

THE BUY-IN PLAYBOOK

How UNPAID earns what TRUTH earned

A staff briefing on why this campaign is built the way it is. It names one adversary. That adversary is the business model that treats a young person's time as inventory to be sold. Not the phone. Not the student. Not the law.

PTW: PROVE THEM WRONG UNPAID BREAK THE ALGORITHM EST. 243

“The script is wrong. The story is ours.”

ONE SENTENCE

UNPAID makes the price visible, then hands students the tools to bill it.

The TRUTH campaign did not argue with cigarettes. It argued with an industry. It gave teenagers a brand, a body of evidence, and a target outside themselves.¹ UNPAID is the same bet on a different industry. The product being sold is a young person's hours. The buyer is an advertiser. The student is the inventory. We print the rate, we print the math, and we let students decide what to do with the receipt.

WHY THIS IS STRUCTURALLY THE SAME BET

Three features made TRUTH work, and all three transfer.

1. The adversary is an institution, not the student. TRUTH moved specific beliefs about companies. Students who came to believe that cigarette companies lie and that companies recruited young people smoked less. Generic health facts did not carry the effect. The belief about the company did.¹ UNPAID moves one belief: my time is priced, sold, and booked as revenue by people I will never meet.

2. It competed as a brand, not as a health message. RTI International, which evaluated the campaign, describes the strategy in advertising terms. TRUTH was built to hold brand equity against tobacco brands.³ The National Social Marketing Centre describes it as a lifestyle brand for teens positioned against the industry rather than against the behavior.² UNPAID is a brand. It has a lockup, a palette, a voice, and a wall.

3. The evidence was public and checkable. The 1998 Master Settlement Agreement put millions of internal industry records into a public archive that students could read for themselves.⁴ Our equivalent is already public: earnings decks, revenue-per-user disclosures, and unsealed state complaints. Students pull the numbers. We print our assumptions next to them so anyone can check the arithmetic.

What we do not claim. TRUTH ran nine figures of paid media across a national market. We are one school with four weeks and a hallway. We are copying the mechanism, not the scale, and every number in this document is labeled with the study it came from.

1. Farrelly et al., "Getting to the Truth," Am J Public Health, 2002. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12036775/>

2. National Social Marketing Centre, truth campaign case study. <https://www.thensmc.com/resources/showcase/truth%C2%AE>

3. RTI International, "Branding behavior: The strategy behind the truth campaign." <https://www.rti.org/publication/branding-behavior-strategy-behind-truthr-campaign>

4. Truth Initiative, "The Master Settlement Agreement: 4 ways it was a landmark." <https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/master-settlement-agreement-4-ways-landmark-tobacco>

THE RECORD

Brand equity moved behavior. Dose moved behavior. The money worked.

BRAND EQUITY

Longitudinal analysis of TRUTH found that brand equity predicted smoking directly. A one-point rise on the brand-equity scale was associated with a **66%** greater chance of not smoking among ever-smokers, and an **80%** greater chance among current smokers six months later.¹ The brand was not decoration. The brand was the active ingredient.

DOSE AND RESPONSE

Using Monitoring the Future data on roughly 50,000 students a year, smoking prevalence fell from **25.3%** to **18.0%** between 1999 and 2002. The campaign was estimated to account for about **22%** of that decline, with a confidence interval of 8.2 percent to 35.6 percent. Exposure showed a dose-response pattern, and the odds ratio strengthened each year, from 0.78 to 0.66 in 2001 and 0.63 in 2002.² That 22 percent share is the basis for the widely quoted figure of about **300,000** fewer youth smokers by 2002.³

A separate study, a separate number. A 2009 longitudinal analysis followed a youth cohort from 1997 to 2004 and found each 10,000-GRP increase in cumulative exposure was associated with a 20 percent lower risk of smoking initiation. That study estimates roughly **450,000** young people prevented from smoking between 2000 and 2004.⁴ These two figures measure different windows and different outcomes. They are not interchangeable and they are not additive. Cite the study, not the headline.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The campaign cost the foundation **\$324M** to run and evaluate. Estimates put averted future medical costs at **\$1.9B to \$5.4B**, at roughly **\$4,302** per quality-adjusted life year.⁵ A later analysis of the FinishIt phase found societal savings of \$3.07B, about \$1,076 per QALY, and a return of \$174 for every dollar spent.⁶ Counter-marketing is cheap relative to what it prevents. Our version costs printer toner and four weeks.

1. Brand equity and smoking behavior, longitudinal analysis, PMC5724797. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5724797/>

2. Farrelly et al., "Evidence of a Dose-Response Relationship Between truth Antismoking Ads and Youth Smoking Prevalence," Am J Public Health, 2005. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1449196/>

3. CrimeSolutions.gov (Office of Justice Programs), truth campaign program profile. <https://crimesolutions.ojp.gov/ratedprograms/truthr-campaign>

4. Farrelly, Nonnemaker, Davis & Hussin, Am J Preventive Medicine, 2009, as reproduced in Jones & Bartlett textbook excerpt. http://samples.jbpub.com/9780763753771/53771_CH10_FINAL.pdf

5. ScienceDaily summary of Holtgrave, Wunderink, Vallone & Healton, 2009. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/02/090212132313.htm>

6. Cost-utility analysis of the truth FinishIt campaign, PMC6888078. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6888078/>

CROWD FIT

It worked hardest on the students adults reach last.

A 2012 study tested whether TRUTH's identity branding landed differently across peer crowds. In a sample of **224** adolescents aged 14 and 15, campaign exposure predicted anti-industry beliefs among students in the deviant and counterculture crowds, and predicted nothing among students in the elite and academic crowds. Exposure levels did not differ much by crowd, so this is a conversion difference, not a reach difference.¹

PEER CROWD	ASSOCIATION WITH CAMPAIGN EXPOSURE
DEVIAANT CROWD	"companies lie" OR 3.71 (1.09 to 12.61)
DEVIAANT CROWD	"companies recruit youth" OR 9.74 (1.72 to 55.03)
COUNTERCULTURE	"companies lie" OR 4.93 (1.23 to 19.68)
COUNTERCULTURE	rejects "smoking looks cool" OR 4.25 (1.12 to 15.78)
MAINSTREAM CROWDS	no significant association

Read that as a staffing instruction. The students who roll their eyes at assemblies are the students this format converts. The campaign works because it does not ask them to obey. It asks them to look at a filing.

TONE

Accounts of the campaign describe the tone as confrontational and irreverent, including stunts such as piling body bags outside a tobacco company's headquarters and putting executives on camera.² No lecture. No moral. A number and a stage.

YOUTH GOVERNANCE

Truth Initiative's youth arm, Community and Youth Engagement, describes its own model as recruit, educate, and mobilize, delivered through leadership training, campus action grants, digital and on-the-ground activism, and direct engagement with decision makers.³ Its Ambassadors fellowship runs on three moves: the fellow creates a self-chosen project, engages peers through events they run themselves, and mobilizes classmates into real actions.⁴

Honesty flag. Those two documents are Truth Initiative describing Truth Initiative. The campaign outcomes are independently peer reviewed. The program structure is self-reported. We copy the structure because it is coherent, not because it has been separately evaluated.

1. Moran, Murphy & Sussman, Journal of Health Communication, 2012, PMC4189779.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4189779/>

2. National Social Marketing Centre, truth campaign case study. <https://www.thensmc.com/resources/showcase/truth%C2%AE>

3. Truth Initiative, Community and Youth Engagement (CAYE) explainer one-pager, 2023.
https://truthinitiative.org/sites/default/files/media/files/2023/04/CAYE%20Explainer%201-pager_FINAL.pdf

4. Truth Initiative, "3 elements of successful youth advocacy work."
<https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/3-elements-successful-youth-advocacy-work>

FAILURE ONE

Philip Morris, "Think. Don't Smoke."

Philip Morris launched a youth-targeted television campaign in December 1998 aimed at children aged 10 to 14. It cost **\$100M** and ran on United States television until January 2003.¹ It is the best documented example of a well-funded prevention message moving the wrong way.

STUDY	FINDING
FARRELLY 2002	exposed youths were MORE open to smoking; no gain in anti-tobacco attitudes
WAKEFIELD 2006	each extra youth-targeted exposure: +3% odds of intending to smoke (OR 1.03)
8TH GRADERS	+4% odds of intending to smoke (OR 1.04)
PARENT CAMPAIGN	+12% odds of intending to smoke; +10% odds of smoking in past 30 days
10TH AND 12TH GRADE	+12% to +14% odds of current smoking from the parent campaign
SAME DATASET	tobacco-control ads were protective: intentions and 30-day smoking both fell

The Wakefield analysis covered 103,172 students across four years of Monitoring the Future data.¹ The Farrelly team found the same directional result in the study that also measured TRUTH.²

THE NUANCE WE WILL NOT HIDE

A randomized experiment with 832 high-school students found that industry-sponsored ads did **not** raise stated smoking intent in a single controlled exposure. What the ads did raise was favorable attitudes toward the tobacco companies. The authors concluded the ads do more to promote corporate image than to prevent youth smoking.³ So the backfire on intent rests on the large real-world dose studies, not on this experiment. Anyone who says the research proves industry ads directly cause smoking intent has skipped a step.

MECHANISM OF FAILURE

Adult and corporate authorship with no credibility on the subject. A message aimed at the behavior instead of the institution. A parent-facing track that read to teenagers as more adult control and less useful information. The study authors put it plainly: authority-framed messages aimed at teenagers invite rejection once adolescents turn toward peers for their standards.¹

1. Wakefield, Terry-McElrath et al., Am J Public Health, 2006, PMC1698148. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1698148/>
2. Farrelly et al., "Getting to the Truth," Am J Public Health, 2002. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12036775/>
3. Henriksen, Dauphinee, Wang & Fortmann, Tobacco Control, 2006, PMC2563637. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2563637/>

FAILURE TWO

D.A.R.E.

A police-led classroom curriculum, at peak roughly **\$750M** a year in federal spending.¹ A 2004 meta-analysis applied strict inclusion rules to eleven controlled studies and found an overall effect essentially at zero: $r = 0.011$, Cohen's $d = 0.023$ with a confidence interval crossing zero, not statistically significant. The authors wrote that D.A.R.E. is ineffective.¹

Mechanism. Uniformed authority delivered it. The content moralized. The target was the student's own choice.

FAILURE THREE

The ONDCP National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign

Congress appropriated **\$1.2B to \$1.4B** between 1998 and 2006. The Government Accountability Office reviewed the official evaluation and found no evidence of a positive outcome on teen drug use, across the whole period or during the marijuana-focused years. Appropriations fell from a requested \$120M to \$60M.²

The core peer-reviewed evaluation followed three national cohorts aged 9 to 18 across four waves. Most analyses showed no effect. At one wave, higher exposure predicted weaker intention to avoid marijuana and weaker anti-drug norms at the following wave.³ The authors also report that exposure at round three predicted initiation at round four, **gamma = 0.11**, confidence interval 0.00 to 0.22.³

Contested. Say so out loud. That initiation finding sits at the edge of significance and it is disputed. The later Above the Influence redesign produced a protective association that was significant only for eighth-grade girls and not for boys or older students, and the authors of that paper declined to assert causation.⁴ A 2010 report to Congress showed youth disapproval of marijuana softening over the same period.⁵ The program office called the campaign effective.⁶ Independent reviewers call the record null to harmful.

THE SHARED MECHANISM OF FAILURE

Adult-authored. Moralizing. Aimed at the behavior instead of the industry. Loud enough that saturation itself signaled the behavior was common. UNPAID inverts all four.

1. West & O'Neal, "Project D.A.R.E. Outcome Effectiveness Revisited," AJPH, 2004. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1448384/>

2. U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-06-818, 2006. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-06-818>

3. Hornik, Jacobsohn, Orwin, Piesse & Kalton, Am J Public Health, 2008, PMC2636541. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2636541/>

4. Terry-McElrath & Emery, Am J Public Health, 2011, PMC3076395. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3076395/>

5. ONDCP, National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign report to Congress, 2010. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ondcp/mc_effectiveness_2010.pdf

6. Office of National Drug Control Policy, "Above the Influence" fact sheet. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/ondcp/ondcp-fact-sheets/above-the-influence-ATI>

WHY INSTRUCTION BACKFIRES

Brehm: tell people what to do and they defend the freedom, not the fact.

Reactance is the unpleasant arousal a person feels when a freedom is threatened or taken. The more the freedom matters, the stronger the push back, and the more likely the person adopts the attitude the message tried to suppress.¹

This is measurable in tobacco prevention. In a randomized study, adolescents high in trait reactance rated every anti-smoking ad less favorably than low-reactance peers, regardless of who paid for it, mean **2.47** against **2.67**. They also reported the strongest intention to smoke.² A Norwegian study of 2,400 youths aged 16 to 20 found reactance associated with smoking, and found that the highest-risk smokers held the most negative view of strong control measures specifically.³

A copy-testing study adds a limit. Anti-industry framing alone did not significantly lower smoking intention. Ads carrying a felt emotional stake did.⁴ Naming the adversary is necessary. It is not sufficient.

THE CLOSEST PUBLISHED ANALOGUE TO SEND THEM THE BILL

Bryan and Yeager, PNAS 2016

A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled experiment with **536** eighth graders. The treatment group read an expose framing healthy eating as autonomy from corporate manipulation and as an act of justice, learned that most ninth graders said they planned to fight back, then wrote their own short essay about why they were angry and what they would do.⁵

MEASURE	RESULT
VALUES ALIGNMENT	3.33 vs 2.18 control, $d = 1.41$, $P < 0.001$
SOCIAL STATUS APPEAL	3.61 vs 3.25, $d = 0.40$, $P < 0.001$
NEXT-DAY BEHAVIOR	chose only unhealthy items: 54% fell to 43%, $P = 0.03$
CARBOHYDRATE, SUGAR	down 7% and 9% in items actually chosen
MEDIATOR	effect fully mediated by status appeal, not by health knowledge

Behavior shifted a full day later, in an unrelated class, with nobody watching for it. The mechanism was status. UNPAID runs that play. The rate is the expose. The receipt is the essay.

1. Brehm's psychological reactance theory, summary of the literature. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological_reactance

2. Henriksen, Dauphinee, Wang & Fortmann, Tobacco Control, 2006, PMC2563637. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2563637/>

3. Wiium, Aaro & Hetland, Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2009. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00501.x>

4. Copy-testing study of anti-industry and victim-based ads, PubMed 16571709. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16571709/>

5. Bryan, Yeager et al., "Harnessing adolescent values to motivate healthier eating," PNAS, 2016. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1604586113>

THE CREW IS THE INTERVENTION

Paluck, Shepherd and Aronow: who carries the norm beats how many see it.

A field experiment across **56** New Jersey schools surveyed **24,191** students to map who spends time with whom. In treatment schools a pool representing 15 percent of the student body was identified, and half of that pool was randomly invited into an anticonflict program. Within each seed group, a randomly varying share were social referents, meaning students in the top 10 percent of the school for being named by others.¹

CONDITION	RESULT
CONTROL SCHOOLS	0.20 disciplinary events per student per year
TREATMENT AVERAGE	0.06 fewer events per student, a 30% reduction
HIGH-REFERENT SCHOOLS	0.08 events per student, a 60% reduction, twice the average effect
PERCEIVED NORMS	shifted only among students with a referent seed as a peer
OVERALL NORM SHIFT	no significant treatment versus control difference
PLAIN EXPOSURE	exposure to any seed did not carry the effect

The schools that put a moderate share of structurally central students into the program, roughly 1.5 percent of the whole student body, doubled the program's effect.¹ That is the single most useful number in this playbook for a school our size.

WHAT THAT MEANS FOR A CREW

Recruit a crew of 8 to 12 students chosen for connection, not for grades and not for good behavior. Ask students who they actually spend time with, and pick from the names that come back most. The posters are the artifact. The crew is the intervention. If the crew is central, the walls are just where their argument gets stored.

Two honest limits. That study measured school discipline for peer conflict. It did not measure smoking or anything about the attention business. Treat it as a model of how norms travel.¹ And peer-led delivery is a modest edge. The strongest comparative meta-analyses put it near $d = 0.24$ ², earlier reviews found peer leaders at least as effective as adults³, and a 2022 systematic review reported effectiveness in about half the studies it examined.⁴ Give students real authority over the work, the cornerstone of participatory practice.⁵

1. Paluck, Shepherd & Aronow, "Changing climates of conflict: a social network experiment in 56 schools," PNAS, 2016. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1514483113>

2. Cuijpers, Journal of Drug Education, 2002, meta-analysis of peer-led programs. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12206061/>

3. Mellanby, Rees & Tripp, Health Education Research, 2000. <https://academic.oup.com/her/article/15/5/533/639474>

4. Systematic review of school-based peer education, BMC Public Health, 2022. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9719233/>

5. UC Berkeley YPAR Hub, youth-led participatory action research design guide. https://yparhub.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/updated_final_ypar_design_guide_.pdf

MECHANIC BY MECHANIC

Their play, our play.

Nothing in the left column is decoration. Each row is a working part with a job. If an UNPAID asset does not map to a row here, it is not part of the campaign.

TRUTH MECHANIC	UNPAID EQUIVALENT
THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY	the attention business model, the buyers of student hours
19 MILLION INDUSTRY DOCUMENTS	earnings decks, revenue per user disclosures, unsealed state complaints
BODY BAGS OUTSIDE HEADQUARTERS	THE PRICE WALL: the rate per hour, printed at hallway scale
BRAND EQUITY, NOT A HEALTH MESSAGE	UNPAID as a brand students want on a sticker
TRUTH AMBASSADORS	DIGGERS, SHOOTERS, WRITERS, BUILDERS
"COMPANIES LIE"	"my hours are inventory and they have a price"
"A GENERATION UNITED AGAINST TOBACCO"	EST. 243 and "WE LOVE YOU"
NATIONAL DAY OF ACTION	WEEK 4: THE US, the day the ledger goes public
DECISION MAKER ENGAGEMENT	students present the ledger to staff and to the board
PAID MEDIA DOSE	four weeks of walls, receipts, and one repeated lockup

The left column is sourced. The tone and stunt record¹, the public document archive², the youth program structure³, and the brand-equity mechanism⁴ are all documented. The right column is ours to earn.

One row deserves a warning. The Price Wall is a stunt, and stunts are the part adults tend to soften. The body bags worked because nobody explained them. Print the rate at the size of a door, put the source under it, and leave it alone.

1. National Social Marketing Centre, truth campaign case study. <https://www.thensmc.com/resources/showcase/truth%C2%AE>

2. Truth Tobacco Industry Documents archive, University of California San Francisco. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth_Tobacco_Industry_Documents

3. Truth Initiative, Community and Youth Engagement (CAYE) explainer one-pager, 2023. https://truthinitiative.org/sites/default/files/media/files/2023/04/CAYE%20Explainer%201-pager_FINAL.pdf

4. Brand equity and smoking behavior, longitudinal analysis, PMC5724797. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5724797/>

WEEK BY WEEK

Who does what, and what lands on the wall.

Students own the work. Adults own the room, the paper, the schedule, and the permissions. Participatory practice calls this power sharing¹, and it is the part programs skip². The youth-activism model we borrowed from runs the same way, with the student choosing the project³.

WEEK 1

THE PRICE

DIGGERS	pull the filings, compute the rate per hour, write the assumptions down
WRITERS	one page of plain math anyone in the building can check
STAFF	hand over one wall, book 20 minutes, sign nothing else
ON THE WALL	the rate, the source, and the arithmetic beside it

WEEK 2

THE DESIGN

SHOOTERS	photograph the design: the feed, the pull, the loop, the hook
BUILDERS	print and hang THE PRICE WALL at hallway scale
STAFF	answer questions with numbers, not with rules
ON THE WALL	the design named as a design, built by people who were paid to build it

WEEK 3

THE OTHER LEDGER

EVERY STUDENT	log one hour reclaimed and what it was spent on instead
WRITERS	turn logs into receipts, printed, unsigned, voluntary
STAFF	post your own receipt first, before you ask a student for one
ON THE WALL	the second ledger, in student handwriting

WEEK 4

THE US

THE CREW	read the totals out loud, present the ledger to staff and the board
EVERY STUDENT	EST. 243, one line each, "WE LOVE YOU"
STAFF	listen in public, then do one thing students asked for
ON THE WALL	the lockup, the totals, and the names of the 243

1. Ozer, "Youth-Led Participatory Action Research," Child Development Perspectives, 2017.
<https://academic.oup.com/cdpers/article/11/3/173/8231587>

2. UC Berkeley YPAR Hub, youth-led participatory action research design guide.
https://yparhub.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/updated_final_ypar_design_guide_.pdf

3. Truth Initiative, "3 elements of successful youth advocacy work."
<https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/3-elements-successful-youth-advocacy-work>

THE PRIMARY MEASURE

Can a student name the business model in their own words?

At week 0 we ask a random sample of students one open question. Who pays for the feed, and what are they buying? We keep the answers. At week 4 we ask the same question of a fresh random sample. The primary result is the change in the percentage of students who can describe the business model in their own words, week 4 against the week 0 baseline. Nothing else is the headline.

PRIMARY MEASURE	PROTOCOL
SAMPLE	30 students drawn at random at week 0, 30 more at week 4
PROMPT	one open question, written, two minutes, no names collected
CODING	two crew members score each answer blind, a third breaks ties
SCORING BAR	names the trade: hours given, attention sold, money collected
REPORTED AS	percent at week 4 minus percent at week 0, with both counts shown

SECONDARY MEASURES

LOCKUP RECALL	can a student say what UNPAID and EST. 243 stand for, unprompted
RECEIPT COUNT	how many receipts students chose to post, by week
CREW CENTRALITY	did we actually recruit well-connected students, checked once
STAFF FIRST	how many staff receipts went up before the first student receipt

WHAT WE NEVER TRACK

We never track individual device use. We never track hours on a phone. We never track compliance, and no measure in this campaign is tied to any student's name. There is no dashboard, no log-in, no monitoring, and no report to a parent. A campaign that surveils the people it is arguing for has changed sides.

Why this measure and not a behavior count. The published mechanisms point here. Brand equity predicted behavior in the TRUTH evaluations¹, and the PNAS eating experiment found its behavioral effect fully mediated by status and values, not by knowledge of consequences². Belief moves first. We also will not claim network effects we did not measure: the social referent study looked at school discipline, and we are borrowing its recruiting logic, not its outcome³.

1. Brand equity and smoking behavior, longitudinal analysis, PMC5724797. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5724797/>

2. Bryan, Yeager et al., "Harnessing adolescent values to motivate healthier eating," PNAS, 2016. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1604586113>

3. Paluck, Shepherd & Aronow, "Changing climates of conflict: a social network experiment in 56 schools," PNAS, 2016. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1514483113>

EIGHT THINGS A SHARP 17-YEAR-OLD WILL CATCH

Risks one through four.

Section 7 of the research brief lists eight places this argument can be broken. Here they are, with what we do about each one. A student who catches us on one of these is right, and the fix is to reprint the asset.

01 500,000 IS NOT 450,000

Risk. Two different Farrelly-team studies, two different windows, two different outcomes. One attributes about 22 percent of the 1999 to 2002 prevalence decline. The other estimates initiation prevented from 2000 to 2004.^{1, 2}

Mitigation. Every asset that uses a figure names the study and the year beside it. The two numbers never appear added together and never appear as substitutes for each other.

02 THE DOCUMENT TO AD COPY LINK IS UNVERIFIED

Risk. Truth Initiative states the campaign exposed industry tactics, but no ad-by-ad paper trail from a specific internal document to a specific ad was found.^{3, 4}

Mitigation. We say the campaign drew on the public record of industry documents released by the settlement. We never say a named document became a named ad.

03 "SEEN" COULD NOT BE CONFIRMED

Risk. A program branded SEEN could not be verified as a national Truth Initiative program in the sources reviewed.⁵

Mitigation. It appears nowhere in this kit. We cite Ambassadors and Community and Youth Engagement, which have primary documents.

04 ABOVE THE INFLUENCE IS GENUINELY CONTESTED

Risk. The program office cited favorable findings. The Government Accountability Office and the lead academic evaluators describe the record as null to harmful. The initiation finding of gamma equals 0.11 sits at the edge of significance.^{6, 7, 8}

Mitigation. We label it contested in the text, cite both sides on the same page, and never use it as a clean win or a clean loss.

1. Farrelly et al., "Evidence of a Dose-Response Relationship Between truth Antismoking Ads and Youth Smoking Prevalence," Am J Public Health, 2005. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1449196/>

2. Farrelly, Nonnemaker, Davis & Hussin, Am J Preventive Medicine, 2009, as reproduced in Jones & Bartlett textbook excerpt. http://samples.jbpub.com/9780763763771/53771_CH10_FINAL.pdf

3. Truth Initiative, "The Master Settlement Agreement: 4 ways it was a landmark." <https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/master-settlement-agreement-4-ways-landmark-tobacco>

4. Truth Tobacco Industry Documents archive, University of California San Francisco. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth_Tobacco_Industry_Documents

5. Truth Initiative, Community and Youth Engagement (CAYE) explainer one-pager, 2023. https://truthinitiative.org/sites/default/files/media/files/2023/04/CAYE%20Explainer%201-pager_FINAL.pdf

6. U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-06-818, 2006. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-06-818>

7. Hornik, Jacobsohn, Orwin, Piesse & Kalton, Am J Public Health, 2008, PMC2636541. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2636541/>

8. Terry-McElrath & Emery, Am J Public Health, 2011, PMC3076395. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3076395/>

EIGHT THINGS A SHARP 17-YEAR-OLD WILL CATCH

Risks five through eight.

The last four risks are about overclaiming. Each one is a place where the evidence is softer than the story we want to tell.

05 THE 2006 EXPERIMENT COMPLICATES THE BACKFIRE CLAIM

Risk. In a single controlled exposure, industry ads did not raise stated smoking intent. The backfire there was on attitudes toward the company.^{1,2}

Mitigation. We attribute the intent backfire to the large real-world dose studies and report the experiment's narrower finding in the same paragraph.

06 PEER-LED IS A MODEST EDGE

Risk. The best comparative meta-analyses land near d equals 0.19 to 0.24, with wide variation between studies.^{3,4}

Mitigation. We claim peer-led is usually at least as good and often somewhat better. We never claim adult-led work fails and student-led work wins.

07 THE SOCIAL REFERENT STUDY MEASURED DISCIPLINE

Risk. It counted disciplinary events for peer conflict across 56 schools. It did not study counter-marketing, tobacco, or the attention business.⁵

Mitigation. We present it as a model of how norms travel through a network, and we say so every time we cite it.

08 THE CREW MODEL LEANS ON SELF-DESCRIPTION

Risk. No separately sourced student-journalism evidence base was found. Our crew structure draws on participatory research practice and on a program's own descriptions of itself.^{6,7}

Mitigation. We label the program documents as self-reported, and we keep the crew structure as a design choice rather than an evidence claim.

1. Henriksen, Dauphinee, Wang & Fortmann, Tobacco Control, 2006, PMC2563637.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2563637/>

2. Wakefield, Terry-McElrath et al., Am J Public Health, 2006, PMC1698148.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1698148/>

3. Cuijpers, Journal of Drug Education, 2002, meta-analysis of peer-led programs. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12206061/>

4. Systematic review of school-based peer education, BMC Public Health, 2022.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9719233/>

5. Paluck, Shepherd & Aronow, "Changing climates of conflict: a social network experiment in 56 schools," PNAS, 2016.
<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1514483113>

6. Truth Initiative, "3 elements of successful youth advocacy work."
<https://truthinitiative.org/research-resources/tobacco-prevention-efforts/3-elements-successful-youth-advocacy-work>

7. UC Berkeley YPAR Hub, youth-led participatory action research design guide.
https://yparhub.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/updated_final_ypar_design_guide_.pdf

THE ONE RULE THAT PROTECTS EVERYTHING ELSE

Your school may have a phone policy. The campaign never mentions it.

Whatever the policy is, it exists and it stands on its own. UNPAID is not its enforcement arm, its explainer, or its friendly face. No campaign asset carries policy language, rules, consequences, or compliance instructions. Not one poster, sticker, receipt, or slide.

FIREWALL	TERMS
NEVER ON AN ASSET	policy text, rules, consequences, compliance instructions
NEVER THE TARGET	the phone, the student, the law, any individual's choices
ALWAYS THE TARGET	the business model that treats a young person's time as inventory
WHO GOES FIRST	adults, every time, with their own receipt on the wall

This is not a style preference. It is the finding. Every failure in Section 3 fused an adult authority message to a teenager's own behavior, and the measured result was flat or worse than flat.¹ Reactance research explains why: threaten a freedom and people defend the freedom.² The one experiment that moved real behavior did the opposite. It handed students an adversary and a status stake, then got out of the way.³

ADULTS GO FIRST

Before a single student is asked for a receipt, staff post theirs. One hour reclaimed, in your handwriting, with your name if you want it there. Students will read the wall to find out whether this is real or whether it is another thing being done to them. Your receipt is the answer.

WHAT TO SAY IN THE HALLWAY

IF ASKED WHY	"Your hours have a price. We printed it. Check the math."
IF ASKED ABOUT RULES	"Different conversation. Ask an administrator."
IF ASKED WHAT WE WANT	"For you to know what you are worth to them."
IF A STUDENT ARGUES	"Show me where the number is wrong. We will reprint it."

"The script is wrong. The story is ours."

PTW: PROVE THEM WRONG / UNPAID / BREAK THE ALGORITHM / EST. 243

1. Wakefield, Terry-McElrath et al., Am J Public Health, 2006, PMC1698148.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1698148/>

2. Brehm's psychological reactance theory, summary of the literature. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological_reactance

3. Bryan, Yeager et al., "Harnessing adolescent values to motivate healthier eating," PNAS, 2016.
<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1604586113>