



# Convenience Advertising

**UNIVERSAL McCANN**

**JOHNSON AND JOHNSON MONISTAT COMMUNICATION PROGRAM:  
EVALUATION REPORT**

A REVIEW OF THE CONVENIENCE ADVERTISING PROGRAM FOR  
UNIVERSAL McCANN AND JOHNSON AND JOHNSON

OCTOBER 2005

**Client Contact:**

Jim Murray  
Convenience Advertising  
3/340 Gore Street  
Fitzroy 3065  
Tel: 613 9486 0233  
Fax: 613 9486 0525  
Email: [jim.murray@conads.com](mailto:jim.murray@conads.com)

**Report Author:**

Jane Gourlay  
Research Assistant  
School of Psychology  
Deakin University  
Burwood Highway  
Burwood 3125  
Tel: 613 9530 3367  
Email: [janeg@deakin.edu.au](mailto:janeg@deakin.edu.au) / [janegourlay@iprimus.com.au](mailto:janegourlay@iprimus.com.au)

## **Table of Contents**

Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	3
Introduction	4
Analysis of Data	5
Sample Characteristics	5
Level and Rate of Recall of Materials	8
Perceptions of the Message	22
Product Preferences & other Sources of Brand Awareness	26
Summary	31
Recommendations	32

## List of Tables

Table s.1	Sample by Age and Marital Status	6
Table s.2	Sample by Occupation / Target Age Group by Occupation	7
Table s.3	Sample by Income / Target Age Group by Income	8
Table 1.1	Rates of Topic and Detailed Message Recall	13
Table 1.2	Message Recall by Age (recoded)	15
Table 1.3	Level of Message Recall by Age (recoded)	15
Table 1.4	Message Recall by Marital Status (recoded)	16
Table 1.5	Message Recall by Occupational Category (recoded)	16
Table 1.6	Level of Message Recall by Occupation (recoded)	17
Table 1.7	Message Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)	17
Table 1.8	Level of Message Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)	18
Table 1.9	Brand Recall by Age (recoded)	18
Table 1.10	Brand Recall by Marital Status (recoded)	19
Table 1.11	Brand Recall by Occupational Category (recoded)	19
Table 1.12	Brand Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)	20
Table 1.13	Level and Rate of Recall of Materials	21
Table 2.1	Perceived Target Audience	23
Table 2.2	Perceived Target Audience of the Target Age Group	24
Table 2.3	Reasons Why Messages were Difficult to Understand	25
Table 2.4	Perceptions of Appropriateness of the Message	25
Table 3.1	Thrush Treatment Product Preferences	27
Table 3.2	Unprompted Brand Recall by Product Preference	28
Table 3.3	Brand Recall in Total by Product Preference	28
Table 3.4	Unprompted Message Content Recall by Product Preference	28
Table 3.5	Both Brand and Content Recall by Product Preference	29
Table 3.6	Sources of Recent Monistat Awareness	30

## Introduction

This report provides an evaluation of the Monistat Communication Program— a narrowcast communication program implemented and managed by Convenience Advertising for Universal McCann and Johnson and Johnson.

The evaluation is based on the analysis of data gathered in 159 survey interviews. These interviews were held in two shopping centers in NSW during September 2005. The interview schedule contained a range of questions. These explored: level and rate of message recall, perceptions of the message and message placement (ie appropriateness of placement in the bathroom environment), existing product preferences and other sources of Monistat awareness. Relevant demographics were also recorded.

The report focuses on the extent to which the program material raised awareness of the Monistat brand and treatment for yeast infections in a specific, appropriate and relevant way. The program was specifically aimed at females aged between 25 and 34 years, and sought to ultimately increase sales of Monistat.

Campaign messages were planned for installation for a period of one month, from July 15<sup>th</sup> to August 15<sup>th</sup> in 29 shopping centers across 5 states. Over 483 display points were installed, however, it was necessary to relocate display points half-way through the program period. The program comprised three different designs with the tagline, "Thrush treatment that comforts while it works."

Finally, interviews were conducted in the locations on an availability basis, so the sample is not a random sample. For this reason, some statistics such as the chi-square as a measure of association between variables cannot be treated with the same level of confidence as would be the case with a random sample, since there is a possibility that the non-randomness of the selection process violates underlying assumptions of the method.

## **Analysis of data**

This section presents an analysis of data relating to the questions asked on the questionnaire. The results are presented under three headings: (1) level and rate of recall of campaign materials (2) perceptions of the message/message placement (3) product preferences and other sources of *Monistat* brand awareness. Firstly, however, a description of the sample characteristics is provided.

### Sample Characteristics

A total of 159 women comprised the sample, all of whom had used the bathroom facilities in the research location just prior or a few days prior to interview.

Approximately one-quarter the sample (n=38, 24%) were aged between 25 and 34 years of age. A further 21% were aged between 16 and 24 years, 29% were aged between 35 and 49 years, and 21% were aged over 50 years. Accordingly, all age groups were well represented in the sample, with one-quarter within the target age group.

The sample predominantly comprised women who were married or in defacto relationships (n=95, 60%), but also included many single women (n=60, 38%).

The age and marital status of respondents is summarized in Table s.1, on the page following.

Table s.1 Sample by Age and Marital Status

		N of Respondents	%
Age Group	Under 16	8	5%
	16-24	34	21%
	25-29	18	11%
	30-34	20	13%
	35-39	15	9%
	40-49	31	20%
	50+	33	21%
Marital Status	Married/defacto	95	60%
	Single	60	38%
	Divorced/widowed	4	2%

The largest occupational category within the sample was *white collar professional*, with 30% of respondents. A further 22% of respondents were studying, 15% were full-time mums and 10% described themselves as *white collar non-professional*.

Of respondents in the target age group, close to half described their occupation as *white collar professional* and one-third were full-time mums. The percentage of respondents within each occupational category for both the total sample, and for respondents within the target age group specifically, are presented in Table s.2, following.

Table s.2 Sample by Occupation and Target Age Group by Occupation

	N of Respondents	% (of total sample)	% (within target age group)
White collar (professional)	48	30%	42%
Student	34	22%	3%
Full-time mum	24	15%	32%
White collar (non-prof.)	16	10%	18%
Blue collar	2	1%	0%
Not working	17	11%	5%
Other			
Retired	7	4%	0%
Part-time	5	3%	0%
Self-employed	3	2%	0%
Service industry	2	1%	0%

Note: 1 respondent did not specify

As might have been expected, occupational category varied significantly according to age group (chi-square test=144.46, (df=18, 158)  $p < .001$ ). Women aged 25–34 years, and 35–49 years, were more likely than women from other age groups to be described as *white collar professional*. Women aged 25–34 years were more likely than women from other age groups to be full-time mums, and women aged under 25 years were more likely than women from other age groups to be studying full-time.

Finally, the net weekly income for the sample and for respondents within the target age group are presented in Table s.3, following. Please note that 53 respondents (one-third) did not report their net weekly income. For respondents who did specify their income, most received between \$300 and \$499 dollars per week (34%) or between \$500 and \$699 dollars per week (36%). However, lower and higher weekly incomes may have been more prevalent, as respondents in higher and lower income brackets may have been more likely than middle income earners to not report their income.



Table s.3 Sample by Net Weekly Income and Target Age Group by Net Weekly Income

	N of Respondents	% (of total known sample)	% (within target age group)
\$100-\$199	16	15%	3%
\$200-\$299	10	19%	3%
\$300-\$399	12	11%	13%
\$400-\$499	21	21%	19%
\$500-\$599	20	19%	32%
\$600-\$699	15	14%	16%
\$700-\$799	4	4%	7%
Over \$800	8	8%	7%

Note: 53 respondents within the total sample did not specify weekly income

7 respondents within the target age group did not specify weekly income

Also, respondents within the target age group reported higher net weekly incomes, as suggested by the values in Table s.3. The average net weekly income for women aged 24 to 35 years was between \$500 and \$599, compared with an average of between \$400 and \$499 for the sample as a whole.

This concludes the description of the sample characteristics.

#### Level and Rate of Recall of Campaign Materials

The effectiveness of the campaign in raising awareness of the Monistat brand and yeast infection treatment is firstly indicated by the extent to which people noticed and attended to the campaign messages, or *campaign awareness*. This is indicated by (1) the rate of message recall unprompted, with verbal prompt and with visual prompt, and (2) the rate and level of brand recall and message content recall.

To establish the level and rate of message recall, respondents were asked a number of questions in the following sequence:

*Q5 Have you used the bathroom facilities in this venue just now or in the past few days?*

A total of 197 women were initially approached to complete the survey questionnaire. Of these 197 women, 159 had visited the bathroom facilities just prior or a few days prior to interview. These respondents were then asked:

*Q6 Now I would like to ask you if you have seen any posters in this building advertising feminine health products?*

Of these 159 respondents, 51 (32%) answered 'yes' to this question, and 108 (68%) answered 'no'.

Respondents who answered no, they had not seen advertising messages regarding feminine health, were then asked:

*Q7 It could have been located in the Women's bathroom. Do you recall it now?*

Out of 108 respondents, 9 answered 'yes', they had seen advertising regarding feminine health in the bathroom and 99 answered 'no', they had not seen it.

Respondents who did not recall any feminine health advertising at this point (n=99) were shown a visual representation of the advertising without branding or text and asked:

*Q8 Have you seen a poster that looks like this anywhere in the Women's bathroom?*

A total of 33 respondents answered 'yes' to this question and 66 answered 'no'. The 33 respondents who recalled seeing the campaign posters at this point represent a *message recall with visual prompt rate of 21%* for the total sample.

Respondents were then asked a series of questions regarding the brand advertised in the message:

Q9 *Do you remember which brand the poster was advertising?*

Q10 *I will read out some brand names and if you can remember, tell me which one it is?*

And regarding the content of the message:

Q11 *Can you remember what the poster said?*

Q12 *Do you remember seeing the following words/headlines on the poster(s) "Thrush treatment that comforts while it works" ?*

This series of questions was firstly used to establish whether the 60 respondents who answered 'yes' to either Q6 or Q7 (*Have you seen any posters advertising feminine health products in the building/bathroom?*) had seen the Monistat campaign messages or some other feminine health advertising, and thus the unprompted message recall rate for the campaign. In total, 18 respondents indicated that they had seen the Monistat campaign posters by recalling either the Monistat brand, the campaign topic or message headline. These 18 respondents represent an *unprompted message recall rate of 11%* for the total sample.

Responses to Q9, 10, 11 and 12 were also used to determine respondents who were initially recalling some other feminine health advertising, but who were subsequently able to recall the Monistat campaign messages with verbal prompting, and thus the verbal prompt message recall rate. A total of 15 respondents initially recalled other feminine health advertising, but were able to recall the Monistat campaign at Q12. These 15 respondents represent a *message recall with verbal prompt rate of 9%*.

In summary, a total of 66 respondents out of 159 recalled seeing the Monistat campaign posters. This equates to a 42% *message recall rate* for the total sample. Of these, half recalled the messages with visual prompting (n=33, 21%), 18 recalled the messages unprompted (11%) and 15 recalled the messages with verbal prompting (9%).

<p>42% of respondents recalled seeing the campaign posters</p> <p>21% of respondents recalled the posters with no prompt or verbal prompt</p> <p>21% of respondents recalled the posters with visual prompting</p>
--

Brand recall was estimated by analysis of responses to the following questions:

*Q9 Do you remember which brand the poster was advertising? And*

*Q10 I will read out some brand names and if you can remember, tell me which one it is?*

In response to Q9, 10 respondents out of 66 were able to recall the brand *Monistat* as the product advertised in the poster. One respondent incorrectly recalled the brand advertised as *Canesten*, 44 respondents were unsure of the brand advertised, and 11 respondents recalled other feminine health advertising and branding at this point. The 10 respondents able to recall the brand *Monistat* represent a 6% *unprompted brand recall rate* for the total sample, or a 15% unprompted brand recall rate for respondents who recalled seeing the campaign posters.

Respondents who were unsure of the brand advertised in the posters they had seen (n=44) were then prompted with a list of feminine health brands:

*Q10 I will read out some brand names and if you can remember, tell me which one it is?*

In response to Q10, a further 8 respondents were able to recall *Monistat* as the brand advertised in the campaign messages. This represents a 5% *prompted brand recall rate* for the total sample, or a 12% *prompted brand recall rate* for respondents who recalled seeing the campaign posters.

In summary, 18 respondents out of 159 recalled the *Monistat* brand. This represents an 11% *brand recall rate* for the total sample. When considering the group of respondents who recalled seeing the campaign posters, 18 respondents out of 66, or 27%, recalled the *Monistat* brand.

Message content recall was estimated by analysis of responses to the following question:

Q11 *Can you remember what the poster said?*

Of the 66 respondents who recalled the campaign posters, most were unable to spontaneously remember what the poster said (n= 45, 68%). A total of 10 respondents (15%) described what the poster said by stating the general topic, ie 'thrush', 'something about thrush' or 'something about infection' and 8 respondents (12%) recalled the detailed message of the poster "Thrush treatment that comforts while it works" or an approximation of the message, such as "Thrush cure that comforts while it works". The remaining respondents recalled content from other advertising material. The statements that respondents made in response to Q11, in order of prevalence, are listed in Table 1.1, following.

Table 1.1 Rates of Topic and Detailed Message Recall

Q11 Can you remember what the poster said?	Rate of recall		
	N	% (of n=66)	% (of total sample, n=159)
Don't know	45	68%	28%
Thrush/something about thrush etc	10	15%	6%
'Thrush treatment that comforts while it works'	7	11%	4%
'Thrush cure that comforts while it works'	1	2%	<1%
Other advertising	4	6%	3%

Note: 1 respondent made more than one response

In relation to this question, two respondents explained that their bags covered the poster when they placed them on the hook on the back of the toilet cubicle door, and so they did not remember what the poster said.

Respondents who could not freely recall the topic or detailed message content of the campaign poster, or who recalled other advertising material (n=48) were then asked:

Q12 Do you remember seeing the following words/headline on the poster(s) "Thrush treatment that comforts while it works" ?

Of 48 respondents, 32 answered 'yes' they could remember seeing the words/headline and 16 answered 'no' they could not.

In summary, of the 66 respondents who recalled seeing the campaign posters, 10 (15%) recalled the topic unprompted, 8 (12%) recalled the detailed message unprompted, 32 (48%) recognised the detailed message when prompted and 16 (24%) were unable to recall or recognise the brand, words or headline of the campaign message.

Further analysis of the level of message content recall from responses to Q9, 10, 11 and Q12 combined showed that, of the 66 respondents who recalled the campaign posters,

- 7 respondents (11%) recalled both the brand and the detailed message
- 4 respondents (6%) recalled both the brand and the message topic
- 1 respondent (2%) recalled the detailed message only
- 7 respondents (11%) recalled the brand only
- 6 respondents (9%) recalled the topic only
- 25 respondents (38%) recognised the detailed message when prompted only, and
- 16 respondents (24%) recognised the creative execution only.

11% of the total sample, or 27% of respondents who recalled seeing the posters, recalled the brand *Monistat*

11% of the total sample, or 27% of respondents who recalled seeing the posters, recalled the topic or the detailed message

7% of the total sample, or 17% of respondents who recalled seeing the posters recalled both the brand and the topic or detailed message

Further analysis of message recall in relation to age indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in message recall according to age group (chi-square test=1.05, (df=3, 159)  $p>.05$ ). It was observed, however, that younger respondents, aged under 25, recalled seeing the campaign posters at higher rates than other age groups. The message recall rate for women in the target age group, 25-34 years, was 37%. The rates of message recall for women aged under 25, 25-34, 35-49, and 50 years and over are presented in Table 1.2, following.

Table 1.2 Message Recall by Age (recoded)

Age group	Recall of campaign posters	
	Yes	No
Under 25	48% (n=20)	52% (n=22)
25-34 years	37% (n=14)	63% (n=24)
35-49 years	41% (n=19)	59% (n=27)
50 years and over	39% (n=13)	61% (n=20)

Further to rates of message recall according to age, women aged 50 and over were much more likely than other age groups to require visual prompting to recall the campaign posters. This finding, however, did not reach statistical significance (chi-square test=6.17, (df=3, 66)  $p>.05$ ). Of women in the target age group who recalled seeing the campaign messages, 6 out of 14, or 43%, recalled the posters without visual prompting. This rate was lower than for women aged under 25, or between 35 and 49 years of age. It should be noted, however, that due to the small number of respondents in each group, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding differences between age groups. The rates of unprompted and verbal prompt recall vs. visual prompt recall for each age group are presented in Table 1.3, below.

Table 1.3 Level of Message Recall by Age (recoded)

Age group	Recall of campaign posters	
	Unprompted/ verbal	Visual
Under 25	60% (n=12)	40% (n=8)
25-34 years	43% (n=6)	57% (n=8)
35-49 years	63% (n=12)	37% (n=7)
50 years and over	23% (n=3)	77% (n=10)

As shown in Table 1.4, following, there was no significant difference in the rates of message recall according to marital status (chi-square test=0.22, (df=1, 159)  $p>.05$ ).



Table 1.4 Message Recall by Marital Status (recoded)

Marital Status	Recall of campaign posters	
	Yes	No
Married/de facto	40% (n=38)	60% (n=36)
Single/divorced	44% (n=28)	56% (n=36)

There was, however, a statistically significant difference in message recall according to the occupational category of the respondent (chi-square test=10.97, (df=4, 158)  $p < .05$ ). As shown in Table 1.5 below, respondents who classified their occupation as 'non-professional' or as 'full-time mum' were less likely than other respondents to recall the campaign messages (21% and 29%, respectively). Respondents described as 'not working', 'retired' or 'working part-time' recalled the campaign messages at the highest rates (61%). These differences between occupational categories may reflect associated characteristic lifestyle 'pace'. That is, women who were 'not working', 'retired' or 'working part-time' may have had more time available to notice and attend to advertising messages and engage in survey interviews. The rates of message recall for different occupational categories are shown in Table 1.5, below.

Table 1.5 Message Recall by Occupational Category (recoded)

Occupational category	Recall of campaign posters	
	Yes	No
Professional	42% (n=20)	58% (n=28)
Full-time mum	29% (n=7)	71% (n=17)
Non-professional	21% (n=5)	79% (n=19)
Student	50% (n=17)	50% (n=17)
Not working/ retired/ part-time	61% (n=17)	39% (n=11)

Note: 1 respondent did not specify occupation

With regard to the level of message recall, however, professional women and students were more likely than other women to recall the campaign messages without visual prompting. These differences did not reach statistical significance

(chi-square test=5.56, (df=4, 66) p>.05). The rates of unprompted and verbal prompt recall vs. visual prompt recall for each occupational category are presented in Table 1.6, below.

Table 1.6 Level of Message Recall by Occupational Category (recoded)

Occupational category	Recall of campaign posters	
	Unprompted/ verbal	Visual
Professional	65% (n=13)	35% (n=7)
Full-time mum	43% (n=3)	57% (n=4)
Non-professional	40% (n=2)	60% (n=3)
Student	59% (n=10)	41% (n=7)
Not working/ retired/ part-time	29% (n=5)	71% (n=12)

In relation to net weekly income, there were no statistically significant differences in message recall according to income. Some variation in recall rates were observed, however, with high and low income earners recalling the messages at higher rates (50% and 58%, respectively) than middle-income earners. The rates of message recall for different categories of net weekly income are shown in Table 1.7, below.

Table 1.7 Message Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)

Net weekly income	Recall of campaign posters	
	Yes	No
\$100-\$299	50% (n=13)	50% (n=13)
\$300-\$499	36% (n=12)	64% (n=21)
\$500-\$699	40% (n=14)	60% (n=21)
\$700 +	58% (n=7)	42% (n=5)

Note: 53 respondents did not specify weekly income

Furthermore, high income earners were observed to be more likely than middle and low income earners to recall the campaign messages without visual prompting. Once again, however, this finding was not statistically significant (chi-square test=5.04, (df=3, 46) p>.05). The rates of unprompted and verbal prompt

recall vs. visual prompt recall for each income category are presented in Table 1.8, below.

Table 1.8 Level of Message Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)

Net weekly income	Recall of campaign posters	
	Unprompted/ verbal	Visual
\$100-\$299	62% (n=8)	38% (n=5)
\$300-\$499	58% (n=7)	42% (n=5)
\$500-\$699	36% (n=5)	64% (n=9)
\$700 +	86% (n=6)	14% (n=1)

Note: 20 respondents did not specify weekly income

Further analysis of *brand* recall in relation to age indicates that, as shown in Table 1.9, below, women aged between 35 and 49 years of age were slightly more likely than younger and older women to recall the Monistat brand. Statistically, however, differences were non-significant (chi-square test=2.80, (df=3, 159)  $p>.05$ ). Of women in the target age group, 25-34 years, 11% were able to recall the Monistat brand.

Table 1.9 Brand Recall by Age (recoded)

Age group	Recall of Monistat brand	
	Yes	No
Under 25	10% (n=4)	90% (n=38)
25-34 years	11% (n=4)	89% (n=34)
35-49 years	17% (n=8)	83% (n=38)
50 years and over	6% (n=2)	94% (n=31)

Also, as shown in Table 1.10, following, women who were married or in defacto relationships were slightly less likely to recall the Monistat brand than single women. This difference, however, also fell short of statistical significance (chi-square test=1.98, (df=1, 159)  $p>.05$ ).

Table 1.10 Brand Recall by Marital Status (recoded)

Marital Status	Recall of Monistat brand	
	Yes	No
Married/de facto	8% (n=8)	92% (n=87)
Single/divorced	16% (n=10)	84% (n=54)

There was no statically significant difference in brand recall according to occupational category (chi-square test=1.24 (df=4, 158)  $p>.05$ ). However, women described as 'not working, retired or part-time' and students were less likely to recall the Monistat brand than women in other occupations. Brand recall for respondents according to category are presented in Table 1.11, below.

Table 1.11 Brand Recall by Occupational Category (recoded)

Occupational category	Recall of Monistat brand	
	Yes	No
Professional	15% (n=7)	85% (n=41)
Full-time mum	13% (n=3)	87% (n=21)
Non-professional	8% (n=2)	92% (n=22)
Student	12% (n=4)	88% (n=30)
Not working/ retired/ part-time	7% (n=2)	93% (n=26)

*Note: 1 respondent did not specify occupation*

Also, high income earners were somewhat more likely, and low income earners were somewhat less likely than other respondents to recall the Monistat brand. This finding too, however, did not reach statistical significance (chi-square test= 5.70, (df=3, 106)  $p>.05$ ). Rates of brand recall according to net weekly income level are presented in Table 1.12, following.

Table 1.12 Brand Recall by Net Weekly Income (recoded)

Net weekly income	Recall of Monistat brand	
	Yes	No
\$100-\$299	8% (n=2)	92% (n=24)
\$300-\$499	15% (n=5)	85% (n=28)
\$500-\$699	9% (n=3)	91% (n=32)
\$700 +	33% (n=4)	87% (n=92)

Note: 53 respondents did not specify weekly income

Further analysis of respondents who recalled both the brand and the topic or detailed message of the campaign (n=11) showed no significant differences according to age (chi-square test=3.63, (df=3, 159) p>.05), marital status (chi-square test=1.00, (df=1, 159) p>.05), occupation (chi-square test=4.47, (df=4, 158) p>.05), or net weekly income (chi-square test=1.42, (df=3, 106) p>.05). It was observed, however, that 0% of women who were 'not working, retired, or part-time', and 17% of women with a net weekly income over \$700, recalled both the brand and the topic or detailed message compared with the 7% rate for the sample overall.

In summary, detailed analysis of message, brand and content recall according to age, marital status, occupational category and net weekly income showed few statistically significant differences between groups. This suggests that, overall, the campaign was equally effective for all age, occupation and income groups, and for women living on their own or in relationships. However, the small number of respondents involved in many of these statistical comparisons make it difficult to draw conclusions regarding recall rates in relation to age, marital status, occupation or income.

In relation to the target age group, it was observed that 37% of women aged 25 to 34 recalled the campaign messages, and approximately half of these did so without visual prompting. In total, 11% of women aged 25 to 34 recalled the Monistat brand and 8% recalled the brand and message content. As such, recall

rates for the target age group were in line with the total sample of respondents as a whole.

It was also observed that professional women, women aged between 35 and 49 years, and women that received a net weekly income of \$700 or more, recalled the Monistat brand and the message content at higher rates than for the sample as a whole. Of women that earned \$700 or more, 33% (n=4) recalled the Monistat brand, and 17% (n=2) recalled both the brand and message content. Of professional women, 15% recalled the Monistat brand and of women aged 35 to 49 years, 17% recalled the Monistat brand.

Concluding this section, level and rate of recall of materials in terms of numbers and percentages for the full sample are listed in Table 1.13, below.

Table 1.13 Level and Rate of Recall of Materials

Level of recall of materials/message	Rate of recall	
	N	% (of total sample)
Campaign posters without prompting	18	11%
Campaign posters with verbal prompt only	15	9%
Campaign posters with visual prompt	33	21%
Campaign posters recalled in total	66	42%
Brand without prompting	10	6%
Brand with verbal prompt	8	5%
Brand recalled in total	18	11%
Topic unprompted	10	6%
Detailed message unprompted	8	5%
Message content recognised when described	32	20%
Message content recalled or recognised in total	50	31%
Brand and topic/or content recalled	11	7%

Of note, 42% of the sample (66 out of 159) noticed and recalled seeing the campaign messages. Of these, half required prompting with a visual representation of the campaign message. These figures reflect a moderate to low level of message awareness and suggest that the campaign posters were moderately successful in attracting the initial attention of their audience.

However, rates of brand and message content recall were moderately low. Around one-quarter of respondents who recalled seeing the posters (18 out of 66, 27%) or 11% of the total sample, recalled the brand *Monistat*. The same percentage recalled either the general or specific content of the messages (18 out of 66, 27%, or 11% of the total sample). Less than 10% of the total sample recalled both the brand and the topic *thrush*, or the thrush treatment message. Therefore, brand awareness was raised in a small minority of the sample as a result of the campaign messages.

Rates of recall for the target age group were similar to those for the sample as a whole. These findings suggest that the campaign was moderately successful in being noticed by both the target audience, and by women in general, but less successful in creating brand and thrush treatment awareness. The relatively short period of program installation in the research location (around one to two weeks) may have been a factor in the levels of brand and content recall.

Respondents' perceptions of the message and message placement is considered next.

#### Perceptions of the Message

Of the 66 respondents who recalled the campaign posters, 50 recalled or recognised the topic or text appearing on the posters. These 50 respondents' perceptions of the message and message placement is considered in this section.

As a measure of perceived message relevance, respondents were asked:

Q15 Who do you think the poster was intended for?

Responses are presented in order of prevalence in Table 2.1, below.

Results showed that the majority of respondents perceived the messages to be intended for a general or inclusive audience rather than for a specific audience. That is, most respondents perceived the messages to be intended for 'Anybody/everyone', 'women in general', or 'someone like me' (29 out of 48 responses, 60%). Respondents who perceived the messages to be for 'someone like me', were from all age groups, occupations and income levels.

Table 2.1 Perceived Target Audience

Group	N	% (of 48)
Anybody/everyone	12	25%
Someone like me	10	21%
Someone older than me	10	21%
Women in general	7	15%
Unsure	4	8%
Someone younger than me	3	6%
People in relationships	1	2%
Someone with thrush	1	2%

Note: 2 respondents did not specify

Respondents who perceived that the messages were intended for 'someone older than me' (n=10) were, in the majority, aged 24 or under (n=6) and respondents who perceived that the messages were intended for 'someone younger than me' (n=3) were all aged over 35. Most respondents who specified the intended audience as an age group other than their own, therefore, broadly identified the target age group as the intended audience (9 out of 13, 69%). These results



indicate that, overall, the campaign messages were perceived as relevant to either a general audience (60%) or broadly, the target audience (19%).

The perceived target audience of women in the target age group only, are detailed in Table 2.2, below.

Table 2.2 Perceived Target Audience of the Target Age Group

Group	N	% (of 10)
Anybody/everyone	5	50%
Someone like me	3	30%
Someone older than me	1	10%
Unsure	1	10%

*Note: 2 respondents did not specify*

These results further suggest that respondents in the target age group would be unlikely to dismiss the advertising on the basis that they considered it intended for 'someone older than me' or some other group of women.

As responses to the next question show, the majority of respondents also evaluated the material as easy to understand.

*Q13 Did you find the poster easy to understand?*

Out of the 47 respondents who answered this question, 38 (81%), answered 'yes', 5 (11%) answered 'no' and 4 (11%) answered 'partly'. The reasons why respondents found the messages difficult to understand are listed in Table 2.3, following. The minority of respondents who had difficulty in understanding the messages were mostly unsure what it was about or what it was advertising (n=6). Further analysis of respondents who did not find the messages easy to understand showed that they were primarily aged over 50 or under 24 (6 out of 9).

Table 2.3 Reasons Why Messages were Difficult to Understand

<i>Q14 What was difficult about the poster to understand?</i>		
Reason	N	% (of 50)
Unsure of what the message was about or what it was advertising i.e. <i>'I'm unsure of what the big thing is and what it is doing.'</i> <i>'I don't know what it's about.'</i>	6	12%
Words were too small	2	4%
The message was 'strange'.	2	4%
'My bag covered the message.'	1	2%

*Note: some respondents gave more than one response*

Respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of displaying feminine health messages in the bathroom environment were investigated by asking the following question:

*Q18 How appropriate is it to display a poster about feminine health in a bathroom environment?*

As Table 2.4 shows, 94% of respondents felt that it was either very appropriate or quite appropriate for posters about feminine health to be displayed in the bathroom environment.

Table 2.4 Perceptions of Appropriateness of the Message

<i>Q18 How appropriate is it to display a poster about feminine health in a bathroom environment?</i>		
	N	% (of 48)
Very appropriate	30	63%
Quite appropriate	15	31%
Unsure/don't know	3	6%
Somewhat inappropriate	0	0%
Very inappropriate	0	0%

*Note: 2 respondents did not specify*

Respondents who were unsure about the appropriateness of displaying feminine health messages (n=3), were in the older age groups (50 and over, n=2, 40–49 years, n=1). These respondents did not provide a reason for their uncertainty regarding the appropriateness of displaying feminine health messages in the bathroom environment.

In summary, messages were perceived in very positive ways. The majority of respondents believed that the messages were inclusive (ie for 'anybody/ everyone', 'women in general', 'someone like me'), and a high majority (81%) of respondents reported that the messages were easy to understand. Almost all respondents (94%) thought it was appropriate for the messages to be displayed in the bathroom environment. Furthermore, of the target age group, 83% perceived that the messages were intended for 'anybody' or 'someone like me', 80% found the messages easy to understand, and 100% thought that it was appropriate to place feminine health advertising in the bathroom environment.

These findings provide support for a positive evaluation of the campaign messages, and suggest that lower levels of brand and content awareness were generally not due to respondents' lack of understanding, or to their disapproval of advertisement in the bathroom environment. These findings also suggest that the messages were appropriately targeted, and it is unlikely that respondents failed to notice brand or message content because they believed that the messages were intended for 'somebody else'.

#### Product Preferences and other Sources of Monistat Brand Awareness

This section details the usual products purchased for thrush treatment, and also, additional sources of exposure to Monistat advertising or information, for respondents who recalled the campaign posters and who recalled or recognised the campaign headline (n=50).

Regarding product preferences, respondents were asked:

Q16 When you are shopping for feminine thrush treatment what products do you usually prefer to buy?

A total of 30 respondents nominated one or more preferred thrush treatment products and 20 respondents stated that either they did not purchase thrush treatment products (n=15) or that they didn't know (n=5). The most common thrush treatment product nominated was *Canesten*, (n=16), followed by *Monistat* (n=12) and *Diflucan* (n=2). Responses to Q16 are listed in order of prevalence in Table 3.1, below.

Table 3.1 Thrush Treatment Product Preferences

Product	N	% (out of 35 responses)
Canesten	16	46%
Monistat	12	34%
Diflucan	2	6%
A foreign product – Chinese herbal	1	3%
Cranberry tablets	1	3%
Whatever my doctor prescribes	1	3%
A tablet product	1	3%
A gel product	1	3%

Note: some respondents nominated more than one product

Rates of brand and message content recall were further examined in relation to respondents' usual product preference (see Tables 3.2 to 3.5, following). Analysis showed that respondents who usually preferred to purchase *Monistat* recalled brand and message content at higher rates than respondents' who purchased either *Canesten* or *Diflucan*. Nonetheless, many respondents who usually preferred to purchase *Canesten* recalled the campaign brand and message content.

In total, 5 respondents who were not usual purchasers of Monistat recalled the Monistat brand and message content featured in the advertising (Table 3.5), and 10 respondents who were not usual purchasers of Monistat recalled the brand *Monistat* (Table 3.3). These respondents may potentially change their future product preference to Monistat as a result of the campaign program, and represent at least 3% to 6% of the sample as a whole.

Table 3.2 Unprompted Brand Recall by Product Preference

Unprompted brand recall (n=10)		
Product preference	N	% (of 10)
Monistat	5	50%
Canesten	3	30%
Diflucan	0	0
None/don't use	2	20%

Table 3.3 Brand Recall in Total by Product Preference

Brand recall in total (n=18)		
Product preference	N	% (of 18)
Monistat	8	44%
Canesten	5	33%
Diflucan	1	6%
None/don't use	4	22%

Table 3.4 Unprompted Message Content Recall by Product Preference

Detailed message content recall (n=8)		
Product preference	N	% (of 8)
Monistat	6	75%
Canesten	1	13%
Diflucan	0	0
None/don't use	1	13%

Table 3.5 Both Brand and Content Recall by Product Preference

Unprompted brand and content recall (n=11)		
Product preference	N	% (of 11)
Monistat	6	55%
Canesten	4	36%
Diflucan	0	0
None/don't use	1	9%

Exposure to additional advertising or information concerning Monistat was investigated by asking respondents:

*Q17 Have you read or heard of anything about Monistat anywhere recently other than in the bathroom environment?*

Of the 46 women who answered this question, around half (n=21, 46%) had not come across anything about Monistat anywhere other than in the bathroom environment. Alternatively, 25 (54%) had recently read or heard about Monistat in some other context. Approximately one-third had heard about Monistat on the television (n=16, 35%). The places or contexts in which respondents had heard or read something about Monistat are listed in Table 3.6, following, in order of prevalence.

Table 3.6 Sources of Recent Monistat Awareness

<i>Q 17 Have you read or heard of anything about Monistat anywhere recently other than in the bathroom environment?</i>		
	N	% (out of 46)
Television	16	35%
Magazine	7	15%
Friends or family	5	11%
Pharmacy	2	4%
Newspaper	1	2%
Nowhere else	21	46%

*Note: some respondents gave more than one response, 4 respondents did not specify*

As might have been expected, respondents who had heard or read something about Monistat other than in the bathroom environment were somewhat more likely than those who had not, to recall the Monistat brand advertised in the messages. In total, 24% of respondents who had not seen or heard anything additional about Monistat recalled the Monistat brand, compared with 48% of respondents who had seen or heard something additional about Monistat. This difference was not, however, statistically significant (chi-square test=2.87 (df=1, 40)  $p>.05$ ). Nonetheless, this observation suggests that higher rates of brand recall for the campaign program might be achieved with concurrent additional media advertising efforts.

## Summary

The aim of the Johnson and Johnson Monistat Communication Program was to raise Monistat brand awareness, and awareness of treatments for thrush, with the view to increasing sales of Monistat. In total, 42% of respondents recalled seeing the campaign posters, 11% recalled the brand *Monistat* and 11% recalled either the topic of the poster, 'thrush', or the detailed message of the poster, '*Thrush treatment that comforts while it works*'. The moderate rate of poster recall indicates fair campaign awareness, but lower rates of brand and content recall suggest that the campaign had a small effect on brand awareness or awareness of thrush treatment. In relation to increasing sales of Monistat, at least 3% to 6% of the total sample may potentially change their future product preference to Monistat as a result of the campaign program.

Findings also showed that respondents perceived the messages in positive ways. For the great majority, messages were perceived as appropriately displayed in the bathroom environment, easy to understand, and inclusive in their appeal, especially amongst the target age group.

Overall, then, the analysis indicates that the campaign was a positive initiative with the limitation that the messages had a small effect on brand awareness and awareness of treatments for thrush, and on potential future sales of Monistat. Given that messages were installed for a limited period of time before interviews were conducted in the research location, it may be that respondents require greater exposure to the messages in order to recall brand and content at higher rates.



## **Recommendations**

No definitive recommendations emerge from the analysis of data collected for this evaluation. The recall rate (42%) indicates that the messages were moderately effective in being noticed by women in this sample, however, the brand and content recall rates are lower than might have been expected.

The low brand and content recall rate may have been due to:

- 1) Insufficient period of installation before survey interviews
- 2) Ineffective communication of brand/content in creative executions
- 3) The number of women interested in thrush treatment products

The data does suggest that the lower rates were generally not due to respondents' lack of understanding, or to their disapproval of advertisement in the bathroom environment. The findings also suggest that the messages were appropriately targeted, and it is unlikely that respondents failed to notice brand or message content because they believed that the messages were intended for 'somebody else'. Nonetheless, approximately 40% of women who did notice the messages reported that they did not usually purchase thrush treatment products. As such, brand recall may have been limited by women 'switching off' as non-users of thrush treatment products.

Data on respondents' exposure to additional Monistat advertising also suggests that higher rates of brand recall for a narrowcast communication program might be achieved by concurrent advertising/promotion in other contexts. Along this line, higher rates of brand and content recall may also result from greater message exposure within the bathroom environment. This would require a campaign program of greater duration.



