

**Coverage of CHAPS (and LGMHPP) mass
media adverts, small media booklets and web-sites**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COVERAGE OF NATIONAL INTERVENTIONS

1. The two CHAPS adverts were recognised by 31.9% (STIs) and 22.8% (PEP) of residents of England & Wales (page 6) both within the previous range of recognition for adverts. Both had substantially higher recognition among London-resident men (42.3% for STIs and 35.0% for PEP, page 11).
2. Recognition of the two CHAPS booklets and magazines was in the range 17-29%, with particularly high recognition of the re-printed *Manual* (29.1%, page 7). Again all had higher recognition among London-resident men (23-38% page 11).

COVERAGE OF LONDON INTERVENTIONS

3. Compared to previous LGMHPP adverts, recognition of GMFA's *Responsibility and RelationTips* was exceptionally high at 60% of London-residents.
4. Recognition of London small media was similar to previous years at around 9-24% of London-residents, with the relatively long *Getting what you want* booklet recognised by 24.0% of London-resident men. The F:S magazine brand was recognised by 36.2% of London-resident men.
5. The mass media adverts *Questioning HIV Prevention* targeted at men living in Bexley and Greenwich was recognised by 24% of Londoners and did not differ among men in these two PCTs compared with those elsewhere in London.

RECOGNITION BIASES IN WRITTEN INTERVENTIONS

6. All National interventions over-serve men in London compared to the rest of England and all London Interventions are also encountered by men outside London - together these mean that there is no significant difference in the London vs. not-London biases of 'National' and 'London' interventions.
7. Almost all interventions are more likely to be seen by exclusively homosexually active men rather than behaviourally bisexual men, those with more rather than fewer male sexual partners and by men who had tested HIV positive rather than those who had not.
8. Less encouraging were biases across age and education. Only one intervention (*Crystal* booklet) was more commonly recognised by younger men and none was more commonly recognised by men with low compared to high education. However, education biases were relatively unusual.
9. Most mass media interventions were significantly more likely to have been seen by Black men compared to White men and Asian men.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents data from the *Gay Men's Sex Survey* (GMSS) 2006 intervention coverage survey. Data from GMSS 2006, 2007 and 2008 will form the basis of a section in the 'Final Evaluation of CHAPS' report due in March 2009.

The survey attempts to measure the coverage of the target population by the interventions and to describe biases in target group coverage by demographic characteristics important to HIV prevention planning. It makes no comment on the *effectiveness* of the interventions at meeting their aim when they are engaged with (ie. when they are read). As such the survey makes a very specific contribution to the evaluation data about the interventions and is not intended to comment on all performance qualities.

Prompted recognition measures were taken for:

- **eight mass media adverts**
(two THT/CHAPS and two THT national interventions, three London-wide interventions by GMFA and a dual-PCT level intervention by the Metro Centre in London);
- **ten small media interventions**
(seven national interventions of which four were by THT/CHAPS and three by THT, three London interventions of which one was from GMFA and two were from Camden PCT, one of which was in collaboration with PACE);
- **seven web-sites**
(four CHAPS/THT sites, two other THT sites and one GMFA site).

Table: The interventions	National (all THT)	Regional (various agencies)
<i>Gay-press mass media adverts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infections - STI's (CHAPS) • PEP (CHAPS) • Hepatitis Info: Hepatitis A, B & C (THT) • Sex HIV Law (THT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility (GMFA) • RelationTips (GMFA) • Condoms: buy them, carry them (GMFA) • Questioning HIV Prevention (Metro Centre)
<i>Multi-site distributed booklets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Manual (CHAPS) • eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters! (CHAPS) • eXposed! 9: How close do you get? (CHAPS) • PEP (CHAPS) • Sex HIV Law (THT) • GHB (THT) • Crystal (THT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten things you need to know about HIV? (Camden PCT) • Getting what you want: in friendships and relationships (PACE & Camden PCT) • F:S magazine (GMFA)
Web-sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infections STIs @ www.chapsonline.org.uk (CHAPS) • PEP @ www.chapsonline.org.uk (CHAPS) • www.ygm.org.uk (CHAPS) • Vive la difference @ www.chapsonline.org.uk (CHAPS) • www.Hepinfo.org (THT) • sex HIV law (THT) @ www.tht.org.uk/prosecutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • www.metromate.org.uk now known as www.gmfa.org.uk (GMFA)

Six of the nine mass media interventions were one part of larger interventions which also included other materials such as posters, post-cards, credit card size cards, booklets, condom packs, beer mats, wrist bands (collectively known as knik-knacks). Many of these materials were used by outreach workers during the period of mass media display. Our earlier randomised control trial (Weatherburn *et al.* 2003) demonstrated that such activities increase the recognition of campaigns. As such, the promoted recognition measures below may over-estimate the proportion of men encountering the mass media adverts as men may have seen the images on other materials.

The six mass media interventions which were part of larger multi-method interventions were the two THT/CHAPS (*STIs* and *PEP*), the two THT (*Hepatitis Info* and *Sex Law HIV*) and the Metro Centre's *Questioning HIV Prevention*. The three GMFA mass media adverts were self-contained.

The survey intends to provide (1) an indication of the 'coverage' of the target group achieved by the interventions (ie. what proportion of men in the target group recognise the interventions) and (2) an indication of the 'up-take' of the interventions when they are encountered (ie. do men pay attention to and read them).

The survey gives no indication of the effectiveness of the interventions at meeting their intended aims (this quality of interventions should be secured during development and before display or distribution occurs). As such the survey provides specific but essential information about one aspect of intervention performance. It is not a comprehensive evaluation of the interventions' performance but a contribution to knowledge of performance that is otherwise difficult to generate by intervenors.

One multiple answer question was asked for each intervention in the online version of GMSS 2006 only. Recognition of all interventions was asked of all men living in England (n=7,063), Wales (n=318), Scotland (n=695) and Northern Ireland (n=210). All respondents reported here were: male; aged 14 years or older; lived in the UK; had been sexually active with a man in the last year or had a Gay, Bisexual or other "queer" identity. For the seventeen national interventions, 2.6% of the sample declined to answer the coverage questions. For the nine London interventions, 2.2% of respondents living in London declined to answer the coverage questions.

2. MASS MEDIA ADVERTS

A general description of mass media adverts and their placement was given to respondents who were asked when they last saw any such advertising. Almost all men (96%) reported ever seeing a mass media advert, the majority having done so within the previous year (86%) and previous month (62%).

When was the last time you saw an advert ABOUT HIV OR SAFER SEX? (n = 8197, missing 89)	%
In the last month	62.2
In the last year	23.6
Over a year ago	10.2
Never	3.9

Five of the eight advert interventions consisted of a number of executions (variations on a theme), the remaining three consisted of a single advert. For the four London adverts, men were shown two or 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

The four National campaigns consisted of a mixture of adverts, booklets, cards and / or web-pages. Men were shown two or three executions (advert, booklet / card, web-site) and were asked whether they remembered seeing *any* images from the campaign. Those saying yes were asked if they had seen the mass media images as above. A separate question asked 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 interventions with web-sites were sorted into two variables, the first about all elements of the interventions (not recognise / recognise but not read / read) the second about the web-sites only. The small number of men who indicated having been to the web-site only were judged to have read the intervention.

2.1 ADVERT COVERAGE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

The following table shows the overall recognition levels for each of the eight mass media interventions in each area and sub-area of the UK.

Table: Proportion of UK residents recognising interventions	THT adverts		CHAPS (THT) adverts		GMFA adverts			Metro Centre advert
	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Infections - STIs	PEP	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV prevention
UK wide (N=8287)	7.3	7.8	30.7	21.1	47.2	43.7	23.7	19.5
England (n=7064)	7.8	8.0	32.2	23.1	48.8	45.7	25.5	19.9
London (n=2362)	10.6	10.2	42.3	35.0	60.0	59.7	38.3	23.5
Bexley & Greenwich (N=49)	14.3	14.6	38.8	35.4	61.2	63.3	40.4	20.4
South West (n=374)	4.8	6.2	27.5	19.4	42.2	38.1	16.4	15.7
South Central (n=326)	5.9	6.5	27.2	13.9	45.8	40.1	21.6	15.5
South East Coast (n=429)	10.1	7.0	35.2	29.3	47.1	44.4	20.8	20.0
East of England (n=377)	8.0	6.7	28.2	18.2	46.5	45.8	25.9	17.4
East Midlands (n=306)	5.0	6.6	24.3	11.1	40.3	38.0	15.8	19.0
West Midlands (n=361)	5.1	7.6	31.5	18.4	43.9	40.8	19.7	18.8
Yorkshire & Humber (n=345)	4.7	9.9	30.4	19.5	46.4	43.1	18.9	19.5
North West (n=619)	6.3	7.5	27.9	16.7	43.5	38.1	16.1	15.8
North East (n=159)	4.4	3.8	18.9	9.4	38.6	30.8	13.3	17.1
Wales (n=318)	3.8	5.7	25.9	14.9	39.5	31.8	14.7	18.6
Scotland (n=695)	4.8	6.8	21.4	8.4	37.4	32.4	13.5	17.0
Northern Ireland (n=210)	3.3	5.8	16.7	5.2	39.0	32.1	12.0	14.8
Planned geographic target group	England Wales & Scotland		England & Wales		Greater London			Bexley & Greenwich

At the UK level the interventions show a very wide range of recognitions, from 7.3% to 47.2%. However, the display speed for the interventions also varied widely.

In coverage surveys between 2001 and 2005 CHAPS interventions were recognised by between 16% and 39% of web-recruited respondents nationally. In the 2006 coverage survey the two CHAPS (THT) adverts are within this range (21% and 31%). The THT national adverts *Hep info* and *Sex HIV Law* both had much lower coverage (at 7% and 8%), with much smaller advertising placement budgets.

Two of the GMFA London adverts had higher *national* coverage than the CHAPS/THT national adverts (47% and 44%). These are the highest national recognition figures ever reported in a GMSS coverage survey.

2.1.1 National coverage cost

The following table shows the display spends and the cost per percentage point of coverage achieved at a national level.

Table: Cost per percentage point of national coverage	THT adverts		CHAPS (THT) adverts		GMFA adverts			Metro Centre advert
	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Infections - STIs	PEP	Responsibility	Relation Tips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV prevention
UK wide recognition (%)	7.3	7.8	30.7	21.1	47.2	43.7	23.7	19.5
Display spend (£)	7,611	6,154	24,976	39,442	16,644	16,984	13,934	2,400
£ / %	1,043	789	814	1,869	353	389	588	123

At a national level, the most efficiently displayed intervention was *Questioning HIV Prevention*, which cost £123 per percent point covered and the most inefficient was PEP which cost approximately fifteen time more per percent point covered.

However, men living in the UK was the target group for none of these interventions. All were intended to over-serve (ie. be encountered by a higher proportion of) men in a particular geographic area of the UK. THT national adverts are targeted at men living in England, Wales and Scotland, CHAPS adverts are targeted at men living in England and Wales, GMFA's adverts are targeted at men living London, and the Metro Centre's advert was targeted at men living Greenwich and Bexley Primary Care Trusts.

2.2 ADVERTS: GEOGRAPHIC BIASES AND TARGET GROUPS

The target group for an intervention is the group of people the intervention is intended to benefit. The following section looks at geographic *biases* in intervention coverage for adverts, independent of the level of coverage.

2.2.1 National vs. London

The following table shows, for each of the eight mass media interventions, the odds ratio for recognition among men living in London compared to men living elsewhere in England and Wales. If men in London saw recognised the adverts at the same level as men elsewhere recognised them, the odds ratio would be 1.0. An odds ratio above 1.0 means men in London are more likely to recognise than men elsewhere, conversely an odds ratio below 1.0 means men in London were less likely to recognise it. The odds ratio is not related to the level of recognition but to the difference in recognition between the two areas.

Table: London-Elsewhere biases in coverage		Ratio of the odds of recognition for men in London to the odds of recognition for men elsewhere in England and Wales		Range (96% confidence interval)
		If the probability of recognition outside London is 1.00	If the probability of recognition inside London is 1.00	
National interventions	STIs	1.91	(0.52)	1.72–2.11
	PEP	2.52	(0.40)	2.25–2.81
	Hep Info	1.45	(0.69)	1.23–1.70
	Sex Law HIV	1.38	(0.72)	1.18–1.61
	Responsibility	1.98	(0.51)	1.79–2.19
London interventions	Relationship Tips	2.34	(0.43)	2.11–2.58
	Condoms buy carry	2.92	(0.34)	2.62–3.26
	Questioning HIV prevention	1.41	(0.71)	1.25–1.59

All 'National' targeted interventions were disproportionately recognised by men living in London. The mean odds ratio of the five interventions was 1.85. So, compared to men living elsewhere in England and Wales, men in London are 1.85 times more likely to recognise national mass media interventions. The other way of looking at it is that compared to men in London, men elsewhere in England and Wales are 0.54 times as likely to recognise mass media adverts (0.54 is 1.00 divided by 1.85).

All 'London' targeted interventions had a collateral benefit for men living outside London. That is, although they are disproportionately recognised by men in London they are also recognised by men outside London - the 'non-target' group of men outside London also benefit from the intervention. The mean odds ratio for the three 'London' interventions was 2.22 (or 0.45), higher than that for the National interventions but not significantly so.

These two effects mean that we have NOT been able to demonstrate that 'London' interventions are any more 'targeted' at men living in London than are 'national' interventions. Or, conversely, 'National' interventions are no less biased towards men living in London than are 'London' interventions. That is, we have been unable to demonstrate a functional difference in the geographic coverage *biases* between National and London interventions.

2.2.2 PCT level advert recognition

One of the mass media interventions (*Questioning HIV Prevention*) had a primary target group of men living in just two London Primary Care Trusts (Bexley and Greenwich in South East London).

There were 49 men living in Bexley or Greenwich who took part in the 2006 coverage survey. Compared to men living elsewhere in London these men were no more or less likely to recognise *Questioning HIV Prevention* (20.4% or 10/49 versus 23.5% or 532/2260) or any of the other three London-wide interventions.

As noted above, this intervention was part of a larger intervention in which other materials carrying similar imagery distributed in community venues and at services in Bexley and Greenwich. Although local distribution of knick-knacks has been shown to increase recognition of mass media interventions (Weatherburn et al. 2003) we found no evidence they had done so in this case as men outside the target area were as likely to recognise the adverts as men elsewhere.

2.3 TARGET GROUP SPECIFIC RECOGNITION FOR MASS MEDIA INTERVENTIONS AND COST PER CLIENT

For each of the eight mass media interventions, the following table shows the estimated number of MSM living in the target group area, the number who recognise and who read the intervention, and the estimated cost per man who read the intervention. We found no evidence that (when they were encountered) engagement with adverts varied by whether men lived in the specified geographic target area or not.

The cost per man is solely the display (or recruitment) cost, not the cost of developing the advert (which is an additional cost for the intervention). Two costs are given: cost per man who recognised the advert, and cost per man who read it. Also, the cost per man engaged is not an indicator of the extent of change in the men who engaged.

The cost per man who engaged with the intervention fell within a narrow range for the seven national and London-wide adverts, between £0.21 and £0.59. However, the cost per man engaged by the Metro Centre's *Questioning HIV Prevention* was £4.09. With an estimated MSM population of approximately 9,000 men in the two PCTs, if all of them encountered it and all read it, a mass media intervention with a display budget of £2,400 would have cost £0.26 per man engaged and living in two PCTs only. However, with a coverage of 20% and engagement of 32% the 'recruitment' cost is sixteen times higher. In addition, although Bexley and Greenwich PCTs are in outer London we have used a London-wide estimate of the proportion of men who are MSM. The estimate of the number of MSM is therefore likely to be inflated and the the costs per client are therefore likely to be an under-estimate for *Questioning HIV Prevention*.

The settings used for the *Questioning HIV Prevention* intervention did not ensure that men living in the target area were disproportionately likely to encounter it compared with other men in London. Although successful targeting of men who live in a particular London PCT may be possible if adverts are displayed in very local press titles, in this case the targeting (ie. higher exposure in the target group) was not achieved.

However, if *QHP* was targeted at all men in London, then 31,102 (23,750–40,715) men encountered it and 9,983 (7,624–13,070) men read it, giving a cost per client engaged of £0.24 (range £0.18–£0.31).

Table: Size of target group, coverage cost per client and engagement cost per client

Agency	THT		CHAPS (THT)		GMFA			Metro Centre
Intervention	Hep Info	Sex HIV Law	STIs	PEP	Respon- sibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy them	Questioning HIV Prevention
Targets MSM living in...	England, Wales & Scotland		England and Wales		London-wide			Greenwich & Bexley
Adult males (from ONS mid-2005 estimate)	23,277,000		21,263,000		2,772,000			163,000
% MSM (95%CI) (from NSAAL2)	2.6 (2.2-3.1)		2.6 (2.2-3.1)		5.5 (4.2-7.2)			5.5 (4.2-7.2)
Number of MSM in target group	605,202 (512,094-721,587)		552,838 (467,786-659,153)		152,460 (116,424-199,584)			8,965 (6,846-11,736)
% of target group recognising intervention	7.4	7.8	31.9	22.8	60.0	59.7	39.3	20.4
Number of men who encountered the intervention	44,785 (37,894-53,397)	47,206 (39,943-56,284)	176,355 (149,224-210,270)	126,047 (106,655-150,287)	91,476 (69,854-119,750)	91,019 (69,505-119,152)	59,917 (45,755-78,437)	1,829 (1,397-2,394)
Display spend (£, press and web based advertising)	7,611	6,154	24,976	39,442	16,644	16,984	13,934	2,400
<i>Display cost / client encountered (£)</i>	<i>0.16 (0.14-0.20)</i>	<i>0.13 (0.11-0.15)</i>	<i>0.14 (0.12-0.17)</i>	<i>0.31 (0.26-0.40)</i>	<i>0.18 (0.14-0.24)</i>	<i>0.19 (0.14-0.24)</i>	<i>0.23 (0.18-0.30)</i>	<i>1.31 (1.00-1.72)</i>
% of those recognising who read it	35.2	28.3	67.4	53.4	52.7	62.2	59.9	32.1
Number of target group who read the intervention	15,764 (13,339-18,796)	13,359 (11,304-15,928)	118,863 (100,577-141,722)	67,309 (56,954-80,253)	48,208 (36,813-63,108)	56,614 (43,232-74,112)	35,890 (27,407-46,984)	587 (448-768)
<i>Display cost / client who read it (£)</i>	<i>0.48 (0.40-0.57)</i>	<i>0.46 (0.39-0.54)</i>	<i>0.21 (0.18-0.25)</i>	<i>0.59 (0.49-0.69)</i>	<i>0.35 (0.26-0.45)</i>	<i>0.30 (0.23-0.39)</i>	<i>0.39 (0.30-0.51)</i>	<i>4.09 (3.13-5.36)</i>

2.4 INTERIM CONCLUSION: THE FALLACY OF GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING OF MASS MEDIA INTERVENTIONS

All interventions have (often implicit) target groups including the desirable geographic bias. However, these nominal groups do not appear to determine where the adverts are placed, or if they do, then the placements are ineffective at ensuring the 'target groups' are disproportionately encounter the interventions.

If such placements cannot be identified, then planners should consider changing the nominal target group of the intervention. In other words, we cannot claim an intervention is 'targeting' men living in area X when we know men outside that area are equally or almost as equally likely to encounter it.

- **There is no evidence of the feasibility of PCT level 'targeting' of mass media adverts to gay and bisexual men in London.**
- **There is no evidence of the feasibility of distinguishing London from 'national' targeted mass media adverts.**

2.5 ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVERTS: WHAT PROPORTION OF MEN RECOGNISING THEM READ THEM?

The following table shows the proportion of all UK-resident men who indicated having recognised each advert; then how those recognising were split between readers and non-readers; and the proportion of recognisers who were also readers (in italics).

% of all UK residents (n=8286)		<i>National adverts</i>				<i>London adverts</i>			<i>2-PCT advert</i>
		<i>CHAPS (THT)</i>		<i>THT</i>		<i>GMFA</i>			<i>Metro Centre</i>
		STIs	PEP	Hep Info	Sex HIV Law	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV Prevention
Recognise it		30.7	21.1	7.3	7.8	47.2	43.7	23.7	19.5
Those who recognise Adverts	Recognise but have not looked at closely or read them	10.0	9.8	4.7	5.6	24.8	16.7	10.6	13.9
	Have read most or all of it	20.7	11.3	2.6	2.2	22.4	27.0	13.1	5.6
<i>% of those who recognised adverts who had read them</i>		<i>67.4</i>	<i>53.4</i>	<i>35.2</i>	<i>28.3</i>	<i>47.4</i>	<i>61.7</i>	<i>55.3</i>	<i>28.7</i>

In previous surveys between 41% and 65% of web-recruited men who recognised an advert said they had read the text. Both the CHAPS (THT) THT national and GMFA London adverts fell within the this range. The two other THT national adverts and the London *Questioning HIV Prevention* adverts showed engagement levels below this range.

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

% of all London residents (n=2363)		London adverts			2-PCT advert
		GMFA			Metro Centre
		Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV Prevention
Recognise it		60.0	59.7	39.3	23.5
Those who recognise Adverts	Recognise but have not looked at closely or read them	28.4	22.5	15.7	15.9
	Have read most or all of it	31.6	37.1	23.5	7.5
% of those who recognised any images who had read adverts		52.7	62.2	59.9	32.1

Recognition of London-wide interventions was significantly higher among London-residents than among men elsewhere in the UK. *Responsibility* and *RelationTips* had particularly high recognition (both 60%) among Londoners. 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.

3.0 SMALL MEDIA (BOOKLETS, CARDS, MAGAZINES)

A general description of small media and their purpose was given to all respondents and they were asked when they last saw any such items. The majority (78%) reported ever taking away a booklet or magazine about HIV / sexual health or safer sex, around half doing so within the last year (52%) and a fifth within the previous month (20%).

When was the last time you took away a card, booklet or magazine ABOUT HIV / SEXUAL HEALTH OR SAFER SEX to read in your own time? (n=8109, missing 177)	%
In the last month	19.6
In the last year	32.0
Over a year ago	26.5
Never	21.9

For each of the ten items of small media, men were shown the front cover. In order to illustrate the form of the interventions men were also shown the back of the *Sex HIV Law* card, the fanned out *Ten things you need to know about HIV* booklet, the folded out versions of the *GHB* and *Crystal* booklets, the 3 different *Getting what you want* covers and the front covers of three editions of F:S magazine. For each item they were 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

For F:S respondents were given a slightly different fourth option *I've read most or all of the copies I've seen*.

A small proportion of respondents (around 2%) gave more than one answer. Responses have been organised into the first four answers plus whether or not men kept a copy. Men who indicated having kept a copy only were judged to have read it.

3.1 SMALL MEDIA COVERAGE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

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 national interventions (n=6883, missing 1403)	CHAPS booklets				THT booklets			Camden PCT booklets		GMFA magazine
	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal	Ten	Getting what you want	F:S
England (n=7064)	18.9	29.7	25.7	19.1	7.7	12.6	12.8	6.8	16.9	20.1
London (n=2362)	30.3	37.6	32.7	23.5	9.5	19.1	18.8	9.0	24.0	36.2
South West (n=374)	15.9	29.6	24.8	18.7	7.3	11.1	10.0	4.1	11.3	11.2
South Central (n=326)	10.8	27.2	21.0	14.9	4.9	9.9	10.2	5.6	13.0	14.6
South East Coast (n=429)	22.0	28.8	25.9	18.8	4.2	9.8	9.8	5.4	11.7	12.7
East of England (n=377)	13.7	24.1	18.8	11.9	7.2	9.1	11.4	5.1	12.3	16.1
East Midlands (n=306)	10.2	23.0	11.8	9.5	5.3	7.9	4.9	4.0	9.9	7.9
West Midlands (n=361)	13.4	33.8	26.9	22.0	7.9	9.2	10.4	5.1	12.6	18.3
Yorkshire & Humber (n=345)	11.4	26.6	22.6	13.7	9.3	7.9	12.1	5.6	15.8	6.4
North West (n=619)	11.7	26.4	25.6	22.2	7.0	9.4	9.5	4.6	15.8	7.7
North East (n=159)	6.9	21.4	13.8	10.3	3.8	5.0	5.7	6.4	10.1	9.4
Wales (n=318)	11.0	38.0	30.2	19.5	5.7	11.0	12.2	5.7	12.5	9.2
Scotland (n=695)	5.4	22.0	15.0	8.2	4.9	8.1	10.0	4.5	9.8	9.6
Northern Ireland (n=210)	2.4	21.0	12.0	7.2	4.3	5.2	6.2	8.1	12.9	9.5

Recognition of all the small media interventions varied by where men lived. London-resident men show the highest levels of recognition for all the national interventions. London-resident men also show the highest levels of recognition for all the London small media interventions.

3.2 ENGAGEMENT WITH SMALL MEDIA: WHAT PROPORTION OF MEN RECOGNISING THEM READ THEM?

The following table shows: the proportion of all UK-resident men who recognised each item of small media; how those who recognised it are then split between non-readers, casual readers and close readers; the overall proportion who had kept a copy; the proportion of those who recognised it who had read most or all of it; and the proportion of those who recognised it who had kept a copy.

% of UK residents (n=8286)		CHAPS (THT)				THT			Camden PCT	GMFA	
		The Manual	eXposed!:8	eXposed!:9	PEP	Sex HIV LAW	GHB	Crystal	Ten things	with PACE Getting what you want	F:S
Recognise it		29.1	24.6	17.9	17.1	7.3	12.0	12.4	6.6	16.1	18.5
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	10.4	9.8	7.4	5.1	3.1	5.6	5.7	3.3	9.7	6.4
	Looked at but not read in detail	7.1	7.4	5.0	4.6	2.3	2.7	2.8	1.6	3.8	6.2
	Read most of it	7.9	6.0	4.5	6.0	1.4	2.8	3.1	1.2	1.8	4.7
I've kept a copy		5.1	2.1	1.5	2.4	0.7	1.1	1.1	0.7	1.0	2.0
% of those who recognised had read most or all of it		27.2	24.2	24.9	35.1	19.2	23.4	24.7	17.8	11.0	25.5
% of those who recognised who had kept		17.6	8.5	8.6	13.9	9.2	9.6	9.2	10.1	6.0	10.6

The CHAPS national small media The Manual and eXposed! 8 were most likely to be recognised. Over a quarter (29%) of all men resident in the UK could recall the CHAPS small media The Manual and a quarter (25%) eXposed! 8. A smaller proportion had seen eXposed! 9 (18%) and the PEP booklet (17%), recognition of which has increased from 11% in GMSS 2005. The two wallet sized cards (Sex HIV Law by THT and Camden PCTs Ten things you need to know about HIV?) had the lowest recognition. However, even the London small media were still recognised by between 1-in-16 (Ten things ...) and 1-in-6 (Getting what you want ..) of all men nationally.

The percentage range of men who recognised booklets who had read them was similar to the previous years (between 11% and 35%) and between 6% and 18% had kept them. Respondents were most likely to have read PEP, The Manual, F:S, Crystal, GHB and the eXposed! magazines. Men were most likely to report keeping The Manual (17.6%).

The following table shows the same measures for the small media among only those men living in London.

% of London residents (n=2363)		CHAPS (THT)				THT			Camden PCT	GMFA	
		The Manual	eXposed! :8	eXposed! :9	PEP	Sex HIV LAW	GHB	Crystal	Ten		with PACE Getting what you want
Recognise it		37.6	32.7	23.5	30.3	9.5	19.1	18.8	9.0	24.0	36.2
Those who recognise it	Recognise but have not looked at closely	12.8	11.7	9.0	8.0	3.6	7.7	7.6	4.2	13.5	9.4
	Looked at but not read in detail	9.8	11.1	7.2	8.5	2.9	4.5	4.6	2.1	6.0	13.0
	Read most of it	10.6	8.2	6.0	11.1	2.2	5.5	5.1	1.7	3.1	11.1
I've kept a copy		6.2	2.5	1.9	4.3	0.9	2.0	1.9	1.2	1.8	4.3
% of those who recognised who had read most or all of it		28.2	25.2	25.6	36.7	23.3	28.7	27.3	18.3	12.8	30.5
% of those who recognised who had kept		16.5	7.7	8.3	14.3	10.0	10.7	10.0	13.0	7.6	11.8

Recognition of small media was higher among London men, particularly with the PEP booklet and F:S which were seen by twice as many men in London as the national percentage. Recognition, reading and keeping of the London and primarily London interventions was more common among the London-resident respondents than among residents of the rest of the UK.

4. WEB-SITES

Respondents were asked when they had last read anything about HIV or safer sex on the internet. The vast majority of all men (90.2%) reported ever reading anything about HIV or safer sex on the internet, the majority having done so within the previous year (75.5%) and the previous month (42.5%). This may partly be a reflection on the recruitment to the survey, since all who completed the coverage element of GMSS were recruited online and may have been more likely than other men to access the internet.

When was the last time you read anything about HIV or safer sex on the internet? (n=8159, missing 127)	%
In the last month	42.5
In the last year	33.0
Over a year ago	14.7
Never	9.8

For two CHAPS campaigns (STIs and PEP) men were not shown the web homepage. For the remaining five web-sites men were shown the homepage and a closeup of the web banner. All were asked to indicate one of the following options.

- No, I have 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 web-site

4.1 ENGAGEMENT WITH WEB-SITES: WHAT PROPORTION OF MEN RECOGNISING THEM READ THEM?

The following table shows the proportion of all UK-resident men who indicated having visited each of the seven web-sites and how those visiting were split between those that had read the content in detail and those that had not. We also show (in italics) the percentage of those who had visited who had read most or all of the site.

% of UK residents (n=8286)		CHAPS (THT)				THT		GMFA
		STIs	Vive la difference	PEP	ygm.org.uk	Hep info	sex HIV law	metromate.org.uk
Visited		4.5	3.5	4.8	5.1	2.6	1.7	9.2
Those who visited	Looked at but not read in detail	3.0	2.6	2.7	4.1	1.7	1.0	6.7
	Read most or all of it	1.5	0.9	2.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	2.5
<i>% of those who visited web-site who had read most or all of it</i>		<i>32.8</i>	<i>25.1</i>	<i>44.0</i>	<i>19.6</i>	<i>32.0</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>27.0</i>

For the four web-sites where a mass media advert also appeared (PEP, STIs, Sex HIV Law and Hep Info) the proportion of all men visiting was lower than the proportion recognising the adverts - between 1.7% and 4.8% had visited the web-sites. While the

greatest proportion of men had visited the *PEP* site (4.8%) the *Hep Info* web-site had a greater proportion of men who recognised it reporting having visited the it.

Between 3.5% and 5.1% of all men surveyed had visited the CHAPS websites (*Vive la différence*, *ygm*, *STI's* and *PEP*). Men aged under 20 were more likely to visit *ygm* (11.5%) compared to men between 20 and 24 (6.8%).

Between 25% and 44% of those visiting a web site reported having read most or all of it. Among men visiting sites, the highest proportion read the *PEP* web-site.

The following table shows the same measures for the web-sites among respondents living in London.

% of London residents (n=2363)		CHAPS (THT)				THT		GMFA
		STIs	Vive la différence	PEP	ygm.org.uk	Hep info	sex HIV law	metromate.org.uk
Visited		6.4	4.5	8.0	4.6	3.3	2.5	15.5
Those who visited	Looked at but not read in detail	4.2	3.4	4.6	3.4	2.0	1.5	11.0
	Read most or all of it	2.2	1.1	3.4	1.2	1.3	1.1	4.6
% of those who visited web-site who had read most or all of it		34.7	25.2	42.7	26.4	39.0	42.4	29.5

All web-sites had higher recognition among London men than men resident elsewhere in the UK, particularly the *PEP* and *Metromate* web-sites. Similar proportions of men in London and nationally were likely to have read most or all of the web-sites.

5. DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PROMPTED RECOGNITION

This section considers differences in recognition across the following six demographic characteristics: sex with women (and men) in the last year; age group; ethnic group; level of formal education; HIV testing history; numbers of male sex partners in the last year. For each characteristic the table shows the proportion of men in each group who recognised the interventions.

Shading of the intervention name indicates that recognition of that intervention significantly varied by that demographic characteristic, using 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. Under each characteristic we consider National and then London targeted interventions.

5.1 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.

5.1.1 National interventions and sex with women

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

% of UK residents recognising (n=8286)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
No sex with women (n=7446)	32.2	22.5	18.1	30.1	25.3	18.5	7.4	7.9	7.3	12.0	12.5
Sex with women (n=840)	17.0	8.3	7.6	20.3	18.1	13.0	6.6	6.5	7.6	11.8	11.3

As in previous coverage data men who did not have sex with women were more likely to recognise all of the national CHAPS interventions than those who did. However, there were no significant differences in recognition for five unshaded THT adverts and booklets when we controlled for differences in age, ethnic group, formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners and directorate of residence.

5.1.2 London interventions and sex with women

Among London respondents, 7.2% had a female sex partner in the last year. The following tables shows recognition of London interventions by whether or not men had female sexual partners in the last year.

% of London residents recognising (n=2363)	Adverts				Booklets		
	GMFA			Metro Centre	Camden PCT		GMFA
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them		with PACE	Getting what you want	
No sex with women (n=2192)	61.8	61.4	40.1	23.5	Ten	24.2	F:S
Sex with women (n=171)	36.4	36.6	27.8	23.6	12.0	21.3	23.3

Men who had not had sex with women were significantly more likely to have seen all of the GMFA London adverts and F:S. There was no significant difference between the groups in having seen the Metro Centre advert or the Camden PCT booklets when we controlled for variation in the other demographic characteristics.

5.2 AGE GROUP

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

5.2.1 National interventions and age groups

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

% of UK residents recognising (n=8269, missing 17)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
under 20 (n=644)	20.7	9.0	6.0	17.3	18.8	9.9	2.7	6.3	7.1	8.8	10.0
20s (n=2552)	31.2	19.9	15.8	33.0	23.7	17.9	5.7	7.1	6.9	12.9	14.6
30s (n=2308)	36.4	28.1	23.5	33.1	28.4	21.1	9.3	9.0	7.6	14.2	13.8
40s (n=1658)	31.9	22.9	18.9	29.1	24.9	17.8	8.9	8.5	8.1	10.7	10.4
50s (n=1107)	21.5	13.8	10.2	18.9	21.5	15.8	7.2	6.5	6.6	8.5	8.7

As in previous coverage surveys, 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 often relatively small. In the current survey, all interventions except *eXposed! 8*, *Sex HIV Law* booklet and advert, and *GHB* showed significant differences in recognition across age groups when we controlled for variation in other demographic characteristics.

In most cases men under twenty were less likely to recognise the interventions than men in their 20s, 30s, and 40s. For two interventions (*Infections - STIs* and *Hep info*) men in their 50s were also more likely to recognise them than men under 20. For just one intervention (*Crystal* booklet) men under twenty were more likely to recognise it than men over 50.

5.2.2 London interventions and age groups

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

% of London residents recognising (n=2354, missing 9)	Adverts				Booklets		
	GMFA			Metro Centre	Camden PCT		GMFA
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV Prevention	Ten	with PACE Getting what you want	F:S
under 20 (n=86)	42.0	42.0	30.0	21.3	15.0	19.0	19.2
20s (n=687)	59.1	60.4	39.2	20.8	10.9	23.9	31.3
30s (n=831)	65.7	64.9	44.1	23.9	8.9	25.7	40.9
40s (n=501)	62.9	59.4	37.3	26.5	6.2	25.1	38.2
50s (n=249)	43.3	46.5	29.8	23.3	7.4	17.5	35.0

When we controlled for variation in other demographic characteristics significant differences emerged for four of the London interventions by age group. However, the differences were not uniform. For F:S men under 20 were less likely to recognise it than men in their 20s, 30s, 40s and 50+. For *Ten things you need to know about HIV* men under 20 were more likely to recognise it than men in their 40s, and there was no significant difference when comparing the under 20s with the other age bands. For two of GMFAs adverts, men under 20 were less likely to recognise them than men in their 20s or 30s (or 40s for *Responsibility*). There were no differences by age for the Metro Centre advert, the Camden PCT/PACE booklet or GMFAs advert about condoms.

5.3 ETHNIC GROUP

Previously CHAPS interventions were intended to be seen equally by all ethnic groups. However, both the CHAPS and London Gay Men's HIV Prevention Programme (LGMHPP) recognise interventions should disproportionately benefit Black men rather than other ethnic groups, as Black men appear to be more likely to sero-convert to HIV.

5.3.1 National interventions and 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.

% of UK residents recognising (n=7894, missing 392)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
White (n=7690)	30.7	21.2	16.9	28.8	24.1	17.4	7.2	7.9	7.3	11.5	11.8
Black (n=72)	42.3	35.3	26.1	38.0	35.2	35.7	15.7	5.8	5.8	21.4	21.4
Asian (n=132)	26.0	13.1	13.1	28.1	26.2	20.9	10.0	7.0	8.5	19.4	20.9

In previous coverage data some CHAPS mass media were more commonly recognised by Black men with White men least likely to recognise them. Controlling for formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, directorate of residence, sex with women and age, Black men and Asian men were more likely to recognise the *GHB* and *Crystal* booklets, compared to White men. Similarly to the 2005 findings, Black men were most likely to recognise the PEP and the STI adverts compared to White and Asian men and more likely to recognise *eXposed! 9* magazine and *Hep info* adverts compared to White men. Asian men were less likely to recognise the STIs and the PEP advert than other men.

5.3.2 London interventions and ethnic groups

The following table shows recognition of the London interventions across three ethnic groups. Controlling for formal education, HIV testing history, volume of male partners, living in Inner or Outer London, sex with women and age, only recognition of F:S magazine varied, where Asian men were more likely than White men to have seen it.

% of London residents recognising (n= 2138, missing 225)	Adverts				Booklets		
	GMFA adverts			Metro Centre	Camden PCT		GMFA
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them		Ten	with PACE Getting what you want	
White (n=2069)	61.0	60.9	38.7	23.3	8.4	23.6	36.5
Black (n=45)	65.9	61.4	53.5	35.7	16.3	32.6	38.6
Asian (n=59)	50.8	51.7	40.7	25.4	10.3	28.1	47.5

5.4 FORMAL EDUCATION

As men with lower levels of formal education are more likely to sero-convert to HIV and show higher levels of unmet prevention need on most indicators, all HIV prevention interventions should disproportionately benefit men with lower levels of formal education rather than those with higher levels of education.

5.4.1 National interventions and education

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

% of UK residents recognising (n=8258, missing 28)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
Low (n=1178)	26.3	17.5	14.3	22.8	24.2	16.9	7.5	7.5	7.4	11.2	9.8
Medium (n=1791)	30.1	18.7	14.4	26.6	23.1	17.1	6.5	8.5	8.0	10.3	12.0
High (n=5289)	31.9	22.8	18.6	31.4	25.1	18.4	7.6	7.6	7.1	12.7	13.1

Controlling for HIV testing history, volume of male partners, directorate of residence, sex with women, age and ethnic group, compared to men with low education, those with medium education were more likely to recognise *STIs*, and men with high education were more likely to recognise *The Manual*. There were no other differences by education.

5.4.2 London interventions and education

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

% of London residents recognising (n= 2357, missing 6)	Adverts				Booklets		
	GMFA adverts			Metro Centre	Camden PCT	GMFA	
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV Prevention	Ten	with PACE Getting what you want	F:S
Low (n=216)	60.5	54.8	36.4	27.2	10.2	19.7	38.5
Medium (n=332)	62.8	61.4	39.7	26.4	10.0	22.8	40.0
High (n=1809)	59.6	59.9	39.6	22.6	8.8	24.8	35.3

Recognition of London materials did not vary by educational attainment when we controlled for variation in other demographic characteristics.

5.5 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.

5.5.1 National interventions and testing history

The following table shows recognition of each of the interventions across three testing history groups. Controlling for volume of male partners, region of residence, sex with women, age, ethnic group and education, men who had tested positive were more likely than men who had never tested to have seen all of the adverts. With the exception of the two *eXposed!* magazines and *Hep. info* adverts men with diagnosed HIV were also more likely than men who had tested negative to have seen interventions.

% of UK residents recognising (n=8190, missing 96)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
Tested positive (n=567)	46.4	49.0	44.7	43.8	35.7	26.7	14.3	17.1	15.0	19.4	19.9
Last test negative (n=4229)	36.3	25.7	21.0	34.2	28.5	21.3	8.5	8.3	7.7	14.1	13.9
Never tested (n=3394)	21.1	10.7	7.4	20.5	17.7	12.2	4.6	5.6	5.6	7.9	9.3

5.5.2 London interventions and testing history

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

% of London residents recognising (n=2322, missing 41)	Adverts				Booklets			
	GMFA				Metro Centre	Camden PCT		GMFA
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them	Questioning HIV Prevention	Ten	with PACE	F:S	
Tested positive (n=258)	71.4	73.3	50.4	30.1	8.3	26.5	53.1	
Last test negative (n=1444)	61.8	61.1	40.4	23.7	9.3	25.4	37.1	
Never tested (n=620)	51.9	50.7	31.8	20.5	8.6	19.4	26.9	

Controlling for variation in other demographic characteristics, men who had tested positive were more likely than men who had never tested to have seen *Responsibility*, *RelationTips*, *Condoms buy them carry them*, *Questioning HIV prevention* and *F:S* magazine compared to men who tested positive. Men who had last tested negative were also less likely to have seen *Responsibility*, *RelationTips*, *Condoms buy carry them*, *Questioning HIV prevention* and *F:S* magazine.

5.6 NUMBER OF MALE SEXUAL PARTNERS

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

5.6.1 National interventions and number of partners

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 recognition of each of the interventions in five male sexual partner numbers groups. Male partner numbers were for the last 12 months.

% of UK receiving (n=8202, missing 84)	CHAPS adverts		CHAPS booklets				THT adverts		THT booklets/ publications		
	Infections - STIs	PEP	PEP	The Manual	eXposed! 8: Brief Encounters!	eXposed! 9: How close do you get	Hepatitis info	Sex HIV Law	Sex HIV Law	GHB	Crystal
30 + (n=784)	46.0	38.6	32.0	42.6	34.5	26.3	9.6	11.6	10.6	19.5	20.9
13 - 29 (n=924)	43.0	31.8	26.1	38.0	33.8	23.3	10.4	9.3	8.3	14.9	16.0
5 - 12 (n=1912)	34.1	24.1	20.4	31.6	25.9	18.6	7.5	9.3	7.9	12.6	12.5
2, 3 or 4 (n=2242)	26.2	16.9	13.3	26.2	21.5	16.2	7.1	6.4	6.2	10.1	10.9
1 (n=1775)	24.8	14.5	10.7	24.1	21.5	15.5	5.5	6.4	6.9	10.4	10.3
None (n=565)	14.6	7.5	5.7	15.4	13.5	8.5	4.4	4.4	4.7	6.9	7.4

Generally the likelihood of recognising interventions increased as partner numbers increased. Controlling for other demographic variation men with 30+ partners were more likely to recognise all interventions except the *Hep info.* adverts. Men with 13-29 partners did not differ in recognition from those with 30+ partners.

5.6.2 London interventions and number of partners

The following table shows recognition of each of the London interventions by the number of men's male sexual partners in the last year.

% of London residents recognising (n= 2335, missing 28)	Adverts				Booklets		
	GMFA adverts			Metro Centre	Camden PCT		GMFA
	Responsibility	RelationTips	Condoms buy carry them		Ten	with PACE Getting what you want	
30 + (n=333)	66.4	70.7	47.3	25.2	12.1	28.5	49.2
13 - 29 (n=350)	64.9	63.0	45.1	26.2	8.7	27.7	45.0
5 - 12 (n=592)	61.0	61.4	37.6	22.8	6.9	21.2	33.3
2, 3 or 4 (n=539)	59.3	56.2	36.8	24.3	8.3	25.6	32.8
1 (n=420)	56.3	55.8	35.8	19.7	10.0	21.5	31.6
None (n=101)	37.2	34.7	28.7	23.7	9.6	11.7	16.0

In the London data, the same pattern was observed for three GMFA adverts, both booklets and F:S.

Ford.Hickson@sigmaresearch.org.uk

13th September 2007