

**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 *PEP* interventions was relatively low at 16.1%, but the campaign was in the midst of national roll-out when coverage measures were taken.
2. At 36.0% recognition of *The bottom line* was the highest for any CHAPS small media since coverage surveys began.

**COVERAGE OF LONDON INTERVENTIONS**

3. Compared to previous LGMHPP adverts recognition of *Cum Outside!* was exceptionally high.
4. Recognition of London small media was similar to previous years at around 20% of London-residents, though the entirely new and much longer *Getting Ready* booklet had lower recognition at 11% of London-resident men.

**BIASES IN MEDIA INTERVENTIONS**

5. National interventions all over-serve men in London compared to the rest of England.
6. In terms of desirable biases, mass and small media interventions were 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. Less encouraging were biases across age and education. Only one intervention (*Condoms*) was more commonly recognised by younger men and one (*Disclosure*) was more commonly recognised by men with low compared to high education.
9. Two mass media interventions (*PEP* and *Cum outside!*) were significantly less likely to have been seen by Asian men compared to White men.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This interim report presents feedback on GMSS 2005 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 July 2006.

Measures of the target coverage achieved by twelve print interventions are reported here. These include six press-based mass media adverts (two CHAPS national interventions and four GMFA London interventions) and six small media (three CHAPS national interventions and three London interventions from Camden PCT).

	<b>National (all THT for CHAPS)</b>	<b>London (agency)</b>
<i>Gay-press mass media adverts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Be confident, be covered (THT, CHAPS)</li><li>• PEP (THT, CHAPS)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why won't he tell? (GMFA)</li><li>• HIV status (GMFA)</li><li>• Cum outside! (GMFA)</li><li>• Disclosure (GMFA)</li></ul>
<i>Multi-site distributed booklets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The bottom line (THT, CHAPS)</li><li>• Exposed 7: Cover boys! (THT, CHAPS)</li><li>• PEP (THT)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need help? (Camden PCT)</li><li>• How can you tell? (Camden PCT)</li><li>• Getting ready (Camden PCT / PACE)</li></ul>

One multiple answer question was used for each intervention.

The coverage measures were taken in the **web version only**.

All respondents were:

- 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 (N=12,322). These included men living in England (n=10,435), Wales (n=541), Scotland (n=1052) and Northern Ireland (n=294).

For the six national interventions, a mean of 1.3% of the national sample declined to answer the coverage questions.

For the five London interventions, a mean of 1.1% of respondents living in London (n=3,151) declined to answer the coverage questions.

## **2. RECOGNITION AND ENGAGEMENT WITH INTERVENTIONS**

### **2.1 MASS MEDIA ADVERTS**

All six of the advert interventions consisted of a number of executions (variations on a theme). For the London agency interventions, men were shown three 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

Similarly with the CHAPS national Condoms campaign - *Be confident, be covered* - men were shown three executions and were asked to indicate from similar options (but with the addition of posters in the third option).

- 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 / posters and have read most or all of them
- I've visited the website

The PEP campaign consisted of both adverts and booklets and to facilitate questioning respondents, were asked in a different way.

Men were shown two executions (poster and booklet) and were initially asked whether they remembered seeing any images from the campaign:

- No, I have not seen any of this campaign
- Yes

Those saying yes were then asked if they had seen the mass media images:

- 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

A separate question ascertained whether they had visited the website:

- No I've not visited the website
- Yes, I've looked at the website but not read it in detail
- I've read most or all of the website.

Responses for all adverts 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 having recognised or not recognised 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 website.

% of all UK residents (N=12,322)		<i>THT adverts</i>		<i>GMFA adverts</i>			
		Condoms	PEP	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum outside!	Disclosure
Do NOT recognise it		68.0	83.9	74.0	76.5	61.4	85.5
Recognise it		32.0	16.1	26.0	23.5	38.6	14.5
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	15.2	7.0	16.4	14.0	11.5	7.8
	Have read most or all of it	16.8	9.1	9.6	9.4	27.1	6.7
<i>% of those who recognised who had read</i>		<i>52.4</i>	<i>56.6</i>	<i>37.0</i>	<i>40.2</i>	<i>70.2</i>	<i>46.0</i>
Have visited the website		1.5	3.3	0.9	0.7	1.7	0.5

In coverage surveys in 2001 and 2002 (see *Successful Measures*) and 2003 CHAPS interventions were recognised by between 25% and 39% of web recruited respondents. In 2004 one campaign fell within this range and one was lower at 18.6% recognition. One of the current CHAPS adverts (*Condoms: Be confident - be covered*) falls within this range while the other (PEP) falls some way below it, though the PEP campaign was still running through the period of data collection. Two of the London adverts also fell within the range for National interventions, with one (*Cum outside!*) showing the highest national recognition of all the adverts.

In previous surveys between 41% and 65% of web-recruited men who recognised an advert said they had read the text. Both the CHAPS national adverts fall in the middle of this range, while one London intervention (*Disclosure*) did so and another (*Cum outside!*) did considerably better having been read by 70%. The other two London adverts showed lower proportions of those reading them.

For all six adverts the proportion visiting a website was much lower than the proportion recognising the adverts. However, the website associated with the PEP intervention was visited by more than twice as many men as the next most popular website. While PEP adverts had relatively low recognition rates (16.1%) they also had the second highest readership rates among those that recognised them, suggesting the campaign was needed.

### London recognition

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

% of all London residents (N=3,151)		GMFA adverts			
		Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum outside!	Disclosure
Do NOT recognise it		65.2	69.1	46.9	79.9
Recognise it		34.8	30.9	53.1	20.1
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	21.1	17.7	13.8	10.4
	Have read most or all of it	13.7	13.2	39.3	9.7
% of those who recognised who had read		39.4	42.7	74.0	48.2
Have visited the website		1.6	1.0	2.6	0.7

As these are intended to be London targeted interventions, recognition was significantly higher among London residents than among men across the UK as a whole. *Cum outside!* had particularly high recognition (53.1%) though it benefited from a very similar number of placements (one of the 3 executions of the advert was run in the Gay press 39 times) compared to *Why won't he tell?* (4 executions appearing a total of 39 times) and *HIV status* (4 executions placed 38 times). The *Disclosure* adverts (3 executions) were not funded as part of the same programme of interventions and benefited from only 16 placements in total.

The proportion recognising interventions who read them was similar to the national figures for these interventions, suggesting men in London are no more likely to read London interventions when they encounter them than were men elsewhere in the UK.

### 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 2%) 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=12,322)		CHAPS booklets			Camden PCT booklets		
		The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
Have NOT seen it		64.0	89.3	77.9	83.2	86.9	94.0
Recognise it		36.0	10.7	22.1	16.8	13.1	6.0
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	13.7	3.5	9.8	9.5	7.6	3.2
	Looked at but not read in detail	10.1	2.6	6.2	4.1	3.4	1.5
	Read most of it	9.3	3.8	4.8	2.3	1.7	0.8
I've kept a copy		4.7	1.3	1.8	1.2	0.5	0.7
% of those who recognised who had read most or all of it		25.8	35.4	21.9	13.7	13.0	14.1
% of those who recognised who had kept		13.0	12.1	8.1	7.2	4.0	11.4

Over a third (36%) of men in the UK could recall the CHAPS small media *The bottom line* and just under a quarter (22%) the issue of *Exposed*. A smaller proportion 11% had seen the national PEP campaign booklet which was in distribution during the period of data collection.

Between 13% and 35% of those men who recognised booklets had read them and between 4% and 13% had kept them. Respondents were most likely to have read the three CHAPS materials *The bottom line*, PEP and *Exposed: Cover boys!*.

The National campaigns *the Bottom Line* and *Exposed* were most likely to be recognised. With the exception of the PEP campaign, national recognition of the Camden PCT (London) small media was less than that for the CHAPS small media, suggesting the collateral benefit of London small media is less than that for adverts. However, these London small media were still recognised by between 1-in-16 and 1-in-6 men nationally.

### **London recognition**

The following table shows the same measures for the local London small media among respondents living in London.

% of all London residents (N=3,151)		Camden PCT booklets		
		Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
Have NOT seen it		77.6	79.7	89.4
Recognise it		22.4	20.3	10.6
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	11.6	11.5	5.2
	Looked at but not read in detail	5.5	5.3	2.7
	Read most of it	3.8	2.9	1.8
I've kept a copy		2.4	1.1	1.8
% of those who recognised who had read most or all of it		17.1	14.4	16.7
% of those who recognised who had kept		10.8	5.2	17.3

Recognition, reading and keeping of the London interventions was more common among the London resident respondents than among residents of the rest of the UK.

### **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 12,322 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 shows 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 was less likely to recognise the intervention compared to the baseline. Where a bold figure is more than 1, that group was 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=10,435) which we split into its four Directorates of Health and Social Care. There were 863 men living in England who gave insufficient information to allocate them to one of these four directorates and were excluded.

#### **National interventions**

CHAPS national intervention 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	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	*Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>London</b> N=3151	40.1	30.5	46.3	22.2	28.8
<b>South England</b> N=2068	33.7	16.1	35.1	10.9	22.0
<b>Mid &amp; East England</b> N=2122	29.9	11.1	33.3	6.3	19.3
<b>North England</b> N=2231	30.5	10.0	30.6	5.7	20.1
<b>Wales</b> N=541	34.0	10.7	41.8	8.4	24.3
<b>Scotland</b> N=1052	18.7	5.3	27.6	2.3	14.1
<b>Northern Ireland</b> N=294	21.6	8.9	35.6	3.1	13.1

Recognition of all national interventions varied by where men lived. London-resident men show the highest levels of recognition for all the national 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 was unity, are shown in the table below.



ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>London</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>South England</b>	.94 0.83 - 1.1	.59 0.50 - 0.68	.78 0.69 - 0.88	.59 0.49 - 0.70	.81 0.71 - 0.93
<b>Mid &amp; East England</b>	.80 0.71 - 0.91	.40 0.34 - 0.48	.76 0.67 - 0.86	.34 0.28 - 0.42	.72 0.62 - 0.82
<b>North England</b>	.82 0.73 - 0.93	.34 0.29 - 0.40	.63 0.56 - 0.72	.30 0.24 - 0.36	.74 0.65 - 0.85
<b>Wales</b>	.97 0.79 - 1.18	.39 0.29 - 0.52	1.13 0.93 - 1.37	.47 0.34 - 0.66	.97 0.78 - 1.21
<b>Scotland</b>	.42 0.35 - 0.50	.18 0.13 - 0.23	.55 0.47 - 0.64	.12 0.08 - 0.18	.47 0.39 - 0.58
<b>Northern Ireland</b>	.49 0.36 - 0.66	.30 0.20 - 0.47	.81 0.63 - 1.06	.13 0.06 - 0.28	.39 0.27 - 0.57

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 *Condoms*, *The bottom line* and *Exposed* as were men living in London. However, they were far less likely to recognise the PEP interventions.
- Men living in South England were less likely to recognise all interventions except *Condoms* compared to men living in London.
- Men living in Mid & Eastern and North England were less likely to recognise all interventions than men living in London.

Compared to London, for the five interventions in the 2003 coverage survey; the six interventions in the 2004 survey; and five interventions in the current survey the mean odds ratio for recognition in each other part of England and Wales was:

	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
South	0.70	0.77	0.74
Midlands	0.62	0.74	0.60
North England	0.54	0.61	0.57
Wales	0.77	0.98	0.79

For all four areas there was little overall difference between 2003 and 2005. The odds ratio moved towards unity between 2003 and 2004 and away from unity between 2004 and 2005 (suggesting little overall change). Changes were modest except in Wales where the positive change from 2003 to 2004 seems to have been reversed from 2004 to 2005. This apparent reverse of the positive change may be a consequence of limited recognition of the two PEP interventions in 2005.

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

### London interventions

Men were asked their Local Authority of residence which allowed those living in London Boroughs to be allocated to inner or outer London.

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	*Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>Outer London</b> N=876	31.6	28.7	48.9	19.4	19.4	17.5	8.8
<b>Inner London</b> N=1400	36.7	32.2	58.8	20.6	21.6	21.6	10.6

Amongst London-resident men recognition of the GMFA mass media adverts *Cum outside!* was higher than the recognition of any of the CHAPS national campaigns.

London-resident men report higher recognition of CHAPS national small media than Camden PCT small media for London. Between 10 and 20% all London-residents recognise the London-specific small media, compared to between 22% and 46% of national 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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>Outer London</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Inner London</b>	1.09 0.90-1.32	1.06 0.87-1.29	1.18 0.98-1.42	.91 0.72-1.14	1.08 0.87- 1.35	1.2 0.95-1.51	1.08 0.80-1.47

- 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		CHAPS booklets		
	*Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>No sex with women</b> N=10595	33.0	17.4	11.6	38.0	22.9
<b>Sex with women</b> N=1725	25.7	7.6	5.3	23.8	17.4

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>No sex with women</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Sex with women</b>	<b>.79</b> 0.69 - 0.90	<b>.49</b> 0.40 - 0.61	<b>.57</b> 0.50 - 0.65	<b>.53</b> 0.41 - 0.68	<b>.77</b> 0.67 - 0.90

- 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 *Condoms advert* and *Exposed booklet* showed less bias in this direction than other interventions.

### London interventions

Among London respondents, 10.0% had a female sex partner in the last year.

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	*Why won't he tell?	HIV status	*Cum Outside!	*Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>No sex with women</b> N=2837	36.2	31.2	55.0	20.9	22.4	20.5	10.4
<b>Sex with women</b> N=314	22.7	27.8	36.1	12.6	22.4	18.7	13.0

Those who had not had sex with women were more likely to have seen three of the GMFA London campaigns. There was no significant difference between the groups in having seen the Camden PCT booklets.

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>GMFA adverts</i>				<i>Camden PCT booklets</i>		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
No sex with women	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Sex with women	.44 0.30-0.66	.64 0.43-0.94	.51 0.36-0.71	.47 0.28-0.79	.89 0.59-1.34	.76 0.49-1.19	.86 0.48-1.56

- All the GMFA adverts were less likely to be recognised by men with female sex partners compared to men that were exclusively homosexually active.
- There was no difference in recognition of the Camden PCT booklets by gender of respondents' partners.

### 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 CHAPS national interventions across five age groups.

% of UK residents recognising	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	*Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>under 20</b> N=1220	31.5	6.9	23.7	4.3	17.3
<b>20s</b> N=4261	33.8	15.0	38.1	9.5	20.9
<b>30s</b> N=3456	32.3	21.6	41.0	14.1	24.4
<b>40s</b> N=2159	30.2	17.6	36.1	13.0	24.3
<b>50s</b> N=1200	28.9	10.9	26.6	7.6	21.0

As 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.

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>under 20</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>20s</b>	.92 0.79 - 1.07	<b>1.64</b> 1.26 - 2.14	<b>1.66</b> 1.41 - 1.95	<b>1.50</b> 1.08 - 2.09	1.15 0.96 - 1.39
<b>30s</b>	<b>.70</b> 0.60 - 0.82	<b>1.86</b> 1.42 - 2.43	<b>1.62</b> 1.37 - 1.91	<b>1.68</b> 1.21 - 2.34	<b>1.23</b> 1.02 - 1.49
<b>40s</b>	<b>.65</b> 0.55 - 0.77	<b>1.47</b> 1.11 - 1.95	<b>1.30</b> 1.09 - 1.56	<b>1.58</b> 1.12 - 2.23	1.20 0.98 - 1.46
<b>50s</b>	<b>.69</b> 0.57 - 0.84	1.06 0.77 - 1.46	.93 0.76 - 1.14	1.12 0.76 - 1.65	1.15 0.92 - 1.44

- Recognition of the *Condoms* advert was most likely among men under 30.
- Excepting *Condoms* men in their 30s were generally the most likely to have seen the national campaigns.

### London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	*Why won't he tell?	HIV status	*Cum Outside!	*Disclosure	*Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>under 20 n=138</b>	25.0	24.6	42.2	11.2	22.2	18.0	8.8
<b>20s n=1022</b>	33.8	30.8	55.1	19.0	25.3	20.2	10.4
<b>30s n=1113</b>	36.	29.7	56.2	20.2	21.9	21.3	12.3
<b>40s n=607</b>	37.3	35.3	50.5	24.4	21.4	20.3	10.0
<b>50s n=265</b>	30.4	29.1	44.9	18.3	14.9	17.5	6.9

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>GMFA adverts</i>				<i>Camden PCT booklets</i>		
	<b>Why won't he tell?</b>	<b>HIV status</b>	<b>Cum Outside!</b>	<b>Disclosure</b>	<b>Need help?</b>	<b>How can you tell?</b>	<b>Getting ready</b>
<b>under 20</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>20s</b>	1.16 0.68-1.98	1.04 0.60- 1.80	1.38 0.84-2.27	1.96 0.87-4.41	1.49 0.80-2.80	1.23 0.64-2.37	3.59 0.86-15.04
<b>30s</b>	1.08 0.63-1.84	.87 0.51-1.51	1.0 0.61-1.64	1.75 0.78-3.94	1.13 0.60-2.13	1.08 0.56-2.08	4.04 0.97-16.86
<b>40s</b>	1.07 0.6-1.86	1.17 0.67-2.05	0.85 0.51-1.41	2.11 0.93-4.81	1.04 0.54-1.99	1.04 0.53-2.05	3.20 0.75-13.65
<b>50s</b>	.84 0.46-1.55	.97 0.53-1.79	.78 0.44-1.36	1.98 0.83-4.72	0.80 0.39-1.65	0.9 0.43-1.89	1.86 0.39-8.76

- Whether men resident in London recognised London interventions did not significantly vary by age.

### 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	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	<b>Condoms</b>	<b>*PEP</b>	<b>The bottom line</b>	<b>*PEP</b>	<b>Exposed: Cover boys!</b>
<b>White</b> N=11532	31.7	16.0	35.9	10.6	22.2
<b>Black</b> N=102	42.4	23.0	42.6	17.0	22.0
<b>Asian</b> N=244	28.8	9.2	30.5	6.7	20.6

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.

In 2005 there was little difference in relation to recognition amongst different ethnicities with the exception of the PEP mass media and leaflet where Asian men were less likely to have seen it compared to Black men and White men.

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>White</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Black</b>	1.42 0.93 - 2.16	1.08 0.64 - 1.81	1.10 0.72 - 1.67	1.35 0.78 - 2.36	.86 0.53 - 1.41
<b>Asian</b>	.92 0.68 - 1.24	<b>.53</b> 0.33 - 0.85	.81 0.60 - 1.08	.66 0.39 - 1.12	1.01 0.73 - 1.41

- Asian men were least likely to have seen the PEP advert.

### London interventions

In the London data there was more variation by ethnicity. In three (of 4) adverts and one (of 3) small media, Asian men were least likely to recognise the interventions.

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	*Why won't he tell?	HIV status	*Cum Outside!	*Disclosure	Need help?	*How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>White</b> n=2779	35.2	31.1	53.9	20.2	22.5	19.9	10.3
<b>Black</b> n=68	39.7	37.9	48.5	28.4	22.1	37.3	17.6
<b>Asian</b> n=102	17.2	22.4	32.0	10.1	26.5	13.3	6.2

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>White</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Black</b>	1.27 0.69 - 2.35	1.55 0.84 - 2.86	1.25 0.67 - 2.31	<b>2.0</b> 1.04 - 3.85	0.93 0.44 - 1.95	<b>2.65</b> 1.42 - 4.92	2.05 0.94 - 4.51
<b>Asian</b>	0.59 0.32 - 1.09	.59 0.31 - 1.12	<b>.48</b> 0.28 - 0.82	.58 0.26 - 1.29	1.27 0.71 - 2.27	1.04 0.55 - 1.98	.65 0.23 - 1.83

- *Disclosure* and *How can you tell?* showed higher recognition among London-resident Black men than white men.
- Asian men were significantly less likely than white men to have seen *Cum Outside!*

### 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	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>Low</b> N=1808	29.9	11.8	28.2	7.9	20.0
<b>Medium</b> N=2853	31.9	13.2	32.7	8..8	23.0
<b>High</b> N=7629	32.6	18.2	39.1	12.1	22.3

Four of the five interventions showed significant univariate difference in recognition across education level. All four were less commonly recognised by men with low 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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	1.10 0.96 - 1.26	1.16 0.95 - 1.41	<b>1.28</b> 1.12 - 1.48	1.15 0.90 - 1.46	<b>1.21</b> 1.03 - 1.41
<b>High</b>	1.06 0.93 - 1.19	<b>1.31</b> 1.10 - 1.56	<b>1.40</b> 1.24 - 1.58	<b>1.24</b> 1.01 - 1.53	1.07 0.93 - 1.23

- The *PEP* campaign and *The bottom Line* were more commonly recognised by men with high education than men with low education.



- Recognition of *The bottom line* increased with increasing education.
- Those with medium education were more likely to have seen *Exposed* than those with Low education.

### London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	*Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	*How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>Low</b> n=272	35.7	29.4	45.0	21.9	19.6	16.7	10.4
<b>Medium</b> n=483	37.2	30.3	53.0	21.2	20.5	17.3	9.9
<b>High</b> n=2393	34.3	31.2	54.1	19.7	23.0	21.4	10.7

Two of the seven London interventions showed significant univariate difference in recognition across education level. Both were more commonly recognised by men with higher education.

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>Low</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Medium</b>	1.16 0.80-1.70	1.04 0.71-1.52	1.49 1.03-2.17	.85 0.55-1.30	1.0 0.63-1.57	1.10 0.68-1.79	1.23 0.65-2.36
<b>High</b>	0.91 0.66-1.26	.91 0.66-1.27	1.27 0.93-1.74	<b>.67</b> 0.46-0.96	1.13 0.77-1.65	1.33 0.88-2.01	1.22 0.69-2.14

- Only one intervention (*Disclosure*) showed significant difference in recognition across education, men with higher education being less likely to recognise it than men with Low education.

### 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	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	*Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>Tested Positive</b> N=687	47.6	43.4	53.4	32.1	33.1
<b>Last Test Negative</b> N=5719	37.2	21.3	43.3	14.5	26.3
<b>Never Tested</b> N=5858	25.1	7.8	26.8	4.4	16.6

As in previous years, men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise all the national 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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>Tested Positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last Test Negative</b>	<b>.74</b> 0.63 - 0.88	<b>.45</b> 0.37 - 0.53	<b>.76</b> 0.64 - 0.90	<b>.47</b> 0.38 - 0.56	<b>.82</b> 0.68 - 0.98
<b>Never Tested</b>	<b>.50</b> 0.42 - 0.60	<b>.20</b> 0.17 - 0.25	<b>.47</b> 0.39 - 0.55	<b>.18</b> 0.14 - 0.23	<b>.54</b> 0.44 - 0.65

- Men who had tested positive were more likely to recognise all the national interventions (including PEP) than men who had never tested or whose last test was negative.
- Men who had NEVER tested were least likely to recognise all of interventions compared men who had tested.

### London interventions

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	*Why won't he tell?	*HIV status	*Cum Outside!	*Disclosure	*Need help?	*How can you tell?	*Getting ready
<b>Tested positive</b> n=687	36.2	37.0	57.4	25.0	22.8	24.3	10.4
<b>Last test negative</b> n=5719	30.7	26.2	43.9	17.2	18.2	15.7	6.9
<b>Never tested</b> n=5858	20.3	19.2	31.2	10.6	14.6	9.2	4.5

As in previous years, men with diagnosed HIV infection were most likely to recognise all the London-specific interventions, and men who had never tested were least likely to recognise them.

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>Tested positive</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Last test negative</b>	<b>.69</b> 0.53-0.91	<b>.68</b> 0.51-0.90	<b>.56</b> 0.41-0.76	<b>0.60</b> 0.44-0.81	.88 0.64-1.21	<b>.65</b> 0.47-0.88	<b>.63</b> 0.42-0.94
<b>Never tested</b>	<b>.48</b> 0.35-0.65	<b>.58</b> 0.42-0.80	<b>.38</b> 0.27-0.53	<b>.41</b> 0.28-0.59	<b>.62</b> 0.43-0.89	<b>.47</b> 0.33-0.68	<b>.45</b> 0.27-0.72

- All seven London-specific interventions were less likely to be seen by men who had never tested than men who had tested positive.
- Six of the seven 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>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	*Condoms	*PEP	*The bottom line	*PEP	*Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>30 +</b> N=1149	43.3	32.0	51.5	24.2	32.7
<b>13 - 29</b> N=1435	41.6	26.2	42.7	17.7	27.8
<b>5 -12</b> N=2842	36.4	18.9	39.1	12.0	23.4
<b>2, 3 or 4</b> N=3522	29.7	11.5	33.6	7.0	20.1
<b>1</b> N=2353	25.3	10.1	32.0	6.9	18.7
<b>None</b> N=977	16.3	4.9	16.8	3.1	12.8

In the 2005 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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	<i>CHAPS adverts</i>		<i>CHAPS booklets</i>		
	Condoms	PEP	The bottom line	PEP	Exposed: Cover boys!
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13 - 29</b>	.94 0.80 - 1.12	.84 0.70 - 1.02	<b>.73</b> 0.61 - 0.86	<b>.74</b> 0.60 - 0.91	<b>.82</b> 0.68 - 0.98
<b>5 -12</b>	<b>.82</b> 0.70 - 0.95	<b>.65</b> 0.55 - 0.77	<b>.69</b> 0.60 - 0.80	<b>.55</b> 0.46 - 0.67	<b>.70</b> 0.59 - 0.82
<b>2, 3 or 4</b>	<b>.63</b> 0.55 - 0.74	<b>.41</b> .034 - 0.49	<b>.61</b> 0.52 - 0.70	<b>.34</b> 0.27 - 0.42	<b>.61</b> 0.52 - 0.72
<b>1</b>	<b>.51</b> 0.43 - 0.60	<b>.35</b> 0.28 - 0.42	<b>.55</b> 0.47 - 0.64	<b>.34</b> 0.27 - 0.43	<b>.55</b> 0.46 - 0.65
<b>None</b>	<b>.32</b> 0.26 - 0.40	<b>.22</b> 0.15 - 0.31	<b>.30</b> 0.24 - 0.38	<b>.19</b> 0.12 - 0.30	<b>.41</b> 0.32 - 0.53

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

### London interventions

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

% of London residents recognising	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	*Why won't he tell?	*HIV status	*Cum Outside!	*Disclosure	Need help?	*How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>30 +</b> n=467	40.0	40.7	66.5	28.7	23.0	26.4	12.6
<b>13 - 29</b> n=490	42.2	35.3	60.0	22.4	23.7	19.8	11.9
<b>5 - 12</b> n=825	35.0	29.3	54.0	19.7	22.3	19.7	9.4
<b>2, 3 or 4</b> n=708	31.7	27.1	46.9	16.9	22.2	18.8	10.2
<b>1</b> n=512	32.7	29.0	48.3	17.5	22.1	20.9	10.3
<b>None</b> n=137	12.6	17.6	27.1	10.4	17.8	9.7	9.6

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, are shown in the table below.

ODDS RATIO 95% confidence interval	GMFA adverts				Camden PCT booklets		
	Why won't he tell?	HIV status	Cum Outside!	Disclosure	Need help?	How can you tell?	Getting ready
<b>30 +</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>13 - 29</b>	.98 0.72-1.33	.75 0.55-1.02	.72 0.52-0.99	.72 0.51-1.01	1.22 0.85-1.75	.88 0.61-1.26	1.35 0.85-2.16
<b>5 - 12</b>	.83 0.63-1.10	.58 0.44-0.77	.65 0.49-0.87	.65 0.47-0.89	1.14 0.81-1.59	.88 0.63-1.23	.88 0.56-1.39
<b>2, 3 or 4</b>	.78 0.58-1.05	.52 0.38-0.71	.57 0.42-0.78	.53 0.37-0.75	1.04 0.73-1.49	.93 0.65-1.33	.83 0.50-1.36
<b>1</b>	.66 0.48-0.91	.59 0.43-0.82	.43 0.31-0.59	.50 0.34-0.73	1.09 0.75-1.59	.94 0.64-1.36	.92 0.55-1.54
<b>None</b>	.33 0.17-0.65	.31 0.16-0.60	.31 0.18-0.55	.23 .09-0.59	.90 0.45-1.78	.37 0.15-0.90	1.01 0.40-2.54

- For the four GMFA adverts recognition generally decreased with fewer sexual partners, and was particularly low among men with no male sexual partners.

- There were few differences by male partner numbers for the Camden PCT small media but men with no partners were significantly less likely to have seen the *How can you tell?* booklet.

#### 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</b>	<b>% recognised (n=4,441)</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</b>	<b>% recognised (n=7,531)</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</b>	<b>% recognised (n=9,587)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
Biology of transmission (adverts)	26.1	10/02 to 01/03	20,661
<b>GMSS 2004</b>	<b>% recognised (n=11,909)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
Think again (adverts)	29.1	24/11/03 to 16/02/04	20,326
Infection situations (adverts)	18.6	12/04/04 to 12/07/04	24,191
<b>GMSS 2005</b>	<b>% recognised (n=12,322)</b>	<b>Display dates</b>	<b>Display cost (£)</b>
Condoms (adverts)	32.0	23/02/05 to 31/05/05	16, 923
PEP (advert)	16.0	23/06/05 to 31/08/05	15,670

## 4.2 CHAPS SMALL MEDIA

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

<b>GMSS 2001</b>	<b>% recognised (n=4,441)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
All the f***ing facts (booklet)	18.9	Sept. 2000	43,000
Exposed 1: (magazine)	21.2	Nov. 2000	72,500
<b>GMSS 2002</b>	<b>% recognised (n=7,531)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed 1: (magazine)	21.8	Nov. 2000	72,500
Exposed 2: Gay sex ... (magazine)	14.2	Oct. 2001	92,000
Exposed 3: Rubber up (magazine)	17.1	March 2002	69,000
<b>GMSS 2003</b>	<b>% recognised (n=9,587)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Exposed 4: Bottoms UP! (magazine)	29.4	Nov. 2002	79,000
The Bottom Line (booklet)	26.7	Jan. 2003	29,000
<b>GMSS 2004</b>	<b>% recognised (n=11,909)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
Below the belt (booklet)	20.2	Sept. 2003	35,482
Exposed 5: Everything's rosy (magazine)	21.7	Nov. 2003	82,430
Exposed 6: Tales of the unexpected (magazine)	21.2	April 2004	84,932
<b>GMSS 2005</b>	<b>% recognised (n=12,322)</b>	<b>Launch date</b>	<b>Volume distributed</b>
The Bottom line (booklet)	36.0	Jan. 2003 + Jan. 2005	40,000 + 15,000
PEP (booklet)	10.7	July 2004 + June 2005	58,212
Exposed 7: Cover boys! (magazine)	22.1	Feb. 2005	66,543

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

7<sup>th</sup> June 2006