



Convenience Advertising

A.34

QQSR

QUALITATIVE & QUANTITATIVE SOCIAL RESEARCH

ACN 056 122 662

PO Box 12, Gungahlin ACT 2912
Ph: 02 6242 1008 Fax: 02 6242 1024
Email: qqsr@orac.net.au
Dr Stephen Mugford, Managing Director

Convenience Advertising of Housing Estates Sharp Safe Messages

Report on Field Work Findings

Dr Stephen Mugford

4.1.2000

2004044

1 Summary of findings

Research was carried out with a total of 96 respondents, divided into two groups—residents of the housing estate (74) and non-residents of the housing estate (22). The sample was also divided into male (47%) and female (53%).

Respondents were adults who used locations in which Convenience Advertising placed health messages. QQSR designed the research and received and analysed the data for the report.

The sample proved to be:

- **Disproportionately young and unmarried**—compared to the distributions of age, marital status that might have been expected, with over 50% under 30 years of age and only 30% married.
- **Currently unemployed**—over two thirds were unemployed (68%).
- **English Speaking**—even though many were from non-english speaking backgrounds, the majority did speak English at home (61%).

With regard to exposure and recall:

- **The vast majority of respondents used the locations in which the health messages were displayed**—with more than half (53%) using the locations on the day of the interview.
- **Over a quarter (28%) of all respondents had unprompted recalled of any poster or message displayed in the stairwell or the drying room**—with almost three-quarters of the respondents seeing the posters in both locations.
- **Over a third (36%) of all respondents had unprompted recall of posters with health related messages**—rising to about 58% when the prompt ‘displaying the modified message’ was added.
- **Basic recall did not vary greatly by category or respondent**—with slightly more males (64%) than females (43%) recalling the poster or message in either of the two locations
- **Most respondents (57%) read at least some of the poster**—with almost 40% admitting they read none of the poster at all.

Their views of the design, appearance and readability of the campaign:

- **The vast majority (64%) of respondents found the poster to be eye-catching**—with almost a quarter (23%) of these declaring the poster to be very eye-catching.
- **More than half of all respondents (56%) liked the design and appearance of the poster**—with a further 41% stating they neither liked nor disliked the design and appearance, only 3% of respondents disliked the poster.
- **Almost all of the respondents stated that it was easy to understand the main message of the poster**—with most (55%) declaring it very easy to understand. Only 3% found the message of the poster quite hard to understand.

- **Similar results were found in regards to the recall of the message of the poster**—over three quarters (84%) found the main message of the poster either very easy or quite easy to remember.

Their views of the method and campaign showed strong support finding that:

- **The information would be useful to someone who injected drugs**—half (50%) of the respondents thought it would be very useful, while a further 36% thought the information would be quite useful.
- **An appropriate way to advertise**—less than 10% found the message of the poster to be somewhat offensive.
- **The issues of drug use and safety on the estate to be important**—almost 80% of the respondents found the issues to be significant.
- **It is a good idea to advertise material about injecting drug use and community safety in this way**—almost three-quarters (71%) said ‘yes, definitely’ with a further 18% stating ‘yes, probably’.

The Sample

As Table 1 shows, the sample consists of 2 sub-samples, consisting of 69 residents of the housing estate (30 males and 39 females), and 19 non-residents (11 males and 8 females). The total sample consisted of 41 males and 47 females and there were 8 non-responses.

Table 1: The Sample (number)

	<i>Residents</i>	<i>Non-Resident</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Male</i>	30	11	41
<i>Female</i>	39	8	47
<i>Total</i>	69	19	88

In this table, raw numbers are shown in order to give a clear picture of the data and an understanding of the sub-sample size. For the following tables, however, the raw numbers are converted to percentages because these offer a clearer comparative picture, which can be hard to ascertain from raw numbers. It must be noted that the numbers used are not always the full sub sample, since in some areas there is no response. Non-response is never a large proportion, however, and the general pattern based on percentages is a reliable and accurate guide both to the overall story and the few areas of inter-sample difference.

Frequency of Visiting for Non-Residents and Exposure to Posters.

Table 2 examines the frequency of visiting the housing estate for non-residents. From this small sub-sample it is apparent that those who do visit the housing estate do so very frequently—18% visit the estate daily and a further 32% visit the estate several times a week. It also becomes apparent that males are more frequent visitors to the estate.

Table 2: How often do you visit the housing estate? (percent by sex)

	Daily	Several times a week	Weekly	Several Times a Month	Less Often
<i>Male</i>	67	83	43	50	0
<i>Female</i>	33	17	57	50	100

Turning to table 3, the data shows that the majority of both residents and non-residents have used the stairwells or drying room either on the day of the interview or in the recent past.

Table 3: Have you used the stairwells or drying room today/recently? (percent)

	Have you used the stairwells or drying room	
	Today	Recently
<i>Yes</i>	53	88
<i>No</i>	47	12

Based on this evidence it is safe to assume that *the majority of residents and visitors alike are exposed to the posters and health messages on a regular basis.*

Recall and Respondent Evaluation of the Messages

If respondents were exposed, did they recall seeing the posters? This question was asked at three levels; a completely unprompted recall, a recall prompted by asking if they had seen health related messages and a recall assisted by showing a modified version of the poster. As Table 4 indicates, the unprompted recall was only 28%, and this rose when prompts were used.

Table 4: Three levels of recall of poster? (percent)

	Unprompted Recall	Recall, Verbal Prompt	Recall, Visual Prompt
<i>Yes</i>	28	36	58
<i>No</i>	67	61	42

Table 5 presents material on the extent to which respondents found the poster to be eye-catching. The majority of all respondents found the poster to be eye-catching with almost one quarter finding the poster very eye-catching. Similar results were apparent when respondents were asked if they liked the design and appearance of the poster, with only 3% expressing a dislike for the poster.

Table 5: Is the poster eye-catching?

How eye catching did you find this poster?	Percent
<i>Very eye-catching</i>	23
<i>Quite eye-catching</i>	41
<i>Not eye-catching</i>	35
<i>Don't Know</i>	1

Table 6: Appearance and Design of the Poster

How much did you like the design and appearance of this poster?	Percent
<i>Liked very much</i>	7
<i>Quite liked</i>	49
<i>Neither liked nor disliked</i>	41
<i>Quite disliked</i>	1.5
<i>Disliked very much</i>	1.5

Table 7, the following page, presents material on the extent to which the respondents read the message. While the majority read all or some of the message a large percentage (40%) admitted to reading none of the message at all.

Table 7: How much of the poster did you read?

	<i>All of it</i>	<i>Some of it</i>	<i>None of it</i>	<i>No answer</i>
Total Sample	22	35	40	3

Table 8 examines the extent to which respondents found the material to be easy to understand and remember. In both cases the majority of the sample found it very easy

to both understand the main message of the poster and also to remember what that main message was.

Table 8: How easy was it to understand/remember the main message of the poster? (percent)

	How easy was it to understand the main message of the poster?	How easy was it to remember the main message of the poster?
<i>Very easy</i>	55	53
<i>Quite easy</i>	31	31
<i>Neither easy nor hard</i>	9	9
<i>Quite hard</i>	3	3
<i>Very hard</i>	-	2
<i>Recall inadequate</i>	2	3

Table 9 examines the extent to which respondents found the material useful. The majority of all respondents found the information not useful at all, while less than one fifth found the information to be very useful to them.

Table 9: How useful did you find the material? (percent)

	Was the information useful?
<i>Very useful</i>	19
<i>Quite useful</i>	24
<i>Not useful</i>	57

In table 10, the data relate to whether the information contained in the poster would be useful to someone who injected drugs. The overall majority of respondents felt that this information would be very useful (50%), with more females stating the information would be quite useful to someone who injected drugs than males (47% compared to 25%).

Table 10: Do you think the information would be useful to someone who injected drugs? (percent)

	Male	Female
<i>Very useful</i>	53	47
<i>Quite useful</i>	25	47
<i>Not useful</i>	22	6

Turning to the issue of whether people took offence at the information contained in the poster, less than 10% of respondents stated that they found the main message of the poster offensive at all. This finding was consistent between the sexes.

Table 11: Did you find the main message of this poster offensive at all?

	Male	Female
<i>Very much</i>	-	-
<i>Somewhat</i>	6	9
<i>Not at all</i>	94	91

Turning to the significance of issues such as drug use and safety within the estate, most respondents (57%) felt that these issues are of high significance, and overall very few (2) felt that these issues have no significance what so ever.

Table 12: How significant do you feel the issues of drug use and safety are on the estate?

	Male	Female
<i>Very significant</i>	58	57
<i>Significant</i>	18	26
<i>Not very significant</i>	21	17
<i>Not at all significant</i>	3	-

Asked the general question of whether the method was a good idea, a very clear and very large majority thought that it was, as the data illustrate in Table 13.

Table 13: Do you think it is a good idea to advertise a material about injecting drug use and community safety in this way?

	Male	Female
<i>Yes, definitely</i>	76	66
<i>Yes, probably</i>	9	26
<i>Not sure</i>	9	8
<i>No, probably not</i>	3	-
<i>No, definitely not</i>	3	-

Asked about why it might not be a good idea, as well as any other ideas they had about the problem, relatively few respondents had negative comments. *Although negative comment was sought, many comments recorded were positive, saying the posters and campaign were a good idea, with the majority of comments being suggestions for improvement.* These included:

- Its okay*
- Make the size bigger, the poster is too small make the front bigger*
- The box conveys the message*
- Every floor should have one, the front and size should be bigger and more of them*
- Place at as many places as possible*
- Place in a common place where everyone reads the message*
- Its a good idea to put the posters near the lifts*
- Pretty happy the way it is*
- Good for drug users*
- More posters, more bins*
- Make it multicultural, more languages*
- Make it bigger, put inside the lifts*
- Use brighter colours*
- Posters need to be bigger, more eye catching*

The negative comments that were made are recorded below, again many could be considered suggestions for improvement as above.

- Concerned about safety to the kids and worried about encouraging more drug users*
- Poster is too small, when walking past I just saw the box and didn't bother reading much of it*
- The box conveys the message so I didn't bother reading the message*
- Could be put at more places*
- Not real clear*

Need for pictorial symbols

Good lot of people use drugs and drop the syringes on the ground

May encourage people to use drugs

On the basis of these few and scattered negative comments, it is reasonable to conclude that *this campaign and method of delivery have no clear, discernible drawbacks.*

The Sample in More Detail

Further information about the sample is presented in these tables.

Table 14 shows the wide spread of ages in the two sub-samples, with a mild peak in the 21-30 age range. There are few differences between the two sub-samples.

Table 14: Age of the samples (percent)

<i>Age</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>17 or under</i>	13	16
<i>18-20</i>	7	8
<i>21-25</i>	14	17
<i>25-30</i>	11	13
<i>30-35</i>	6	7
<i>35-40</i>	7	8
<i>40-45</i>	6	7
<i>45-50</i>	8	10
<i>50-55</i>	-	-
<i>55-60</i>	5	6
<i>60 or older</i>	7	8

The following table shows that the large majority of the survey sample are unemployed.

Table 15: Currently Employed (percent)

<i>Are you currently employed</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Yes</i>	33
<i>No</i>	67

Table 16 shows that the vast majority of the sample are currently single, with most of the remainder in a marital relationship.

Table 16: Marital Status (percent)

<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Married</i>	30
<i>Single</i>	65
<i>Divorced</i>	4
<i>De facto</i>	1

Table 17 examines the most commonly spoken language at home. It is clear that the majority of respondents speak English in the family home, even when it may not be their first language.

Table 17: Language spoken at home (percent)

Language Spoken at Home	Percent
<i>English</i>	62
<i>Turkish</i>	6
<i>Vietnamese</i>	5
<i>Somali</i>	3
<i>Other</i>	24

Conclusions

The Convenience Advertising – City of Melbourne/Office of Housing Sharp Safe Communication strategy is successfully delivering highly targeted information to both residents and non-residents of the housing estates.

The programme has achieved recall rates which indicate that over a quarter of respondents (28%) have unprompted recall of a message on their last visit to the toilets. This rose to 58% when respondents were shown a visual prompt.

The communication material has achieved levels of recall which are commensurate with its targeting objectives, which segment particular message types, by location and indicators of venue location usage. Messages have been placed, in locations which have evidenced some level of drug taking activity, yet which are also locations which may be utilised by non-drug using visitors and residents.

One intended purpose of this ranking and targeting strategy is to prevent the development of community anxiety or resistance to communication material which addresses issues of injecting drug use, syringe disposal, and community health and safety.

The programme is particularly successful in introducing this material into the community with a minimum of message resistance.

64% of respondents found the posters to be eye catching, and 56% of respondents liked the design and appearance of the poster, and almost all respondents found the main message of the posters easy to understand, and recall.

The evaluation research project evidences that no significant community concern has been realised as a result of the programme. In fact, a significant level of acceptance is evident. Over half of all respondents thought the information would be very useful to someone who injected drugs, and approximately 90% of respondents felt that the use of public toilets was an appropriate way to communicate material about injecting drug use and safety.

In addition, 80% of respondents found the issues of drug use and safety on the estates to be significant.

A cross referencing of these data produces a programme which is evidenced to be:

- Recalled by a significant proportion of the sample
- Considered eye catching and memorable by a significant proportion of the sample
- Is considered appropriate and significant by a majority of the sample.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended that further message development be undertaken which could emphasise other aspects of community safety, and which may address other aspects of community safety and health, while still foregrounding the issue of syringe disposal
- The location of messages may be reviewed to incorporate a more generic community safety message type in more public/high traffic locations on the estate(s), in response to some anecdotal material gathered during the field work.

Sharp safe - City Safe

Sharp Safes are placed around the city. They enable safe disposal of needles and syringes, and reduce the harm to the community and the environment.



Sharp safe



City Safe



If you find a needle and syringe please call
COUNCIL HOTLINE on **9658 9658** for safe collection



Sharp safe - City Safe

Sharp Safes are placed around the city. They enable safe disposal of needles and syringes, and reduce the harm to the community and the environment.



Overdose

If you find an unconscious person there is chance they have overdosed. Stay calm and act immediately.

Ring 000 and ask for an ambulance.

Then follow these First Aid steps:

Danger - check to see if there is a used needle near the person.

If there is carefully put it in a safe place.

Response - check if the person is conscious. Gently shake them and ask if they can hear you.

Airway - check the person's airway; lay them on their side and tilt their head back for easier breathing. Clear their mouth if necessary.

Breathing - look, listen, and feel that they are breathing;

If they are not breathing, begin mouth to mouth:

- Lay the person on their back.
- Place one hand under their neck and tilt their head back.
- Seal nostrils with fingertips, breathe into their mouth, give up to 5 breaths to achieve 2 effective breaths (chest rises and falls).
- Continue mouth to mouth resuscitation, 1 breath every 4 seconds until they begin to breathe again or medical help arrives.

Circulation - check for a pulse

Only attempt CPR if you have been trained.

If you find a needle and syringe please call

COUNCIL HOTLINE on 9658 9658 for safe collection

For drug and alcohol counselling, referral and advice call

DIRECTLINE on 9416 1818



Sharp safe - City Safe

Sharp Safes are placed around the city. They enable safe disposal of needles and syringes, and reduce the harm to the community and the environment.



Safely Discarded Syringes

Sometimes syringes are not disposed of safely.

If you feel confident:

- Pick up the syringe by the barrel,
- Do not touch the sharp end or attempt to recap it;
- Place it in a sharp safe, or a screwtop, puncture proof, plastic container;
- To dispose of the container appropriately, take it to the nearest needle exchange or contact the COUNCIL HOTLINE.

If you find a needle and syringe please call
COUNCIL HOTLINE on **9658 9658** for safe collection



Sharp safe - City Safe

Sharp Safes are placed around the city. They enable safe disposal of needles and syringes, and reduce the harm to the community and the environment.



Safe Disposal of Injecting Equipment

Unsafe disposal of needles and syringes is dangerous, and places yourself and others at risk of disease:

- Do not share any injecting equipment,
- Recap your own needle only;
- Safely dispose of your used equipment in a disposal container and return to an exchange service, or place in a sharp safe.

Support your exchange by returning

If you find a needle and syringe please call
COUNCIL HOTLINE on **9658 9658** for safe collection

