

**Coverage of CHAPS (and other) mass
media adverts and small media booklets**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cutting the advertising spend of CHAPS national mass media interventions does not appear to have negatively impacted on the level of coverage they achieve. The current set of interventions appear to have performed similarly to earlier interventions.

Far greater detail on demographic differences in coverage has been achieved through the larger sample size. Knowledge of biases in access to print media can be used to inform the planning of future interventions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Measures of the target coverage achieved by eight print-based national interventions are reported here. The eight interventions included five press based media adverts and three multi-distributed leaflets. They were:

<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	Facts for life In two minds
<i>Other adverts</i>	How much would you tell Assume nothing in backrooms What are your reasons
<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>	All the f***ing facts The manual Exposed 1

The coverage measures were taken in the booklet and web versions of the *2001 National Gay Men's Sex Survey*. One multiple answer question was used for each intervention.

In total we received coverage questionnaires from 6123 men who (a) lived in England, (b) had sex with a man in the last year and/or expected to have sex with a man in the future. Of these 62% were recruited on the web and 38% were recruited using the booklet.

For each of the eight interventions asked about, a mean of 3.2% did not answer the question.

2. COMPARATIVE LEVELS OF PROMPTED RECOGNITION

Previous years' coverage measures were taken face-to-face at Pride-type events. Among the current sample, 37.7% of respondents had been to a Gay Pride or Mardi Gras event in the last year. For comparisons with previous years, we first look at overall levels of recognition among this subgroup (n=2217).

<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>% any recognition</i>
Facts for life	43.1
In two minds	64.6

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national adverts were recognised by between 40% and 55% of their target group. The current two adverts used approximately 1/3 of the advertising budget and achieved comparable coverage.

<i>Other adverts</i>	<i>% any recognition</i>
How much would you tell	52.0
Assume nothing in backrooms	32.5
What are your reasons	18.1

The THT's advert *How much would you tell* was asked about in our 2000 survey and was recognised by 77%, making this advert stand out as achieving high coverage with low spend. The advert still shows a high level of recognition. The other two adverts used smaller advertising budgets. GMFA's advert *What are your reasons* shows a similar level of recognition to earlier GMFA adverts on a similarly very low display spend.

<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>	<i>% any recognition</i>
All the f***ing facts	41.8
The manual	24.3
Exposed 1	35.4

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national leaflets were recognised by between 10% and 20% of their target group. Recognition of *The manual* was very similar to the levels found in two previous surveys in 1999 (23.1% recognised) and 2000 (23.4% recognised). The two new leaflets show a substantially higher level of recognition suggesting increased effectiveness of leaflet distribution.

3. ENGAGEMENT WITH INTERVENTIONS

Because we are still making comparisons with previous years, the following section again uses only those respondents who had been to a Gay Pride or Mardi Gras event in the last year (n=2217).

3.1 MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

For the five adverts men were shown one or two examples from each set of ads and were asked to indicate one of the following three options:

- No, I have not seen any of these adverts or posters.
- I recognise them but have never looked at or read them.
- I've seen copies of the adverts and/ or posters and have read most or all of them.

The next table shows the proportion of men indicating each option for the five adverts. The bottom line (*in italics*) shows the third line as a proportion of the second and third.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons
No, I have not seen	56.9	35.4	48.0	67.5	81.9
Recognise but have not looked at closely	20.2	18.5	22.2	13.8	9.2
Have read most or all of them	23.0	46.2	29.8	18.7	8.9
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>	<i>53.2</i>	<i>71.4</i>	<i>57.3</i>	<i>57.5</i>	<i>49.2</i>

In our first wave of coverage surveying, we found that an average of 59% of men who recognised an advert said they had actually read the text. The proportion in this set of interventions is similar, with *In two minds* showing a particularly high level of engagement.

3.2 SMALL MEDIA (LEAFLETS)

For the three leaflets, men were shown the front (and in one case back) of the leaflet and were asked to indicate one of the following five options:

- No, I have not seen the booklet called <title>.
- I recognise it but have never looked at it or read it.
- I've looked at a copy but not read it in detail.
- I've read most of it.
- I've got my own copy of it.

The next table shows the proportion of men indicating each option for the three leaflets. The bottom two lines (*in italics*) show those who said they had read it or kept it as a proportion of those who recognised it, and the proportion of those who had kept it represents of those who recognised it.

	CHAPS leaflets		
	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
No, I have not seen it	58.2	75.7	64.6
Recognise but have not looked at closely	13.3	6.7	12.7
Looked at but not read in detail	9.1	4.3	10.0
Read most of it	11.0	4.1	7.4
I've kept a copy	8.3	9.2	5.3
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>	<i>46.3</i>	<i>54.7</i>	<i>35.9</i>
<i>% of those who recognised who had kept</i>	<i>19.9</i>	<i>37.9</i>	<i>15.0</i>

Our earlier surveys suggested between 40% and 55% of men who recognised leaflets said they had actually read them. Two of the current leaflets fall within this range but the third, *Exposed 1*, showed a smaller proportion of those recognising it had actually read it.

In terms of keeping the leaflet, *The manual* showed the highest retention rate which may be accounted for by its 'directory' design. *Exposed 1* is large format booklet intended as a

magazine style resource. The proportion of men who indicated they kept a copy of it may be a reflection of what people do with magazines.

4. DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PROMPTED RECOGNITION

Previous years coverage measures used samples of around 300 men. A sample size of this size was able to detect that two adverts were disproportionately recognised by younger rather than older men. The 2001 sample size is almost twenty times larger and can show us other biases in recognition.

The following sections consider differences in recognition across six demographic characteristics within the 2001 data. It uses the entire sample of 6123 men. Because this sample also includes the men who had not been to a Pride event in the last year (and who were less likely to recognise the interventions) the overall levels of recognition below are lower than those given above for comparison with previous years. The six characteristics considered are:

- region of residence
- age
- education
- gender of partners
- ethnic group
- HIV testing history

In each of the columns of the tables where recognition significantly varies, the group in which recognition is highest has been shaded, whilst that showing the lowest level has been underlined. Subsequently, a row with a lot of shading indicates a group who is consistently disproportionately exposed to these interventions, while a row with much underlying shows a group who encounter them relatively less often.

4.1 REGIONAL HEALTH AUTHORITY OF RESIDENCE

CHAPS adverts and leaflets are national interventions as their intended target group is all gay men in England, not biased by where they live. Ideally then, the proportion of men who recognised the interventions would be the same in each region of the country. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions for each regional sub-sample.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			CHAPS leaflets		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
London	35.0	64.1	48.8	32.8	16.9	32.4	21.5	27.9
SE	37.7	46.8	38.2	24.9	12.8	30.6	16.2	25.9
NW	30.4	42.3	35.7	18.1	15.2	31.1	14.1	26.5
Trent	30.4	<u>38.3</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>17.7</u>	12.6	<u>22.0</u>	<u>12.7</u>	27.9
W Mids	32.8	<u>39.8</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>17.4</u>	14.5	29.1	15.5	31.5
N&Y	<u>27.2</u>	43.9	35.2	18.0	13.9	23.4	<u>13.2</u>	30.5
Eastern	<u>28.3</u>	46.2	38.5	19.5	14.4	<u>21.6</u>	16.3	28.0
SW	32.5	43.9	35.3	21.4	15.0	28.3	21.9	31.8
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no

Recognition of all but two of the interventions varied with where men lived. Men living in London show better access to these interventions overall than those living elsewhere. Trent and the West Midlands would benefit from additional investment in display and distribution of these interventions if they are to benefit equally with the rest of the country.

4.2 GENDER OF SEXUAL PARTNERS

Within the group 'homosexually active men' CHAPS interventions prioritise men who have sex with men only over men who have sex with both men and women. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions by the gender of men's sexual partners in the last year.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			CHAPS leaflets		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
no one	19.8	26.4	25.4	9.1	9.5	17.2	7.9	21.3
women only	<u>8.5</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>15.3</u>
men and women	21.3	22.7	18.0	14.5	10.4	17.2	11.7	22.4
men only	35.1	53.4	42.5	25.3	15.6	30.9	18.3	29.6
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Men who had sex with men only were more likely to recognise each of the interventions and men who had sex with women only were least likely to recognise them. This suggests successful targeting.

4.3 AGE

A general recommendation for HIV prevention interventions is that they disproportionately benefit men under rather than over 40. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions in five age groups.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			CHAPS leaflets		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
to 19	<u>25.0</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>24.6</u>	<u>13.9</u>	12.4	<u>22.2</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>22.7</u>
20s	32.6	50.2	39.8	23.8	14.3	29.5	18.3	27.5
30s	34.4	53.4	44.5	27.7	15.7	31.7	18.5	30.5
40s	33.9	49.4	40.5	21.5	14.4	27.1	16.5	28.2
50+	34.9	43.2	31.0	20.3	16.4	25.3	14.9	30.6
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes

All but one of the interventions (*What are your reasons*) showed difference in recognition across the age range. All were least likely to be recognised by the under 20 years olds. Men in their 30s were usually the group most likely to recognise them. This data suggest

current print interventions are not suitable for targeting younger men, particularly those under 20.

4.4 ETHNIC GROUP

All CHAPS interventions are intended to be of equal benefit to men of all ethnic groups. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions by four ethnic group sub-samples.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			CHAPS leaflets		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
White	32.4	48.2	38.9	<u>22.4</u>	14.8	28.5	16.7	28.1
Asian	40.5	48.3	31.4	26.1	13.9	27.0	20.3	26.3
Black	37.1	54.8	37.6	44.7	18.3	34.0	19.1	30.4
Mixed & other	33.5	56.7	39.5	34.3	10.6	31.0	20.8	33.5
sig.	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no

Only one intervention showed a different level of recognition across ethnic groups, *Assume nothing in backrooms*, and this was most likely to be recognised by Black men and least likely among White men. This suggests current print media interventions are equally accessible to different ethnic groups.

4.5 EDUCATION

All CHAPS interventions are intended to disproportionately benefit men with lower levels of formal education rather than those with higher levels of education. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions by across three education groups.

	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			CHAPS leaflets		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
low	33.4	<u>41.0</u>	<u>33.6</u>	<u>20.0</u>	16.6	26.3	15.4	27.4
medium	31.2	45.6	37.5	21.6	15.2	28.7	16.9	28.1
high	33.4	55.8	43.2	26.3	<u>13.2</u>	30.1	18.1	28.9
sig.	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no

Three of the interventions showed greater recognition among men with higher education while one showed greater recognition among men with lower education. Further detail on the advertising strategies of the interventions will be sought to illuminate these differences.

4.6 HIV TESTING HISTORY

There is a general recommendation that HIV prevention programmes should disproportionately benefit men with HIV infection. However, not all interventions are targeted equally at all three testing history groups. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the eight interventions by across three testing history groups.

	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>Other adverts</i>			<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>		
	Facts for life	In two minds	How much would you tell	Assume nothing	What are your reasons	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed 1
never	<u>27.1</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>30.5</u>	<u>17.1</u>	<u>12.8</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>23.8</u>
negative	36.2	55.9	45.3	28.3	16.3	33.8	21.0	31.8
positive	54.9	70.2	60.7	37.8	19.3	48.6	31.8	37.7
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise each of the eight interventions, and men who had never tested were least likely to recognise them. *What are your reasons*, which was targeted at men who had not been diagnosed with HIV, showed the same pattern. This suggests that while national print interventions will not be good at targeting positive men in particular (due to their minority on the population), all interventions should attend to their possible impact on positive men as they will be most likely to encounter them. The best aims for national interventions will be those shared by men, irrespective of HIV testing history or HIV infection status.

David Reid
<david.reid@sigmaresearch.org.uk>

April 11th 2002