While a Majority of Canadians Feel Informed on the Issue of HIV/AIDS, They're Less Informed Now (57%, -13 pts.) Compared to Five Years Ago (70%)

Less Canadians (34%, - 25 pts.) Believe HIV/AIDS to be an International Emergency, While More (54%, +18 pts) Think Calling the Disease a 'Pandemic' is an Exaggeration

Public Release Date: Tuesday, October 16th, 2012, 3:00 PM EDT

Ipsos Reid is Canada's market intelligence leader and the country's leading provider of public opinion research. With operations in eight cities, Ipsos Reid employs more than 600 research professionals and support staff in Canada. The company has the biggest network of telephone call centres in Canada, as well as the largest pre-recruited household and on-line panels. Ipsos Reid's Canadian marketing research and public affairs practices are staffed with seasoned research consultants with extensive industry-specific backgrounds, offering the premier suite of research vehicles in Canada—all of which provide clients with actionable and relevant information. Ipsos Reid is an Ipsos company, a leading global survey-based market research group. To learn more, visit www.ipsos.ca

For copies of other news releases, please visit
http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/

While a Majority of Canadians Feel Informed on the Issue of HIV/AIDS, They're Less Informed Now (57%, -13 pts.) Compared to Five Years Ago (70%)

Less Canadians (34%, - 25 pts.) Believe HIV/AIDS to be an International Emergency, While More (54%, +18 pts) Think Calling the Disease a 'Pandemic' is an Exaggeration

Toronto, ON – While a majority (57%) of Canadians feel 'informed' (11% very well/46% reasonably well) on the issue of HIV and AIDS, this number is down compared to those who felt 'informed' on the issue when the same question was posed five years ago (70%, 16% very well/54% reasonable well), according to a new poll conducted by Ipsos Reid on behalf of World Vision. Conversely, more Canadians (43%, +13 pts.) believe they are 'not informed' (5% not at all/38% a little) on the disease in 2012 compared to 2007 (30%, 2% not at all/29% a little).

One-third (34%, -25 pts.) of Canadians believe that 'HIV and AIDS is a worldwide pandemic best described as an international emergency', which is a view that is down substantially from five years ago (59%). A majority (54%, +18 pts. from 2007) of Canadians, however, now believe that 'HIV AIDS is a serious problem, but to describe it as a pandemic is an exaggeration'. The following table outlines in full detail the different views Canadians have towards HIV and AIDS and the difference of the opinions compared to 2007 results:

View	2012 Results	2007 Results	Difference
HIV and AIDS is a worldwide pandemic best described as an international emergency	34%	59%	- 25 pts.
HIV and AIDS is a serious problem, but to describe it as a pandemic is an exaggeration	54%	36%	+18 pts.
I am unaware of the impact of HIV and AIDS	9%	5%	+4 pts.
HIV and AIDS is a serious problem but does not concern Canadians	3%	1%	+2 pts.

Thinking about the spread of HIV and AIDS, Canadians' perceptions on who is most vulnerable to contracting the disease have also changed drastically. Half (49%, +20 pts.) of Canadians believe that men are the most vulnerable to contracting HIV and AIDS, up significantly from 2007 (29%). One-quarter (26%, -6 pts.) of Canadians think women are most vulnerable to contracting the disease, which down slightly from five years ago (32%). Half as many Canadians in 2012 (15%) believe that young girls are most vulnerable compared to 2007 (30%), while the number of Canadians who believe young boys are most vulnerable has remained consistent (10% in 2012 vs. 9% in 2007).

Nearly all Canadians believe that access to quality health care (94%), increased education and awareness of the disease and how it's transmitted (94%), and cheaper and accessible

medicines (93%) would help improve the quality of life for people living with HIV and AIDS, as these views have remained fairly stable over the last five years. Three-quarters (76%, -5 pts.) believe that a reduction of poverty would improve life quality for people living with the disease, down slightly from 2007 (81%). The table below compares these views against those measured five years ago:

Improve Quality of Life?	**2007**		**2012**	
	Yes	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
Access to Quality Health Care	95%	5%	94%	6%
Increased Education and Awareness of the Disease and How It's Transmitted	94%	6%	94%	6%
Cheaper and Accessible Medicines	94%	6%	93%	7%
Reduction of Poverty	81%	19%	76%	24%

Those who volunteer in activities to combat HIV and AIDS has also remained consistent over the last five years. 5% (up 1 pt. from 2007) say they are involved in such activities to help those in Canada, while 95% say they do not (down 1 pt. from 2007). 4% of Canadians (down 1 pt. from 2007) say are involved in activities to combat HIV and AIDS to help those in developing countries, while 96% (up 1 pt. from 2007) are not involved in such activities.

These are some of the findings of an Ipsos Reid poll conducted between October 1st to 8th, 2012, on behalf of World Vision. For this survey, a sample of 1,005 Canadians from Ipsos' Canadian online panel was interviewed online. Weighting was then employed to balance demographics to ensure that the sample's composition reflects that of the adult population according to Census data and to provide results intended to approximate the sample universe. The precision of Ipsos online polls are calculated using a credibility interval. In this case, the poll is accurate to +/- 3.5 percentage points of all Caandians in the general population. All sample surveys and polls may be subject to other sources of error, including, but not limited to coverage error, and measurement error. For more information on credibility intervals, please visit the Ipsos website at http://ipsos-na.com/dl/pdf/research/public-affairs/IpsosPA_CredibilityIntervals.pdf

For more information on this news release, please contact:

Sean Simpson
Associate Vice President
Ipsos Reid
Public Affairs
(416) 572-4474

For full tabular results, please visit our website at *www.ipsos.ca*. News Releases are available at: *http://www.ipsos-na.com/news/*

How to Calculate Bayesian Credibility Intervals

The calculation of credibility intervals assumes that Y has a binomial distribution conditioned on the parameter θ\, i.e., Y|θ~Bin(n,θ), where n is the size of our sample. In this setting, Y counts the number of "yes", or "1", observed in the sample, so that the sample mean ($\bar{y}$) is a natural estimate of the true population proportion θ. This model is often called the likelihood function, and it is a standard concept in both the Bayesian and the Classical framework. The Bayesian[1] statistics combines both the prior distribution and the likelihood function to create a posterior distribution. The posterior distribution represents our opinion about which are the plausible values for θ adjusted after observing the sample data. In reality, the posterior distribution is one's knowledge base updated using the latest survey information. For the prior and likelihood functions specified here, the posterior distribution is also a beta distribution (π(θ/y)~β(y+a,n-y+b)), but with updated hyper-parameters.

Our credibility interval for θ is based on this posterior distribution. As mentioned above, these intervals represent our belief about which are the most plausible values for θ given our updated knowledge base. There are different ways to calculate these intervals based on $\pi(\theta/y)$. Since we want only one measure of precision for all variables in the survey, analogous to what is done within the Classical framework, we will compute the largest possible credibility interval for any observed sample. The worst case occurs when we assume that a=1 and b=1 and $y = n/2$. Using a simple approximation of the posterior by the normal distribution, the 95% credibility interval is given by, approximately:

$$\bar{y} \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

..

[1] *Bayesian Data Analysis, Second Edition, Andrew Gelman, John B. Carlin, Hal S. Stern, Donald B. Rubin, Chapman & Hall/CRC | ISBN: 158488388X | 2003*

For this poll, the Bayesian Credibility Interval was adjusted using standard weighting design effect 1+L=1.3 to account for complex weighting[2]

Examples of credibility intervals for different base sizes are below.

Sample size	Credibility intervals
2,000	2.5
1,500	2.9
1,000	3.5
750	4.1
500	5.0
350	6.0
200	7.9
100	11.2

/

[2] *Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for unequal Pi . Journal of Official, Statistics, 8, 2, 183200.*