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If we believe media, teenagers sometimes seem to make questionable choices on SNS

'SNew sneaky hat-trend on Facebook is pedophile-paradise'

Students Confess Their Darkest Secrets on Facebook (Mashable.com)

Why?

• Lack of care?
• Lack of awareness?

Who should teach them?
The role of school education

- Emphasized by many authors (Livingstone & Haddon, 2009; Marwick et al., 2010, Patchin & Hinduja, 2010, ...)
- Topic formally included in curriculum in many countries
- But inconsistent implementation! (Safer Internet Forum, 2009; Sharples et al., 2009)
  - 42% of English teachers never lectures about online safety
  - Only 11% report to do so frequently
  - SNS often blocked in schools

Based on:
- Existing materials (Childfocus, Insafe 2011)
- Needs-analysis of teachers: focus group (Vanderhoven, Schellens, & Valcke, 2011)
- Risks: contact, content & commercial (DeMoor et al, 2008)
- Instructional guidelines:
  - Active learning
  - Authentic learning
  - Multiple perspectives
  - Collaborative learning

Developed materials

- 3 packages, one for each category of risk
  - Content risks
  - Contact risks
  - Commercial risks
- Teacher manual + student syllabus
- Secondary education
- Short-term: one hour/package

Main objectives:
- raising awareness
- changing unsafe behavior
- Evaluation necessary!

\[ \text{RQ1: Does a short term intervention in the form of one session about content, contact or commercial risks have an impact on the awareness and/or behavior of teenagers} \]
A course on content risks

A course on contact risks

A course on commercial risks

**Awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Content Risks</th>
<th>Contact Risks</th>
<th>Commercial Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A course on content risks</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course on contact risks</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course on commercial risks</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ:** Does a short term intervention in the form of one session about content, contact or commercial risks have an impact on the awareness of teenagers?

- All courses obtained their goal concerning raising awareness
- Even cross-content-effects (overlap)

But is raising awareness enough? What about behaviour?
- Media literacy interventions often have no impact on behaviour (Martens, 2010)

**Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Content Risks</th>
<th>Contact Risks</th>
<th>Commercial Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A course on content risks</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course on contact risks</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course on commercial risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible explanations:**
- Raising awareness is not enough to change behavior
- Short-term intervention not enough?

More research is needed to find critical factors to change behavior

→ design-based research

**2nd iteration:**
adapted version based on the previous results

**How to change behaviour?**

Theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1985)
Collaborative learning: important instructional strategy (Duffy & Cunningham, 1996)

- Counterproductive in this particular case?

Collaborative learning decreased in materials
Opportunities for individual reflection increased

RQ2: is there a difference in impact on awareness, attitudes and behaviour with regard to contact risks on SNS between a course with collaborative learning and a course with individual reflection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative learning</th>
<th>Individual reflection</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Introduction</td>
<td>introduction of the subject</td>
<td>No exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: simulated profile</td>
<td>together with a peer ↔ alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: class discussion</td>
<td>guided by the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: voting game</td>
<td>green and red cards ↔ write down individually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Theory</td>
<td>real-life examples + summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRETEST
Online survey, measuring:
• Awareness
• Behaviour

INTERRUPTION
1. No course (43 classes)
2. Course with collaborative learning (43 classes)
3. Course with individual reflection (25 classes)

POSTTEST
Online survey, measuring:
• Awareness
• Behaviour

Course with collaborative learning
Course with individual reflection

Awareness:
- Course with collaborative learning: .29*
- Course with individual reflection: .23*

Contact risks:
- Course with collaborative learning
- Course with individual reflection: .21*

(*p<0.02)
• All courses obtain their goal with regard to raising awareness
• Only a course with individual reflection has an impact on behaviour

Theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1985)

RQ3: Is there more impact on behaviour when involving parents (actively or passively)?

PASSIVE PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT | ACTIVE PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT | CONTROL
---|---|---
1: info parents | Information evening | /
2: homework (fake profile) | alone | Together with parents
3: course | Same course | No parents

PRETEST
Online survey, measuring:
• Awareness
• Behaviour

INTERVENTION
1. Control course (7 classes)
2. Course + homework with parents (9 classes)
3. Course + information evening for parents (6 classes)

POSTTEST
Online survey, measuring:
• Awareness
• Behaviour
Preliminary results

• All courses have an impact on awareness and behaviour (replication)
• Difficult to reach parents by organizing information evening
• Barely a different impact when involving parents

• Education can play an important role
• Raising awareness not enough
• Finding critical aspects important
• Impact evaluation necessary!

Thank you!
Any questions?

Ellen.Vanderhoven@ugent.be