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## Research organization

## Research goal

To probe the awareness and necessity of the advertising campaign "Protect me, I'm small".

## Method

Direct interview at the respondents home, using computer (CAPI Computer Assisted Personal Interview).

## Sample

15-74 aged inhabitants of Lithuania

## Recruitment

Respondents were selected representatively: sampling is distributed geographically so that it's proportions would correspond with data from Lithuania's department of statistics.
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Latviug g. 19A
LT-08113 Vilnius
www.pvc.lt

## Executive:
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Greenhall, Upės g. 21, LT-08128 Vilnius
www.sic.lt
Project manager:
Dalia Olšauskė
tel.: 52054515
dalia.olsauske@sic.lt
Report was prepared by:
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Agnė Šimkūnaitė
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## Summary

> Considering the fact that the campaign is not a typical TV commercial and that without TV and radio, more niche informational channels were chosen, awareness of the campaign is high. 39\% of inhabitants of Lithuania have seen or heard either promotional or informational material of the campaign. Also $14 \%$ of inhabitants claim that they have heard about this campaign, though they have not came across to promotional or informational material.
> The biggest part of audience was reached by radio advertisement. Overall, radio advertisement was heard by $22 \%$ of inhabitants.
> The promotional message was clear.
$76 \%$ of all respondents at least partially understood the message correctly. Totally correctly the message was comprehended by $55 \%$ of all respondents.
> Inhabitants consider the campaign "Protect me, I'm small" to be necessary. 86\% of respondents feel the need for this campaign.

Notice and perception of the advertisement

## Awareness of the campaign

39\% of Lithuania's inhabitants have seen or heard either promotional or informational material of the campaign. Also $14 \%$ of inhabitants claim that they have heard about this campaign, though they have not came across to promotional or informational material.

Mostly persons of 20-29 y.o. and families with children under 3 y.o. have seen the advertisement.

Women, persons of 40-49 y.o., respondents with higher education, employed and families with children over 3 y.o. more often claim that they have heard about this campaign, although particular promotional or informational material they haven't seen/heard.

Look at: sectional information in the appendix

Have heard about the campaign, although haven't seen the material


## Notice of the advertisement

The biggest party of audience was reached by the radio advertisement. 11\% of respondents heard about this campaign only through this channel (unique channel attraction). Overall $22 \%$ of inhabitants have heard radio advertisement, yet a part of them came across to this information also in other ways.
The commercial was seen by $16 \%$ of respondents. In general, this promotional alternative attracted $7 \%$ of unique viewers. Considering the fact that advertisement didn't have a wide grid in the television and more niche ways of reaching (public transport or internet) were used, the indicator is quite good.
The smallest part of audience was reached by booklets, posters and stickers.
$14 \%$ of respondents heard about the campaign from several sources. It is so called the synergetic effect of advertisement. Information that reached inhabitants from several channels is more certain and more memorable.
In the appendix the sectional information is presented.

Unique channel attraction


General channel attraction


Percentage is calculated from all respondents, $\mathrm{N}=503$

## Perception of the advertisement

Regardless of whether the respondent has ever came across to the informational material of the campaign before the research or not, he/she was asked to indicate what this advertisement is about.
$76 \%$ of all the respondents at least partially understood the message correctly. Totally correctly the message was comprehended by $55 \%$ of all respondents.

Most often respondents replied quiet abstractedly that advertisement is about the safety of children, their protection or simply just about kids.

We must have in mind that each respondent could have indicated several answers, thus after coding their answers the common expression of percentage is higher than $100 \%$. The proportion of correct promotional message (ratings next to the graph) is recorded only if at least one answer of respondent indicates the correct perception, thus the proportion is converged into $100 \%$.


Percentage is calculated from all respondents, $\mathrm{N}=503$

## Advertisement perception among those who have seen the advertisement

Respondents who have seen the advertisement before the research more often comprehended it correctly.

79\% of these persons at least partially understood the message correctly and 61\% comprehended it completely correctly.

| Taking care of children, their <br> protectionResponsible, positive parenthood $\square 5 \%$About parenting, education,training$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { More communications, attention } \\ \text { and love to children }\end{array}\right] 43 \%$About children weakness, <br> sensibility, gentle behaviour with... | 24\% | At least <br> partially |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| About children safety/protection $\square$ Violence against children $\square 12 \%$ | $70$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { message } \\ & 79 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| About children, childhood $\square 15 \%$ <br> About the relations of children and <br> their pareants, tpaternity, \\| $2 \%$  <br> Other (advertisement <br> comprehended not correctly) \|3\% | 18\% |  |
|  | $21$ | Uncomprehended message 21\% |

## Necessity of the campaign

Inhabitants consider the campaign "Protect me, I'm small" to be necessary (86\%).
Respondents who have seen the advertisement, persons under 39 y.o., employed, inhabitants that do not have a family and representatives of families with children more often than other inhabitants believe that the campaign "Protect me, I'm small" is necessary.
In the appendix sectional information is presented.
-Very necessary - Probably necessary ■Probably unnecessary Really unnecessary Hard to say
All respondents $(\mathrm{N}=503)$


Those who have seen the promotional/ informational material ( $\mathrm{N}=194$ )


Those who have heard about the campaign, though haven't seen any material ( $\mathrm{N}=70$ )


Haven't heard/ seen ( $\mathrm{N}=239$ ) $\square$

## Comparison of advertisement indicators

In order to fully understand the indicators of the campaign, it is proper to compare them with other advertisements. Unfortunately, available indicators of social sector advertisements cover very narrow target groups or their active period is very long, thus it's not possible to compare data with them. However, we can use the available TV commercial indicators from financial an telecommunications sectors.
Data shows that the campaign have reached excellent results. Considering the fact that TV commercial in the campaign constituted only a small informational part, the notice of informational/ promotional material is quiet high. Moreover, although it is transmitted not a particular service or product, yet an abstract idea, the perception of promotional message is quiet high.

■Advertisement "Protect me, I'm small" - Financial sector advertisements $\quad$ Telecomunications sector advertisements


[^0]
## Appendix



## Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

| Gender |
| :---: |
| Male $\square$ 47\% |
| Female $\square$ 53\% |
| Age |
| 15-19 y/o ■ 9\% |
| 20-29 y/o 19\% |
| $30-39$ y/o 16\% |
| $40-49 \mathrm{y} / \mathrm{o}$ 19\% |
| 50-59 y/o 16\% |
| 60-74 y/o 20\% |
| Education |
| Primary, basic - 22\% |
| Secondary 33\% |
| Advanced vocational education $\square 19 \%$ |
| Higher $\square$ 26\% |
| Region |
| Vilnius 18\% |
| Other city 23\% |
| Other town $\square$ 27\% |
| Village $\quad 32 \%$ |


| Occupation |
| :---: |
| Employed $\square$ 46\% |
| Not working $\square$ 54\% |
| Martial status |
| Married/ living with a partner $\square 52 \%$ |
| Single 26\% |
| Divorced/ widowed $\quad 23 \%$ |
| Children |
| Don't have children $\square$ 67\% |
| Have children up to $3 \mathrm{y} / \mathrm{o}-12 \%$ |
| Have just 4-16 y/o children $\square$ 22\% |
| Income |
| Up to 500 Lt $\square$ 29\% |
| 501-800 Lt 30\% |
| 801-1000 Lt 15\% |
| 1001 lt and more - 14\% |
| Did not indicate - 12\% |

## Awareness of the campaign by socio-demographic characteristics

|  |  | Sample | Have seen promotional/ informational material | Have hear about the campaign, although haven't seen the material | Do not have any knowledge about the particular campaign |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Male | 234 | 37\% | 11\% | 53\% |
|  | Female | 269 | 40\% | 17\% | 43\% |
| Age | 15-19 y/o | 44 | 48\% | 13\% | 39\% |
|  | 20-29 y/o | 97 | 49\% | 16\% | 35\% |
|  | 30-39 y/o | 82 | 36\% | 11\% | 53\% |
|  | 40-49 y/o | 97 | 39\% | 23\% | 37\% |
|  | 50-59 y/o | 82 | 34\% | 15\% | 51\% |
|  | 60-74 y/o | 100 | 29\% | 5\% | 66\% |
| Education | Primary, basic | 110 | 34\% | 8\% | 58\% |
|  | Secondary | 168 | 38\% | 9\% | 53\% |
|  | Advanced vocational education | 96 | 34\% | 19\% | 47\% |
|  | Higher | 129 | 46\% | 22\% | 32\% |
| Region | Vilnius | 92 | 42\% | 18\% | 40\% |
|  | Other city | 114 | 34\% | 10\% | 55\% |
|  | Other town | 135 | 36\% | 16\% | 48\% |
|  | Village | 162 | 41\% | 13\% | 46\% |
| Occupation | Employed | 232 | 39\% | 18\% | 43\% |
|  | None working | 271 | 38\% | 10\% | 51\% |
| Marital status | Married/living with a partner | 260 | 40\% | 16\% | 44\% |
|  | Single | 130 | 41\% | 14\% | 45\% |
|  | Divorced/widowed | 113 | 33\% | 8\% | 59\% |
| Children | Don't have children | 335 | 34\% | 13\% | 53\% |
|  | Do have children up to $3 \mathrm{y} / \mathrm{o}$ | 59 | 55\% | 8\% | 37\% |
|  | Have just 4-16 y/o children | 109 | 45\% | 20\% | 35\% |
| Income | Up to 500 Lt | 146 | 34\% | 12\% | 54\% |
|  | 501-800 Lt | 152 | 41\% | 12\% | 47\% |
|  | 801-1000 Lt | 77 | 30\% | 24\% | 46\% |
|  | 1001 Lt and more | 69 | 46\% | 12\% | 41\% |
|  | Did not indicate | 59 | 48\% | 11\% | 41\% |
|  | All respondents | 503 | 39\% | 14\% | 47\% |

Percentage presented in rows. Green color marks a statistically higher values, red - lower.

## Notice of the advertisement by socio-demographic characteristics

|  |  | Sample | Saw the advertisement on TV/internet/public transport | Heard the advertise ment on the radio | Saw a booklet | Saw a sticker or a poster | Saw the advertisement through several channels | Heard about the campaign, although did not see any material | Do not have any knowledge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Male | 234 | 6\% | 9\% | 4\% | 3\% | 15\% | 11\% | 53\% |
|  | Female | 269 | 8\% | 12\% | 4\% | 4\% | 13\% | 17\% | 43\% |
| Age | 15-19 y/o | 44 | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% | 6\% | 18\% | 13\% | 39\% |
|  | 20-29 y/o | 97 | 6\% | 19\% | 1\% | 2\% | 20\% | 16\% | 35\% |
|  | 30-39 y/o | 82 | 10\% | 11\% | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 11\% | 53\% |
|  | 40-49 y/o | 97 | 7\% | 8\% | 4\% | 5\% | 14\% | 23\% | 37\% |
|  | 50-59 y/o | 82 | 4\% | 12\% | 3\% | 1\% | 13\% | 15\% | 51\% |
|  | 60-74 y/o | 100 | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 2\% | 12\% | 5\% | 66\% |
| Education | Primary, basic | 110 | 8\% | 8\% | 2\% | 2\% | 13\% | 8\% | 58\% |
|  | Secondary | 168 | 5\% | 13\% | 6\% | 1\% | 14\% | 9\% | 53\% |
|  | Advanced vocational education | 96 | 4\% | 11\% | 4\% | 2\% | 12\% | 19\% | 47\% |
|  | Higher | 129 | 10\% | 11\% | 2\% | 8\% | 16\% | 22\% | 32\% |
| Region | Vilnius | 92 | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 7\% | 20\% | 18\% | 40\% |
|  | Other city | 114 | 7\% | 6\% | 5\% | 3\% | 13\% | 10\% | 55\% |
|  | Other town | 135 | 8\% | 12\% | 1\% | 2\% | 13\% | 16\% | 48\% |
|  | Village | 162 | 7\% | 17\% | 2\% | 3\% | 13\% | 13\% | 46\% |
| Occupation | Employed | 232 | 6\% | 11\% | 4\% | 5\% | 14\% | 18\% | 43\% |
|  | None working | 271 | 8\% | 11\% | 4\% | 2\% | 14\% | 10\% | 51\% |
| Marital status | Married/living with a partner | 260 | 7\% | 14\% | 5\% | 2\% | 12\% | 16\% | 44\% |
|  | Single | 130 | 6\% | 10\% | 3\% | 5\% | 18\% | 14\% | 45\% |
|  | Divorced/widowed | 113 | 7\% | 6\% | 2\% | 4\% | 15\% | 8\% | 59\% |
| Children | Don't have children | 335 | 6\% | 7\% | 3\% | 3\% | 14\% | 13\% | 53\% |
|  | Do have children up to $3 \mathrm{y} / \mathrm{o}$ | 59 | 9\% | 27\% | 5\% | 1\% | 12\% | 8\% | 37\% |
|  | Have just 4-16 y/o children | 109 | 9\% | 13\% | 4\% | 6\% | 14\% | 20\% | 35\% |
| Income | Up to 500 Lt | 146 | 5\% | 18\% | 2\% | 1\% | 8\% | 12\% | 54\% |
|  | 501-800 Lt | 152 | 9\% | 6\% | 6\% | 3\% | 17\% | 12\% | 47\% |
|  | 801-1000 Lt | 77 | 3\% | 5\% | 3\% | 4\% | 15\% | 24\% | 46\% |
|  | 1001 Lt and more | 69 | 8\% | 16\% | 1\% | 6\% | 16\% | 12\% | 41\% |
|  | Did not indicate | 59 | 8\% | 9\% | 6\% | 8\% | 18\% | 11\% | 41\% |
|  | All respondents | 503 | 7\% | 11\% | 4\% | 3\% | 14\% | 14\% | 47\% |

Percentage presented in rows. Green color marks a statistically higher values, red - lower.

## Necessity of the campaign by socio-demographic characteristics

|  |  | Sample | Necessary | Unnecessary | Hard to say |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Male | 234 | 85\% | 10\% | 5\% |
|  | Female | 269 | 88\% | 7\% | 6\% |
| Age | 15-19 y/o | 44 | 99\% |  | 1\% |
|  | 20-29 y/o | 97 | 93\% | 5\% | 1\% |
|  | 30-39 y/o | 82 | 94\% | 2\% | 4\% |
|  | 40-49 y/o | 97 | 78\% | 13\% | 9\% |
|  | 50-59 y/o | 82 | 89\% | 6\% | 5\% |
|  | 60-74 y/o | 100 | 75\% | 16\% | 10\% |
| Education | Primary, basic | 110 | 80\% | 14\% | 6\% |
|  | Secondary | 168 | 84\% | 7\% | 8\% |
|  | Advanced vocational education | 96 | 91\% | 6\% | 2\% |
|  | Higher | 129 | 91\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| Region | Vilnius | 92 | 93\% | 5\% | 2\% |
|  | Other city | 114 | 90\% | 6\% | 4\% |
|  | Other town | 135 | 89\% | 3\% | 8\% |
|  | Village | 162 | 77\% | 16\% | 7\% |
| Occupation | Employed | 232 | 90\% | 8\% | 2\% |
|  | None working | 271 | 83\% | 8\% | 9\% |
| Marital status | Married/living with a partner | 260 | 85\% | 8\% | 6\% |
|  | Single | 130 | 94\% | 4\% | 2\% |
|  | Divorced/widowed | 113 | 80\% | 13\% | 7\% |
| Children | Don't have children | 335 | 83\% | 10\% | 7\% |
|  | Have children up to $3 \mathrm{y} / \mathrm{o}$ | 59 | 91\% | 1\% | 8\% |
|  | Have just 4-16 y/o children | 109 | 94\% | 6\% | 0,5\% |
| Income | Up to 500 Lt | 146 | 83\% | 11\% | 6\% |
|  | 501-800 Lt | 152 | 85\% | 9\% | 6\% |
|  | 801-1000 Lt | 77 | 90\% | 3\% | 7\% |
|  | 1001 Lt and more | 69 | 92\% | 7\% | 1\% |
|  | Did not indicate | 59 | 84\% | 9\% | 7\% |
|  | All respondents | 503 | 86\% | 8\% | 6\% |

Percentage presented in rows. Green color marks a statistically higher values, red - lower.


[^0]:    *Correct message comprehension is calculated from those who have seen the advertisement

