

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

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**NATIONAL INTERVENTIONS**

1. Recognition of CHAPS mass media adverts is stable even though display spending has been reduced from about £67,000 to about £21,000, per intervention.
2. At least one quarter of all gay men and bisexual men in England and Wales recognise each CHAPS mass media advertising campaign.
3. Recognition of CHAPS small media adverts is increasing. At least one quarter of all gay men and bisexual men in England and Wales recognise each CHAPS small media intervention.
4. The majority of significant biases in these interventions are in the direction suggested by needs assessments. However, two large concerns emerge concerning the national interventions. data:
5. Some national small media are under-serving men with lower education.
6. Coverage is not equitable across England: gay communities outside London, particularly those in the North of England, are under-served by these interventions. However, coverage of both mass and (especially) small media interventions has risen substantially in Wales since the funding of CHAPS Cymru.

**LONDON INTERVENTIONS**

7. All the biases found in these interventions are in the direction suggested by needs assessments.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This interim report presents feedback on GMSS 2003 coverage data. Data from GMSS 2003, 2004, 2005 will form the basis of a section in the next 'Final Evaluation of CHAPS' report due in March 2006.

Measures of the target coverage achieved by eleven print interventions are reported here. This includes four press-based mass media adverts (one CHAPS national intervention; three GMFA London interventions) and eight small media (four CHAPS national interventions; four London interventions – three from Camden PCT and one from THT). The interventions were:

	<b>National (all THT/CHAPS)</b>	<b>London (Agency in brackets)</b>
<i>Gay-press mass media adverts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biology of transmission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationships: testing, telling, listening (GMFA)</li> <li>• Condoms: just as safe (GMFA)</li> <li>• Express yourself (GMFA)</li> </ul>
<i>Multi-site distributed leaflets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bottom line</li> <li>• Exposed 4: bottoms up</li> <li>• Come fly with me</li> <li>• Up, up and away</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condoms: Everything a gay men needs to know (Camden PCT)</li> <li>• Need help? (Camden PCT)</li> <li>• Good sexual health (Camden PCT)</li> </ul>
<i>Multi-site distributed CD / Leaflet</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sex Pigs (THT)</li> </ul>

The coverage measures were taken in the web version only of the *2003 National Gay Men's Sex Survey*. One multiple answer question was used for each intervention. All these men:

- were aged 14 years or older;
- had sex with a man in the last year and / or expected to have sex with a man in the future.

Recognition of National interventions were asked of men living in England (n=9102) or Wales (n=485). For the five national interventions, a mean of 1.0% of men declined to answer the coverage question.

Recognition of London interventions were asked of men who said they lived in Greater London (n=2470). For the seven London interventions, a mean of 0.8% of respondents declined to answer the coverage question.

## 2. RECOGNITION AND ENGAGEMENT WITH INTERVENTIONS

### 2.1 MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

For each of the four interventions men were shown two executions from each and asked to indicate one of the following three options:

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

The next tables show the proportion of all men indicating each option for the four adverts asked about in 2003. The bottom line of each table (*in italics*) shows the third line as a proportion of the second and third.

% of GMSS 2003 respondents	CHAPS advert (England or Wales residents)	Other adverts (London residents only)		
	Biology of transmission	Relationships: testing, ..	Condoms: just as safe	Express yourself
No, I have not seen	73.9	64.4	60.5	57.4
Any recognition	26.1	35.7	39.5	42.7
Recognise but have not looked at closely	13.0	17.2	21.3	16.7
Have read most or all of them	13.1	18.5	18.2	26.0
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>	<i>50.3</i>	<i>51.8</i>	<i>46.0</i>	<i>60.9</i>

Over a quarter (26.1%) of all men resident in England and Wales had seen and could recall the CHAPS adverts called *Biology of transmission*. While GMFA adverts have higher recognition this is true of all interventions for London-resident men (33.0% of London residents recognised *Biology of transmission* (see section 3.1). Changes in recognition compared to previous years is addressed in section 4.

In coverage surveys from 2001 and 2002 (see *Successful measures*) between 41% and 65% of web-recruited men who recognised an advert said they had actually read the text. The proportion in this set of interventions is similar.

### 2.2 SMALL MEDIA (LEAFLETS)

For the 5 small media, men were shown the front cover and asked to indicate as many as applied of the following options. A small proportion (around 1%) gave more than one answer.

- No, I've never seen it
- I recognise it but have never looked at it or read it.
- I've looked at it but not read it in detail.
- I've read most or all of it.
- I've kept a copy of it.

The next tables show the proportion of men indicating each option for the eight small media asked about in 2003. The four items in the first table are national interventions and data is reported for all residents of England and Wales. The four items in the second table were LONDON local interventions - data is only shown for London residents.

In both the following tables, 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 who had kept it as a proportion of those who recognised it.

% of England & Wales residents <b>GMSS 2003</b>	<b>CHAPS leaflets</b>			
	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
No, I have not seen it	75.3	70.6	77.9	83.7
Recognise but have not looked at closely	10.4	12.9	11.5	8.3
Looked at but not read in detail	6.3	7.9	5.0	3.8
Read most of it	5.4	6.5	3.9	2.8
I've kept a copy	3.5	2.9	2.3	1.9
<i>% of those who recognised who had read most of it and/ or kept</i>	<i>32.2</i>	<i>29.3</i>	<i>25.8</i>	<i>26.6</i>
<i>% of those who recognised who had kept</i>	<i>14.3</i>	<i>9.8</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>11.9</i>

About a quarter (24.7% to 29.4%) of all web-recruited men resident in England and Wales had seen and could recall the CHAPS small media *The Bottom line* and *Exposed - issue 4*. Changes in recognition compared to previous years is addressed in section 4.

Our earlier coverage surveys (*Successful measures 2003*) suggested that among web-recruited men between 18% and 39% of those recognising a small media had read them and / or kept them. In this 2003 data the range of responses is smaller for CHAPS interventions at between 29% and 33%. Also the differences in reading and retention rates between traditional booklets (*The Bottom line*) and the magazine-style *Exposed* series is smaller than previously reported. This suggests *Exposed - issue 4* has a higher retention rate than any previous magazine in the series.

% of London residents <b>GMSS 2003</b>	<b>Other leaflets</b>			
	<b>Sex Pigs CD (THT)</b>	<b>Condoms: needs to know (C. PCT)</b>	<b>Need help? (C. PCT)</b>	<b>Good sexual health (C. PCT)</b>
No, I have not seen it	84.6	74.6	72.4	79.0
Recognise but have not looked at closely	5.4	12.0	15.2	9.9
Looked at but not read in detail	2.8	6.8	6.2	5.3
Read most of it	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.8
I've kept a copy	4.7	2.4	2.7	2.3
<i>% of those who recognised who had read most of it and kept</i>	<i>47.5</i>	<i>26.1</i>	<i>22.6</i>	<i>27.5</i>
<i>% of those who recognised who had kept</i>	<i>30.5</i>	<i>9.3</i>	<i>9.7</i>	<i>11.1</i>

The London small media interventions were recognised by between 21% and 28%, similar to the National leaflets, but the CD leaflet was recognised by fewer men (15%) which is in keeping with its limited (and targeted) distribution. The CD did show by far the highest engagement and retention though. Almost a third of the men who recognised the CD had kept a copy. The engagement and retention measures for the other leaflets are very similar to the national leaflets.

### 3. DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PROMPTED RECOGNITION

The following sections consider differences in recognition across seven demographic characteristics. It uses the entire web sample of 9,587 men aged 14 or over, resident in England or Wales and homosexually active, or intending to be in the future. The seven characteristics considered are: Directorate of residence; sex with women; age; ethnic group; education; HIV testing history; and male sexual partner numbers in the last year.

For each characteristic a table shows the proportion of men in each group who recognised the interventions. For each characteristic we also show a multi-factor analysis where the results are expressed as Odds Ratios. Odds Ratios use a baseline for the comparisons (usually the priority group within the characteristic, such as men under 20 or less well educated men) and show where recognition significantly varies between this group and each of the other groups within the category. The figures in bold show significant variation. Where a bolded figure is LESS than 1, that group are LESS likely to recognise the intervention compared to the baseline. Where a bolded figure is MORE than 1, that group are MORE likely to recognise the intervention compared to the baseline. Hence, a row with a lot of bold indicates a group which is significantly less likely (if the figures are less than 1) or more likely (if the figure is MORE than 1) to recognise these interventions, compared with the denominator.

#### 3.1 AREA OF RESIDENCE

The largest part of the sample is resident in England (n=9102) which we split into its 4 Directorates of Health and Social Care. The 894 men living in England who gave us insufficient information to allocate them to one of these four directorates are excluded.

##### *National Interventions*

% of England & Wales residents	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>			
	<b>Biology of Transmission</b>	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
<b>London</b> N=2701-2717	33.0	36.3	34.3	36.2	28.0
<b>South England</b> N=1798-1802	26.1	21.7	27.8	19.3	12.4
<b>Mid &amp; Eastern England</b> N=1784-1795	23.5	18.7	27.3	15.4	11.6
<b>North England</b> N=1843-1851	19.8	19.2	26.9	14.2	9.7
<b>Wales</b> N=479-482	20.8	22.4	29.6	20.2	15.2

Controlling for sex with women, age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history and volume of male partners, the Odds Ratio for men recognising the adverts in different parts of the country when the odds of recognising it in London is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS leaflets		
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>London</b>	1.00	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
<b>South England</b>	0.86 0.74-1.01	<b>0.69</b> 0.59-0.81	0.93 0.80-1.08	<b>0.54</b> 0.46-0.64	<b>0.47</b> 0.38-0.57
<b>Mid &amp; Eastern England</b>	<b>0.77</b> 0.66-0.91	<b>0.58</b> 0.49-0.68	0.87 0.75-1.02	<b>0.43</b> 0.36-0.51	<b>0.45</b> 0.37-0.55
<b>North England</b>	<b>0.58</b> 0.50-0.68	<b>0.53</b> 0.45-0.62	0.87 0.75-1.02	<b>0.35</b> 0.29-0.42	<b>0.35</b> 0.28-0.43
<b>Wales</b>	<b>0.66</b> 0.49-0.87	0.84 0.64-1.10	1.03 0.79-1.33	<b>0.65</b> 0.49-0.87	<b>0.67</b> 0.49-0.93

As in previous coverage data (*Successful measures*), recognition varied by where men lived. Overall, men living in London were most likely to recognise all the national interventions (except *Exposed 4*) and men resident in North England were the group with lowest recognition of almost all interventions.

- *Biology of transmission* was recognised in South England as much as London, but less commonly recognised anywhere else.
- The *Bottom Line* was recognised in Wales as much as London, but more commonly recognised in London than any other English directorate.
- Recognition of *Exposed 4* did not vary by directorate.
- The two travel small media were less likely to be recognised in all parts of the country compared to London.
- The North of England is consistently under-served by these National interventions.

### London Interventions

The remaining interventions were shown to men who told us their Local Authority was in the London Directorate area and / or who answered affirmatively a specific question asking if they lived in Greater London.

% of London residents	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relation- ships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>Inner London</b> N=1394-1401	38.9	41.3	48.1	18.5	27.3	28.7	20.8
<b>Outer London</b> N=789-797	32.0	36.8	36.8	11.6	22.0	25.0	19.5

While London-resident men's recognition of GMFA mass media adverts is higher than their recognition of CHAPS national adverts this reflects their similar display spends and the fact that all GMFA media placement is geared towards London residents. London-resident men report higher recognition of CHAPS national small media than Camden PCT local small media for London. However, the differences are not substantial and a quarter of all London-residents recognise almost all small media.

Controlling for sex with women, age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history and volume of male partners, the Odds Ratio for men recognising the adverts in outer London when the odds of recognising it in inner London is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>Other adverts (GMFA)</i>			<i>Other leaflets</i>			
	Relation- ships	Condoms just as...	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>Inner London</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Outer London</b>	0.86 0.69-1.06	0.95 0.78-1.17	<b>0.71</b> 0.58-0.88	<b>0.69</b> 0.52-0.92	0.87 0.69-1.10	0.85 0.68-1.07	0.96 0.75-1.24

- No intervention was seen by more outer London residents than inner London residents.
- Two of the interventions (*Express Yourself* advert and *Sex Pigs* compact disc-leaflet) were significantly less widely recognised in outer than inner London.
- All other interventions were equally recognised by Inner and Outer London residents.

### 3.2 SEX WITH WOMEN

Within the group homosexually active men, CHAPS interventions prioritise those who have sex with men only, over men who have sex with both men and women. The following tables shows simple recognition by whether or not men had female sexual partners in the last year.

#### *National Interventions*

As in previous coverage data (*Successful measures*), men who did not have sex with women were much more likely to recognise all of the national interventions than those who did.

% of England & Wales residents	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>			
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>No sex with women</b> N=8389-8422	27.0	26.1	30.8	23.5	17.3
<b>Sex with women</b> n=1088-1100	19.3	13.8	18.6	11.7	8.9

Controlling for age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners and directorate of residence, the Odds Ratio for celibate, heterosexual and behaviourally bisexual men recognising the adverts when the odds of exclusively homosexually active men recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>			
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>No sex with women</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Sex with women</b>	<b>0.81</b> 0.67-0.99	<b>0.53</b> 0.43-0.67	<b>0.63</b> 0.52-0.77	<b>0.64</b> 0.51-0.81	<b>0.76</b> 0.59-0.98

- Compared to men who did not have sex with women, those who did were significantly less likely to have seen all of the national interventions.

### **London Interventions**

% of London residents	<b>Other adverts (GMFA)</b>			<b>Other leaflets</b>			
	<b>Relation-ships</b>	<b>Just as safe</b>	<b>Express yourself</b>	<b>Sex Pigs (THT)</b>	<b>Condoms, everything (CPCT)</b>	<b>Need help? (CPCT)</b>	<b>Good sexual health (CPCT)</b>
<b>No sex with women</b> N=2263-2277	37.1	40.7	44.1	16.2	25.6	27.2	20.9
<b>Sex with women</b> N=179-181	16.7	24.4	23.5	10.1	23.2	32.8	21.9

Controlling for age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners and living in Inner or Outer London, the Odds Ratio for celibate, heterosexual and behaviourally bisexual men recognising the adverts when the odds of exclusively homosexually active men recognising it is unity, were as follows:

<b>ODDS RATIO</b>  <b>95% confidence interval</b>	<b>Other adverts (GMFA)</b>			<b>Other leaflets</b>			
	<b>Relation-ships</b>	<b>Just as safe</b>	<b>Express yourself</b>	<b>Sex Pigs (THT)</b>	<b>Condoms, everything (CPCT)</b>	<b>Need help? (CPCT)</b>	<b>Good sexual health (CPCT)</b>
<b>No sex with women</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Sex with women</b>	<b>0.34</b> 0.21-0.59	<b>0.55</b> 0.36-0.85	<b>0.48</b> 0.31-0.75	0.85 0.46-1.56	1.09 0.69-1.71	1.25 0.82-1.91	0.95 0.58-1.55

- As with the National adverts, London adverts are seen by significantly more men who did not have sex with women than those who did.
- Unlike National leaflets, the London leaflets were equally recognised by the two groups.



### 3.3 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 twelve interventions in five age groups.

#### **National Interventions**

In previous coverage data men in their 30s were usually most likely to recognise national interventions, although differences in recognition between men in their 20s, 30s and 40s were generally relatively small.

% of England & Wales residents	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS leaflets		
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>under 20</b> N=751-761	21.8	16.7	23.8	11.2	8.1
<b>20s</b> N=2666-2678	25.8	27.1	31.3	21.8	16.2
<b>30s</b> N=2373-2383	28.8	28.3	31.6	26.7	20.1
<b>40s</b> N=1146-1151	26.2	23.1	28.1	22.8	16.2
<b>50s</b> N=608-611	27.1	14.7	24.7	19.7	12.8

Controlling for ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, directorate of residence and sex with women, the Odds Ratio for each age band when the odds of men under 20 years of age recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS leaflets		
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>under 20</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>20s</b>	0.98 0.79-1.22	<b>1.32</b> 1.05-1.67	1.16 0.94-1.42	<b>1.46</b> 1.11-1.92	<b>1.44</b> 1.05-1.98
<b>30s</b>	0.97 0.78-1.21	1.14 0.90-1.45	1.03 0.84-1.28	<b>1.57</b> 1.19-2.08	<b>1.54</b> 1.12-2.17
<b>40s</b>	0.87 0.68-1.12	0.91 0.70-1.18	0.87 0.69-1.10	1.30 0.96-1.75	1.19 0.84-1.69
<b>50s</b>	1.02 0.78-1.35	<b>0.59</b> 0.4-0.82	0.82 0.63-1.08	1.26 0.90-1.76	1.04 0.70-1.54

- Two national interventions showed no significant difference in recognition with increasing age (*Biology of transmission* and *Exposed 4*).
- For the *Bottom line* men in their 20s were significantly more likely recognise it than men under 20. Men over 50 were significantly less likely to recognise it compared to any other age group.
- The two travel leaflets were significantly more likely to be recognised by men in the 20s and 30s, compared to men under 20.

### London interventions

% of London residents	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>under 20</b> N=67-69	35.3	44.9	38.2	<u>9.0</u>	29.0	31.9	23.9
<b>20s</b> N=660-664	37.8	42.7	42.1	12.0	28.2	31.3	21.6
<b>30s</b> N=765-772	40.0	44.5	48.1	21.0	28.2	25.8	21.6
<b>40s</b> N=321-325	33.7	33.2	44.9	18.3	24.1	28.9	21.6
<b>50s</b> N=133-135	19.3	27.6	29.3	9.0	14.8	16.3	12.6

Controlling for ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, living in Inner or Outer London and sex with women, the Odds Ratio of men in each age band recognising the interventions when the odds of men under twenty recognising them is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
under 20	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
20s	0.86 0.45-1.64	0.73 0.40-1.35	0.76 0.40-1.44	0.85 0.29-2.54	0.62 0.32-1.21	0.94 0.49-1.83	0.83 0.40-1.73
30s	0.83 0.44-1.59	0.72 0.39-1.34	0.80 0.42-1.52	1.58 0.54-4.68	0.52 0.27-1.02	0.71 0.37-1.38	0.81 0.39-1.69
40s	0.63 0.32-1.24	<b>0.44</b> 0.23-0.84	0.72 0.37-1.39	1.25 0.41-3.80	<b>0.44</b> 0.22-0.88	0.88 0.44-1.75	0.83 0.39-1.77
50s	<b>0.33</b> 0.15-0.70	<b>0.40</b> 0.19-0.81	<b>0.42</b> 0.20-0.87	0.66 0.20-2.25	<b>0.27</b> 0.12-0.61	<b>0.39</b> 0.17-0.86	0.42 0.17-1.02

- In general, older men (those over 50 in particular) were significantly less likely to recognise adverts compared with men under 20.
- Among the three Camden PCT small media, two were significantly less likely to be recognised by older men compared to men under 20, with the other one (and *Sex Pigs*) showing no significant age effects.

### 3.4 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 sub-samples: all white, all Black and all Asian men.

#### **National Interventions**

In previous coverage data (*Successful measures*), some CHAPS mass media were more commonly recognised by Black men with White men least likely to recognise them. Using multiple logistic regression, it appeared the finding was 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 were resident in London, where recognition is always highest, and the majority were recruited via the booklet, in which coverage is always higher.

% of England & Wales residents	CHAPS adverts	CHAPS leaflets			
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>White</b> N=8902-8940	25.9	24.1	29.2	22.0	16.2
<b>Black</b> N=88-90	33.3	52.2	51.7	26.7	23.9
<b>Asian</b> N=189-191	25.8	25.7	<u>25.8</u>	21.5	<u>14.8</u>

Controlling for formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, directorate of residence, sex with women and age, the Odds Ratio for each ethnic minority group recognising the adverts when the odds of white men recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts	CHAPS leaflets			
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
White	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Black	1.15 0.69-1.91	<b>2.78</b> 1.71-4.52	<b>2.16</b> 1.34-3.49	1.04 0.61-1.77	1.27 0.72-2.22
Asian	0.87 0.59-1.28	0.83 0.56-1.24	0.78 0.53-1.15	0.68 0.44-1.03	0.67 0.42-1.09

- Recognition of *Biology of transmission* did not vary by ethnicity.
- For the *Bottom line* and *Exposed 4* Black men were more likely to recognise the interventions than White British men. While Asian men appear to be least likely to recognise them, the effects are not significant, suggesting the under-serving of Asian men previously observed in National CHAPS intervention may have been eliminated.
- Recognition of the two travel leaflets did not vary by ethnicity.

### London Interventions

% of London residents	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>White</b> N=2167-2180	35.9	38.9	42.5	16.0	25.1	27.3	20.7
<b>Black</b> N=50-51	36.0	54.0	50.0	17.6	29.4	44.0	26.0
<b>Asian</b> N=89-90	31.5	36.7	43.8	10.1	21.1	31.1	19.3

Controlling for formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, living in Inner or Outer London, sex with women and age, the Odds Ratio of men in each minority ethnic group recognising the interventions when the odds of White men recognising them is unity, were:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>White</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Black</b>	1.20 0.62-2.31	1.58 0.84-2.98	1.55 0.81-2.98	0.75 0.28-1.98	1.09 0.53-2.22	1.77 0.93-3.38	1.92 0.98-3.79
<b>Asian</b>	0.76 0.44-1.31	1.02 0.61-1.70	1.27 0.76-2.13	0.55 0.22-1.41	0.79 0.42-1.48	1.13 0.65-1.96	0.78 0.39-1.55

- None of the London interventions showed significant differences by ethnic group.

### 3.5 FORMAL 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 twelve interventions across three education groups.

### National Interventions

% of England & Wales residents	CHAPS adverts	CHAPS leaflets			
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
<b>Low</b> N=2278-2297	23.2	19.6	28.6	18.3	13.4
<b>Medium</b> N=2904-2924	24.9	23.8	28.1	20.4	14.4
<b>High</b> N=4273-4287	28.5	28.0	30.7	25.4	19.2

Controlling for HIV testing history, volume of male partners, directorate of residence, sex with women, age and ethnic group, the Odds Ratio for medium and high education men recognising the adverts when the odds of men with low education recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS leaflets		
	Biology of Transmission	Bottom line	Exposed 4: bottoms up	Come fly with me	Up, up and away
95% confidence interval					
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	1.11 0.95-1.29	<b>1.31</b> 1.12-1.54	1.01 0.87-1.17	1.08 0.91-1.29	0.97 0.80-1.18
<b>High</b>	1.10 0.95-1.27	<b>1.26</b> 1.08-1.47	0.98 0.85-1.13	<b>1.21</b> 1.04-1.42	1.16 0.97-1.38

- Neither *Biology of transmission* nor *Exposed 4* showed any biases by education.
- The *Bottom line* was more commonly recognised by men with *medium* or *high* levels of education and *Come fly with me* was more commonly recognised by men with *high* education.
- No intervention was more commonly recognised by men with lower education than by men with higher education.

### London Interventions

% of London residents	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>Low</b> N=379-383	30.2	38.1	39.1	16.2	23.8	28.5	22.6
<b>Medium</b> N=533-539	35.4	38.6	40.7	14.3	24.2	27.9	20.5
<b>High</b> N=1521-1528	37.0	40.2	44.4	16.2	26.2	27.3	20.8

Controlling for HIV testing history, volume of male partners, living in Inner or Outer London, sex with women, age and ethnicity, the Odds Ratio of men with medium and high education recognising the interventions when the odds of men with low education recognising them is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
95% confidence interval							
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	1.12 0.80-1.56	0.91 0.66-1.26	0.92 0.67-1.28	0.81 0.52-1.24	0.91 0.63-1.32	0.95 0.67-1.35	0.74 0.50-1.09
<b>High</b>	1.09 0.82-1.46	0.95 0.72-1.25	0.98 0.74-1.30	0.82 0.57-1.17	0.95 0.70-1.29	0.86 0.63-1.16	0.77 0.56-1.07

- None of the London interventions showed significant difference in recognition across the education groups.

### 3.6 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 tables show recognition of each of the twelve interventions across three testing history groups.

#### **National Interventions**

In this coverage data, men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise all the interventions, and men who had never tested were least likely to recognise them. The same pattern was evident in 2001 and the 2002 coverage data.

% of England & Wales residents	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>			
	<b>Biology of Transmission</b>	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
<b>Tested positive</b> n=565-570	35.9	39.6	37.7	42.8	33.0
<b>Last test negative</b> n=4486-4507	31.6	29.6	34.6	26.3	19.6
<b>Never tested</b> n=4385-4415	19.2	17.7	23.0	15.2	10.8

Controlling for volume of male partners, directorate of residence, sex with women, age, ethnic group and education, the Odds Ratio for men who have never tested and those whose last test was negative recognising the adverts when the odds of men who had tested positive recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>	<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>			
	<b>Biology of Transmission</b>	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
<b>95% confidence interval</b>					
<b>Tested positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last test negative</b>	0.88 0.71-1.09	<b>0.73</b> 0.59-0.90	0.87 0.70-1.07	<b>0.56</b> 0.45-0.69	<b>0.60</b> 0.48-0.75
<b>Never tested</b>	<b>0.54</b> 0.43-0.68	<b>0.49</b> 0.39-0.62	<b>0.55</b> 0.44-0.69	<b>0.37</b> 0.29-0.46	<b>0.41</b> 0.32-0.52

- Men who had never tested were on average half as likely to recognise all the interventions than men who had tested positive.
- Men whose last test was negative were less likely to recognise three of the five interventions compared with diagnosed positive men.

### London Interventions

% of London residents	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>Tested positive</b> N=270-272	39.5	44.9	56.7	29.9	36.3	33.5	24.4
<b>Last test negative</b> N=1420-1429	38.1	41.9	45.9	16.9	27.0	28.7	22.7
<b>Never tested</b> N=745-754	29.7	33.0	31.5	8.5	18.7	23.2	16.4

Controlling for volume of male partners, living in Inner or Outer London, sex with women, age, ethnicity and education, the Odds Ratio of men who had never tested or tested negative recognising the interventions when the odds of men who had tested HIV positive recognising them is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	Other adverts (GMFA)			Other leaflets			
	Relationships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>Tested positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last test negative</b>	0.87 0.64-1.86	0.90 0.67-1.21	<b>0.65</b> 0.48-0.88	<b>0.68</b> 0.48-0.96	<b>0.60</b> 0.44-0.82	0.75 0.55-1.04	0.95 0.66-1.35
<b>Never tested</b>	0.74 0.52-1.04	0.74 0.53-1.03	<b>0.46</b> 0.32-0.64	<b>0.31</b> 0.20-0.49	<b>0.46</b> 0.32-0.66	<b>0.62</b> 0.43-0.89	0.67 0.45-1.01

- Men who had never tested were on average half as likely to recognise one of the three GMFA adverts compared to men who had tested positive. However, recognition of the other two adverts did not vary by HIV testing history.
- Men whose last test was negative were also less likely to recognise three of the five interventions than were positive men.
- No intervention was less commonly seen by men with HIV than those without. Most were least commonly seen by those who had never tested. *Sex Pigs* in particular showed a large difference between positive men and those who had never tested.

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.

### 3.7 VOLUME OF MALE SEXUAL PARTNERS

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.

#### **National Interventions**

In previous coverage data there has been a consistent relationship between recognition and numbers of male partners in the last year. All the interventions were more likely to be recognised by men with the highest number (30+) of sexual partners. Generally the likelihood of recognising interventions increased as partner numbers increased.

% of England & Wales residents	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>		
	<b>Biology of Transmission</b>	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
<b>30 +</b> N=1010-1016	37.2	38.3	38.5	34.5	27.7
<b>13 - 29</b> N=1199-1208	31.7	31.3	35.5	30.0	21.9
<b>5 - 12</b> N=2214-2228	27.9	26.1	30.3	24.6	18.3
<b>2, 3, or 4</b> N=2675-2682	23.9	21.0	27.9	17.6	12.8
<b>1</b> N=1680-1694	22.7	21.6	26.9	18.5	12.8
<b>None</b> N=644-645	11.0	10.2	13.7	8.7	5.4

Controlling for directorate of residence, sex with women, age, ethnic group, education and HIV testing history, the Odds Ratio for men with different numbers of partners recognising the interventions when the odds of men who had more than thirty partners recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>CHAPS leaflets</i>		
	<b>Biology of Transmission</b>	<b>Bottom line</b>	<b>Exposed 4: bottoms up</b>	<b>Come fly with me</b>	<b>Up, up and away</b>
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13- 29</b>	0.84 0.69-1.03	<b>0.79</b> 0.64-0.97	0.95 0.78-1.17	0.88 0.71-1.09	<b>0.79</b> 0.63-0.99
<b>5 - 12</b>	<b>0.74</b> 0.62-0.89	<b>0.68</b> 0.56-0.82	<b>0.77</b> 0.64-0.92	<b>0.73</b> 0.60-0.88	<b>0.68</b> 0.55-0.84
<b>2, 3, 4</b>	<b>0.69</b> 0.57-0.83	<b>0.61</b> 0.50-0.73	<b>0.78</b> 0.65-0.94	<b>0.61</b> 0.50-0.74	<b>0.55</b> 0.44-0.68
<b>1</b>	<b>0.64</b> 0.52-0.78	<b>0.60</b> 0.49-0.74	<b>0.70</b> 0.58-0.86	<b>0.65</b> 0.53-0.81	<b>0.59</b> 0.47-0.75
<b>None</b>	<b>0.33</b> 0.24-0.46	<b>0.32</b> 0.22-0.45	<b>0.39</b> 0.29-0.54	<b>0.25</b> 0.17-0.38	<b>0.25</b> 0.16-0.40



- No intervention was more commonly seen by men with fewer than 30 partners than it was by men with more than 30 partners.
- An overall pattern emerges of men being less likely to recognise interventions the fewer partners they had. As men with larger numbers of partners are priorities for prevention programmes, this is an encouraging finding.

### **London Interventions**

In the London local data, the same pattern is observed for all the three mass media adverts and two of the four small media interventions.

% of London residents	<i>Other adverts (GMFA)</i>			<i>Other leaflets</i>			
	Relation-ships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>30 +</b> n=450-454	38.5	43.6	54.1	26.2	32.6	28.5	23.1
<b>13 - 29</b> n=416-421	34.9	41.0	48.1	21.3	25.8	28.0	20.5
<b>5 - 12</b> N=646-653	37.8	39.3	39.4	12.9	27.6	27.6	21.1
<b>2, 3, or 4</b> N=500-503	33.4	37.9	38.8	12.0	20.7	24.9	20.6
<b>1</b> N=317-318	38.4	40.3	39.9	9.4	22.0	32.8	22.4
<b>None</b> N=99-101	16.2	22.8	17.0	5.0	12.9	18.8	11.0

Controlling for living in Inner or Outer London, sex with women, age, ethnicity, education and HIV testing history, the Odds Ratio of men with different numbers of male partners recognising the interventions when the odds of men with more than thirty partners recognising them is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO  95% confidence interval	<i>Other adverts (GMFA)</i>			<i>Other leaflets</i>			
	Relation-ships	Just as safe	Express yourself	Sex Pigs (THT)	Condoms, everything (CPCT)	Need help? (CPCT)	Good sexual health (CPCT)
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13 - 29</b>	0.88 0.64-1.20	0.97 0.71-1.32	0.79 0.58-1.07	0.79 0.54-1.13	<b>0.67</b> 0.48-0.95	0.88 0.62-1.24	0.79 0.54-1.15
<b>5 - 12</b>	0.96 0.72-1.28	0.85 0.64-1.14	<b>0.53</b> 0.40-0.70	<b>0.51</b> 0.35-0.73	0.86 0.63-1.16	0.92 0.67-1.26	0.92 0.65-1.29
<b>2, 3, 4</b>	0.80 0.58-1.10	0.79 0.58-1.08	<b>0.57</b> 0.42-0.78	<b>0.47</b> 0.31-0.71	<b>0.60</b> 0.42-0.84	0.86 0.61-1.21	0.89 0.61-1.29
<b>1</b>	<b>1.08</b> 0.76-1.54	0.90 0.63-1.27	<b>0.60</b> 0.42-0.86	<b>0.37</b> 0.22-0.62	<b>0.64</b> 0.43-0.96	<b>1.46</b> 1.01-2.12	1.05 0.69-1.59
<b>None</b>	<b>0.39</b> 0.19-0.79	0.58 0.32-1.06	<b>0.31</b> 0.16-0.59	<b>0.32</b> 0.11-0.94	<b>0.39</b> 0.18-0.86	0.82 0.42-1.58	0.57 0.25-1.26

- There was no relationship between male partner numbers and recognition for one of the adverts (*Just as safe*) and one leaflet (*Good sexual health*)
- One other leaflet (*Need help?*) Was most commonly recognised by men with one male partner in the last year.
- For all other interventions recognition decreased with fewer sexual partners, and was particularly low among men with no male sexual partners.

#### 4. CHANGES IN RECOGNITION OF CHAPS INTERVENTIONS

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 for coverage data. This gave us a sample sizes of 6825 in 2001 (2384 booklet and 4441 web recruits) and 11046 in 2002 (3515 booklet and 7531 web). This change gave us access to vastly larger samples - at a similar cost - which allowed us to examine coverage for specific target groups. With the increasing scale and success of the web-based version of GMSS we switched to only using the web version for coverage questions in 2003.

These changes make comparison with coverage data from 1997-2000 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 (see *Successful measures*). This data showed that the switch of methods from Pride to web and booklet recruitment suppresses baseline coverage. Men recruited through the web were consistently and substantially less likely to report having encountered all interventions. This accounts for the apparent slight fall in overall recognition for the mass media adverts compared to 1997-2000 data. The change of methods also probably suppresses the observed increase in recognition of CHAPS small media interventions.

##### 4.1 CHAPS MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

Our 1997-2000 coverage data, from men recruited at Pride events, estimated that CHAPS national adverts were recognised by between 40% and 55% of their target group. These figures were achieved with a display cost of £53,000 to £73,000 (with an average of £67,812 per intervention, see *Advertising Awareness* 2001).

The two new CHAPS adverts in 2000-2001 (*Facts for life* and *In two minds*) had display costs of about £40,000 and achieved comparable coverage to previous adverts (see *Successful measures* 2003), whether you took the overall web and booklet figures (31-47% recognised), the Pride attending sub-sample (42-63%) or the booklet sample only (43%-60%) or the web sample only (25%-39%).

GMSS 2001 % any recognition	% Web (n=4441)	Display dates	Display cost (£)
Facts for Life (adverts)	24.8	09/00 to 02/01	39,808
In two minds? (adverts)	39.3	11/00 to 02/01	40,252

The two new CHAPS adverts in 2001-2002 (*Just as unbelievable* and *Clever dick*) used display costs £20,252 and £22,046 respectively and still achieved comparable coverage (see *Successful measures* 2003) whether you took the overall web and booklet figures (31-32% recognised), the booklet sample only (44%-44%) or the web sample only (26%-27%).

GMSS 2002 % any recognition	% Web (n=7531)	Display dates	Display cost (£)
Just as unbelievable (adverts)	26.5	10/01 to 01/02	20,252
Clever dick (adverts)	26.7	03/02 to 05/02	22,046

In 2003 web-only data, 26.1% of all men recognised the 2002-2003 mass media advert *Biology of transmission*. This is comparable to 2001 web-only figures of 24.8% for *Facts for life* and 2002 web-only figures of 26.5% recognising *Just as unbelievable* and 26.7% recognising *Clever dick*. While all these figures are all lower than those for *In two minds* (39.3% of web-only recruits recognised this in 2001) we believe this campaign to have had unusually high recognition.

<b>GMSS 2003 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=9587)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
Biology of transmission (advert)	26.1	10/02 to 01/03	20,661

#### **4.2 CHAPS SMALL MEDIA**

Our first set of coverage data estimated that CHAPS national leaflets were recognised by between 10% and 20% of their target group (see *Advertising Awareness*, 2001). The two CHAPS 2001 leaflets (*Exposed - issue 1* and *All the f\*\*\*ing facts*), showed levels of recognition that were at the upper end of this range and higher than almost all of the previous CHAPS small media. In the 2001 data, recognition of the two small media interventions was *higher* irrespective of whether you took the overall web and booklet figures (27% recognised), the Pride attending sub-sample (34%-40%) or the booklet sample only (38%-43%) or the web sample only (19%-21%).

<b>GMSS 2001 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=4441)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
All the f***ing facts (booklet)	18.9	September 2000	43,000
Exposed - issue 1 (magazine format)	21.2	November 2000	72,500

Again in 2002, recognition of the three versions of *Exposed* was high compared to 1997-2000 small media figures, irrespective of whether you took the overall web and booklet figures (21-29% recognised), or the booklet sample only (36%-45%) or the web sample only (14%-22%).

<b>GMSS 2002 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=7531)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed - issue 1 (magazine format)	21.8	November 2000	72,500
Exposed - issue 2 (magazine format)	14.2	October 2001	92,000
Exposed - issue 3 (magazine format)	17.1	March 2002	69,000

Taking 2001 and 2002 data together we suggested recognition of CHAPS small media had increased from 1997-2000, probably because of increasingly effective leaflet distribution (see *Successful measures* 2003). In the 2003 coverage data, recognition of *Exposed - issue 4* and *The Bottom line* was *higher* than any previous year (27%-30% of the web sample recognised them). This data suggests further increases in recognition of CHAPS small media and confirms that such increases are not solely the function of the magazine format used for the *Exposed* series, since the increase also applies to more traditional format of the booklet *The Bottom line*.

<b>GMSS 2003 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=9587)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed - issue 4 (magazine format)	29.4	November 2002	79,000
The bottom line (booklet)	26.7	January 2003	29,000

We have reported previously (*Successful measures*) that the *Exposed series (1-3)* had a relatively high recognition rate compared to more traditional leaflets. *Exposed - issue 4* is more widely recognised than any previous magazine in the series. While *The Bottom line* is marginally less widely recognised, it is more widely recognised than any previous small media (including *Exposed 1-3*) that we have web-recruited coverage measures for.

David Reid  
<[david.reid@sigmaresearch.org.uk](mailto:david.reid@sigmaresearch.org.uk)>

31<sup>st</sup> January 2004