

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

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**COVERAGE OF NATIONAL INTERVENTIONS**

1. The three CHAPS campaigns were recognised by 23.8% (*Closer*); 29.8% (*PEP*); and 34.3% (*Get it On*) of men resident in England & Wales (page 4) all within the previous range of recognition for campaigns. All three campaigns had substantially higher recognition among London-resident men (31.2% for *Closer*; 40.2% for *PEP*; and 41.0% for *Get it On*) than men resident elsewhere in the UK.
2. Recognition of the three CHAPS booklets and magazines was in the range 22-28%, with particularly high recognition for *eXposed!* 9 (27.7%, page 8). Again all had higher recognition among London-resident men (31-38%, page 8) than men resident elsewhere in the UK.

**COVERAGE OF LONDON INTERVENTIONS**

3. Compared to previous LGMHPP adverts, recognition of GMFA's *Headlines* and *Reasons* was not particularly high among London residents (42.0% for *Headlines* and 25.7% for *Reasons*, see page 6).
4. *Healthy Respect* was a THT (TiPi) intervention for people with diagnosed HIV. Men with diagnosed HIV were more likely to recognise it (12.5%) than men tested negative (6.4%) and men who had never tested for HIV (4.6%). However, all adverts had similar biases towards men with diagnosed HIV (page 13).

**RECOGNITION BIASES IN INTERVENTIONS**

5. 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. There is no evidence of the feasibility of distinguishing London from 'national' targeted mass media adverts (pages 3-5).
6. Most 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 (pages 12-14).
7. Three interventions (*Get it On*, *eXposed!* 10; and GMFA's *Reasons* adverts) were significantly more likely to have been seen by Black men compared to White men and Asian men. All others showed no biases in recognition by ethnicity (page 13).
8. Less encouraging were biases across age. No intervention was more commonly recognised by younger men compared with older men (page 12).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

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

The survey measures the coverage of the target population by the written interventions and describes biases by demographic characteristics important to HIV prevention planning. 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.

Prompted recognition measures were taken in the online version of GMSS 2007. Included were:

- **Six mass media adverts** - three CHAPS (THT) and one THT London intervention, and two London-wide interventions by GMFA.
- **Three small media interventions** (all CHAPS / THT).
- **Five specific websites** (three CHAPS / THT, one THT, and one GMFA website).

The interventions	National (all CHAPS / THT)	Regional (London)
<i>Gay-press mass media adverts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer (CHAPS)</li> <li>• Get it On (CHAPS)</li> <li>• PEP (CHAPS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Healthy Respect (THT)</li> <li>• Headlines (GMFA)</li> <li>• Reasons (GMFA)</li> </ul>
<i>Multi-site distributed booklets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PEP (CHAPS)</li> <li>• eXposed! 9: How close do you get? (CHAPS)</li> <li>• eXposed! 10: Let's get it on! (CHAPS)</li> </ul>	(none)
<b>Websites</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www.chapsonline.org.uk/closer">www.chapsonline.org.uk/closer</a> (CHAPS)</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.chapsonline.org.uk/getiton">www.chapsonline.org.uk/getiton</a> (CHAPS)</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.pep.chapsonline.org.uk">www.pep.chapsonline.org.uk</a> (CHAPS)</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.tht.org.uk/healthyrespect">www.tht.org.uk/healthyrespect</a> (THT)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www.gmfa.org.uk/sex">www.gmfa.org.uk/sex</a></li> </ul>

The three CHAPS adverts (*Closer*, *Get it On* and *PEP*) were part of larger interventions which also included other materials such as posters, post-cards, credit card size cards, booklets, condom packs etc. (collectively known as knik-knacks). Many of these materials were used by outreach workers during the period of mass media display. Our earlier randomised controlled trial (Weatherburn *et al.* 2003) demonstrated that such activities increase the recognition of campaigns. *Healthy Respect* included adverts in the press and a website targeting people with diagnosed HIV in Greater London. The two GMFA mass media adverts were self-contained press adverts (with some online promotion) targeting gay and bisexual men in London.

## 2.0 OVERALL CAMPAIGN RECOGNITION

The three CHAPS national campaigns consisted of a mixture of adverts, booklets, knik knaks and websites. Men were shown two or three images from each campaign (advert, booklet, condom pack) and were asked whether they remembered seeing *any* of the images. Those saying yes were asked separate questions about whether they had seen the adverts, the booklet (in the case of PEP) and if they had visited the specific website.

The following table shows the overall recognition for each of the CHAPS campaigns in each area and sub-area of the UK. For comparison we include the THT *Healthy Respect* adverts which were intended to be seen by anyone with diagnosed HIV in London, and the GMFA adverts which were intended to be seen by all MSM in London. Coverage of these interventions was based on their adverts only. For these three adverts, men were shown three executions and 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

% of men recognising adverts	CHAPS (THT) campaigns			THT advert	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>UK-wide (n=5200)</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>England (n=4504)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>33.2</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>19</b>
East of England (n=319)	<u>17.8</u>	<u>31.3</u>	<u>25.1</u>	7.2	30.6	15.9
East Midlands (n=226)	<u>17</u>	33.6	<u>19.8</u>	3.9	19.0	12.7
London (n=1670)	<b>34.1</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>25.7</b>
North East (n=142)	<u>16</u>	<u>26.6</u>	29.6	9	25.9	11.8
North West (n=420)	24.3	37.6	29.6	5.7	24.3	15.2
South Central (n=296)	19.5	34.9	<u>25.5</u>	5.7	29.7	18.1
South East Coast (n=346)	32.1	37.6	28.9	4.6	30.8	14.4
South West (n=331)	22	32.7	27.2	8.4	27.8	14.2
West Midlands (n=365)	26.6	36.9	29.4	4.1	25.1	12.3
Yorkshire & Humber (n=304)	20.3	<u>32.5</u>	28	8.2	28.2	14.7
<b>Wales (n=222)</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Scotland (n=357)</b>	16.4	28.3	15.6	10.9	27.2	12
<b>Northern Ireland (n=111)</b>	14.3	27.4	12.6	10.7	21.4	8.8
Planned geographic reach	England & Wales			London	London	

Across the UK, the CHAPS campaigns show a range of recognitions from 26.1% to 37.1%, although the display spend for the interventions also varied (see below). In coverage surveys between 2001 and 2005 CHAPS interventions were recognised by between 16% and 39% of web-recruited men across the UK. In this survey the three CHAPS (THT) campaigns are at the upper end of this range.

However, men living in the UK was not the target group for any of these interventions. CHAPS campaigns were targeted at men living in England and Wales (and GMFA's adverts were targeted at men living in Greater London). Across England, CHAPS campaigns show a wide range of recognitions. They are always most commonly recognised by men resident in London. Men resident in Strategic Health Authorities where there is no CHAPS partner agencies tended to have the lowest rates of recognition especially men resident in the East of England and North East (the bottom three recognition rates are highlighted in each column).

All 'National' targeted interventions were disproportionately recognised by men living in London and 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. Effectively we have been unable to demonstrate a functional difference in the geographic coverage between National and London interventions.

## 2.1 COVERAGE COST

The following table shows the display spends and the cost per percentage point of coverage achieved for various geographic areas. Total investment in the PEP campaign is shown since the campaign had "run" four times prior to this coverage survey.

Cost per percentage point of national advert coverage	CHAPS (THT) campaigns			THT advert	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>Display spend (£, press + online advertising)</b>	<b>15021 + 5000</b>	<b>25105 + 5000</b>	<b>61798</b>	<b>4044</b>	<b>15833 + 4152</b>	<b>14263 + 1730</b>
<b>% UK-wide overall recognition</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>18.1</b>
£ per % across UK	875	902	2139	642	635	884
<b>% England &amp; Wales overall recognition</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>18.7</b>
£ per % across Eng. & Wales	842	876	2074	674	623	856
<b>% England overall recognition</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>19.0</b>
£ per % across England	835	871	2060	674	614	842
<b>% London overall recognition</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>25.7</b>
£ per % across London	642	735	1538	562	476	623

At a UK level, the most efficiently displayed intervention was *Headlines* (GMFA) which cost £635 per percent point covered and the most inefficient was PEP which cost approximately three times more per percent point covered.

For each of the five interventions targeting men that have sex with men (MSM), the following table shows the estimated number of MSM living in the target area, the number who recognise the intervention and the estimated cost per man who recognised the intervention. The cost per man is solely the display cost, not the cost of developing the advert.

Agency	CHAPS (THT)			GMFA	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	Headlines	Reasons
Targets MSM living in...	England and Wales			Greater London	
Number of adult males (ONS mid-2005 estimate)	21,263,000			2,772,000	
% MSM (95% CI) (from NatSSAL 2)	2.6 (2.2-3.1)			5.5 (4.2-7.2)	
Number of MSM in target group	552,838 (467,786-659,153)			152,460 (116,424-199,584)	
% of target group recognising intervention	<b>23.8</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>25.7</b>
Number of men who encountered the intervention	131,575 (111,333-156,878)	189,623 (160,452-226,089)	164,746 (139,400-196,428)	64,033 (48,898-83,825)	39,182 (29,920-51,293)
Display spend (£, press and online advertising)	20021	30105	61798	19985	15993
Display cost / client encountered (£)	0.15 (0.13-0.18)	0.16 (0.13-0.19)	0.38 (0.31-0.44)	0.31 (0.24-0.41)	0.41 (0.31-0.53)

The cost per man who engaged with the interventions fell within a narrow range - for the CHAPS interventions between £0.15 and £0.38. *Closer* and *Get it On* were particularly cost efficient since their recognition was gained from running the interventions only once.

The nominal geographic target groups of campaigns (and adverts) do not appear to determine where the adverts are placed, or if they do, then the placements are ineffective at ensuring the 'geographic target groups' disproportionately encounter the interventions. If such placements cannot be identified, then planners should consider changing the nominal target group of these interventions. In other words, we cannot claim an intervention is 'targeting' men living in area X when we know men outside that area are almost as likely to encounter it.

- **There is no evidence of the feasibility of distinguishing London from 'national' targeted mass media adverts.**

### 3. 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 (95%) reported ever seeing a mass media advert, the majority having done so within the previous year (85%) and previous month (61%).

When was the last time you saw an advert ABOUT HIV OR SAFER SEX? (n = 5227, missing 118)	%
In the last month	61.3
In the last year	23.7
Over a year ago	10.4
Never	4.6

### 3.1 OVERALL ADVERT COVERAGE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

Five of the six adverts consisted of a number of executions (variations on a theme), and the remaining one (PEP) consisted of a single advert. The following table shows the overall recognition levels for each of the adverts in each area and sub-area of the UK. Please note these measures are advert recognition only.

% of men recognising adverts	CHAPS (THT)			THT	GMFA	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>UK-wide</b> (n=5200, missing 145)	<b>22.9</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>England</b> (n=4504)	<b>24</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>19</b>
East of England (n=319)	15.6	<u>27.3</u>	<u>21.1</u>	5.6	30.6	15.9
East Midlands (n=226)	<u>14.5</u>	31.4	<u>19</u>	2.6	19.0	12.7
<b>London</b> (n=1670)	<b>31.2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>25.7</b>
North East (n=142)	<u>13.2</u>	<u>23.8</u>	24.1	7.6	25.9	11.8
North West (n=420)	22.5	33.6	25.8	4.7	24.3	15.2
South Central (n=296)	17.8	32.3	24.6	4.7	29.7	18.1
South East Coast (n=346)	28.9	35.3	26.6	4	30.8	14.4
South West (n=331)	19.3	27.7	24.6	6.6	27.8	14.2
West Midlands (n=365)	23.1	32.8	27.2	3.5	25.1	12.3
Yorkshire & Humber (n=304)	<u>15.1</u>	<u>27.6</u>	<u>23.4</u>	7.5	28.2	14.7
<b>Wales</b> (n=222)	<b>21</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Scotland</b> (n=357)	13.7	24.2	12.8	8.7	27.2	12
<b>Northern Ireland</b> (n=111)	13.4	23.9	10.8	8.9	21.4	8.8
Planned geographic reach	England & Wales			London	Greater London	

At the UK-level the adverts show a very wide range of recognitions, from 6.3% to 33.4%. However, the display spend 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 this survey the three CHAPS (THT) adverts are within this range (24% to 35%). The THT national adverts *Healthy Respect* had much lower coverage (at 6.3%), with much smaller advertising placement budgets. The two GMFA London adverts had *national* coverage within the range of CHAPS (THT) national adverts (18% and 31.5%).

As *Healthy Respect* was an intervention for men with diagnosed HIV it is no surprise that men with diagnosed HIV were more likely to have recognised it (12.5%) than men tested negative (6.4%) and men who had never tested for HIV (4.6%). However, all adverts had similar biases towards men with diagnosed HIV (see section 6.4).

### 3.2 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=5200, missing 145)		CHAPS (THT)			THT	GMFA	
		Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>Recognise adverts</b>		<b>22.9</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>18.1</b>
Of all UK-resident men	Recognise but have not looked at closely or read them	10	18.3	13.7	4.0	16	10.8
	Have read most or all of it	12.9	15.1	14.3	2.3	15.5	7.3
% of those who recognised adverts who had read them		56.1	45.3	51.1	37.0	49.2	40.3

In previous surveys between 40% and 65% of web-recruited men who recognised an advert said they had read the text. All three CHAPS (THT) national and GMFA London adverts fell within this range but at its lower end. The other THT national advert showed engagement levels below this range (at 37.0%).

The following table shows the same measures among London-resident men only.

% of all London residents (n=1670, missing 68)		CHAPS (THT)			THT	GMFA	
		Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>Recognise adverts</b>		<b>31.2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>25.7</b>
Of all London-resident men	Recognise but have not looked at closely or read them	13.2	22	18.4	4.1	20.2	13.8
	Have read most or all of it	17.1	19	21.8	3.1	21.7	11.9
% of those who recognised adverts who had read them		56.5	46.3	54.3	43	51.8	46.4

Recognition of adverts was significantly higher among London-residents than among men elsewhere in the UK. *Headlines*, *Get it On*, and *PEP* had particularly high recognition among London residents. The proportion recognising interventions who read them was similar across all interventions, suggesting men in London are no more likely to read London-specific interventions than THT / CHAPS national interventions.

#### 4.0 SMALL MEDIA (BOOKLETS, 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 (76%) reported ever taking away a booklet or magazine about HIV / sexual health or safer sex, around half doing so within the last year (46%) and one-in-six within the previous month (17%).

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=5209, missing 136)	%
In the last month	17.3
In the last year	29
Over a year ago	29.6
Never	24.1

We asked about three items of small media - two version of eXposed! magazine and the PEP booklet that formed part of the PEP campaign. For each of these items men were shown the front cover 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 the first four answers plus whether or not men kept a copy. Men who indicated only having kept a copy were judged to have read it.

#### 4.1 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 all UK resident men	CHAPS (THT) small media		
	PEP	eXposed! 9	eXposed! 10
<b>UK-wide (n=5204, missing 141)</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>23.7</b>
<b>England (n=4509)</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>24.6</b>
East of England (n=318)	16.7	<u>17.5</u>	<u>15.4</u>
East Midlands (n=226)	<u>12.8</u>	<u>18.8</u>	17.5
<b>London (n=1671)</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>31.5</b>
North East (n=142)	<u>14.1</u>	24.5	20.8
North West (n=423)	19.6	29	26.4
South Central (n=297)	17.1	22.2	<u>16.1</u>
South East Coast (n=346)	21.5	22.7	18.8
South West (n=333)	17.4	23.1	20.7
West Midlands (n=367)	19.3	27.5	24.3
Yorkshire & Humber (n=304)	<u>15.5</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>17.0</u>
<b>Wales (n=223)</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>27.4</b>
<b>Scotland (n=360)</b>	8.1	16.9	13.9
<b>Northern Ireland (n=111)</b>	6.3	14.2	13.4

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 small media interventions. Across the rest of England recognition is usually lowest in the Strategic Health Authorities where there are no CHAPS partners - East of England, North East and South Central - though it was also relatively low in Yorkshire & Humber and the East Midlands.

## 4.2 ENGAGEMENT WITH SMALL MEDIA

The following table shows: the proportion of all UK-resident men who recognised each item of small media; the proportions that were non-readers, casual readers and close readers; and the overall proportion who had kept a copy. We also report 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 all UK residents (n=5204, missing 141)		CHAPS (THT)		
		PEP	eXposed! 9	eXposed! 10
<b>Recognise it</b>		21.8	27.7	23.7
Of all UK-resident men	Recognise but have not looked at closely	6.7	11.8	11.7
	Looked at but not read in detail	5.8	7.7	6.3
	Read most or all of it	9.3	8.2	5.8
I've kept a copy		2.9	2.5	2.0
% of those who recognised who had read most or all of it		42.5	29.4	24.3
% of those who recognised who had kept		13.2	8.9	8.2

The CHAPS national small media *eXposed! 9* was most likely to be recognised but a fifth to a quarter of all men resident in the UK could recall these three CHAPS small media. The proportion of all UK-resident men recognising *eXposed! 9* had risen from 18% in GMSS 2006 to 27.7% in 2007. Similarly, the proportion recognising the *PEP* booklet had risen from 17% in 2005 to 21.8% in GMSS 2007.

The percentage range of men who recognised booklets who had read most or all of them was similar to the previous years for the two editions of *eXposed!*. However, a higher proportion of men (42.5%) recognising the *PEP* booklet had read most or all of it, compared to any small media previously included in coverage surveys. Between 8% and 13% of men recognising booklets had kept a copy of them. Again, men were most likely to report keeping the *PEP* booklet.

## 5. WEBSITES

Respondents were asked when they had last read anything about HIV or safer sex on the internet. The vast majority of all men (91.9%) reported ever reading anything about HIV or safer sex on the internet, most having done so within the previous year (77.0%) and the previous month (44.2%). 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=5220, missing 125)	%
In the last month	44.2
In the last year	32.9
Over a year ago	14.8
Never	8.1

## 5.1 WEBSITE COVERAGE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

For the CHAPS campaigns men who indicated having recognised any of the campaign were asked *Have you visited the {NAME} campaign WEBSITE at {web address}?* and offered the following responses:

- 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 website

Men were not shown the web homepage image for CHAPS websites.

For the GMFA website on sex men were shown two screen grabs of the homepage and asked the same question as above.

CHAPS national interventions are targeted at men living in England and Wales only (not Scotland or Northern Ireland). Within England and Wales, they are intended to be seen equally by men living in different geographic areas. The THT intervention *Healthy Respect* was intended to be seen by people with diagnosed HIV in London. The GMFA website on sex is intended to be seen by all MSM in London.

% of all men who had visited websites	CHAPSONline (THT)			THT	GMFA
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	gmfa/sex
<b>UK-wide</b> (n=5198, missing 147)	<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>22.2</b>
<b>England</b> (n=4506)	<b>4.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>23.2</b>
East of England (n=317)	<u>3.1</u>	5.4	<u>4.7</u>	1.6	21.2
East Midlands (n=226)	<u>2.6</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	0.0	15
London (n=1668)	<b>5.6</b>	<b>7.6</b>	8.9	<b>2.7</b>	<b>33.3</b>
North East (n=141)	4.2	<u>3.5</u>	<b>9.9</b>	1.4	18.2
North West (n=422)	<u>2.1</u>	<u>4.0</u>	6.1	0.5	15.6
South Central (n=295)	3.7	4.4	5.7	1.0	20.9
South East Coast (n=344)	3.7	4.7	5.4	0.6	18.8
South West (n=332)	3.9	5.1	6.6	1.8	16.0
West Midlands (n=367)	3.3	4.3	5.4	0.8	12.0
Yorkshire & Humber (n=303)	3.6	5.0	6.6	2.6	15.2
<b>Wales (n=221)</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>18.9</b>
<b>Scotland (n=357)</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>14.2</b>
<b>Northern Ireland (n=111)</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>13.4</b>

Recall of CHAPS websites was higher in this survey (4-7%) than previous years, though still relatively low compared to recognition of the GMFA website (at 22.2% across the UK). Recognition of all websites varied by where men lived. London-resident men show the highest levels of recognition for all the interventions including those with a much wider geographic reach.

## 5.2 ENGAGEMENT WITH WEBSITES: 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 five websites 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 all UK residents (n=5198, missing 147)		CHAPOnline (THT)			THT	GMFA
		Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	gmfa/sex
<b>Visited website</b>		<b>4.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2</b>
Of all UK-resident men	Looked at but not read in detail	2.5	3.6	3.5	1.1	16.5
	Have read most or all of it	1.8	2.3	2.9	0.9	5.7
<i>% of those who visited website who had read most or all of it</i>		<i>42</i>	<i>38.8</i>	<i>45.9</i>	<i>43.7</i>	<i>25.5</i>

For the four websites where a specific mass media advert also appeared (*Healthy Respect*, *Closer*, *Get it On*, and *PEP*) the proportion of all men visiting was substantially lower than the proportion recognising the adverts - between 2.0% and 6.6% had visited these sites. The PEP website had the highest recognition among the THT sites though it was also the longest established of them. Between 38% and 46% of those visiting any THT website reported having read most or all of it.

The GMFA website is not tied to any specific mass media adverts but is promoted on all their adverts. While it is not surprising that it has higher recognition than themed websites, the differential is very large, with 22.2% of all UK-resident men saying they had visited it. Among, those that had visited it, a quarter (25.5%) said they had read most or all of the content. At the time of the survey there were 46 pages on the Sex and Sexual Health area of the GMFA website and about 68 additional pages which were likely to be perceived of as being part of the same website. Given the scale of content the figures for reading *most or all of it* are high.

The following table shows the same measures among men living in Greater London.

% all London resident men (n=1668, missing 70)		CHAPOnline (THT)			THT	GMFA
		Closer	Get it On	PEP	Healthy Respect	gmfa/sex
<b>Visited website</b>		<b>5.6</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>33.3</b>
Of all London-resident men	Looked at but not read in detail	2.8	4.2	4.9	1.1	24.7
	Have read most or all of it	2.8	3.3	4.1	1.6	8.6
<i>% of those who visited website who had read most or all of it</i>		<i>50</i>	<i>44.5</i>	<i>45.6</i>	<i>57.8</i>	<i>25.9</i>

All websites had higher recognition among London men than men resident elsewhere in the UK, and similar proportions of men in London and nationally were likely to have read most or all of the websites if they had visited them.

## 6. DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN PROMPTED RECOGNITION

This section considers differences in recognition across the following five demographic characteristics: sex with women (and men) in the last year; age group; ethnic group; HIV testing history; and 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 data indicates that recognition of that intervention significantly varied by that demographic characteristic using cross-tabulations. The figures in **bold** show the group most likely to recognise the intervention, figures that are underlined show the group least likely to recognise the intervention.

### 6.1 SEX WITH WOMEN

Among all gay and bisexual men, CHAPS interventions prioritise those who only have sex with men because they are likely to be involved in HIV transmission, than others who have sex with both men and women. The following tables shows simple recognition of national interventions by whether or not homosexually active men had female sexual partners in the last year.

% of all UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts			CHAPS booklets			THT adverts	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	PEP	eXp 9!	eXp 10!	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>No sex with women</b> (n=4306)	<b>25.3</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>29.4</b>	24.9	6.3	<b>33.5</b>	18.6
<b>Sex with women</b> (n=471)	<u>14.3</u>	<u>24.9</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>8.1</u>	<u>21.3</u>	21.3	7.0	<u>24.7</u>	15.8

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 *eXposed! 10*, the THT adverts *Healthy Respect* and the GMFA *Reasons* adverts.

### 6.2 AGE GROUP

A general recommendation for HIV prevention interventions is that they benefit younger rather than older men. The following table shows simple recognition of the national interventions across five age groups.

% of all UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts			CHAPS booklets			THT adverts	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	PEP	eXp 9!	eXp 10!	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>under 20</b> (n=545)	<u>9.4</u>	<u>22.9</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>18.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	5.7	28.6	14.9
<b>20s</b> (n=1747)	21.8	29.7	27.0	20.3	23.9	22.8	6.7	32.0	16.4
<b>30s</b> (n=1313)	<b>29.0</b>	37.0	<b>37.0</b>	<b>29.6</b>	32.8	26.1	5.5	32.9	18.9
<b>40s</b> (n=963)	26.0	37.9	31.2	24.9	<b>33.2</b>	<b>26.7</b>	6.0	30.6	20.1
<b>50+</b> (n=566)	18.6	<b>38.0</b>	19.8	16.0	25.6	20.8	6.3	30.7	18.3

As in previous coverage surveys, men over 30 were most likely to recognise all the CHAPS national interventions, although differences in recognition between men in their 30s and 40s were often relatively small, and men in their 50s were most likely to

recognise *Get it On*. For all the CHAPS national interventions men under twenty were least likely to recognise the interventions even compared to men over 50.

In the current survey, neither of the GMFA adverts, nor *Healthy Respect* showed significant differences in recognition across age groups.

### 6.3 ETHNIC GROUP

CHAPS interventions should disproportionately benefit Black men rather than other ethnic groups, as Black men appear to be more likely to sero-convert to HIV. 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 all UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts			CHAPS booklets			THT adverts	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	PEP	eXp 9!	eXp 10!	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>White</b> (n=4664)	22.5	33.0	28.2	21.5	26.9	<u>22.5</u>	5.8	31.5	<u>17.2</u>
<b>Black</b> (n=113)	32.8	<b>45.7</b>	35.4	30.7	36.0	<b>35.4</b>	9.6	32.5	<b>29.8</b>
<b>Asian</b> (n=136)	20.3	<u>29.2</u>	19.1	19.1	34.3	32.6	8.8	29.2	22.1

In previous coverage data some CHAPS interventions were more commonly recognised by Black men with White men least likely to recognise them. Black men were most likely to recognise *Get it On* and *Reasons* compared to White and Asian men and more likely to recognise *eXposed! 10* compared to White men.

### 6.4 HIV TESTING HISTORY

There is a general recommendation that HIV prevention programmes should over-serve men with diagnosed HIV infection. However, not all interventions are targeted equally at all three testing history groups. The following table shows recognition of each of the interventions across three HIV testing history groups.

% of all UK residents recognising	CHAPS adverts			CHAPS booklets			THT adverts	GMFA adverts	
	Closer	Get it On	PEP	PEP	eXp 9!	eXp 10!	Healthy Respect	Headlines	Reasons
<b>Tested positive</b> (n=478)	<b>42.5</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>29.0</b>
<b>Last test negative</b> (n=2630)	26.5	37.0	34.0	27.2	32.3	26.5	6.4	33.9	19.3
<b>Never tested</b> (n=2082)	<u>14.0</u>	<u>24.4</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>18.3</u>	<u>17.2</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>27.1</u>	<u>13.8</u>

Men with diagnosed HIV were most likely to recognise all the interventions, followed by men who had tested negative, who were more likely than men who had never tested to recognise interventions. Of all these interventions only *Healthy Respect* was targeted at people with diagnosed HIV.

## 6.5 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.

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 all UK residents recognising	<b>CHAPS adverts</b>			<b>CHAPS booklets</b>			<b>THT adverts</b>	<b>GMFA adverts</b>	
	<b>Closer</b>	<b>Get it On</b>	<b>PEP</b>	<b>PEP</b>	<b>eXp 9!</b>	<b>eXp 10!</b>	<b>Healthy Respect</b>	<b>Headlines</b>	<b>Reasons</b>
<b>30 +</b> (n=457)	<b>38.2</b>	<b>45.6</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>40.7</b>	31.1	7.0	37.3	<b>23.9</b>
<b>13 - 29</b> (n=555)	35.7	<b>45.0</b>	<b>43.5</b>	34.1	38.2	<b>33.6</b>	6.8	<b>40.5</b>	<b>24.2</b>
<b>5 - 12</b> (n=1100)	26.0	35.8	31.9	25.2	30.0	25.1	5.1	34.3	18.7
<b>2, 3 or 4</b> (n=1382)	19.0	32.1	23.8	17.2	24.7	22.0	6.8	31.6	16.1
<b>1</b> (n=1164)	17.8	28.1	23.8	17.5	23.0	20.4	6.3	28.1	15.8
<b>None</b> (n=527)	<u>10.7</u>	<u>20.1</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>18.7</u>	<u>16.0</u>	6.2	<u>18.9</u>	<u>15.0</u>

Generally the likelihood of recognising interventions increased as partner numbers increased until men had 13 or more male partners. Men with 13-29 partners did not usually significantly differ in rates of recognition from those with 30+ partners.

[Ford.Hickson@sigmaresearch.org.uk](mailto:Ford.Hickson@sigmaresearch.org.uk)

4<sup>rd</sup> September 2008