Evaluation of Social Marketing Campaigns

- Formative Evaluation: audience analysis, content testing and evaluate buy strategy

- Process Evaluation: who did the campaign reach?

- Outcome Evaluation: did the campaign impact awareness, knowledge, behavioral predictors (attitudes, beliefs, etc.)?
LPYSP Media Campaign Evaluation

- Many possible approaches – surveys, experiments, observational studies, or “natural experiments” (based on available data)
- Available data (inexpensive)
- LPYSP Process Evaluation: exposure
- LPYSP Outcome Evaluation: awareness of Lifeline (operationalized as calls in to the 800 number)
Process Measure – Exposure

- Why it matters? Lack of exposure is a primary failure of social marketing campaigns.

- The Gross Rating Point (GRP) measures potential exposure; can estimate based on media buy data.

- Important to remember that these are rates of potential exposure; measures “expected” exposure; does not guarantee individuals attend to the message.
LPYSP Media Campaign

- Current analysis for media campaigns conducted in 2007 and 2008

- The campaigns are designed to increase awareness of youth suicide and suicide prevention

- Each media message includes the national suicide prevention *Lifeline* number (1-800-273-TALK).
Outcomes – Methods

- Longitudinal analysis of *Lifeline* call center data in Louisiana (from 2005-2008); data include date of call, start time, and originating zip code
- Multi-level model to estimate whether calls increase in zip codes and months during which campaign advertisements are conducted
- Natural experiment that compares monthly call volumes in zip codes in which a campaign is being conducted with zip codes in which no campaign is being conducted.
Outcome – Hypothesis

• Hypothesize that calls should increase in months when media campaigns are active and in the zip codes where the advertisements are broadcast, posted, or printed.

• Why it matters? Use of the *Lifeline* is dependent on awareness of the 1-800 number.
Outcome Findings (1)

Estimates of Exposure Effects of Advertising Campaign on Monthly Call Volumes to *Lifeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print (Newspaper)</td>
<td>5.570</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard</td>
<td>1.862</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busboard</td>
<td>6.259</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>6.301</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Findings (2)

Estimated Statewide Call Volume Impacts by Advertisement Type

- Movie: 807
- Print: 401
- Radio: 15
- Billboard: 912
- Busboard: 701
Questions

Results from our analysis have been accepted for publication in

*Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*
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