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• Use of social network sites ↑
  • American teens (12-17): 73%
    (Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, & Zickuhr, 2010)
  • Flemish youngsters (12-18): 87%
    (Paulussen et al., 2010)

→ Concerns about privacy and security
‘New sneaky hat-trend on Facebook is pedophile-paradise’
Amke (18): “I think you’re better not posing with stupid things like beer. That is not ok if, for example, you’re boss is checking your profile”. (Apestaartjaren.be)
Amke (18), who was warning about employers checking profiles, appears to have a profile picture on which she is posing with two beers. “I’m young, so that’s not too inappropriate” she defends herself. (Apestaartjaren.be)
Students Confess Their Darkest Secrets on Facebook

"I don't wear make up to appeal to men. I wear make up so that I can look at myself in the mirror and actually think that the stranger staring back at me is beautiful."
Are media overreacting?

- Eg. Hate groups
- Eg. Adapted pictures, wrong status updates
- Eg. Sexting, sexual pictures
- Personal information on profile, privacy settings?

Target advertising, social advertising, data sharing with third companies

De Moor et al. (2008)

De Moor et al. (2008)
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
The role of school education

• Survey study showed indirect impact of school attention on unsafe behaviour (Vanderhoven, Schellens & Valcke, 2013)

• Few empirical intervention studies:
  • Impact on awareness
  • No impact on attitudes or behaviour

(Martens, 2010; Vanderhoven, Schellens & Valcke, submitted)
How to change behaviour?

Theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1985)

- Attitude
- Subjective norm
- Perceived behavioral control
- Perceived social pressure
- Intention
- Behavior

• Reputation related
• Opportunities
How can we integrate this knowledge in education?

1) decrease the social desirability of unsafe behaviour with peers as well
2) decrease the impact of the opinion of teenagers’ peers on their behaviour
• Collaborative learning: important instructional strategy (Duffy & Cunningham, 1996)
• Counterproductive in this particular case?

→ Collaborative learning decreased in materials
→ Opportunities for individual reflection increased
→ RQ: 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?
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**PRETEST**
Online survey, measuring:
- Awareness
- Attitudes
- Behaviour

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

**POSTTEST**
Online survey, measuring:
- Awareness
- Attitudes
- Behaviour
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- 1497 pupils
- 113 classes
- Aged 11 - 19 years (M=14.90, SD=1.88)
## procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Learning</th>
<th>Individual Reflection</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1: Introduction</strong></td>
<td>introduction of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2: simulated profile</strong></td>
<td>together with a peer ↔ alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3: class discussion</strong></td>
<td>guided by the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4: voting game</strong></td>
<td>green and red cards ↔ write down individually</td>
<td>No lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5: Theory</strong></td>
<td>real-life examples + summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Multilevel analyse: pupils in classes
• Controlled for pretest scores
• Impact of intervention on posttest scores:
  • Awareness
  • Attitudes
  • Behaviour
→ Bonferroni correction ($\alpha=.02$)
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→ RQ: 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?

→ YES
• All courses obtain their goal with regard to raising awareness
• Only a course with individual reflection has an impact on attitudes and behaviour
Implications

• For practice:
  • Interventions should not be developed without empirical and theoretical consideration
  • Individual reflection should be part of any intervention with regard to risks on SNS in secondary education
Implications

• For research:
  • Importance of evaluation studies
    • Are existing materials effective?
    • Is our finding extendable to other interventions about reputation related behaviour?
  • Importance of defining critical design guidelines
    • Other important aspects of materials?
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Theory of planned behavior (Azjen, 1985)

- Attitude
- Subjective norm
- Perceived behavioral control
- Intention
- Behavior

Content – Introduction – Framework – Procedure – Results – DISCUSSION

Peers

Parents
E.g., privacy-settings
Thank you!
Questions/remarks?

Ellen.Vanderhoven@ugent.be