

Piloting the Questionnaire

Before disseminating the questionnaire out to the intended population, it was decided that it would be ideal if it was possible to get it tested by people who would come under the intended audience of the questionnaire, to gauge their initial thoughts of the newly designed questionnaire. The intention of piloting the questionnaire was imperative for the questionnaire because some of the aspects of what the questions were trying to find from the audience would be difficult for the eventual recipients to understand, unless it was explained to them properly and in an appropriate manner. Given the initial input, the questionnaire was then piloted by two individuals separately, so that there could be an initial idea for how well they understood some of the more technical questions being asked of them. Also, it gave the author a chance to get some feedback on things such as the layout, the way questions were presented and the answers that the recipient were allowed to give and finally any errors that they could spot that were made.

The pilot was conducted through a sit-down chat between the person piloting the questionnaire and the author, where they were asked to carry out the questionnaire as if they would normally, but to give their opinions as they were going through the process. These opinions were then taken down on a piece of paper and have been written up below:

Pilot One

- Concerning the “terms of service” question, leuan felt that a lot of recipients would answer that they would say they didn’t read terms of service based off of his experience with his friends. It was explained to him that the reason this question was included was so that if there were people that read the terms of services, that it could be seen if they felt more comfortable with the findings from the research and analysis in comparison with those who don’t.
- Concerning the “What is included in a tweet” question, from the initial description give about what is included in a tweet, he still didn’t understand what the question was about. From the description, he still could not understand the type of information given away when sending out a tweet, he still just assumed his initial thoughts of just your name, twitter handle and the text you put in the tweet were sent out. He suggested that the questionnaire designer re-write the description to make it clearer to the recipient, which was then amended appropriately.
- Concerning the “third party applications” question, initially he did not understand the downside to other people having access to personal information because he thought it was secure. After answering the first question on page two, he could then see the potential dangers.
- He felt that the questionnaire was too long, maybe putting people off completing the questionnaire fully. It was explained to leuan that it was necessary for such an in-depth questionnaire because of the reasons of needing to explain each technical question fully
- He felt that the way that the questions on page two of the questionnaire were a bit crammed and could be quite difficult for some to read because of the way it was presented. Again, it was explained that the

difficulty of manipulating the layout of a questionnaire produce in Google Forms as with that type of question the layout is fixed.

- His thoughts about the questionnaire were exactly what had been predicted and what would have been expected from the results after disseminating it into the public. Leuan's initial thoughts were that he knew that information was collected but didn't know about how the manipulation of this information could potentially impact him in a negative way

Pilot Two

- Concerning the "number of tweets sent a day" question, Tom thought that the initial answers provided to the recipient were too similar and that this would show in the results. Having answers of "0-1" and "1-2" and "3 or more" wouldn't give a true reflection the type of user that the recipient was as opposed to the suggestion of spacing out the answers to give a wider range of numbers. Having the answers the way they were would more or less class all users the same way because there is no real difference between the answers. This suggestion was incorporated into the questionnaire to gain a truer reflection of the user.
- Tom felt the initial layout of the questionnaire would potentially skew the results because the question "Do you feel safe" was asked after giving away potentially scary information in the question concerning "What are you most scared of when using Twitter." This suggestion was undertaken and the questionnaire's layout was subsequently changed.
- Concerning the "third party application" question, Tom felt that he didn't understand what was being described as a third party application. Having discussed with him what it was, he could then see what was trying to be explained, so he suggested describing it in a way in which most users would recognise a third party application. A lot of people would be most familiar with them through mobile apps with the message "sign in via Twitter" so he suggested include this in the description, which was amended appropriately.
- Concerning the statement questions on page two, Tom did not feel that the adjectives "worried" and "uncomfortable" were shown in the right context, since initially the questionnaire was produced in a way that showed "uncomfortable" being worse than "worried." He suggested switching the two adjectives around as most users would find being worried about something to be worse than being uncomfortable with something.
- Picked up a spelling error in the same question, where "uncomfortable" was misspelled.
- Concerning the control question on page two, he felt that the feature that included having videos appear on user's home page or timeline to be too much for the user to see every time they access their accounts. He suggested having a separate menu under the help settings where such videos could be included, which would keep people's already

cluttered timelines and profiles less cluttered than needed. The change was made within the questionnaire.

Feedback from Questionnaire

After disseminating the questionnaire, there was other anonymous feedback which had been received from a few recipients, who felt they had some points to make about the questionnaire. Most of them were about how the questionnaire could have been improved by changing a few things. Below these suggestions have been documented.

- For the “location services” question and the “adding location to a tweet” question, recipients felt that the answers that were given would not reflect all of the public’s thoughts. They thought that the inclusion of an extra answer on top of yes and no should have been included to incorporate the opinions of those who did not know locations could be added to tweets or those who did not know what they could enable location services.
- For the “what insecurities do you have” question, recipients felt that there should have been an option to include the opinion of those who did not have any fears of using social media. With the way the question was written with an answer being required for this question, you are pigeon-holing a person’s opinion into an answer which does not accurately reflect their opinion.
- For the “Do you feel safe on Twitter question?” from the second page, it was brought up a number of times that the question seemed contradictory, since the actual question was “do you feel safe?” while the supporting text leads with “has your opinion changed.” This led to some confusion for the recipients who pointed out that from the question above that they now felt no longer safe using Twitter and that their opinions had changed. This meant that they didn’t know whether to answer no for feeling safe on twitter, or yes for the opinion has changed. Recipients noted that re-wording the underlying text would have led to less confusion, but most understood that the answer were related to the question “do you feel safe?” From evaluation of the question, it was clear to see where the confusion may have come from.
- General feedback received from the questionnaire suggest that the studies underlying assumptions were correct in that a lot of people knew that information was collected from them but did not know the possibilities of having all this information being available to everyone could be potentially dangerous to them.
- General feedback received suggests that the recipients understood what the questions were asking from them and that allowed them to answer the questions as accurately as possible to reflect their true opinions.