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1. Executive summary

1.1 Background and methodology

This report details the findings of Stage 1 of a full, formative evaluation of the THINK! Education resources. The broad objectives of the evaluation are to understand the impact that the resources have had on road safety education in England and to inform the DfT of any required changes to the programme going forward. The detailed objectives were to explore the following:

- **Awareness of the resources** – what proportion of pre-school, schools and out of school groups are aware of the resources?
- **The uptake of the resources** – how many resources have been ordered and how many teachers, parents and students have been exposed to them?
- **The quality of materials produced** – how do those who have used the resources rate their usability, credibility and relevance, and how engaging are they for young people, teachers, parents and other intermediaries?
- **Awareness and understanding** – to what extent have the messages outlined in the strategy for the specific resources and target audiences been clearly conveyed and understood?
- **Attitudes towards road safety** – to what extent have the resources increased knowledge and changed attitudes in line with the desired learning goals for each of the target audiences?
- **Road safety behaviour** – to what extent have the resources affected road safety behaviour, and equipped pupils with skills set out in the education strategy, for being a pedestrian, cyclist, passenger and, in later life, a driver and motorcyclist?
- How materials have helped teachers, parents, RSOs, police officers and youth group leaders to **deliver a coordinated approach** to child road safety education; this includes understanding how the THINK! resources fit within the wider context of other resources used and safety topics covered.
- How materials have been integrated with **other THINK! road safety materials** to benefit from the brand as a trusted and recognised source of information.
- What are users’ **expectations** of online versus print materials?
- What are teachers’ **preferences** for downloading/ordering materials and what is their capacity for printing resources in particular?
- What are the **most desirable print materials** they would want to continue ordering?
- How does the extent of the current THINK! Education offline provision **compare to other** education programmes?
Stage 1 focussed on Early Years and Upper Primary resources, with Stage 2 intended to focus on Lower Primary resources in addition to the overall uptake of the resource set. This report is in relation to Stage 1 only and aims to gain an understanding of the following specific objectives:

- The quality of the resources, including the perceived usability, credibility and relevance
- The perceived effect on awareness and understanding of Road Safety
- The perceived effect on attitudes towards Road Safety
- The perceived effect on road safety behaviour
- The impact on the approach to Road Safety education delivery, including how easily the resources can be incorporated into lessons alongside other road safety resources
- The fit with other THINK! materials
- Expectations and experiences of using the resources, including levels of enjoyment and engagement of pupils, teachers and group leaders
- Preferences for format of delivery
- Comparison with other road safety resources

For Stage 1, resources relating to Early Years and Upper Primary settings were evaluated in situ. Settings were identified and recruited on the basis of having ordered print resources. 10 case study visits took place to observe road safety resource usage as follows:

- Five in Early Years settings
- Three in schools in relation to Upper Primary (Years 3-6)
- Two in out-of-school Upper Primary settings (Brownies and Cubs)

Each case study visit was followed up with a telephone interview around three weeks afterwards to discuss any further thoughts or observations teachers and session leaders had in relation to the usage of the resources and their impact.

Two of the sessions (one in an Early Years setting and one in an Upper Primary school) were observed using other THINK! branded resources, but follow-up sessions were run using the THINK! Education resources. These sessions were described and analysed via telephone interviews with the teachers.

In addition, analysis was carried out on the usage of the website, based on Google Analytics data, and print requests to date, using catalogue data.

This report details the findings of Stage 1 of the evaluation only. Therefore conclusions are summative and will be used to help shape Stage 2 lines of enquiry and feed into final conclusions at the end of the evaluation. Full conclusions and recommendations will be provided in the final report at the end of Stage 2 of the evaluation.
1.2 Road safety education

Road safety was a topic habitually covered in all settings visited.

- In schools, it tended to be covered on an ad hoc basis where it fitted in with other topic areas, often related to PSHE.
- In Early Years settings it was woven in to curriculum framework areas such as safety.
- Out-of-school groups would cover it in relation to Road Safety badges.

Road safety resources were often put together by teachers and group leaders by gathering information and activity ideas from multiple sources. Local Authorities (LAs) delivered resource packs to schools and Early Years settings, and charities such as Brake and CAPT (Child Accident Prevention Trust) were mentioned as other good providers of road safety materials by teachers interviewed.

Many resources not produced by the DfT were branded with the THINK! logo thus contributing to the strength of the brand and adding credibility to other resources. Co-branded CAPT resources were an example of this, where the THINK! logo had added further credibility. However, this also created issues in relation to the stand-out of the current set of THINK! Education resources as some settings had not realised a new set of curriculum-focussed resources had been developed.

Early Years settings and schools also regularly worked with external intermediaries, such as RSOs or the Police, who would come in to deliver road safety education, or take children out on visits. However, staff were often unclear on the exact content of road safety education delivered by these external agents. This should be explored further in Stage 2 of the evaluation.

Parental engagement in road safety education was low. The most common form of parental engagement was via regular newsletters sent out to parents by schools and Early Years settings, but these were not followed up on by staff. Out-of-school groups did not engage parents in road safety education as it was not seen to be within their remit. In some cases, there was evidence that THINK! Education resources had helped teachers with parental engagement around road safety, and this is explored in later sections of this report.

1.3 Discovering the resources

Teachers and group leaders displayed low recall in remembering how they first discovered the THINK! Education resources. However, all were familiar with the THINK! brand and there were examples of where teachers and leaders had specifically sought out resources in relation to this campaign.
Associations with the THINK! campaign were strong, but due to this some teachers had failed to understand that there was a new set of education-related resources. Observations in two of the settings – one at Early Years and one in an Upper Primary school – revealed that older DfT resources or co-branded THINK! resources were being used on the understanding that these constituted the THINK! Education resources. A marketing strategy that highlights the new education resources’ unique selling points (USPs) in comparison is therefore required to overcome these perceptions.

1.4 Think! Education resource usage

Settings were not recruited for this research based on the extent to which or the way in which the THINK! Education resources had been used. As a result, the resources were observed being used in a variety of ways, which often differed by setting. Early Years settings were typically the most creative. This came from the need to be more flexible in their approach to road safety education to find a method that would engage children of a young age in the topic.

Early Years settings were less likely to use the digital interactive elements of the resources due to lack of available facilities. As a result, a variety of other resources such as toys and fluorescent jackets, in addition to THINK! Education print resources, were used. Stories were also used to engage children in the topics. Key messages covered were:

- Traffic awareness
- Holding hands and crossing the road
- Wearing a seatbelt
- Wearing bright clothing
- Traffic light colours

Upper Primary schools took a more structured approach to using the resources, running whole lessons on particular key messages. The Tales of the Road booklet was used in a variety of ways as a stimulus for discussion, and the videos were also used for this. Interactive games such as Snakes and Hazards were also popular, although teachers had made up their own games and quizzes in addition. Key themes covered were:

- The Green Cross Code (as a general stimulus and way to raise awareness of road safety)
- Pedestrian Safety (in particular what to wear and paying attention to traffic)
- Crossing the road (how to cross the road safely and sensibly)

Out-of-school groups found the online resources hardest to build into their sessions due to the facilities available. They would typically run a series of sessions using ideas from the resources to help children work towards a badge. However, there was less commonality observed in the ways sessions were run and leaders varied in their approach from showing children the
videos to more creative sessions making posters based on the *Tales of the Road* booklet.

Home-link sheets were used by many of the schools and Early Years settings as an easy way to communicate with parents around road safety. Posters were also put up to stimulate discussion between parents and children in the corridors, as they were more likely to be seen by parents here than in the classroom.

### 1.5 Quality of the resources and suggested improvements

The resources were considered to be of very high quality and teachers and session leaders appreciated the ease with which they were able to adapt them to their needs; this was an important aspect for all teachers and group leaders, and set the *THINK! Education* resources apart from others they had used. *THINK! Education* resources were therefore considered to be the best available.

The website was also found to be easy to navigate, which helped the planning of sessions, and print materials were found to be of high quality.

However, there were some improvements suggested by teachers and group leaders:

- Make A4 posters available in A2 format
- Include the outline of a red man as well as a green man to colour in
- Provide print versions of online interactives, such as a Snakes and Hazards board
- Make the online activities more accessible for Early Years by including audio instructions and visual prompts alongside the text
- Include clearer links to transition activities on the site to avoid the risk of older Upper Primary pupils becoming disengaged with more basic interactives
- Provide a CD or DVD of the resources to be accessible offline
- Pay better attention to language in relation to EAL (English as an Addition Language) children and parents
- Provide leaflets with information for parents in several languages to help settings communicate around the site

### 1.6 Impact of the resources

*Key impacts on enjoyment and behaviour*

Case study visits were designed to ascertain the level of engagement and enjoyment of young people, teachers and group leaders in using the resources, as well as to gain a sense of likely behavioural impacts.
All settings reported an increase in awareness of road safety matters following usage of the resources, noted in particular by a greater awareness and tendency to talk about road safety when out on trips. This represents observational, anecdotal evidence only, but offers an encouraging indication of the potential impact of the resources on attitudes, behaviour and knowledge of road safety.

Observations also noted clear enjoyment of all sessions using the THINK! Education resources, which contributed to greater engagement than usual in the topic. This has positive implications for the more long-term impacts of the resource in relation to engaging young people in the topic of road safety. However, more robust, quantitative data would need to be gathered to provide conclusive evidence in relation to this.

**Additional impacts at Early Years**
At Early Years, some teachers also noted impacts on the development of other key skills such as communication and independent thinking due to the type of activities that were used to tackle the topic, as suggested in the lesson ideas section.

**Lesson recall**
At Upper Primary, high recall of key messages covered in sessions was observed. However, there was less evidence to support the long-term impact that sessions had had on children due to a higher degree of existing knowledge within this age group. New information that made the topic feel more relevant to children at Upper Primary age, such as that related to listening to MP3s or wearing hoods, was more likely to be recalled than information that children already knew, such as “stop, look, listen.”

Recall was not specifically tested at Early Years as children were too young to take part in interviews with researchers. However, teachers often started lessons by recapping simple messages, such as traffic light colours, with children, and this demonstrated good recall based on previous sessions.

**Impacts on parental engagement**
Anecdotal evidence was provided to support indications of impacts on parents’ knowledge at Early Years. Some children had spoken about road safety at home following their lesson, or spoken to their parents about the posters in the corridors.

Children at Upper Primary level were not likely to talk to their parents about road safety and there was no evidence of the THINK! Education resources affecting their propensity to do this. However, there was anecdotal evidence pointing to cases where siblings had been reminded of key messages learned in sessions using the THINK! Education resources.

Evidence as to a potential increase in the engagement of parents in road safety matters was also noted via the use of home-link sheets. The success of
the use of home-link sheets could not be measured as teachers had not
t followed up on parents’ reactions to these. What is indicated, however, is an
attitudinal shift within schools and Early Years settings which have been able
to build parental engagement more easily into their plan for road safety
education.

No impacts relating to parental engagement were noted in Upper Primary
out-of-school settings as it was not seen as relevant to these groups’ remit.

Impact on approach to Road Safety education
In relation to teachers’ and group leaders’ approach to road safety education,
some evidence of greater cohesion was noted. Adults teaching road safety
felt less need to collect resource ideas and activities from several sources
due to the comprehensiveness of the THINK! Education set. This allowed the
topic to be more easily planned into the curriculum for schools.

The detail and range of topics covered through the resources also allowed
teachers and session leaders to cover a fuller range of topics within the road
safety theme. It also provided a more creative set of activity ideas than found
in other resources. This resulted in greater confidence of many staff
delivering the sessions, which has implications for the potential future uptake
of road safety education overall.

No evidence was found to suggest a more coordinated approach between
settings’ and RSOs’ delivery of road safety education. This is something that
will be looked at in more detail in subsequent stages of the evaluation.

1.7 Website analytics
Stage 1 website analytics provided an initial sense of how the website has
been used. This data will be combined with further website traffic data and
print requestor data at Stage 2. This will be analysed within the context of the
full evaluation findings to provide insight around developments for the THINK! Education strategy moving forward.

The website was visited 1.2 million times between the period of April 2009 to
October 2010. Peaks in the amount of website traffic were in line with key
dates for marketing activity, which indicates the effectiveness of marketing
strategies.

Over two fifths (42.1%) of website traffic was channelled through referral sites,
with Tales of the Road being responsible for the biggest share. This indicates
a strong link between the above-the-line (ATL) campaign (e.g. national
advertising) and the education strategy.
Around a third (31.1%) of website traffic came from search engines. The most popular search terms were ‘road safety’ and ‘think education’ which again indicate the strength of the THINK! brand in relation to the education programme.

The pupils’ area of the site was the most viewed, and the Upper Primary section was the most popular within this, reflecting the higher usage of online elements of the resource observed during the case studies.

The traffic poster PDF and the Tales of the Road PDF were the most viewed webpages on the site, again in line with observed resource usage during the case study visits.

1.8 Print requestor analysis

Between May 2009 and November 2010, Tales of the Road and the Parents Booklets were the most requested print resources due to the number of booklets ordered per request, with Tales of the Road accounting for over half (53.3%) of the volume of all print requests. All of these resources were likely to be ordered in bulk by requestors, suggesting they then distributed them to parents and pupils as appropriate.

Over time, print requests have not increased as much as online views of equivalent PDF resources. However, peaks in print requests do mirror those of PDF views at the same time, namely in May 2010 and September 2010.

In terms of types of requestor, school staff made up the biggest group, while RSOs have ordered the highest volume of resources. This is likely to be due to their remit in working across schools, and suggests they have distributed resources to settings they visit.

The general public were most likely to order the Journey Planner while the Lower Primary Parents Booklet was the resource most ordered by out-of-school groups. This can be examined further in Stage 2.

1.9 Conclusions

Key conclusions in relation to this stage of the research are as follows.

Road safety education
- Road safety education is an important topic in schools and Early Years settings
- Current approaches to road safety education lack coordination and topics tend to be delivered on an ad hoc basis throughout the year using a wide variety of resources, adapted to individual settings’ needs
• Schools and Early Years settings tend to deliver road safety in the winter term, during Road Safety Week or prior to school holidays, which present key marketing opportunities
• Out-of-school settings potentially only deliver road safety every few years, according to badge cycles
• There is a clear need for a set of comprehensive and easily adaptable road safety resources, such as those offered within THINK! Education

Awareness of the resources
• Teachers tended to stock-pile old resources and so awareness of the new THINK! Education resources was lower than expected
• Web activity does suggest that current marketing has driven users to the site, however
• Reach is potentially a bigger issue than level of marketing activity and so new marketing strategies need to address this
• The THINK! brand has strong credentials and brand perceptions, but appears to be diluting the impact and awareness of the new set of THINK! Education resources
• Clear USPs need to be communicated to help the THINK! Education materials stand out from previous catalogue sets and co-branded materials

Uptake of the resources
• Online uptake of the resources has so far been encouraging and is continually growing
• Key referral sites need to be considered in future marketing strategies as these are important to maintain. Particular attention should be paid to sites that might help increase the reach of awareness
• Some print requests count towards a small minority of orders made and could be made available as download only, or printed to order
• Stage 2 should provide a fuller analysis of resource uptake

Delivery and quality of the resources
• Materials have been used in a wide variety of ways, reflecting the ease with which they can be incorporated into lessons and other delivery sessions, even among those who were less familiar with the resource
• However, there was no evidence of teachers or group leaders delivering sessions working progressively through the site. Rather, they would dip in and out of the site as best met needs and adapt elements as required
• This flexibility was considered a key strength of the resource by deliverers
• Few improvements were suggested to the resource set as a whole, and all of these are minor amends to format or content as described
• The THINK! Education programme was felt to stand out from other road safety resources in terms of quality and ease of delivery. It has
therefore been successful in achieving its aims in this respect within the Early Years and Upper Primary audiences

**Impact of the resources**

- Based on anecdotal evidence, there are positive indications as to the impact on attitudes, awareness and understanding of young people having used the resources
- Children and pupils demonstrated enjoyment and higher-than-usual engagement with the topic of road safety, indicating the potential for maintained awareness throughout life
- For Upper Primary pupils in particular, the resources also proved effective in making well-known messages relevant to them at their age
- The delivery of road safety education has also been made easier and more coordinated within class or year groups at particular settings
- There is some evidence to suggest that parental engagement was also becoming more built in to road safety delivery plans
- However, there is no evidence to suggest that the resources have been successful in helping a more coordinated approach between schools or settings and RSOs or other intermediaries. This is a key area to explore at Stage 2.

Full conclusions are included at the end of this report.
2. Context

2.1. Background

The Department for Transport’s (DfT’s) THINK! road safety campaign was first launched in 2000 as the banner under which all government road safety messages would be delivered with the aim to reduce the number of road casualties by 2010. Since then, awareness of the campaign has grown and brand recognition is high. There is a vast array of materials, such as booklets, posters and media downloads available to support the campaign, as well as a full above-the-line media campaign.

In 2008, the DfT decided to separate child and adult marketing strategies in relation to the THINK! campaign to focus on the formation of good road-sense habits among children, in contrast to the changing of bad habits among adults. As part of this, the Department commissioned EdComs to develop a suite of education resources to support schools in the delivery of road safety education to children within the curriculum.

A three-year education strategy was designed for Early Years, Primary and Secondary settings which aimed to:

- complement the work of other road safety organisations
- reflect the needs of different age groups, teachers, parents and other intermediaries
- use an up-to-date presentational style and tone of voice
- ensure the resources are identifiable across the educational stages and reflect the above-the-line strategy and approach.

A number of sets of resources were designed to correspond to particular age groups at different stages of education. Each resource set has different learning goals and development pointers that build on the previous set to provide children and young people with a cohesive and holistic road safety education journey. The specific goals for each education stage are outlined below:

**Pre-school (Early Years)**
- Sets of rules
- Strategies for parental involvement
- Support and tools for parents
- Resources that aid communication between parent and child

**5-7 years old (Lower Primary)**
- Educate on cause and effect
- Skills development through involvement in decisions
- Explanation of rule
- Communication skills (especially between parent and child)
- Problem solving in familiar situations

**7-11 years old (Upper Primary)**
- Independent decision-making
- Transition
- Proactive responsibility for decision-making
- Hazard identification
- Risk management
- Problem solving
- Moving towards greater freedom so show more complex/less familiar situations

**11-14 years old (Lower Secondary)**
- Transition
- Risk management
- Ability to apply learning to different scenarios
- Recognition of peer influence
- Fit with other issues/dangers
- Transferable rules and skills
- Making difficult choices

**14-16 years old (Upper Secondary)**
- Positive peer influence
- Peer education
- Team work
- Challenge risk behaviour
- Consequence of actions/future projection
- Reassess attitude and behaviour
- Relate to aspirations e.g. driving

The Primary site (including Early Years, Lower Primary and Upper Primary) includes a range of resources for pupils, teachers, senior management, parents and other intermediaries such as RSOs. Resource materials include interactive games and activities for pupils, stories, worksheets, audio-visual content, teacher notes and lesson ideas. All content that is not interactive (i.e. all text or picture-based content) is available to download from the site or to order in print format via the THINK! catalogue online or over the phone.

In addition to these resources intended for use in primary schools, materials have also been developed for out-of-school groups to help the issue of road safety be addressed in non-formal education environments, and a stakeholder toolkit designed specifically for road safety professionals.

The Secondary resource is designed to be delivered online via a set of interactive activities. It also contains information for students and parents, lesson plans for teachers and access to media campaigns.

Materials were developed in stages and have been launched at different times across 2009 and 2010 as follows:
- Early Years and Upper Primary resources; Primary Senior Management Toolkit – launched April 2009
- Lower Primary resources – launched late February 2010
- Out-of-school resources – launched March 2010
- Stakeholder toolkit – to be launched January 2011
- Secondary transition lessons; Road Safety Education (Senior Managers’ Toolkit) – launched June 2010
- Bulk of the Secondary resources – launched September 2010

Following the launch of the resources, the DfT have commissioned a formative evaluation into the uptake, usage and value of the resources in order to understand how this new set of curriculum resources fit within the schools road safety environment.
3. Objectives

The evaluation aims to assess the success and impact of the THINK! Education strategy against initial KPIs set out for the education programme, as far as is possible. These are:

1. **Awareness of the resources** – what proportion of pre-school, schools and out of school groups are aware of the resources?
2. **The uptake of the resources** – how many resources have been ordered and how many teachers, parents and students have been exposed to them?
3. **The quality of materials produced** – how do those who have used the resources rate their usability, credibility and relevance, and how engaging are they for young people, teachers, parents and other intermediaries?
4. ***Awareness and understanding** – to what extent have the messages outlined in the strategy for the specific resources and target audiences been clearly conveyed and understood?
5. ***Attitudes towards road safety** – to what extent have the resources increased knowledge and changed attitudes in line with the desired learning goals for each of the target audiences?
6. ***Road safety behaviour** – to what extent have the resources affected road safety behaviour, and equipped pupils with skills set out in the education strategy, for being a pedestrian, cyclist, passenger and, in later life, a driver and motorcyclist?

In addition to these KPIs, the DfT also want to understand the impact the THINK! Education resource materials have had on delivery. Specifically, how they have:

7. Helped teachers, parents, RSOs, police officers and youth group leaders to deliver a coordinated approach to child road safety education; this includes understanding how the THINK! resources fit within the wider context of other resources used and safety topics covered.
8. Integrated with other THINK! road safety materials to benefit from the brand as a trusted and recognised source of information.

In order to ensure the education materials are offered in the most cost effective way in the future, the evaluation also aims to recommend how the mix of online and offline materials should be configured going forward. This will be done by exploring the following:

9. What are users’ expectations of online versus print materials?
10. What are teachers’ preferences for downloading/ordering materials and what is their capacity for printing resources in particular?
11. What are the **most desirable print materials** they would want to continue ordering?

12. How does the extent of the current *THINK! Education* offline provision **compare to other** education programmes?

Different objectives are addressed at different stages of the evaluation, according to the audience and methodology. However, each stage builds on the next to provide a holistic overview across the resource set at the end of the project. This is described in detail in the Methodology section below.

The evaluation has been designed to be a formative evaluation of the *THINK! Education* resources. For this reason, emphasis is placed on examining the effectiveness of the materials and their format of delivery, which may shape any changes or development of the resources going forward.

*Notes on objectives 4, 5 and 6*

The aim of this stage of the evaluation in relation to objectives 4, 5 and 6 was to provide insight based on anecdotal evidence in a small number of settings on the potential impacts of the resources on knowledge, attitude and behaviour change. An attempt to measure the effectiveness of the *THINK! Education* resource in changing attitudes, behaviour and knowledge is not within the scope of these objectives and would require longitudinal research with test and control groups.

Objectives to be explored as part of Stage 2 are discussed in section 8 on page 74 of this document.
4. Methodology

4.1 Overview of methodology

Research is to take place in three iterative stages according to the launch date of different areas of the resource. Stages 1 and 2 focus on the Primary and out-of-school resources, while Stage 3 will focus on the Secondary schools offer. Stage 3 methodology is yet to be confirmed and will in part be shaped by learnings from Stages 1 and 2.

This document is a report on the Stage 1 findings only and as such the methodology taken for Stage 1 only is outlined below. The approach to Stage 2 methodology is addressed in section 8 on page 74 of this document.

As outlined in section 3, the methodology has been designed to meet different objectives at different stages of the evaluation. For Stage 1, Objectives 2-12 have been addressed, in particular relation to Early Years and Upper Primary areas; however, these cannot be fully addressed via the qualitative methodology used alone. It is intended that findings from this stage will be built upon and added to at Stage 2.

The methodology for Stage 1 is described in detail below.

4.2 Addressing the objectives at Stage 1

Stage 1 of the evaluation assessed the effectiveness of the DfT THINK! Education resources in relation to Early Years (under 5s) and Upper Primary (7-11s) age groups. Specifically, therefore, it has aimed to understand the following in relation to resources designed for these age groups:

- The quality of the resources, including the perceived usability, credibility and relevance
- Perceived effect on children’s awareness and understanding of Road Safety
- Perceived effect on children’s attitudes towards Road Safety
• Perceived effect on children’s road safety behaviour in the immediate term
• The impact on the approach to Road Safety education delivery, including how easily the resources can be incorporated into lessons alongside other road safety resources
• The fit with other THINK! materials
• Expectations and experiences of using the resources, including levels of enjoyment and engagement of pupils, teachers and group leaders
• Preferences for format of delivery
• Comparison with other road safety resources in relation to usage, preference, awareness and access

It was felt that a qualitative approach was most appropriate to address these objectives, in order to gain a full and detailed understanding of how the resources could be practically implemented in schools across the country. However, findings therefore cannot be generalised to the wider population for this Stage. Stage 1 will provide context for the wider quantitative survey at Stage 2, which will seek to understand the country-wide picture of resource uptake and awareness in addition to usage and appeal.

Stage 1 of the evaluation also included analysis of the requestor database and web site traffic. This will be built on in subsequent stages of the research to give a full picture of resource uptake.

4.3 Case study visits

4.3.1 Approach
Case study visits were conducted to observe the usage of the THINK! Education resources. This methodology was not designed to be nationally representative but to provide insight that can be viewed within the context of the full evaluation, incorporating qualitative and quantitative Stage 1 and Stage 2 findings.

Researchers observed lessons/ sessions where the resources were used, making note of how the resources were incorporated into the lessons, and levels of engagement throughout. This provided researchers with an in-depth understanding of how road safety was approached and how THINK! resources were being used within road safety education. Teachers and young people were then interviewed in order to gain their perspective on the resources.

Each visit consisted of the following elements:

• Observation of a session on road safety (of varying length depending on the setting)
• Interview with teacher/ session leader (around 30 minutes)
- Mini group discussion with children taking part in session (where age appropriate) (up to 10 minutes)
- Interview with any other teachers or group leaders involved in delivery of the resource (around 15 minutes)

NB: In two sessions, researchers observed teachers using other THINK! branded resources not part of the THINK! Education set. However, these teachers were then asked to run a separate session in which these resources were used, and they were interviewed following this. This process and rationale is explained fully in section 4.3.3 below.

Around three weeks after the visits, teachers/ leaders were re-contacted by telephone to discuss how (if at all) the lessons had been built upon, and to gather any feedback around changes to the behaviour or attitudes of children involved. These interviews were also useful to gauge the extent to which the resources had affected the approach to road safety within the school/group.

Fieldwork took place between 27th September and 4th November 2010.

4.3.2. Sample and recruitment

Five case study visits were conducted as relevant to each of the two resource areas, Early Years and Upper Primary, resulting in 10 case study visits overall. These were split between schools and out-of-school settings as initial examination of the requestor database highlighted a significant number of requests for school resources pertaining to out-of-school settings. It was therefore important to understand how these settings were using the resources also.

Three school and two out-of-school settings were visited for each resource area, to understand the use of the resources within formal and informal learning environments.

Resource users were recruited from contacts on the print requestor database. To ensure representation from a range of settings, recruitment guidelines were set out to be followed according to availability of suitable contacts within the database. The guidelines stipulated as wide a range as possible of the following criteria across each sample (Early Years and Upper Primary):
- Rural/urban/suburban geographic split
- Different levels of deprivation
  - This was ascertained according to certain measures identified within the Spirit Database of schools and colleges throughout the UK (number of free school meals/BME groups/number of pupils with English as a first language)
  - Area rankings on the 2007 multiple deprivation indices were also taken into account where relevant
- Areas identified as having a high incidence of KSI (killed or seriously injured) among children of relevant ages according to 2008 KSI data supplied by the DfT (top 20 number of incidences)
  - This was treated as less important than geographic area and deprivation scale so as not to limit available contacts.

These recruitment criteria were set out to ensure as little bias in the sample as possible towards any particular area or school/setting type. They were not designed to provide a basis for conclusions to be drawn on difference of impact between particular demographic groups or geographical areas. A much larger sample would be required in order to robustly identify any difference of this nature.

No other recruitment criteria, such as the extent to which teachers were using the THINK! Education resources, were set, so as not to bias the sample with any pre-formed ideas as to how teachers should be using the resources. Teachers were identified as resource users if they had ordered print materials, as explained in section 4.3.3 below. As a result, settings were visited that had varying levels of prior experience in using the resources. This provided a broader and more accurate picture of how the resources were being used in practice than a sample pre-recruited to be using materials in a particular way. The report can therefore only outline examples of usage observed during fieldwork. Stage 2 surveying should aim to gain a more accurate picture of how the resources have been used by teachers more widely.

The diagrams below indicate the final sample frame for the Stage 1 case study visits.
4.3.3 Notes on the approach

Defining users
The intended sample consisted of schools and out-of-school groups who were already using the THINK! Education resources, in order to understand the impact using these resources had had on approaches to road safety education.

Due to there being no way to identify website visitors, “users” were defined as those who had ordered print materials. This skewed the sample towards those who were potentially using the online elements of the resource less. However, this approach was taken based on the assumption that those ordering print resources were likely to be using these alongside digital resources. We were therefore able to capture online usage examples via these respondents.

Since Stage 1 recruitment, data capture processes have been put in place on the website in an attempt to capture some online-only users to take part in Stage 2 fieldwork, should this be required. However, it will still not be possible to identify level or extent of engagement with the materials via this data alone. Indeed, in order to gain an accurate picture of how the resources are being used, it is important not to pre-define levels of engagement within recruitment criteria.

Identifying users
A further difficulty in identifying users was the limited amount of information available through the print requestor database. An initial stage of database cleaning was required to acquire contact details for each of the listed institutions.

However, in most cases a named contact was not available, meaning the person who placed the order could not be traced. In these cases, visits were still conducted to willing institutions on the basis that a representative had previously ordered THINK! Education resources and that other members of staff, taking part in this research, had used them.
At some settings, however, no staff members could be identified who had previously used the resources. Due to the limited number of requestor contacts, it was decided to ask some of these settings to run a session or set of sessions using the *THINK! Education* resources in a way that felt appropriate to their setting. This meant a specific session, or set of sessions, was run with teachers or session leaders using the resources for the first time in three different settings – one Early Years setting, one Upper Primary school and one Upper Primary out-of-school group. The emphasis of these visits therefore shifted to understanding how road safety education is normally conducted and how the DfT education resources could fit alongside or add to their current set of resources, rather than understanding the impact already felt of this. These sessions have been analysed alongside the rest of the sample in relation to resource usage observed during the case study visits.

*Identifying relevant resources*

In light of the difficulty in reaching named users of the DfT *THINK! Education* resources, recruiters spoke to potential participants to ascertain whether or not they were using the resources before booking in visits with them. In two cases, teachers claimed to be using the resources but visits brought to light that the specific *THINK!* resources relevant to this evaluation were not being used. In these cases, teachers were asked to run a subsequent session using the education resources. Due to budget and time restraints these sessions were not observed by EdComs researchers but follow-up conversations were held by telephone to understand how they had run and to explore teachers’ response to these resources within the context of other *THINK!*-branded resources previously being used. These conversations included teachers’ thoughts on pupil responses to the resources, and one also gathered parent feedback, which has been included in the analysis for this report. In these settings, the impact of the *THINK!* brand could be assessed as a whole, but the specific impact of the Education resources on policy and approach could only be discussed from a hypothetical stand-point. However, given the length of time between initial contact and follow-up interviews (around 3 weeks) these settings were able to describe how discovering these new resources had already impacted on their approach.

The below diagrams display the sample again, indicating what kind of user each of the settings were:
Early Years settings
Due to the type of provision available for Early Years, and the flexibility of the curriculum framework, the distinction between formal and informal environments is less clear cut than at Upper Primary. As a result, the recruitment of three school and two out-of-school settings for this sample is indicative only of the type of settings visited based on self-classification.

Out-of-school settings were children’s centres but children would still follow a structured day, as they might at school, and these were purpose-built settings. Conversely, preschool and playschool formats could be less structured and held in village halls or similar informal settings. However, all Early Years settings aimed to follow the Early Years framework, ensuring children were stimulated and learning through play and exploration. The distinction between in-school and out-of-school settings for this age group is therefore less relevant than for older children, and we have referred to Early Years settings all together in this report.
4.4 Requestor analysis

Analyses of requestor databases and website activity were carried out. Print requests being placed between the dates of 1st May 2009 and 20th November 2010 were analysed, while internet activity between 5th April 2009 and 10th October 2010 was examined. These dates represent the extent of the data available at the time of analysis. This analysis will be updated at Stage 2 to incorporate requests and downloads between October/November until March 2011.

This analysis aimed to answer the following specific questions in relation to usage of the THINK! Education resources:

- How do most-requested print resources relate to the most-viewed web pages?
- How do key dates e.g. marketing activity, school term dates relate to volume of print requests and website visits?
- Where does the web traffic come from?
- Who is ordering the most materials and in what quantity?

4.4.1 Database analysis

Due to a change in the method of data capture in July 2010, two separate databases relating to print requests were combined into one to be analysed. Media codes were missing from many entries relating to orders made while the original data capture tool was in use, making it impossible to identify the requestor type for some orders.

However, as far as possible, the database was analysed according to volume of request, type of requestor and date of order through the use of pivot tables in Excel. This analysis was then compared as far as possible with download volumes from the website, and implications towards the bigger picture of the resource’s success have been identified where appropriate. Further analysis of the full requestor dataset within the context of quantitative survey research at Stage 2 will provide more conclusive evidence to this effect.

4.4.2 Website analysis

Activity on the website was analysed using the Google Analytics tool. In particular, data on site and page visits over time was observed and compared to key dates relating to marketing activity. Particular areas of the site registering the highest levels of activity were also examined in more detail.

During the month of November 2009 an error occurred in the data capture of the web statistics. For this reason, all data relating to November 2009 has been removed from the website analysis.

For the first few weeks following the launch of the secondary site, data on visits to the secondary and primary sites was combined. It was not possible to separate out overall site visit data during this time and so this was also taken into account during the analysis of website traffic data.
Main findings

The main findings in this report are split into two sections.

**Section A** examines data gained via the case study visits to settings using the *THINK! Education* resources. Findings are relevant to the Early Years and Upper Primary areas of the resource.

**Section B** analyses data from the requestor database and website traffic. Findings are relevant to all areas of the resource between April 2009 and October 2010.
5. Section A - Main Findings

5.1 Road safety education in context

5.1.1 Current approach to road safety education

Road Safety was a topic covered as a matter of course by all the schools and out-of-school groups visited, and was perceived as an important issue to discuss with children from a young age. Approaches were consistent across similar settings and age groups. However, not all schools had a specific policy around road safety and it was not something that always took priority within school educational plans; this was dependent on the situation of the setting, such as the busyness of roads nearby, and other priorities within School Improvement Plans which may take precedence.

In schools at Upper Primary level, the topic was incorporated into the curriculum on an ad hoc basis where it fitted with other topic areas. For example, it was often covered as part of Citizenship or PSHE within broader topics of safety, and was discussed with classes before they went out on school trips. It could also be prompted by concerns around specific road safety issues related to the school’s location, for example busy roads, parked cars. Whole school approaches were also often taken with road safety being a suitable topic for assemblies. This approach meant that road safety was a topic that was covered and reinforced throughout the school year, despite its small part within the curriculum. Due to this constant reiteration of road safety messages, pupils demonstrated good awareness of key pedestrian safety messages by the time they arrived at the end of primary school, namely “stop, look and listen.” With the exception of some younger children in Early Years settings, road safety was therefore not a new topic for any of the pupils involved in this research and all had a good understanding of key messages.

Pupils in Year 6 were afforded particular time to road safety education due to the transition to secondary school. This placed the emphasis on learning to be a responsible pedestrian and on cycling proficiency, as pupils would start to make their way to school independently. Some schools ran cycling proficiency programmes for pupils but may not spend much time in the classroom on road safety lessons.

In Early Years settings, road safety was covered at a much more basic level but was also woven into learning via other key topics. Due to the flexibility of the Early Years framework, topics covered were prompted by the interests of the children and/or parents, and teachers would build on this. For example, teachers said that boys would often like police cars so they would use this interest to cover the topic of traffic, into which road safety would fit. Safety and safeguarding was another key topic area within the framework that was
used to cover road safety, with the emphasis being on holding hands or wearing a seatbelt, and this could be built into many situations. One Early Years setting had run a session on seatbelts after parents mentioned that they were having difficulty with their children sitting tight in their child seats. Due to the young age of children in Early Years settings, messages were being delivered on the assumption that children did not have any prior road safety awareness, and reiterated in order to encourage children to remember them on a more long-term basis. However, it was recognised that they did need to be repeated on a regular basis as children would not retain them otherwise, hence teachers’ tendency to incorporate them where possible across the curriculum framework.

While road safety was covered as appropriate and relevant throughout the school year, the Autumn term was often a key period, specifically due to evenings becoming darker meaning greater care needs to be taken to be seen on the roads. Road Safety Week also takes place during this term and so schools and Early Years settings would gear their teaching of the topic around this. This evaluation took place prior to Road Safety Week and many of the settings involved brought forward their running of road safety sessions to enable observation for the benefit of the evaluation. However, several settings declined taking part in the evaluation due to Road Safety Week taking place after fieldwork as they did not wish to disrupt their termly plan. Website traffic data for uptake during Road Safety Week 2009 is missing so this observation cannot be verified on a larger scale until further website analysis has been carried out for 2010. Another key time of year for road safety education was just before school holidays when children would be playing outside.

School and out-of-school settings at Early Years did not vary in terms of how road safety was approached due to the less clear-cut definition of formal and informal learning at this age: all settings were similar in both approach and aims. However, out-of-school settings relevant to the Upper Primary age group did differ from school settings in their approach to road safety education due to the different function they performed compared to schools.

Both Upper Primary out-of-schools settings covered road safety specifically in relation to working towards a badge. When it was decided that the Cubs or Brownies should get their Road Safety Badge, three or four consecutive sessions would be held in relation to the topic, covering off the requirements set out by the Scout or Guide Association. This included topics such as knowledge of the Green Cross Code. Road safety pointers and reinforcements of the Green Cross Code were also given at punctual points throughout the year, for example when out on trips, similarly to school settings.

However, due to Brownies and Cubs being members of the group for a few years, road safety was not necessarily a topic that was covered each year to save repetition of the same information; once the Road Safety Badge was
earned, there was no need to revisit the topic within sessions. Therefore, road safety was often only dealt with in detail once every few years to ensure it was new information to all the children in the group.

5.1.2 Road Safety resources

Road safety was perceived as a practical topic and as such teachers were often inclined to teach it in a practical way. For this reason, they were often not using teaching resources but relying on props, such as fluorescent jackets or bands, or practical situations, such as actually crossing the road, to teach road safety messages. In Early Years settings in particular, playgrounds were also a key area and many had pretend roads or toy traffic lights, as well as a selection of tricycles and bikes, which teachers would use to reinforce messages when children played with them. At Upper Primary, role play was particularly useful for similar reasons – it helped children visualise the situation and gain as much practical experience as possible within a safe environment.

However, Early Years and Upper Primary school settings were also using a range of classroom resources to reinforce messages. LAs had often provided resources of their own for schools to use, including packs for teachers, with lesson ideas, booklets and information for parents; in some cases, THINK! Education print materials had been included in these packs, for example in Sheffield. Charities such as Brake and CAPT (Child Accident Prevention Trust) were also mentioned as providing resources used by teachers. Bespoke resources being used were typically posters, storybooks and worksheets, but teachers would also make up their own resources such as quizzes, based on their own knowledge, and by searching on the internet for different elements that could be brought together. One teacher mentioned Communicate in Print as a good online source of pictures and posters to use.

However, the THINK! brand was very well recognised in relation to resources for schools. In many cases, resources provided by LAs or charities were branded with the THINK! logo and teachers would associate them with products from the THINK! catalogue. Teachers could often not recall where they got the resources from and assumed they were sent to them by the DfT if they displayed this logo. However, this assumption does not necessarily indicate that teachers were passively expecting resources to be sent to them; rather it illustrates the impact that resource sharing has on end-users’ perceptions of provenance. Colleagues or predecessors had often ordered resources, which had then been added to the pool of general materials used. Teachers dipping into this pool noted THINK! as the prominent brand and so assumed that these materials had been produced by the DfT as part of the same programme. This is encouraging evidence for the strength and awareness of the THINK! brand overall, but becomes problematic in relation to the stand-out of the Education resources within the wider set.
Resources that were being used and regarded as DfT education resources due to THINK! branding included the following:

- **Salman and Friends** – a set of story books for Early Years incorporating road safety messages into stories children can relate to and engage with. This was a Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative resource and was not generally available.
- **DfT THINK! Active Juniors** – another set of stories aimed at Upper Primary. This is not an official DfT resource and so indicates the extent to which the THINK! brand is being used outside of DfT-sponsored resources. CAPT booklets – teacher and parent booklets, as well as picture stories for children, in relation to road safety.

With the exception of one of the CAPT booklets, titled *It’s fun to go out but…*, these resources appear to no longer be in print and so no further information has been found on them. However, what this illustrates is the extent to which teachers retain resources that they have previously used and liked and may not necessarily search for more until they run out or feel they need replacing due to wear and tear. In addition to these, many settings were using old DfT resources such as booklets for parents or worksheets, which they had been using for years and so trusted to provide the information they wanted. The DfT therefore need to be sure to maintain a consistent marketing strategy in order to inform settings of new resources that are published, informing them how these add to and differ from previously produced materials.

In general, it was felt that there was not a huge amount of classroom resources to support the teaching of road safety and teachers had learned to be creative in their approach as a result. There was nothing that linked elements of road safety education explicitly to the curriculum, other than the THINK! Education resources, which were being used often in conjunction with resources or lesson ideas previously used. In general we know that teachers greatly appreciate resources that make explicit links to the curriculum as it makes it easier to plan their use into lessons. However, teachers consulted for this research would not necessarily expect this for resources linked to topics such as road safety that play a minor role in curriculum schemes. For this reason, the THINK! Education resources were set apart by this useful linking but teachers did not appreciate this until they had used them as it was not something they knew to look for when selecting resources to use. This is therefore a key unique selling point to bring out in any marketing information to encourage the uptake of these resources over others that may previously have been used.

In the Upper Primary out-of-school settings, the resource pool was felt to be sparser and groups would often just use the resources provided on the Guide or Scout Association websites as these were easy to find and endorsed by the relevant association. However, there was also less expectation for bespoke resources and group leaders approached the topic of road safety from a more practical and creative viewpoint than teachers within school and Early Years settings. Resources needed would often just
include art material to make a poster, or game ideas. Copies of the Green Cross Code were often most useful for these groups as children had to demonstrate knowledge of this to earn their badge.

Group leaders often also lacked the time or means to look for resources online because they needed to do this in their own time – employers did not appreciate leaders spending time at work on voluntary out-of-work activity, and this also meant that printing off resources was an issue for many. This suggests that hard copy resources, such as the out-of-school group leaders notes booklet produced by the DfT within the THINK! Education programme, are the most suitable for these settings.

5.1.3 Other road safety intermediaries

Schools and Early Years settings all had relationships with local RSOs (Road Safety Officers) who would come into the school or setting to run sessions, or take children out to events at particular points in the year. These would usually tie in to specific activity, such as Road Safety Week or a relevant PSHE day or topic. However, teachers were often quite removed from this process and did not know much detail about what was covered or which resources were used by RSOs during these sessions. Children’s centres visited tended to know more about the work of the RSOs and spoke about their ongoing relationship, but were still unclear as to which resources were being used and how they fitted with those already being used by teachers.

Similarly, visits from the Police and Fire Service had taken place in most schools and Early Years settings visited, but teachers were not always sure of exactly what was covered or how. Within these sessions, road safety tended to be covered within the broader topic of safety more generally and speakers would give practical advice and demonstrations. There was no particular pattern noted in relation to the frequency of these visits across the year, but key campaign or themed weeks, such as Safety Week or Road Safety Week, would often provide the catalyst.

In one school, there was also involvement from a local secondary school in relation to road safety. Here, sixth form students had come in to deliver an interactive theatre piece to pupils on road safety. However, this was not a regular occurrence.

This approach to using other intermediaries within road safety education indicates a certain lack of cohesion. Teachers would programme in visits from external agents to be in time with Road Safety Week or relevant PSHE days where road safety would be tackled and so they would be coordinated visits in relation to timeliness; however, there was no evidence of a coordinated delivery approach between schools or settings and the external deliverer in relation to the content or scope of the sessions.
The Cub and Brownie groups visited had a much lower level of interaction with external intermediaries. Police workers had given talks in the past but not in relation to road safety. Road safety was therefore a topic that was delivered entirely by the group leaders and assistants in these settings.

5.1.4 Engaging parents in road safety

Parental engagement is a topic of great import within the primary school setting. However, in relation to road safety, engagement with parents and carers was observed on a minimal scale in both school and out-of-school settings. It was observed by teachers that it was hard to reach the parents who would benefit the most from learning about road safety as they would typically not pay as much attention to attempts at engagement.

The most common form of parental engagement was to include road safety information within regular newsletters that went home. This was designed to give parents tips or information about road safety, such as wearing seatbelts, but in no observed cases had this activity been followed up by teachers. At Upper Primary level, this was the main method of parental engagement around road safety as other core curriculum topics, such as literacy and numeracy, were considered more important to engage parents with.

Posters were another common tool used for parental engagement, as they were put up for parents to see when they came to drop off and pick up their children. This was particularly the case for Early Years settings, and children’s centres especially, where children were younger and so parents were relied on more to reinforce important messages.

Children’s centres also had a broader remit to include parents and run parental events and so road safety was a topic that had been covered during these sessions by both children’s centres visited. For example, one centre had run a joint session with their linked primary school where parents who were dropping off their children in the morning were invited to stay and attend a session on safety, including road safety. This event was also attended by the centre’s RSO. Regular evening and daytime sessions were also run by children’s centres, which offered the opportunity for parents to enter into dialogue with the centre about road safety issues and learn tips for themselves. However, these sessions were run separately to sessions with Early Years children and were not specifically aimed at parents of children in Early Years so did not form part of a coordinated approach to road safety education within families.

In Upper Primary out-of-school settings, no parental engagement activity was observed. Parents dropped their children off and then came to pick them up very swiftly, and it was not considered within the remit of the group to involve parents in topics or activities being carried out within sessions.
5.2 Discovering the THINK! Education resources

None of the schools or settings visited recalled having ordered print resources from the THINK! catalogue. This is symptomatic of the number of resources teachers are used to receiving across the curriculum, and we know from experience that teachers often cannot remember everything they have ordered due to the volume of need. This means that road safety resources are also competing for stand-out against resources linked to other curriculum areas, and there is the perception of a constant influx of resource marketing (however, this was not examined within the scope of this study).

Consequently, most teachers could not remember how they had first heard of or acquired the THINK! resources, despite having a rich selection available at their school or Early Years setting. Indeed, in many settings there was a bank of road safety resources being used and added to by different staff members at different times, resulting in a lack of clarity around their provenance. As Section 4.3.3 outlines, this resulted in there being several settings where the resources had been ordered but had not been shared or used by teachers.

Stage 2 should be able to shed light on the proportion of those having ordered the resources who have actually used them, to understand how widespread an issue this is.

However, the THINK! brand was very well respected and teachers and out-of-school group leaders were aware that they had been using resources branded as part of the THINK! campaign. This did cause some confusion in terms of observing usage of the current THINK! Education resources, and two settings observed were mistakenly using resources not part of the new set. This is a clear demonstration of the strength of the THINK! brand yet the lack of stand-out of the education materials within this, as already discussed in the previous section.

Nonetheless, there were a few examples of teachers or group leaders who were sure of how they acquired the current set of THINK! Education resources. One teacher had called up the number on the back of some older THINK! resources to order further copies, and was told there were some new resources available, while a Cub group leader had purposely typed “think” into a search engine to find resources, as he was already aware of the campaign. Both these examples demonstrate further the strength of the THINK! brand. One Early Years teacher recalled finding the resources through typing “personal safety” into an internet search engine. Although she was not specifically looking for THINK! resources, the fact she found them through searching a more generic term is encouraging for the volume of web users being directed to the site. Data on website traffic is provided in Section B of this report.

No schools or Early Years settings visited within the evaluation had heard about the new set of THINK! Education resources via their RSO, despite feeling confident their RSO would know about them. This further supports the
hypothesis that there is a lack of cohesion between schools’ and RSOs’ approach and delivery of road safety education.

Other routes to learning about the resources came from LA information and more generic internet searches. However, where resources were provided through the LA, there had not been a conscious decision to acquire them; rather, the LA included teacher or parent booklets as part of a pack. This dampened the brand awareness and it was not clear to teachers in these cases that the materials were part of the same THINK! Education set as those found online.

5.3 THINK! Education resource usage

The evaluation observed several different uses of the THINK! Education resources that build a picture of the impact the resource set has made to settings and children. In all cases, lesson ideas were taken from the site and adapted to suit teachers’ or session leaders’ needs, and often incorporated into lessons using other resources or ideas. THINK! Education was felt to be an effective and easy resource to use and adapt in this way.

All settings have been analysed together in relation to resource usage as all had the opportunity to use the resources over a course of time. However, where there are indications as to the different approaches to the resources according to previous usage and level of familiarity, these have been drawn out.

5.3.1 Usage within Early Years settings

Most of the Early Years sessions observed covered several topics from across the resource, which all linked together. There was not the sense that the resource was being covered systematically via different topic areas being covered in succession. Instead, key messages were focussed on one at a time and brought together for reiteration across one or several sessions. The most important messages were considered to be:

- Traffic awareness
- Holding hands and crossing the road
- Wearing a seatbelt
- Wearing bright clothing
- Traffic light colours

These were felt to fit with the Early Years curriculum framework and this did not differ in settings where the THINK! Education resources had not previously been used.

Within Early Years settings, print materials were more popular than interactive activities. This was partly to do with a lack of access to the internet or
interactive whiteboard in many settings, but also a general sense that more kinaesthetic learning approaches were most appropriate to engage children at this age. Lesson ideas were therefore taken from the teachers’ section in line with this. Lessons were also less rigidly planned than at Upper Primary level and teachers would often improvise an activity, such as role play, based on the interests of the children. Again, this was observed in settings where the resources had been previously used as well as in those using them for the first time.

Due to this lack of facilities, no teachers ran group activities via the interactive whiteboard with this age group. One teacher set up a computer for children to play the Be Bright Be Seen game on individually with the help of the teaching assistant, and another mentioned that she planned to set up the computer in the foyer of the children’s centre for parents to play on with their children. This meant that the online material was not fully taken advantage of at this level, and the resource acted in many cases more as a useful guide for teachers, in conjunction with the posters which were useful visual prompts.

In line with the general approach to road safety education, which was less structured at this age compared to Upper Primary, usage of the resource was also on an ad hoc and flexible basis, with no settings having set out plans to follow the resource through the various stages. However, this is not to say that only one-off sessions were held. In one children’s centre trialling the resources for the first time, the teacher had built in a lesson using the resources to follow-on from a previous PE lesson teaching children about traffic light colours, and in another pre-school a whole day was spent holding various sessions focussing on different themes throughout.

Below are provided more detailed examples of how the materials were observed being used.

Examples of usage
One of the most popular ways of using the resources was via discussion around the traffic poster. This poster was shown to children either via the interactive whiteboard, if available, or in print copy, and the teacher would discuss with them each of the vehicles. This approach had the advantage of letting the children see what they found interesting in the picture, which the teacher could then generate relevant discussion around, as is the approach recommended within the Early Years framework. One teacher used the sounds attached to the online version of this poster to talk to pupils about what noises different vehicles make, but could only play these from her own laptop; other teachers covered traffic noises within their discussion of the print copy. This was a discussion that children generally seemed to enjoy as they could talk about their own cars, their own observations, and make their own noises.

Crossing the road was also a key theme addressed within the observed Early Years sessions, and two of the sessions used the story, Bansi the Best to
cover this. In one session the teacher read out the story of Bansi projecting the relevant PDFs onto the interactive whiteboard to illustrate it. In another session, the teacher role played the story with the children, incorporating the idea of needing to hold hands when crossing the road, and used print outs of the different crossings from the online resource to show children what they looked like and the buttons they needed to press when using them.

Another common way to use the resources at this age was to incorporate simple role play to reinforce the message of holding hands, as mentioned above. Several teachers played very simple role play games with the children, walking them around the classroom or the playground holding hands, telling them to stop, look and listen when they came to an imaginary road. The children all enjoyed this kind of activity as it was active and they could play in a group. Stay Close to Klara was also used to reinforce the message about holding hands once children were sat on the carpet for carpet time after an activity had taken place. At one children’s centre, the message about holding hands was reinforced further by an exercise where the children had to colour in a hand and then draw around their own and colour it in. This was not an activity taken from the THINK! Education site although the teacher attributed the worksheet to the DfT. This is therefore an example of resources being used under the assumption of their DfT provenance, without their forming part of the THINK! Education set. This was a worksheet that had been used for a few years, such that the teacher believed it was attributable to the DfT without knowing exactly where it had come from.

Song was also a popular tool used to reinforce road safety messages. One teacher taught the children The Car Seat Click while other teachers used their own songs in relation to traffic light colours and “stop, look, listen”. The fact teachers were using their own songs illustrates the relevance of this as a teaching tool, and therefore the effectiveness of the Car Seat Click song in the THINK! Education site. Children all enjoyed learning and singing songs, which were always reinforced by talking about the subject of the song throughout other activities to provide context and meaning.

Two of the sessions observed used dressing up to teach children about the right kind of clothing to wear. In one session this was incorporated with the role play of Bansi the Best, while in the other it was a stand-alone activity taken from the lesson ideas on the THINK! Education website. One teacher also ran a dressing-up session as a follow-up to the observed session in their sensory room so that children could see the brightness of the reflective clothing under UV light. This was a variation on the suggested site activity and illustrates the creativity and flexibility that teachers were adding to the suggested activity ideas on the site. This was a very popular activity with the children and was felt to be effective in teaching them about wearing the right colour clothing outside.
Finally, reiterating the meaning of traffic light colours was also something that was covered in several of the Early Years sessions. One teacher had run a previous PE lesson where she had made the hall into a road and used coloured card cut into circles to represent the traffic lights. All the children were told they were cars and had to stop, go or get ready according to the colour that was held up. At the beginning of the observed lesson, the teacher recapped this, testing children’s memories of what each of the colours meant. At the end of the session, she handed out the outline drawings of the green man from the site and her own version of a red man, and asked the children to colour them in the right colours according to whether they were standing (red man) or walking (green man). Most children were able to do this, although some used their own colours or mixed all three colours together, demonstrating a lack of understanding of the task rather than a lack of understanding of the meaning of the different colours.

Response of children
Children within Early Years settings were all clearly engaged in learning about road safety via these delivery methods. Teachers were able to hold their attention for longer than they normally would on one topic due to the variety and creativity of the approaches used. It was clear through observation that children were enjoying the tasks: they were able to walk away if they got bored yet this happened rarely. The excitement with which the children shouted out responses to questions, volunteered for role play, sang songs and tried on brightly coloured clothing was testament to their enjoyment of the lessons using the resources.

5.3.2 Usage within Upper Primary schools

Lessons observed at Upper Primary level were more structured than those at Early Years and were more focussed in terms of the topics covered; teachers tended to choose a theme and spend a whole session on that. However, in general, teachers had still tailored their use of the resource to fit with their own scheme of work, rather than working through the sections systematically. This was seen as a positive attribute of the resource in that it could be easily adapted to need. Key themes covered were:

- The Green Cross Code (*Tales of the Road* as a general stimulus and way to raise awareness of road safety)
- Pedestrian Safety (in particular what to wear and paying attention to traffic)
- Crossing the road (how to cross the road safely and sensibly)

These were all felt to fit with and support associated important themes at Upper Primary such as taking responsibility and gaining independence.

In the school where DfT resources had not previously been used, a series of lessons relating to road safety had been run, all centred around *Tales of the*
Road, and observation took place in the last lesson. This indicates a difference in the way the resources had been used compared to schools where the THINK! materials were more embedded and tended to be used on a more one-off basis. However, no conclusions can be drawn from this relating to the difference in usage given the small size of the sample. This is something that should be explored in Stage 2 to gain a fuller picture of how the resources are implemented in primary schools according to level of familiarity with the resources.

Lessons tended to be structured by looking at a piece of information and holding a discussion around it, before setting a creative task where pupils needed to think for themselves. Games were also popular at this level as a good way to engage pupils in what could be perceived as a relatively dry topic.

While lesson ideas were taken from the THINK! Education site, teachers also used the materials in other ways as stimulus within lessons, thus adding their own ideas to those suggested on the site. However, due to the firmer structure of lessons at this level, and the time allowed to pupils to discuss and develop their own ideas, fewer variations of resource usage were observed compared to Early Years settings. This does not imply that the resource is perceived as less versatile for this age group but is merely a factor of different needs at different levels. The resources were thought to be well adapted and adaptable to the needs of teachers at Upper Primary.

However, similarly to Early Years observations, no group interactive activities were carried out online during these lessons. Teachers used the interactive whiteboard to show videos or PDFs, but games were played in smaller groups on individual computers.

**Examples of usage**

The Tales of the Road booklet was popular and was used in different ways by teachers at Upper Primary level, other than those suggested on the site. One teacher asked the pupils to work in groups to create a poster communicating the key messages from specific pages of the booklet; another (the first-time user described above) used the booklet alongside the adverts as a stimulus for discussion over a few weeks. In the final session, which was observed, he set pupils the task of designing a game to teach young children about road safety, based on what they had learned from the Tales of the Road. In both lessons, these were stimulating and enjoyable activities for the pupils as they were able to apply their knowledge to something creative, thus reinforcing the messages they had learned. The activities set, however, had been adapted from their current forms in the THINK! Education lesson ideas.

The videos were also used within lessons as a stimulus for further discussion. One teacher showed the Kerr’s Story video after the poster activity described above and set the pupils the accompanying worksheet. However, this was a
discursive exercise and once different sections of the worksheet had been completed, she went through the answers with the pupils, replaying sections of the video where necessary. Throughout, pupils were encouraged to think about different ways the accident could have been avoided as well as how each of the people involved felt.

**Snakes and Hazards** and **Code Breaker** were also used during one of the observed sessions with a group of Year 5 pupils. The games were used as a plenary to the lesson, which had focussed on pedestrian safety. The teacher showed them how to play using the interactive whiteboard, but then pupils worked in pairs on a laptop so that they could work at their own pace.

However, in addition to these examples, teachers also made up their own resources, or used alternative resources within the observed lessons. Examples of this are given below.

One teacher made up a quiz based on *Tales of the Road* which he played with pupils at the start of the lesson as a refresher of previous lessons. This was run on the interactive whiteboard and was made very active and dynamic by asking pupils to stand up and demonstrate their answers, for example, how to stand when crossing the road. The teacher preferred this delivery of the quiz to using the interactive activities and it meant he could choose the questions he asked. This then led into the rest of the lesson using the *Tales of the Road* booklet and so demonstrated the versatility and adaptability of the materials provided on the **THINK! Education** site.

Another teacher ran a lesson using a different set of resources associated with the DfT called **Active Juniors**. This was an example of confusion where the resources had been branded with the **THINK!** logo and therefore assumed to be the most relevant resources for schools. This lesson incorporated role play around the discovery of an accident, which the pupils enjoyed as it was very active and required them to apply knowledge they had learned. The **THINK! Education** resources reinforced similar messages around independent thinking and decision-making.

**Response of pupils**

Overall, pupils at Upper Primary were highly engaged in the lessons observed using the resources in this way. The opportunities to use creativity and apply their acquired knowledge to tasks were greatly appreciated and were found highly enjoyable. The variety of activities covered within lessons, and within series of lessons where more than one was spent on road safety, was also successful in maintaining pupils’ engagement in the topic. Despite road safety seeming like a dry topic, the way the resources were used to deliver it in an interactive way managed to bring it to life and make it fun for the pupils. This was noted in pupils’ reactions during observation of the lessons being run, but also by pupils themselves during post-lesson mini focus groups.
“I liked the games. You’re still learning something from the game but it’s still fun. I learned where the best places to cross are.”
(Year 5 pupil)

5.3.3 Usage within Upper Primary out-of-school groups.

Within the out-of-school groups, leaders used the resources to help children work towards their Road Safety badge. Due to the lack of internet connection in the settings (village or community halls) leaders were unable to use any of the interactive resources online and so conducted offline activities with the children. In both settings the school resources were used instead of the out-of-school leaders’ book. For the Cubs, this was due to the out-of-school resources not being available when the leader initially came across the resources. For the Brownies, this was what had been used by the leader asked to try out the resources for the purposes of this evaluation.

Despite the similar objectives and available resources, sessions were structured in different ways in each of the observed settings and little commonality was found between them. This cannot be attributed to the different levels of familiarity with the resources since many other variables may have been influential. However, it can be noted that the Cub leader who had found the resources prior to the out-of-school resources being available had not noted this new addition to the set as he had just gone back to the same resources (videos) he had previously found. The DfT need to be careful to market this new addition to the resource set clearly to those who may have come across the resources prior to bespoke out-of-school materials being made available.

Examples of usage
The Cubs were shown the video of Kerr’s Story on a laptop brought in by the leader. There was no internet connection in the hall where the session took place, but the leader had been able to download and save the videos from the site to his laptop, which he appreciated being able to do. The video was shown twice and the children were then given the associated worksheet from the lesson plan to complete. They conferred while doing this, and the leader then went through the answers with them via discussion. The leader commented that he would not normally take this approach to sessions as it made them too similar to school, but the opportunity to do it every now and again was welcome. He had previously found the videos when the resources had first been launched and so repeated the session without noticing any new resources made for out-of-school groups. This session was one of a series that had been planned in for cubs to work towards their badge.

The Brownies session was the third of four lessons being planned. In previous sessions Brownies had played the Snakes and Hazards game offline, covered the Green Cross Code, conducted role plays relating to seat belt usage, done the worksheet on road signs and learned about traffic lights.
In this session, they were asked to create posters relating to the Green Cross Code and spent the whole session on this. This was a clear demonstration of previous learning that had taken place, and the children all enjoyed the opportunity to be creative. Following sessions were to be run looking at bright clothing and using the out-of-school booklet which the leader had just discovered. After this, children who had attended all sessions were to be awarded their road safety badge.

Response of children
In out-of-school settings, children also appeared to be highly engaged in the topic of road safety via the use of these resources and boredom levels were visibly low.

Children had mixed opinions about the video session as some of them disliked the writing task. However, others enjoyed the writing task as it gave them the opportunity to think. Most enjoyed watching the video and were attentive and engaged throughout.

The Brownies also all visibly enjoyed the observed session and claimed to have enjoyed the previous sessions held. They enjoyed being able to learn important information through carrying out a creative or fun task, with the poster activity being particularly popular.

5.3.4 Parental engagement

Most Early Years settings and some schools had made use of the Home-link sheets by sending these home to parents in lieu of information sheets they would otherwise have made themselves. Some schools had set these tasks as homework for the pupils, but had not followed up on whether it had been done. One infant school was also planning to put the home-link sheets up on the personalised learning section of the school VLE (virtual learning environment) so that parents could access it from home.

Posters were also a useful way to engage parents in road safety and many of the schools and Early Years settings had put up posters from the THINK! Education set to bring issues to parents’ attention.

At the children’s centres, sessions were regularly held with parents around various issues relating to parenting. One centre had held a specific session around the THINK! Education online resources as part of their follow-up activity within the revised methodology (this was a centre who had been using other THINK! resources). This session was used to show parents the site and the activities they could do on there with their children, as well as information for them. It was the first time this had been done at the centre and feedback from parents was positive. As a result, the centre was planning to hold further sessions in the future using the THINK! Education resources in a similar way.
5.4 Quality of the resources

5.4.1 Users’ responses to the resources

Overall the resources were considered to be of an exceptionally high quality. Teachers and group leaders commented on both the volume and topic coverage of the materials, with particular comments on the breadth of the issues that were covered, and the diversity of approaches available in order to ensure variety in the lessons.

Within Early Years and Upper Primary school settings, teachers were used to tailoring resources to their specific needs and found that the THINK! Education materials were easy to use and adapt in this respect. The teaching ideas in particular were praised as being easy to use and interpret as materials were clearly linked in where relevant, and teachers were able to select certain activities or run the whole lesson as outlined. The stories and videos in particular were felt to be a highly effective way to introduce the topic of road safety to children.

Out-of-school settings also found the resources well put-together and easy to use, despite both groups using resources primarily aimed at school settings. The main issue in these settings was the lack of internet access, but the ability to print off most of the materials needed to carry out the games offline was appreciated.

In addition to lesson plans and materials being easy to use, the website itself was felt to be easy to navigate by all teachers and group leaders, with no usability issues to highlight. The look and feel of the site was also generally praised, with the cartoon style feeling appropriate for most ages. Children in Year 6 were beginning to find the drawings a little too young to appeal to them, but the range of activities within the lesson ideas counteracted any sense that the resource was not aimed at children of their age.

Due to the very strong brand credentials attached to the THINK! campaign, the resources were immediately understood to be authoritative and trustworthy. Indeed, some teachers and leaders had specifically searched online for THINK! resources, or had ordered the current set on the strength of previously produced resources. Those who had not, were already using a wide range of non-catalogue THINK! resources which provided implicit credibility to this new set. In this respect, the resource was felt to meet, and even exceed, expectations.

Whether or not the resources had been specifically sought out on the strength of the campaign brand, all those consulted as part of the Stage 1 evaluation recognised their strength in terms of fit within the curriculum. It was noted among all teachers, regardless of their previous knowledge of the
resources that these resources, as well as being easy to use, were unique within the road safety offer in setting out clear lesson ideas and curriculum links. This made them easy to fit into lessons where relevant and presents a major USP. Despite some issues with brand stand-out within the rest of the THINK! catalogue, the THINK! Education resources did therefore provide a differentiated and advantageous offer to Early Years and Upper Primary users compared to other THINK! resources and other road safety resources used. This needs to be clearly communicated in all marketing materials.

“If you look on the internet for resources on road safety this is probably the most up-to-date and the one that uses media the best. I’d say it’s the best out there really. If you’re looking for road safety resources there isn’t anything better than that available to teachers.”

(Year 5 teacher, Upper Primary)

“I liked this resource as it was basic. Other resources are only for older kids and take it for granted that children have some sort of previous knowledge.”

(Reception teacher, Early Years)

5.4.2 Improvements to the resources

Despite an overall positive reception of the resource set, there were some minor issues brought to light around executional aspects. However, it must be noted that the majority of these issues were mentioned only once probed and as isolated incidents. This suggests they are not major issues in relation to the quality.

Print Resources
While the quality of the print materials provided was felt to be very high in terms of paper quality and colour definition, the size of the A4 posters created some issues for the Early Years setting. Where interactive whiteboards were not available, teachers were using the A4 posters to talk through the stories with children. However, these posters were felt to be too small to carry out these discussions effectively as a group. The A2 traffic poster was felt to be the perfect size as it was big enough to put on a wall and discuss with a group of children; there was therefore a call for the other posters to be offered in the same size format also.

Again, within the Early Years setting, it was noted that there was the outline of a green man to print out and colour in, but no red man. One teacher who had carried out this activity with her Early Years class had had to draw and photocopy her own red man standing still for the children to colour in also. She felt it was important to have both the green and red man so that children could understand the difference between the two, and the traffic light colour message could be reinforced. However, this teacher did also note that, while she had carried out the colouring exercise with her children (and it was also observed in other Early Years settings), colouring was not usually
recommended at Early Years and children are encouraged to draw their own pictures rather than colour in pre-defined outlines.

While it was appreciated that there were print alternatives to all the interactive activities so that they could still be played offline, some teachers were a little disappointed with what these text versions offered. In particular, one out-of-school group leader would have liked to be able to print off the Snakes and Hazards board from the site, rather than just the questions and instructions. She had to search online for a Snakes and Ladders board which she printed off from another site. However, even in this case she found the A4 size a little small, and so would have ideally wanted to be able to order a larger print version of the Snakes and Hazards board from the print catalogue. This would also mean that she would have had a high quality version to use and keep for future sessions. She also felt that the text versions of the stories made them a little long and less stimulating for the children than the animated online versions.

“[the resources] were good, but most of the fun games were not accessible to us without the internet. We were left with the boring bits and some of the stories ended up being too long. With Snakes and Hazards it would’ve been good if they provided a board, as I had to download one from somewhere else.”

[Out-of-school group leader, Upper Primary]

However, it is to be noted that this leader was referring to the school resources, not designed for use in out-of-school settings. She had not yet used the out-of-school leaders' booklet, addressing this issue by providing ideas for more creative activities not reliant on connection to the internet.

**Online Activities**

In general, the online materials were found to be of high quality and enjoyable to use. However, for the Early Years settings there was some disappointment that the Be Bright Be Seen game only provided text prompts for the children as most of them could not read at this age. One teacher commented that audio instructions would be helpful as well as simpler visual feedback, such as thumbs up/down or smiley faces, to indicate if the correct answer was selected. This would allow children to play the games more independently. Similarly, it was felt the stories should also have an audio option so that teachers could choose whether to read them out themselves or use another voice. Including more audio options would make the interactive activities more accessible to Early Years settings as they would be able to set up a computer for children to play the games or listen to the stories on individually.

Conversely, one Year 6 teacher felt the interactive activities to be a little basic for his pupils, compared to other online educational games he had seen. For this reason he shied away from using them for fear of disengaging his pupils with the topic. Instead, he made up his own quiz, which he felt to be a more
age-appropriate format than the games supplied to measure learning outcomes. He therefore suggested that the site should include simple quizzes. This teacher felt the two-dimensional graphics on the site held little appeal for his pupils, and some of the pupils also felt that even the more sophisticated cartoon graphics of the *Tales of the Road* stories were too babyish for them. Clearer signposting to activities designed for Transition may have helped this teacher find online activities appropriate for his pupils. Currently, these are hidden within lesson plans for specific topics rather than being independently signposted.

**Format of the resources**

Due to the number of difficulties with internet access within Early Years and out-of-school settings in particular, some teachers and leaders would also have liked to have access to the interactive elements of the site via a DVD, or just the audio aspects via a CD. The media elements of the resources were considered to be a strong differentiating factor of this set of resources, and so teachers and leaders who could not gain easy access to them in their settings were frustrated at this.

The issue of the online format is one that is often highlighted by teachers during resource evaluation. However, most primary schools do have access to the internet in classrooms, and Early Years and out-of-school settings are more likely to have issues relating to this. Since there are a higher number of media and interactive activities requiring the internet aimed at Upper Primary pupils than Early Years, this reflects this likely bias in delivery format and suggests the resources are well designed for needs at different ages. Similarly, the out-of-school leaders' booklet provides activities to be delivered via offline formats, thus catering for the likely lack of internet access in this setting.

Some settings also noted an issue with the level of language required for the resources. Particularly for children and parents with English as another language (EAL) some of the terminology and phrasing was difficult to understand. One Upper Primary teacher used the example of the term “backing out” used in the *Kerr’s Story* video being difficult for less able pupils to understand, and in Early Years settings teachers mentioned they often needed to simplify the stories provided in order to make sure that all the children understood them. These settings also mentioned that the home-link sheets were difficult for many EAL parents to understand, and required extra work on their part to either sit and verbally explain it to them, or rewrite a simpler version. One children’s centre in particular requested that these sheets be made available in other key languages such as Punjabi.

Related to this point, one Upper Primary teacher also felt that some of the activities on the resource were too conceptual and therefore made it harder for pupils to take on board the messages. This was a particular issue again for pupils with a lower level of English, but was also a point made in relation to many children being kinaesthetic learners meaning the more practical the
One children’s centre was planning to put the website up in the foyer of the centre so that parents could look at it when they came in. However, the manager felt that having access to leaflets designed to inform parents about the resource would be useful in signposting them to it. Parents were used to picking up leaflets containing advice in this way and she felt the THINK! Education site was a relevant resource to bring to their attention. The posters had been particularly useful to the centre in raising awareness of road safety among parents, and she felt that leaflets would be a helpful addition in this approach.

5.5 Insight around the potential impact of the resources

5.5.1 Insight around the potential short-term impact on attitudes, behaviour and knowledge

In all settings, teachers and group leaders felt the THINK! Education resources to have had a positive impact on the awareness of road safety among children. This was true in all settings, regardless of how much they had previously used the resources. The three-week gap between the initial observation and the follow-up interview was enough for teachers to note impacts even if they had not previously used the resources. Teachers and group leaders were able to observe increased knowledge within the classroom and increased awareness when out on trips. Where relevant, pupils and children also spoke about how helpful and enjoyable the resources had been. The online format of the resource was also thought to increase the potential for impact as it enabled children to continue engaging with key messages once at home or outside the classroom.

However, it must be noted that these positive outcomes are based on anecdotal evidence observed in a small number of settings, who used the materials in various and differing ways. Conclusive evidence relating to the effectiveness of the THINK! Education resource in changing attitudes, behaviour and knowledge cannot be drawn from this study alone.

Impacts on children at Early Years

It was clear during observations that children in Early Years settings were understanding the road safety messages they were being taught. This was evident through their repetition of the messages such as calling out the
correct traffic light colours or holding each others’ hands during road-crossing role plays. Some children who were old enough were also able to tell researchers what they had learned during the lesson.

“If there’s a zebra crossing we need to stop, look and listen.”

(Reception pupil, Early Years)

Teachers also provided anecdotal evidence of a greater awareness of road safety in general when on outings. For example, teachers had noted children making a point of holding hands when out on the road and telling adults they needed to be holding their hands. Not only did this demonstrate learning and understanding of key road safety messages and the ability to translate these into improved behaviour, but it also contributed to developing independence skills as children were learning to look out for their own safety, and ensure that adults are keeping them safe.

Further examples of developing wider skills were also observed. At one preschool, the teacher had held the How Traffic Moves activity with children, encouraging them to talk about different vehicles using toys. She felt that this had developed their communication, speaking and listening skills, as well as their knowledge of different traffic, as they had to explain what they knew about their vehicle and listen to what others said about theirs.

“Taking the vehicles out of the bag was useful because it got them to talk to each other and practice their communication skills.”

(Pre-school teacher, Early Years)

Impacts on parents at Early Years
Anecdotal evidence was also provided to support road safety being discussed more between parents and their children. This was important to teachers as they recognised that school learning needed to be reinforced at home and elsewhere.

After one playschool ran a THINK! Education lesson last year on car seats, in response to a request by a parent, some parents then commented that their children had spoken about this at home; children were also more willing to sit tight in their car seats after the lesson. This is a clear demonstration of the successful impact this lesson had had on both children’s attitudes and behaviour, and the communication between parents and children around road safety.

One children’s centre had also noted parents talking to their children about the posters they had from the site up in the corridors. This was notable as parents had not previously shown engagement in this topic with their children. Again, this demonstrates the THINK! Education resources’ role in facilitating communication around road safety between children and their parents or carers.
Another children’s centre had also run a session with parents on the THINK! Education site. This was as part of follow-up activity using the new THINK! Education resources rather than older resources previously being used. Feedback forms were gathered from this session. Parents were very positive about what they had learned and commented that it had helped them think about road safety and how to tackle the issue with their children. Some of them had children who were still too young for the topic to be relevant, but they claimed to feel better prepared for when their children do reach that age. This is obviously an immediate response and can only be indicative of any longer term impact, but does illustrate the effectiveness of the resource in placing road safety in parents’ minds as an important topic.

“I will introduce my child to the website and keep discussing road safety as she gets older, particularly towards winter months.”
(Parent of two-year-old, Early Years)

Impacts on pupils at Upper Primary
Case study visits also noted a high degree of engagement and enjoyment in sessions among pupils using the THINK! Education resources at Upper Primary level. During post-session group discussions, pupils demonstrated a high level of recall of the messages and facts they had learned during the sessions, and teachers spoke about pupils asking when the next session would be. There was consistency between the impacts noted at this level across school and out-of-school settings.

It was generally felt by teachers and group leaders that the resources did not teach children new information but that they worked to reinforce messages and bring road safety top of mind. While children knew the “rules” the resources helped them to understand the reasons for these and the consequences for not following them. However, certain key messages were retained as new information that was relevant in particular to children at Transition. These were:
- Road accidents are the biggest cause of accidental death among teenagers
- Listening to MP3s and wearing hoods could be dangerous when crossing the road

This is information that would not necessarily have been covered before and so stood out. The fact it made the messages relevant to the children’s age group was also significant in the extent to which it was retained. As such, Year 5 and 6 teachers also felt it prepared pupils well for their transition to secondary school.

“If you’re listening to your ipod or MP3, what if a car’s coming and it’s reversing and it might not see you because you’ve got a hoody on and you can’t see the car. It’s quite dangerous.”
(Year 6 pupil, Upper Primary)
However, although these messages were recalled immediately after the sessions, teachers were less confident as to the long-term impact on attitudes and behaviour. They found it harder to keep track of this due to pupils only being with them for a year before moving on to the next class or school, but did feel that using these resources had helped pupils’ general road safety awareness and knowledge. Most had a sense that road safety attitudes had improved, but were unable to provide any specific examples to evidence this in practice.

One Brownie leader was able to provide anecdotal evidence as to the impact of using the resources, however. She had previously held a session looking at road signs with the children and noticed that when they went out on a trip following this, they were noticing road signs and pointing out the ones they had learned. She felt this had had a particular impact on them as it was, again, new information.

This evidence from teachers suggests that, while the resources are effective in reinforcing messages that are already well engrained, the biggest impact on children’s knowledge and attitudes at Upper Primary was around pieces of information that were new to them. Most of the messages included in the resources were felt to be reinforcing road safety messages that pupils at Upper Primary level already knew well. Potentially, these new messages, or new angles on already embedded messages, could then bring road safety back to top of mind and encourage children to re-think about some of the issues they are already aware of. However, the research was not able to identify direct impacts on behaviour at this age via feedback from teachers and group leaders.

Impacts on parents at Upper Primary
No teachers or session leaders at Upper Primary had actively engaged parents in the delivery of the THINK! Education resources. The only parental engagement activity there had been was to send home the home-link sheets in a few cases. However, no follow-up had been sought in relation to these activities and so impacts on parents are not possible to ascertain. No parents had spontaneously provided feedback after receiving these sheets.

Pupils themselves also admitted that they had not and would not speak to their parents about road safety matters following the sessions they had had with the resources. This was not a topic of conversation they would normally broach with their parents and the resources had not encouraged them to do so. However, due to their age and the focus of the resources being on gaining independence, it is perhaps to be expected that this would not necessarily be something they would share with their parents.

However, there was evidence of children sharing what they had learned with other members of their family, such as siblings, if they felt it would be helpful
to them. One girl spoke about how she had reminded her sister of road safety pointers when she went outside to play with her bike.

“My sister was going out with her bike and I told her to wear a reflective vest.”
(Brownie, Upper Primary)

This indicates an awareness of taking responsibility based on the information covered by the THINK! Education road safety sessions, and could indicate a change in behaviour prompted by a more responsible attitude. However, the report cannot be conclusive around this point.

Upper Primary children, therefore, overall were unlikely to talk spontaneously about what they had learned and the difference this had made to them, but their behaviour suggested that they understood when to apply their road safety knowledge.

5.5.2 Impact on approach to road safety education

The THINK! Education resources were felt to enhance the current road safety resource offer and provide a more focussed, structured approach to teaching road safety in schools and out-of-school groups. Despite different approaches to delivery, Early Years settings, Upper Primary schools and Upper Primary out-of-school groups all noted similar impacts in relation to this.

In settings that had not previously used the THINK! Education resources, some changes to the approach taken to road safety education could already be noted in the interim between the observational visit and the follow-up interview. These were in line with the impacts already being noted in settings that had been using the resources for a longer period of time. This is highly positive as it suggests that not only are the resources easy to implement and build in to programmes of learning, but that they have the potential to quickly improve approaches to road safety education in settings where they are used. Stage 2 research should be able to more clearly identify impacts the resource has had on approaches to road safety more generally.

Impact on planning and preparation
A key impact made by the set of resources was the one-stop-shop approach to teaching road safety it facilitated. Teachers and session leaders had been used to looking around for different road safety resources and piecing together activities made from various different materials. However, across the sample of those who had been using the resources for longer, there was felt to be much less need for this since the launch of the THINK! Education materials. This was due to the variety of activities and themes covered by the resources, meaning teachers did not have to look around for stimulating material, but also the helpful way in which the materials were presented,
allowing teachers to dip in and out of lesson plans as they saw fit. Those who were less familiar with the resources also noted this as a key positive attribute and envisaged a much quicker and simpler planning process in future.

The overriding impact this format had on schools’ and Early Years settings’ strategic approach to road safety was that it had helped it become a topic that can be easily planned to slot in to the curriculum wherever needed. Early Years settings in particular noticed that they were able to be much more structured in their approach to road safety education than they had previously been. This potentially makes road safety an even more accessible topic for schools and Early Years settings to access than previously.

“I was looking for something that makes my planning easy and this was perfect as it has curriculum links. I don’t have to devise something myself as most of it is provided.”

(Playschool teacher, Early Years)

One playschool had made plans to order enough fluorescent jackets for each child after using the THINK! Education resources, to be used on outings and in road safety education. This illustrates the shift in importance given to road safety education in this school since the use of the resources and suggests that a similar impact could be observed in other settings also.

For the out-of-school groups, this format had changed the approach leaders took to preparing sessions and so made it an easier topic to cover, but there was less evidence of strategic change. Since road safety was a topic covered on a rotational basis to ensure that it was not repeated with the same set of children, leaders were still only likely to cover it once every few years. The biggest impact for these groups was therefore the time they saved in putting together a session. However, time was a big issue for these leaders as they would have to prepare sessions alongside full-time jobs; it therefore should not be underestimated in terms of the difference it has made, and will make, to their delivery of road safety education. Nonetheless, due to the nature of these groups and their approach to road safety education being linked to badge topics, the resources would be unlikely to increase the frequency with which road safety is covered in these settings.

**Impact on topics covered**

Another impact observed on the approach taken to road safety was the level of detail and topic areas that were covered through the THINK! Education resources. Several teachers noted that the resource suggested activities and provided information that they would otherwise not have used or known about. For example, Upper Primary teachers were encouraged to cover wider thematic areas such as cycling and passenger safety, where previously they would have only covered pedestrian safety. This was identified as an advantage that the THINK! Education resources had over other offers.
In Early Years settings, the same expansion in the topics covered was observed. One infant school noted that these resources had enabled them to teach road safety at an appropriate level for Reception as most resources they had used in the past were better tailored to Year 1 upwards. The resources also provided teachers with new, more creative ideas for delivery, which was appreciated and felt to rejuvenate their approach to the topic overall.

“I don’t think I would have thought about rolling cars down a tube!”
(Pre-school teacher, Early Years)

These factors all worked together to boost teachers’ confidence overall in teaching about road safety. This was particularly mentioned in Early Years settings where staff would change from day to day and so not have the opportunity to learn from each other or build as solid relationships with the children. The THINK! Education resources helped reassure teachers that they were delivering appropriate messages via appropriate methods with children at this age. It was noted that this was something the THINK! Education resources achieved over and above other road safety resources used.

**Impact on parental engagement**

An impact on the approach to parental engagement in road safety education was also noted in some settings. As previously mentioned, Early Years settings and Upper Primary schools had sent home-link sheets home to parents. Although no feedback had been gained from these sheets, this did represent a new approach to parental engagement for many. The home-link sheets were more activity-based and teachers claimed often contained more detailed information than the newsletter updates they had previously been sending in relation to road safety. These sheets also impacted on the time teachers had available to plan trips or other aspects of teaching as they were quick to print off and needed no tailoring.

However, there were more creative ideas for engaging parents which came from using the THINK! Education website. In addition to one school intending to upload the home-link sheets to the VLE, another was planning to have the site up at a parents evening to encourage discussion, and a children’s centre was about to set up a parents’ group where the site would also be used. These were all plans in place among setting previously not using the THINK! Education materials. While these actions have yet to take place meaning no impacts can be seen, what these intentions indicate is that teachers have been prompted to think about new ways to include parents in the delivery of road safety. This represents a potentially important shift in the general approach to parental engagement with this topic, which has previously been passive and minimal.

**Impacts on working with other intermediaries**

Despite clear indications as to the impact of the THINK! Education resources on settings’ approaches to road safety education as outlined above, there
was little or no evidence to support a more cohesive approach between schools and other intermediaries, such as RSOs or Police or Fire service visits. Teachers were aware of when visits were due to take place and how this fitted in with the timetabling of their own teaching of road safety, but were no more aware of what resources outside visitors were using in light of the THINK! Education campaign. For example, no settings talked about following up visits by continuing discussions around the topics covered by external intermediaries, or about planning sessions together with these individuals.

Stage 2 of the evaluation should examine RSOs’ usage of the resources in particular to provide a fuller picture of this interaction. However, these initial findings suggest that the resources could provide greater support to settings and RSOs to help achieve a cohesive, collaborative approach to road safety education.
6. Section B – Main Findings

This section of the report details findings from the web traffic and print requestor analysis. While there are key objectives linked to this section of the methodology, full conclusions relating to these objectives cannot be drawn until the full data can be analysed in the context of quantitative survey findings at Stage 2. This section therefore outlines summative findings but does not seek to conclude the extent to which the THINK! Education strategy has met its aims regarding content mix and reach.

NB: all web data is excluding data from November 2009 due to an error in the data capture tool for this month. Data from the first few weeks following the launch of the secondary site was also included in overall website traffic data. This includes data captured within the two weeks at the end of September and the beginning of October.

6.1 Website visitor analysis

6.1.1 Key indicators

Over the evaluation period of April 2009 through to October 2010 the DfT THINK! Education website was visited over 121,000 times by 94,303 unique visitors, excluding November 2009 visitors. This equates to over 1.2 million page views overall.

Figure 1: Key indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
<th>Weekly Average</th>
<th>Monthly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique visitors</td>
<td>94,303</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>121,645</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>6,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page views</td>
<td>1,291,308</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>17,217</td>
<td>72,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)
6.1.2 Visitor timeline and key date analysis

Site visits were broken down by week, and this can be observed in Figure 2 below. On average there was an upward trend in the number of visits to the site over time between April 2009 and October 2010, with peaks in the volume of visits and visitors at specific key points corresponding to key campaign dates as indicated. This demonstrates that marketing materials have been effective at driving traffic to the site. Troughs in the volume of visits and visitors correlate understandably with school holiday dates. Due to Road Safety Week falling in November 2009, site visit data cannot be included in this graph. It is therefore not possible to observe the impact on site traffic that this campaign had in 2009. This can be included in relation to Road Safety Week 2010 in the Stage 2 report.

Figure 2: Timeline analysis by each week of the evaluation period

The top three weeks for both the number of unique site visitors and the number of site visits, or views, were the weeks commencing 3rd October 2010 (40,219 views; 2,658 visitors), 26th September 2010 (39,805 views; 2,621...
visitors) and 16th May 2010 (39,064 views; 2,563 visitors). Each of these weeks had over twice as many page views and unique visitors than the weekly average. While these do not correspond to particular key dates, the figures do strongly illustrate the increased awareness and popularity of the site over time. However, it must be noted that two of these weeks (3rd October and 26th September) correspond to weeks where secondary site data was combined with primary site visit data, which could account for the high volume of visits.

6.2 Traffic Source analysis

Three key channels were identified as those through which web users have arrived at the THINK! Education site. These are:

- Direct traffic - visits from people who clicked a bookmark or who typed the site URL directly into their browser
- Referring Sites - visits from people who clicked to the site from another site
- Search Engines - visits from people who clicked to the site from a search engine results page

Figure 3 shows a breakdown of the proportion of visits to the site by their channel source.

**Figure 3: Proportion of site visits by source**

![Traffic Source Analysis Chart]

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)

This data indicates that referring sites, i.e. sites hosting a link to the THINK! Education site, were the biggest source of site traffic. This equates to 50,736
visits through referrals, compared to 37,514 through search engines and 32,406 visits through direct traffic. The presence of THINK! Education site links on key referral sites is therefore crucial to maintain traffic to the site.

Figure 4 below displays the top 10 sites from which visitors to the THINK! Education site were referred. Of the 42.1% of visits that were through a referral, by far the most popular route was via the Tales of the Road site. This demonstrates the strength of the link between the above-the-line children’s campaign and the education strategy.

**Figure 4: Top 10 referral sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Site</th>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>talesoftheroad.direct.gov.uk</td>
<td>16,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-teaching-resources.co.uk</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>britishcouncil.org</td>
<td>1,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct.gov.uk</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brake.org.uk</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roadsafetygb.org.uk</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>google.co.uk</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillsworkshop.org</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girlguiding.org.uk</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>startpage.dft.gsi.gov.uk</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)

Other referral sites were responsible for significantly less traffic to the site. However, it is encouraging that free-teaching-resources.co.uk was the second most popular referral site as this is known to be a very popular site teachers go to for resources related to all subjects; it is therefore testament to the perceived quality of the THINK! Education resources that it should create such a high volume of web traffic. This also validates the investment in placing a link on this site. The fact that the site also features on girlguiding.org.uk, which has so far been responsible for 372 referrals, is also promising as it highlights the potential for a real presence within the out-of-school market. Specifically targeted marketing via this site and scouts.org.uk, the official Scouts Association site, would help boost traffic to the site from the out-of-school audience further. These are important channels to maintain as the case study visits indicated the importance for these sites in sourcing materials for this audience.

As Figure 3 demonstrates, nearly a third (31.1%) of visits were via search engines, into which visitors to the site typed a range of search terms. Figure 5 below illustrates the most popular search terms and highlights the variation in those used.
The most popular search terms were ‘road safety’ (accounting for 2,612 visits), ‘think education’ (1,830 visits) ‘think’ (1,694 visits), ‘road safety for children’ (1,552 visits) and ‘think road safety’. The appearance of the search terms related to ‘think’ further supports evidence for the high brand awareness of the THINK! campaign, observed during the case study visits also.
6.3 Web content

6.3.1 Content areas

In total there were over 1.2 million page views to the THINK! Education Primary website, spread across the three main areas: pupils, teachers and parents. In total the pupil pages were the most popular in terms of page views with 665,009 views over the evaluation period (April 2009 – October 2010). This is in contrast to 340,455 views for the teachers pages and 71,916 for the parents pages. This is in line with what we would expect as we know that teachers will very often plan their lessons via accessing pupil pages on online resources so that they can see directly what activities are available.

Figure 6 below displays the percentage share of each category and illustrates the popularity of the pupils pages.

Figure 6: Breakdown of page view by area

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)

---

1 Note figures don’t add up to total page views due to existence of some pages not in these categories, for example ‘Contact us’ and ‘Availability’
Within the pupil section, data was also analysed to understand which area was the most visited. Figure 7 below illustrates that the Upper Primary (Aged 7-11) pages were the most popular, taking over half of all pupil area visits. These pages received 504,665 views compared to 250,765 and 193,048 page views for the Lower Primary (Aged 5-7) and Early Years (Aged 3-5) pages respectively. This is in line with indications from the case study visits that Upper Primary online activities were more popular due to online access being often harder in Early Years settings. There is also a higher volume of online content within the 7-11 area, which could account for this higher proportion of web visits. However, this also confirms that this difference in content type between the different areas matches usage, and therefore need. The content mix therefore appears to be appropriate.

### Figure 7: Breakdown of page views by age group

![Circle chart showing page views by age group](image)

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)

#### 6.3.2 Media and PDF resources

The web analytics demonstrated that PDF files were significantly more viewed than media files on the site. The data for the volume of page views by resource type shows that the PDF files were viewed 74,670 times compared to 14,214 views of the media files. This is in line with what could be expected in light of the case study visits, where teachers with no access to the internet in their classroom had accessed and downloaded PDF files.

Figure 8 below displays the top 15 media and PDF files by page views. This data shows the relative popularity of the PDF resources over the media files. The majority of PDF files accessed were relevant to Early Years or Lower
Primary activities, while the media files were more likely to be relevant to Upper Primary. This is in line with earlier data indicating that the Upper Primary section was the most visited and further supports evidence that lessons at this level are more likely to be using online resources than younger age groups.

**Figure 8: Top 15 most viewed media and PDF files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media file</th>
<th>Page views</th>
<th>PDF file</th>
<th>Page views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kerrs-story</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>traffic_poster.pdf</td>
<td>5,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yasmins-story</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>tales_of_the_road.pdf</td>
<td>5,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safest-place</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>crossing_the_road_poster.pdf</td>
<td>3,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ailsa-story</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>colour_me_bright.pdf</td>
<td>3,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr-lumpys</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>green_is_for_go.pdf</td>
<td>3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snakes-and-hazards</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>traffic_lights_poster.pdf</td>
<td>3,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amirs-story</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_1_theme_1_pdf</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-safely</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>zebra_crossing_poster.pdf</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>activitysheet_1_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crash-scene</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_2_theme_2_pdf</td>
<td>2,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be-bright-be-seen</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_1_theme_2_pdf</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whats-coming-next</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>activitysheet_2_theme_1.pdf</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavement</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>booklet_senior_managers.pdf</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look-all-around</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>story_stay_close_klara.pdf</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop-look-listen</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>lower-primary/activitysheet_2_theme_1_pdf</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Google analytics 01/04/09 – 10/10/10 (exc Nov 09)

A range of PDF resources were accessed with the most popular resources being the ‘traffic poster’ and the ‘tales of the road’ resource. These were also popular resources noted during the case study visits. Of the media files viewed over the time period, the top three files; Kerr’s Story, Yasmin’s Story and Safest Place (part of the Codebreaker game) accounted for 34% of all the page views of media files on the site. These are all Upper Primary resources and this further reinforces the observation that media content is more relevant to this age group than at Early Years.
6.4 Print resource requests

The following section analyses the range, scale and trends in requests for print resources and compares this with those for downloaded resources to understand any emerging patterns as to the best mix of print and online materials.

The data analysed in this section is drawn from a DfT database of customer requests for resources over the period of May 2009 to November 2010. In total 32,231 individual records were available for review.

6.4.1 Requests overview

Between May 2009 and November 2010, the total volume of resources requested was dominated by a small number of booklet resources, with the top four resources accounting for 92% of all the resources requested. The top four resources requested by volume were Tales of the Road – A Highway Code, Road Safety Matters – Early Years Parents Booklet, Road Safety Matters – Upper Primary Parents Booklet and Road Safety Matters – Lower Primary Parents Booklet. For each of these resources, the ratio of volume to requests was 183, 145, 170 and 104 respectively. This indicates that requestors were sharing these resources, and Stage 2 investigations should be able to shed light on who these have been shared with. Fewer requests for the Lower Primary parents booklet have been made, but this is likely to be because this section of the resource was launched later; the ratio of quantity per order for this publication is still relatively high, although it is lower than for the other three mentioned above, and than for the Journey Planner, which was the fifth most popular resource by volume. Stage 2 should be able to provide more insight into who has ordered what and how each has been used.

A number of other resources such as the A4 Zebra Crossing poster (2,073 requests), the A4 Pedestrian Crossing the Road Poster (1,990 requests) and the A4 Puffin Crossing poster (1,900 requests) had a well above average number of requests but a lower quantity per request. This indicates they are still popular resources but schools and other requestors would not typically need large quantities of these resources, maybe given the type of resource they are (posters). Figure 9 illustrates the volume data for all requests over this period.
Figure 9: Count and quantity of hard copy resources requested, May 2009 – November 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>% of volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tales of the Road - A Highway Code</td>
<td>1,310,758</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Early Years Parents Booklet</td>
<td>441,544</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Upper Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>388,424</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Lower Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>122,696</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Planner</td>
<td>48,362</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Colour Me Brightly Activity Sheet</td>
<td>26,554</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Green Man Colouring Activity Sheet</td>
<td>25,894</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Pedestrian Crossing The Road Poster</td>
<td>23,065</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Puffin Crossing Poster</td>
<td>22,928</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Zebra Crossing Poster</td>
<td>12,307</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Early Years and Primary Schools</td>
<td>11,637</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Busy Traffic Poster</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Leaders Notes</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Country Poster</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Town Poster</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Play Poster LP</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Pack Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Secondary Schools</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Pack - Crossing the Road</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers’ Pack Cycle Safety</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Pack In-Car Safety</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,460,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfTRequestor Database, May 2009 to November 2010
6.4.2 Print requests and web views

The following analysis compares the data on the number of individual requests for paper resources with the number of on-line views of PDF resources. This analysis highlights trends and characteristics of the demand for paper and on-line resources.

*The Tales of the Road* was the second most visited PDF resource on the site (see Figure 8), demonstrating a high level of consistency between online usage and print requests. However, unlike the webpage views where the traffic poster was the most popular resource, other posters were more popular in print, namely the A4 puffin and pedestrian crossing posters.

Print requests and PDF page views were also compared over time. Figure 10 illustrates the findings as far as possible. However, due to the volume of data available

**Figure 10: Comparison of the timeline of paper copy requests and PDF page views between May 2009 and November 2010**

![Graph showing comparison of paper requests and PDF page views]


Over time the total number of PDF views have increased while print order requests have remained more stable. This suggests that while online views are becoming more and more popular, print requests are unlikely to increase at the same rate.

However, there are also comparable trends over time. May 2010 and September 2010 are both times of peak requests for paper resources and
views of on-line PDF resources, which suggests these may be key moments for planning in road safety teaching. Print requests also reach a peak in October 2009, which may be linked to preparations for Road Safety Week. This data is missing from the web analytics for this period, but 2010 data will be available for comparable analysis at Stage 2 of the evaluation, yielding greater insight on the impact of Road Safety week on both web views and print requests.

6.4.3 Requestor types

The DfT requestor database also allows an analysis of number of requests and volume of resources requested by user group. Changes to the online catalogue order process meant that from 10th July 2010 requisitioners were asked to identify which user group they belonged to. The following analysis looks at 8,561 individual records (out of a total of 32,231 between May 2009 and November 2010) where user group information was supplied.

Figure 11 illustrates how each of the key user groups break down according to request volumes.

**Figure 11: Breakdown of requests by user group, between 10th July and November 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User group</th>
<th>Requests Number</th>
<th>Requests %</th>
<th>Quantity Number</th>
<th>Quantity %</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School staff</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>37,465</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school groups (e.g. Brownies, Cub Scouts, Childminders)</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other education</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>24,059</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Officer</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>230,817</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>224.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>29,469</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/fire/armed forces</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>86,388</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>140.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Road Safety</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>69,791</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>33,561</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>305.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,561</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>535,474</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfT contacts database 10th July to November 2010

As could be expected, school staff were responsible for the highest number of requests for print resources, with 30% of the total number of requests placed by schools. However, in terms of volume of resources ordered, RSOs ordered the most, accounting for 43% of all the resources ordered. This could be attributed to the fact that they work across several schools and so would order copies for each of the schools they visited. The Police/ Fire/ Armed services and other Road Safety professionals also ordered more in terms of volume than schools alone.
These orders can be broken down by resource type so as to give a picture of which publications were most relevant to particular groups. Figure 12 below displays the breakdown of resources ordered by user group.
Table 12: Breakdown of quantity of resources accessed by type of resource and user group, between 10th July and November 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Road Safety Officer</th>
<th>Police/fire/armed forces</th>
<th>Other Road Safety</th>
<th>DfT</th>
<th>General public</th>
<th>Other education</th>
<th>Out of school groups</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tales of the Road - A Highway Code</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Lower Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Upper Primary Parents Booklet</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Matters - Early Years Parents Booklet</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Planner</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Early Years and Primary Schools</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Colour Me Brightly Activity Sheet</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Green Man Colouring Activity Sheet</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Puffin Crossing Poster</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Zebra Crossing Poster</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Pedestrian Crossing The Road Poster</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of School Leaders Notes</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Country Poster</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Be Bright Be Seen in the Town Poster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Busy Traffic Poster</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety Education for Secondary Schools</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Poster LP - A2 Poster</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Notes</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Teachers' Pack</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers’ Pack - Crossing the Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack Cycle Safety</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary Teachers Pack In-Car Safety</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (volume)</td>
<td>230,817</td>
<td>86,388</td>
<td>69,791</td>
<td>37,465</td>
<td>33,561</td>
<td>29,469</td>
<td>24,059</td>
<td>23,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (%)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DfT contacts database 10th July to November 2010
This analysis shows that *Tales of the Road - A Highway Code* is the most popular resource (in terms of volume requested) for all groups apart from the general public and out-of-school groups. For the general public the most popular resource was the *Journey Planner* which accounted for 53.8% of total resources requested by this group, while out-of-school groups were most likely to order the *Lower Primary Parents Booklet* (42.2%). This provides interesting indications as to the usage of these resources, which can be further explored at Stage 2.
7. Conclusions

Stage 1 of the evaluation has provided clear indications as to the positive impact of the resource on the delivery of road safety in schools and other settings.

Road safety education

Road safety education was found to be a topic that was considered of importance within the Early Years and Upper Primary settings visited within this evaluation, despite it forming only a minor part of the curriculum. However, there was little evidence of a structured or coordinated approach to delivering this topic based on previous practice, and a wide range of resources were generally used in an ad hoc fashion, which teachers needed to combine and tailor to meet their needs.

➢ The current landscape is therefore favourable for the new set of THINK! Education resources as there is a real need for a comprehensive set of materials that can help teachers deliver a coordinated approach to road safety education.

Road safety education was typically delivered during key weeks during the year, namely Road Safety Week, or before school holidays when teachers knew that pupils would be likely to be playing outside.

➢ Further analysis can be carried out in Stage 2 to ascertain the peak time to market to schools in relation to this.

Out-of-school groups at Upper Primary level appear to take a less regular approach to road safety education, potentially only covering it every few years according to the cycle of badges. This presents a greater barrier to using the THINK! Education resources within this kind of setting compared with schools and there is little that can be done on behalf of the DfT to encourage road safety to be covered more regularly in these settings.

➢ However, the same need can be identified within this setting as for schools in relation to a comprehensive and easy-to-use resource relating to road safety. The THINK! Education resources could help encourage some out-of-school groups to deliver a more comprehensive programme of road safety education.

Awareness of the resources

There was evidence to suggest that teachers did not regularly seek out new road safety resources and would keep using ones that had been previously used until they needed to be replaced. This resulted in lower awareness of the new set of THINK! Education resources than expected within the sample.
However, website analytics indicated that current marketing activity has been effective at driving traffic to the website. This suggests that the marketing materials have been effective but that reach has not been as wide as it could have been in order to raise awareness across schools, Early Years and out-of-school settings.

- Future marketing strategies should take care to incorporate Early Years and out-of-school settings such as Surestart centres so as to attain as wide a reach as possible. Online or viral marketing via websites used by out-of-school groups may also prove effective.

The ubiquity of the THINK! brand generated by strong ATL marketing and numerous joint branding ventures with other road safety publishers has also not helped the stand-out of the new set of education resources. Many resources produced by other organisations have been attributed to the DfT’s campaign as a result, which may have dampened the impact of the launch of THINK! Education. There is also a danger that the THINK! logo could be used on resources that are not of the same standard as DfT-produced materials, which could have negative brand implications on the campaign as a whole.

Given the reliance on proactive ordering of print resources, marketing needs to be sure to address this and encourage the uptake of THINK! Education resources as opposed to deliverers relying on existing stocks of co-branded material.

- The DfT should be careful moving forward to protect the THINK! brand as much as possible, and to develop a marketing strategy that clearly sets out the USPs in relation to the THINK! Education materials. These have been identified in particular as:
  - Explicit links to the curriculum at all levels, including specific material for out-of-school groups
  - Comprehensive range of resources and lesson ideas that can be easily adapted to fit into any setting
  - Wide range of topics covering pedestrian, cycle, road and car seat safety
  - Activities explicitly targeted at Transition

Uptake of the resources

No clear picture of the uptake of the resources can be gained from this initial stage of research. However, web analysis has provided indications that online uptake is healthy and continually growing. Certain key sites have provided traffic to the THINK! Education site and links on these sites therefore need to be maintained.

- All future marketing strategies should include careful consideration of where links could best be placed to encourage the highest volume of traffic. Sites such as the Guiding Association and the Scout
Association could prove important for driving out-of-school traffic to the site in particular.

Initial requestor database analysis highlights a steady and continuous stream of requests for print resources, with *Tales of the Road* and the three parents booklets being the most popular materials, usually ordered in bulk. This suggests that they are being ordered with the intention that they will be shared, but this evidence is not conclusive on its own to this effect. Other materials, such as teacher booklets and packs have been significantly less popular, which may raise questions as to the validity of producing these as print materials.

- Lesser-requested materials may not be worth printing in advance given the extent of their use. It may be worth considering only offering them as downloadable items, or printing them to order. Stage 2 research should provide more robust insight on this issue.

**Delivery and quality of the resources**

Teachers and group leaders consulted within this Stage of research demonstrated a wide range of different applications of the *THINK! Education* materials. This reflects the ease with which all users were able to adapt and tailor the resources to meet their needs, regardless of how familiar they were with them. Those who had not previously used the resources appeared to have no more difficulty than those who had previously used them in planning and applying the materials to their delivery. This indicates the high perceived quality of the materials and the way in which they have been compiled within the resource.

However, there was no evidence of teachers or group leaders systematically working their way through the website or resource set in order to deliver a progressive programme of road safety education. Materials and ideas from lesson plans were cherry-picked to be adapted and combined according to the needs of teachers. Despite there being an intended structure to the resource in this way, deliverers considered this flexibility to be a key positive attribute to the *THINK! Education* resources.

Few improvements were suggested to the materials themselves and all users were highly satisfied with the resource set. The strength of the *THINK!* brand has lent great further credibility to the resources, and, due to this, users consider them to lead the market in terms of variety, usability and accessibility.

- No major improvements are therefore suggested in order to develop the resource set. However, in order to increase accessibility further, improvements suggested to some areas of content and format should be considered, namely:
  - Make A4 posters available in A2 format
- Include the outline of a red man as well as a green man to colour in
- Provide print versions of online interactives, such as a Snakes and Hazards board
- Make the online activities more accessible for Early Years by including audio instructions and visual prompts alongside the text
- Include clearer links to transition activities on the site to avoid the risk of older Upper Primary pupils becoming disengaged with more basic interactives
- Provide a CD or DVD of the resources to be accessible offline
- Pay better attention to language in relation to EAL children and parents
- Provide leaflets with information for parents in several languages to help settings communicate around the site

**Impact of the resources**

Indications as to the immediate impacts on the attitudes and behaviour of young people in relation to road safety are positive, based on anecdotal evidence provided by teachers and group leaders, such as greater interest in the topic and looking out for themselves and each other when out on trips.

There was a perception at Upper Primary level that most of the key road safety messages were familiar to children at this age. However, key messages and examples used within the resource were able to refresh the messages and make them relevant to children of transition age in particular. What was also clear was the enjoyment that children gained from taking part in lessons using these resources and therefore the heightened engagement in road safety as a subject matter. This has the potential to increase general road safety awareness as they move through life. However, no conclusive evidence in relation to the longevity of this impact can be within the scope of this study.

- Indications from this Stage of the study therefore suggest that the DfT could feasibly achieve their aim in changing attitudes, awareness and understanding in relation to road safety via the THINK! Education resources. However, further research to gather more robust data would be needed to confirm the extent to which this aim has been achieved as this is currently only based on observational and anecdotal evidence from a small number of settings. Understanding more around the general approach to road safety education would help to place any future impact research into a meaningful context. This contextual understanding could be gained via Stage 2 of the evaluation.

Road safety deliverers consulted for this evaluation have been able to easily build road safety education into their delivery plans via the use of the THINK! Education resources, and expanded the remit of previous road safety education topics. Parental engagement has also become easier to build into
road safety delivery, although it remains a largely passive activity, which represents a starting shift in approach.

- The resources have proved to set themselves apart and provide the tools to help with a more coordinated approach to road safety education in this sense. Further research as part of Stage 2 could help to collect more robust evidence to support this observation.

However, it is unclear the extent to which these resources have contributed to the coordinated approach to road safety education between schools or Early Years settings and external road safety intermediaries. Initial indications based on this Stage of research suggest that no impact has been effective.

- There is therefore potentially scope for encouraging a more coordinated approach via RSOs in particular. This is something that should be explored in more detail in Stage 2.

Further stages of the evaluation will be able to assess responses to the resources in relation to overall awareness and uptake, and include an analysis of Lower Primary materials as well as print requests.
8. Next steps

Findings from Stage 1 of the evaluation have highlighted the need to revisit the objectives for Stage 2 in order to ensure the most value is gained from insights gathered moving forward.

In light of the low awareness of the THINK! Education resources as distinct from other road safety materials, and the ad hoc, unstructured approach to teaching road safety in schools and other settings, it is clear that a greater understanding of the drivers and barriers to using DfT resources is needed in order to successfully move the THINK! Education strategy forward. With this in mind, anecdotal evidence collected relating to impacts on behaviour, attitudes and knowledge can be considered less achievable without first gathering more robust data on the ways in which teachers engage with road safety education, the resources they use and the way in which the THINK! Education resources sit within that framework.

DfT and EdComs have therefore agreed that Stage 2 of the evaluation will focus on a smaller set of objectives in order to help inform future marketing strategy. This stage of the evaluation will also gather greater contextual evidence around how road safety is delivered in schools and other settings, that could, as a secondary benefit, provide a useful backdrop to any larger behavioural or attitudinal change studies that may be carried out in relation to the THINK! Education campaign in the future.

The agreed objectives to focus on moving forward are:

1. **Awareness of the resources** – what proportion of pre-school, schools and out of school groups are aware of the resources?
2. **The uptake of the resources** – how many resources have been ordered and how many teachers, parents and students have been exposed to them?
3. **The quality of materials produced** – how do those who have used the resources rate their usability, credibility and relevance, and how engaging are they for young people, teachers, parents and other intermediaries?
4. How the resources have helped teachers, parents, RSOs, police officers and youth group leaders to deliver a coordinated approach to child road safety education; this includes understanding how the THINK! resources fit within the wider context of other resources used and safety topics covered.
5. How the materials have been integrated with other THINK! road safety materials to benefit from the brand as a trusted and recognised source of information.
6. What are users’ expectations of online versus print materials?
7. What are teachers’ preferences for downloading/ordering materials and what is their capacity for printing resources in particular?

8. What are the most desirable print materials they would want to continue ordering?

9. How does the extent of the current THINK! Education offline provision compare to other education programmes?

A greater focus on the quantitative elements of the research has been agreed for Stage 2, based on these objectives. The proposed approach to this stage has been provided to the DfT in a separate document, based on discussions held with DfT and EdComs.