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As part of TfL’s commitment to improving the safety of powered two-wheeler (P2W) riders, they are developing a new campaign aimed at motivating riders to slow down on London’s roads.

Research was required to understand how P2W riders respond to a number of creative concepts developed by M&C, and to help inform the most effective avenue moving forward.

2CV conducted 9 groups with motorcyclists (including professionals) and scooter riders, between 21st – 24th January, 2013.
What success looks like (from the creative brief)

**Business Objective**
- To show customers we care about their safety by educating them about risk and encouraging positive behaviour change that benefits them as individuals

**Marketing Objective**
- To encourage P2W riders to reduce their speed, in order to contribute to a reduction in motorcyclist KSIs

**Key Criteria**
- To make riders reappraise the risks of riding too fast, without giving them the opportunity to opt-out of this
- To make riders reconsider how fast they ride
- To clearly communicate to riders to slow down when they are riding too fast
- To motivate riders to reduce their speed when they’re riding too fast
Four creative routes and two overseas ads were explored

What Could Have Been
What Happens

Warning Signals
Body Worlds

Overseas TVC 1.
Overseas TVC 2.

NB: A fifth route (Too Fast to Live) was explored in the first night of groups, but subsequently dropped to allow for exploration of the two overseas ads.
Headlines from the research
Overall response

- Riders take a ‘vigilance’ and safety message, but do not specifically take out a message about speed reduction
  - This is exacerbated by the fact that riders have a tendency to focus on risks posed by others (e.g., car doors opening, pedestrians stepping out, carelessness), the environment (e.g., potholes, ice, oil spills) and their own general riding behaviours (recklessness, impulsiveness, filtering) alongside speed.
  - To tackle the issue of speed, the concepts will need to be more explicit and focus on familiar and unequivocal ‘speed’ scenarios

- Two creative avenues were identified as having good potential;
  - Dual outcomes: (greatest potential) What Could Have Been highlights that there are a number of outcomes for an accident/ride and motivates riders to reconsider their actions
  - Fear/vulnerability: What Happens engages riders with the feeling of fear/vulnerability they have when at risk and encourages more defensive/protective riding. However, there is a need for caution as some riders struggle with the conceptual nature of the idea in What Happens
    - In both executions, there is a big opportunity to dial up ‘speed’ as the key factor in causing a near miss/accident

- The concept of near misses is familiar and emotive, but when focusing on past near misses riders are quick to attribute fault to others and feel they have already incorporated these lessons into their riding style
  - There may be a need to reconsider the end line to deliver a stronger call-to-action
Summary of response
Riders take a safety message, but do not specifically take out a speed reduction message

- Scenarios are seen to show more general reckless and unsafe riding;
  
  *He wasn’t riding too fast, he was just reckless. Most people stop at a T-junction*  
  *Motorcycle, Family*

  *He’s filtering, not speeding. It’s saying ‘don’t take unnecessary risks’*  
  *Motorcycle, Pre-family*

  *How is that about speed? He’s not even moving!*  
  *Motorcycle, Family*

  *It’s about falling off your bike – but they’ve flipped it around; instead of the rider hitting the road, the road is hitting him*  
  *Motorcycle, Pre-Family*

- Furthermore, riders are quick to assume other factors are at fault rather than their own speed;

  *Most accidents are caused by cars drivers not paying attention*  
  *Scooter, Pre-Family*

  *I hit a pedestrian – he broke his leg in three places. He was wearing headphones, not paying attention and stepped out right in front of me! I told the insurance company it wasn’t my fault.*  
  *Motorcycle, Pre-Family*

- Whilst a speed message is delivered in the end line, it is not seen anywhere else in the ad. Therefore, to take a speed message, riders have to make a leap

A need for a more directive approach to talking about speed
Riders view their speed within the context of many other factors.

Riders believe many risks are beyond their control and are quick to apportion blame. Any ad will have to work hard to encourage riders to isolate speed as a factor.
Some opt-out because they feel that a speed message is not relevant to London

- London congestion can give riders an opportunity to reject speed messages, on the grounds that it is ‘too busy to speed in London’

- This can be compounded by the belief that scooters have insufficient power to speed
  - Particularly in comparison to motorbike riders, who are perceived to be more likely to speed

particularly true of scooter riders; demonstrating risky behaviour from rider’s POV focuses on their experience rather than the style of bike
Familiar speed-related scenarios could be used to encourage reflection and opt-in

- The most familiar speed scenarios involve riders having insufficient time to respond to unexpected external factors;
  - Car/bus pulling out without indicating
  - Car/bus stopping unexpectedly
  - Vehicle pulling out from side-road (possibly misjudging rider’s speed)
  - Distracted cyclist veering into rider’s path
  - Pedestrian stepping onto the road unexpectedly
  - Dog running onto the road unexpectedly
  - Riding too fast, unable to see obstacle on the road (drain)

- Whilst riders can recognise that reducing their speed would allow them more time to respond to unexpected events, their first response is often to blame the external factors

- A small number of scenarios were raised, in which riders believed their speed was the key factor;
  - Approaching a roundabout at speed - trying to nip ahead of an oncoming vehicle
  - Riding too fast in wet conditions
  - Quickly weaving between lanes
Shock-factor enhances emotional engagement

- Riders respond to ideas that have an element of shock-factor, which enhances emotional engagement and can prompt reappraisal of their riding style.

- Explicit crash scenes have high impact.
  - Particularly evident in ‘The Ride’ which has the double shock-factor of a rider falling off their bike and being hit by the truck.

- However, there are other means to create ‘shock-factor’ and dial up the emotional response to ads through visual and auditory means, without showing a crash, including:
  - Evoking a visceral response to risk-taking (physiological responses in What Happens)
  - Screeching brakes and hospital noises.

  When you see a big crash it really drives it home. They’re the ads you remember.
  Scooter, Pre-family

  When you hear screeching brakes it takes you right back to the times when you’ve had a near miss. I can totally relate.
  Motorcycle, Family
Response to the creative ideas

What’s working and watch-outs
Introduction to evaluation

- As none of the ads clearly communicated a speed reduction message they cannot be directly evaluated against the success criteria.

- Therefore in this section we have explored the ads against three core aspects of the success criteria without the issue of speed factored in, in order to provide clear direction:
  - Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)
  - Reappraisal of how they ride
  - Motivates behaviour change
What Could Have Been: What’s Working – Dual outcome illustrates a choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)</th>
<th>Reappraisal of how they ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly communicates risk</td>
<td>Shows familiar context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO explicitly communicates the</td>
<td>Familiar London roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences of taking risks. Eg</td>
<td>(with other traffic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fracturing spine or breaking neck</td>
<td>enhances engagement (not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>just speeding down motorway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock factor</td>
<td>Emotionally engages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of severe physical injury and</td>
<td>Family scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital scenario</td>
<td>prompts reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on what audience has to lose, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotionally engages riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the consequences of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dangerous riding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivates behaviour change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered to take action</th>
<th>Clear comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual outcome puts risk in context</td>
<td>Leading with risky behaviour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and communicates that riders have</td>
<td>followed by emotional outcome-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a choice in how the events unfold</td>
<td>clear link between risk-taking and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential injury/loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss aversion</td>
<td>Idea of duality is quite powerful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire not to miss out on life and</td>
<td>Scooter, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday pleasures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It involves kids and family who you leave behind, so it’s a bit more personal. Motorbike, Family

It makes you feel sad, but it also makes you feel happy because there are two parts to the story Scooter, Family

It makes you realise life could change in a split second. Motorbike, Family
### What Could Have Been: Watch outs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)</th>
<th>Reappraisal of how they ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequences dialled up</strong></td>
<td><strong>May opt-out of family scenario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative consequences of reckless riding may be lost amidst the happy family images (implies that reckless riding has no consequences)</td>
<td>Whilst family scenes are very powerful for older audiences (both those with and without families), the younger audiences struggled to relate to these scenes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At the end of the night he’s tucked up in bed with his wife. Looks like a pretty happy ending to me!**

**Motorbike, Family**

**I don’t relate to it...he’s got a family and I don’t**

**Motorbike, Pre-family (25-35)**

### Motivates behaviour change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single risk scenario</th>
<th>Cognitive process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If only one scenario is shown, riders may only link risk to this behaviour. Risk of opt-out if riders cannot relate to risk behaviour shown</td>
<td>Many voiced preference for visual portrayal of dual outcome (not just VO). Deemed to increase comprehension and impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**It would have more impact if you show the alternative. Like ‘Sliding Doors’ - flicking between the two.**

**Motorbike, Pre-family**

---

Dialling up the consequences of speed may further motivate riders to slow down.
**What Happens: What’s Working – visceral response taps into vulnerable rider feeling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)</th>
<th>Reappraisal of how they ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matter-of-fact</td>
<td>Project into ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts about ‘puncturing eyes’ give matter-of-fact account of the risks of riding</td>
<td>Ambiguous scenario may allow audience to project personal experiences into the ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatable experience</td>
<td>Embeds in riding ‘feeling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights the physical response to danger, which many riders can relate to; pounding heart, clenched jaw and closing eyes</td>
<td>Visceral response, prompts reflection on their own riding behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captivating ambiguity</td>
<td>Motivates behaviour change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous scenario (absence of a bike and helmet) was captivating for some, who tend to ‘switch off’ during speeding ads</td>
<td>Protective instincts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evoking visceral response heightens protective instincts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport for London**

Words like ‘puncture’ with regard to your eye, don’t sound too pleasant

Motorbike, Family

I like the description of the clenching of the jaw. I remember all that, I could relate to it, your body goes into ‘protect mode’

Motorbike, Family

It draws you in, because you’re trying to figure out what’s going on

Scooter, Pre-family

I found it quite hard-hitting, there’s a real sense of what’s impending

Scooter, Family
What Happens: Watch outs – abstract execution can be hard to decode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)</th>
<th>Reappraisal of how they ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract scenario → opt-out</strong></td>
<td><strong>No risk scenario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle to relate to a situation in</td>
<td>Execution does not portray a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which a chunk of tarmac would fly</td>
<td>risk behaviour, therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the air</td>
<td>difficult for riders to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recognise their own behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrealistic responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Required action is unclear</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riders struggle to relate to some of</td>
<td>Potential unclear from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the physiological responses;</td>
<td>visuals/concept what riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilating eardrums and raising hands</td>
<td>need to do to minimise their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to face</td>
<td>risks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *It doesn’t make sense to use a bit of tarmac. It’d make more sense if it was a car*
  - Scooter, Family
- *I don’t really care if my inner-ear dilates, it’s not something I’d ever be aware of*
  - Motorbike, Family
- *He’s not wearing a helmet – it’s just not realistic*
  - Motorbike, Pre-family
- *If you have a near miss on a bike you wouldn’t put your hands in front of your face, you clench the handlebars even tighter!*
  - Scooter, Pre-family
- *If you have a near miss on a bike you wouldn’t put your hands in front of your face, you clench the handlebars even tighter!*
  - Scooter, Pre-family
**Warning Signals: What’s working – engages rider in the experience**

- **Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)**
  - Showing specific scenarios
    - Helps communicate the risky behaviours which lead to a crash
  - Depicting a crash
    - Clearly communicates the consequences of taking risks – screeching tyres and crunching metal prompt emotive response

- **Reappraisal of how they ride**
  - Rider POV: easy to project into
    - Hooks riders with the thrill of riding, allowing audience to project themselves, their bike & their experiences into the ad

- **Motivates behaviour change**
  - Defensive riding
    - Reflection on past near misses, encourages more defensive riding to protect against the risks posed by other road users

---

**I like the idea of a helmet-cam. It’s realistic. It captures your interest because you can relate to it**

-Motorbike, Family

**The bit where you heard the screeching caught my attention**

-Motorbike, Pre-family (25-35)

**It’s like you’re telling yourself what you’re doing… and you’re more likely to listen to yourself**

-Scooter, Pre-family (19-25)
**Warning Signals: Watch outs – riders struggle to decode and process the message simultaneously**

- **Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out):**
  - Message comprehension: Warning light often associated with mechanical problem, which can prompt opt-out.
  - There’s something wrong with the bike – it needs oil. So I’d pull over and sort it out. (Motorbike professional)

- **Reappraisal of how they ride:**
  - Opt-out of responsibility: Easy to attribute risky situations to other road users.
  - Specific scenarios: Potential for opt-out if riders don’t relate to specific behaviours.
  - You only get a few people that ride like that. (Scooter Family)

- **Motivates behaviour change:**
  - Decode retrospectively: ‘Warning light’ is not clear, therefore many don’t realise something is wrong with their behaviour until the end of the ad. Riders must reflect back to decode what happened (particularly challenging for an audience that doesn’t want to engage).
  - It took me a while to figure out what was going on with the light. (Scooter Pre-family (19-25))
**Body Worlds: Lacks context and emotional hooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reappraisal of risks (without opt-out)</th>
<th>Reappraisal of how they ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intriguing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some familiar with Von Hagen were intrigued by the scientific narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facts hook people in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/facts work well for a predominantly male audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Working</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Static object</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riders struggled to take out a speed message from a static object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalist concept</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks clear link to riding. Audience felt the memory message could apply to any behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lacks context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No scenarios or context to communicate risky behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motivates behaviour change**

- **Emotional engagement**
  Abstract message lacks emotional hooks to engage audience

- **Message comprehension**
  Memory anecdote falls down (memory is amazing, yet we sometimes forget)

**Not Working**

- It doesn’t make me go ‘ouch!’
  It’s boring. It feels like a science lesson
  Scooter, Pre-family (19-25)

- It implies your brain forgets near misses, so in that respect how are you supposed to do anything about it?
  Motorbike, Pre-family (25-35)
Near misses are interpreted within a broadly risky environment and often are not linked to speed

- Riders often ‘resolve’ past near-misses by attributing fault to other road users, environmental factors, and the general risky nature of P2Ws (to resolve cognitive dissonance)

- As such, the end line ‘remember your last near miss’ struggles to focus the audience on ways in which their own riding behaviour (and speed) contributed to the event

Opportunity for end line to deliver stronger directional message to prompt speed reduction
Riders struggled to link the CTA to the creative ideas shown

- As a speed reduction message was not taken out of the creative ideas, there was a perceived disconnect between the ad and the end line ‘Think! Don’t ride too fast’

- When explored in isolation, riders understood the ‘too fast’ end line to be about relative speed, rather than speeding per se
  - A scenario about relative speed is required for the end line to be relevant

Think!  Don’t ride too fast.

It says ‘don’t ride too fast’ but nothing in that ad was about riding too fast. Yeah he was being an idiot, but it wasn’t about speed Motorcycle, Pre-family
TAC: ‘Accident Reconstruction’
Learnings from ‘Accident Reconstruction’

- Showing speed as the discernable factor between two outcomes (crash vs near miss) engages riders, and empowers them to think about this in the future

- Explicitly targeting speed ensures clear take-out and reduces opportunity to blame to others

- Opening on the negative outcome helps riders engage with the message from the outset

---

I like that it’s such a marginal amount. Just 8km/hour, that’s 3mph, it’s nothing.
Scooter, Pre-family (19-25)

It’s a single message, it’s really clear; slow down to increase your change of survival.
Motorcycle, Family

Reversing it works well. You know it’s bad news from the very beginning
Motorcycle, Pre-Family
TAC: ‘The Ride’
Learnings from ‘The Ride’

- Recognising and acknowledging the general feelings and risks associated with riding helps engage audience that are reluctant to engage with a speeding message.

- Visceral ‘shock factor’ is powerful for engagement and motivating behaviour change.

- Watch Out: Riding behaviours that are too extreme may cause opt-out.
Points for consideration
Points for Consideration

- Showing speed as the discernable factor between two outcomes engages riders, and empowers them to think about their speed in the future
  - Clear focus on speed reduction is required to get riders to reappraise their speed
  - To address speed, the concepts need to be more explicit, focussing on familiar, unequivocal ‘speed’ scenarios
  - The ads could work equally well if it was decided to communicate more general defensive riding

- Near miss concept is familiar / emotive, but focussing on past near misses doesn’t prompt reappraisal of own behaviour
  - There may be a need to reconsider the end line to deliver a stronger call-to-action

- Starting with the negative outcome/risky behaviour (with no ambiguity) helps riders to engage and evaluate risks
  - Explicitly showing negative consequences motivates behaviour change
  - Risk of opt-out if risky behaviours have no consequences (Eg WCHB: Impact diluted by seemingly ‘happy ending’)
  - If only one speed scenario is shown, riders may only link risk to this behaviour, and potentially opt-out if they cannot relate to risk behaviour shown. (Potential to show multiple speed scenarios to maximise resonance and reduce opt-out)

- Embedding the feeling of riding into the message optimises engagement;
  - Showing relatable scenarios (most effective from the riders POV)
  - Visceral response to risk/vulnerability

- Shock factor helps emotional engagement and motivation;
  - Highlighting what is at stake from riding too fast (loss aversion)
  - Tapping into the visceral experience of feeling vulnerable
Methodology and sample:

8 x 1.5 hr focus groups with non-professional riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Life stage</th>
<th>Where cycle</th>
<th>Claimed risk taking behaviour</th>
<th>Riding attitude</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motorbike riders (50-700cc)</td>
<td>Pre-family (19-25)</td>
<td>Mixed Inner and Outer London</td>
<td>Very high-risk</td>
<td>Look at Me</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motorbike riders (50-700cc)</td>
<td>Pre-family (25-35)</td>
<td>Outer-London</td>
<td>Very high-risk</td>
<td>Look at Me</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motorbike riders (50-700cc)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Inner-London</td>
<td>Very high-risk</td>
<td>Look at Me</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motorbike riders (50-700cc)</td>
<td>Pre-family</td>
<td>Mixed Inner and Outer London</td>
<td>Moderate risk</td>
<td>Mix of Performance Hobbyists and Performance Disciples</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motorbike riders (50-700cc)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Inner-London</td>
<td>High-risk</td>
<td>Mix of Performance Hobbyists and Performance Disciples</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motorbike riders &gt;700cc</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>Low-risk</td>
<td>Mix of Performance Hobbyists and Performance Disciples</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Scooter riders &lt;125cc</td>
<td>Pre-family</td>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>High-risk</td>
<td>Mix of Look at Me and Car Aspirants</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scooter riders (&lt;125cc)</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Inner-London</td>
<td>Road risk to fall out naturally</td>
<td>Car Rejecters</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 x 1.5 hr focus group with professional riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Life stage</th>
<th>Where cycle</th>
<th>Claimed risk taking behaviour</th>
<th>Riding attitude</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional motorbike riders &gt;125cc</td>
<td>Mixed (natural)</td>
<td>Mixed Inner and Outer London</td>
<td>Moderate to high-risk</td>
<td>Mixed (natural)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research conducted by 2CV on 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th of January 2013
NB: Group 1 was run twice due to recruitment issues with the first group