

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

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**COVERAGE OF NATIONAL INTERVENTIONS**

1. Compared to previous CHAPS adverts, recognition of *Infection Situations* was poor but *Think Again* was a little above average.
2. Recognition of CHAPS small media was also similar to previous years.

**COVERAGE OF LONDON INTERVENTIONS**

3. Compared to previous London adverts, recognition of *Sex Tips* and *How HIV Transmission works* was extremely high, while that for *Use Lube* was average.
4. Recognition of London small media was similar to previous years.

**BIASES IN MEDIA INTERVENTIONS**

5. National interventions equally serve men in London and Wales but under-serve men elsewhere in England, particularly men in the North of England.
6. In terms of desirable biases, overall these mass and small media interventions are disproportionately recognised by groups more likely to be involved in HIV-related exposure behaviours.
7. As is desirable, almost all interventions are more likely to be seen by gay rather than bisexual men, those with more rather than fewer sexual partners and by men who have tested HIV positive rather than those who have not.
8. Some interventions are more likely to be recognised by Black men than other ethnic groups (and none are less likely to be recognised by Black men), as is suggested by needs assessments.
9. Less encouraging were biases across age and education. Only one intervention (*Below the Belt*) was more commonly recognised by younger men, while a few were more commonly recognised by older men. No intervention was more commonly recognised by men with lower education, while a few were more commonly recognised by men with higher education.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

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

Measures of the target coverage achieved by eleven print interventions are reported here. These include five press-based mass media adverts (two CHAPS national interventions and three GMFA London interventions), five small media (three CHAPS national interventions and two London interventions from Camden PCT) and one combined advert and small media intervention (from THT).

	<b>National (Agency in brackets)</b>	<b>London (Agency in brackets)</b>
<i>Gay-press mass media adverts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Think again (THT, CHAPS)</li> <li>• Infection situations (THT, CHAPS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sex Tips for Boys (GMFA)</li> <li>• How HIV transmission works (GMFA)</li> <li>• Use lube (GMFA)</li> </ul>
Combined advert & booklet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three pricks (THT)</li> </ul>	
<i>Multi-site distributed booklets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Below the belt (THT, CHAPS)</li> <li>• Exposed 5: Everything's rosy (THT, CHAPS)</li> <li>• Exposed 6: Tales of the unexpected (THT, CHAPS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semen, sex and HIV (Camden)</li> <li>• AIDS: a Gay man's guide (Camden)</li> </ul>

One multiple answer question was used for each intervention.

The coverage measures were taken in the **web version only**. All respondents are:

- male
- 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 all interventions (including those interventions targeted at men living in London) were asked of all men living in the UK. These included men living in England (n=10,249), Wales (n=480), Scotland (n=912) and Northern Ireland (n=268). For the six national interventions, a mean of 1.0% of the national sample declined to answer the coverage questions.

For the five London interventions, a mean of 1.0% of respondents living in London (N=3177) declined to answer the coverage questions.

## 2. RECOGNITION AND ENGAGEMENT WITH INTERVENTIONS

### 2.1 MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

All five of the advert interventions consisted of a number of executions (variations on a theme). For each, men were shown two executions and were asked to indicate as many as apply from the following:

- 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
- I've visited the website

Responses were organised into two variables, the first with three values (not recognised / recognised but not read / read), the second indicating whether or not men had been to the web site. The small number of men who indicated having been to the web site only were judged to have read the intervention.

#### **National recognition**

The following table shows the proportion of men who indicated not having recognised or recognised at all the intervention; then how those recognising were split between readers and non-readers; the proportion of recognisers who were also readers (in italics); and finally, the overall proportion who had visited the web site.

% of all UK residents (N=11,909)		<i>THT adverts</i>		<i>GMFA adverts</i>		
		<b>Think again</b>	<b>Infection situations</b>	<b>Sex tips for boys</b>	<b>How HIV transmission works</b>	<b>Use lube</b>
Do NOT recognise it		70.9	81.4	60.3	61.7	71.6
Recognise it		29.1	18.6	39.7	38.3	28.4
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	13.4	9.0	11.8	16.5	12.9
	Have read most or all of it	15.7	9.6	27.9	21.8	15.5
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>		<i>54.0</i>	<i>51.6</i>	<i>70.3</i>	<i>56.9</i>	<i>54.6</i>
Have visited the website		1.7	1.6	4.5	1.8	1.2

In coverage surveys in 2001 and 2002 (see *Successful Measures*) CHAPS interventions were recognised by between 25% and 39% of web recruited respondents. One of the current CHAPS adverts (Think Again) falls within this range while the other (Infection situations) falls somewhat below it. All three of the London adverts also fell within the range for National interventions, with two being particularly high.

In the 2001 and 2002 surveys between 41% and 65% of web-recruited men who recognised an advert said they had read the text. Four of the five current interventions fall in the middle of this range while one London intervention (Sex Tips for Boys) showed a particularly high level of reading.

For all five interventions the proportion visiting a web site is much lower than the proportion recognising it. However, the web-site associated with 'Sex Tips for Boys' was visited by more than twice that for any other.

### **London recognition**

The following table shows the same measures for the London interventions among the London respondents.

% of all London residents (N=3,177)		GMFA adverts		
		Sex tips for boys	How HIV transmission works	Use lube
Do NOT recognise it		46.6	45.5	66.9
Recognise it		53.4	54.5	33.1
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	15.6	20.5	15.1
	Have read most or all of it	37.8	34.0	18.0
% of those who recognised who had read		70.8	62.4	54.4
Have visited the website		5.5	2.5	1.7

As these are intended to be London targeted interventions, recognition is higher among London residents than in the country as a whole. However, the proportion recognising who read is similar suggesting men in London are no more likely to read London interventions when they encounter them than are men elsewhere in the UK.

Although the proportion visiting the web sites is higher in London than elsewhere, it is still small compared with the proportion seeing the adverts.

## **2.2 COMPOSITE ADVERT / BOOKLET INTERVENTION**

One intervention (*Three Pricks* from the THT) was a combination of both a series of mass media adverts and a booklet. We may expect recognition of this intervention to be higher than for 'advert only' or 'booklet only' interventions, there being two parts to it each of which men could encounter separately.

Men were shown the advert and postcard and were asked to indicate as many as applied of the following options:

- No, I have not seen any of this campaign
- I recognise the campaign but have never looked closely at or read it
- I've read most or all of the advert
- I've read most or all of the booklet
- I've kept a copy of the booklet
- I've visited the website

Responses were organised into three variables, the first with five values (not recognised / recognised but not looked at closely / read advert only / read booklet only / read both advert and booklet), the second indicating whether or not men had been to the web site,

and the third indicating whether men had kept a copy of the booklet. The small number of men who indicated having been to the web site only were judged to have read the intervention. Men who indicated having kept a copy only were judged to have read it.

% of all UK residents (N=11,909)		Three pricks (THT)
Have NOT seen it		60.0
Recognise it		40.0
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	19.7
	Read advert only	14.5
	Read advert and booklet	2.1
	Read booklet only	3.7
<i>% of those who recognised who had read advert and/or booklet</i>		<i>50.8</i>
Have visited the website		1.8
Have kept a copy of the booklet		2.0

The overall national recognition of this intervention was higher than all the 'advert only' interventions but lower than two London specific interventions in London. The proportion reading either part of the combined intervention however was at the low end of the range.

The proportions visiting the web site or holding onto a copy of the booklet were much lower than the proportion recognising or reading.

### 2.3 SMALL MEDIA (BOOKLETS)

For the five items of small media, men were shown the front cover of the booklet and asked to indicate as many as applied of the following options.

- 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

A small proportion of respondents (around 1%) gave more than one answer. Responses have been organised into one of four answers plus whether or not men kept a copy. Men who indicated having kept a copy only were judged to have read it. The following table shows national coverage for all six small media.

% of UK residents (N=11,909)		CHAPS booklets			Other booklets	
		Below the belt	Exposed 5: Everything 's rosy	Exposed 6: Tales of the unexpected	Semen, sex & HIV (Camden)	AIDS: Gay man's guide (Camden)
Have NOT seen it		79.8	78.3	78.8	87.7	83.1
Recognise it		20.2	21.7	21.2	12.3	16.9
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	9.7	9.5	8.8	6.5	8.7
	Looked at but not read in detail	5.2	6.7	5.8	3.3	4.3
	Read most of it	5.4	5.5	6.7	2.5	3.9
I've kept a copy		3.7	1.9	2.1	1.2	2.1
% of those who recognised who had read most of it		26.7	25.3	31.6	20.3	23.1
% of those who recognised who had kept		18.3	8.8	9.9	9.8	12.4

About a fifth (20%-22%) of web-recruited men resident in UK could recall the CHAPS small media *Below the Belt* and the two issues of *Exposed*. 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 and the reading of these interventions fall within that range. Keeping a copy of the media appears particularly common for 'Below the Belt'.

National recognition of the London small media was less than that for the national small media (unlike the advert recognition), suggesting the collateral benefit of London small media is less than that for adverts. However, these London small media are still recognised by between 1-in-8 and 1-in-6 men nationally. The following table shows the same measures for the local London small media among respondents living in London.

% of all London residents (N=3,177)	Other booklets	
	Semen, sex & HIV (Camden PCT)	AIDS: Gay man's guide (Camden PCT)
Have NOT seen it	75.8	75.7
Recognise it	24.2	24.3
Recognise but have not looked at closely	12.1	11.6
Looked at but not read in detail	6.4	5.9
Read most of it	5.6	6.8
I've kept a copy	2.8	4.2
% of those who recognised who had read most of it	23.1	28.0
% of those who recognised who had kept	11.6	17.3

Recognition, reading and keeping of the London interventions were all more common among the London respondents than among the UK as a whole.

### **3. DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PROMPTED RECOGNITION**

This section considers differences in recognition across the following seven characteristics:

- the area of the UK lived in
- sex with women in the last year
- age group
- ethnic group
- level of formal education
- HIV testing history
- numbers of male sex partners in the last year

The analysis uses the entire web sample of 11,909 men aged 14 or over, resident in Britain and homosexually active (or intending to be in the future).

For each characteristic the first table shows the proportion of men in each group who recognised the interventions. An asterisk (\*) indicates that recognition of that intervention significantly varied at the uni-variate level across that characteristic.

For each characteristic the second table shows 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 is less likely to recognise the intervention compared to the baseline. Where a bolded figure is more than 1, that group is 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 figures are more than 1) to recognise these interventions, compared with the priority groups.

Under each characteristic we consider National and then London targeted interventions.

#### **3.1 AREA OF RESIDENCE**

The largest part of the sample is resident in England (n=10249) which we split into its four Directorates of Health and Social Care. There were 812 men living in England who gave insufficient information to allocate them to one of these four directorates and were excluded.

##### ***National interventions***

CHAPS national interventions are targeted at men living in England and Wales only (not Scotland or Northern Ireland). Within England and Wales, they are intended to be seen equally by men living in different areas.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	* Think again	* Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5	* Exposed 6
<b>London</b> N=3145	38.4	23.5	40.9	29.8	30.9	33.1
<b>South England</b> N=2083	27.5	20.0	33.8	19.7	19.9	21.0
<b>Mid &amp; East England</b> N=2027	28.7	18.0	31.0	21.5	21.5	18.6
<b>North England</b> N=2103	25.2	15.3	25.2	18.5	18.8	17.6
<b>Wales</b> N=476	28.4	22.6	36.3	26.5	24.7	23.5
<b>Scotland</b> N=912	19.5	11.8	20.9	12.6	16.9	13.4
<b>Northern Ireland</b> N=266	29.7	10.9	25.9	13.2	18.4	15.5

Recognition of all national interventions varied by where men lived with London showing the highest level of recognition for all interventions.

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	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>London</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>South England</b>	<b>0.75</b> 0.66-0.85	0.92 0.80-1.06	0.90 0.79-1.01	<b>0.73</b> 0.64-0.84	<b>0.66</b> 0.58-0.76	<b>0.64</b> 0.56-0.74
<b>Mid &amp; East England</b>	<b>0.79</b> 0.70-0.90	<b>0.80</b> 0.70-0.93	<b>0.79</b> 0.70-0.90	<b>0.80</b> 0.69-0.91	<b>0.72</b> 0.63-0.82	<b>0.55</b> 0.48-0.63
<b>North England</b>	<b>0.65</b> 0.57-0.74	<b>0.65</b> 0.56-0.76	<b>0.58</b> 0.51-0.66	<b>0.65</b> 0.56-0.74	<b>0.61</b> 0.53-0.70	<b>0.51</b> 0.44-0.59
<b>Wales</b>	0.84 0.67-1.05	1.10 0.86-1.40	1.11 0.90-1.36	1.13 0.90-1.43	0.92 0.73-1.17	0.80 0.63-1.01
<b>Scotland</b>	<b>0.50</b> 0.41-0.60	<b>0.50</b> 0.40-0.63	<b>0.48</b> 0.40-0.57	<b>0.43</b> 0.34-0.53	<b>0.57</b> 0.47-0.69	<b>0.40</b> 0.32-0.49
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	0.93 0.70-1.24	<b>0.47</b> 0.32-0.71	<b>0.68</b> 0.51-0.91	<b>0.45</b> 0.31-0.65	<b>0.66</b> 0.48-0.92	<b>0.51</b> 0.36-0.72

As in previous coverage data recognition varied by where men lived independent of differences in other characteristics.



- Men living in Wales were as likely to recognise all interventions as were men living in London.
- Men living in South England were less likely to recognise all interventions except *Infection Situations* than were men living in London.
- Men living in Mid & Eastern England or North England were less likely to recognise all interventions than men living in London.

The mean odds ratio for recognition in each part of England and Wales compared to London for the five interventions in the 2003 coverage survey and for the six interventions in the current survey are as follows:

	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
South	0.70	0.77
Midlands	0.62	0.74
North England	0.54	0.61
Wales	0.77	0.98

For all four area the odds ratio moved closer to unity (suggesting a move towards greater geographic equity). However, the differences were modest except for Wales where the change resulted in equity of coverage with London.

- Many men living in Scotland and Northern Ireland recognise these interventions: CHAPS provides considerable collateral benefit to these countries.

### ***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 recognising	<b>GMFA adverts</b>			<b>Camden PCT booklets</b>	
	<b>* Sex tips for boys</b>	<b>* How HIV works</b>	<b>Use lube</b>	<b>* Semen, Sex &amp; HIV</b>	<b>* AIDS: Gay man's guide</b>
<b>Inner London</b> N=1658	58.7	60.4	32.0	26.3	28.0
<b>Outer London</b> N=874	51.3	51.7	33.4	21.8	20.5

While London-resident men's recognition of GMFA mass media adverts was 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 the London-specific 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	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
Outer London	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Inner London	1.12 0.94-1.33	1.16 0.97-1.39	0.87 0.72-1.04	1.11 0.90-1.36	1.31 1.07-1.61

- No significant differences were found in the levels of recognition among men living in Inner and Outer London.

### 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, or gay rather than bisexual men, gay men being more likely to be involved in HIV transmission related behaviours.

#### National interventions

The following tables shows simple recognition by whether or not men had female sexual partners in the last year.

% of UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts		THT advert + booklet	CHAPS booklets		
	* Think again	* Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
No sex with women N=10434	30.6	19.2	33.0	23.0	23.9	23.3
Sex with women N=1339	17.4	14.6	24.0	13.5	13.1	13.5

As in previous coverage data men who did not have sex with women were more likely to recognise all of the national interventions than those who did.

Controlling for age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners and directorate of residence, the Odds Ratio for men with female sex partners recognising the adverts when the odds of men without female partners recognising it is unity, were as follows:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		THT advert+ booklet	CHAPS booklets		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
No sex with women	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Sex with women	<b>0.56</b> 0.48-0.66	<b>0.82</b> 0.69-0.97	<b>0.76</b> 0.66-0.87	<b>0.58</b> 0.49-0.70	<b>0.56</b> 0.47-0.67	<b>0.59</b> 0.49-0.70

- 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.
- The *Infections Situations* showed less bias in this direction than other interventions.

**London interventions**

Among London respondents, 6.8% had a female sex partner in the last year.

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	* Sex tips for boys	* How HIV works	* Use lube	* Semen, Sex & HIV	* AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>No sex with women</b> N=2942	55.5	56.4	33.7	26.1	26.7
<b>Sex with women</b> N=213	24.4	28.2	25.5	14.2	18.4

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:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>No sex with women</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Sex with women</b>	<b>0.26</b> 0.17-0.39	<b>0.40</b> 0.27-0.58	0.72 0.49-1.07	<b>0.46</b> 0.27-0.79	<b>0.60</b> 0.37-0.98

- Four of the five interventions were less likely to be recognised by men with female sex partners (the only exception was *Use lube*).

### 3.3 AGE GROUP

A general recommendation for HIV prevention interventions is that they disproportionately benefit younger rather than older men.

#### **National interventions**

The following table shows simple recognition of the interventions in five age groups.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	* Think again	* Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>under 20</b> N=1154	23.2	15.8	22.6	18.7	17.3	14.0
<b>20s</b> N=3996	29.1	18.4	29.9	24.6	23.3	20.9
<b>30s</b> N=3505	31.2	20.5	34.5	23.8	24.5	24.5
<b>40s</b> N=2046	29.0	18.0	35.6	20.1	23.1	24.5
<b>50s</b> N=1179	28.2	17.5	33.8	13.3	18.4	23.6

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.

In the current survey, all interventions showed significant univariate differences in recognition across age groups. In all cases it was men in their 30s and/or 40s who were most likely to recognise the interventions.

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	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>under 20</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>20s</b>	1.03 0.87-1.22	1.01 0.83-1.23	1.12 0.95-1.33	1.01 0.84-1.21	1.13 0.93-1.35	<b>1.22</b> 1.00-1.49
<b>30s</b>	0.95 0.80-1.13	1.03 0.84-1.25	1.19 0.99-1.41	<b>0.82</b> 0.68-0.99	1.06 0.87-1.28	<b>1.25</b> 1.02-1.53
<b>40s</b>	0.87 0.72-1.04	0.85 0.69-1.06	<b>1.25</b> 1.04-1.50	<b>0.66</b> 0.54-81	0.99 0.80-1.21	<b>1.27</b> 1.03-1.57
<b>50s</b>	0.91 0.74-1.11	0.89 0.71-1.13	<b>1.29</b> 1.06-1.57	<b>0.45</b> 0.36-0.58	0.82 0.65-1.03	<b>1.37</b> 1.09-1.73

- The booklet *Below the belt* was significantly more widely recognised by men under 30 than by men over thirty.
- Recognition of two interventions (The magazine format *Exposed 6* and the composite intervention *Three Pricks*) increased with increasing age.

### London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	* Sex tips for boys	* How HIV works	Use lube	* Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>under 20</b> N=129	37.2	27.1	30.2	22.8	23.4
<b>20s</b> N=966	53.5	54.1	35.4	28.8	28.0
<b>30s</b> N=1188	58.4	61.0	32.3	25.2	26.1
<b>40s</b> N=595	53.3	55.2	32.8	24.6	24.2
<b>50s</b> N=269	39.0	38.8	30.7	16.4	24.7

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	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>under 20</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>20s</b>	1.63 0.97-2.73	<b>1.97</b> 1.16-3.37	1.26 0.73-2.17	1.05 0.57-1.95	0.86 0.46-1.62
<b>30s</b>	1.49 0.89-2.49	<b>2.09</b> 1.22-3.56	1.05 0.61-1.82	0.80 0.43-1.48	0.78 0.42-1.47
<b>40s</b>	1.20 0.71-2.04	1.47 0.85-2.55	1.08 0.61-1.89	0.70 0.37-1.33	0.68 0.36-1.31
<b>50s</b>	0.68 0.39-1.19	0.85 0.48-1.53	1.06 0.59-1.92	<b>0.46</b> 0.23-0.93	0.80 0.41-1.58

- *How HIV transmission works* was seen by more men in their 20s and 30s than by men under 20.
- *Sex, semen & HIV* was half as likely to be seen by men over 50 than by men under 20.

### 3.4 ETHNIC GROUP

Previously CHAPS interventions were intended to be seen equally by all ethnic groups. However, a recent recommendation for HIV prevention programmes is that they should disproportionately benefit Black men rather than other ethnic groups, as Black men appear to be more likely to sero-convert to HIV.

#### **National interventions**

The following table shows simple recognition of each of the interventions by three ethnic sub-samples: all white, all Black and all Asian men.

% of UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts		THT advert + booklet	CHAPS booklets		
	* Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>White</b> N=11032	28.8	18.7	31.9	21.6	22.1	22.1
<b>Black</b> N=115	47.8	19.8	41.4	40.2	48.2	31.9
<b>Asian</b> N=232	30.2	15.5	28.9	19.8	21.0	18.2

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 was always highest, and the majority were recruited via the booklet, in which coverage was always higher.

In the 2004 data-set the three small media and one of the adverts were significantly more commonly recognised by Black men than other ethnic groups.

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		THT advert + booklet	CHAPS booklets		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>White</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Black</b>	<b>2.10</b> 1.39-3.16	0.88 0.53-1.47	1.29 0.85-1.95	<b>1.85</b> 1.21-2.83	<b>2.58</b> 1.72-3.88	1.26 0.81-1.95
<b>Asian</b>	1.08 0.80-1.47	0.83 0.57-1.20	0.96 0.70-1.30	0.82 0.58-1.17	0.97 0.69-1.36	0.85 0.60-1.22

- Three interventions (one advert and two booklets) were more commonly seen by Black men than by the White majority.

### **London interventions**

In the London data the same pattern was not observed.

% of London residents recognising	<i>GMFA adverts</i>			<i>Camden PCT booklets</i>	
	* Sex tips for boys	* How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>White</b> N=2753	55.0	56.3	32.5	24.9	25.7
<b>Black</b> N=76	44.7	46.1	44.0	36.5	34.7
<b>Asian</b> N=112	35.7	31.3	29.2	24.8	23.2

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 as follows:

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>GMFA adverts</i>			<i>Camden PCT booklets</i>	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>White</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Black</b>	0.79 0.46-1.36	0.84 0.49-1.44	<b>1.71</b> 1.01-2.88	<b>1.98</b> 1.13-3.46	<b>1.78</b> 1.02-3.10
<b>Asian</b>	<b>0.60</b> 0.38-0.96	<b>0.33</b> 0.20-0.55	0.94 0.58-1.53	1.20 0.72-2.03	0.65 0.35-1.20

- One advert and both booklets showed higher recognition among the Black men than among the White men.
- Two of the adverts showed lower recognition in the Asian men than in the White men.

### 3.5 FORMAL EDUCATION

As men with lower levels of formal education are more likely to sero-convert to HIV, all interventions are intended to disproportionately benefit men with lower levels of formal education rather than those with higher levels of education.

#### **National interventions**

The following table shows simple recognition of each of the interventions across three education groups.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert+ booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	* Think again	Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>Low</b> N=2821	26.4	17.2	30.7	18.9	22.8	21.7
<b>Medium</b> N=3467	28.9	19.3	29.9	21.0	21.4	20.8
<b>High</b> N=5449	30.6	18.9	33.9	24.2	23.3	23.3

Four of the six interventions showed significant univariate difference in recognition across education level. All four were more commonly recognised by men with high education.

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 95% confidence interval	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	<b>1.16</b> 1.03-1.31	1.14 0.99-1.30	0.99 0.89-1.12	1.10 0.96-1.26	0.90 0.79-1.02	0.99 0.87-1.13
<b>High</b>	1.08 0.97-1.21	1.01 0.89-1.15	1.03 0.93-1.15	<b>1.26</b> 1.11-1.42	<b>0.86</b> 0.77-0.97	0.92 0.82-1.04

- *Think Again* was more commonly recognised by men with medium education than men with low education.
- *Below the belt* was more commonly recognised by men with high education than men with low education.
- *Exposed 5* was more commonly recognised by men with lower education than by men with higher education.



## London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	* AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>Low</b> N=506	54.3	50.4	31.6	24.9	20.4
<b>Medium</b> N=658	54.9	54.3	33.6	25.3	26.3
<b>High</b> N=1976	52.9	55.8	33.4	25.5	27.7

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 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	1.03 0.78-1.36	1.19 0.90-1.57	1.02 0.77-1.35	0.97 0.71-1.34	1.35 0.98-1.87
<b>High</b>	0.88 0.70-1.12	1.13 0.89-1.43	0.97 0.76-1.23	0.98 0.75-1.28	<b>1.44</b> 1.08-1.90

- Only one intervention (*AIDS: a gay man's guide*) showed significant difference in recognition across education, men with higher education being more likely to recognise.

### 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.

#### **National interventions**

The following tables show recognition of each of the interventions across three testing history groups.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	* Think again	* Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>Tested Positive</b> n=726	44.5	27.0	48.8	33.8	35.6	36.1
<b>Last Test Negative</b> n=5606	34.1	20.8	36.9	26.3	26.2	26.4
<b>Never Tested</b> n=5452	22.0	15.3	24.6	16.0	17.2	16.1

As in previous years, 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.

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 95% confidence interval	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert+ booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>Tested positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last test negative</b>	<b>0.79</b> 0.67-0.94	<b>0.79</b> 0.66-0.95	<b>0.70</b> 0.60-0.83	<b>0.79</b> 0.66-0.93	<b>0.80</b> 0.67-0.95	<b>0.81</b> 0.68-0.96
<b>Never tested</b>	<b>0.53</b> 0.45-0.63	<b>0.62</b> 0.51-0.75	<b>0.47</b> 0.40-0.56	<b>0.51</b> 0.42-0.61	<b>0.57</b> 0.48-0.69	<b>0.55</b> 0.46-0.66

- Men who had tested positive were twice as likely to recognise all the interventions than men who had never tested.
- Men who had NEVER tested were least likely to recognise all of interventions compared men who had tested negative.

## London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	* Sex tips for boys	* How HIV works	* Use lube	* Semen, Sex & HIV	* AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>Tested positive</b> n=394	61.9	69.1	29.6	34.3	38.0
<b>Last test negative</b> n=1831	57.3	57.7	33.8	27.3	26.9
<b>Never tested</b> n=923	42.0	42.0	38.6	17.7	19.5

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	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>Tested positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last test negative</b>	0.90 0.70-1.16	<b>0.64</b> 0.50-0.84	<b>0.76</b> 0.60-0.98	0.80 0.62-1.03	<b>0.61</b> 0.48-0.79
<b>Never Tested</b>	<b>0.64</b> 0.49-0.85	<b>0.48</b> 0.36-0.64	<b>0.72</b> 0.54-0.95	<b>0.49</b> 0.36-0.68	<b>0.40</b> 0.29-0.54

- All five interventions were less likely to be seen by men who had never tested than men who had tested positive.
- Three of the five interventions were also less likely to be seen by men whose last test was negative than by men who had tested positive.

### 3.7 VOLUME OF MALE SEXUAL PARTNERS

A general recommendation for HIV prevention programmes is they disproportionately benefit men with more rather than fewer sexual partners, men with more partners being more likely to be involved in HIV transmission related behaviours.

#### National interventions

In previous coverage data there has been a consistent relationship between intervention recognition and numbers of male partners in the last year. The following table shows simple recognition of each of the interventions in five male sexual partner numbers groups. Male partner numbers were for the last 12 months.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	* Think again	* Infection situations	* Three Pricks	* Below the belt	* Exposed 5: bottoms up	* Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>30 +</b> N=1239	38.9	25.4	44.8	29.8	32.4	35.6
<b>13 - 29</b> N=1456	37.0	22.5	41.3	28.5	29.6	29.5
<b>5 - 12</b> N=2947	32.5	19.8	34.8	23.8	23.9	23.4
<b>2, 3 or 4</b> N=3432	26.2	17.3	28.8	19.9	19.3	19.1
<b>1</b> N=1938	22.9	15.2	24.1	17.1	19.1	16.5
<b>None</b> N=718	13.8	10.6	16.0	11.0	11.6	10.2

In the 2004 data-set all interventions were more likely to be recognised by men with the highest number (30+) of male partners. Generally the likelihood of recognising interventions increased as partner numbers increased.

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>THT advert + booklet</i>	<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Think again	Infection situations	Three Pricks	Below the belt	Exposed 5: bottoms up	Exposed 6: unexpected
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13 - 29</b>	0.96 0.81-1.13	0.88 0.73-1.05	0.93 0.79-1.09	1.01 0.85-1.21	0.95 0.80-1.13	0.86 0.73-1.02
<b>5 - 12</b>	0.87 0.75-1.00	<b>0.79</b> 0.67-0.93	<b>0.76</b> 0.66-0.88	<b>0.85</b> 0.72-0.99	<b>0.77</b> 0.66-0.90	<b>0.68</b> 0.59-0.79
<b>2, 3 or 4</b>	<b>0.70</b> 0.60-0.81	<b>0.70</b> 0.59-0.82	<b>0.63</b> 0.54-0.72	<b>0.72</b> 0.61-0.84	<b>0.63</b> 0.54-0.74	<b>0.57</b> 0.49-0.67
<b>1</b>	<b>0.57</b> 0.49-0.68	<b>0.58</b> 0.48-0.70	<b>0.47</b> 0.40-0.56	<b>0.61</b> 0.50-0.73	<b>0.60</b> 0.50-0.71	<b>0.46</b> 0.39-0.56
<b>None</b>	<b>0.35</b> 0.27-0.45	<b>0.40</b> 0.30-0.54	<b>0.34</b> 0.26-0.43	<b>0.40</b> 0.30-0.54	<b>0.37</b> 0.28-0.49	<b>0.31</b> 0.23-0.41

- All the national interventions were most commonly recognised by men with higher numbers of sexual partners, and recognition declined with decreasing partner numbers.

### London interventions

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

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	* Sex tips for boys	* How HIV works	* Use lube	* Semen, Sex & HIV	* AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>30 +</b> N=531	62.5	66.9	36.5	32.1	31.6
<b>13 - 29</b> N=517	58.2	61.9	34.6	30.6	31.1
<b>5 - 12</b> N=841	56.2	54.7	33.1	25.1	24.7
<b>2, 3 or 4</b> N=751	48.7	49.8	32.3	23.1	24.9
<b>1</b> N=379	44.9	43.8	32.7	18.8	20.2
<b>None</b> N=121	30.6	32.2	19.0	9.9	19.8

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	GMFA adverts			Camden PCT booklets	
	Sex tips for boys	How HIV works	Use lube	Semen, Sex & HIV	AIDS: Gay man's guide
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13 - 29</b>	0.94 0.71-1.25	0.84 0.62-1.12	0.94 0.71-1.26	1.06 0.78-1.42	1.06 0.79-1.43
<b>5 - 12</b>	0.94 0.73-1.21	<b>0.73</b> 0.56-0.95	0.89 0.69-1.15	0.83 0.63-1.09	0.82 0.62-1.08
<b>2, 3 or 4</b>	<b>0.70</b> 0.54-0.91	<b>0.60</b> 0.46-0.78	0.87 0.66-1.14	0.87 0.65-1.16	0.93 0.70-1.24
<b>1</b>	<b>0.55</b> 0.41-0.75	<b>0.44</b> 0.32-0.61	0.91 0.66-1.25	<b>0.56</b> 0.39-0.82	0.72 0.50-1.03
<b>None</b>	<b>0.42</b> 0.25-0.70	<b>0.48</b> 0.29-0.80	<b>0.50</b> 0.28-0.89	<b>0.48</b> 0.24-0.95	0.87 0.48-1.56

- For four of the five 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

##### 4.1 CHAPS MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

Changes in the recognition of CHAPS adverts is shown in the following table.

<b>GMSS 2001 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=4441)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
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
<b>GMSS 2002 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=7531)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
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
<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
<b>GMSS 2004 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=11,909)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
Think again (advert)	29.1	24/11/03 to 16/02/04	20,326
Infection situations (advert)	18.6	12/04/04 to 12/07/04	24,191

## 4.2 CHAPS SMALL MEDIA

Changes in the recognition of CHAPS small media is shown in the following table.

<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 1: (magazine)	21.2	November 2000	72,500
<b>GMSS 2002 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=7531)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed 1: (magazine)	21.8	November 2000	72,500
Exposed 2: Gay sex ... (magazine)	14.2	October 2001	92,000
Exposed 3: Rubber up (magazine)	17.1	March 2002	69,000
<b>GMSS 2003 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (n=9587)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed 4: Bottoms UP! (magazine)	29.4	November 2002	79,000
The Bottom Line (booklet)	26.7	January 2003	29,000
<b>GMSS 2004 % any recognition</b>	<b>% Web (N=11,909)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Below the belt (booklet)	20.2	September 2003	35,482
Exposed 5: Everything's rosy (magazine)	21.7	November 2003	82,430
Exposed 6: Tales of the unexpected (magazine)	21.2	April 2004	84,932

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

2<sup>nd</sup> May 2005