



Convenience Advertising

AGB McNAIR
EVALUATION 1993

CONTENTS

Page No.

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.	INTRODUCTION	11
3.	OBJECTIVES OF THE CAMPAIGN EVALUATION	13
4.	TRAVELLER INTERCEPT METHODOLOGY	15
5.	SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS	19
6.	DETAILED TRAVELLER INTERCEPT FINDINGS	22

- Appendix:
- Traveller Air Airport Site Summary
 - Traveller Airport Intercept Survey Instrument and Interviewer Notes

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AGB McNair was commissioned to conduct a broad based evaluation of the Information for Travellers' 'Travel Safe' Campaign on behalf of the Federal Department of Health, Housing and Community Services.

The department has produced comprehensive information and materials targeting people travelling to, from and within Australia. The campaign is broad based providing information to all travellers to make them aware of the increased risk of contracting HIV when away from home. Within this general approach frequent, business travellers and young backpackers have been specifically targeted.

Messages on HIV prevention were delivered to both in-bound and out-bound travellers, using various means including convenience advertising in airport and bus terminals and at selected backpacker/youth hostels, brochures, airline ticket messages, print advertising and editorials in tourist information publications, illuminated billboards, animated campaign video, PR activities in travel and tourism media, and advertising and editorials in in-flight magazines.

The broad based campaign evaluation aimed to:

- assess the campaign strategy, its process and implementation;
- report on the campaign's development;
- determine the level of campaign reach and, recall, specific messages taken out from the campaign and which forms of material were sourced by travellers;
- assess attitudes towards the campaign, per personal relevance and likely impact on future behaviour; and
- assess the achievement, overall effectiveness and outcomes of the campaign.

To measure the impact and effectiveness of the campaign on key target groups, the evaluation comprised.

- (i) depth interviews with travel agents;
- (ii) observations of youth hostel sites and discussions with hostel management;
- (iii) traveller intercept interviews at international and domestic Australian airports;
- (iv) focus group discussions with backpackers and sex tourists (to Thailand/ Philippines).

The traveller intercepts were the major part of the campaign evaluation linked to the various activities and placement strategies which centred on Australian domestic and international airports. The summary that follows, and this report generally, focusses on the findings from 893 **traveller intercept** interviews.

Major Findings from the Evaluation

- The Travel Safe Campaign has, relative to its budget achieved high levels of awareness amongst travellers as well as a high degree of acceptance. Almost half of all airport travellers (including in-bound, out-bound, international and domestic) were aware of information from the Travel Safe campaign. Among the multiple campaign formats utilised, convenience advertising in particular, was the most effective for travellers. For those respondents who had an opportunity to see convenience advertisements, awareness of the campaign was significantly higher than the average.
- Frequency of air travel among most Australians is low and therefore the probability of multiple exposures to the Travel Safe Campaign materials is low. This makes the awareness result even more effective. Impact was particularly strong for some groups who recalled, sometimes after only one exposure and an intervening trip aboard, specific Travel Safe messages such as 'AIDS never takes a holiday'. Such impact is unlikely to have been achieved if the campaign was less targeted and not focused at the point of departure when receptivity and Impact, because of its relevance, is most likely to be high.

- 66% of travellers who were aware of the campaign in some form, spontaneously (that is without any prompting) recalled one of the precise messages of the Campaign. Among these 'safe sex/use condoms' was recalled specifically by 20%, 'AIDS never takes a holiday' by 8%, Travel Safe' by 12%.
- Travellers were generally very positive towards the campaign, rated the presentation of materials highly and overall felt the campaign had been effective. The campaign:
 - provided people with a reminder about risks of infection;
 - wasn't embarrassing;
 - was easy to read and put in a simple format;
 - was not judged to be a waste of time and money; and
 - should continue to be aimed at all travellers, youth and in fact 'everyone in the community', not just to 'high-risk groups'.
- The campaign was said to be of personal relevance to almost half of all travellers (47%) but was especially higher for key target groups, Including young people (58% of 18-24s), solo holiday makers (59%), and those who use condoms always (75%). This suggests that the Travel Safe, Campaign was relevant for sexually active people (travellers), that is, those who are most likely to be at risk from HIV transmission.
- While a small portion of the sample engage in sexual behaviour generally and when away on trips that may put themselves and others at risk, a larger proportion use condoms and practice safe sex. Further, the likelihood of condom use and practicing safe sex on future trips away is enhanced by the influence of the campaign.

- The information from the campaign struck an important chord with travellers: nearly all respondents agreed it was very important to alert travellers to risks associated with HIV when away from home. Further, 97% agreed it was at least **just as important** to practice safe sex when travelling as at home, compared with only 1 % who said it was **less** important.

The increased 'risk of infection' when travelling was an issue of increasing awareness and concern. People accept that a greater emphasis needs to be placed on taking precautions including practising safe sex while away from home (and their usual environment). Continued appropriate health related messages were thought to be needed to remind travellers of the risks (especially HIV infection) when travelling.

Other findings from the traveller intercepts combined for both surveys are presented below:

- Forty-four percent of all travellers interviewed recalled the Travel Safe Campaign in some form: 25% on initial questioning and a further 19% after being shown a sample of campaign materials. Overall Campaign recall was slightly higher during wave 1 at 46%, than during wave 2 at 41 %.
- The opportunity for multiple exposure to any messages from the campaign, in airports generally, is low for the vast majority of Australian travellers. Of those who have travelled overseas by air in the last 12 months, 95% have taken only one trip. This means that 1 in 2 air travellers intercepted had recalled the campaign after (in most cases) only one exposure. Whereas, for example, television based advertising campaigns can provide high levels of both reach (wide audience) and frequency (multiple exposures) this campaign has focussed its message delivery to increase the efficiency of impact on target audiences at key transit points. This trade off of higher levels of broad reach and frequency for targeted impact appears to, have been effective. Overwhelmingly those exposed to the campaign agree with its objectives, its importance and the methods of execution. Risk of infection is already an area of concern to travellers and the Travel Safe messages therefore rated as being important reminders and likely to influence traveller's behaviour.

- Of the sub set of out-bound travellers who spontaneously reported using the airport toilets where convenience advertisements were displayed, the recall rate was 67%. This shows the effectiveness of convenience advertising in raising campaign awareness and the greater opportunity to influence behaviour.
- Overall 34% of travellers interviewed recalled, without prompting, seeing campaign materials at airport conveniences (38% during wave 1 and 29% in wave 2), 30% on poster/billboards at airports (25% during wave 1 and 35% in wave 2) and 25% recalled seeing brochures from the campaign (21% during wave 1 and 29% in wave 2). Since the inception of the campaign evaluation, it appears that overtime brochures from the campaign have had an increasing impact on the level of recall among travellers, along with illuminated poster/billboards. Convenience advertising continued as an important source of campaign information, although losing its dominant position held during wave 1 of the evaluation.

Among other forms of campaign material, messages on airlines tickets was mentioned by only 4% and the video (introduced at selected domestic terminals and youth hostels) by only 3% of all travellers.

- The most frequently mentioned source or location of the campaign material recalled was at airport terminals (57%). Brochures at travel agents was mentioned by 17% of travellers interviewed.
- The campaign information was read in depth by 29% of travellers who were aware of or had seen the campaign. A further 67% had at least browsed or skipped through the information.

- Attitudes towards the Campaign were largely positive. (This was further evidenced in the youth hostel discussions with managers and backpacker groups).
 - 80% overall agreed or agreed strongly that the Campaign *reminded me about HIV infection*
 - 86% felt it was **not embarrassing**
 - 84% agreed or agreed strongly that the campaign message was *put into a simple/easy to read format*
 - 62% agreed or agreed strongly that the campaign materials were *catchy and colourful*
 - 84% agreed or agreed strongly that the campaign was **not a waste of time and money**
 - 83% agreed or agreed strongly that campaign brochures *should be given to all travellers*
 - 84% **disagreed** or disagreed strongly that campaign materials *should be given only to high risk people*, and
 - 76% strongly agreed or agreed that the *campaign overall was effective*

- Travellers were asked, who or which groups the campaign was attempting to reach. 36% mentioned spontaneously 'everyone in the community', 33% 'young travellers' and 23% 'all travellers'. Less than 10% mentioned either 'homosexuals', 'IV drug users' (each 5%) 'those on organised sex tours' (3%) 'promiscuous people' (5%). The campaign was, therefore, seen as wide-reaching in the community and applicable for all people and. all kinds of travellers.
 - 75% of travellers rated the presentation of campaign material as being effective or very effective. Only 2% believed it was very ineffective.

- 47% of travellers felt that the material was very relevant or of some personal relevance to them. Only one in four felt the campaign was of no relevance (26%).
- 76% believed that information in the campaign would influence *other people's* behaviour whilst travelling, while only 17% felt it would influence their **own** behaviour when travelling in the future. Of those who felt the campaign would influence their own behaviour, most were likely to be in the **high risk** categories, including:
 - solos (26%)
 - under 25 year olds (27%)
 - South East Asia travellers (23% vs 15% of travellers to other ports)
 - those who use a condom (30%), and
 - unattached people (27%).
- Almost all believed it was very important (85%) to alert travellers to the risks associated with contracting HIV when away from home. A further 12% felt it was somewhat important. Only 2% thought it was unimportant.
- Two new questions were asked during wave 2 of the evaluation. The risk of infection (including hepatitis and HIV) along with eight other items were ranked for travellers' level of concern when planning an overseas trip. The 'risk of infection' scored a high or very high level of concern for just over half of travellers overall (52%). This compared with 'losing baggage' (60%) down to sickness/injury (47%).

Risk of infection rated equal second along with 'health insurance' (at 10%) after 'flight safety' (at 22%). This shows that the risk of infection is a concern, high on the agenda for people, when planning an overseas trip.

- Over one-third of travellers during wave 2 (38%), believed it was more important to practice safe sex when travelling than when at home; only 1% said it was less important and 59% said it **just** as important. Thus, 97% of travellers believed it was at least **just** as important to practice safe sex when away from home – because some people were likely to behave differently when away on holidays or when travelling and not take necessary precautions.

The main reason given for the greater importance placed on practising safe sex when travelling was the increased risk of infection (26%) and higher chance of catching a virus (11%).

These findings show that there is widespread awareness and concern of the increased risk of infection when travelling overseas and there should be a greater emphasis on taking precautions and practising safe sex while away. There is a need for and acceptance of appropriate health related messages to remind travellers of the dangers (especially, risks of HIV infection) when travelling (especially) overseas.

From the sealed section ...

- 31 % reported changes to their sexual activity because of AIDS. The most usual change involved condom use or practising safe sex. Of the 58% who said they had made no changes most were in a low risk group (married or in a steady relationship).
- 13% reported having sex with someone other than their partner in the last 6 months (particularly so for men and 18-24 year olds).
- 37% of all travellers always or sometimes used a condom. Those who found the Campaign of more relevance, were much more likely to use a condom. Further, condom use (always or sometimes) was highest among 18-24s (53%) and 25-39s (42%). Condom use (always or sometimes) among business travellers was lower than the average (at 27%).

- Among those who had casual sexual contact on their recent trip or intended to on their next trip, the campaign was largely seen as being very relevant or of some relevance. 11% of in-bound travellers reported **having** casual sexual contact with locals or other visitors to the area, on their recent trip. 10% of out-bound travellers **intended** to have casual sex with locals of the area or other visitors to the area they were visiting.
- Only 1% of those interviewed reported that they had ever injected drugs for recreational use/pleasure (and around 2% for medical use). None of these respondents reported injecting drugs or taking equipment away with them on their recent trip.
- The likelihood of taking injecting equipment for themselves or others on their next trip was highly unlikely. Only 3% said it was very likely and only 1% somewhat likely.
- Travellers to South East Asian ports, one of the target groups, appear to appreciate the risk of HIV transmission when travelling and realise the importance of being reminded of such dangers. They are slightly more likely to engage in at-risk sexual behaviour or intend to when away, while at the same time heeding the campaign messages by packing and using condoms (or intending to in the future) compared with other travellers.

Implications and Recommendations

- The broad based campaign strategy in place to reach different target groups in different locations has generally been appropriate and effective. While the centre piece has been the use of convenience advertising targeting travellers at airports, other campaign materials have been useful in providing a supporting role in aiding awareness, such as brochures distributed by travel agents, advertisements in tourist publications and messages on airline tickets.

- Given the low campaign awareness and limited preventative behaviour among the business traveller target group, more focussed placement of materials would increase exposure and impact. Presently a lack of campaign materials 'in business class' conveniences, limited messages on corporate purchased airline tickets, and limited video display of campaign messages have weakened the impact on this target group.
- The campaign video has only had limited. distribution to date and thus limited impact. The uncertainty of the in-flight video and distribution to only a small number of accommodation venues has meant that the significance of its reach and impact has not been able to be fully exploited.
- During the early part of the evaluation, the supply of brochures to, and the distribution of brochures by Travel Agents was inconsistent. Problems arose due to the need for travel agents to use their discretion and to select from a range of brochures to give to clients. In May 1992, AGB recommended that efforts be directed towards reducing the number of brochures available and developing one brochure to give to clients. Attempts have been made to improve the distribution of brochures to clients with the co-operation of travel agents' organisations.
- The distribution of brochures at points **other** than travel agents has been poor. Our audit of airport terminals has shown that there are very few areas where campaign brochures are available. In addition their prominence has not always been high. It is suggested that the Department maintain its efforts to ensure that brochures are handed to all travellers by customs/immigration ration staff at airports, in much the same way that declaration forms are given to all travellers.
- Through the focus group research early in the campaign evaluation, it appeared that sex tourists to South East Asian ports were either impervious to the campaign or to safe sex messages generally, yet they are one, of the, key target groups. Although materials from the campaign were in their formative stages when the focus groups were conducted this group may need special attention at overseas locations in addition to efforts to influence their behaviour in Australia. While this group was characterised generally by its bravado even the most cynical agreed that reminders of safe sex messages at least caused them to think again.

2. INTRODUCTION

AGB Australia was commissioned to conduct a broad based evaluation of the Travel Safe Campaign on behalf of the Federal Department of Health, Housing and Community Services.

In developing campaign materials to warn travellers about the risk of HIV, the Department has targeted a range of locations and traveller groups. The locations have included international and domestic airports, coach/bus terminals and youth hostel/backpacker accommodation venues. Target groups of the Campaign have been:

- budget travellers (young travel travellers/backpackers)
- business travellers (frequent adult travellers)
- sex tourists
- travellers to/from Thailand, Philippines and other South East Asia
- international and domestic travellers

Messages on HIV prevention were delivered to in-bound and out-bound travellers using various means, including:

- advertising in toilet blocks located at domestic and international airports, transit centres and selected backpacker/youth hostels;
- seven separate brochures with general information about HIV on display for self selection at customs points, at immigration offices, and in some airport lounges and distributed by travel agents in travel wallets;
- print advertising and editorials targeted to tourist Information publications (eg 'This Week' series and 'Hello' series);

- illuminated billboard and transit site advertisements in airports;
- animated campaign video displayed at selected domestic airport lounges and distributed to selected youth hostel/backpacker venues;
- PR activities designed to generate publicity in travel and tourism media; and
- advertising and editorials in in-flight magazines.

The focus of the evaluation was to intercept 893 travellers at international and domestic airports over two survey waves during July/August and December 1992. The first survey provided the opportunity to give interim feedback on the campaign's progress and enabled the Department to develop the activities of the campaign in time to trace its impact during the second survey.

This report documents the objectives of the campaign evaluation, the traveller intercept methodology, characteristics of the sample achieved and the main findings from the evaluation.

Appended are the traveller airport site summary, and materials used during the survey (questionnaires, instructions to interviewers and showcards). A separate volume includes the detailed computer tabulations from the traveller intercepts.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE CAMPAIGN AND THE EVALUATION

3.1 Campaign Objectives

The objective of the campaign is to ensure that all travellers are aware of and knowledgeable about risks of HIV transmission whilst travelling. In particular, travellers need to be aware that:

- safe sex practices should be maintained whilst travelling as they should at home;
- injecting equipment used in IV drug use, acupuncture, tattooing, or earpiercing may not be sterile;
- blood supplies, possibly, may not be safe in other countries where blood screening is not mandatory.

The campaign will develop and produce information materials and PR activities that increase awareness:

- that they may be putting themselves and others at risk from HIV infection;
- of the means of protection from infection; and
- of services available for help on HIV related issues.

3.2 Evaluation Objectives

The Travel Safe Campaign evaluation aimed to:

- assess the campaign strategy, its process and implementation;
- report on the campaign's development;
- determine the level of reach and recall, specific messages taken out from the campaign and which forms of campaign material were sourced by travellers;
- determine the level of personal relevance of the campaign material;
- determine the level of impact on behaviour likely in the future;
- assess the attitudes towards the campaign; and
- assess the achievement, overall effectiveness and outcomes of the campaign.

The evaluation has used a number of different stages of research, in order to adequately measure the impact and effectiveness of the campaign on key target groups. These have included:

- (i) travel agent depth interviews
- (ii) youth hostel observations of site and discussions with management at selected campaign/non-campaign venues
- (iii) traveller intercept interviews at (international and domestic) airports across Australia (Wave 1 conducted during July/August and Wave 2 during December)
- (iv) focus group discussions with backpackers and sex tourers to Thailand/Philippines

Results from stage (iii) above – the traveller intercepts – are the focus of this report. The travel agent depth discussions, (i) above, were conducted by April 1992 and reported separately to the Department in May 1992 whilst the focus group discussions with backpackers/sex tourers, (iv) above, were conducted during late July 1992 and reported separately to the Department in August 1992.

4. TRAVELLER INTERCEPT METHODOLOGY

A major focus of the evaluation strategy was to conduct intercept interviews with travellers at selected Australian International and Domestic Airports.

These interviews were conducted in two waves:

- (i) during July/August 1992 with **in-bound** and **out-bound** travellers
- (ii) during December 1992 with **In-bound** and **out-bound** travellers

The two-wave approach allowed AGB to measure and report to the Department the ongoing impact and effectiveness of the Travellers' Campaign and provided the opportunity to develop and implement further activities for the campaign over time.

AGB Australia set out to conduct 400 interviews each with out-bound and in-bound Australian born travellers and a further 100 interviews with foreign born nationals. It was considered important to gain the views from and measure the impact of the campaign upon foreign born travellers entering or departing Australia. Around 450 interviews were conducted during each survey Wave.

Quotas

During both survey waves, quotas were established for the sample based on:

1. Traveller type (out-bound/in-bound) by city
2. Age (25% under 25, 40% 25-39 and 25% 40+ years).
3. Gender (66% male, 34% female – as men are more likely to engage in high risk (sexual) behaviour whilst travelling, particularly to South East Asian destinations)
4. Travel origin and/or destination (50% South East Asia, 50% other for international flights)
5. Main trip purpose (25% minimum business/work related, 15% minimum holiday/organised tour, 50% holiday/other general traveller)

The main quotas imposed on achieving interviews with travellers at international and domestic terminals varied between survey waves. During Wave 1, 325 interviews with international travellers and 125 with domestic travellers were conducted. In Wave 2, greater emphasis was placed on the international traveller when 375 interviews with international travellers and 75 with domestic travellers were conducted.

AGB was largely interested in interviewing travellers who were:

- frequent international travellers
- young solos
- visiting and returning from 'high risk' South East Asian countries
- travelling for short holidays or business trips (1 to 2 weeks).

Where Interviews were Conducted

Intercept interviews were conducted at major Australian International and Domestic Airports (at Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth and Darwin). The interviews with out-bound travellers were held at departure lounges (once travellers cleared customs in international terminals). With in-bound travellers, interviews were conducted while passengers were waiting for baggage/luggage before proceeding to customs clearance (subject to permission), at transit lounges for in-transit passengers, or at the waiting lounges afterwards, if the former methods were not suitable.

AGB sought prior permission to conduct the fieldwork from FAC and Customs officials in each city at international terminals, and from Ansett and Australian Airlines management at the nominated domestic terminals. Accredited AGB interviewers were vetted by airport duty managers and customs officials before the commencement of fieldwork so that interviewing could be conducted in appropriate, secure locations.

Site Observation

In addition to conducting the intercept interviews, AGB interviewers, at the commencement of a 'shift', completed an **observation** audit of areas where campaign materials were displayed to travellers. A record was made of which campaign convenience advertisements, billboards, brochures, etc. were available, their prominence and the number of areas where information was on display. Also a note of competitive material/advertising was noted (such as other brochures or leaflets on display). (An example of the audit sheet is included in the appendix.)

Issues Addressed in Questionnaire

The questionnaire was pilot tested during late June 1992 and minor amendments made to the survey form. The final questionnaire averaged between 15-25 minutes to complete. Issues that were explored in the survey were:

- unaided and aided awareness of campaign information
- level of concern for issues (including risk of HIV infection) when planning an overseas trip (Wave 2)
- recall of messages and content from the material (ie what is understood from the information)
- reactions to the material
- evaluation of the information, including its suitability and relevance to them personally
- possible impact of material on attitudes, knowledge and behaviour
- importance of practicing safe sex when travelling compared to when at home (Wave 2)
- personal sex and drug behaviour (collected from a self-completed sealed questionnaire)

This approach allowed for some insight into the extent to which the campaign may have influenced traveller behaviour.

Self-completion Section

At the end of the personal interview, all travellers surveyed were asked if they would be willing to self-complete the final section, on more sensitive and personal issues. These related to sexual and drug use behaviours.

The purpose of the self-completion sealed section was to collect sensitive information in a form that would not embarrass either the respondent or interviewer, and was likely to permit honest and open responses. This would enable some analysis of people's response to the campaign to be undertaken in relation to sexual and drug using behaviour.

Once agreed, a double-sided sheet was filled in by the respondent, placed in a separate envelope, handed back to the interviewer and sealed in front of the respondent to ensure confidentiality.

A pre-coded number was assigned to the self-completion page to match that issued to the main intercept questionnaire. However no identifying information about the respondent (name or address) was recorded so anonymity for respondents was assured.

5. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Details of the final sample achieved over both survey Waves and in total for the traveller intercepts are provided below together with the main demographic features. The achieved sample closely matched the quotas set for the survey (see quotas set on page 15).

	Wave 1		Wave 2		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age						
Under 18 years	5	1	19	4	24	3
18-24	98	22	91	20	189	21
25-39	187	42	188	42	375	42
40-54	119	27	124	27	243	27
55+	32	7	30	7	62	7
Sex						
Men	293	66	294	65	587	66
Women	148	34	158	35	306	34
Traveller Type						
Out-bound Australian	209	47	165	37	374	42
Out-bound Foreign National	42	10	54	12	96	11
In-bound	190	43	233	52	423	47
Terminal						
International	311	71	374	83	685	77
Domestic	130	29	78	17	208	23

(cont'd)

	Wave 1		Wave 2		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Airport						
Sydney	140	32	134	30	274	31
Melbourne	141	32	135	30	276	31
Brisbane	72	16	77	17	149	17
Perth	66	15	75	16	141	16
Darwin	22	5	31	7	53	6
Area of Origin/Destination						
South East Asian port	148	34	207	46	355	40
Other pod	293	66	245	54	538	60
Length of Trip/Travels						
1 week or less	116	26	87	19	203	23
1 - 4 weeks	165	37	169	37	334	37
1 - 2 months	74	17	84	19	158	18
2 - 6 months	35	8	56	12	91	10
6+ months	42	10	35	8	77	9
Don't know/not stated	9	2	21	5	30	3
Main Trip Purpose						
Business/Work related	133	30	132	29	265	30
Visit/Holiday with friends/relations	162	37	180	40	342	38
Holiday with organised tour party	37	8	35	8	72	8
Holiday – self only	91	21	77	17	168	19
Other	17	4	12	3	29	3
Don't know/not stated	1	*	16	3	17	2

(cont'd)

	Wave 1		Wave 2		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Frequency of Overseas Air Travel						
None	155	35	137	30	292	33
1 - 2 times	155	35	147	33	302	34
3 - 5 times	69	16	95	21	164	18
6 - 10 times	40	9	49	11	89	10
11+ times	18	4	24	5	42	5
Education Level						
Secondary to 4 years	30	7	42	9	72	8
Secondary 5 to 6 years	86	20	97	21	183	20
Trade/Technical Course/Certificate	90	20	72	16	162	18
Some University/Tertiary undertaken	63	14	62	14	125	14
University/Tertiary graduate	168	38	176	39	344	39
Other	2	*	3	1	5	1
Gross Personal Annual Income						
\$20,000 and under	101	23	120	27	221	25
\$20,001 - \$30,000	85	19	72	16	157	18
\$30,001 - \$40,000	88	20	67	15	155	17
\$40,001 - \$60,000	59	13	81	18	140	16
\$60,001 - \$80,000	45	10	32	7	77	9
\$80,001+	39	9	69	15	108	12
Don't know/Not stated	24	6	11	2	35	4
Total Wave 1 sample	441	100	452	100	893	100

6. DETAILED FINDINGS

The findings from the traveller intercepts are presented in total (for both survey waves combined) and individually by wave where applicable.

Travel Safe Campaign Recall (Qs 5a/5b)

All out-bound and in-bound travellers were asked whether they had seen or heard any advertising or read any recent articles concerning the Travel Safe Campaign.

- 25% were aware of the Campaign after this initial prompt (27% wave 1, 23% wave 2).
- Those who were not aware of the Campaign were shown sample materials from the Campaign featuring a selection of convenience advertisements and brochures. Among this group (n=666), 25% recalled seeing the campaign material, prior to the interview (27% wave 1, 24% wave 2).

Thus, in total, 44% of all travellers interviewed were aware of the Travel Safe Campaign either on initial prompting or after being shown a selection of campaign materials (46% during wave 1, 41% during wave 2).

Those groups for whom campaign awareness was highest (over the 2 waves) included:

- out-bound over in-bound travellers (48% to 39%) the focus of the campaign
- people aged 25-39 (49%), one of the key target groups
- women over men (48% to 41%)
- university/tertiary graduates (50%)

Business travellers in total recalled the campaign at a slightly lower than average level (at 41%).

Prior to the prompted awareness questions, all respondents were asked whether they had noticed any signage, posters or billboard advertising on "travel and safety" at the airport. 25% said that they had noticed such information (27% wave 1, 22% wave 2): 47% of these mentions related to the Travel Safe campaign (44% in wave 1, 51% in wave 2). Thus, around 12% of respondents spontaneously recalled information that was campaign related. The information spontaneously reported about the campaign dealt with AIDS awareness, risks associated with using drugs and syringes, the reduced risks of contracting HIV from condom use and a generalised take care to practice safe sex and avoid AIDS' message.

Level of Concern for things when planning an overseas trip (Qs 3a-c – wave 2 only)

Among the level of concern of nine possible items when planning an overseas trip (asked of all travellers intercepted during wave 2), risk of infection (hepatitis or HIV) was of high or very high level of concern to 52% of travellers. This compares with 60% concern for 'losing baggage', 59% concern for 'flight on time' down to 47% 'sickness/injury'.

The risk of infection (hepatitis or HIV) was one of three items of most concern for 26% of travellers. The risk of infection overall was the equal second item of **most** concern at 10% along with 'health insurance' behind 'flight safety' at 22% for people, when planning an overseas trip. This shows that the risk of infection (hepatitis or HIV) is on the minds of most travellers when planning an overseas trip.

Level of concern for issues when planning an overseas trip (wave 2):

	Very high or high concern %	3 of most concern %	Of most concern %
Health insurance	53	26	10
Flight on time	59	27	8
Losing/running out of money	49	28	9
Losing baggage	60	37	8
Flight safety	56	39	22
Sickness/injury	47	30	9
Law/order in other countries	52	24	5
Quality of health care overseas	55	27	7
Risk of infection (hepatitis or HIV)	52	26	10

The concern for risk of infection was higher than the average among:

1. 18-24 year olds (59%)
2. travellers to/from South East Asian ports (65%)
3. those who use a condom (always or sometimes 63%)

'Risk of infection' was of **most** concern particularly for the following groups:

- solo holiday makers (16%)
- 18-24s (18%)
- condom users (always or sometimes, 16%)

The information, here, shows that the 'risk of infection' is an issue for people when planning for an overseas trip. This suggests that there is a place for appropriate health related messages to remind travellers of the dangers (such as, risk of HIV infection) when travelling overseas and explains the high level of acceptance of such a campaign aimed at international and domestic travellers at the point of departure or arrival.

Initial Impressions of the Campaign (Q. 11)

After being shown samples of the campaign material all respondents were asked for their initial impressions of the material. The vast majority of sentiments were positive toward the campaign. Only 14% of all replies over both surveys were negative toward the campaign. The main reactions were:

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
Good idea/good brochure	37	62
Informative/effective information	16	22
Educational/essential public information	10	7
Appealing to eye/attractive/colourful	9	12
Well presented/put together	8	5
Self explanatory/to the point/good reading	7	9
Makes you take notice/creates awareness	5	13
Good reminder about AIDS	4	10
Easy to read	3	4
AIDS education	3	6
Other positive sentiments	3	3
Message needs to be clearer/stronger	4	7
Needs to be larger/not eye catching	3	8
Inappropriate presentation for AIDS	1	-
Other negative sentiments	4	-
Other mentions	6	4
None	1	2
Don't know/Not stated	4	5

Where Campaign Seen/Heard and Form Taken (Qs 6 & 7)

Among those who recalled the Campaign in some form, 38% (in wave 1, 29% in wave 2) recalled seeing campaign information as small poster (convenience) advertisements in toilets, 25% (in wave 1, 35% in wave 2) as (illuminated) poster/billboards at airports and 21% (in wave 1, 29% in wave 2) as leaf lets/brochures (largely through travel agents).

Among other forms of campaign material, messages on airline tickets (not yet universal) was recalled by only 5% (in wave 1, 3% in wave 2) and the video was seen by only 3% (during wave 1, 2% during wave 2).

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %	Total %
Form of Campaign Information			
Convenience adverts (posters in toilets)	38	29	34
(illuminated) poster/billboards	25	35	30
Brochures	21	29	25
On an airline ticket	5	3	4
Adverts or mention on radio	4	5	5
In-flight magazine article	3	5	4
Video on display	3	2	3
Newspaper	3	8	6
Tourist publication article/advert	*	2	1
Other forms mentioned	21	6	13
Not stated	3	-	1

(* Refers to percentages between 0 and 0.5)

Other responses mentioned over both survey waves included television, information from a travel agent and talking with friends.

- The source or location of the campaign material seen by travellers was chiefly at airport terminals (60% in wave 1, 55% in wave 2). Brochures on the campaign at travel agents were noticed by 15% (in wave 1, 18% in wave 2).

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
Where Campaign Information was seen		
Airport terminals	60	55
Travel agent brochures	15	18
Airline ticket	6	3
Article in newspaper	5	7
Magazine/articles in tourist publications	4	7
Hotel/motel accommodation	2	3
In-flight publications	2	4
Youth Hostel/Backpacker accommodation	*	3
Other mentions	25	17
Not stated	4	3

Other mentions included Television, with passport or at passport office, at University, Gymnasium, hospital and school..

- The information from the campaign overall was read in-depth (Q.8) by 29% of travellers who were aware of/had seen the Travel Safe Campaign (31 % in wave 1, 27% in wave 2). A further 67% (in wave 1, 71 % in wave 2) had **at least** browsed or skipped through the information.

Those groups more likely to have read the information in-depth than the average were:

- in-bound travellers (34%), and
- women over men (33% to 27%)

Messages Taken Out from Campaign (Q.9)

All travellers aware of the campaign were asked (without prompting) what they thought the main message was.

- Two-thirds of travellers overall spontaneously recalled one of the precise messages of the campaign (63% wave 1, 68% wave 2), particularly the 'safe sex/use condom' message. 9% overall could not recall what that main message was.

The central theme of the Campaign 'Travel Safe' was specifically recalled by more travellers later into the campaign evaluation. Specific messages to 'avoid blood transfusions overseas' or 'avoid getting a tattoo overseas' were not recalled at all by travellers intercepted.

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
Main Messages from the Campaign Recalled		
Safe sex/use condoms	23	17
AIDS never takes a holiday	10	7
Travel Safe	8	16
Play it safe – overseas	7	7
Remember to pack the condoms	5	7
AIDS – a world traveller	5	6
Don't bring AIDS home	2	5
Play it safe in Australia	2	1
Pack for good health	*	2
Other messages recalled	28	23
Not stated	9	9

Other messages recalled included mainly general AIDS awareness and prevention, followed by AIDS and drugs generally, to insure yourself and to be careful/health wise.

Rating of Characteristics/Features of the Campaign (Q. 10)

- All travellers aware of the campaign were asked to rate the campaign material on eleven (11) categories such as whether it provided fresh information; a reminder of HIV risks; was simple/easy to read; fun/entertaining; of relevance; who it should be given to and overall was it effective.

Interviewers randomly selected a start point (a statement to begin at) to eliminate order bias.

The Campaign scored highly on most categories, particularly the following:

- reminded me about HIV infection (76% in wave 1 strongly agreed or agreed and 83% in wave 2)
- was **not** embarrassing (85% in wave 1, 87% in wave 2)
- was put into a simple/easy to read format (85% in wave 1, 84% in wave 2)
- was **not** a waste of time and money (84% in wave 1, 83% in wave 2)
- information should be given to all travellers (80% in wave 1, 86% in wave 2)
- information **should not only** be given to high risk people (84% over both waves)
- was effective overall (80% in wave 1, 73% in wave 2).

Further, the campaign:

- provided fresh information on the subject (of warning about the risks of HIV infection) to 27% (during wave 1, 28% in wave 2);
- was seen as being fun and entertaining by some (21% in wave 1, 19% in wave 2);
- was catchy and colourful to nearly two-thirds (64% in wave 1, 60% in wave 2);
- had **something** to do with most travellers (44% during wave 1 and 50% in wave 2 disagreed the Campaign had nothing to do with me).

The ratings for each statement, over both survey waves, are summarised below:

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neither	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	Mean*
Gave fresh information about topic	– wave 1	27	22	48	-0.4
	– wave 2	28	23	45	-0.2
Reminded me about HIV/ AIDS infection	– wave 1	77	12	7	1.0
	– wave 2	83	7	5	1.0
Was embarrassing	– wave 1	5	6	85	-1.4
	– wave 2	2	6	87	-1.3
Was put into a simple/ easy to read format	– wave 1	85	10	3	1.3
	– wave 2	84	8	4	1.1
Was fun & entertaining	– wave 1	21	49	29	-0.2
	– wave 2	19	45	31	-0.2
Was catchy & colourful	– wave 1	64	25	9	0.7
	– wave 2	60	20	16	0.5
Was a waste of time & money	– wave 1	4	9	84	-1.3
	– wave 2	4	8	83	-1.2
Had nothing to do with me	– wave 1	34	21	44	-0.1
	– wave 2	28	18	50	-0.3
Should be given to all travellers	– wave 1	80	11	7	1.2
	– wave 2	86	5	5	1.3
Should only given to high risk people	– wave 1	7	6	84	-1.3
	– wave 2	7	5	84	-1.2
Overall was effective	– wave 1	80	14	4	1.1
	– wave 2	73	16	7	0.8

- Mean score is calculated on a +2 to -2 scale, where +2 is totally agree and -2 is totally disagree with statement (excluding any don't know response, which averaged around 3-4%).

Target Audiences of the Campaign (Q.12)

All travellers interviewed were asked (without prompting) who, or which groups the campaign was attempting to reach.

- 37% (in wave 1, 35% in wave 2) mentioned spontaneously 'everyone in the community', while 30% (in wave 1, 37% in wave 2) mentioned 'young travellers' and 18% (in wave 1, 28% in wave 2) 'all travellers'. 6% or less over both waves mentioned any of the 'high risk' groups: homosexuals, IV drug users, business travellers or travellers on organised sex tours.

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
Who is Campaign trying to reach?		
Everyone in the community	37	35
Young travellers	30	37
All travellers	18	28
Homosexuals	6	5
IV drug users	5	5
Business travellers	5	6
People who are promiscuous	4	6
Travellers on organised 'sex tours'	3	4
Other groups	26	7
Not stated	1	1

Other groups mentioned included heterosexuals, males, first time travellers, sporting clubs and pubs and those with no idea of what AIDS is about.

Effectiveness of Material Presented (Q. 13)

- 78% (in wave 1, 71% in wave 2) of all travellers interviewed rated the presentation of campaign material as being very effective or effective. 14% (in wave 1, 19% in wave 2) felt the presentation was neither effective nor ineffective while 7% (in wave 1, 9% in wave 2) left it was ineffective to some degree. Only 1 % (in wave 1 '3% in wave 2) felt it was very ineffective.

The presentation of the material overall was rated highest among:

- 18-24s (82% very effective or effective)
- women (81%)

Personal Relevance of Campaign Material (0. 14)

- Just under half of all travellers overall stated the Campaign was either 'very relevant to me' or of 'some relevance to me'. One-quarter said overall it was of 'little relevance to me' while another quarter said it was of 'no relevance'. The results were consistent over both survey waves as indicated by the following:

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
The Campaign was ...		
Very relevance to me	18	14
Of some relevance to me	29	34
Of little relevance to me	26	25
Of no relevance to me	27	26

The campaign overall was of most personal relevance for the following groups:

- solo holiday makers (59% very/some relevance)
- 18-24s (58%)
- international travellers (50%)
- Sydney travellers (52%)
- lower income earners (57% of under \$20K earners)

Campaign relevance was seen to be higher for more frequent condom users than infrequent users. 75% of travellers who always used a condom stated that the campaign was very or somewhat relevant to them, while for 54% who sometimes used a, condom, the campaign was very or somewhat relevant. This suggests that the campaign is relevant for sexually active people (travellers) ie those who are most likely to be at risk from HIV transmission.

Campaign Influence on Peoples' Own Behaviours
(Qs 17a/18b wave 1; Qs 15a/6b wave 2)

All travellers were asked whether they believed the information in the campaign would influence **other people's** behaviour whilst travelling.

- 77% (in wave 1) believed that it would influence other people's behaviour whilst travelling (75% in wave 2). This high figure was consistent across all sub-groups of interest.
- The main reasons offered (without prompting) by travellers as to why the campaign will (or will not) influence future behaviour whilst travelling, are presented below:

	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 %
Will Influence Behaviour (because):		
Make people more aware/about AIDS/STDS	19	30
Make them more responsible/sensible/think twice	13	16
Another reminder/another method of reinforcement	13	16
Take precautions/advice on how to be careful	6	9
Stands out people will notice	4	4
Remind people of fatal effect of AIDS (including death)	2	9
Informative	2	5
Remind them of risks involved	2	20
Will Not Influence Behaviour (because):		
People will still do what want/make up their own minds	10	13
Information not presented well enough/does not stand out	4	3
People believe 'it won't happen to me'	3	8
Other mentions	7	2
Don't know/Not stated	17	2

- Travellers were then asked whether **they** personally were likely, to do anything differently or take any precautions, when travelling in the future.

While only 15% (in wave 1) mentioned that the campaign was likely to influence their own behaviour when travelling in the future (19% in wave 2), many of these people were likely to be in the most at risk categories, including:

- solo holiday makers (26%)
 - 18-24 year olds (27%)
 - people travelling to/from South East Asian ports (23% vs 15% travelling to other international ports)
 - regular condom users (30% of always/sometimes users), and
 - singles or those not in a steady sexual relationship (27%)
- Different actions, which were spontaneously mentioned by the 17% of travellers, likely to be taken in the future largely related to messages inherent in the campaign advertising. These were:

	Wave 1	Wave 2
	%	%
Be careful/more precautions needed	41	52
Safe sex	14	12
Travel with condoms	12	12
Use condoms	11	12
Abstain	5	8
Other mentions	18	6
Don't know/Not stated	3	6

Importance of practicing safe sex while travelling (Q. 17 – wave 2 only)

During wave 2 an additional question was asked on whether it is more or less important to practice safe sex when travelling than when at home.

97% believed it was at the least **just as** important to practice safe sex when travelling as when at home. Only 1% said it was **less** important. 38%, in fact, said it was more important to practice safe sex when away from home.

The reasons for the greater importance for people to practice safe sex included increased risk of infection (26%) and, more specifically, higher chance of catching a virus (11 %).

Importance of Alerting Travellers to AIDS Risk when Away From Home (Q. 19 wave 1; 0. 18 wave 2)

- Almost all travellers interviewed (87% in wave 1 and 83% in wave 2) believed it was very important to alert travellers to the risks associated with contracting HIV when away from home. A further 10% (in wave 1, 14% in wave 2) felt it was somewhat important. Only 2% (in wave 1, 1% in wave 2) felt it was unimportant.

This high level of support was consistent across all sub-groups.

Self-completion – Seated Section

The main frequencies evident from the self-completion section filled out by travellers at the end of the main interview are presented here. For a full account refer to the detailed computer tabulations contained in a separate volume to this report.

When interpreting these results, as this section was self-completed the incidence of non-compliance (around 10% or higher further into the section) needs to be considered.

- 78% (in wave 1, 82% in wave 2) of respondents described themselves as heterosexual; 1% bisexual; (2%; 3%) homosexual and (9%; 11%) not sexually active (question A.1).
- Three-quarters of respondents reported having had sex in the last 12 months with persons of opposite sex only (75% in wave 1, 80% in wave 2); persons of the same sex only (2%; 3%); persons of same and opposite sex (1 %) or no one 12% (A.2).
- 62% (in wave 1, 69% in wave 2) are presently in a steady sexual relationship; 29% (in wave 1, 27% in wave 2) are not (A.3).
- Two thirds of travellers in steady relationships, have been in the relationship for over two-years; 5% under 6 months, 10% 6 months-1 year; and 10% between 1-2 years.

- 60% overall had made no changes to their sexual activity, and 31% made some changes to their sexual activity, because of AIDS (A.5). This proportion was higher than the average among:
 - 18-24s (43%) and 25-39s (36%)
 - men (35% over women 25%)
 - Sydney travellers (38%)
 - Travellers to/from South East Asia ports (32% versus other 28%)

- Changes made to sexual activity, largely involved use of condoms (48%). Other changes included being more selective/beware of one night stand (6%); practice safe sex (12%); only one partner now/married (9%); more careful (10%) abstain/no sex (3%) (A.6).

- For those who didn't make any changes to sexual activity, the main reasons were: happily married/steady relationship/one partner (38%); no need/not relevant to me/not in risk categories (19%); already use condoms (5%); practice safe sex (5%); not promiscuous (1%) (A.7).

- 15% of travellers stated they have had sex with someone other than partner; 75% had not (A.8). This was higher among men than women (18% to 9%).

- 5% stated that their partner has had sex with other people; 68% said no while 27% didn't know/not stated (A.9).

- 22% of travellers claimed they always used a condom; 15% sometimes used a condom; 5% rarely used while 44% didn't use at all (A.10). Condom use (always or sometimes) was highest among 18-24s (53%) and 25-39x (42%). It was lower than the average for business travellers (at 29%), whilst use was higher for those travelling to/from South East Asia ports (42% than 36% for other international ports).

- 11 % of in-bound travellers **had** casual sexual contact on their recent cent trip with locals, local prostitutes or other visitors to the area; 61 % had sex with no one (A. 11). This proportion was slightly higher among 18-39s (14%), men (14%) and travellers to/from South East Asia ports (15%). 10% of out-bound travellers **intended** to have casual sex with locals of the area (including local prostitutes) or other visitors to the area. 13% said with travel companions while 58% said no one (A.13).
- 23% of in-bound travellers on this recent trip, had taken precautions for safe sex: 15% packed condoms and 8% used condoms. 53% didn't need to as they were in a monogamous relationship (A.12). Most of the high risk groups were more likely to have packed and/or used condoms, particularly solo travellers:

	Packed Condoms	Used Condoms
Solos	34	19
Men	17	11
18-24s	22	14
South East Asia travellers	19	10

- With regard to their **next** trip, the likelihood of travellers taking the following precautions were: packing condoms (28% likely versus 20% not likely); using condoms (26% likely versus 17% unlikely); practice safe sex (34% likely versus 12% unlikely) (A.14). Around half of respondents did not commit an answer to this question. Solo travellers in particular were most likely to take precautions in the future (40% to pack condoms and 39% to recent use condoms). Men, 18-24 year olds and South East Asia travellers were slightly more likely than the average traveller to take such precautions in the future.

- 1% of all travellers had ever injected any drugs for recreational/pleasure and around 2% for medical purposes (B.1). None of these injected drugs or took equipment with them on their recent trip.
- The likelihood of taking injecting equipment for themselves (or anyone else) or their next trip was highly unlikely. Only 3% said it was very likely; 1% somewhat likely; 8% not likely and 60% not at all likely. A further 3% were unsure at this stage while 23% did not state an answer (B.10).