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## Executive Summary

Social media has radically altered corporations' marketing of unhealthy products to young people. Social media influencers embody these shifts, and yet - particularly in an Aotearoa New Zealand context - we know little about the nature or extent of their practices. Influencers are part of covert, under the radar marketing strategies unique to social media. These blur lines between usergenerated and commercial content, making existing public health marketing regulations less effective. To explore these practices, we conducted a research project entitled Instagram influencers, unhealthy products, and covert marketing to young people (funded by a Health Research Council New Zealand Explorer Grant). Focusing on alcohol, tobacco, and vaping, this research used innovative methodologies to explore influencer marketing on Instagram.

The research project involved three stages: 1) a survey with young people; 2 ) an analysis of influencer accounts; and 3 ) interviews with influencers. This report focuses on the stage one survey, and presents findings that provide the context and background for the broader project. It outlines the methods employed in undertaking the survey, a description of the sample, and findings related to access to digital devices, internet access and use, social media activity, and respondents' engagement with influencers.

Methods: An online survey was developed, piloted and finalised containing 5 sections: demographics, internet access, social media use, engagement with social media influencers, and knowledge of unhealthy product marketing. The survey and data collection procedures were approved by Massey University ethics committee. Recruitment took place in high schools, universities and polytechnics in the lower North Island in 2021. There were 807 respondents who completed more than $70 \%$ of the survey. They were aged $16-20$ years (Mean $=17.1$ years). The sample included a range of gender identities ( $58 \%$ female, $33 \%$ male, $7 \%$ another gender, $2 \%$ did not give their gender) and ethnicities ( $65 \%$ Pākehā; 20\% Māori, $3 \%$ Pasifika, $11 \%$ another ethnicity).

Key findings: Respondents were highly engaged internet users. They accessed the internet through a range of digital devices both inside and outside of the home, and $98 \%$ reported using the internet several times a day or almost constantly. They were also highly engaged users of social media, having used an average of 7.5 platforms. The apps they used most frequently were YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, Facebook/Facebook Messenger, and TikTok; $87 \%$ of the sample reported using Instagram daily. Respondents were asked about social media influencers, and $83 \%$ said they followed at least one influencer, and also listed up to three names of influencers whose content they enjoy and follow regularly. A highly diverse group of 891 social media influencers were identified, including 698 influencers who were named once and 193 who were named two or more times. The top-named influencers were most often based in the USA, followed on Instagram and represented fashion and lifestyle types of influencers.

Conclusions: These findings demonstrate that young people in Aotearoa are connected online for much of their lives through a range of devices. They actively use multiple social media platforms, and many are highly engaged, using some platforms continuously throughout the day. Over four-fifths of the sample follow social media influencers, and named hundreds of influencer accounts as favourites, that were highly diverse with influencers who were based primarily outside Aotearoa.

## Introduction

Social media has radically altered corporations' marketing of unhealthy products to young people. Social media influencers embody these shifts, and yet - particularly in an Aotearoa New Zealand context - we know little about the nature or extent of their practices. Influencers are part of covert, under the radar marketing strategies unique to social media. These blur lines between usergenerated and commercial content, making existing public health marketing regulations less effective. To explore these practices, we conducted a research project that started with exploring the views of young people aged 16-20 years. We aimed to investigate young people's internet and social media use, the influencer accounts they follow, the online influencer content with which they engage, and their exposure to unhealthy product marketing (vape, alcohol and tobacco).

The results of the survey informed the next two stages of the research. This included collecting and analysing the content of popular influencers' accounts as identified by survey participants, including instances of unhealthy product content and marketing. The survey results also helped to identify New Zealand-based influencers who were approached to take part in the third stage of the research, namely in-depth interviews about what it means to be an influencer and views on unhealthy product marketing.

This report presents our survey methods and key survey data from the first stage of our project. It explores young peoples' hardware access, internet access and use, their social media use and activity, and the influencer accounts they follow - including the platforms they follow them on and their categorisation of the content that influencers post. Young peoples' perceived exposure to unhealthy product marketing and findings from stages two and three of the project are being disseminated through peer-reviewed journal articles.

## Survey methods

## Development of the survey

An online Qualtrics survey was developed to obtain information from young people aged 16-20 years. The survey questions were created after reviewing different online approaches to collecting self-report information about social media use in young people (e.g., Pew Research Centre (2018); Crothers et al. (2016)). The survey was piloted by a range of high school and university students not participating in the study, for clarity, length, and ease of use. Questions were subsequently revised based on the 'think-aloud' responses they gave to researchers as they went through the survey. The final survey consisted of five major sections: Demographics, internet access, social media use, engagement with social media influencers, and knowledge of unhealthy product marketing. A copy is provided in Appendix $A$.

## Procedure and Recruitment

During March - July 2021, students aged 16-20 years in 19 high schools, two universities and two polytechnics in the lower North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand were invited to complete a webbased survey. A member of the research team gave in-person presentations to classes or year group assemblies in 17 schools that were located in cities, towns and rural areas ( 11 greater Wellington region, 4 Manawatū region, 4 Taranaki region). Two schools were sent a recorded video presentation that introduced the research for students to watch due to restrictions around the Covid-19 pandemic and schools not hosting visitors on site.

Within universities, recruitment posters were placed around the campus (toilet blocks, cafes, main thoroughfares etc.). Posters outlined details of the research and invited students to participate in the study by scanning a QR code on the poster, which took them directly to the online survey (see Appendix B). It also informed them of the prize draw and Human Ethics Committee approval details. Researchers also spoke to 7 undergraduate classes in media studies, psychology, and health, explaining the details of the study and eligibility criteria. These details as well as a link to the survey were uploaded on relevant online course sites.

The survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Participants had the option of leaving the survey incomplete and returning to it later. At the end of the survey participants could provide their details (on a separate link) to enter a draw for one of three $\$ 100 \mathrm{gift}$ vouchers. Contact information was deleted once the draw had been conducted.

## Ethical considerations

Survey participants were fully informed prior to taking part. The information sheet outlining the aims of the study and what participation would involve was on the survey landing page, and participants were required to agree to take part under these conditions before they were able to start the survey. Participation in the survey was voluntary and anonymous, participants had the option of pulling out of the survey at any stage, and skipping any question they chose not to answer. Details entered for the prize draw were recorded and stored separately from participation responses so identifying information could not be linked to survey responses. The study was approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee (ID 4000023065).

## SECTION A: THE SURVEY SAMPLE: DEMOGRAPHIC AND DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

## Sample size and completion rates

Data for the survey demographics were calculated including all participants who had completed at least one section of our key areas of interest (influencers and marketing). Participants who had completed at least one of these sections had completed $73 \%$ of the survey and were included in all further analyses. There were 807 participants ( $69.3 \%$ ) in this group. Analyses were undertaken to compare the demographics of this group with those who dropped out partway through ( $n=357$, $30.7 \%$ ) and results showed that these groups did not systematically differ from the 807 participants. The numbers of participants who completed each section of the survey are shown in Table 1 below.

## Table 1: Completion rates for the survey

| Survey stage | Percentage | Number of <br> responses |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Opened survey, but didn't progress | $20.3 \%$ | 236 |
| Completed only demographic section | $2.5 \%$ | 29 |
| Completed demographic and internet section | $4.2 \%$ | 49 |
| Completed demographic, internet, and social media sections | $3.7 \%$ | 43 |
| Completed demographic, internet, social media, and influencers sections | $1.9 \%$ | 22 |
| Completed all sections | $67.4 \%$ | 785 |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | 1164 |

## Sample age, gender, ethnicity, educational institution, and geographical location

The sample was predominately aged under 18, as set out in Table 2. The mean age was 17.1 years.

## Table 2: Age of sample

| Age | Number of <br> Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | 295 | $36.6 \%$ |
| 17 | 278 | $34.4 \%$ |
| 18 | 115 | $14.3 \%$ |
| 19 | 67 | $8.3 \%$ |
| 20 | 39 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Under 18 | 573 | $71.0 \%$ |
| 18 and over | 221 | $27.4 \%$ |
| Missing | 13 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | 100.0 |

The gender of participants is outlined in Table 3, where those who selected more than one gender or selected a gender minority were categorised as "gender diverse". As shown, over half of the sample were female (58\%), $33 \%$ identified as male, $6 \%$ identified as non-binary, transgender, fa'afafine, intersex or something else, with $3 \%$ not yet sure of their gender or preferred not to say.

## Table 3: Gender of sample

| Gender | Number of <br> Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Girl/Woman | 469 | 58.1 |
| Boy/Man | 267 | 33.1 |
| Gender diverse | 49 | 6.1 |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 22 | 2.7 |
| Total | 807 | 100.0 |

An overview of the ethnicity of the sample is provided in Table 4. For the purposes of this summary, ethnicity was calculated based on taking all participants that had selected multiple ethnicities and first categorising any who mentioned Māori as "Māori" and then any who mentioned a Pacific Island ethnicity as "Pasifika" and then anyone who mentioned Pākehā as "Pākehā". Anyone who didn't mention any of those ethnicities was grouped and categorised as other. For example, if someone selected Pākehā, Māori, and Cook Island for their ethnicity, they would have been categorised as "Māori" in this simplification. This method for recording the data suggests over half the sample were Pākehā/NZ European (65\%), 20\% were Māori, and 3.3\% Pasifika. The remainder were classified as "other" (11.4\%), which included ethnicities such as Chinese and Indian, while a very small minority preferred not to provide their ethnicity (1\%).

Table 4: Ethnicity of sample

| Ethnicity | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pākehā/NZ European | 522 | 64.7 |
| Māori | 160 | 19.8 |
| Pasifika | 27 | 3.3 |
| Other | 92 | 11.4 |
| Prefer not to say | 6 | 0.7 |
| Total | 807 | 100.0 |

The educational institution attended is outlined in Table 5, which shows the sample is dominated by high school students (77\%).

Table 5: Educational institution of sample

| Institution | Number of <br> Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| High School | 618 | $76.5 \%$ |
| University | 189 | $23.5 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | 100.0 |

The school decile for high school students is provided in Table 6. Missing data represents schools where no governmental decile information is available (for example, private schools). The deciles have been grouped low, medium, and high. This tripartite categorisation suggests, where decile information is available, the sample is skewed towards higher (36\%) over lower (20\%) decile schools, with most schools classed as medium (44\%).

Table 6: School decile of sample

| Institution | Number of <br> Responses | Total <br> Percentage | Valid <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low (1-5) | 112 | $18.1 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ |
| Medium (6-8) | 246 | $39.8 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ |
| High (9-10) | 201 | $32.5 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ |
| Total | 559 | $90.4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Missing Decile | 59 | $9.6 \%$ |  |
| Total | 618 | $100.0 \%$ |  |

Participants were asked to self-report where their household was located, i.e., in an urban (city/town) or in a rural area. The results, presented in Table 7, suggest the majority of our sample of young people live in urban areas (69\%).

Table 7: Geographical location of household

| Institution | Number of Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Urban | 557 | $69.0 \%$ |
| Rural | 170 | $21.1 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 80 | $9.9 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | 100.0 |

## SECTION B: HARDWARE ACCESS, INTERNET ACCESS, AND INTERNET USE

Overall, our survey suggests that our sample of young people are highly engaged internet users with access through a range of hardware devices both inside and outside of the home.

Table 8 shows responses to our first question regarding access to four different types of device within the household where participants currently live. The table excludes six of the 807 participants who answered, "Don't know/prefer not to say". Almost everyone reported having access to a mobile phone (99\%) and a desktop/laptop computer (97\%), although access does not necessarily indicate personal ownership of the device by the young person.

Table 8: Access to hardware within the home

| Device | Number of <br> Responses | Total <br> Percentage | Percentage of <br> Cases |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mobile Phone | 793 | $33.6 \%$ | $99.0 \%$ |
| Desktop/laptop | 780 | $33.1 \%$ | $97.4 \%$ |
| Gaming Console | 413 | $17.5 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |
| iPad or tablet | 374 | $15.8 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |
| Total | 2360 | $100.0 \%$ |  |

Table 9 summarises the Internet connection available to participants in their homes. Response categories for this question included: broadband (including Wi-Fi), mobile phone data, dialup/phone modem, "other" (with open text response), cannot connect, and don't know/prefer not to say. Participants could choose more than one category. Table 9 suggests access is primarily via broadband and mobile phone data. Note that the survey was completed at a time when dial up services were ending in Aotearoa New Zealand, with Vodafone/One withdrawing its last dial up plans in May 2021.

Table 9: Type of Internet connection in the home

| Connection Type | Number of <br> Responses | Total <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Broadband \& mobile phone data | 448 | $55.5 \%$ |
| Broadband (only) | 272 | $33.7 \%$ |
| All connection types selected | 35 | $4.34 \%$ |
| Cannot connect at home | 19 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Mobile phone data (only) | 12 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Broadband and dialup | 7 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Other connection | 6 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 5 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Dialup (only) | 2 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Mobile phone data and dialup | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |

Participants were asked to specify the capacity of their main source of Internet connection, with the following response categories: Unlimited, capped (with an open text response to specify the limit), and don't know/prefer not to say. Table 10 indicates most participants ( $80 \%$ ) have access to an unlimited data plan for their main Internet connection.

## Table 10: Capacity of main Internet connection

| Capacity | Number of Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Unlimited | 648 | $80.3 \%$ |
| Capped | 66 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 93 | $11.5 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |

Participants were asked whether they had access to the Internet outside of the home through wireless handheld devices such as a mobile phone or a tablet. Table 11 demonstrates that 95\% of the sample had mobile internet access.

Table 11: Access to the internet outside of the home

| Access outside home | Number of Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 769 | $95.3 \%$ |
| No | 17 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 21 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |

Participants were asked how often they used the Internet, either on a computer, tablet, or a mobile phone. Results are shown in Table 12 and indicate $98 \%$ of our sample use the internet several times a day or almost constantly.

Table 12: Frequency of Internet use

| How often use Internet? | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 470 | $58.2 \%$ | $58.2 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 321 | $39.8 \%$ | $98.0 \%$ |
| About once a day | 2 | $0.2 \%$ | $98.2 \%$ |
| Several times a week | 2 | $0.2 \%$ | $98.4 \%$ |
| Less often | 1 | $0.1 \%$ | $98.5 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 11 | $1.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |  |

## SECTION C: SOCIAL MEDIA USE

As with use of the Internet generally, overall, our survey suggests that the sample of young people are highly engaged users of social media across a variety of different sites and messaging apps. In this section we identify the variety of social media used by participants and outline differences in the number of sites used across different demographic groups. We also discuss participants' favourite sites and sites they use but would prefer not to.

## Variety of social media sites used and frequency of engagement

Participants were asked to name all the social media and messaging apps that they have used at any stage (not necessarily currently). Table 13 and Figure 1 outline the top sites named and the proportion of the sample that use or had used them (percentage of cases). Table 13 and Figure 1 exclude 7 of the 807 participants who answered that they had never used any social media sites at all. YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, Facebook/Facebook Messenger, and TikTok are most popular.

Table 13: Top social media sites participants have ever used

| Social media Site | Frequency | Percentage <br> of cases |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| YouTube | 772 | $96.5 \%$ |
| Instagram | 768 | $96.0 \%$ |
| Snapchat | 710 | $88.8 \%$ |
| Facebook Messenger | 689 | $86.1 \%$ |
| Facebook | 683 | $85.4 \%$ |
| TikTok | 621 | $77.6 \%$ |
| Pinterest | 497 | $62.1 \%$ |
| WhatsApp | 412 | $51.5 \%$ |
| Twitter (now "X") | 358 | $44.8 \%$ |
| Reddit | 264 | $33.0 \%$ |
| LinkedIn | 72 | $9.0 \%$ |
| Signal | 18 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Other | 63 | $7.9 \%$ |
| Total | 5927 |  |

Figure 1: Top social media sites participants had ever used (percentage of cases)


The following six tables (Tables 14-19) describe the frequency of use for the top six sites and messaging apps identified in Table 13. Figure 2 summarises the percentage of each platform's user base that visits each site at least once per day. On this metric, the sites that attract the most engagement from their user base are Instagram (89.8\%), Snapchat (82.9\%), and TikTok (81.4\%), while YouTube - the site with highest overall users (96.5\%) - is lower in engagement 65.9\%). Facebook (8.2\%), Snapchat (6.8\%), and TikTok (6.6\%) have the highest percentage of ex-users.

Table 14: Frequency of use for YouTube (96.5\% usage)

| YouTube users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 120 | $15.6 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 215 | $27.8 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |
| About once a day | 174 | $22.5 \%$ | $65.9 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 147 | $19.0 \%$ | $84.9 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 67 | $8.7 \%$ | $93.6 \%$ |
| Less often | 35 | $4.6 \%$ | $98.2 \%$ |
| No longer use | 14 | $1.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 772 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used YouTube | 28 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Table 15: Frequency of use for Instagram (96.0\% usage)

| Instagram users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 175 | $22.8 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 444 | $57.8 \%$ | $80.6 \%$ |
| About once a day | 71 | $9.2 \%$ | $89.8 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 38 | $4.9 \%$ | $94.7 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 10 | $1.3 \%$ | $96.0 \%$ |
| Less often | 15 | $2.0 \%$ | $98.0 \%$ |
| No longer use | 15 | $2.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 768 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used Instagram | 32 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Table 16: Frequency of use for Snapchat (88.8\% usage)

| Instagram users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 243 | $34.2 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 267 | $37.6 \%$ | $71.8 \%$ |
| About once a day | 79 | $11.1 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 31 | $4.4 \%$ | $87.3 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 19 | $2.7 \%$ | $90.0 \%$ |
| Less often | 23 | $3.2 \%$ | $93.2 \%$ |
| No longer use | 48 | $6.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 710 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used Snapchat | 90 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Table 17: Frequency of use for Facebook Messenger (86.1\% usage)

| FB Messenger users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 57 | $8.3 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 177 | $25.7 \%$ | $34.0 \%$ |
| About once a day | 160 | $23.2 \%$ | $57.2 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 151 | $21.9 \%$ | $79.1 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 50 | $7.2 \%$ | $86.3 \%$ |
| Less often | 59 | $8.6 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| Don't know | 2 | $0.3 \%$ | $95.2 \%$ |
| No longer use | 33 | $4.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 689 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used FB Messenger | 111 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Table 18: Frequency of use for Facebook (85.4\% usage)

| Facebook users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 39 | $5.7 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 175 | $25.7 \%$ | $31.4 \%$ |
| About once a day | 171 | $25.0 \%$ | $56.4 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 115 | $16.8 \%$ | $73.2 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 67 | $9.8 \%$ | $83.0 \%$ |
| Less often | 59 | $8.6 \%$ | $91.6 \%$ |
| Don't know | 1 | $0.2 \%$ | $91.8 \%$ |
| No longer use | 56 | $8.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 683 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used Facebook | 117 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Table 19: Frequency of use for TikTok (77.6\% usage)

| TikTok users | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Almost constantly | 180 | $29.0 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |
| Several times a day | 234 | $37.7 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| About once a day | 91 | $14.7 \%$ | $81.4 \%$ |
| A few times a week | 41 | $6.6 \%$ | $88.0 \%$ |
| Every few weeks | 17 | $2.7 \%$ | $90.7 \%$ |
| Less often | 17 | $2.7 \%$ | $93.4 \%$ |
| No longer use | 41 | $6.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 621 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Never used TikTok | 179 |  |  |
| Total | 800 |  |  |

Figure 2: Percentage of the user base for top six sites that visits the site at least once per day


The final frequency of engagement table (Table 20) provides a holistic overview of social media engagement across the whole social media ecology as identified in Table 13. Table 20 outlines the number of users that visit each site identified in Table 13 at least once per day and expresses this as a percentage of the total number of social media users ( $n=800$ ). Instagram, Snapchat, YouTube and TikTok, and to a lesser but still significant extent Facebook and Facebook Messenger, are most often visited. Pinterest, Twitter (now "X"), WhatsApp, and Reddit engage a much smaller minority of users, while Signal and Linkedln barely register as sites visited regularly.

Table 20: Percentage of social media users that visit the site at least once per day

| Platform/app | Responses | Percentage of social <br> media users |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Instagram | 690 | $86.7 \%$ |
| Snapchat | 589 | $74.0 \%$ |
| YouTube | 509 | $63.9 \%$ |
| TikTok | 505 | $63.4 \%$ |
| Facebook Messenger | 394 | $49.5 \%$ |
| Facebook | 385 | $48.4 \%$ |
| Pinterest | 116 | $14.6 \%$ |
| Twitter | 102 | $12.8 \%$ |
| WhatsApp | 100 | $12.6 \%$ |
| Reddit | 66 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Signal | 9 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Linkedln | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |

## Demographic differences in the number of sites participants had ever used

The total number of social media sites and messaging apps each participant had ever used was calculated and the results are provided in Table 21 and Figure 3. The number of sites ever used ranged from zero to fourteen. The mean was 7.42 and the median was 8 . The table also includes a trichotomised site count which groups social media users into low (1-5), medium (6-9) and high (1014 ), in terms of the number of sites ever used.

Table 21: Number of social media sites/messaging apps ever used

| Number of Platform/apps used | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative <br> Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 7 | $0.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| 1 | 4 | $0.5 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| 2 | 9 | $1.1 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| 3 | 19 | $2.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| 4 | 33 | $4.1 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| 5 | 55 | $6.8 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ |
| 6 | 111 | $13.8 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ |
| 7 | 149 | $18.5 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
| 8 | 172 | $21.3 \%$ | $69.3 \%$ |
| 9 | 123 | $15.2 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ |
| 10 | 81 | $10.0 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ |
| 11 | 33 | $4.1 \%$ | $98.6 \%$ |
| 12 | 6 | $0.7 \%$ | $99.4 \%$ |
| 13 | 5 | $0.5 \%$ | $99.9 \%$ |
| 14 | 1 | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Low (1-5) | 120 | $15.0 \%$ |  |
| Medium (6-9) | 555 | $69.4 \%$ |  |
| High (10-14) | 125 | $15.6 \%$ |  |
| Total | 800 | $100.0 \%$ |  |

Figure 3: Frequency of social media sites/messaging apps ever used


The trichotomised site count variable (low, medium, high) shown in Table 21 was used to explore differences in the number of sites ever used across different sociodemographic groups. A series of Chi-square analyses were undertaken to analyse differences in number of sites ever used by age, gender, school decile, ethnicity, and geographic location. Results are provided in Tables 22-26.

As shown in Table 22, participants who were aged over 18 were significantly more likely to have used a greater number of social media platforms and messaging apps, as we might expect.

Table 22: Differences in number of social media sites ever used across age groups

| Age analysis |  | Social media site count |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Under 18 | Count | 92 | 398 | 78 | 568 |
|  | \% within age | 16.2\% | 70.1\% | 13.7\% | 100.0\% |
| 18 and over | Count | 26 | 147 | 46 | 219 |
|  | \% within age | 11.9\% | 67.1\% | 21.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Count | 118 | 545 | 124 | 787 |
|  | \% of total | 15.0\% | 69.3\% | 15.8\% | 100.0\% |

Chi square ( $2, \mathrm{~N}=787$ ) $=7.48, \mathrm{p}=.02$, Cramers $\mathrm{V}=.10$

There were also significant differences in number of sites ever used across the gender groups, as shown in Table 23. Participants in the diverse gender identity category were more likely to report using more sites, while male participants were more likely to report using fewer sites than females or other genders.

Table 23: Differences in number of social media sites ever used across gender groups

| Gender analysis |  | Social media site count |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Girl/women | Count | 45 | 353 | 70 | 468 |
|  | \% within gender | 9.6\% | 75.4\% | 15.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Boy/man | Count | 63 | 166 | 36 | 265 |
|  | \% within gender | 23.8\% | 62.6\% | 13.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Diverse | Count | 9 | 25 | 13 | 47 |
|  | \% within gender | 19.1\% | 53.2\% | 27.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Count | 117 | 544 | 119 | 780 |
|  | \% of total | 15.0\% | 69.7\% | 15.3\% | 100.0\% |

Chi square (4, $\mathrm{N}=780$ ) $=34.37, \mathrm{p}<.001$, Cramers V $=.15$

There were no significant differences in number of social media sites used by high school students across the different school decile groups, as shown in Table 24.

Table 24: Differences in number of social media sites ever used across decile groups

| School decile analysis |  | Social media site count |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Low decile | Count | 18 | 83 | 10 | 111 |
|  | \% within decile | 16.2\% | 74.8\% | 9.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Medium decile | Count | 47 | 160 | 38 | 245 |
|  | \% within decile | 19.2\% | 65.3\% | 15.5\% | 100.0\% |
| High Decile | Count | 26 | 143 | 27 | 196 |
|  | \% within decile | 13.3\% | 73.0\% | 13.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Count | 91 | 386 | 75 | 552 |
|  | \% of total | 16.5\% | 69.9\% | 13.6\% | 100.0\% |

Chi square (4, $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) $=6.08, \mathrm{p}=.19$, Cramers V $=.07$

Number of social media sites ever used varied significantly by ethnicity, as shown in Table 25. Pasifika participants were more likely to report using fewer social media sites than other ethnicity groups.

## Table 25: Differences in number of social media sites ever used across ethnicity groups

| Ethnicity analysis |  | Social media site count |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Pākehā | Count | 75 | 364 | 81 | 520 |
|  | \% within ethnicity | 14.4\% | 70.0\% | 15.6\% | 100.0\% |
| Māori | Count | 17 | 119 | 22 | 158 |
|  | \% within ethnicity | 10.8\% | 75.3\% | 13.9\% | 100.0\% |
| Pasifika | Count | 9 | 15 | 2 | 26 |
|  | \% within ethnicity | 34.6\% | 57.7\% | 7.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Other | Count | 19 | 54 | 18 | 91 |
|  | \% within ethnicity | 20.9\% | 59.3\% | 19.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Count | 120 | 552 | 123 | 795 |
|  | \% of total | 15.1\% | 69.4\% | 15.5\% | 100.0\% |

Chi square (6, $\mathrm{N}=795$ ) $=15.72, \mathrm{p}=.02$, Cramers V $=.10$

Finally, Table 26 suggests that number of social media sites ever used varied significantly by geographical location. Participants located in rural localities reported using fewer social media and messaging apps than those located in urban localities.

Table 26: Differences in number of social media sites used across geographical location groups

| Urban/rural analysis |  | Social media site count |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low | Medium | High |  |
| Urban | Count | 70 | 386 | 99 | 555 |
|  | \% within location | 12.6\% | 69.5\% | 17.8\% | 100.0\% |
| Rural | Count | 34 | 117 | 17 | 168 |
|  | \% within location | 20.2\% | 67.1\% | 10.1\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Count | 104 | 503 | 116 | 723 |
|  | \% of total | 14.4\% | 69.6\% | 16.0\% | 100.0\% |

Chi square ( $2, \mathrm{~N}=723$ ) = 10.00, $\mathrm{p}=.007$, Cramers V $=.12$

## Participants' social media and messaging app preferences

Participants were asked their favourite social media site or app to visit and use. Responses are shown below (including instances where more than one social media site was mentioned).

Table 27: Participants' favourite social media site or app

| Social media site/app | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instagram | 217 | 26.1\% |
| Snapchat | 209 | 25.2\% |
| TikTok | 126 | 15.2\% |
| YouTube | 99 | 11.9\% |
| Pinterest | 30 | 3.6\% |
| Reddit | 19 | 2.3\% |
| Messenger | 14 | 1.7\% |
| Twitter | 13 | 1.6\% |
| No favourite | 12 | 1.4\% |
| Facebook | 11 | 1.3\% |
| Discord | 10 | 1.2\% |
| Instagram and Snapchat | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Don't' know/prefer not to say | 6 | 1.2\% |
| WhatsApp | 6 | 0.7\% |
| Snapchat and TikTok | 6 | 0.7\% |
| Instagram and TikTok | 5 | 0.6\% |
| Tumblr | 4 | 0.5\% |
| Instagram Snapchat and TikTok | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Line | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Porn Hub | 2 | 0.2\% |
| WeChat | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Instagram and Twitter | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Instagram and YouTube | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Pinterest and TikTok | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Pinterest and YouTube | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Instagram and Pinterest | 2 | 0.2\% |
| All sites are favourite | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Discord and Xbox app | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Gibbo Hub | 1 | 0.1\% |
| No site specified | 1 | 0.1\% |
| QQ | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Reddit and 4chan | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Snapchat and Messenger | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Snapchat Instagram Messenger and TikTok | 1 | 0.1\% |
| The Hub | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Tumblr and Twitter | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Twitch | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Twitch and Youtube | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Xbox app | 1 | 0.1\% |
| YouTube and TikTok | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Total |  | 100.0\% |

The total times a social media site was mentioned was counted, which showed that Instagram was mentioned the most often, followed by Snapchat, TikTok, and YouTube as shown in Table 28 and Figure 3.

Table 28: Summary of participants' most mentioned favourite social media site

| Platform/app | No. times mentioned |
| :--- | :---: |
| Instagram | 242 |
| Snapchat | 230 |
| TikTok | 144 |
| YouTube | 105 |
| Pinterest | 36 |
| Reddit | 20 |
| Facebook Messenger | 16 |
| Twitter | 16 |
| Facebook | 11 |

Figure 4: Frequency of participants' most mentioned favourite social media site


Participants were then asked to name any social media sites or apps they use even though they do not enjoy visiting them. Findings are shown in Table 29 below (including instances where more than one social media site or app was mentioned). Many participants ( $n=375$ ) had no sites or apps in this category, but the standout answer for site used despite not enjoying the experience is Facebook ( $n=163$ ).

Table 29: Participants' social media sites or apps they use but do not enjoy

| Sites use but don't enjoy | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None | 375 | 46.8\% |
| Facebook | 163 | 20.3\% |
| Instagram | 62 | 7.7\% |
| Snapchat | 49 | 6.1\% |
| TikTok | 25 | 3.1\% |
| Twitter | 17 | 2.1\% |
| Messenger | 14 | 1.7\% |
| WhatsApp | 14 | 1.7\% |
| Yes | 14 | 1.7\% |
| Don't know/Prefer not to say | 9 | 1.1\% |
| Pinterest | 8 | 1.0\% |
| Majority | 5 | 0.6\% |
| Facebook and Messenger | 4 | 0.5\% |
| Messenger and WhatsApp | 4 | 0.5\% |
| Facebook and Instagram | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Facebook and Snapchat | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Instagram and Snapchat | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Linkedln | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Reddit | 3 | 0.4\% |
| YouTube | 3 | 0.4\% |
| Discord | 2 | 0.2\% |
| Capcut | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Facebook and WhatsApp | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Facebook Instagram and Youtube | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Gibblatron.com | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Google classroom | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Instagram and TikTok | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Instagram and Youtube | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Line | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Outlook | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Porn hub | 1 | 0.1\% |
| School Apps | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Snapchat and Messenger | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Stories | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Telegram | 1 | 0.1\% |
| The hub | 1 | 0.1\% |
| WeChat | 1 | 0.1\% |
| WhatsApp and WeChat | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Zootube | 1 | 0.1\% |
| Total |  | 100.0\% |

The total number of times a social media site that participants use but don't enjoy was counted, and results are shown in Table 30 and Figure 4 below. While the site most frequently mentioned was Facebook by a considerable margin, Instagram and Snapchat also feature prominently in the list.

Table 30: Summary of sites participants used but did not enjoy

| Site use but don't enjoy | \# times mentioned |
| :--- | :---: |
| Facebook | 175 |
| Instagram | 71 |
| Snapchat | 56 |
| TikTok | 26 |
| Facebook Messenger | 23 |
| Twitter | 17 |
| WhatsApp | 20 |
| Pinterest | 8 |

Figure 5: Frequency of sites participants used but did not enjoy


## SECTION D: SOCIAL MEDIA INFLUENCERS

In this section we report on the influencers that our participants followed, or considered their content important in their online lives. Our approach was to be as inclusive as possible in obtaining this information. We aimed to capture, for the first time in Aotearoa New Zealand, the online personas that young people themselves considered "influential", including more "micro influencers" who may only have a few thousand followers.

Before answering any of the questions in this section of the survey, young people received the following information, which was developed from the literature and through survey pre-testing (see page 5, "Development of the survey" section):

In the next section, we're going to ask you some questions about social media influencers. Who are social media influencers? Influencers aren't just on Instagram--they're people who can be found on other social media including Facebook, YouTube, Tik Tok and so on. Across different platforms, influencers have some things in common. They tend to:

- have built some form of reputation for their knowledge, opinions, interest, or expertise on a specific topic
- regularly produce engaging content on their preferred social media channels
- have followings of enthusiastic people who engage with their content
- usually have large followings, from a few thousand to millions of people

We're also interested in who YOU find influential even if those people have fewer followers. Celebrities can also be influencers if you find them influential.

The findings in this section were developed from responses to survey questions presented following this introductory information.

## Frequency of engagement with influencers

Participants were initially asked if they followed or regularly saw content from any social media influencers on social media. Table 31 provides an overview of participant responses and suggests that social media influencers form a part of many of our participants' experiences on social media (83\%).

Table 31: Frequency of participants engagement with influencers

| Follow an influencer or |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| regularly see their content? | Number of Responses | Percentage |
| Yes | 665 | $82.9 \%$ |
| No | 88 | $11.0 \%$ |
| Don't know/prefer not to say | 49 | $6.1 \%$ |
| Total | 807 | $100.0 \%$ |

Chi-Square analyses were undertaken to examine if sociodemographic differences in engagement with influencers were evident, but no statistically significant effects were found for age, gender, school decile, ethnicity, or location.

The 665 participants who answered yes in Table 31 were asked to name up to three influencers that they could recall. 1571 responses (out of a potential of 1995) were provided. Answers that did not relate to identifiable influencer accounts were removed, including brands named (e.g., "Red Bull"), organisations (e.g., "New Zealand Police"), and generic answers (e.g., "celebrities"), resulting in 1505 named influencer accounts. After accounting for those named twice or more, 891 different influencers were identified, which included 698 named once and 193 named two or more times.

## Diversity of influencers engaged with by participants

Findings show that participants engage with a highly diverse group of social media personalities operating accounts/profiles that they consider to be influential in their online social worlds. This diversity is difficult to summarise. However, the top twenty influencer accounts identified are outlined in Table 32 in descending order, including their Instagram follower count as of March 2022 (the top platform for influencer engagement - see Table 34) and their nationality. This top twenty list tends towards influencers with higher follower counts, including both established celebrities who actively use social media through to those who became well known through social media.

## Table 32: Top twenty influencer accounts identified

| Influencer | \# of participant <br> followers | Instagram follower <br> count Mar. 2022 | Nationality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Emma Chamberlain | 45 | $13,500,000$ | USA |
| Kendall Jenner | 29 | $181,000,000$ | USA |
| Kylie Jenner | 28 | $257,000,000$ | USA |
| Addison Rae | 18 | $39,700,000$ | USA |
| Billie Eilish | 15 | $90,000,000$ | USA |
| Kim Kardashian | 14 | $243,000,000$ | USA |
| David Dobrik | 14 | $12,900,000$ | USA |
| Tana Mongeau | 13 | $5,700,000$ | USA |
| KSI (Olajide Williams) | 12 | $10,400,000$ | UK |
| PewDiePie (Felix Kjellberg) | 12 | $21,600,000$ | Sweden |
| The Sidemen (7 members, incl. KSI) | 11 | $13,300,000$ | UK |
| Bretman Rock (Bretman Sacayanan) | 11 | $17,500,000$ | Philippines |
| Markiplier (Mark Fischbach) | 10 | $9,100,000$ | USA |
| The Rock (Dwayne Johnson) | $266,000,000$ | USA |  |
| Olivia Neill | 9 | 732,000 | Ireland |
| Anna Paul | 9 | 719,000 | Australia |
| Bella Hadid | 9 | $44,800,000$ | USA |
| Sarah's Day (Sarah Stevenson) | $9,200,000$ | Australia |  |
| Zendaya (Zendaya Coleman) | $103,000,000$ | USA |  |
| Harry Styles | $99,000,000$ | UK |  |

We examined the top influencers identified by participants from different sociodemographic groups, and some differentiation in influencers followed was evident. An example is provided Table 33.

Table 33: Top ten influencer accounts identified by educational institution

| Educational Institution | Influencer | \# of followers (within institution) | Instagram follower count Mar. 2022 | Nationality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The Sidemen (7 members, incl. KSI) | 8 | 13,300,000 | UK |
|  | Addison Rae | 5 | 39,700,000 | USA |
|  | David Dobrik | 5 | 12,900,000 | USA |
|  | Jacksepticeye (Seán McLoughlin) | 5 | 7,500,000 | Ireland |
|  | Kylie Jenner | 5 | 257,000,000 | USA |
|  | LeBron James | 4 | 96,600,000 | USA |
|  | Anna Paul | 3 | 719,000 | Australia |
|  | Kim Kardashian | 3 | 243,000,000 | USA |
|  | Markiplier (Mark Fischbach) | 3 | 9,100,000 | USA |
|  | The Ace Family | 2 | 1,200,000 | USA |
|  | Emma Chamberlain | 13 | 13,500,000 | USA |
|  | Kylie Jenner | 11 | 257,000,000 | USA |
|  | Kendall Jenner | 9 | 181,000,000 | USA |
|  | Billie Eilish | 7 | 90,000,000 | USA |
|  | PewDiePie (Felix Kjellberg) | 7 | 21,600,000 | Sweden |
|  | Bella Hadid | 5 | 44,800,000 | USA |
|  | David Dobrik | 5 | 12,900,000 | USA |
|  | Kim Kardashian | 5 | 243,000,000 | USA |
|  | Markiplier (Mark Fischbach) | 5 | 9,100,000 | USA |
|  | Tana Mongeau | 5 | 5,700,000 | USA |
|  | Emma Chamberlain | 9 | 13,500,000 | USA |
|  | Kendall Jenner | 8 | 181,000,000 | USA |
|  | Addison Rae | 7 | 39,700,000 | USA |
|  | KSI (Olajide Williams) | 6 | 10,400,000 | UK |
|  | Tana Mongeau | 6 | 5,700,000 | USA |
|  | Mia Khalifa | 5 | 25,200,000 | USA |
|  | NELK Boys | 5 | 4,100,000 | USA |
|  | The Rock (Dwayne Johnson) | 4 | 266,000,000 | USA |
|  | Hannah Barret/Laity | 4 | 93,200 | NZ |
|  | Lana Rhodes | 4 | 16,500,000 | UK |
|  | Emma Chamberlain | 18 | 13,500,000 | USA |
|  | Kendall Jenner | 6 | 9,100,000 | USA |
|  | Sarah's Day (Sarah Stevenson) | 4 | 1,200,000 | Australia |
|  | Cody Ko | 3 | 2,000,000 | Canada |
|  | David Dobrik | 3 | 12,900,000 | USA |
|  | Devon Lee Carlson | 3 | 1,400,000 | USA |
|  | James Charles | 3 | 24,800,000 | USA |
|  | Jazz Thornton | 3 | 138,000 | NZ |
|  | Lil Nas X (Montero Lamar Hill) | 3 | 11,100,000 | USA |
|  | Sam Robinson | 3 | 650,000 | Australia |

Note that for Table 33, where the number of followers for the institution is tied, inclusion in the top ten list was based upon the influencers' overall follower count in the sample as a whole.

## Platforms on which influencers are engaged with and followed

After naming up to three influencers, participants were asked to name each social media platform where they followed them, or where they routinely came across their content. The question offered a pre-selected list of sites, with "other" also being an option (with an invitation to name the site in an open text response). Multiple answers were possible, and many participants engaged with influencers and/or their content across more than one platform. Table 34 summarises participant responses, showing the number of yes responses to each platform, summed across the three nominated influencers and then across the sample. Importantly, these are counts of responses not of respondents. The number of respondents is hard to summarise as it varies by influencer and platform. The response frequencies are shown in descending order, with Instagram, YouTube, and TikTok being the top sites where influencers are followed and/or their content seen.

Table 34: Platforms where influencers were followed and/or their content seen

| Platform | Number of Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Instagram | 1226 | $36.4 \%$ |
| YouTube | 842 | $25.0 \%$ |
| TikTok | 516 | $15.3 \%$ |
| Twitter | 206 | $6.1 \%$ |
| Snapchat | 176 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Facebook | 146 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Pinterest | 89 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Reddit | 39 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Facebook Messenger | 20 | $0.6 \%$ |
| WhatsApp | 14 | $0.4 \%$ |
| WeChat | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Other | 82 | $2.5 \%$ |
| Total | 3364 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Categorising influencers

We asked survey respondents to categorise chosen influencers according to the influencer's type, from a list of pre-determined categories including an "other" option with a prompt to provide an open text response. Table 35 outlines their choices for the top twenty influencers and notes the number of respondents who chose to use multiple categories. A majority responded with two or more categories, and their distribution suggests an influencers' "personal brand" can mean different things to different respondents. There are exceptions here, for example PewDiePie (Felix Kjellberg) and Markiplier (Mark Fischbach) are clearly "gamers" in the minds of survey participants. But the differentiation of responses remains suggestive of a diversity of engagement with influencers and potentially a diversity of meanings made from influencers' content. Despite this overall picture, fashion/lifestyle influencers dominate the top of the list. It is also notable that, even where influencers are well known celebrities their influencer persona can supplement or exceed their preestablished identities. For example, The Rock (Dwayne Johnson) - predominantly known as a film star which is evident in his online postings - is categorised as a health, lifestyle, and sports influencer, while Billie Eilish - a popular musician - is also categorised as a fashion influencer.

Table 35: Participants' Categorisation of the Top Twenty Influencers

|  |  | Frequency of participants' categorisation of influencer type (bolded frequency = top two categories) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Influencer | $\begin{aligned} & \text { To } \\ & \underline{\bar{O}} \\ & \sum_{0}^{0} \\ & \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{7}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{Ј} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \underline{\Phi} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 울 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { 운 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & \text { a. } \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots . \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | ¿ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \frac{3}{n} \\ & \frac{5}{n} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { 뭄 } \end{aligned}$ | Coded $>1$ <br> category | \% |
| E. Chamberlain | 45 | 41 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 40 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 39 | 87\% |
| Kendall Jenner | 29 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 23 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 69\% |
| Kylie Jenner | 28 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 68\% |
| Addison Rae | 18 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 89\% |
| Billie Eilish | 17 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 65\% |
| Kim Kardashian | 15 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 60\% |
| David Dobrik | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 71\% |
| Tana Mongeau | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 71\% |
| KSI | 13 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 85\% |
| PewDiePie | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 58\% |
| The Sidemen | 12 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 92\% |
| Bretman Rock | 11 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 82\% |
| Markiplier | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 36\% |
| The Rock | 10 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 100\% |
| Olivia Neill | 10 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 90\% |
| Anna Paul | 9 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 89\% |
| Bella Hadid | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 78\% |
| Sarah's Day | 9 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 89\% |
| Zendaya | 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 78\% |
| Harry Syles | 8 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 75\% |
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## Appendix A: Online survey for HRC project Instagram influencers, unhealthy products, and covert marketing to young people

## Sections:

A. Demographics
B. Internet Access
C. Social Media Use
D. Social Media Influencers
E. Knowledge of Unhealthy Product Marketing

## A. Demographics

Info: First, we're going to ask you some questions about who you are and where you are from. Remember that any information you provide will be kept anonymous.

QA1 Do you attend high school or university?
Response categories: High school or university
QA2 What is the name of your high school or university?
Response categories: Universities and high schools in NZ
QA3 How old are you?
Open text response. Survey ends if age<16
QA4 Which of the following best describe your current gender? Select all that apply.
Response categories: Girl/woman, Boy/man, Transgender, Non-binary, Agender, Takatāpui, Fa'afafine, I'm not yet sure of my gender, Something else, please state [open text response], prefer not to say

QA5 Which ethnic group(s) do you belong to? Select all that apply
Response categories: New Zealand European or Pākehā, Māori, Samoan, Cook Islands, Tongan, Niuean, Chinese, Indian, Other (please state)

QA6 Who do you live with?
Response categories: With my two parents together, Mainly with one of my parents, I move between my parents, I live with other family members, I board/flat/live with another household/family (not my own family), I live in a flat with other peers, (If institution = high school) I live at boarding school or in a boarding hostel, (If institution = university) I live a university hostel, I live by myself, I live with my partner/spouse.

QA7 Is your household located in an urban area, i.e. a city or town, or in a rural area?
Response categories: Urban, Rural, Don't know, Prefer not to say.

Over the last 12 months have you worked for money or had a paid job? (you may choose as many as you need)

Response categories: Yes, a regular full-time job, Yes, a regular part-time job (e.g. paper run), Yes, I worked during the school/university holidays, Yes, I did casual work during the school/university term, No, I didn't work for pay in the last year.

## B. Internet Access

Info: Next, we're going to ask you some questions about your internet access and activity in general.
QB1 Where you currently live, do you have or have access to (select all that apply): A mobile phone, A desktop or laptop computer, A gaming console, An iPad/Tablet.

Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QB2 What type of internet connection do you have where you currently live ? Note: Internet access through a mobile phone counts if used at home. Fibre counts as broadband (select all that apply):

Response categories: Dial-up/Phone modem, Broadband (including the use of that broadband connection via wifi), Mobile phone data, Other (please state [open space], Can't connect to the internet at home, Don't know, Prefer not to say

QB3 Outside of the home, do you use the internet through wireless hand-held devices, such as a mobile phone or a tablet?

Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QB4 About how often do you use the internet, either on a computer, tablet or a mobile phone? Response categories: Almost constantly, Several times a day, About once a day Several times a week, Less often, Don't know, Prefer not to say.

QB5 What is the capacity of your main source of internet connection,
Response categories: Unlimited, Capped (please specify the limit if known [open text]), Don't know, Prefer not to say.

QB6 Who pays for your main source of internet access?
Open text response.

## C. Social Media Use

Info: Thank you for your responses so far. In the next section, we'll ask you some more specific questions about your social media use, including which sites you visit, how often you visit them, and what you do when you visit them.

QC1 Have you ever used any of the following social media sites or messaging apps (select all that apply)?

Response categories: Facebook, Facebook Messenger, Instagram, Snapchat, YouTube, Tik Tok, WeChat, WhatsApp, Twitter, Pinterest, Reddit, LinkedIn, Other (please provide [open text]), I have never used any social media sites or messaging apps, prefer not to say

QC2 Thinking about the social media sites or apps you use ... About how often do you visit or use (list populated from responses to QC1).

Response categories: Constantly, Several times a day, About once a day, A few times a week, Every few weeks, Less often, Don't know.

QC3 How do you use the following social media sites or apps? Select all that apply (list populated from responses to QC1)

Response categories: I scroll through other people's content, I create my own content, I send direct messages

QC4 Which social media site or app is your favourite to visit and use? Why?
Open text response
QC5 Are there any social media sites or apps you use even though you do not enjoy visiting them? Why do you continue to use them?

## Open text response

QC6 Are there any social media apps you have stopped using? Why did you stop using them? Open text response

## D. Social Media Influencers

Info: Nearly there! In the next section, we're going to ask you some questions about social media influencers.

Info: Who are social media influencers?
Influencers aren't just on Instagram--they're people who can be found on other social media including Facebook, YouTube, Tik Tok and so on. Across different platforms, influencers have some things in common. They tend to:

- have built some form of reputation for their knowledge, opinions, interest, or expertise on a specific topic
- regularly produce engaging content on their preferred social media channels
- have followings of enthusiastic people who engage with their content
- usually have large followings, from a few thousand to millions of people

We're also interested in who YOU find influential even if those people have fewer followers. Celebrities can also be influencers if you find them influential.

QD1 Do you follow or see content from any influencers on social media?
Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know.
QD2 If QD1 = Yes (If no or don't know go to QD6a) Please name up to three of your favourite social media influencers whom you can recall. Feel free open another browser tab or app to check your social media account if you need help remembering the name/handle of an influencer.

Open text response $\times 3$.

QD3a Which social media platform(s) do you follow/see content from these influencers on? (select all that apply)? [pipe influencer 1, 2, 3 into a matrix]

Response categories: Facebook, Facebook messenger, Instagram, Snapchat, YouTube, Tik Tok, WeChat, WhatsApp, Twitter, Pinterest, Reddit, LinkedIn, Other (please provide [open text])

QD3b If QD3a = Other (for any influencer) You indicated you follow an influencer on a social media platform that isn't on our list. Please type the platform you see their content on below:

Open text response
QD4a What type of influencer(s) are the following (select all that apply)?
Response categories: Fashion, Gamily, Health, Travel, Lifestyle, Food, Pets, Parenting, Sports, Activism, Creative/art, Music, Other, Prefer not to say

QD4b If QD4a = Other (for any influencer) You indicated we needed a different category to describe an influencer(s) that you follow. Please describe what kind of influencer they are below

Open text resonse
QD5a. Which social media influencers are most popular with your peers?
Response categories: Influencers that are popular with my peers (please name below): Open text response, I don't know which influencers are popular with my peers

QD5b If QD1 = Yes. Do you also follow or see content from this influencer(s)?
Response categories: Yes, No, Prefer not to say.
QD6 Are you currently, or would you like to be in the future, a social media influencer?
Open text response.

## E. Knowledge of Unhealthy Product Marketing

Info: Finally, we're going to ask you about your experience of marketing on social media posts related to alcohol, cigarettes, and vapes.

QE1a Have you ever searched for vape information via social media?
Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE1b If QE3a = yes then (If no, don't know, prefer not say go to QE4)
How often do you access information about vape products via the following social media (list populated with positive responses from QC1)?

Response categories: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Rarely, Never Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE2a Have you ever seen any vape product advertising on the following social media (list populated with positive responses from QC1)?

Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.

QE2b. If any Q4a = yes then (if all no, don't know, prefer not to say go to QE5) Which, if any, of the following have you done in the last month?

- Liked a vape brand on social media
- Shared something related to a vape brand, such as a status, Tweet, or picture
- Followed a vape brand on social media
- Entered a competition run by an vape brand online or on social media
- Searched for vape adverts on websites or social media.

Response categories for each: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE3a. Have you ever seen any cigarette advertising on the following social media (list populated with positive responses from QC1)?

Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE3b. If any Q5a = yes then (if all no, don't know, prefer not to say go to QE6)

- Which, if any, of the following have you done in the last month?
- Liked a cigarette brand on social media
- Shared something related to a cigarette brand, such as a status, Tweet, or picture
- Followed an cigarette brand on social media
- Entered a competition run by a cigarette brand online or on social media
- Searched for cigarette adverts on websites or social media.

Response categories for each: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE4a. Have you ever seen any alcohol advertising on the following social media (list populated with positive responses from QC1)?

Response categories for each: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.
QE4b. If any QE6a = yes then (if all no, don't know, prefer not to say go to QE7) Which, if any, of the following have you done in the last month?

- Liked an alcohol brand on social media
- Shared something related to an alcohol drinks brand, such as a status, Tweet, or picture
- Followed an alcohol brand on social media
- Entered a competition run by an alcoholic drinks brand online or on social media
- Searched for alcoholic drinks adverts on websites or social media.

Response categories for each: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.

For positive responses to QE7 then (If no survey ends):
On what social media sites do you upload pictures of yourself or your friends drinking, smoking or vaping? Select all that apply (indicated from list populated from positive answers to QC1).

QE10 Have other people uploaded pictures of you drinking an alcoholic drink, smoking, or vaping? Response categories: Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to say.

Appendix B: Recruitment poster for HRC project Instagram influencers, unhealthy products, and covert marketing to young people


