

Executive summary

This report analyzes data from Wave 14 of the 2016 Pew Research Center's American Trends Panel focusing on social media use and politics. Chi-square analyses examines the differences in ways news is consumed, the perception of media fairness and accuracy, and the role of social media in political awareness. The findings indicate statistically significant differences in how people engage with the news from the type of news they follow, the device used to obtain the news, and preference for online news consumption from different social media platforms. Despite the statistical significance of the comparisons, the effect sizes were mostly weak suggesting that the differences between groups have little practical impact.

Overview of Dataset

The survey data for this report is Wave 14 of the 2016 Pew Research Center's American Trends Panel which focuses on social media use and politics. The survey was conducted January 12 – February 8, 2016. Twelve survey questions from the complete survey is used for this report.

Methods of Analysis

Frequency descriptive statistics and a chi-square analysis were done for each of the twelve questions using SPSS. Missing variables in the dataset were automatically recognized by SPSS. Only the frequency data corresponding to the survey responses are used in the chi-square analysis. "Refused" entries are not considered in the analysis since it is not a survey response. The frequency for each response was used in the chi-square analysis which was weighted before conducting the analysis. A chi-square test for independence was performed on questions with two or more categories. A chi-square test for goodness of fit was performed on questions with a single category. A significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ is assumed and a table of chi-square critical values is used to determine the significance of the calculated chi-square statistic.

Results

Question: How closely do you follow a) International news b) National news c) Local news d) News about your neighborhood?

H_0 : There is no significant difference in how closely people follow international, national, local, and neighborhood news.

H_a : There is a significant difference in how closely people follow international, national, local, and neighborhood news.

Vernacular: People follow the news at about the same level.

The frequency of responses for each sub-question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries $N = 18,549$. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 16.919 for $df = 9$ ($\chi^2 = 507.541$) and a p-value less than the significance level ($p < 0.001$) suggesting that there is a significant difference in how closely people followed each type of news and the null hypothesis can be rejected. The calculated effect size (Cramer's V) is 0.096 which is weak ($ES \leq 0.2$) suggesting that although the result is statistically significant, the fields are weakly associated.

Statistics				
	NEWS_LEVEL A. How closely do you follow... International news	NEWS_LEVEL B. How closely do you follow... National news	NEWS_LEVEL C. How closely do you follow... Local news	NEWS_LEVEL D. How closely do you follow... News about your neighborhood
N	Valid	4654	4654	4654
	Missing	0	0	0

NEWS_LEVELA. How closely do you follow...International news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very closely	1172	25.2	25.2	25.2
	Somewhat closely	2288	49.2	49.2	74.3
	Not very closely	939	20.2	20.2	94.5
	Not at all closely	243	5.2	5.2	99.7
	Refused	12	.3	.3	100.0
Total		4654	100.0	100.0	

NEWS_LEVELB. How closely do you follow...National news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very closely	1949	41.9	41.9	41.9
	Somewhat closely	2035	43.7	43.7	85.6
	Not very closely	507	10.9	10.9	96.5
	Not at all closely	138	3.0	3.0	99.5
	Refused	25	.5	.5	100.0
Total		4654	100.0	100.0	

NEWS_LEVELC. How closely do you follow...Local news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very closely	1699	36.5	36.5	36.5
	Somewhat closely	2087	44.8	44.8	81.3
	Not very closely	703	15.1	15.1	96.5
	Not at all closely	148	3.2	3.2	99.6
	Refused	17	.4	.4	100.0
Total		4654	100.0	100.0	

Response * Question Crosstabulation

		Question				Total
Response		a	b	c	d	
Very closely	Count	1172	1949	1699	1655	6475
	Expected Count	1620.4	1615.9	1618.7	1620.1	6475.0
	% within Response	18.1%	30.1%	26.2%	25.6%	100.0%
	% within Question	25.2%	42.1%	36.6%	35.7%	34.9%
	% of Total	6.3%	10.5%	9.2%	8.9%	34.9%
	Standardized Residual	-11.1	8.3	2.0	.9	
Somewhat closely	Count	2288	2035	2087	1805	8215
	Expected Count	2055.9	2050.1	2053.6	2055.4	8215.0
	% within Response	27.9%	24.8%	25.4%	22.0%	100.0%
	% within Question	49.3%	44.0%	45.0%	38.9%	44.3%
	% of Total	12.3%	11.0%	11.3%	9.7%	44.3%
	Standardized Residual	5.1	-.3	.7	-5.5	
Not very closely	Count	939	507	703	854	3003
	Expected Count	751.5	749.4	750.7	751.4	3003.0
	% within Response	31.3%	16.9%	23.4%	28.4%	100.0%
	% within Question	20.2%	11.0%	15.2%	18.4%	16.2%
	% of Total	5.1%	2.7%	3.8%	4.6%	16.2%
	Standardized Residual	6.8	-8.9	-1.7	3.7	
Not at all closely	Count	243	138	148	327	856
	Expected Count	214.2	213.6	214.0	214.2	856.0
	% within Response	28.4%	16.1%	17.3%	38.2%	100.0%
	% within Question	5.2%	3.0%	3.2%	7.0%	4.6%
	% of Total	1.3%	0.7%	0.8%	1.8%	4.6%
	Standardized Residual	2.0	-5.2	-4.5	7.7	
Total	Count	4642	4629	4637	4641	18549
	Expected Count	4642.0	4629.0	4637.0	4641.0	18549.0
	% within Response	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within Question	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	507.541 ^a	9	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	520.953	9	<.001
N of Valid Cases	18549		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 213.62.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.165	<.001
	Cramer's V	.096	<.001
N of Valid Cases		18549	

Question: Thinking about news (by news we mean information about events and issues that involve more than just your friends and family), how often do you get news a) on a desktop or laptop computer b) on a mobile device (such as a smartphone or tablet)?

H₀: There is no significant difference in how often people get the news on desktops or laptops compared to mobile devices.

H_a: There is a significant difference in how often people get the news on desktops or laptops compared to mobile devices.

Vernacular: People get the news from their desktops or laptops and on their mobile devices about the same amount.

The frequency of responses for each sub-question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries N = 8,672. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 7.815 for df = 3 ($\chi^2 = 254.261$) a p-value less than the significance level ($p < 0.001$) suggesting that there is a significant difference in how often people get the news on desktops and laptops compared to mobile devices and the null hypothesis can be rejected. The calculated effect size (Cramer's V) is 0.171 which is weak ($ES \leq 0.2$) suggesting that although the result is statistically significant, the fields are weakly associated.

Statistics

		NEWS_DEVIC EA. On a desktop or laptop computer?	NEWS_DEVIC EB. On a mobile device (such as a smartphone or tablet)?
N	Valid	4339	4339
	Missing	315	315

NEWS_DEVICEA. On a desktop or laptop computer?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Often	2091	44.9	48.2	48.2
	Sometimes	1411	30.3	32.5	80.7
	Hardly ever	584	12.5	13.5	94.2
	Never	250	5.4	5.8	99.9
	Refused	3	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	4339	93.2	100.0	
Missing	System	315	6.8		
Total		4654	100.0		

NEWS_DEVICEB. On a mobile device (such as a smartphone or tablet)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Often	2031	43.6	46.8	46.8
	Sometimes	1070	23.0	24.7	71.5
	Hardly ever	546	11.7	12.6	84.1
	Never	689	14.8	15.9	99.9
	Refused	3	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	4339	93.2	100.0	
Missing	System	315	6.8		
Total		4654	100.0		

Response * Question Crosstabulation					
		Question			
		a	b	Total	
Response	Often	Count	2091	2031	4122
		Expected Count	2061.0	2061.0	4122.0
		% within Response	50.7%	49.3%	100.0%
		% within Question	48.2%	46.8%	47.5%
		% of Total	24.1%	23.4%	47.5%
	Sometimes	Standardized Residual	.7	-.7	
		Count	1411	1070	2481
		Expected Count	1240.5	1240.5	2481.0
		% within Response	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%
		% within Question	32.5%	24.7%	28.6%
	Hardly ever	% of Total	16.3%	12.3%	28.6%
		Standardized Residual	4.8	-4.8	
		Count	584	546	1130
		Expected Count	565.0	565.0	1130.0
		% within Response	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
	Never	% within Question	13.5%	12.6%	13.0%
		% of Total	6.7%	6.3%	13.0%
		Standardized Residual	.8	-.8	
		Count	250	689	939
		Expected Count	469.5	469.5	939.0
Total	% within Response	26.6%	73.4%	100.0%	
	% within Question	5.8%	15.9%	10.8%	
	% of Total	2.9%	7.9%	10.8%	
	Standardized Residual	-10.1	10.1		
	Count	4336	4336	8672	
	Expected Count	4336.0	4336.0	8672.0	
	% within Response	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	% within Question	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	254.261 ^a	3	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	262.629	3	<.001
N of Valid Cases	8672		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 469.50.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.171	<.001
	Cramer's V	.171	<.001
N of Valid Cases		8672	

Question: Regardless of how closely you follow national news, how well do the national news media keep you informed of the most important national stories of the day?

H₀: The national news media do not significantly differ in how well they keep people informed of important national stories.

H_a: The national news media does significantly differ in how well they keep people informed of important national stories.

Vernacular: The national news media do a similar job keeping people informed of important national stories.

The frequency of responses for the question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries N = 4,633 and the expected frequencies were assumed to be equal. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 7.815 for df = 3 ($\chi^2 = 2711.926$) a p-value less than the significance level (p = 0.000) suggesting that the national news media does significantly differ in how well they keep people informed of important national news stories and the null hypothesis can be rejected. Since this analysis tested for goodness of fit (single category), the effect size was calculated using the Cohen's omega formula ($\omega = \text{square root of } \chi^2 / N^2$) to be 0.0112 which is weak ($ES \leq 0.2$) suggesting that although the result is statistically significant, the responses are weakly associated.

Statistics

NATLMEDIA_JOB. Regardless of how closely you follow NATIONAL NEWS, how well do the national news media keep you informed of the most important NATIONAL stories of the day?

N	Valid	4654
	Missing	0

NATLMEDIA_JOB. Regardless of how closely you follow NATIONAL NEWS, how well do the national news media keep you informed of the most important NATIONAL stories of the day?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very well	1100	23.6	23.6	23.6
	Fairly well	2579	55.4	55.4	79.1
	Not too well	786	16.9	16.9	95.9
	Not at all well	168	3.6	3.6	99.5
	Refused	21	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	4654	100.0	100.0	

Frequency

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
168	168	1158.3	-990.2
786	786	1158.3	-372.2
1100	1100	1158.3	-58.2
2579	2579	1158.3	1420.8
Total	4633		

Test Statistics

	Frequency
Chi-Square	2711.926 ^a
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 1158.3.

Question: In presenting the news dealing with political and social issues, do you think that news organizations deal fairly with all sides, or do they tend to favor one side?

H₀: News organizations deal fairly with all sides of political and social issues.

H_a: News organizations tend to favor one side of political and social issues.

Vernacular: News organizations are fair in their reporting of political and social issues.

The frequency of responses for the question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries N = 4,585 and the expected frequencies were assumed to be equal. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 3.841 for df = 1 ($\chi^2 = 1574.693$) a p-value less than the significance level (p = 0.000) suggesting that news organizations tend to favor one side of political and social issues and the null hypothesis can be rejected. Since this analysis tested for goodness of fit (single category), the effect size was calculated using the Cohen's Omega w formula to be 0.0087 which is weak ($ES \leq 0.2$) suggesting that although the result is statistically significant, the responses are weakly associated.

Statistics

WATCHDOG_3. In presenting the news dealing with political and social issues, do you think that news organizations deal fairly with all sides, or do they tend to favor one side?

N	Valid	4654
	Missing	0

WATCHDOG_3. In presenting the news dealing with political and social issues, do you think that news organizations deal fairly with all sides, or do they tend to favor one side?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Deal fairly with all sides	949	20.4	20.4	20.4
	Tend to favor one side	3636	78.1	78.1	98.5
	Refused	69	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	4654	100.0	100.0	

Frequency

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
949	949	2292.5	-1343.5
3636	3636	2292.5	1343.5
Total	4585		

Test Statistics

	Frequency
Chi-Square	1574.693 ^a
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 2292.5.

Question: How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by a) People that you are close with b) People you are not particularly close with c) News organizations?

H₀: There is no significant difference in accuracy of news posted online by people you're close to, not close to, or news organizations.

H_a: There is a significant difference in accuracy of news posted online by people you're close to, not close to, or news organizations.

Vernacular: The news posted online by people you're close to, not close to, or news organizations is equally accurate.

The frequency of responses for each sub-question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries N = 11,281. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 12.592 for df = 6 ($\chi^2 = 1389.580$) a p-value less than the significance level ($p < 0.001$) suggesting that the accuracy of news posted online differs between people you're close to, not close to, or news organizations and the null hypothesis can be rejected. The calculated effect size (Cramer's V) is 0.248 which is moderate ($0.2 < ES \leq 0.6$) suggesting that the fields are moderately associated.

Statistics

		NEWSACCA. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...People that you are close with	NEWSACCB. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...People you are not particularly close with	NEWSACCC. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...News organizations
N	Valid	4045	3370	4040
	Missing	609	1284	614

NEWSACCA. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...People that you are close with

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very accurate	272	5.8	6.7	6.7
	Somewhat accurate	2844	61.1	70.3	77.0
	Not too accurate	796	17.1	19.7	96.7
	Not at all accurate	65	1.4	1.6	98.3
	Refused	68	1.5	1.7	100.0
	Total	4045	86.9	100.0	
Missing	System	609	13.1		
Total		4654	100.0		

NEWSACCB. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...People you are not particularly close with

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very accurate	63	1.4	1.9	1.9
	Somewhat accurate	1674	36.0	49.7	51.5
	Not too accurate	1432	30.8	42.5	94.0
	Not at all accurate	142	3.1	4.2	98.2
	Refused	59	1.3	1.8	100.0
	Total	3370	72.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1284	27.6		
Total		4654	100.0		

NEWSACCC. How accurate, do you think, is the news posted online by...News organizations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very accurate	558	12.0	13.8	13.8
	Somewhat accurate	2918	62.7	72.2	86.0
	Not too accurate	459	9.9	11.4	97.4
	Not at all accurate	58	1.2	1.4	98.8
	Refused	47	1.0	1.2	100.0
	Total	4040	86.8	100.0	
Missing	System	614	13.2		
Total		4654	100.0		

Response * Question Crosstabulation

			Question			
			a	b	c	Total
Response	Very accurate	Count	272	63	558	893
		Expected Count	314.8	262.1	316.1	893.0
		% within Response	30.5%	7.1%	62.5%	100.0%
		% within Question	6.8%	1.9%	14.0%	7.9%
		% of Total	2.4%	0.6%	4.9%	7.9%
	Somewhat accurate	Standardized Residual	-2.4	-12.3	13.6	
		Count	2844	1674	2918	7436
		Expected Count	2621.5	2182.5	2632.0	7436.0
		% within Response	38.2%	22.5%	39.2%	100.0%
		% within Question	71.5%	50.6%	73.1%	65.9%
	Not too accurate	% of Total	25.2%	14.8%	25.9%	65.9%
		Standardized Residual	4.3	-10.9	5.6	
		Count	796	1432	459	2687
		Expected Count	947.3	788.6	951.1	2687.0
		% within Response	29.6%	53.3%	17.1%	100.0%
	Not at all accurate	% within Question	20.0%	43.2%	11.5%	23.8%
		% of Total	7.1%	12.7%	4.1%	23.8%
		Standardized Residual	-4.9	22.9	-16.0	
		Count	65	142	58	265
		Expected Count	93.4	77.8	93.8	265.0
Total	% within Response	24.5%	53.6%	21.9%	100.0%	
	% within Question	1.6%	4.3%	1.5%	2.3%	
	% of Total	0.6%	1.3%	0.5%	2.3%	
	Standardized Residual	-2.9	7.3	-3.7		
	Count	3977	3311	3993	11281	
	Expected Count	3977.0	3311.0	3993.0	11281.0	
	% within Response	35.3%	29.4%	35.4%	100.0%	
	% within Question	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	35.3%	29.4%	35.4%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1389.580 ^a	6	<.001
Likelihood Ratio	1383.080	6	<.001
N of Valid Cases	11281		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 77.78.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.351	<.001
	Cramer's V	.248	<.001
N of Valid Cases		11281	

Question: In the past week, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites a) Facebook b) Twitter c) Google Plus d) LinkedIn e) Instagram f) Vine g) Tumblr h) YouTube i) Reddit j) Snapchat?

H_0 : There is no significant difference in the likelihood of people learning about the presidential campaign or candidates across different social media platforms.

H_a : There is a significant difference in the likelihood of people learning about the presidential campaigns or candidates across different social media platforms.

Vernacular: People are likely to learn about the presidential campaign or candidates no matter the social media platform.

The frequency of responses for each sub-question is shown below and used in the analysis to test the null hypothesis for total entries $N = 10,794$. The chi-square analysis resulted in a chi-square statistic greater than the critical value of 16.919 for $df = 9$ ($\chi^2 = 1661.276$) and a p-value less than the significance level ($p = 0.000$) suggesting people learn differently from the different social media platforms about the presidential campaigns or candidates and the null hypothesis can be rejected.

The calculated effect size (Cramer's V) is 0.392 which is moderate ($0.2 < ES \leq 0.6$) suggesting that the fields are moderately associated.

Statistics											
		SNSELECTA. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Facebook	SNSELECTB. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Twitter	SNSELECTC. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Google Plus	SNSELECTD. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? LinkedIn	SNSELECTE. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Instagram	SNSELECTF. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Vine	SNSELECTG. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Tumblr	SNSELECTH. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? YouTube	SNSELECTI. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Reddit	SNSELECTJ. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Snapchat
N	Valid	3210	908	894	1348	933	115	198	2542	288	439
	Missing	1444	3746	3760	3306	3721	4539	4456	2112	4366	4215

SNSELECTA. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Facebook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	1642	35.3	51.2	51.2
	No	1557	33.5	48.5	99.7
	Refused	11	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	3210	69.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1444	31.0		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTB. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Twitter

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	390	8.4	43.0	43.0
	No	512	11.0	56.4	99.3
	Refused	6	.1	.7	100.0
	Total	908	19.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3746	80.5		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTC. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Google Plus

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	229	4.9	25.6	25.6
	No	651	14.0	72.8	98.4
	Refused	14	.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	894	19.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3760	80.8		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTD. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? LinkedIn

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	65	1.4	4.8	4.8
	No	1272	27.3	94.4	99.2
	Refused	11	.2	.8	100.0
	Total	1348	29.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3306	71.0		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTE. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Instagram

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	113	2.4	12.1	12.1
	No	813	17.5	87.1	99.2
	Refused	7	.2	.8	100.0
	Total	933	20.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3721	80.0		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTF. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Vine

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	16	.3	13.9	13.9
	No	99	2.1	86.1	100.0
	Total	115	2.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4539	97.5		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTG. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Tumblr

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	43	.9	21.7	21.7
	No	152	3.3	76.8	98.5
	Refused	3	.1	1.5	100.0
	Total	198	4.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4456	95.7		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTH. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? YouTube

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	454	9.8	17.9	17.9
	No	2064	44.3	81.2	99.1
	Refused	24	.5	.9	100.0
	Total	2542	54.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2112	45.4		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTI. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Reddit

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	134	2.9	46.5	46.5
	No	152	3.3	52.8	99.3
	Refused	2	.0	.7	100.0
	Total	288	6.2	100.0	
Missing	System	4366	93.8		
Total		4654	100.0		

SNSELECTJ. In the PAST WEEK, did you learn something about the presidential campaign or candidates from each of the following sites? Snapchat

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	42	.9	9.6	9.6
	No	394	8.5	89.7	99.3
	Refused	3	.1	.7	100.0
	Total	439	9.4	100.0	
Missing	System	4215	90.6		
Total		4654	100.0		

Response * Question Crosstabulation

			Question										
			a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	Total
Response	Yes	Count	1642	390	229	65	113	16	43	454	134	42	3128
		Expected Count	927.0	261.4	255.0	387.5	268.3	33.3	56.5	729.7	82.9	126.3	3128.0
		% within Response	52.5%	12.5%	7.3%	2.1%	3.6%	0.5%	1.4%	14.5%	4.3%	1.3%	100.0%
		% within Question	51.3%	43.2%	26.0%	4.9%	12.2%	13.9%	22.1%	18.0%	46.9%	9.6%	29.0%
		% of Total	15.2%	3.6%	2.1%	0.6%	1.0%	0.1%	0.4%	4.2%	1.2%	0.4%	29.0%
		Standardized Residual	23.5	8.0	-1.6	-16.4	-9.5	-3.0	-1.8	-10.2	5.6	-7.5	
	No	Count	1557	512	651	1272	813	99	152	2064	152	394	7666
		Expected Count	2272.0	640.6	625.0	949.5	657.7	81.7	138.5	1788.3	203.1	309.7	7666.0
		% within Response	20.3%	6.7%	8.5%	16.6%	10.6%	1.3%	2.0%	26.9%	2.0%	5.1%	100.0%
		% within Question	48.7%	56.8%	74.0%	95.1%	87.8%	86.1%	77.9%	82.0%	53.1%	90.4%	71.0%
		% of Total	14.4%	4.7%	6.0%	11.8%	7.5%	0.9%	1.4%	19.1%	1.4%	3.7%	71.0%
		Standardized Residual	-15.0	-5.1	1.0	10.5	6.1	1.9	1.1	6.5	-3.6	4.8	
		Total	Count	3199	902	880	1337	926	115	195	2518	286	436
Expected Count	3199.0		902.0	880.0	1337.0	926.0	115.0	195.0	2518.0	286.0	436.0	10794.0	
% within Response	29.6%		8.4%	8.2%	12.4%	8.6%	1.1%	1.8%	23.3%	2.6%	4.0%	100.0%	
% within Question	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
% of Total	29.6%		8.4%	8.2%	12.4%	8.6%	1.1%	1.8%	23.3%	2.6%	4.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1661.276 ^a	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	1766.451	9	.000
N of Valid Cases	10794		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.33.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.392	.000
	Cramer's V	.392	.000
N of Valid Cases		10794	

Discussion

The results of the chi-square analysis suggest that there are statistically significant differences in how people consume and perceive the news although its impact varies. Despite the statistical significance, the weak effect size indicates that these differences are not substantial in practice. For news level, people follow different types of news at varying levels, but the weak effect size indicates that the actual differences may not be meaningful. Similarly, how often people get the news from desktops/laptops compared to mobile devices varies but the association between them is weak. Perceptions of fair and accurate news reporting differs significantly, but the strength of these perceptions may not be overwhelming. The moderate association of social media platforms

suggests that certain platforms play a more prominent role in how news is consumed. Overall, statistical significance is apparent across all of the analyses but the practical significance varies.