - Poland

### 5.1 Introduction

Date: 3 March 2015

Location: Kraków, Poland

**The TV and print adverts** were presented to both groups in the following order:

1. **TV/print advert N° 1** –innovation / entrepreneurship(project N° 29) - *Marta from Kraków;*
2. **TV/print advert N° 2** –green jobs (project N° 78) - *Elena from Spain;*
3. **TV/print advert N° 3** –youth (project N° 18) - *Karina from Latvia.*

#### 5.1.1 Profiles of participants

The first focus group was carried out with members of the public aged 20-34, the second group – with people aged 35-55.

Ten participants attended each of the two focus groups and there was an even spread within each age band regarding the age and the working status of participants. In each of the focus groups, 5 participants were female and 5 were male. The participants were recruited by Coffey and Ipsos- MORI. All of the recruited participants had neutral stance to the EU.

#### 5.1.1 Media consumption habits of participants (group 20-34)

**Most do not watch TV on a regular basis**, and a few admitted not to watch TV at all. Of the ones who watch TV from time to time (mainly documentaries, news and sports events), all claimed **watching adverts only passively** and switching channels/carrying out other activities while adverts are shown on TV.

**All of the participants claimed to be social media savvy** and using Facebook on a regular basis (mostly using their Facebook account on a daily basis to read news about their friends and family, but not commenting or becoming actively engaged in discussions). Two participants use Twitter, but also in a rather passive way (i.e. reading others' tweets, but not tweeting themselves).

Only four participants remembered a TV advert that they have seen lately and that they consider particularly memorable (an electrical goods store advert and an advert for a mobile phone provider) but all four reported to remember it "*because it was really annoying and was being repeated all the time*".

#### 5.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (group 35-55)

The **majority of participants watch TV on a daily basis** (mostly news channels, series, and sport). **All but one use Facebook on a day-to-day basis** and two participants use Twitter. With one exception, all use social media passively, i.e. reading posts of other people or re-tweeting, but not joining conversations online, or tweeting their own content.

**Half of participants remembered a TV advert** that they have seen lately and that they consider particularly memorable (a phone network advertisement that was played very frequently on many channels; a grocery supermarket advert; a car advert, Polish beer *Żubr*). The latter is appreciated for because it is suggested to be "*intelligent and surreal*" and have good word-play.

## 5.2 Discussion with individuals aged 20-34

### 5.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Nearly half of the group remembered seeing at least one EU advert. One participant had seen two ('Entrepreneurship' and 'Green jobs'), three participants have seen only one advert ('Entrepreneurship'), and six participants did not recall seeing any of the TV adverts.

When shown the advert, most liked the 'Entrepreneurship' advert the most, mentioning the "*best colour scheme*" (i.e. blue) and the fact that the main character was supposedly from Kraków – the city where the focus groups have taken place. Two of the participants found the 'Green jobs' advert the best, believing that the topic (starting up an eco-cosmetics company) was the most interesting, and finding the actress "*the best looking*". One participant liked the 'Youth' advert the most, attributing that to the fact that he himself is interested in participating in Erasmus+ in the near future.

Regarding the adverts they liked the least, for most the 2<sup>nd</sup> advert ('Green jobs'), as they found the colour "*irritating*" and believed there was a dissonance in promoting "*green* (i.e. eco-friendly) *company using red colour*". They also believed this advert to be the **least convincing**, in terms of the plot of the advert not reflecting accurately the theme it was promoting.

When probed deeper about the themes of the adverts, all of the participants claimed it is **relatively easy to "decipher" what the adverts are meant to represent**, and believed the adverts to be clearly targeted at certain audiences, namely entrepreneurs, wannabe-entrepreneurs and students looking to participate in an Erasmus exchange. However, once again, the participants commented that the adverts "**lack concrete information**", "*only provide a sketchy picture*" and "*you don't really know what the intended result of these ads is*". The latter comment, in particular, highlights the perceived lack of a distinct call to action in the adverts. One participant believed the adverts to be "*an inspiration for further search, but nothing more than an inspiration – they don't really tell me what to do next*".

When asked whether they found the adverts to be distinct from other TV advertisements, the participants were **appreciative of the consistent style** of the adverts, i.e. the fact that all of the adverts were similar in terms of design. However, in general, the participants did not seem very fond of the adverts. The phrases used by the participants to describe the adverts were, for example, "*vague*" and "*indistinct*".

#### Understanding

Next, the participants were asked to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they associate each advert with. The table overleaf presents an overview of three key words that the participants assigned to each of the three adverts.

TV Advert N° 1	TV Advert N° 2	TV Advert N° 3
Union, project, business	Union, project, eco-cosmetics	Union, project, youth
Satisfaction, systematic, youth	Engagement, youth, work	Youth, rhythmical, cooperation
Grandiloquent, blue, business	Grandiloquent, red, youth	Grandiloquent, pink, youth
Chaos, weird figures, smokescreen	Dumb, weird figures, titanic	Joyful, pink, weird figures
Dynamic, youth, change	Dynamic, work, red	Dynamic, change, mobility
Heavenly, help, perfection	Joyful, precise, helpful	Vitality, youth, fun
Weak, lots of talking, little truth	Red, information, business	Pink, information, help
Finance, support, help for business	Prosperity, change, cooperation	Success, help, partnership
Kraków, business, EU funds	Spain, help, EU funds	Latvia, science, help
Interesting, bold, blue	Bath, red, bubbles	Blonde, dance, youth

The participants were asked whether or not the slogan of the information campaign ("Pracujemy dla Ciebie") interests them, and whether or not they considered it credible.

One participant said that he believes the slogan to be "average"; three participants agreed that the slogan is easy to remember and **can easily become an "earworm"**. Most, however, felt that "we are working for you" (*pracujemy dla ciebie*) sounds very much like "we are working instead of you" (*pracujemy za ciebie*), i.e. telling the viewer that (s)he can sit back and **do nothing and that the EU will take care of everything**, which in the opinion of the participants is a "*blatant lie*". Following this, some of the participants called the slogan "*EU propaganda*" and expressed their belief that in order for the adverts to be enticing and credible, the slogan needs to change. The proposed changed slogans focused more on the help aspect, i.e. requiring some participation from the recipient of the support: "*we are helping you*" and "*we can help you*".

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, the participants were asked what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why.

In this aspect, several participants highlighted yet again their dissatisfaction with the slogan featured in the adverts, emphasizing that would have much rather seen examples of how the EU is *helping*, not that it is *working*. Others admitted outright that the shown adverts have "*no impact whatsoever*" on their feelings towards the EU; or that the "*lack of any concrete information in the adverts*" leaves them with a "*so what?*" question and that this is the reason the adverts have "*very limited impact on how (they) feel and think about the EU*". At the same time, participants admitted that **adding a simple voiceover sentence along the lines of "go to this and this website and check for yourself" would most likely make them more positive** towards the EU, as they could find information on what the EU is exactly doing for persons like themselves. A few participants found the adverts "*repelling*", feeling that they seem too much like "*propaganda*" and "*beg the question: who is it exactly that is working instead of me*". They also found the adverts "*infantile, with all the childish colours and the muzak*" and evoking the sense of the EU "**not being really serious about helping people**".

## 5.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints

### Recall and appreciation

Participants were shown high resolution-big format copies of print advertising material supporting the TV adverts and asked if they have already seen one or more of the print adverts. None of the participants had seen any of them.

Next, participants were asked what they think of the adverts and why. Most thought that the print adverts are coherent with the TV adverts and that now, having just seen the TV clips they would recognise their context.

At the same time, the participants would **not be naturally inclined to read the messages** presented in the print ads (*"Even if I was very bored at a bus stop and this was the only poster there"*). All agreed that the **font on the bottom of the print is far too small** to be legible, even though the prints were shown in approx. 1 x 1.5 m size. The participants agreed that the text is the most interesting part of the print, i.e. more interesting than the image, and that this is the only element that gives the printed advert *"any credibility"* and *"actually shows something at least a tiny bit more concrete"*.

Some participants believed that the print adverts can be of interest only for people *"who know what they are looking for"* and those *"who already know that adverts like that are out there"*. One person suggested that adding a QR code to the prints could encourage people to visit the project' website.

## 5.2.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

### Digital promotion

Participants were asked if they had seen any adverts related to the campaign anywhere on the internet. None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Next, we asked the participants, based on what they have seen so far, how likely they would be to look for more information, and what would be their reasons. There were mixed responses to this question. **Half of participants would look for more information**, e.g. are there any other ways in which the EU can help entrepreneurs. The other half said they have not found any of the themes featured so far interesting enough to look for more information.

### The website

The participants were shown the website and asked to suggest to the moderator how to navigate it (tell which information/links to access), and asked what the participants think of it.

All of the participants felt that there was **no link between the previously presented TV clips and print adverts and the website**, quoting *"huge contrast between the styles, design, and level of information"*. The overall impression of the website was that it is **"outdated"**, *"antediluvian"*, with *"really bad graphics"*. However, participants felt that the website is functional and the use of filters makes it easy to access detailed information on particular projects.



#### 5.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole

Next, we asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why.

The majority of the participants said that they **liked that "The EU is at least trying to speak to normal people"**, but at the same time they felt that in order to **"really work" the slogan of the campaign needed to be changed**. Interestingly, more participants favoured changing the slogan at this point compared to when they were initially asked. The opinion prevailed that *"there has to be a catch – no one will work for you for no compensation"*. At the same time some of the participants agreed that being suspicious of the *"catch"* is a typical of the Polish mentality, and that it might not necessary mean that the intentions of the adverts were dubious.

Many of the participants further highlighted that they found the campaign to offer **"fluff" instead of real-life examples** and that they would prefer *"real-life people talking about real-life projects"*.

In terms of the campaign's memorability, the majority of the participants agreed that they will remember the campaign now that they have seen and discussed all of its elements, however, as one of the participants put it: *"It's now stuck in my mind, but not in a good way. It is kind of annoying, especially the clips, but I would definitely recognise them now"*.

The participants also believed that the campaign would reach far more people if the access to information was easier, for example if the campaign would include posters and leaflets distributed in university careers' centres, and job centres. This reflects the fact that this group tends not to watch TV very regularly, if at all.

## 5.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35 - 55

### 5.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Some of the group had seen at least one advert, but none recalled seeing them all. One participant had seen two ('Entrepreneurship' and 'Youth'), three participants have seen only one advert ('Entrepreneurship'); no-one had reported seeing 'Green jobs'; and six participants did not recall seeing any of the TV adverts.

Four of the participants liked that all of the adverts were "*similar, you could easily see that they are a part of the same campaign*". Three of the participants liked the 'Youth' advert the most, finding it "*the most clear*". The rest of the participants were unable to offer any positive comments on any of the adverts.

Regarding the adverts they liked the least, most mentioned the 'Green jobs' advert, quoting the red colour "*confusing if you want to talk about anything being ecological*" and "*looking more like a shampoo advert – why is the actress almost naked for most of it?*" Others who did not comment on this advert felt unable to point to the advert they disliked the most.

When asked about the general appreciation of the clips, the **prevailing opinions were that the adverts were "too fast", "too cramped", "too chaotic – you don't know what to look at", "the creatures in the morph suits were distracting and confusing"**.

On the question of if the topics of the adverts are sufficiently understandable, all of the participants had **no problems with identifying helping businesses, opening an eco-cosmetics company, and opportunities for youth**, respectively. However, most voiced concerns that the adverts were "*clearly not aimed at people over the age of 30*", "*all of the actors are very young people*", and that "*there was chaos*", "*there was **too much happening** at the same time*". Over a half of the participants indicated that they would like to see a campaign "*more suited*" to people who are not that young, with one lady remarking: "*I find it condescending that the EU thinks that only young people are dynamic and are thinking of starting their own businesses. What about people over 40, over 50 who might want to start something? Don't we count?*"

Most found the adverts to be distinct from other TV adverts, especially due to the use of "*gaudy colours*" and "*movement overload*", however in terms of content, they considered the adverts "**vague**" and "*lacking substance*".

#### Understanding

Next, the participants were asked to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they associate each advert with. The table overleaf presents an overview of three key words that the participants assigned to each of the three adverts.

TV Advert N° 1	TV Advert N° 2	TV Advert N° 3
Kraków, company, plans	Cosmetics, bio, help	Girly, fashion, sightseeing
Kraków, own company, EU help	Ecology, support, trend	Student, Erasmus, EU help
Kraków, blue, office	Spain, the same actress, red	Girl, pink silhouettes, fake
Surprise, curiosity, check	Curiosity, use, joy	Boredom, impatient, phantoms
Polish business, borders, Marta	Elena, Spain, ballet	Karina, science, Latvia
Blue, stars, sky	Ugly, ballet, flowers	Journeys, adventure, sightseeing
EU, entrepreneur, help	Creativity, skirt, stairs	University, student, sewing
Company, EU, perspectives	EU, cosmetics, nature	Student, EU, knowledge
Blue, fast, modern	Origin, cosmetics, ecology	Scene, help, investment
Help, phantoms, work	Support, help, local	EU, youth, learning

The participants were asked whether or not the slogan of the information campaign ("Pracujemy dla Ciebie") interests them, and whether or not they considered it to be credible.

**None of the participants considered the slogan to be interesting or credible.** Some of the participants suggested that more accurate, hence credible, slogan would rather include words like "support" (*wspieramy*) or "help" (*pomagamy*), as the current slogan suggests doing the work instead of someone. Several participants emphasized that they could not see "any tangible effects of EU help from these adverts".

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, participants were asked what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why.

The participants agreed universally that the adverts do **not offer enough information** about the means and ways in which the EU could help them personally. A few of the participants shrug their shoulders and expressed opinions such as "I don't think it is supposed to make me feel anything. It's clearly not aimed for people my age", however, six participants agreed that **the adverts may be an impulse for people who are interested in obtaining EU support to look for information further.** When asked whether they themselves would be inclined or interested to look into more information, all but one said "no". The one participant stated outright that he is an inspiring entrepreneur and that he will "look more into it as soon as he gets home".

### **5.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

#### **Recall and appreciation**

Participants were shown high resolution-big format copies of print advertising material supporting the TV adverts and asked to raise their hand if they have already seen one or

more of the print adverts. None of the participants had seen any of them.

Next, we asked the participants what they think of the adverts and why. There was an overall consensus, that **the prints "fit" with the TV clips in terms of design**, and that it was easy to see that they were part of the same campaign as the clips. The participants were most keen to comment on the 2<sup>nd</sup> print (Elena from Spain), which brought the most negative associations. Words such as "brothel", "grotesque", "fake, stage-like" were mentioned; the participants found this print too much focused on the main-character, which apparently gave the impression of "you people are working for me". The participants also **did not like that the "phantoms"** (people in the morph suits) were not cut out from the prints, they found them "**confusing and weird**".

The greatest, universally agreed objection to the prints related to the **size of the font**. All of the participants found the information placed on the bottom of the prints "*completely illegible*", despite the fact that the prints were high resolution and scaled up to approx. 1 x 1.5 m dimensions.

When being informed that the prints were not intended to be used as billboards but press inserts, all of the participants agreed that they are "*useless*" as the only thing they would be able to see "*are the main characters, the phantoms and the slogan. But nothing really comes out of that. I've seen those. So what? I'll flip the page and forget about it in a second.*"

A number of participants believed that the print adverts could have been much improved by **highlighting the internet address or turning the prints into large-scale posters**, to be used e.g. "*at tram stops*".

### 5.3.3 Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line

#### **Digital promotion**

Participants were asked if they had seen any adverts related to the campaign anywhere on the internet. None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Next, we asked the participants, based on what they have seen so far, how likely they would be to look for more information, and what would be their reasons. **Only one person was clearly interested in obtaining more information**; two participants indicated "*maybe*", and the remaining ones said that they are "*not at all interested*".

A few participants suggested that in order to be effective, the **digital campaign should be featured in "profile-specific online media"** such as websites for engineers, education specialists' websites or political portals.

#### **The website**

The participants were shown the website and asked to suggest to the moderator how to navigate it (tell which information/links to access), and asked what the participants think of it.

Majority of the participants were **very positively surprised that projects featured on the website included projects focused on the older people** and asked to spend a few minutes reading about the project N° 9 ("Home is where the heart is: a 21st century

approach to healthcare for Galicia's ageing population").

Overall, the participants found **the website to be "the most clear element of the campaign"**, offering far more concrete information, and very easy to navigate and understand. The participants also appreciated *"finally some nice muted colours"* and the option to filter by country and category.

Other comments related to the fact that the website would be even more *"robust"* and offer better information if there was a chance of seeing whether a given **project has already finished or is still in the course of being implemented**.

As the only negative comment, two participants found the project titles *"too long and not really clear"*.

#### **5.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**

Next, we asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why.

The majority of participants reiterated that the TV clips and the prints were *"too crowded and chaotic"* to appeal to them, and that they **would appreciate the internet address** to be featured more heavily and clearly, as on the website *"we can try to find the information we want, at our own pace"*. Most believed that it is a *"good idea that the EU is trying to promote itself"*, but felt somewhat left out because in their opinions the current TV and print campaign was *"clearly targeting young people only"*.

Most agreed that they **would not be interested in seeing an ongoing information campaign**, because it would *"bore and put people off"*.

#### **5.3.5 Views on the EU**

This question was not asked in the older group – the focus group exceeded its time.

## 5.4 Summary of key findings and observations

### **Media consumption**

The younger participants do not watch a lot of TV (some even reported not watching it at all). At the same time, all of the older participants do watch TV – majority of them watches it daily;

There were no major differences in social media use between the two groups. All participants use Facebook at least several times a week, but in almost all cases their use is passive – i.e. reading news, catching up on posts by friends/family but not engaging in discussions in Facebook groups. Only a handful of people in both groups use Twitter, again in a passive manner (rather reading tweets than tweeting).

### **Views and perceptions of the TV adverts**

#### Recall and appreciation

Out of the total study population, only a minority has seen the TV adverts before. There was a tendency to prefer the advert set in Kraków.

Generally people understood the topics being presented in the adverts. The older group found the TV adverts more chaotic and difficult to follow than the younger group, but both felt the information was vague / lacking.

Both groups really did not like that the advert about eco cosmetics was red, not green. The consistency between the adverts gives a sense of belonging to the same campaign.

Both of the groups picked up on the lack of call to action in the TV ads. They would suggest finishing the advert with the voiceover saying something along the lines of “if you want to know more, check the website X”. As they stand now, the adverts leave people with a big “so what?” question.

#### Understanding

The older group felt the adverts were directed at “young people” in general; the younger group believed the adverts to be targeting particular groups (wannabe entrepreneurs, students willing to go on Erasmus);

Both of the groups believed that the adverts do not feature real-life people and real-life projects.

Both groups found the slogan to be less than perfect, and both of the groups suggested the same alternative: EU helps you. Participants in both groups felt that “EU working for you” gives a connotation of “EU working instead of you”, i.e. telling the viewer that (s)he can sit back and do nothing and that the EU will take care of everything, which in the opinion of the participants is a “*blatant lie*”. *A linguistic note: in Polish 'working for you' is 'pracuje dla ciebie'; 'working instead of you' is 'pracuje za ciebie'. These sound very similar.*

#### Potential impact/influence of the TV adverts

The majority of participants stated that the TV adverts did not change their view on the EU, however across both groups there was a feeling of appreciation that the EU is “*at least trying to communicate*”.

### ***Views and perceptions of the prints***

#### Recall and appreciation

None of the participants had seen the print adverts.

Both groups did not like the prints, stating that the most important information were in fact the “*tiny, illegible sentences*” at the bottom of the ads, not the graphics.

Suggestions for improvement included scaling the prints up to an at least poster size (A1) and including a QR code which would lead directly to the campaign's website.

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign on-line***

#### Digital promotion

None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Less than a half of all of the participants would look for further information online.

A few participants from the older group suggested that in order to be effective, the digital campaign should be featured on specific web portals (for engineers, education specialists' websites or political portals.)

#### The website

Both groups agreed that it is easy to navigate and user friendly.

There were strong discrepancies in the perceptions of the other elements of the website between the groups: the younger group did not like the design (one person said it is *antediluvian*), the older group said it is the best element of the campaign in terms of clarity. The older group particularly liked that one can search by theme.

The older group was also very surprised to find projects that can relate to others than youth. They would have preferred the website address to be featured more prominently in the adverts (both TV and print).

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole***

Although appreciative of the effort that they have seen went into preparing the campaign, the participants in both of the groups perceived the adverts as very inconcrete, giving no real information and being infantile. The participants self-reported that they would much prefer “*real people talking about real projects*” (they thought the projects featured were very abstract).

Whilst the participants saw a clear connection between the TV adverts and the prints, they believed there was no obvious connection between the two and the website, due to the significant differences in the style and visual side.

## 6. Annex 2F: Focus Groups report - Portugal

### 6.1 Introduction

Dates: 02 March 2015 (Group 2) and 09 March 2015 (Group 1)

Location: Porto, Portugal

The TV and print adverts were presented to both groups in the following order:

1. **TV/print advert N° 1** (project N° 41): "EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers" ("*Proteger os compradores online*");
2. **TV/print advert N° 2** (project N° 23): "EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation" ("*Investir na Inovação*").
3. **TV/print advert N° 3** (project N° 78): "EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs" ("*Apoiar os Empregos Ecológicos*").

#### 6.1.1 Profiles of participants

Group 1 consisted of 9 participants, 4 females and 5 males, in the range of 20-34 years old. One of the participants, male, was unemployed, while the remaining participants were employed full-time. Except for one participant, the general feel on the EU was neutral.

Group 2 consisted of 9 participants, 5 females and 4 males, in the range of 35-55 years old. Two of the participants, one male and one female, were unemployed, while the remaining participants were employed full-time. The general feel on the EU was neutral.

#### 6.1.2 Media consumption habits of participants (group 20-34)

The majority of the participants **watch TV on a daily basis** (e.g. news, documentaries, series, movies and sports events). In terms of ads, most of them said that they do not have any interest in them and record their programs of interest **to skip the advertising**. Almost all the participants use social networks on a daily basis, for **personal (Facebook) and professional purposes (LinkedIn)**.

All participants remember a TV advert that they have seen lately. Most referred advertisements related to discounts, mainly from hypermarkets and insurance companies. The first ads that come to mind are advertising campaigns that began many years ago - strong brands such as Nike and Coca-Cola.

#### 6.1.3 Media consumption habits of participants (group 35-55)

Most of the participants **watch TV on a daily basis** and, in general, are not interested in watching commercials (participants prefer to record the programmes to **avoid watching advertising**). The participants mostly use channels that allow them to watch news, documentaries and interviews, for example SIC Notícias, TVI 24 Horas, RTP1 and RTP2.

In terms of social networks the vast majority use Facebook and LinkedIn on a daily basis.

All participants remember a TV advert that has marked their childhood and accompanied them through to adulthood (examples include: Mokambo, Coca-Cola, Flora, Dodot). Furthermore, they **all recall recent publicity** from car manufacturers and telecommunications operators (such as Fiat, Citroen, NOS and Meo).



## 6.2 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 20-34

### 6.2.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

Seven participants had seen the TV adverts before. The majority of them (5/9) liked TV advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) the most, followed by TV adverts N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers) and N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) (2/9 each).

Overall, the group found that all TV advert colours were too strong and that the characters were moving too fast. This means that the message is not captured in its entirety and some details were lost.

One of the participants mentioned that the message cannot be perceived by all the age groups, more specifically children and old people who wouldn't be able to watch the TV adverts in question. For this reason, this participant suggested that, in the future, **studies should be carried out in each country in order to adapt the TV adverts to the reality of each country**. On this matter, the vast majority of participants stated that these ads are prepared for a **specific target audience - young people at the beginning of their career**.

Another topic discussed was the choice of images' for the TV adverts. In general, the participants stated that the scenarios were **unrealistic and too futuristic** (similar to "aliens"). However, they do not have this opinion about TV advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) because it is related to technology and therefore seems to be appropriate.

Mostly everyone agreed that the TV adverts have excessive movement, leading to a misperception of the message. In general, the participants **criticized the choice of strong colours** as it makes the TV adverts heavy and difficult to understand.

Most of participants selected TV advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) as their favourite, not only by the subject but also as a whole - it has a better design and impact.

Participants felt **closer to the topic as it takes place in the city of Porto** and the chosen colour is blue (on the one hand is linked to the main football club in town and on the other hand is a colour that is automatically associated to the technology theme). Participants commented that it reminds them of an ad that is currently displayed on Portuguese television. It is an advertisement for a telecommunication brand that wishes to show an innovative and technologically advanced product.

With regard to the TV advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers), some participants identify themselves with the situation (online banking).

However, they found the colour a **bad choice and the dialogue confusing and barely noticeable**. Only one of the participants highlighted the detail that appears at the end of the video (image of a journey), giving the idea that there are no barriers and borders across the EU countries. Most participants mentioned that it is a day-to-day issue but that in fact, the quality level of the message **"leaves a great deal to be improved"**.

Two participants liked the TV advert N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) the most, because for them it is a subject of "future" and that is fashionable.

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. The majority of participants liked the TV advert N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) the least (7/9), followed by the TV advert N° 1 EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers (2/9). None of the participants liked the TV advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) the least.

The majority of participants think that the **message presented in the TV advert N° 3 is the most confusing one.**

The advertising was harshly criticized, beginning with the chosen colour. The red colour is associated with "fire" not with ecology. All of them invoked that the ad colour should have been green to facilitate the perception and increase the credibility of the message. They agree that this is an actual issue, but it is not an initiative relevant to the current reality.

For TV advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers) criticisms were related to the way the content was presented. In other words, the **content was of interest to all, however, the ad was confusing and the images were not adequate.** Some of them pointed out questions such as: "**Are the actors inside of a safe?**", "**Why does a German couple appear? Is it just a concern for them and not for us? If the couple is already working for me, I do not need to do anything else**".

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV. The majority of opinions thought they did.

Most of participants said that they are **used to clearer and less intensive adverts** (music, colour and movements more balanced). Nevertheless, if it was a massive campaign, **it would have impact and people would talk about it**, but it would **never be remarkable**. People are used to adverts that promote a product and not used to simply informative and descriptive adverts.

On the other hand, a participant mentioned that EU needs to review all of these adverts because the purpose of the campaign is to inform and to ensure more awareness. The same person stated that that this objective was not being achieved and it is necessary to ensure an image of credibility that the Institution wants to portray to the general public.

### Understanding

We then asked participants to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they think each advert is about. The table overleaf presents an overview of key words that the participants associate with each of the three adverts.

<b>TV Advert N° 1</b> <i>– Protecting online shoppers</i>	<b>TV Advert N° 2</b> <i>Investing in innovation</i>	<b>TV Advert N° 3</b> <i>Supporting green jobs</i>
Security Low transaction costs Privacy	New ideas Projects Blue	Local economy Ecological projects
Darkness Confusion Ambiguous	Darkness Dynamism Clear message	Darkness Dynamism Unreal
Security Secured internet shopping European funds	Confusion Pragmatism	Fiction Dynamism Colour
Yellow Secured internet shopping German couple	Blue Innovation Projects	Red Green companies Organic cosmetics

Security Innovation	Support Innovation	Healthy economy
Convenience Trust Shorten distances	Innovation Entrepreneurship Funds for all European	Ecological responsibility Sustainability
Quickness Traveling Easiness	Technology Projects Development	Ecology Fashion
Security Online privacy Digital world	Academic research Technological innovation Young entrepreneurs	Organic products Environmental liability Green companies

Next, we asked them what they thought about the subjects of these adverts and whether or not they interest them. The majority of participants **were interested in the different subjects** presented in the adverts.

One of the participants indicated that the subjects presented were **interesting, but not novel**. When this was pointed out, the majority of participants stood up for the EU, stating that if the subjects are not new it is because we have been working on the right subjects for a long time.

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the slogan of the informative campaign ("*Trabalhamos para si*") interests them and whether or not they consider it credible.

All of the participants made an immediate distinction between the advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers) and the other two, mentioning that the first slogan is perfectly adjusted to advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers), in contrast to the other ones.

In the advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers), the sentence reinforces the feelings of security and adjustability to reality conveyed in the advert. In this one, EU is providing a service to citizens, while the other adverts show that there are incentives to specific groups.

Therefore, the participants suggested for adverts N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) and 3 slogans like: "*Apoiamos os seus projectos*" and "*Trabalhamos juntos/ consigo*". They opted to the word **"support" instead of "work"** because they relate that word with a feeling of anger. Furthermore, one participant added the following: "***I am glad to know they are working for me because they are working with my money***". Another participant reinforced this idea, saying the following: "***You must be kidding! I work in a totally precarious position for 8 years and they even have the courage to say that they are working for me***".

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, we asked the participants what the TV adverts make them feel about the EU and why. There were diverging opinions. On the one hand, the participants stated that the adverts were adjusted to reality and to the participants' age, **concluding that EU is concerned with helping and supporting them**. However, two participants stated that they could not forget the fact that EU keeps living on past promises and trying to recover from an image of continuous and successive mistakes throughout its history. They also emphasized the EU tendency to invest in infrastructures, neglecting micro-economic issues like the unemployment and the creation of new workplaces.

Moreover, we asked the participants whether or not the TV adverts have changed their view on the EU in any way and why. Three out of nine participants stated that their opinion about EU had not changed because the adverts only transmit a feeling of hope and everything seemed too vague and without objectivity. The participants mentioned that is

**not clear when, where and how the projects were / are being developed.**

**Five out of 9 participants stated that their opinion had changed**, but not radically. They said that the campaigns provide more information and they appreciate the fact that the EU is trying to get closer to the citizens and showing the work accomplished to date. One of the participants emphasized this idea with the following statement: **"I thought they were just there, met from time to time and earning their salaries with my money"**.

**All the participants pointed out that the more the adverts are showed, the more the target audience will be pleased with the message and the more credible the presented projects will be.** They also mentioned that the presence of the EU flag in all adverts reinforces the sense of citizenship and concern for all (the flag represents credibility).

### **6.2.2 Views and perceptions of the prints**

#### **Recall and appreciation**

We handed out copies of the printed advertising material supporting the TV adverts to each of the participants and asked them to raise their hand if they have already seen one or more of the print adverts. None of the participants had seen any of the prints.

Then, we asked the participants what they thought about the adverts and why. The **majority of them thought that the print adverts presented the same subjects as the TV adverts.** They found the information more useful and more memorable than the TV adverts. According to the majority, the **print adverts are better (than the TV adverts) because they provide more factual information about a specific topic** (number of projects, subject, and others).

In relation to the colour and the clarity/understandability of the message, all the participants agreed that **advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers) is confusing and not explicit enough** because people had difficulty in understanding the images and in reading the text (the **colour choice was considered bad**). All participants agreed that the other two adverts have a visual impact. Visually, they preferred advert N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) (a positive opinion compared to the video). However, they kept the opinion that the content of the advert does not match with the way it is presented (red colour).

Most participants highlighted that the **printed adverts are more understandable than the videos**, allowing an immediate understanding of the message: i) these are three of the many projects that are being supported by the EU; ii) there is information about the website where they can get more information.

One of the negative aspects pointed out before (as negative in the video) was the impact of the slogan in the end of each advert. Nevertheless, **when the slogan is printed, the impact becomes positive because people automatically get interested to know more about the programmes.** This is also a way for people to reflect about the subject once they have access to all information (the video is short and concentrates a lot of information, which makes difficult to capture the whole message).

One of the participants, also mentioned that the **footer font is excessively small** and in a normal situation (the print was given to him), he would not read it. Furthermore, this small size makes him feel that they **want to hide something** and that such information is

not relevant.

We asked the participants whether the ads contributed to making the campaign more visible/ understandable. The majority of respondents thought that the print adverts contributed to making the campaign more visible/ understandable, however, they are not well executed.

The participants thought that in terms of sound and design the campaign was unsuccessful. However, they stated that people interested in the EU subjects (and in any institutional campaign) appreciate this kind of information because they think that EU purpose is to clarify and to inform all the citizens. One of the participants concluded with the following statement: "**We are lazy people and we need information to come to us**".

### 6.2.3 Views and perceptions of the online campaign

#### Digital promotion

Next, we asked the participants to raise their hand if they had seen any adverts related to this campaign on the internet and where. **Two of the participants had seen the adverts online (Youtube ads).**

Then we asked the participants, based on what they had seen, so far, how likely they would be to look for more information and why. Five out of the 9 participants would look for more information online, e.g. if they were interested in starting their own business: "**I am working for a year to be an entrepreneur**". However, overall people were **not excited about looking for more information**. They said that they would do it when they had time and **if, for any reason, they have the need to explore the subject**. On the other hand, all the participants said that they will talk to friends and family members about this; they know people that are unemployed and may not know of these initiatives.

#### The website

We then presented the website to the participants and asked them to navigate it, telling us which information/links to access, and asked them what they thought of it.

All the participants thought that there was no (apparent) link between the communication campaign and the website.

Some strengths and weaknesses were raised when the website was evaluated. It is important to point out that the majority of participants **appreciated the fact that the projects' information always follows the same template/ structure**. The way information is provided helps users organize ideas and information (once it is divided by theme and country) - "good content", "approachable and uniform information".

Regarding the less positive aspects, the website look was immediately highlighted – **it looks like it was done by a different entity** from the one that made the other parts of the campaign (TV adverts and prints). Participants reiterated the fact that it is **necessary to standardize the campaign** so that people immediately identify the institution and the inherent message – "Without the EU symbol we couldn't identify that we were looking at the same information campaign".

In regards to the website's first page the majority of participants pointed to the **lack of innovative design**, out of alignment with what was previously presented - there was no visual line with the strong colours, which was very present in the other parts of the campaign. Quoting one of the participants, "**the homepage looks like it was made in Windows 98 and still seems unfinished and under construction**". Nonetheless, a participant liked the homepage visual aspect, enhancing that it is simple and accessible to

all users. She reinforced the idea that even information only of interests to a minority **has to be accessible to everyone** – *“that’s the problem of our country”*.

In addition, some improvements were identified:

- To create a section where some **real situations** videos are provided (similar with Portuguese TV series “Portugueses pelo Mundo”). In these videos, the whole process could be shown – from the application to the granting of support, ending in project implementation;
- To link the different designs being used in the distinct presentation ways (website, TV adverts, prints). In the event of a radio presentation it would be interesting to use the same voice used in TV adverts;
- To withdraw the featured line of some projects so that users have direct access to all choices and information (or maybe to display a prompt at the beginning saying “check out all our projects”);
- To improve the website colours and dynamism in a way that users can be involved – to suggest improvements, to share ideas about their projects, etc.;
- To create a discussion forum;
- To build a new search method/ “simulator” in such a way that users can create their own profile (login) with basic information like i) age, ii) education, iii) professional status, iv) fields of interest, etc.. - with these personal profiles the website could show projects according to users interests.

#### **6.2.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**

We asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why. There were **divergent opinions** about the perception that each participant had about the campaign. However, all participants **appreciate the existence of the campaign and they would like it to continue**. All the means currently employed are necessary, positively enhancing the prints, which was the most appreciate medium. However, **no means of communication can be dropped because they are complementary**. The participants emphasized the need for ads, which seem more real so that people identify themselves with the presented situations. They feel there is still a long way to go and that campaigns should be more extensive. Besides that, they think it is important to bring citizens together with “smaller” concerns, more suited to day-to-day of everyone. However, at the end of the session, one participant had not understood the role and involvement of EU institutions – *“I am still ignorant and unenlightened about all this”*.

Ultimately, this campaign is seen like **a boost to the union of different countries**. Participants pointed out that the campaign is **crucial to underline the values and goals of EU constitution** and these cannot be forgotten.

Some recommendations were made for future campaigns:

- Campaigns have to acquire an EU “face”. This initiative could be developed through **explanatory sessions** – this kind of sessions are usually expensive, but they have more tangible results (e.g. visits to universities and schools where the young public is more concentrated);
- To make documentaries with cases of success and failure, to be showed in prime time – after the news, on a public television channel. It is also important that these cases

introduce some evolutionary and financial data (e.g. in the first ad: How much did cost of bank transactions decrease in recent years?);

- The advertisements have to reach the target audience on a massive scale;

Some strategic places, where people are “forced” to see the information, were identified (e.g. queues in public institutions, subway, cinemas, etc.). In public institutions, it would be interesting to have access to selected information (e.g. in a health centre the information would be about health, in a university it would be about students exchange programs, etc.).

### 6.2.5 Views on the EU

Next, we asked the participants to identify three things regarding what the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

Euro
Union
Hope
Support
Spirit of enterprise
Working on real projects
Invisibility
Little information
Single market
Peace
Stability
Security
Movement between countries
Bureaucratic
Non-transparent
European businesses and citizens
Frontiers
Development
Policy
Cooperation
Globalization

Next, we asked the participants whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. The majority of participants had not changed their opinion about the EU recently.

Lastly, after the presentation and discussion on the ads, the participants were requested to give their opinion on the EU in one of three aspects - negative, neutral or positive - as well as the first three words that came to their minds when thinking about the union.

Only one of the participants showed a positive opinion on the EU while the remaining participants showed neutral opinions. In general, views are similar, normally including the following terms: euro, easiness to move between member countries (no barriers), security, union, development, bureaucracy, lack of transparency and information.

Afterwards, the participants were requested to give their broad opinion on the EU and to reflect whether it had changed after the focus group and all the information shared. Most participants admitted their opinion had **somewhat changed in a positive manner**. They admitted that they now have better knowledge on the quantity of on-going projects and are

reassured of their reality. In addition, they said they now have broader knowledge on the EU and of sources of information, as well as they recognized that **projects to help young workers find jobs are a reality.**

The following are some of the concrete opinions of the participants:

*"It changed a bit; I am now convinced that we live in a more positive than negative union."*

*"My opinion changed since I noticed some changes in the EU policy, in place for everyone."*

*"My point of view remains ambivalent but could now become positive; there is, however, the need for the EU to present further evidence and fieldwork."*



## 6.3 Discussion on the Pilot with individuals aged 35-55

### 6.3.1 Views and perceptions of the TV adverts

#### Recall and appreciation

The attitude towards and ad is determined on an ad-by-ad basis. That is, if the topic discussed is part of day-to-day life of participants and **if it directly affects their well-being, they are more likely to be positive** towards the ad.

After seeing all three ads, participants agreed that the ads are **easily identified as being from an institution** (they are aware that this is done on purpose and they **expect such ads to be better**). The majority of participants (8/9) found that the ads had **i) too much colour, ii) little notion of reality** because actors do not look like real people and **iii) it is always the same song playing which makes the ads boring**. Regarding this last point, there were two participants who defended the choice of a unique song as being good because it promptly captures people's attention. Overall, participants **preferred audio as opposed to visual form of advertising**. People identified and understood the issues presented, but the details and content/purpose of the ads were **not retained after the showing**.

In a first video that was shown, none of the participants understood **the status of the project** ("Are the projects in progress right now?", "Are these old projects?"). Concerning the investment, this gave them a sense of mistrust and uncertainty – they did not understand how exactly the EU supports different projects ("What kind of support is available?").

Finally, participants mentioned that it was an unambitious campaign because the people in charge limited themselves to the **minimum quality standards** – "they didn't think outside the box". One participant also noted that ads in general are about **EU self-promotion** instead of being about people and projects. Another participant said that **"when someone says he's working for me I am just suspicious. I get confused and I have many doubts"**.

Only one attendee liked the graphic design of different videos because she is colour blind and the strong and uniform colours helped her interpreting the images.

Five of the 9 participants had seen the TV adverts before – 6 of them **preferred TV advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers)**, 2 preferred N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) and 1 preferred N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation).

The **majority of participants identified themselves with the images/ message presented in the TV advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers)**. They emphasized **the importance of the subject in their every-day lives** where in many situations users do not feel safe shopping online. People liked the fact that credit card use is a priority issue for the EU. Besides that, a participant said he is afraid to use credit cards – **"I do not dare to shop online, I am very afraid! I do not even use credit cards on the internet. I feel that this topic has all Portuguese and European people as target audience."**

Concerning video N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation), there was one participant who preferred it. She mentioned that she works in sciences and that this advert was interesting to her. Besides that, in her professional career, the advertised support will be particularly important for her.

Two participants preferred TV advert N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) because it refers to **a new generation concern**. They mentioned it is important to promote environmentally friendly products and to support young entrepreneurs in their companies. These two participants highlighted their curiosity at the **use of red instead of green** (usually associated to this kind of matters) in this advert.

Next, we asked the participants which advert they liked the least and why. Opinions were mostly divided between TV adverts n° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) and n° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs) - 4 participants each. Just one person considered the TV advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers) to be the least interesting.

For advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) people did not identify themselves with the subject of technology and they found the colours too strong (“a little kitschy”). The advert content is not clear because there is **too much movement and people can miss the details**. One of the participants mentioned, **“the concept of business incubators already exists in Portugal, but may not be properly realised”**. Another person referred that “UPTEC is not well represented in this advert. It is much better than it looks here and it could be better presented, by providing more detail”.

About advert N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs), participants were even more critical. One person said the advert is presented **“like a promise”** and **“it is not serious, I just see a pink young lady. In my opinion this is misspent money”**. The different opinions were that this is an actual person, but that it is presented in an unoriginal, **confusing and vague way**.

Next, we asked the participants whether or not the adverts stand out compared to other adverts on TV and most of them said they **stand out for negative reasons**. Furthermore, participants stated that these adverts **should only be shown on public channels (as opposed to commercial channels)**, if they are communicating a message and not trying to sell a product (like e.g. institutional adverts relating to census or elections). No **one found the ads to be memorable** – people who are curious about the topics have to search to find more details.

### Understanding

We asked the participants to write down three top-of-mind key words for what they think each advert is about. The table below presents an overview of key words that the participants associate with each of the three adverts.

<b>TV Advert N° 1</b> <i>Protecting online shoppers</i>	<b>TV Advert N° 2</b> <i>Investing in innovation</i>	<b>TV Advert N° 3</b> <i>Supporting green jobs</i>
Secured internet shopping European Union Bank transfers	Porto Brand Work for you Incubator project	Local products Green products Healthier local economy
Online security Less expenditure Ease the day-to-day	Entrepreneurship Youth Innovation	Ecology Local economy Small projects
Security Union German project	Entrepreneurship Union Porto	Spain Sustainability Ecology
Security Easiness	Support Entrepreneurship	Opportunity Ecology Preoccupation
Shopping Payments	Business incubator Support	Support Green economy

Easiness	EU	EU
Secured internet shopping	Science Technology	Companies Ecology
Secured internet shopping	Innovation	Green economy
Innovation Secured internet shopping Development	Companies Electronic commerce	Companies Sustainability Ecology

Next, we asked the participants what they think about the themes/ topics covered in the adverts and whether or not they interest them. The majority of participants said they were **interested in the different themes/ topics presented**.

Nevertheless, almost everyone said that the topics are **not priority** since they do not affect their every-day life (except for TV advert N° 1 - EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers). However, one participant stated "I look at these topics and I admit they can be very helpful to my children".

Then we asked the participants whether the slogan of the information campaign ("*Trabalhamos para si*") appeals to them and whether or not they consider it credible.

The majority of participants (7/9) do not think the slogan to be proper. They believe it should be replaced by **another one, which gives the sense of support to citizens** – "*Apoiamos ideias*", "*Trabalhamos juntos*", "*Trabalhamos consigo*".

Generally, the slogan was subject to **harsh criticism** from the participants. Some expressions like these were used: "***I think it is arrogant***", "***I feel uncomfortable because it is exaggerated***", "***It shocks me***", "***It is so strong that even becomes unbelievable***", "***Its' people ideas being used, the only thing they have to do is support us***".

For two participants the slogan sent **a supportive message** to people enabling them to face the country's challenges in a positive way. There is encouragement of entrepreneurship for people who want to create their own businesses.

### **Potential impact / influence of the TV adverts**

Next, we asked the participants what the TV adverts made them feel about the EU and why. There was a difference in the feelings of the participants. On one hand, some participants stated that **these adverts reinforced the idea that there is a gap between the EU and the citizens** – the EU is concerned with issues, which do not affect citizens' daily lives and that the ads are not very enlightening nor focused. On the other hand, there were participants who thought that **the campaign is a good initiative**, because they made them feel more informed - their knowledge about EU work has increased. In fact, there is a general sense of surprise because some participants had never seen or heard of the campaign before.

Next, we asked the participants whether the TV adverts had changed their view on the EU in any way and why. The majority of participants (8/9) stated that the TV adverts **did not change their view on the EU**. They think the support is **not addressed to individuals, but for corporate entities** (large business groups and lobbies already present in Portugal). One of the participants elaborated "***I still do not know what they are doing there. All I see is motorways***".

According to most participants, there is still significant distance between the different EU countries and these initiatives do not bring them closer together.

### 6.3.2 Views and perceptions of the prints

#### Recall and appreciation

Afterwards we handed out copies of advertising material to each of the participants and asked them if they had already seen one or more of the printed adverts. None of the participants had seen the printed adverts before.

Subsequently, we asked the participants what they think about the adverts and why. The majority of the participants thought that the printed adverts showed the same themes as the TV adverts. However, they thought that there was **no clear / direct link between the information presented in the printed advert and the message (as with the TV adverts)**.

In regards to printed advert N° 1 (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers), the **colours were confusing and the message was not completely understandable and was not appealing at first sight**. Moreover, the text was difficult to read and “the chosen layout was a mistake” since it “goes against the basic rules of design”.

Regarding printed adverts N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) and N° 3 (EU: Working for you – Supporting green jobs), the majority of the participants thought that it worked better than the respective video adverts. Afterwards, we asked the participants whether or not the ads contributed to make the campaign more visible / understandable. Here, the majority of respondents found that the content **(text) made the campaign more clear**. The participants began by stating that this is a **complementary** means of communication, which may help reach different target groups. The respondents also demonstrated a clear **satisfaction with the print, as it makes the message more understandable**. One of the participants added that, with this advert, he “was **able to get complete clarity**”, something that he had not been able to get before. Nevertheless, everyone agreed that the **footnotes were too small** to be read.

According to the participants, the public avoids watching ads. Consequently, prints facilitate interactions with the public since they encourage people to read them for example in situations where they are **waiting in line**. The participants also gave **suggestions to place these ads in newspapers and magazines** given that it calls the attention of readers and that many people do not have access to the internet.

Finally, one of the participants called attention to the fact that prints may be interpreted badly as they are partially at odds with projects that EU supports, such as green economy projects, release of ecologic products, etc.

### 6.3.3 Views and perceptions of the online campaign

#### Digital promotion

Next, we asked the participants to raise their hand if they have seen any adverts related to this campaign on the internet and where. None of the participants had seen the adverts online.

Then, we asked the participants, based on what they have seen, so far, how likely they would be to look for more information and why. The majority of participants **would look for more information and talk with friends about the initiative**.

### **The website**

Next we showed the website to the participants and asked them to navigate on it (to tell us which information/ links to access) and asked them what they think of it.

Most of the participants considered the website to be **“easy”, “intuitive”, “simple”, “objective” and “direct”**. Just **one of them knew the website before** because he was curious to explore the initiative, after had been contacted for it. However, this person had never seen the advertising videos.

All the participants liked the website, but they did not find visual aspect appealing. Still, they admit that **for an institutional website they were not expecting something else** – people give more value to the content and to the way projects are presented (consistent and with the necessary detail).

In terms of recommendations, the following were highlighted:

- To improve the graphic component and design;
- To make the website more interactive, with a discussion forum section;
- To create a new section clearly showing which **steps citizens have to follow to apply to the different kinds of support available**.

Only one person appreciated the fact that the site is not visually confusing. He prefers “clean” and “less complex” websites.

#### **6.3.4 Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**

Subsequently, we asked the participants what they think about this campaign and why. There were **mixed opinions** in the group about the views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole - only some participants appreciated the information it offered.

No one found the campaign to be memorable though some positive points are worth mentioning:

- The **main campaign goal was understood by everyone**;
- Directly and indirectly, the campaign attempts to bring citizens closer to the EU;
- In time of crisis, as in the case of Portugal, the campaign has a **“soothing” effect** for the population. The fact that people feel supported creates an atmosphere of hope.

Nevertheless, some negative aspects were identified:

- To the majority of participants the **slogan did not have the desired impact** and should be changed;
- The fact that the protagonists of the ads **do not seem “alive” and “realistic” creates a sense of “fiction movie”**.

As a recommendation, most of the participants agreed that:

- **Printed advertisement has a greater impact**;
- Information campaigns should be conducted in villages and town halls, business niches (as start-ups), employment centres and in other public institutions;
- The use of all means of communication can be effective because it guarantees that the various audiences are covered.

Campaigns should be more regular so that citizens have access to the information and get closer to the EU.

### 1.3.5 Views on the EU

Next, we asked the participants to name three things regarding what the EU means for them. The table below presents an overview of what the EU means to the participants.

Distant Partial Set of aimless countries Should intensify efforts
--

Furthermore, we asked the participants whether or not they have changed their opinion (about the EU) recently and why. The majority of participants had not changed their opinion about the EU. However, the participants consider the following developments as having an impact on their opinion about the EU: EU's refugee policy, TTIP negotiations with the US, and 'fortress Europe'.

## 6.4 Summary of key findings and observations

### *Views and perceptions of the TV adverts*

#### Recall and appreciation

Most of the participants had seen the TV adverts before.

There were very different opinions about the informative campaign developed by EU. While the older group preferred the first TV advert (EU: Working for you – Protecting online shoppers), the younger group preferred the second TV advert (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation). The younger group chose the most dynamic and futurist advert, which content was about technology. The older group preferred subjects relevant to their day-to-day life.

At the same time, the older group thought that the ads were comparable with institutional ads (such as presidential elections ads, government elections ads, etc). Contrary to that, the younger group found that the ads were comparable to any television ad – of a relevant brand. In fact, this younger group even compared the TV advert N° 2 (EU: Working for you – Investing in innovation) to a Portuguese telecommunications brand ad.

#### Understanding

The majority of participants were **interested in the different themes/ topics presented** in the adverts and generally supported its objective. However, participants indicated that the adverts either contained **too much visual and audio information**, which made the message harder to understand, or that the message was not credible. There are different opinions regarding the slogan of the information campaign ("*trabalhamos para si*"). The majority of participants considered the slogan inappropriate because it fosters the idea that the EU wants to promote it-self.

Participants often felt that they were **not the targets of the campaign**, which was more geared towards young technology entrepreneurs or large companies.

### Potential impact/ influence of the TV adverts

The majority of participants stated that the TV adverts **did not change their view on the EU**. They perceived the different projects portrayed in the adverts positively and thought that the messages should be more comprehensive and understandable.

### ***Views and perceptions of the prints***

#### Recall and appreciation

None of the participants had seen the printed adverts before.

The majority of participants indicated that the prints were very complementary with the videos as they provided additional information about the projects, which made them **more tangible**. They also **welcomed the link to a website**, where they could find additional information.

### ***Views and perceptions of the online campaign***

#### Digital promotion

Two participants had seen the online adverts.

The groups had different opinions about the digital promotion. Since the adverts were shown online and the access was thus easy, the majority of participants would look for more information, e.g. additional/ other projects.

#### The website

The majority of participants in both groups indicated that the website was user-friendly, however, not aligned with the look and feel of the campaign.

### ***Views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole***

There were **mixed views and perceptions of the campaign as a whole**. The majority of participants thought that the campaign as a whole is not memorable, but they would like it to continue.

At the same time, the majority of participants in both groups agreed that this type of campaign is a good idea, but they were critical that they could not relate it to the stories that were selected.