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Participants:

- 589 participants (47% male)
- 9 to 16 years old ($M = 11.48$ years, $SD = 1.30$)
- 27 Classes (10 secondary)

Social network condition:

- 15% of the participants is influence agent
- 4 or 6 influence agents per class (gender balanced)
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## Timeline

<table>
<thead>
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<th>Pre-measure</th>
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Control variables include sociometric measures labeled V1 to V6.
Mass media intervention

Social network intervention

$M = 15.69, SD = 20.60$

$t(1000) = 7.67, p < .001$

$M = 7.21, SD = 14.60$
Mass media intervention:

(M = 69.09, SD = 30.42)

Social network intervention:

(M = 40.20, SD = 32.72)

\[ t(306.73) = 8.88, \ p < .001 \]
Social network intervention

Mass media intervention

\[ M = 4.68, \ SD = 1.61 \]

\[ M = 3.46, \ SD = 1.97 \]

\[ t(739.75) = 9.54, \ p < .001 \]
Experiences with filming the content

➢ Quality of the content

Hi Thabo,

Vanmiddag heb ik naar het materiaal gekeken van [redacted] en helaas is het materiaal niet goed genoeg om [redacted]
Experiences with filming the content

- Quality of the content
- Appointments with the influence agents
Experiences with filming the content

- Quality of the content
- Appointments with the influence agents
- Following instructions

Oh, nice!
Conclusions

- No evidence that the social network intervention is more effective than the mass media intervention or control

- Explorations suggest that a social network intervention increases the perceived social norms

- Explorations suggest that the intervention message is better received in the social network intervention compared to the mass media intervention
Discussion

- Increase during the intervention in all conditions
  - No idea why the control group also increased

- Intervention period is (too) short
  - Investigate the effect of the separate vlogs

- The influence agents liked filming the vlogs
  - Needed some help in the filming process (primary school)
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