

**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 CHAPS mass media interventions (2001 and 2002) have performed similarly to earlier interventions (1997 to 2000), although their advertising spend has been substantially reduced and they have included no 'outdoor' advertising (previous CHAPS interventions used posters on London underground, bus shelters and bus-sides etc.)

The current CHAPS national small media interventions (2001 and 2002) show higher coverage than earlier interventions (1997 to 2000). This is probably due to greater emphasis on the infrastructure for small media distribution and especially more efficient distribution in London. The novel *Exposed* series shows high recognition though relatively low retention rates. This probably reflects the increased volume printed compared to previous leaflets; the distribution strategy which included inserts in the gay press as well as distribution to racks in venues alongside more traditional 'leaflets'; and the format (A5 magazine style).

Far greater detail on demographic differences in coverage has been achieved through the larger sample size, achieved through our shift in recruitment methods.

1. Coverage of both mass and (especially) small media interventions has risen substantially in Wales since the funding of CHAPS Cymru. Men in Wales were most likely to recognise the most recent small media, *Exposed - issue 3*.
2. Generally residents of the London and the South directorates are more likely than men in the Mid & Eastern and North directorates to be aware of interventions. Men in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland were least likely to have seen most interventions, excepting the Scottish *Stigma* intervention most commonly seen in Scotland, and *Exposed - issue 3*, most commonly recognised in Wales.
3. Exclusively homosexually active men were most likely to see interventions and exclusively heterosexually active men were least likely to.
4. The majority of interventions were least likely to be recognised by those under twenty or over fifty. Differences in recognition between men in their 20s, 30s and 40s were generally relatively small.
5. Asian men were least likely to recognise interventions.
6. Those with low educational attainment were least likely to recognise interventions.
7. Men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise each of the interventions, and men who had never tested were least likely to recognise them.
8. Generally those with a single partner in the previous year were the least likely to have seen any interventions, the likelihood of recognising interventions increased as partner numbers increased

1. INTRODUCTION

This interim report presents the first feedback on GMSS 2002 coverage data. It also updates and incorporates data presented in the 2001 coverage interim data report. Data from these two GMSS years will form the basis of a single chapter on coverage in the second 'Final Evaluation of CHAPS' report due in April 2003.

Measures of the target coverage achieved by sixteen print-based national interventions are reported here. This includes eleven press-based mass media adverts (4 from CHAPS) and five small media (leaflets, all from CHAPS).

The interventions were:

<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	Facts for life (2001 survey) In two minds? (2001 survey) Just as unbelievable (2002 survey) Clever dick (2002 survey)
<i>Other adverts</i>	How much would you tell? (THT, 2001 survey) Assume nothing in backrooms (THT, 2001 survey) What are your reasons? (GMFA, 2001 survey) Look what's back (THT, 2002 survey) Enjoy Fucking? (GMFA, 2002 survey) Stigma - if you listen ... (Healthy Gay Scotland, 2002 survey) You choose (Victoria Clinic, 2002 survey)
<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>	All the f***ing facts (2001 survey) The Manual (1999, 2000 & 2001 survey) Exposed - issue 1 (2001 & 2002 survey) Exposed - issue 2 (2002 survey) Exposed - issue 3 (2002 survey)

The coverage measures were taken in the booklet and web versions of the 2001 and 2002 *National Gay Men's Sex Survey*. One multiple answer question was used for each intervention.

In total we received coverage questionnaires from 6,825 men in GMSS 2001 and 11,046 men in GMSS 2002.

All these men:

- (a) gave enough information on their residence to allocate them to one of the four NHS directorates in England or told us they lived in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland.
- (b) had sex with a man in the last year and / or expected to have sex with a man in the future and / or (in 2002 only) described themselves as gay or bisexual.

In 2001, 65% were recruited on the web and 35% were recruited using the booklet. In 2002 these proportions were 68% and 32% respectively.

For each of the 16 interventions asked about, on average (mean) 3.4% (2.9% in 2001 and 3.9% in 2002) did not answer the coverage questions.

2. COMPARATIVE LEVELS OF PROMPTED RECOGNITION

From 1997 to 2000, coverage data was gathered face-to-face at Pride-type events across England. Samples sizes averaged about 300 men per year. In 2001 and 2002 we switched to using the web and booklet versions of the GMSS questionnaire to gather this data. This gives us access to vastly larger samples - at a similar cost - which allows us to examine coverage for specific target groups (such as less well educated men, for example).

However, it makes comparison with coverage data from 1997-2000 (reported in *Advertising Awareness, 2001*) much more problematic as the methods of data collection vary. As one means of assessing the difference in base-line coverage measures, for the GMSS 2001 data we examined coverage among those in the web and booklet samples, who also reported attending a Gay Pride or Mardi Gras event in the last year (36.5%, n=2401). This data is shown below along with overall recognition figures for booklet and web data combined, booklet only and web only.

GMSS 2001 % any recognition	% ALL Booklet & Web (n=6825)	% Booklet (n=2384)	% Web (n=4441)	% PRIDE Attendees (n=2401)
Facts for Life (CHAPS)	31.1	43.0	24.8	42.1
In two minds? (CHAPS)	46.2	59.6	39.3	62.9
How much would you tell? (THT)	37.4	48.9	31.4	50.9
Assume nothing in backrooms (THT)	22.0	31.7	17.1	31.2
What are your reasons? (GMFA)	14.1	18.1	12.0	17.5
Exposed - issue 1 (CHAPS)	27.0	38.3	21.2	34.3
All the f***ing facts (CHAPS)	27.1	42.6	18.9	40.2
The Manual (CHAPS)	15.8	27.1	9.9	23.1

This data demonstrates that the switch of methods from Pride to web and booklet recruitment suppresses baseline coverage. Men recruited through the web are consistently and substantially less likely to report having encountered all interventions. Since the web sample constitutes two thirds of the whole sample this accounts for the slight fall in overall coverage measures, at least for the mass media adverts, compared to 1997-2000 data.

Compared to Pride attendees recruited via the booklet or web, all men recruited via the booklet are marginally less likely to have encountered mass media interventions and are marginally more likely to encounter small media interventions. We recommend, therefore that any comparisons to coverage data from 1997-2000 be made on booklet-recruited men only. Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national adverts were recognised by between 40% and 55% of their target group (*Advertising Awareness, 2001*). The two CHAPS 2001 adverts used approximately one third of the advertising budget of earlier CHAPS mass media adverts, and achieved comparable coverage (43.0% and 59.6% among booklet recruited men).

The THT advert *How much would you tell?* was asked about in our 2000 survey and was recognised by 77%, making it stand out as achieving high coverage with low spend. In 2001 the advert still showed a high level of recognition (49%). 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.

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national leaflets were recognised by between 10% and 20% of their target group (*Advertising Awareness*, 2001). In the 2001 data, recognition of the three small media interventions was *higher* irrespective of whether you take the overall web and booklet figures (16-27% recognised), the Pride attending sub-sample (23%-40%) or the booklet sample only (27%-43%) or the web sample only (10%-21%). The two CHAPS 2001 leaflets (*Exposed - issue 1* and *All the f***ing facts*), show substantially higher levels of recognition than previous CHAPS small media, suggesting increased effectiveness of leaflet distribution.

% any recognition	% ALL Booklet & Web (n=11046)	% Booklet (n=3515)	% Web (n=7531)
GMSS 2002			
Just as unbelievable (CHAPS)	30.7	40.4	26.5
Clever dick (CHAPS)	31.9	43.9	26.7
Look what's back (THT)	37.6	46.9	33.6
Enjoy Fucking? (GMFA)	32.7	39.3	29.9
You choose (Victoria Clinic)	25.1	32.7	21.8
Stigma - if you listen ... (HGS)	17.0	20.0	15.7
Exposed - issue 1	28.8	45.0	21.8
Exposed - issue 2	20.8	35.9	14.2
Exposed - issue 3	24.8	42.7	17.1

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national adverts were recognised by between 40% and 55% of their target group (*Advertising Awareness*, 2001). The two CHAPS 2002 adverts used approximately one third of the advertising budget of pre-2001 CHAPS adverts and achieved comparable coverage (40.4% and 43.9% among booklet recruited men).

Apart from *Stigma - if you listen*, the other three mass media adverts used similar advertising budgets and achieved similar levels of recognition. GMFA's advert *Enjoy fucking?* shows a higher level of recognition than earlier GMFA adverts but had a higher display spend.

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national leaflets were recognised by between 10% and 20% of their target group (*Advertising Awareness*, 2001). In the CHAPS 2002 data, recognition of the three version of *Exposed* was *higher* irrespective of whether you take the overall web and booklet figures (21-29% recognised), or the booklet sample only (36%-45%) or the web sample only (14%-22% recognised). Coverage of *Exposed - issue 1* was also higher in 2002 than it was in 2001, its year of release.

3. ENGAGEMENT WITH INTERVENTIONS

3.1 MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

For the eleven adverts men were shown one or two executions from each set 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 two tables show the proportion of men indicating each option for the five adverts asked about in 2001, and the six adverts asked about in 2002. In both tables the data is shown for web recruited and booklet recruited men separately.

The bottom line of each table (*in italics*) shows the third line as a proportion of the second and third.

% Web Only / % Booklet only	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts		
	Facts for life	In two minds?	How much would you tell?	Assume nothing	What are your reasons?
GMSS 2001					
No, I have not seen	75.2 / 57.0	60.7 / 40.4	68.6 / 51.1	82.9 / 68.3	88.0 / 81.9
Recognise but have not looked at closely	14.5 / 19.6	14.5 / 17.0	15.9 / 19.8	8.5 / 14.0	7.0 / 8.8
Have read most or all of them	10.3 / 23.5	24.8 / 42.6	15.5 / 29.1	8.6 / 17.6	4.9 / 9.3
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>	<i>41.4 / 54.5</i>	<i>63.1 / 71.5</i>	<i>49.4 / 59.5</i>	<i>50.4 / 55.6</i>	<i>41.2 / 51.4</i>

% Web only / % Booklet only	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts			
	Just as unbelievable	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma - listen ...	You choose
GMSS 2002						
No, I have not seen	73.5 / 59.6	73.3 / 56.1	66.4 / 53.1	70.1 / 60.7	84.3 / 80.0	78.2 / 67.3
Recognise but have not looked at closely	11.1 / 14.3	9.4 / 12.2	10.6 / 11.9	11.3 / 15.2	7.4 / 11.1	11.1 / 13.7
Have read most or all of them	15.4 / 26.1	17.3 / 31.7	23.1 / 35.0	18.6 / 24.0	8.2 / 8.9	10.7 / 19.0
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>	<i>58.2 / 64.6</i>	<i>64.8 / 72.2</i>	<i>68.6 / 74.7</i>	<i>62.3 / 61.2</i>	<i>52.5 / 44.4</i>	<i>48.9 / 58.1</i>

In our first wave of coverage surveying (1997-2000), 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 in 2001, and *Clever dick* and *Look what's back* showing high levels of engagement in 2002.

Compared to booklet recruited men those recruited on the web are consistently less likely to recognise any of the adverts. For the majority of adverts web-recruited men who have seen them are also less likely to have read those adverts, compared to booklet recruited men.

3.2 SMALL MEDIA (LEAFLETS)

For the five small media, men were shown the front (and in one case back) cover and 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 asked about in 2001 and the three asked about in 2002. Exposed - Issue 1 was asked about in both years of surveying. The bottom two lines of each table (*in italics*) show those who said they had read it or kept it as a proportion of those who recognised it, and the proportion who had kept it as a proportion of those who recognised it.

% Web only / % Booklet only	CHAPS leaflets		
	All the f***ing facts	The manual	Exposed - 1
GMSS 2001			
No, I have not seen it	81.1 / 57.4	90.1 / 72.9	78.8 / 61.7
Recognise but have not looked at closely	8.8 / 11.7	4.2 / 7.0	10.8 / 11.4
Looked at but not read in detail	4.5 / 9.3	1.9 / 4.0	6.6 / 10.3
Read most of it	3.9 / 12.2	1.5 / 5.1	2.7 / 9.1
I've kept a copy	1.7 / 9.4	2.3 / 11.1	1.1 / 7.5
<i>% of those who recognised who had read most of it and kept</i>	<i>29.5 / 50.6</i>	<i>38.3 / 59.5</i>	<i>18.1 / 43.3</i>
<i>% of those who recognised who had kept</i>	<i>8.9 / 22.0</i>	<i>23.4 / 40.8</i>	<i>5.4 / 19.6</i>

% Web only / % Booklet only	CHAPS leaflets		
	Exposed - 1	Exposed - 2	Exposed - 3
GMSS 2002			
No, I have not seen it	78.2 / 55.0	85.8 / 64.1	82.9 / 57.3
Recognise but have not looked at closely	10.4 / 14.3	6.8 / 11.3	7.7 / 13.8
Looked at but not read in detail	6.1 / 14.6	3.4 / 10.9	4.4 / 11.6
Read most of it	3.9 / 11.4	2.9 / 9.4	3.6 / 12.1
I've kept a copy	1.4 / 4.7	1.1 / 4.3	1.4 / 5.2
<i>% of those who recognised who had read most of it and kept</i>	<i>24.2 / 35.8</i>	<i>28.4 / 38.0</i>	<i>29.2 / 40.6</i>
<i>% of those who recognised who had kept</i>	<i>6.2 / 10.5</i>	<i>8.1 / 11.9</i>	<i>8.4 / 12.2</i>

Leaflets in the *Exposed series (1-3)* are large format (A4) magazine style. They have a relatively high recognition rate (14-22% among the web recruited men and 36% - 45% among the booklet recruited men) compared to more traditional leaflets (see *Advertising Awareness, 2001*).

Our earlier coverage surveys (*Advertising Awareness, 2001*) suggested between 40% and 55% of men who recognised small media, actually read them. For booklet recruited men, between 36% and 60% of men recognising the items had read them. Among web recruited men between 18% and 39% of those recognising them had read them. Compared to more traditional small media leaflets, the *Exposed series* are at the lower end of the reading rate range.

In terms of keeping the small media items, *The Manual* showed the highest retention rate (23%-41% of those that recognised it) which may be accounted for by its 'directory' design. The *Exposed series* show lower retention rates (5%-20%) which 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. Samples of this size were 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 the 2002 sample is more than 30 times larger. These samples can show us other biases in recognition.

The following sections consider differences in recognition across seven demographic characteristics common to the 2001 and 2002 data. It uses the entire samples for each year, that is 6,825 men in GMSS 2001 and 11,046 men in GMSS 2002. 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 seven characteristics considered are:

- Directorate of residence
- gender of partners
- age
- ethnic group
- education
- HIV testing history
- Male partner numbers

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. Hence, a row with a lot of shading indicates a group who is consistently disproportionately aware to these interventions, while a row with much underlining shows a group who encounter them relatively less often.

4.1 DIRECTORATE OF RESIDENCE

All men are resident in the UK. The largest part of each year's sample is resident in England (n=6058 in 2001 and 9667 in 2002), which we split into its 4 Directorates of Health and Social Care. There are insufficient men in Wales (n= 214 and 417 respectively), Scotland (n=459 and 795 respectively) and Northern Ireland (n= 94 and 167 respectively) to sub-divide these samples further.

2001	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	34.7	64.5	49.2	32.8	17.1	32.7	21.6	28.0
South England	36.4	46.6	37.7	24.0	13.4	30.3	18.5	28.4
Mid & Eastern England	31.6	42.3	34.4	18.7	14.3	25.6	14.8	30.1
North England	28.2	41.4	34.4	17.5	14.2	26.6	13.5	27.5
Wales	21.0	34.0	27.2	16.7	12.4	14.1	8.1	17.1
Scotland	18.7	26.6	27.2	13.1	<u>7.6</u>	14.8	5.5	16.1
Northern Ireland	<u>15.1</u>	<u>19.1</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>6.5</u>	8.5	<u>10.8</u>	3.3	<u>10.8</u>
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

In the 2001 data, recognition of interventions varied by where men lived. Overall, men living in London were more likely to be aware of almost all mass media adverts. Men resident in South England were usually the second most likely group to recognise adverts - apart from *Facts for life*, which they were most likely to recognise, and *What are your reasons?*, a London campaign by GMFA. Men resident in North England were usually the English group with lowest recognition, though recognition was still higher there than among men resident in Wales, Scotland and Ireland.

For the leaflets, the pattern for *All the f***ing facts* and *The Manual* was very similar to mass media adverts. However, *Exposed - issue 1* showed high recognition across England with a peak in Mid & Eastern England.

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
London	38.6	42.0	53.7	46.1	<u>13.2</u>	37.7	34.0	24.4	27.9
South England	32.5	31.8	37.7	34.5	<u>13.8</u>	22.9	30.0	22.0	26.8
Mid & Eastern England	30.3	32.6	33.3	28.2	<u>15.3</u>	22.6	29.3	20.9	25.3
North England	27.0	27.5	28.8	26.5	<u>16.3</u>	22.1	27.3	21.0	23.4
Wales	28.4	30.0	28.3	<u>22.3</u>	<u>11.4</u>	19.0	30.1	18.7	31.3
Scotland	18.4	17.2	34.8	25.0	49.4	<u>13.6</u>	15.5	<u>8.9</u>	12.4
Northern Ireland	<u>14.8</u>	<u>12.9</u>	<u>23.1</u>	23.6	<u>11.1</u>	14.9	<u>12.9</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>8.1</u>
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Again, in the 2002 data, recognition of interventions varied by where men lived. Overall, men living in London were more likely to be aware of almost all mass media adverts. Men resident in South England were usually the second most likely group to recognise adverts - apart from *Clever dick*, and *Stigma*, a Scottish campaign by Healthy Gay Scotland. Again, men resident in North England were usually the English group with lowest recognition, though recognition was still higher there than among men resident in Scotland and Ireland. These findings are reversed for *Stigma*, which was designed as a Scottish-specific campaign, but placed in UK-wide issues of *Gay Times*.

For the leaflets, the pattern for *Exposed - issue 1* and *Exposed - issue 2* was very similar to mass media adverts. However, *Exposed - issue 3* showed highest recognition in Wales. Wales also saw increased recognition of all interventions, including mass media, suggesting that the formation of THT Cymru and CHAPS Cymru with specific funding has already increased penetration of CHAPS interventions.

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 tables shows simple recognition of each of the interventions by the gender of men's sexual partners in the last year.

2001	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	19.5	25.7	25.6	9.8	9.8	15.9	<u>7.8</u>	20.5
women only	<u>10.5</u>	<u>10.4</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>9.2</u>	9.1	<u>13.0</u>
men and women	20.7	21.8	17.9	14.9	10.7	16.6	11.2	22.1
men only	33.2	50.9	40.9	23.8	14.8	29.3	16.9	28.2
sig.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

In the 2001 data, men who had sex with men only were more likely to recognise all of the interventions and men who had sex with women only were least likely to. This suggests CHAPS and other interventions are targeting successfully in this regard.

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
no one	21.0	17.7	19.9	24.3	14.1	15.2	<u>19.0</u>	<u>12.8</u>	17.8
Women Only	<u>4.2</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>9.9</u>	20.5	12.3	<u>9.7</u>
Men & Women	15.0	17.3	20.6	17.5	12.0	13.5	20.3	13.7	14.7
MEN Only	33.3	34.5	40.8	35.3	17.8	27.1	30.6	22.2	26.7
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

In the 2002 data, the same pattern exactly emerges. That is, men who had sex with men only were more likely to recognise all of the interventions and men who had sex with women only were least likely to.

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 sixteen interventions in five age groups.

2001	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>23.7</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>24.4</u>	<u>13.8</u>	11.9	<u>21.0</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>21.6</u>
20s	30.3	47.6	38.0	22.3	13.4	27.6	16.7	26.0
30s	32.9	50.4	42.7	26.4	15.0	30.2	17.1	29.1
40s	32.9	47.7	39.8	20.5	14.1	25.9	15.6	27.5
50+	34.9	42.4	30.2	20.2	16.4	24.9	14.7	30.1
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes

In the 2001 data, all but one of the interventions (*What are your reasons?*) showed differences in recognition across the age range. The majority of interventions were least likely to be recognised by the under 20 years olds. Men in their 30s were usually the group most likely to recognise interventions, although differences in recognition between men in their 20s, 30s and 40s were generally relatively small. One mass media advert (*Facts for life*) and one small media (*Exposed 1*) were most commonly recognised by men over 50.

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
to 19	30.6	<u>28.0</u>	30.1	<u>29.6</u>	19.5	22.1	<u>20.8</u>	19.0	<u>21.8</u>
20s	33.0	31.9	40.0	35.0	19.3	24.9	27.3	20.1	24.5
30s	31.7	33.1	41.3	32.4	15.8	26.6	30.4	21.7	25.5
40s	28.4	34.0	37.0	32.7	15.9	26.5	32.2	21.5	27.3
50 +	<u>23.7</u>	28.7	<u>26.8</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>12.6</u>	<u>21.6</u>	31.0	20.6	22.4
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

In the 2002 data, all but one of the interventions (*Exposed - issue 2*) showed differences in recognition across the age range. However, the relatively predictable pattern of variation by age seen in the 2001 data is not replicated in 2002.

The CHAPS mass media adverts were most commonly recognised by men in their 20s and 40s respectively. However, other adverts were most commonly recognised by men in their 30s (two), 20s and *Stigma* was most commonly recognised by men under 20.

Again, for the mass media adverts, the differences in recognition between men in their 20s, 30s and 40s were generally relatively small.

The pattern for the 3 small media interventions was much more stable: *Exposed - issues 1 and 3* were both most commonly recognised by men in their 40s, followed by men in their 30s. They were least commonly recognised by men under 20. Recognition of *Exposed - issue 2* did not vary by age, and was generally lower.

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 interventions by three ethnic group sub-samples: all white, all Black and all Asian.

2001	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	30.8	45.7	37.4	<u>21.3</u>	14.1	26.9	15.5	26.8
Asian	33.9	49.2	31.9	26.4	13.7	28.2	21.0	25.8
Black	37.5	55.4	38.0	45.2	18.5	34.4	19.3	30.8
sig.	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no

In the 2001 data, neither of the CHAPS mass media but one of the others (*Assume Nothing*) were more commonly recognised by Black men. In both these cases White men were least likely to recognise the interventions. Using multiple logistic regression, it appears the finding that Black men are most likely to recognise interventions is largely the outcome of the differential distribution of ethnicities across the UK and differential recruitment methods for ethnicities. That is, the vast majority of Black men are resident in London, where recognition is always highest, and the majority were recruited via the booklet, in which coverage is always higher (see introduction).

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
White	30.9	32.0	37.2	32.3	17.1	24.9	<u>28.5</u>	<u>20.4</u>	<u>24.6</u>
Asian	<u>23.6</u>	25.9	<u>35.9</u>	<u>31.4</u>	13.6	<u>22.1</u>	30.0	25.8	25.8
Black	35.3	37.5	50.3	43.8	17.7	32.4	43.3	36.4	35.9
sig.	Yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes

In the 2002 data, one of the two CHAPS mass media vary by ethnicity, and three of the other four mass media adverts and all three small media do. In every case where there is variation Black men are most likely to recognise the interventions. For the three mass media Asian men are least likely to recognise them and for the three small media White men are least likely to recognise them. Again, using multiple logistic regression, it appears the finding that Black men are most likely to recognise interventions is largely the outcome of the differential distribution of ethnicities across the UK and differential recruitment methods for ethnicities. That is, the vast majority of Black men are resident in London, where recognition is always highest, and the majority were recruited via the booklet, in which coverage is always higher (see introduction). However, the finding that

Asian men are least likely to recognise interventions survives such detailed analysis and is not an outcome of more of them being recruited via the web.

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 sixteen interventions across three education groups.

2001	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	31.9	<u>39.4</u>	<u>32.0</u>	<u>19.5</u>	16.0	<u>25.5</u>	<u>14.4</u>	26.7
medium	29.6	43.1	36.3	<u>19.8</u>	14.2	26.4	15.3	26.2
high	31.6	53.2	41.8	25.2	<u>12.8</u>	28.7	17.1	27.7
sig.	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no

In the 2001 data, three of the five mass media adverts, and two of the three small media showed greater recognition among men with higher education and lowest recognition among men with least education. One mass media intervention (*What are your reasons?*) showed the inverse effect. Further detail on the advertising strategies of the interventions will be sought to illuminate this contrary finding.

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
low	<u>28.4</u>	30.2	<u>31.0</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>21.3</u>	29.3	22.1	26.3
medium	32.0	32.5	38.3	32.3	18.6	24.3	28.0	21.1	24.8
high	31.2	32.5	41.0	35.2	<u>16.4</u>	27.8	29.1	19.9	23.9
sig.	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no

In the 2002 data, five of the six mass media adverts, but none of the three small media showed greater recognition among men with high or medium education and lowest recognition among men with least education. One mass media intervention (*Stigma*) showed the inverse effect. Further detail on the advertising strategies of the interventions will be sought to illuminate this contrary finding.

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 sixteen interventions across three testing history groups.

2001	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
never	<u>25.7</u>	<u>37.4</u>	<u>29.3</u>	<u>16.2</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>22.7</u>
negative	34.8	53.7	44.2	27.2	15.7	32.6	19.7	30.6
positive	52.9	68.8	60.3	36.4	19.2	48.0	31.0	37.3
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

In the 2001 data, men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise all 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 interventions are not good at targeting positive men specifically (due to their minority of 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.

2002	CHAPS adverts		Other adverts				CHAPS leaflets		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
never	<u>25.2</u>	<u>26.0</u>	<u>30.3</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>22.7</u>	<u>16.8</u>	<u>20.3</u>
negative	34.7	36.5	43.4	36.3	18.3	29.2	33.5	23.0	27.8
positive	45.0	44.2	53.1	47.2	17.8	41.5	43.9	35.2	38.0
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Again in the 2002 data, men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise each of the nine interventions, and men who had never tested were least likely to recognise them.

4.7 MALE SEXUAL PARTNER NUMBERS

A general recommendation for HIV prevention interventions is that they disproportionately benefit men with higher numbers of male sexual partners. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the interventions in five male sexual partner numbers groups. Partner numbers are for the last 12 months.

2001	<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
One	<u>25.7</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>32.8</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>12.2</u>	<u>20.4</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>24.6</u>
2, 3 or 4	29.2	40.6	31.9	17.5	13.5	24.3	14.2	25.7
5 to 12	33.4	49.2	40.3	23.2	14.6	29.4	16.4	29.0
13 to 29	37.2	55.4	45.2	28.3	15.7	32.3	20.2	28.2
30 +	36.7	61.8	48.1	36.9	17.6	37.8	20.6	31.5
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

In the 2001 data, there is a consistent and predictable relationship between recognition and numbers of male partners in the last year. All but one of the interventions were disproportionately more likely to be recognised by men with the highest number (30+) of sexual partners. Generally those with a single partner in the previous year were the least likely to have seen any of these interventions, and the likelihood of recognising the interventions increased as partner numbers increased.

2002	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>Other adverts</i>				<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>		
	Just as unb ..	Clever dick	Look what's back	Enjoy Fucking?	Stigma	You choose	Exposed 1	Exposed 2	Exposed 3
One	<u>26.5</u>	<u>25.6</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>28.7</u>	15.5	<u>19.2</u>	26.1	18.6	<u>20.1</u>
2, 3 or 4	29.1	27.0	32.8	31.0	17.6	21.9	<u>25.5</u>	<u>18.2</u>	23.0
5 to 12	31.9	34.4	41.2	35.0	17.4	26.4	29.1	20.5	26.2
13 to 29	37.6	40.9	47.5	37.4	17.8	32.2	36.6	26.8	31.2
30 +	38.0	46.8	54.3	40.3	17.8	37.2	38.2	29.1	32.2
sig.	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes

Again in the 2002 data, there is a consistent and predictable relationship between recognition and numbers of male partners in the last year. All but one of the interventions were disproportionately more likely to be recognised by men with the highest number of sexual partners. Generally those with a single partner in the previous year were the least likely to have seen any of these interventions, and the likelihood of recognising the interventions increased as partner numbers increased. For one mass media intervention, *Stigma*, there was no relationship between partner numbers and recognition.

David Reid
<david.reid@sigmaresearch.org.uk>
January 24th, 2003