notes

Chisq p-values

- Null hypothesis - independent
- Alternative hypothesis - they are NOT independent
- high p-value = there is no relation
- low p-value = there is a relation

Common treshold is 0.05 (or 5%) and I suggest you stick with it. So if a p-value is below 5% there is not enough evidence to support the null hypothesis that x and y are independent. You have to accept that x and y are dependent.

If the p-value is above 5% there is not enough evidence to disprove that x and y are independent. You have to accept that they are independent.

H4

H4a (table of counts)

The table of frequencies of use of different platforms. Based on the entire, combined, data set [Fb,Ig,Sc].

	1	2	3	4
q1.1_usefb	18	56	129	903
q1.2_useig	230	227	285	364
q1.3_usesc	44	76	196	790

H4b (Chisq p-values)

Chisq tests of the type Platform_use_freq ~ q8.1, q8.2, q8.3. #PlatformSpecific, #BeforeAfter

Table 2: Facebook

	q8.1_freqpost	q8.2_freqsend	q8.3_freqread
noEdu	0.999	0	0.000
Edu	0.943	0	0.648

Table 3: Instagram

	q8.1_freqpost	q8.2_freqsend	q8.3_freqread
noEdu	0.000	0.030	0.000
Edu	0.013	0.671	0.664

Table 4: Snapchat

	q8.1_freqpost	q8.2_freqsend	q8.3_freqread
noEdu	0.013	0	0.000
Edu	0.539	0	0.319

H5 (Chisq p-values)

Only fb_q9 and ig_q9 are answered correctly with disagreement. The rest of the questions sc_q9, 10, 11 and 12 for the three platforms are answered correctly with agreement.

Table 5: Facebook

	q9binary vs q10binary	q11binary vs q12binary
noEdu	0.006	0
Edu	0.187	0

Table 6: Instagram

	q9binary vs q10binary	q11binary vs q12binary
noEdu	0.113	0.001
Edu	0.985	0.354

Table 7: Snapchat

	q9binary vs q10binary	q11binary vs q12binary
noEdu	0.208	0.117
Edu	0.599	0.024

H0

H0a (Chisq p-values)

Caring about privacy settings vs eiditing privacy settings. Taken on the entire, combined, data set [fb,ig,sc]

before	0
after	0

H0b (correlation)

before	-0.364
after	-0.493

HX

HXa (table of counts)

The row labels in the tables below are as well 1 to 4. Q15 vs Q16

Table 10: Facebook before. q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
16	24	46	11
0	24	91	13
0	6	63	17
0	0	9	14

Table 11: Facebook after q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
6	5	8	1
0	6	15	6
0	1	11	7
0	0	4	2

Table 12: Instagram before. q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
1	2	13	2
1	9	37	4
1	2	57	8
0	0	8	9

Table 13: Instagram after q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
1	4	5	1
0	6	8	4
0	0	4	4
0	0	0	1

Table 14: Snapchat before. q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
9	14	21	4
1	32	80	9
1	11	146	21
0	0	25	36

Table 15: Snapchat after q15 rows, q16 cols

1	2	3	4
8	6	11	1
2	21	21	1
0	1	19	3
0	0	3	1

HXb (Chisq p-values)

Platform specific and before/after q15 vs q17, q18 and q19

Table 16: Facebook

	q17.1_targetme	q18.1_targetfr	q19.1_comfortsell
noEdu	0.354	0.007	0.065
Edu	0.198	0.350	0.228

Table 17: Instagram

	q17.1_targetme	q18.1_targetfr	q19.1_comfortsell
noEdu	0.019	0.000	0.002
Edu	0.847	0.652	0.882

Table 18: Snapchat

	q17.1_targetme	q18.1_targetfr	q19.1_comfortsell
noEdu	0.013	0.024	0.001
Edu	0.653	0.409	0.041

H6, Q13 vs Q14

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.000	0.000	0.000
Edu	0.265	0.015	0.006

H1, 10-05-2017, q15 vs q16

Chisq

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.000	0.000	0
Edu	0.003	0.262	0

Correlation

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.406	0.303	0.490
Edu	0.486	0.467	0.451

H2, 10-05-2017, q15 vs q17

Chisq

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.354	0.019	0.013
Edu	0.198	0.847	0.653

Correlation

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.075	0.002	0.105
Edu	0.131	-0.171	0.007

H3, 10-05-2017, q15 vs q18

Chisq

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.007	0.000	0.024
Edu	0.350	0.652	0.409

Correlation

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.095	0.171	0.144
Edu	0.047	-0.293	0.012

H4, 10-05-2017, q15 vs q19

Chisq

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	0.065	0.002	0.001
Edu	0.228	0.882	0.041

Correlation

	fb	ig	sc
noEdu	-0.039	-0.033	-0.029
Edu	-0.116	-0.164	-0.231