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1. Executive Summary

This document presents the Malta results of a study undertaken as part of the CONSENT project. Analyses and results are based on an online survey regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. The questionnaire consisted of 75 questions and was available online in several European languages, including Maltese, between July and December 2011. For the dissemination of links to this online questionnaire in Malta, a mix of national media and University of Malta channels were used, ranging from banner ads on various media platforms and an media release to personalised emails and a special edition of the University’s Campus e-newsletter.

The Malta sample consists of 618 respondents (7.2% of the total sample), of which 39% male and 61% female, with an average age of 29 and 80% tertiary education. With 84% UGC users (total sample 90%), 11.08 mean years of internet usage (total sample 10.67) and 95.4% using the internet at home every day or almost every day (total sample 93%), it is considered a sample of predominantly experienced internet users.

This level of experience is confirmed by the Maltese respondents’ awareness and behaviour regarding the handling of technical details: 70% are aware of “cookies” (total sample 65%), though less than 2 out of three respondents actually ever disabled them (Malta 64%, total sample 68%). On the level of specific technical measure taken to maintain or increase personal internet security, some practices (pop-up window blockers, checking opt-in / opt-out boxes, blocking emails) are more established than others (checking for spyware, clearing the browser history), with the Malta sample showing similar results to the overall sample average.

92.4% of Maltese respondents indicated that they shop online (total sample 87.4%), with little disparities between the different age groups and a strong preference to buy (via Debit/Credit card or Electronic Money) at the time of ordering. Of those Maltese respondents who never bought anything online, 46.2% highlighted their lack of trust in online sellers as a reason for this, which differs significantly from the overall sample average (15.4%).

The large proportion of Maltese respondents (83.7%) who have ever opened an account with a social networking website (SNS) is similar to the total sample average (86.7%) and confirms Facebook’s own statistics that Maltese users range on the very top within the EU (77%, total EU27 average 51%). Regarding other UGC websites, Maltese respondents stand out with 38.9% having ever created an account with a business networking website (total sample 16.7%); all other UGC website types are under the 25% mark.

As the main drivers for the use of SNS sites, Maltese respondents indicate their interest in networking (44.3%, total sample 31%) and as reasons for SNS non-usage are given networking effects, a more general disinterest and technical problems (combined 89.6%, total sample 85.8%). In deleting a SNS account, trust issues and concern about information misuse play a certain role (Malta: 20.6%, total sample 29.9%). Similar proportional reasons are given for
deleting an account with an UGC website, but lack – or loss – of interests remain the core motivator behind deleting an account.

Regarding the perception of general risks related to the disclosure of personal information on UGC websites, Maltese respondents appear less apprehensive than the overall average. However, they do perceive a clearly increased risk of privacy loss and information misuse (5.70 and 5.88 respectively on a 7 point scale, 1=disagree and 7=agree). On the level of specific risks perceived, 71.1% of Maltese respondents consider it likely or very likely that information is used or shared without their knowledge or consent, and 80.4% that it is used to send them unwanted commercial offers, proportions being similar to the overall sample average. Respondents from Malta also show the highest concern of the risk of discrimination (32.3%, total sample 22.9%) as a result of information they disclose on UGC websites, and they also score amongst the highest for the perceived risk to their personal safety, and of damage to their personal reputation.

Generally, Maltese respondents show an overall average awareness about the use of personal information by website owners. There are high levels of awareness and acceptance of the use of information by website owners to contact users by email (awareness 89.2%, acceptance 87.7 %). Similarly high is the awareness and acceptance of the use of personal information to customise content and advertising. However, whilst there appears some form of “balance” between user awareness and user acceptance towards these practices, there are substantially lower levels of acceptance of in-depth gathering of information, selling it, or making it available to others. Such practices are seen as largely unacceptable (Malta 68%, total sample 74%).

Actual experience of privacy invasions is comparably low with Maltese respondents scoring 2.6 (total sample 2.89) on a 7 point scale (1=never, 7=very frequently). To safeguard their privacy, 53.2% of Maltese respondents often or always change the privacy settings of their personal profiles on UGC sites (overall sample average of 53.5%), and 78.6% (total sample 79.7%) of those who change privacy settings indicated that they made the privacy settings stricter so that others can see less information about them.

In dealing with privacy policies relatively few respondents from Malta (37%) ever decided not to use a website due to their dissatisfaction with the site’s privacy policy, but over half of Maltese respondents never or rarely actually read a site’s terms and conditions (54%) or privacy policy (50.7%). If reading the privacy policies, respondents rarely read the whole text (Malta 5.5%, total sample 10.8%), although being rather confident that – when reading it – the text is mostly or fully understood (Malta 61.8%, total sample 63.6%).
2. Introduction

The analyses and results in this document are based on an online survey regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. This study was undertaken as part of the CONSENT project – “Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy” (CONSENT; G.A. 244643) – which was co-financed by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development of the European Union (SSH-2009-3.2.1. “Changes in Consumption and Consumer Markets”).

This document highlights the findings from the study that are relevant to Malta. Other separate reports are available for the countries listed in the table below.

The online questionnaire used in this study consisted of 75 questions and sub-questions, covering general internet usage, online behaviour – in particular regarding online shopping and UGC websites – and the related consumer perceptions and attitudes. Given the specific interest of this research project, attitudes and practices in the disclosure of personal information and online privacy were particularly targeted.

The questionnaire was available online between July 2011 and December 2011. A snowball technique was used to promote the study and disseminate links to the questionnaire. A total of 8641 individuals from 26 countries completed at least a part of the questionnaire. Fourteen countries had respondent numbers which were sufficient for a meaningful quantitative analysis by country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number of Respondents¹</th>
<th>% of Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,641</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ As the online questionnaire allowed respondents to leave individual questions out / not respond to all questions, these numbers can vary in the following analyses. If questions allowed – or required – more than one answer analyses may also be based on the number of responses (rather than number of respondents).
Of the total number of respondents, 45% were male and 55% female. The average age of respondents was 30 years, and the highest education level achieved by participants was of 34% secondary school or lower and 66% tertiary education. 45% of respondents were students. 71% of respondents described their location as urban, 13% as sub-urban and 16% as rural.

This quantitative analysis does not claim to be representative of either the entire EU population or the respective individual EU countries listed above, due to the fact that the sample used was a non-probability sample. Firstly, given that an online questionnaire was used, the population of possible respondents was limited to individuals with internet access. Secondly, although the dissemination of links to the online questionnaire (see also chapter 3 Methodology) was targeting a wider public to include all age groups, education levels, employment situations and geographic locations, its points of origin were the partners in this project, many of which are universities. This has resulted in a sample that is more likely to be representative of experienced, frequent internet users who are very likely to also be UGC users, and it also contains a substantial proportion of students.

Consequently, the frequency of internet usage amongst CONSENT respondents is slightly higher than in studies with samples that reflect the general population (in particular Eurobarometer\(^2\) and Eurostat\(^3\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Usage at Home</th>
<th>Every day / almost every day</th>
<th>2-3 times a week</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Less often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobarometer(^4)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurostat 2011(^5)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This above-average frequent usage is also supported by a comparison of the incidence of online shoppers (CONSENT total sample: 87.4% vs. Eurobarometer: 60%; Eurostat 2011: 58%) and Social Networking Site (SNS) users (CONSENT total sample: 86.7% vs. Eurobarometer 52%; Eurostat 2011: 53%).

However, throughout this report the CONSENT data are, wherever possible, compared with those from these studies and local reports to constantly evaluate the “proximity” of the CONSENT results to those from surveys which aim to be representative of the EU population as a whole.\(^5\) In order to facilitate such comparison, the online questionnaire included a number of

---


\(^4\) For comparison reasons, percentages have been recalculated without those respondents who never use the internet and/or have no internet access.

\(^5\) In the Eurobarometer study, the total average is, obviously, based on the results in all 27 EU countries. Additionally – and in contrast to the total CONSENT sample, the EU27 average is a weighted average based on the respective population size in each country. Consequently, the total Eurobarometer average will be comparably closer to the country results of e.g. Germany or the UK, and less similar to the results of e.g. Slovakia or Malta.
marker questions which are largely compatible in content and/or structure with questions set in other studies. Responses to these marker questions make comparisons between results of different studies possible and also highlight possible different interpretative standpoints.

In this context, one noticeable result of the present study is that the general aspects related to perceptions, attitudes and practices in UGC usage across national boundaries do vary from country to country, but they do not appear to reflect any general North/West-South/East divide as stated in the Eurobarometer survey, e.g., regarding what information is perceived as personal, or high SNS usage rates versus low online shopping rates (and vice versa).

Additionally, the CONSENT data did not reveal any general trend which would confirm a socio-geographic divide. On the level of specific perceptions and practices, observable variations do exist, but rather than ascribing these to either socio-economic differences or putative “national characters” it may be more productive to depict and analyse a situation where shifting ideas and concerns about online privacy and disclosure of personal information are informed by different local – institutional, legal, historical – and trans-local structures, which merge and supersede each other. Instead of linking CONSENT results back to assumed “cultural” differences, they can then contribute to the understanding of a, perhaps, specifically European dynamic where ideas and concerns transgress national boundaries. This aspect of the study which requires further qualitative research is addressed in another separate CONSENT study (Work Package 8).

the CONSENT study is not aiming at representing a total EU population but a trans-European perspective on internet users, we have chosen to attribute to every European respondent the same weight.
3. Methodology

The English and Maltese versions of the online questionnaire used in this study may be viewed in Appendix A.1 and A.2. The questionnaire was also translated into Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, French, Hungarian, German, Greek, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, and Swedish. Respondents could choose which language to see the questionnaire in by selecting from a pull-down menu on the first page of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was available online between July 2011 and December 2011. A snowball technique was used to promote the study and disseminate links to the questionnaire. Each partner in the CONSENT project was responsible for the dissemination of links in their respective country.

In Malta, a mix of national media and University of Malta channels was used for the dissemination of links to the online questionnaire.

- Banner ads were placed on Malta’s leading news portal - timesofmalta.com at the beginning of the data collection period.
- 8th August – 14th August 2011: 20% occupancy of banner ad at top of News page.
- 15th August – 21st August 2011: 10% occupancy of banner ad at top of Home page.
- A media release was sent to all major media in Malta on 5th August 2011 with information about the CONSENT project with prominent mention of the online questionnaire and also providing a link to the questionnaire.
- A Banner ad was placed on the Faculty of Media & Knowledge Science, University of Malta website from August to November 2011.
- Personalised emails explaining the research were sent in November 2011 to a selection of present and some past University of Malta students.
- A Banner ad was placed on timesofmalta.com News section with 10% occupancy of Leader Board on the News page for two weeks commencing Oct 31 2011.
- The University of Malta’s communications office sent a special edition of “News on Campus” on Nov 1st 2011 to all who have a @um.edu.mt email address informing them of the study and providing a direct electronic link to the questionnaire.
4. The Sample

4.1 General Demographics

The data analysis for Malta is based on a sample size of 618, representing 7.2% of the total number of respondents to the study. The gender distribution for the Malta sample is 39% male and 61% female, and the average age of respondents was 29 years with a standard deviation of 10 (average age for all respondents: 30). 20% of Maltese respondents indicated their highest level of education as secondary school or lower, 80% responded indicating tertiary education; however, only 35% of respondents were students. Finally, 83% described the area where they live as urban or suburban and only 13% as rural. This reflects both the very high population density in Malta as well as the spread of urbanisation which makes the distinction between urban and rural rather vague and subjective.6

In comparison with a recent publication of Malta’s National Statistics Office7 (NSO Malta), this demographic distribution is not fully representative of internet users as, there, the gender split of internet users is about even (51% male; 49% female). Following these NSO statistics, only 55% of internet users hold a post-secondary or tertiary education, and only 8.3% are students. However, as further analyses did not reveal any significant deviations at the level of gender, age or education level8, this different sample distribution is considered acceptable.

4.2 General Internet Usage

Following Eurostat 2011 and the NSO Malta 2012, 75% of Maltese households had access to the internet, and 65% of internet users participated in social network sites. Additionally, according to Facebook statistics9 77% of these internet users were Facebook users, making the Maltese the “top social networkers” within the 27 EU member states (EU 27 average: 51%). However, within the CONSENT sample regarding overall UGC usage, Maltese respondents are slightly “below average” UGC users (84% vs. total sample 90%) – but with an overall pool of very active internet users in a variety of age groups.

---

6 With more than 1,300 inhabitants per square kilometre Malta has the highest population density in the EU (source: Eurostat 2010; http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tps00003; accessed 05/2012)
8 There are some aspects where age plays a certain role – in such case, a sub-split into age groups is included in the respective tables/graphs.
9 Source: Socialbakers.com; accessed 05/2012.
The cross country comparison of mean years of internet usage seems to indicate a noticeable East/West divide with Czech Republic, Poland, Romania and Slovakia all being significantly below the CONSENT average of 10.67 years. This divide, however, becomes less distinct when looking at the average age of respondents: For example, the low numbers in Ireland, Poland and Slovakia have to be seen in relation to their rather low average age; similarly, the comparably high numbers e.g. in France, Italy and the Netherlands correspond with a high average age. In the Malta sample, this relation between years of internet usage and respondents’ age can also be observed – additionally to a slight gender variation and the “gap” widening with increasing age (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>UGC Users</th>
<th>UGC Non-Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>6,977</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Mean years of Internet Usage</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Average Age of Respondents (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>3.779</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.472</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>4.134</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td><strong>11.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.503</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>4.107</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td><strong>10.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.712</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Malta: Mean years of Internet Usage by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Mean years of Internet Usage</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or less</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>1.791</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>3.369</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the respondents’ location, there is very little variation which may be related to Malta’s specific predominantly urban geography\(^{10}\); additionally, the definition of location may also be influenced by the respective respondent’s self-ascriptions and personal interpretations.

Malta: Mean years of Internet Usage by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mean years of Internet Usage</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the high frequency of internet usage at home by Maltese respondents (95.4%) is confirmed by NSO data (96.3%). There is, however, some variation in CONSENT data and NSO data regarding the usage of internet at work (CONSENT Malta sample: 58.9%; NSO – usage at work or place of education: 48.5%).

Malta: Frequency of Internet Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Every day / almost every day</th>
<th>2-3 times a week</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
<th>Less often</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\)The NSO Malta states that it is very difficult to distinguish between urban and rural areas in the Maltese Islands. Although locality characteristics and population densities vary from each other, the differences are not such that would facilitate the drawing of distinctions between urban and rural areas. (source: National Office of Statistics Malta, https://secure2.gov.mt/nso/site/page.aspx?pageid=215, accessed 06/2012).
5. Results

5.1 Online Behaviour

5.1.1 General Behaviour

The level of an individual’s internet literacy and that individual’s privacy concerns represent a complex (and ambivalent) relationship. Since some level of internet proficiency is required for users to be able to avail themselves of privacy options, the awareness and usage of technical measures to protect personal information has been targeted within the analysis of general online behaviour. In this context, the awareness and the practices of disabling or deleting “cookies” are considered as markers for such technical knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall considerably higher frequency of internet usage (at home) within the CONSENT total sample in comparison to the Eurobarometer sample (see table xx above) allows for the general assumption that CONSENT respondents are significantly above-average experienced in handling technical details. The Maltese respondents themselves show a slightly above-average awareness of the use of cookies (70%; total sample 65%), within an “East-West divide” (except for Ireland and the UK) that ranges between 50% (Slovakia) and 91% (Netherlands).

Notwithstanding this higher-than-average awareness of cookies claimed by Maltese respondents, only 64% of those Maltese respondents who were aware of the use of cookies stated that they ever disabled them. Here, the distribution between the different countries may be linked to a combination of factors, ranging from country-specific levels of technical internet experience to general user inertia.  

Similarly, different “technical” measures being taken to maintain or increase personal internet security cannot simply be explained by differences in geographic regions.

---

11 Differences between awareness and actual practices may, here, also be linked to the fact that many websites do not work properly if cookies are generally disabled (rather than deleted on a selective basis). Additionally, it can also be browser-dependent how easy (or difficult) it is to disable cookies.
On a general level, some practices (pop-up window blockers, checking opt-in / opt-out boxes, blocking emails) are more established than others (checking for spyware, clearing the browser history), with frequencies ranging from 60.4% of all respondents always or often watching for ways to control what people send them online, to 48% of all respondents always or often clearing their browser history. The lowest spread between countries is observable in the practice of blocking messages (Slovakia 47.9%, Italy 67.3%) whilst the highest spread is in watching for ways to control what is being sent online (Slovakia 32.6%, Netherlands 85.1%). In all practices, Maltese respondents show similar results to the overall average.

5.1.2 Online Shopping Behaviour

The higher incidence of online shopping found in the current study when compared to previous studies may, again, reflect the fact that the sample in the CONSENT study is one of experienced internet users whereas those in other studies is more likely to consist of general internet users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>CONSENT sample</th>
<th>Eurobarometer12</th>
<th>Eurostat 2010</th>
<th>Eurostat 2011</th>
<th>NSO Malta 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 The percentages applied in the Eurobarometer, Eurostat and NSO Malta studies are all based on internet users.
Of the 14 countries analysed in the CONSENT study, seven countries had over 90% of respondents stating that they shopped online. Five of the remaining seven countries which scored lower than 90% are those traditionally regarded as belonging to the former eastern block, the remaining two, Italy and Spain may be seen as representative of a southern European flank. Thus, there can be observed a certain East/South-West/North divide; however, the figures for Malta do not “fit” into such classification, which may be, partially, due to Malta’s comparably strong economic standing within the EU and an infrastructure which facilitates the delivery of goods ordered online.

Online shopping activity of the Maltese respondents appears to be not significantly linked to age, especially when one takes into account that the dip to just below 90% for the 20 years or less age group is probably attributable to the lower income and purchasing power which is a natural condition for this age group.

Regarding online shopping frequency, Maltese respondents are fairly “average” in comparison to other European respondents, with 64% shopping between 1-10 times a year compared to the total sample average of 63.1%. This similarity to the total average also applies to those respondents who shop online between 11-20 times per year for which the Malta average is 20.3% compared to the total sample average of 20.5%.

Results indicate that there is a strong preference in Malta to pay (via Debit/Credit card or Electronic Money) at the time of ordering. This contrasts with respondents from Germany and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or less</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30 years</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also in East European countries where there is a strong preference for payment to be made at or after the time of delivery. These differences may point at potential trust issues with online shopping providers in these countries, or it may be a reflection of the availability of the option of payment at or after delivery; this option is rarely available in Malta as much of the online shopping is carried out with organisations based outside Malta that require prepayment.

The issue of lack of trust was highlighted by those Maltese respondents (106) who have never bought anything online. Of these 106 respondents 46.2% stated lack of trust in online sellers was their reason for refraining from online shopping. This level of lack of trust differs widely from that indicated by the respondents from other countries where the overall percentage of respondents who refrained from online shopping because of trust issues was only 15.4%. This contrasts with respondents from other nationalities whose reasons for refraining from online shopping were: a dislike of disclosing personal information (financial details / address: 23.8% of total sample) and the shopping experience itself – not being able to “see/touch/try things” (26% of total sample).

A further stratification of the reasoning behind not getting involved in online shopping on a country level results in very small absolute numbers with limited significance; however there is
also no general sign that age or urban/rural location influence trust, or foster the preference for a more (or less) “traditional” shopping experience.

| Malta: Payment Preferences in Online Shopping (1st preference) by Age |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | At the time of ordering online by Debit or Credit card | At the time of ordering online using Electronic Money | At the time of ordering by charging your mobile phone on landline | At the time of delivery | After delivery | Other |
| 20 years or less | Count | 52 | 87 | 3 | 21 | 18 | 0 |
| | Percentage | 28.7% | 48.1% | 1.7% | 11.6% | 9.9% | 0.0% |
| 21 – 30 years | Count | 61 | 117 | 7 | 20 | 19 | 2 |
| | Percentage | 27.0% | 51.8% | 3.1% | 8.8% | 8.4% | 0.9% |
| > 30 years | Count | 61 | 80 | 3 | 18 | 14 | 2 |
| | Percentage | 34.3% | 44.9% | 1.7% | 10.1% | 7.9% | 1.1% |

5.1.3 UGC-related Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever created an account with a SNS website?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobarometer: Malta</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobarometer: EU27</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large proportion of Maltese respondents having ever opened a SNS account is similar to the overall CONSENT results and confirms the Facebook statistics in which Maltese users range on the very top within the EU (see also section 4.2). Further analysis reveals that there is no significant difference in opening a SNS account amongst those living in an urban (84%), suburban (90%) or rural (88%) areas.
With which UGC websites have you ever created an account for your personal use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website Type</th>
<th>Malta Count</th>
<th>Malta Percentage</th>
<th>Total Sample Count</th>
<th>Total Sample Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business networking websites such as LinkedIn</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating websites such as parship.com</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites where you can share photos, videos, etc., such as Youtube</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites which provide recommendations and reviews, such as Tripadvisor</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro blogging websites such as Twitter</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, my-heritage</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-player online games</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of Maltese respondents having ever created accounts with business networking websites (38.9%) stands at double the percentage for the total sample. This indication of a strong preference among Maltese users to create accounts with business networking websites is also confirmed by the result from another CONSENT study on the Identification and Classification of UGC Services carried out in 2009 (Work Package 2) which found that LinkedIn in Malta has a comparably large community of users. This higher incidence of accounts with business websites is counter-balanced by smaller percentages of respondents who open accounts with all other types of UGC websites.

Furthermore, with respect to membership in Dating Websites, the average for Maltese respondents (1.7%) is less than half that of the total sample (4.5%). This finding is somewhat at odds with the results obtained by a member of the CONSENT team undertaking a 16 month monitoring exercise of certain Dating Websites which provide data in the public domain. The number of accounts in Malta on the Badoo dating website alone between August 2011 and December 2012 varied between approximately 42,000 and 52,393. If these figures are taken at face value, this would mean that well over 10% (by some counts 14%) of the total Maltese population is on a dating website. The percentage is considerably higher when calculated as a percentage of internet-active adult Maltese residents. Even if one were to allow for various recognised forms of distortions (e.g., duplicate accounts, pseudonyms, fake data, fake pictures) for the latest counts of over 50K Maltese residents with active dating site accounts, the percentage of Maltese who are members of dating websites would appear to be at least equal and probably closer to double the average for the total CONSENT sample. This is not surprising given that information about participation in dating websites may be considered to be sensitive data and that this data may be under-reported not only in Malta but across all states responding in the CONSENT survey. What is of note is the size of the apparent discrepancy and the extent of under-reporting in Malta, especially given that a strong element of checking is possible in a small community by visual identification from online pictures.
5.2 UGC Perceptions and Attitudes

Between the different SNS websites available, Maltese respondents gave a clear preference to Facebook (having opened an account with) which was preferred by 99.4% of Maltese respondents (Hi5 17.8%, MySpace 17%), being as such even slightly above the proportion of total CONSENT respondents having ever opened an account with Facebook (96.7%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why would you miss this SNS website (Facebook)?</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many people I know have an account with this site</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s easier to use than other sites</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has more features than other sites</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust this site more than other sites</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s easier to meet new people on this site</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more fashionable</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is used worldwide</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives you information quickly</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can find out what is happening worldwide</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above it appears that for Maltese respondents the primary driver for the use of Facebook is networking and, to a lesser extent, its worldwide coverage, with Maltese respondents being the ones most motivated by networking of all CONSENT respondents, only followed by Italy (38.6%) and the Czech Republic (36.5%), and the UK (25.7%) at the lower end. A similar distribution of answers was given to the question why this site is being used most often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why don’t you use your account with this SNS site?</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can no longer access my account</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This type of website no longer interests me</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried the website but found I didn’t like</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I no longer trust the company running the website</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends / colleagues no longer use this website</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about use of information about me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasoning for SNS non-usage (after having opened an account) is neither overwhelmingly related to trust issues nor to a concern of personal information misuse, but rather to networking effects (Malta 26.9%, total sample 34.4%), a more general disinterest (Malta 36.3%, total sample 47.4%), or – specifically in the case of Malta – technical problems relating to accessing the site (26.4%).
### Why did you delete your account with this SNS site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Malta Count</th>
<th>Malta Percentage</th>
<th>Total Sample Count</th>
<th>Total Sample Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tried the website but found I didn’t like</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The website no longer interests me</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I no longer trust the company running the site</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends / colleagues no longer use this website</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about use of information about me</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the reasons given for deleting the account, trust issues and concern about information misuse and/or disclosure are clearly more strongly indicated (combined 29.9%\(^{13}\) of total sample, Malta 20.6%) than was the case for simply not using the account. Dislike and disinterest are the major motivators for people deleting their accounts, as was the case for non-use of the account.

### Why did you delete your accounts with UGC websites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Malta Count</th>
<th>Malta Percentage</th>
<th>Total Sample Count</th>
<th>Total Sample Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tried the website but found I didn’t like</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The website no longer interests me</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I no longer trust the company running the site</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends no longer use this website</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of the website is not worth the money</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about use of information about me</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want people to know that I have used this website</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of reasoning for deleting an UGC (non-SNS) account is very similar to the one for deleting a SNS account. 27.3%\(^{14}\) of Maltese respondents claimed that they deleted accounts with UGC websites because of privacy or trust issues. This compares to 33.3% of total respondents with similar concerns.

---

\(^{13}\) Combined percentages of respondents answering “I no longer trust the company running the site”, “I was concerned about use of information about me” and “I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted”.

\(^{14}\) Combined percentages of respondents answering “I no longer trust the company running the site”, “I was concerned about use of information about me”, “I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted” and “I don’t want people to know that I have used this website.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>20 years or less</th>
<th>21 - 30 years</th>
<th>&gt; 30 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This kind of website does not interest me</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadn’t heard of this type of website before now</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know you could open an account with websites like this before now</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of my friends use this website</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not worth the money</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was concerned about use of information about me</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit these sites but don’t feel the need to become a member</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the main reason for not opening an account with an UGC (non-SNS) site appears to be the lack – or loss – of interest, which is even stronger expressed with increasing age. The specific concern about information disclosure is also increasing with the respondents’ age, and although this percentage remains relatively low in Maltese respondents as well as in the total sample (4.1%) it may indicate that whilst among most respondents potential misuse of information disclosed online is not top of mind, there is a small core of respondents for whom this is a concern.
5.3 Disclosure of Personal Information

5.3.1 Types of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking of your usage of UGC sites, which types of information have you already disclosed?</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work history</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID card / passport number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things you do (hobbies etc.)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastes and opinions</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos of you</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who your friends are</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites you visit</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone number</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no substantial difference between Malta and the majority of CONSENT respondents in other countries on the types of information disclosed online. However, there are some differences to the results of the Eurobarometer survey, which split the question between information released on SNS websites and information given in the context of online shopping:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eurobarometer Survey: Which types of information have you already disclosed?</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>EU 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On online shopping website</td>
<td>On SNS websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Information</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Information</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work history</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID card / passport number</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things you do (hobbies etc.)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastes and opinions</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos of you</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who your friends are</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites you visit</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone number</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levels of disclosure regarding hobbies, tastes and opinions, photos and friends relationships on SNS websites amongst Maltese respondents in the Eurobarometer study are fairly similar to each other, though generally lower than those found amongst Maltese CONSENT respondents. However, the Maltese (as well as all) CONSENT respondents are significantly less likely to have disclosed their ID card / passport number and, in particular, their home address. The substantial difference between Eurobarometer respondents in disclosing the home address on online shopping sites (Malta 95%, EU27 89%) and on SNS websites (Malta 46%, EU27 39%) supports the assumption that CONSENT respondents, the majority of which are very regular SNS users, consider their home address at a different level of privacy than hobbies, tastes and opinions, photos, or friends relationships.

5.3.2 Risk Perceptions

The set of results in the table above relates to general risk perceptions: Maltese respondents, whilst mostly agreeing that giving personal information online is risky, are similarly apprehensive to the overall CONSENT average about this. In the Eurobarometer survey, 24% of Maltese respondents (EU27: 33%) agreed with the statement that disclosing personal information “is not a big issue”, whereas 71% disagreed (EU27: 63%); but 57% of Maltese (EU27: 74%) agreed with the statement that “disclosing information is an increasing part of modern life” – a statement which could be read as a certain acceptance of risk but may, partially, also be blurred with differing interpretations of a “modern life”. Again similarly to the overall CONSENT average, Maltese CONSENT respondents perceive a clearly increased risk of privacy loss and information misuse. Additionally, though on a slightly lower level than the overall average, more Maltese respondents agreed than disagreed that providing websites with personal information involves unexpected problems.

15 The base for these Europbarometer questions was both internet users and non-users. However, on a EU27 level the results show no substantial differences between users and non-users.
Analyses on the level of specific risks connected with the disclosure of personal information on UGC sites show an even more differentiated picture. Whilst, here, the statements in the CONSENT and Eurobarometer studies for the results shown in the tables above were identical, different questions were asked about the statements. This makes a direct comparison of the results from the two studies difficult. The Eurobarometer question requires selecting the most important risks up to a maximum of three answers which necessarily focuses attention on the risks more generally encountered and deemed to have the most serious consequences. By contrast, the CONSENT data reflect a more realistic picture of the perception of the likelihood of all potential consequences. There is a higher level of perceived likelihood of all risks in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations that the following is likely to happen as a result of disclosing information on UGC sites (combined answers ‘likely’ and ‘very likely’)</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being used without your knowledge</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being shared with third parties without your agreement</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being shared to send you unwanted commercial offers</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your personal safety being at risk</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming victim of fraud</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being discriminated against (e.g. job selection)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation being damaged</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eurobarometer</th>
<th>Malta</th>
<th>EU27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the most important risks connected with disclosure of personal information</strong> (Respondents could choose up to 3 answers)</td>
<td>In Online Shopping</td>
<td>On SNS websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being used without your knowledge</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being shared with third parties without your agreement</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information being shared to send you unwanted commercial offers</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your personal safety being at risk</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming victim of fraud</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being discriminated against (e.g. job selection)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation being damaged</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT study when compared to the importance of these risks found in Eurobarometer, except for becoming a victim of fraud. Becoming a victim of fraud is certainly an important risk (as shown from the Eurobarometer results), but it is perceived as not amongst the three risks most likely to occur in the CONSENT study.

More than 70% of respondents in the CONSENT study think that it is likely or very likely that information disclosed on UGC sites is used without their knowledge, used to send them unwanted commercial offers and shared with third parties without their agreement. The other four risks are deemed to be far less likely to occur (all less than 33%).

It is also interesting to note that whereas responses regarding the likelihood of the top three situations are somewhat “homogenous” on a similarly high level across countries, there are larger disparities in perception of the more personal risks such as personal safety, risk of job discrimination, the risk to personal reputation and becoming the victim of fraud. Here, respondents from Malta are amongst those countries which show a high level of perceived risk. They are the 3rd highest with a perceived risk to personal safety at 29.5% (overall average 24.4%). Maltese respondents scored highest for perceived risk of discrimination as a result of information they have supplied (32.3%, overall average 22.9%), and they also scored amongst the highest overall for the perceived risk of damage to personal reputation.
5.3.3 Awareness and Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure what this means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malta</strong></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>6,993</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maltese respondents show an overall “average” awareness about the use of personal information, compared to some countries with an increased awareness (Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Poland), and those where respondents were less aware (Ireland, UK, Slovakia). These differences cannot be simply ascribed to national differences in internet exposure or internet experience. Here, awareness (or non-awareness) may be rather linked to internet-related local information policies and regulations.
Base: Only respondents who answered that it was unacceptable to contact users by email.
Base: Only respondents who answered it was unacceptable to customize the content users see.

Base: Only respondents who answered it was unacceptable to customize the advertising users see.
Base: Only respondents who answered it was unacceptable that website owners share information (not linked to the user’s name) with other parts of the company.
Base: Only respondents who answered it was unacceptable that website owners sell information to other companies.

Base: Only respondents who answered it was unacceptable that website owners gather in-depth information and make it available to others.
Regarding the awareness – and acceptance – of specific purposes, the use of personal information by website owners to contact users by email appears to be known about and accepted by most respondents. There are uniform high levels of awareness (above 84%) and acceptance (above 77%) of use of information by website owners to contact users by email, with the exception of Slovakia (awareness 71.2%, acceptance 64.4%). The large majority of those who deem it acceptable for website owners to use information to contact users by email think that this should only be done if permission has been granted by users.

Results for Maltese respondents are around the sample average for both awareness and approval. Of those who do not think it acceptable for information to be used to contact them by email, in most countries (except Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia and Spain) the majority still think it unacceptable even if they were to be paid a fee. There is little support for the idea of receiving site related bonuses in return for information being used to contact users by email.

Awareness and acceptance of the use of personal information to customise content and advertising is also high, though not at the levels of use of information to contact users by email and with more variability between countries. Maltese respondents are also in this case around the sample average for both awareness and approval. Interestingly, it appears that most CONSENT respondents, whilst accepting the customisation of content more than the customisation of advertising, are generally more willing to consider commercial trade-off’s in advertising than in the customisation of content. This may relate to the comparatively higher awareness of advertising, but, potentially, also to a privacy-related fine line drawn between the sphere of “private” (and not to be commercialised) content and the “public” sphere of advertising.

However, whereas in being contacted by email as well as in the customisation of content and advertising there still appears to be some form of “balance” between user awareness and user acceptance, acceptance levels are clearly decreasing when personal information (both linked and not linked to the user’s name) is being shared with other parts of the website owner’s company. Gathering in-depth information about users and making it available or selling it to others is largely seen as unacceptable, and commercial trade-offs in this respect are also not widely accepted. Here, respondents from Malta (together with respondents from Spain) show the lowest level of non-acceptance (Malta 68%, total sample 74%).
5.4  Privacy

5.4.1  Experience of Privacy Invasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>How frequently have you been victim of what you felt was an improper invasion of privacy on the internet? Rating on a 7-point scale 1 = never, 7 = very frequently</th>
<th>How much have you heard or read about the potential misuse of the information collected from the internet? Rating on a 7-point scale 1 = not at all, 7 = very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malta</strong></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual experiences of invasions of privacy are, as is to be expected, much lower than second-hand experience of misuse of information on the internet. Maltese respondents score a little lower than the total sample average on both personal invasion of privacy and hearing or reading about misuse of information. The Eurobarometer study has similar results: 34% of Maltese respondents had “heard” about violation of privacy or fraud (EUR27: 55%), but only 9% (EU27: 12%) had been affected themselves (or family/friends). In the Eurostat 2010 research, 4% of Maltese actually reported an abuse of personal information.
### 5.4.2 Safeguarding Privacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>39/9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect to the question how the respondents safeguard their privacy, just over half of the Maltese respondents (53.2%) often or always change the privacy settings of their personal profiles on UGC sites. This is comparable to the overall sample average (53.5%). Over one in ten of respondents from Italy, France, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic and Romania never change the privacy settings of their personal profile on UGC sites. Maltese respondents who never or rarely changed privacy settings amounted to 14.8% of Maltese respondents which is compared to 18% of total respondents.

The Eurobarometer survey included a similar question, asking whether the respondents “ever tried to change the privacy settings”. There, Maltese respondents gave a similar picture (54%; EU27: 51%). However, “trying” is a more vague expression which asks more for (more or less serious) intentions rather than actual practices. As a comparison of security consciousness, the NSO Malta report states that 36.9% of internet users modified the security settings of their internet browser.

On an overall level the CONSENT data reveal a strong confidence (into providers’ practices) of those users who never changed privacy settings. In fact 38.6% of respondents either trusted the site to set appropriate privacy settings, or they were happy with the standard settings. Another 14.7% “did not find the time to look at the available options”, revealing a certain user inertia.

Given that only 8.1% of respondents stated that they have never changed privacy settings, a focus on the practices of those who actually did change their settings reveals more substantial results – also on a country level:
Malta: Changes in Privacy Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I have made the privacy settings less strict such that more information about me is available to others</th>
<th>Sometimes I have made the privacy settings stricter and sometimes less strict</th>
<th>I have made the privacy settings stricter so that others can see less information about me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>4,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, Maltese respondents strongly tend to change their privacy settings to a stricter level, demonstrating a similar behaviour to the overall average, whereas results of other nationalities range from 63.8% (Romania) to 89.9% (Germany). Regarding what specific settings are actually being changed, a comparison shows that some practices, in particular changing who can see a personal profile, are significantly more established than others (particularly storing one’s history), with Malta, again, being similar to the total CONSENT average. The widest disparities between country results can be observed in the setting who can see one’s photograph online, allowing for the assumption that, here, levels of technical experience merge with different perspectives on the privacy of personal pictures.
5.4.3 Dealing with Privacy Policies

There is much variability between responses from different countries on the question relating to the impact of privacy policies on behaviour. Relatively few respondents (37%) from Malta and Ireland have ever decided not to use a website due to dissatisfaction with the site’s privacy policy; whereas in Spain and the Netherlands more than three out of five respondents claim to have done so.

Results from the set of graphs below suggest that many respondents are giving consent without being aware of what they are consenting to. A significant proportion of respondents rarely or never read a website’s terms and conditions before accepting them, with some variability between countries. At one end of the range, 45.2% of respondents in Germany and 45.5% of respondents in Italy rarely or never read the terms and conditions. At the other end of the range, 69.7% of Irish respondents and 68.6% of UK respondents rarely or never read websites’ terms and conditions. Just over half of respondents from Malta (54%) rarely or never read the terms and conditions before accepting them. A small core of respondents always read terms and conditions, 12.3% amongst Maltese respondents do so which is similar to the sample average (11.3%).

A fairly similar pattern of results was recorded for reading of websites’ privacy policies when creating an account with a substantial number of respondents never or rarely reading them (total sample average 54%).

The majority of those who do read privacy policies do not read the whole text (total sample 89.2%). Only 5.5% of Maltese respondents read all the text, the fewest amongst all countries, whereas as many as 18.3% of Bulgarian respondents read all the text of privacy policies. Despite the low number of respondents who read all of the text of privacy policies there is a fair deal of confidence that what is read in privacy policies is fully or mostly understood (sample average 63.6%). 61.8% of Maltese respondents usually understand most or all of what they read in privacy policies.
6. Conclusion

The Maltese CONSENT respondents represent a sample of predominantly experienced – and very frequent – internet users in a local environment with generally high SNS usage.

At the same time, it appears that their level of taking technical measures to maintain or increase their personal internet security – due to lack of knowledge, user inertia, or perceivedunnecessary – does not fully keep up with this high-frequency usage. However, Maltese CONSENT respondents do clearly perceive increased risks regarding the disclosure of personal information on UGC websites (similar to the total sample average), with above-average concerns specifically regarding the risk of being discriminated against (e.g. in job selection).

This specific risk awareness is also reflected in general levels of awareness regarding the various practices of website owners. Levels of awareness and non-acceptance are rather high and, mostly, around the total sample average – with a slightly increased willingness to accept these practices under conditions or against receiving financial compensation. This, if being linked back to the comparably high level of awareness, may point at a certain level of reflectivity towards these website owners’ practices.

It doesn’t, though, explain why only just over half of the Maltese CONSENT respondents have ever changed their privacy settings (often or always), with average results regarding all specific protection measures such as the accessibility of their personal profile, their pictures, restrictions who can see when they are online, or the storage of their history. In this context, privacy policies appear not to be widely accepted as a valuable source of privacy-related information, with more than half of the Maltese (as well as the average CONSENT) respondents never or rarely reading them.

Probing the contradictory “gap” between these reported practices and the Maltese UGC users’ awareness and risk perception, will require – and be one of the core tasks of – further research as set out in the qualitative research planned in CONSENT Work Package 8.
Appendices
A.1 English Online Questionnaire

0.0 Introduction

Make your views count!
And help in strengthening the legal protection of consumers and online users.

This survey is part of the CONSENT project – a collaborative project co-funded by the European Commission under the FP7 programme – that aims to gather the views of internet users from all countries of the EU on the use of personal information, privacy, and giving consent online.

This information will be used to prepare briefings to European policy makers and legal experts aimed at encouraging the strengthening of the legal protection of consumers and online users. Results will also be published on the CONSENT website.

Filling in this questionnaire takes about 15 minutes. All responses are anonymous and no personal details such as your name, email address or IP address will be processed. You may stop and return to the questionnaire at a later point. Your assistance in this project is much appreciated.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this project.

For more information visit the CONSENT website at www.consent.law.muni.cz

Privacy Policy
No personal information (such as name or e-mail) is collected in this questionnaire. All data collected are anonymous and are not linked to any personal information. This site uses a “cookie” to allow you to return to the questionnaire and continue from the same place you were before if you do not complete and submit it the first time you visit. This questionnaire is hosted by Qualtrics. The Qualtrics privacy policy may be viewed at www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement.

1.0 Internet experience

1.1 For how many years have you used the Internet? ___ years.

1.2 How often do you use the internet in the following situations?
1=Everyday/almost every day;
2=Two or three times a week;
3=about once a week;
4=two or three times a month;
5=less often;
6=never
1. At home
2. At your place of work
3. Somewhere else (school, university, cyber-café, etc)

ALT.1.3 Do you ever buy things online?
1=yes 2=no

1.3.H.1 How many times a year do you buy items online?

1.3.H.2 When making purchases online how do you prefer to pay?
1st preference, 2nd preference, 3rd preferences.
1. At the time of ordering online by Debit card or Credit card
2. At the time of ordering online using Electronic Money such as Paypal, Moneybookers, etc
3. At the time of ordering online by charging your mobile phone or landline
4. At the time of delivery
5. After delivery
6. Other - please give details

1.3.H.3 Why haven’t you ever bought anything online?
1. I don’t trust online sellers
2. I would like to buy online but I do not have a debit or credit card
3. I would like to buy online but online purchase websites are difficult to use
4. I don’t like disclosing my financial details online
5. I don’t like disclosing details of where I live online
6. I fear that when I receive the things I bought they will not be what I ordered
7. I don’t like the idea of having to return things to online shops
8. I prefer to be able to see/touch/try things before I buy them
9. I dislike paying for delivery of items I’ve bought online
10. Other reason (please give details)

1.3.H.4 How likely are you to purchase items online in the next six months?
1=very unlikely
2=unlikely
3=neutral
4=likely
5=very likely

ALT 2.0 UGC services usage

ALT.2.1. Have you ever created an account with a social networking website such as Facebook, MySpace, classmates, etc
1=yes 2=no
ALT.2.2 Which social networking websites have you opened an account with?
Facebook, MySpace
Please also include the top local website/s identified for your country as reported in WP2.
Other 1 (please give details). Other 2 (please give details)

ALT.2.2.1 Why did you choose to open an account with ..... rather than any other site?
1. Many people I know have an account with this site
2. It’s easier to use than other sites
3. It has more features than other sites
4. I trust this site more than other sites
5. It’s easier to meet new people on this site
6. It is more fashionable
7. It is used worldwide
8. It’s in the language I prefer to use
9. Other (please give details)

ALT.2.2.2 Do you still have and use the account you opened with <website mentioned>?
1. I still have it and use it everyday/ almost everyday
2. I still have it and use it every week
3. I still have it but use it less often than once a week
4. I still have it but don’t use it
5. I deleted the account

ALT.2.2.2.1 Why don’t you use your account with <website mentioned>?
1. This type of website no longer interests me
2. I can no longer access my account
3. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
4. I no longer trust the company running the website
5. My friends/ colleagues no longer use this website
6. I was concerned about use of information about me
7. Other (please give details)

ALT.2.2.2.2 Why did you delete your account with <website mentioned>?
1. The website no longer interests me
2. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
3. I no longer trust the company running the website
4. My friend/ colleagues no longer use this website
5. I was concerned about use of information about me
6. I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted
7. Other (please give details)

ALT.2.2.3 Do you still have and use the accounts you opened with social networking websites?
1. I still have it and use it everyday or almost everyday
2. I still have it and use it every week
3. I still have it but use it less often than once a week
4. I still have it but don’t use it
5. I deleted the account

ALT.2.2.3.1 If one of these sites were to close down, which would you miss most?

ALT 2.2.3.1.1 Why would you miss this site?
1. Many people I know have an account with this site
2. It’s easier to use than other sites
3. It has more features than other sites
4. I trust this site more than other sites
5. It’s easier to meet new people on this site
6. It is more fashionable
7. It is used worldwide
8. It gives you information quickly
9. You can find out what is happening worldwide
10. Other <please give details>

ALT.2.2.3.2 Why do you use this site most often?
1. Many people I know have an account with this site
2. It’s easier to use than other sites
3. It has more features than other sites
4. I trust this site more than other sites
5. It’s easier to meet new people on this site
6. It is more fashionable
7. It is used worldwide
8. It gives you information quickly
9. You can find out what is happening worldwide
10. Other <please give details>

ALT.2.2.3.3 Why don’t you use your account with <website mentioned>?
1. I can no longer access my account
2. This type of website no longer interests me
3. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
4. I no longer trust the company running the website
5. My friends/colleagues no longer use this website
6. I was concerned about use of information about me
7. Other (please give details)

ALT.2.2.2.2 Why did you delete your account with <website mentioned>?
1. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
2. The website no longer interests me
3. I no longer trust the company running the website
4. My friend/colleagues no longer use this website
5. I was concerned about use of information about me

Open information box on UGC SITES

Some types of websites allow users to edit or add to the content of the website which can then be read by other users of the website. This is done by, for example, posting comments (e.g., Facebook) or reviews (e.g., tripadvisor), joining discussions, uploading video and digital material (e.g., YouTube, flickr), editing material (e.g., Wikipedia) etc. These types of websites are called User Generated Content (UGC) sites.

ALT 2.9 With which of the following User Generated Content (UGC) websites have you ever created an account (not just visited the site) for your personal use?

B. Business networking websites such as LinkedIn, Xing.com
C. Dating websites such as parship.com
D. Websites where you can share photos, videos, etc, such as Youtube, flickr
E. Websites which provide recommendations and reviews (of films, music, books, hotels etc), such as last.fm, tripadvisor
F. Micro blogging sites such as twitter
G. Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, myheritage
H. Multiplayer online games such as secondlife.com, World of Warcraft

ALT 2.9.1 Why haven’t you ever opened an account on this kind of website/these kind of websites?
1. This kind of website does not interest me
2. Hadn’t heard of this type of website before now
3. Didn’t know you could open an account with websites like this before now
4. None of my friends use this website
5. It is not worth the money
6. I was concerned about use of information about me
7. I visit these sites but don’t feel the need to become a member
8. Other

ALT 2.9.2 Do you still have all the accounts you opened with UGC websites?
1=I still have all the accounts I’ve opened with UGC sites
2=I have some but have deleted others
3=no, I’ve deleted them all

ALT 2.9.2.1 Have you used ALL the accounts you have with UGC websites in the past 6 months?
1=yes 2=no
ALT.2.9.2.1.1 Why haven’t you used some of the accounts in the past 6 months?

1. I can no longer access my account
2. It’s not the kind of website that I use regularly
3. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
4. Website no longer interests me
5. I no longer trust the company running the website
6. My friends no longer use this website
7. I was concerned about use of information about me
8. Other (please give details)

ALT.2.9.2.2 Why did you delete your accounts with UGC websites?

1. I tried the website but found I didn’t like it
2. The website no longer interests me
3. I no longer trusted the company running the website
4. My friends no longer use the website
5. Membership of the website is not worth the money
6. I was concerned about use of information about me
7. I want the content that I have created on the website to be deleted
8. I don’t want people to know that I have used this website
9. Other (please give details)

3.0 Disclosure Behaviour on UGCs

3.1 Thinking of your usage of UGC sites (such as social networking sites, sharing sites, and gaming sites), which of the following types of information have you already disclosed (when you registered, or simply when using these websites)?

1. Medical information (patient record, health information)
2. Financial information (e.g., salary, bank details, credit record)
3. Your work history
4. Your national identity number (USE APPROPRIATE TERM IN EACH COUNTRY), card number, passport number
5. Your name
6. Your home address
7. Your nationality
8. Things you do (e.g., hobbies, sports, places you go)
9. Your tastes and opinions
10. Photos of you
11. Who your friends are
12. Websites you visit
13. Your mobile phone number
14. Your email address
15. Other (write in)
16. Don’t know

4.0 Perceived Risks
4.1 For each of these situations please indicate how likely you think that this could happen as a result of your putting personal information on UGC sites.
1=very unlikely 2=unlikely 3=neutral 4=likely 5=very likely

1. Your information being used without your knowledge
2. Your information being shared with third parties without your agreement
3. Your information being used to send you unwanted commercial offers
4. Your personal safety being at risk
5. You becoming a victim of fraud
6. You being discriminated against (e.g. in job selection, receiving price increases, getting no access to a service)
7. Your reputation being damaged

5.0 Behaviour relating to Privacy Settings
Open information box on PERSONAL PROFILES
A personal profile on a UGC site (such as social networking sites, sharing sites, gaming sites) consists of information such as your age, location, interests, an uploaded photo and an "about me" section. Profile visibility – who can see your information and interact with you - can in some cases be personalised by managing the privacy settings offered by the site.

5.1 Have you ever changed any of the privacy settings of your personal profile on a UGC site?
1=Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5=Always

5.1.1 Why haven’t you ever changed the privacy settings?
1. I did not know that privacy settings existed
2. I do not know how to change the settings
3. I am afraid that if I change the privacy settings the site will not work properly
4. I did not know that I could change the settings
5. I trust the site to set appropriate privacy settings
6. I am happy with the standard privacy settings
7. I did not find the time to look at the available options
8. Other (please give details)

5.1.2 How have you changed the privacy settings?
1. I have made the privacy settings less strict such that more information about me is available to others.
2. Sometimes I have made the privacy settings more strict and sometimes less strict.
3. I have made the privacy settings more strict so that others can see less information about me.
5.1.3 Which of these privacy settings have you changed?
“never” “rarely” “sometimes” “often” “always”
1. I have changed who can see my profile
2. I have changed who can see my photograph
3. I have changed who can see when I am online
4. I do not store my history
5. Other (please give details)

6.0 Perceived Playfulness/Ease of Use/Critical Mass
Thinking of the UGC site you use, or if you use more than one your favourite UGC site, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by clicking on the point on the scale that best represents your views where 1=disagree and 7=agree.

6.2 Using UGC sites is fun
7.3 This website is simple to use.
7.4 I easily remember how to use this website.
8.1 Many people I am in touch with use this website.

9.0 Behaviour relating to Terms & Conditions and Privacy Policies
Most internet websites require that users accept, normally by ticking a box, the website’s Terms & Conditions before giving you access to the website.

9.1 When you create an account with a website how do you accept the site’s terms and conditions
5=I always read the terms & conditions before accepting them
4=I often read the terms & conditions before accepting them
3=I sometimes read the terms & conditions before accepting them
2=I rarely read the terms & conditions before accepting them
1=I never read the terms & conditions before accepting them
6=don’t know/not sure what this means

9.2 When you create an account with a website you have not used before do you read that website’s privacy statement or policy?

Open information box on PRIVACY POLICIES
On internet websites, apart from Terms & Conditions (or sometimes as part of them) privacy statements or privacy policies set out how the personal information users enter online will be used and who will have access to it.
1=I never read privacy policies
2=I rarely read privacy policies
3=I sometimes read privacy policies
4=I often read privacy policies
5=I always read privacy policies

9.2.1 When you read privacy statements/privacy policies do you usually:
9.2.2 When you have read privacy statements or privacy policies would you say that:
1. I’m not sure whether I understood them or not
2. I usually did not understand them at all
3. I usually did not understand most parts of them
4. I usually understood most parts of them
5. I usually understood them fully
6. Don’t know/don’t remember

9.2.3 Have you ever decided to not start using a website or to stop using a website because you were dissatisfied with the site’s privacy policy?
1=yes, 2=no 3=don’t know/don’t remember

9.3.1 Why don’t you ever read privacy statements or privacy policies?
1. I did not know about privacy policies before now
2. I do not know where to find privacy policies on a website
3. Privacy policies are too long to read
4. Privacy policies are too difficult to understand
5. If I want an account with a website I don’t care about its privacy policy
6. The privacy policy on a website makes no difference to me because I have nothing to hide
7. The privacy policy on a website makes no difference to me because websites ignore the policies anyway
8. If the website violates my privacy the law will protect me in any case
9. Other (write in)

10.0 Awareness & Attitudes – Processing of Information
10.1 The information you include in your account or profile on a website may be used by the website owners for a number of purposes. Were you aware of this?
1=yes, 2=no, 3=not sure what this means

10.2.A Please indicate whether you were aware that websites owners can use the information you include in your account or profile to:
1=Yes 2=No 3=Don’t know

10.2.B Please indicate what you think about website owners making use of the personal information you include in your account/profile to:
1= It’s an acceptable thing to do, they don’t have to ask me; 2=It’s acceptable but only if I give permission; 3=Not acceptable; 4=not sure/ don’t know
1. customize the content you see
2. customize the advertising you see
3. contact you by email
4. share information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company
5. share your information (linked to your name) with other parts of the company
6. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies
7. gather in-depth personal information about you from their own and other websites and make it available to others

10.3 Would it be acceptable to you if you were paid a fee to allow the website to:
1=yes it would be acceptable 2=no it would never be acceptable 3=it would depend on the amount paid 4=I would prefer to be given site related bonuses rather than money fee 5=don’t know
1. customize the content you see
2. customize the advertising you see
3. contact you by email
4. share information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company
5. share your information (linked to your name) with other parts of the company
6. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies
7. gather in-depth personal information about you from their own and other websites and make it available to others

Open information box on COOKIES
In addition to information you yourself have provided in your account or profile, websites can also have access to information about your activity on the web such as which sites you have visited, your preferences on a website, etc. Websites do this through information (sometimes referred to as a “cookie”) stored by the program (web browsers such as Internet Explorer, Firefox, Safari, etc) you use to surf the internet

10.4 Are you aware that websites have access to information about your activity on the web through the use of “cookies”?
1=yes, 2=no, 3=not sure what this means

10.4.1 Web browsers give you the option of refusing permission to websites to store information about your activities by disabling cookies in your web browser. Have you ever disabled cookies in your web browser
1=yes, 2=no, 3=don’t remember/don’t know

11.0 Perceived privacy risks
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about personal information and the internet by clicking on the point on the scale that best represents your views where 1=disagree and 7=agree.

11.1 In general, it would be risky to give personal information to websites.
11.2 There would be high potential for privacy loss associated with giving personal information to websites.
11.3 Personal information could be inappropriately used by websites.
11.4 Providing websites with my personal information would involve many unexpected problems.

12.0 Technical Protection
Thinking of how you behave online, please indicate how often you do the following:
1=never 2=rarely 3=sometimes 4=often 5=always 6=don’t know what this is 7=don’t know how
12.1 Do you watch for ways to control what people send you online (such as check boxes that allow you to opt-in or opt-out of certain offers)?
12.2 Do you use a pop up window blocker?
12.3 Do you check your computer for spy ware?
12.4 Do you clear your browser history regularly?
12.5 Do you block messages/emails from someone you do not want to hear from?

14.0 Privacy victim
14.1 How frequently have you personally been the victim of what you felt was an improper invasion of privacy on the internet where 1=never and 7=very frequently?

15.0 Media exposure
15.1 How much have you heard or read during the last year about the potential misuse of the information collected from the internet where 1=not at all and 7=very much?

16.0 Disposition to value privacy
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about personal information where 1=disagree and 7=agree.

16.1 Compared to my friends, I am more sensitive about the way online companies handle my personal information.
16.2 To me, it is the most important thing to keep my online privacy.
16.3 Compared to my friends, I tend to be more concerned about threats to my personal privacy.

17.0 Social Norms
17.1 People whose opinion I value think that keeping personal information private is very important.
17.2 My friends believe I should care about my privacy.
17.3 People who are important to me think I should be careful when revealing personal information online.

For the next questions please think about your behaviour in general, not just online.

18.0 Tendency to Self-Disclosure
Indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with people where 1=disagree and 5=agree

18.1 I do not often talk about myself. (R)
18.2 I usually talk about myself for fairly long periods of time.
18.3 Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions. (R)
18.4 Once I get started, I intimately and fully reveal myself in my disclosures.
18.5 I often disclose intimate, personal things about myself without hesitation.

19.0 General caution
Thinking about your behaviour generally, not just online
1=never 2=rarely 3=sometimes 4=often 5=always

19.1 Do you shred/burn your personal documents when you are disposing of them?
19.2 Do you hide your bank card PIN number when using cash machines/making purchases?
19.3 Do you only register for websites that have a privacy policy?
19.4 Do you look for a privacy certification on a website before you register your information?
19.5 Do you read license agreements fully before you agree to them?

20.0 Demographics
This section relates to information about you. It may be left blank but it would greatly assist our research if you do complete it.

20.1 Sex  1=male; 2=female

20.2 Age __ years

20.3 What is the highest level of education you have completed?
1=no formal schooling
2=Primary school
3=Secondary/High School
4=Tertiary Education (University, Technical College, etc)

20.4 Employment

NON-ACTIVE
Responsible for ordinary shopping and looking after the home, or without any current occupation, not working | 1
Student | 2
Unemployed or temporarily not working | 3
Retired or unable to work through illness | 4

**SELF EMPLOYED**
Farmer | 5
Fisherman | 6
Professional (lawyer, medical practitioner, accountant, architect, etc.) | 7
Owner of a shop, craftsmen, other self-employed person | 8
Business proprietors, owner (full or partner) of a company | 9

**EMPLOYED**
Employed professional (employed doctor, lawyer, accountant, architect) | 10
General management, director or top management (managing directors, director general, other director) | 11
Middle management, other management (department head, junior manager, teacher, technician) | 12
Employed position, working mainly at a desk | 13
Employed position, not at a desk but travelling (salesmen, driver, etc.) | 14
Employed position, not at a desk, but in a service job (hospital, restaurant, police, fireman, etc.) | 15
Supervisor | 16
Skilled manual worker | 17
Other (unskilled) manual worker, servant | 18

### 20.5 Nationality
Austrian, Belgian, British, Bulgarian, Cypriot, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Irish Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Maltese, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovakian, Slovenian, Spanish, Swedish, Other

### 20.6 Country of residence
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland,
Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, UK, Other

20.7 Is the area where you live: Urban/Rural/Suburban?

20.8 Main Language spoken at home
Basque, Bulgarian, Catalan, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, Galician, German, Greek, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Luxembourgish, Maltese, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovak, Slovene, Spanish, Swedish, Other <Please give details>

20.9 Religion 1=Buddhist, 2=Christian 3= Hindu, 4=Jewish, 5=Muslim, 6=Sikh, 7=no religion, 8=Other religion (please give details)
A.2 Maltese Online Questionnaire

0.0 Introduzzjoni

Ara li l-vehmiet tiegħek jgħoddu!
U għin sabiex tissahāḥ il-protezzjoni legali tal-konsumaturi u ta’ dawk li jużaw l-internet.

Din l-informazzjoni se tintuża għal preparazzjoni ta’ stħarriġ lil dawk li jfasslu l-politika Ewropea u lill-esperti legali bil-ghan li tissahāḥ il-protezzjoni legali tal-konsumaturi u ta’ dawk li jużaw l-internet. Ir-rizultati se jkunu pubblikati wkoll fuq il-websajt CONSENT.
Grazzi talli ħadt sehem f’dan il-proġett.
Ghal aktar informazzjoni, tista’ żżur il-websajt CONSENT fuq: www.consent.law.muni.cz

Avviz dwar il-privatezza

L-ebda informazzjoni personali (bhal per eżempju isem jew email) m’hi qegħda tinġabar f’dan il-kwestjonarju. L-informazzjoni kollha li tinġabar tibqa’ anonima u ma tkunx assoċjata ma ebda informazzjoni personali, la tiegħek u lanqas ta’ ħaddiehor. Dan il-websajt juża’ “cookie” sabiex jekk għal xi raguni tieqaf qabel ma jkollok ċans twiegeb il-mistoqsijiet kollha inti tkun tista’ terga’ lura u tkompi timla l-kwestjonarju mill-istess post fejn tkun waqfaft. Dan il-kwestjonarju jinżamm fuq is-sit elettroniku tal-kumpanija Qualtrics. Informazzjoni fuq kif Qualtrics thares il-privatezza tiegħek tinstab www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement

1.0 L-esperjenza fuq l-internet

1.1 Kemm-il sena ilek tuża l-internet? ____snin

1.2 Kemm-il darba tuża l-internet fis-sitwazzjonijiet imsemmija hawn taħt?
1=Kuljum/kważi kuljum;
2=Darbejn jew tliet darbiet fil-ġimgħa;
3=madwar darba fil-ġimgħa;
4=darbtejn jew tliet darbiet fix-xahar
5=anqas sikwit;
6=qatt
1. Id-dar
2. Fuq il-post tax-xogħol
3. Xi mkien ieħor (l-iskola, l-università, internet café, eċċ.)

1.3 Kemm-il darba tuża l-internet għal kull wieħed minn dawn l-ghanijiet imsemmija hawn taht?
1=kuljum/kważi kuljum;
2=darbtejn jew tliet darbiet fil-ġimgħa;
3=madwar darba fil-ġimgħa;
4=darbtejn jew tliet darbiet fix-xahar
5=anqas sikwit;
6=qatt

A. Divertiment
B. Edukazzjoni
Č. Ričerka li għandha x’taqsam max-xogħol
D. Finanzi personali (banek, negozjar ta’ stocks)
E. Attwalità (ahbarijiet, sports, it-temp)
F. Relatat mas-safar (ričerka, ibukkjar)
G. Ġbir ta’ informazzjoni fuq prodotti
H. Xiri ta’ prodotti online

1.3.H.1 Kemm-il darba fis-sena tixtri affarijiet online?

1.3.H.2 Meta tixtri affarijiet online kif tippreferi thallas?
1 preferenza, 2 preferenza, 3 preferenza
1. Bl-użu tad-Debit card jew tal-Credit card meta tordna online
2. B’pagament elettroniku bis-sistemi Paypal, Moneybookers, eċċ, meta tordna online
3. Billi tpoġġih fuq il-kont tal-mowbajl jew tal-linja fissa tat-telefown meta tordna online
4. Meta jasal l-oġġett
5. Wara li jkun wasal l-oġġett
6. Xi mod ieħor –aghhti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok

1.3.H.3 Ghalfejn qatt ma xtrajt xi ħaġa online?
1. Ma nafdax bejjiegħa fuq l-internet
2. Nixtieq nixtri online iżda m’għandix debit jew credit card
3. Nixtieq nixtri online iżda siti fejn tixtri online huma diffiċli tużahom
4. Ma rridx naghti dettalji finanzjarji personali online
5. Ma rridx naghti l-indirizz tad-dar online
6. Nibża’ li meta nirċievi l-oġġett li nkun xtrajt ma jkunx kif ordnajt
7. Ma toghġobnix l-idea li nibghat lura ogġetti lil online shops
8. Nippreferi nara/nħoss/nipprova l-affarijiet qabel ma nixtrihom
9. Ma nieħux pjaċir inħallas ghall-ġarr ta’ oġġetti li nkun xtrajt online
10. Xi raġuni oħra (agħti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

1.3.H.4 Taħseb li se tixtri xi oġġett online fis-sitt xhur li ġejjin?
   1. hemm ċans żgħir ħafna
   2. probabbilment le
   3. newtrali
   4. probabbilment iva
   5. hemm ċans kbir ħafna

I. Komunikazzjoni ma’ oħrajn (chat/email)
J. Siti ta’ social networking
K. Oħrajn (niżżel hawn)

ALT.1.3 Qatt tixtri affarijiet online?

ALT 2.0 L-użu ta’ servizzi UGC

ALT.2.1 Qatt ħloqt kont fuq xi websajt ta’ social networking bhal Facebook, MySpace, SkolaĦbieb, ecċ.?
   1=iva 2=le

ALT.2.2 Fuq liema websajt ta’ social networking ftaḥt kont?
   Facebook, MySpace, SkolaĦbieb, leħor 1 (semmi) leħor 2 (semmih)

ALT.2.2.1 Għalfejn għażilt li tiftaħ kont ma’ .............. milli ma’ sit ieħor?
   1. Ħafna min-nies li naf għandhom kont hemm
   2. Huwa aktar faċli tużah minn oħrajn
   3. Huwa aktar attrezzat minn siti oħra
   4. Nafda dan is-sit aktar mill-oħrajn
   5. Huwa aktar faċli tiltaqa’ ma’ nies oħra fuq dan is-sit
   6. Dan is-sit hu aktar moda
   7. Jiġi wżat madwar id-dinja kollha
   8. Juża l-lingwa li nippreferi nuża jien
   9. Raġuni oħra (agħti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

ALT.2.2.2 Għad ghandek u għadek tuża l-kont li ftaḥt ma’ <s-sit imsemmi>?
   1. Għadu għandi u nużah kuljum/kważi kuljum
   2. Għadu għandi u nużah kull ġimgħa
   3. Għadu għandi iżda nużah anqas minn darba fil-ġimgħa
   4. Għadu għandi iżda ma nużahx
   5. Ghalaqt il-kont

ALT.2.2.2.1 Għalfejn m’għadekx tuża l-kont ma’ <s-sit imsemmi>?
1. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’ghadux jinteressani
2. M’ghadnix nista’ nidhol fil-kont tieghi
3. Ipprovajt dan is-sit iżda m’ghogobnix
4. M’ghadnix nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
5. Ἡbiebi/shabi m’ghadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
6. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tieghi
7. Raġuni ohra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

ALT.2.2.2.2 Għalfejn għalaqt il-kont ma’ <s-sit imsemmi>?
1. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’ghadux jinteressani
2. Ipprovajt dan is-sit iżda m’ghogobnix
3. M’ghadnix nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
4. Ἡbiebi/shabi m’ghadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
5. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tieghi
6. Xieq li l-kontenut li jien hlaqt fuq is-sit jitneħħa
7. Raġuni ohra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

ALT.2.2.3 Għad għandek u għadek tuża l-kontijiet li ftaħt fuq websajts ta’ social networking?
1. Għadu għandi u nużah kuljum jew kważi kuljum
2. Għadu għandi u nużah kull ġimgħa
3. Għadu għandi iżda nużah anqas minn darba fil-ġimgħa
4. Għadu għandi iżda ma nużahx
5. Għalaqt il-kont

ALT.2.2.3.1 Jekk wieħed minn dawn is-siti kellu jagħlaq, ta’ min l-aktar se thoss in-nuqqas?

ALT.2.2.3.1.1 Kieku għalfejn thoss in-nuqqas ta’ dan is-sit?
1. Ἡafna min-nies li naf għandhom kont hemm
2. Huwa aktar faċli tużah minn oħrajn
3. Huwa aktar attrezzat minn siti oħra
4. Nafda dan is-sit aktar mill-oħrajn
5. Huwa aktar faċli tiltaha’ ma’ nies ohra fuq dan is-sit
6. Dan is-sit hu aktar moda
7. Jiġi wżat madwar id-dinja kollha
8. Jaghtik l-informazzjoni malajr
9. Tista’ ssir taf x’inhu jiġri mad-dinja kollha
10. Raġuni ohra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

ALT.2.2.3.2 Għalfejn tuża dan is-sit l-aktar drabi?
1. Ἡafna min-nies li naf għandhom kont hemm
2. Huwa aktar faċli tużah minn oħrajn
3. Huwa aktar attrezzat minn siti oħra
4. Nafda dan is-sit aktar mill-oħrajn
5. Huwa aktar faċli tiltaqa’ ma’ nies oħra fuq dan is-sit
6. Dan is-sit hu aktar moda
7. Jiġi wżat madwar id-dinja kollha
8. Jagħtik l-informazzjoni malajr
9. Tista’ ssir taf x’inhu jiġri mad-dinja kollha
10. Raġuni oħra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħţbok)

ALT.2.2.3.3 Għalfejn ma tużax il-kont li għandek ma’ <s-sit imsemmi>?
1. M’għadnix nista’ nidħol fil-kont tiegħi
2. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’għadux jinteressani
3. Improvajt dan is-sit iżda m’għogobnix
4. M’għadnix nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
5. Ħbiebi/shabi m’għadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
6. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tiegħi
7. Raġuni oħra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħţbok)

ALT.2.2.3.4 Għalfejn għalaqt il-kont li kellek ma’ <s-sit imsemmi>?
1. Improvajt dan is-sit iżda m’għogobnix
2. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’għadux jinteressani
3. M’għadnix nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
4. Ħbiebi/shabi m’għadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
5. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tiegħi
6. Nixtieq li l-kontenut li jien ħlaqt fuq is-sit jitneħħa
7. Raġuni oħra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħţbok)

Aktar taqřrif dwar SITI UGC

ALT 2.9 Ma’ liema websajts UGC qatt kelke xi kont (mhux sempliċiment dhalt fiha) ghall-użu personali tiegħek?

B. Websajts ta’ business networking bħal Linkedin, Xing.com
C. Websajts ta’ dating bħal parship.com
D. Websajts fejn tista’ taqsam ritratti, vidjows, eċċ. ma’ oħrajn bħal Youtube, flickr
E. Websajts li jipprovdu rakkomandazzjonijiet u reċensjonijiet (ta’ films, mużika, kotba, hotels, eċċ.) bħal last.fm, tripadvisor
F. Siti ta’ micro blogging bħal twitter
G. Siti Wiki bħal Wikipedia, myheritage
H. Multiplayer online games bħal secondlife.com, World of Warcraft

ALT.2.9.1 Ghalfejn qatt ma ftaht kont ma’ din it-tip ta’ websajt/ dawn it-tipi ta’ websajts?
1. Din it-tip ta’ websajt ma tinteressanix
2. Qatt ma kont smajt dwar din it-tip ta’ websajt
3. Ma kontx naf li tista’ tiftaħ kont ma’ dawn it-tipi ta’ websajts
4. Ἡadd minn ħbiebi ma juża din il-websajt
5. Ma tiswiex toqghod thallas għaliha
6. Kont imħassba dwar l-użu ta’ informazzjoni personali fuqi
7. Inżur dawn is-siti iżda ma nhosx li ħandi nsir membru
8. Raġuni/ijiet oħra

ALT.2.9.2 Għad għandek il-kontijiet kollha li kont ftaht fuq il-websajts UGC?
1= Iva, għad għandi l-kontijiet kollha li kont ftaħt fuq il-websajts UGC
2= Għad għandi ftit minnhom iżda għalaqt oħrajn
3= Le, għalaqthom kollha

ALT.2.9.2.1 Użajt il-kontijiet kollha li għandek fuq il-websajts UGC f’dawn l-ahħar 6 xħur?
1= iva 2= le

ALT.2.9.2.1.1 Ghalfejn ma wżajtx ftit mil-kontijiet f’dawn l-ahħar 6 xħur?
1. M’għadnix nista’ nidhol fil-kont tiegħi
2. Mhiex it-tip ta’ websajt li nuża b’mod regolari
3. Ipprovajt dan is-sit iżda m’għogobnix
4. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’ghadux jintereżsani
5. M’ghadnix nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
6. Ħbiebi m’ghadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
7. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tiegħi
8. Raġuni oħra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)

ALT.2.9.2.2 Ghalfejn għalaqt il-kontijiet li kellek f’websajts UGC?
1. Ipprovajt dan is-sit iżda m’għogobnix
2. Dan it-tip ta’ sit m’ghadux jintereżsani
3. Ma bqajtx nafda l-kumpanija li tmexxi dan is-sit
4. Ħbiebi m’ghadhomx jużaw dan is-sit
5. Ma tiswiex toqghod thallas għas-shubija f’din il-websajt
6. Inkwetajt fuq x’użu jista’ jsir mid-dettalji personali tiegħi
7. Nixtieq li l-kontenut li ħloqt fuq il-websajt jitneħħa
8. Ma rridx li n-nies isiru jafu li kont nuża din il-websajt
9. Raġuni oħra (aghti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)
3.0 Informazzjoni li żvelajt fuq siti UGC

3.1 Meta taħseb kif użajt siti UGC (bħal siti ta’ social networking, siti sharing, u siti ta’ gaming), liema tip ta’ informazzjoni diġà żvelajt (meta rregistrat, jew sempliciment meta użajthom)?

1. Informazzjoni medika (rekord tal-pazjent, dettalji dwar is-saħħa)
2. Informazzjoni finanzjarja (eż. s-salarju, dettalji tal-bank, rekord tal-credit)
3. Il-work history tiegħek
4. In-numru tal-karta tal-identità jew passaport tiegħek
5. Ismek
6. L-indirizz tad-dar tiegħek
7. In-nazzjonalità tiegħek
8. Affarijiet li tagħmel (eż. passatempi, sports, postijiet li żżur)
9. Il-gosti u l-opinjonijiet tiegħek
10. Ritratti tiegħek innifsek
11. Min huma ħbiebek
12. Websaţjs li żżur
13. In-numru tal-mowbajl tiegħek
14. L-indirizz elettroniku tiegħek
15. Tip ieħor (niżlu)
16. Ma nafx

4.0 Perċezzjoni ta’ riskji

4.1 Jekk jogħġbok indika f’ kull waħda minn dawn is-sitwazzjonijiet kemm taħseb li hemm ċans li tiġri minħabba li tkun żvelajt informazzjoni personali fuq siti UGC.

1= hemm ċans żgħir ħafna 2= probabbilment le 3= newtrali 4=probabbilment iva 5= hemm ċans kbir ħafna

1. Informazzjoni dwariek tintuża mingħajr ma tkun taf
2. Informazzjoni dwariek tinxtered ma’ terzi mingħajr il-kunsens tiegħek
3. Informazzjoni dwariek tintuża biex jibgħatulek of ferti kummerċjali li ma tridx
4. Is-sigurtà personali tiegħek tkun fil-periklu
5. Issir vittma ta’ frodi
6. Issir diskriminazzjoni kontrik (eż. f’għażla għal impjieg, billi tirċievi żieda fil-prezz, ma jkollokx aċċess għal xi servizz)
7. Ir-reputazzjoni tiegħek titħammeġ

5.0 Imġiba relatata ma’ Privacy Settings
Aktar taghrif dwar Profili Personalì
Profil personali fuq sit UGC (bhal siti ta’ social networking, dawk sharing, u tal-gaming)
jikkonsisti minn informazzjoni bhall-età tieghek, fejn toqghod, x’jinteressak, xi ritratt li tkun
tellajt u xi taqsimma “dwari”. Il-profile visibility – min ikun jista’ jara l-informazzjoni dwarek u
jkun f’kuntatt miegħek – jista’, f’xi każi, jiġi personalizzat billi jithaddmu l-privacy settings li
joffri s-sit.

5.1 Qatt biddilt xi haġa mill-privacy settings fil-profil personali tieghek fuq sit UGC?
1= Qatt, 2= Rari, 3= Kultant, 4= Sikwit, 5= Dejjem

5.1.1 Għalfen qatt ma biddilt il-privacy settings?
1. Ma kontx naf li jeżistu l-privacy settings
2. Ma nafx kif inbiddel is-settings
3. Nibża’ li jekk inbiddel il-privacy settings, is-sit ma jahdimx sew
4. Ma kontx naf li nista’ nbiddel is-settings
5. Nafda s-sit biex ikun hemm privacy settings xierqa
6. Jien kuntent/a bil-privacy settings standard
7. Ma sibtx ħin biex nara l-ġhażliet li hemm
8. Risposta oħra (aġht j-dettalji, jekk jogħbok)

5.1.2 Kif biddilt il-privacy settings?
1. Għamilt il-privacy settings anqas stretti sabiex oħrajn isibu aktar informazzjoni
2. Xi daqqiet għamilt il-privacy settings aktar stretti u xi daqqiet anqas stretti.
3. Għamilt il-privacy settings aktar stretti sabiex oħrajn isibu anqas informazzjoni
4. Ma nżommx il-history tiegħi
5. Risposta oħra (aġht j-dettalji, jekk jogħbok)

5.1.3 X'biddilt minn dawn il-privacy settings?
“qatt” “rari” “kultant” “sikwit” “dejjem”
1. Biddilt min ikun jista’ jara l-profil tieghi
2. Biddilt min ikun jista’ jara r-ritratt tiegħi
3. Biddilt min ikun jista’ jara li qiegħed/qiegħda online
4. Ma nżommx il-history tiegħi
5. Risposta oħra (aġht j-dettalji, jekk jogħbok)

6.0 Perċezzjoni ta’ Playfulness

Jekk taħseb dwar is-sit UGC li tuża, jew jekk tuża aktar minn sit wieħed ahseb fis-sit UGC
favorit tiegħek, jekk jogħbok indika l-livell ta’ qbil tiegħek mad-dikjarazzjonnijiet li ġejjin billi
 tiklikkja fuq il-punt tal-iskala li jirrappreżenta l-aktar x’taħseb int, fejn 1=ma taqbilx u 7=li
taqbel.
6.1 Meta nuża siti UGC nieħu pjačir
6.2 Meta nuża siti UGC nieħu gost
6.3 Meta nuża siti UGC inħossni ferhan/a
6.4 Meta nuża siti UGC inqanqal il-kuržità tieghi
6.5 Meta nuża siti UGC inheġgeġ l-immaġinazzjoni tieghi

7.0 Perċezzjoni ta’ kemm hu faċli tużah

Kif għadek taħseb dwar is-sit UGC li tuża/is-sit UGC favorit tiegħek, jekk jogħġbok indika l-livell ta’ qbil tiegħek mad-dikjarazzjonijiet li ġejjin.

7.1 Din il-websajt faċli tużaha.
7.2 Malajr tgħallimt kif nuża din il-websajt.
7.3 Din il-websajt sempliċi biex tużaha.
7.4 Mill-ewwel niftakar kif nuża din il-websajt.
7.5 Kien faċli titgħallem tuża din il-websajt.

8.0 Perċezzjoni ta’ Critical Mass

Għall-darba oħra bil-ħsieb tas-sit UGC li tuża/is-sit UGC favorit tiegħek, jekk jogħġbok indika l-livell ta’ qbil tiegħek mad-dikjarazzjonijiet li ġejjin.

8.1 Ħafna min-nies li jien f’kuntatt magħhom, jużaw din il-websajt.
8.2 Dawk in-nies ma’ min jiena f’kuntatt se jibqgħu jużaw din il-websajt fil-futur.
8.3 Dawk in-nies ma’ min nikkomunika fuq din il-websajt se jibqgħu jużaw din il-websajt fil-futur.
8.4 Ħafna min-nies ma’ min jiena f’kuntatt jużaw din il-websajt b’mod regolari.

9.0 Imġiba li għandha x’taqṣam mat-Termini u l-Kondizzjonijiet u mal-Politika dwar il-Privatezza

Il-parti l-kbira tal-websajts fuq l-internet jirrikjedu li dawk li jużawhom jaċċettaw, normalment billi jimmarkaw kaxxa, it-Termini u l-Kondizzjonijiet tal-websajt qabel ma jingħataw aċċess għaliha.

9.1 Meta toħloq kont ma’ websajt, kif taċċetta t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet tas-sit?
  5= Dejjem naqra t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet qabel ma naċċettahom
  4= Sikwit naqra t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet qabel ma naċċettahom
  3= Kultant naqra t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet qabel ma naċċettahom
  2= Rari naqra t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet qabel ma naċċettahom
  1= Qatt ma naqra t-termini u l-kondizzjonijiet qabel ma naċċettahom
  ?= ma nafx迷你ex ċert/a xi jfisser dan
9.2 Meta toħloq kont fuq websajt li qatt ma wżajt qabel, taqra d-dikjarazzjoni fuq il- il-politika dwar il-privatezza tal-websajt?

**Aktar tagħrif fuq il-POLITIKA dwar il-PRIVATEZZA**

Fuq websajts tal-internet, apparti t-Termini u l-Kondizzjonijiet (jew kultant bħala parti minnhom), dikjarazzjoni fuq, jew il-politika dwar, il-privatezza, jispjegaw kif se tintuża l-informazzjoni personali li jagħtu *online* dawk li jużaw is-sit, kif ukoll min se jkollu aċċess għal din l-informazzjoni.

1= qatt ma naqra l-politika dwar il-privatezza
2= rari naqra l-politika dwar il-privatezza
3= kultant naqra l-politika dwar il-privatezza
4= sikwit naqra l-politika dwar il-privatezza
5= dejjem naqra l-politika dwar il-privatezza

**9.2.1 Meta taqra dikjarazzjonijiet/il-politika dwar il-privatezza, inti s-soltu:**

1= naqra ftit ħafna mit-test
2= naqra ftit mit-test
3= naqra kważi t-test kollu
4= naqra t-test kollu

**9.2.2 Meta tkun qrajt id-dikjarazzjonijiet jew il-politika dwar il-privatezza, tgħid li:**

1. Miniex ċert/a jekk fhimthomx jew le
2. Is-soltu ma fhimhom xejn
3. Is-soltu ma fhimtx il-parti l-kbira tagħhom
4. Is-soltu fhimt il-parti l-kbira tagħhom
5. Is-soltu fhimhom kollha
6. Ma nafx/ma niftakarx

**9.2.3 Qatt iddeċidejt li ma tibdiex tuża websajt jew li tieqaf tuża websajt għax ma kontx sodisfatt/a bil-politika dwar il-privatezza tas-sit?**

1= iva, 2= le, 3= ma nafx/ma niftakarx

**9.3.1 Għalfefjn qatt ma taqra dikjarazzjonijiet jew il-politika dwar il-privatezza?**

1. Ma kontx naf fuq il-politika dwar il-privatezza
2. Ma nafx fejn issib il-politika dwar il-privatezza fuq websajt
3. Il-politika dwar il-privatezza tkun twila wisq biex tooqghod taqrahha
4. Il-politika dwar il-privatezza hija tqila wisq biex tifhimha
5. Jekk irrid kont fuq websajt, ma jimpurtanix fuq il-politika tal-privatezza tagħha
6. Il-politika dwar il-privatezza ta’ websajt ma tagħmillix differenza għax m’ghandi xejn x’nahbi
7. Il-politika dwar il-privatezza ta’ websajt ma tagħmillix differenza għax il-websajts xorta waħda jinjorawha
8. Jekk il-websajt tikser il-privatezza tieghi, xorta waħda se tipproteġini l-liği
9. Risposta oħra (agħti d-dettalji, jekk jogħġbok)
10.0 Għarfien u Atitudni – Il-Proċessar tal-Informazzjoni

10.1 L-informazzjoni li tinkludi fil-kont jew profil tiegħek fuq websajt tista’ tintuża mis-sidien tal-websajt għal numru ta’ għanijiet. Kont tafu dan?
1= iva, 2= le, 3= miniex ċert/a xi jfisser dan

10.2.A Jekk jogħġbok, indika jekk kontx taf li s-sidien ta’ websajts jistgħu jużaw l-informazzjoni li int tinkludi fil-kont jew profil tiegħek sabiex:
1= Iva 2= Le 3= Ma nafx

10.2.B Jekk jogħġbok, indika x’taħseb dwar l-użu, mis-sidien ta’ websajts, tal-informazzjoni personali li int tinkludi fil-kont jew profil tiegħek sabiex:
1= Hija ħaġa aċċettablbi, m’għandhomx għalfejn jistaqsuni; 2= Hija ħaġa aċċettabbli iżda jekk nagħtihom il-permess biss; 3= mhix ħaġa aċċettabbli; 4= miniex żgur/a/ma nafx

1. ifasslu (customize) l-kontenut li tara
2. ifasslu (customize) r-reklamar li tara
3. jikkuntattjawk bl-email
4. jaqsmu informazzjoni (mhux linkjat m’ismek) dwar l-imġibba tiegħek ma’ sezzjonijiet oħra tal-kumpanija
5. jaqsmu l-informazzjoni dwarek (linkjat m’ismek) ma’ sezzjonijiet oħra tal-kumpanija
6. ibieghu informazzjoni (mhux linkjat m’ismek) dwar l-imġibba tiegħek ma’ kumpaniji oħra
7. jiġbru informazzjoni personali dettaljata dwarek mill-websajt tagħhom u minn oħrajn u taġhttu aċċess għaliha lil nies oħra

10.3 Issiba ħaġa aċċettabbli kieku kellhom ħallhom iħallsuk miżata sabiex tħallli l-websajt:
1=iva tkun aċċettabbli 2= le ma tkun qatt aċċettabbli 3= jiddependi minn kemm iħallsuni 4= nippreferi nirċievi bonusijiet relatati mas-sit milli miżata 5= ma nafx

1. tfassal (customize) il-kontenut li tara
2. tfassal (customize) r-reklamar li tara
3. tikkuntattjak bl-email
4. taqsam informazzjoni (mhux linkjat m’ismek) dwar l-imġibba tiegħek ma’ sezzjonijiet oħra tal-kumpanija
5. taqsam l-informazzjoni dwarek (linkjat m’ismek) ma’ sezzjonijiet oħra tal-kumpanija
6. tbiegh informazzjoni (mhux linkjat m’ismek) dwar l-imġibba tiegħek ma’ kumpaniji oħra
7. tigbor informazzjoni personali dettaljata dwarek minna u minn websajts oħrajn u taġhtti aċċess għaliha lil nies oħra
Aktar tagħrif dwar **COOKIES**

10.4 Int taf li l-websajts għandhom aċċess ghal informazzjoni dwar l-attività tiegħek fuq l-internet bl-użu ta’ “cookies”?
1= iva, 2= le, 3= miniex żgur/a xi jfisser dan

10.4.1 Il-web browsers jagħtuk l-għażla li ma taghtix permess lill-websajts biex iżommu informazzjoni dwar l-attivitàet tiegħek billi jwaqqfu l-cookies fil-web browser tiegħek. Qatt waqqafu cookies fil-web browser tiegħek?
1= iva, 2= le, 3=ma niftakarx/ma nafx

10.4.1.1 Għalfejn qatt ma waqqafu cookies?
1. Ma nafsibx li hemm bżonn
2. Il-websajtx ma jahdmux sew jekk twaqqaf il-cookies
3. Il-websajts jahdmu aktar bil-mod jekk twaqqaf il-cookies
4. Ma nafx kif inwaqqaf il-cookies
5. Risposta ohra

11.0 Perċezzjoni ta’ riskju fil-privatezza
Jekk jogħġbok indika l-livell ta’ qbil tiegħek mad-dikjarazzjonijiet li ġejjin dwar informazzjoni personali u l-internet billi tiklikkja fuq il-punt tal-iskala li jirrappreżenta l-aktar x’taħseb int, fejn 1=ma taqbilx u 7=li taqbel.

11.1 Ġeneralment, hemm riskju meta taghti informazzjoni personali fuq websajts.
11.2 Hemm potenzjal qawwi ta’ privatezza assoċjat mal-għoti ta’ informazzjoni personali fuq websajts.
11.3 Informazzjoni personali tista’ tiġi wżata b’mod mhux xieraq mill-websajts.
11.4 L-għoti ta’ informazzjoni personali tiegħi lill-websajts jinvolvi ħafna problemi mhux mistennija.

12.0 Il-Protezzjoni Teknika
Meta taħseb dwar l-imġiba tiegħek online, jekk jogħġbok indika kemm-il darba taħmel minn dak li ġej:
1= qatt 2=rari 3=kultant 4=sikwit 5=dejjem 6=ma nafx x’inhu dan 7=ma nafx kif
12.1 Taghti kas kif tista’ tikkontrolla x’jibgħatulek in-nies online (pereżempju tiċċekkja l-kaxxi li jħalluk tidhol jew toħroġ fejn ikun hemm ċerti offerti)?
12.2 Tuża pop up window blocker?
12.3 Tiċċekkja l-kompjuter tiegħek għal għal online (pereżempju tiċċekkja l-kaxxi li jħalluk tidhol jew toħroġ fejn ikun hemm ċerti oferti)?
12.4 Tneħħi l-browser history tiegħek regolarment?
12.5 Tibblokkja messaġġi/emails minn xi ħadd li ma tridx kuntatt miegħu/magħha?

13.0 Thassib dwar il-Privatezza

Għal kull wahda mill-mistoqsijiet li ġejjin, jekk jogħġbok indika l-livell tat-thassib tiegħek fejn 1=ma għandek thassib ta’ xejn u 5= għandek thassib serju

13.1 Għandek thassib dwar organizzazzjonijiet online li mhumiex dak kollu li jgħidu li huma?
13.2 Għandek thassib dwar serq ta’ identitá online?
13.3 Għandek thassib dwar nies online li ma jkunux min jgħidu li huma?
13.4 Għandek thassib dwar min jista’ jidhol fir-rekords mediċi tiegħek elettronikament?
13.5 Għandek thassib li jekk tuża l-credit card tiegħek biex tiixtri xi ħaġa fuq l-internet, xi ħaddiehor se jakkwista/jinterċetta n-numru tal-credit card tiegħek?
13.6 Għandek thassib li jekk tuża l-credit card tiegħek biex tiixtri xi ħaġa fuq l-internet, il-card tiegħek se turi ħlas aktar milli suppost?

14.0 Vittma tan-nuqqas ta’ privatezza

14.1 Kemm-il darba int personali kont vittma ta’ dak li int thoss li kien dħul mhux xieraq fil-privatezza fuq l-internet fejn 1=qatt u 7= sikwit ħafna?
15.0 Exposure fuq il-medja

15.1 Kemm smajt jew qrajt matul l-aħħar sena dwar il-potenzjal ta’ użu ħażin tal-informazzjoni miġbura minn fuq l-internet fejn 1=xejn u 7= ħafna?
16.0 Kemm wieħed hu dispost li jpoġġi valu fuq il-privatezza

Jekk jogħġbok indika l-livell ta’ qbil tiegħek mad-dikjarazzjonijiet li ġejjin dwar informazzjoni personali fejn 1= ma naqbilx u 7= naqbel.

16.1 Meta nqabel ruħi ma’ shabi, jien aktar sensittiv/a dwar il-mod kif kumpaniji online jużaw l-informazzjoni personali tiegħi.
16.2 Għalija hija l-aktar ħaża importanti li nżomm il-privatezza online tiegħi.
16.3 Meta nqabel ruħi ma’ shabi, għandi tendenza nitħasseb aktar dwar theddid għall-privatezza personali tiegħi

17.0 In-Normi Soċjali

17.1 Dawk in-nies li jien napprezza l-opinjoni taghhom jaħsbu li huwa importanti ħafna li żżomm informazzjoni personali privata.
17.2 Hbiebi jaħsbu għandi naghti kas tal-privatezza tiegħi.
17.3 Dawk in-nies li huma importanti għalija jaħsbu li għandi noqghod attent/a meta niżvela informazzjoni personali online.
18.0 It-Tendenza li tiżvela lilek innifsek
Indika l-livell li jirrifletti kif int tikkomunika man-nies fid-dikjarazzjonijiet li ġejjin fejn 1= ma 
naqbilx u 5= naqbel
18.1 Ma noqghodx nitkellem dwari sikwit. (R)
18.2 Is-soltu noqghod nitkellem dwari ghal ħin twil mhux ħażin.
18.3 Rari ħafna li nesprimi x’nemmen u x’nahseb. (R)
18.4 Jekk nibda, inkompli niżvela kollox dwari f’dak li nghid anki dak ta’ natura intima.
18.5 Sikwit niżvela affrijiet personali u ta’ natura intima mingħajr ħsieb ta’ xejn.

19.0 Il-kawtela ġenerali
Aħseb dwar l-imġiba tieghek in ġenerali, mhux biss dik online
1= qatt 2= rari 3= kultant 4= sikwit 5= dejjem
19.1 Tqatta/tahraq id-dokumenti personali tieghek meta tarmihom?
19.2 Taħbi n-numru tal-PIN tal-card tal-bank tieghek meta tuża cash machines/tixtri?
19.3 Tirregistra biss f’dawk il-websajts li ghandom politika tal-privatezza?
19.4 Tfittex ċertifikazzjoni dwar privatezza fuq websajt qabel ma tirregistra l-informazzjoni 
tieghek?
19.5 Taqra l-ftehim tal-liċenzja kompletament qabel ma taċċetta?

20.0 Demographics
Din it-taqsima għandha x’taqsam ma’ informazzjoni dwarek. Tista’ thalliha vojta iżda jekk 
timliha tkun ta’ ghajnuna kbira għar-riċerka tagħna.
20.1 Sess 1= raġel; 2= mara
20.2 Età _____snin
20.3 F’liema livell ta’ edukazzjoni wasalt?
1= Ma mortx skola
2= Skola Primarja
3= Skola Sekondarja
4= Edukazzjoni Terzjarja (l-Università, Kulleġġ Tekniku, eċċ)
20.4 Impjieg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MHUX ATTIV</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsabbli għax-xiri ta’ kuljum u biex tiehu hsieb tad-dar, jew bla impjieg kurrenti, bla xoghol</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qieghed/qieghda jew temporanjament bla xoghol</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irtirat/a jew jew marid/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF EMPLOYED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidwi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajjied</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professjonist/a (avukat/a, tabib/a, accountant, perit, ecc.)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sid ta’ hanut, artiġjan, tip ieħor ta’ self-employed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negożjant, sid (shih jew bi shab) ta’ kumpanija</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPJEΓAT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professjonist/a impjegat/a (tabib/a impjegat/a, avukat/a, accountant, perit)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xogħol ta’ maniġer ġenerali, direktur jew parti mit-top management (direttur maniġerjali, direktur ġenerali, tip ieħor ta’ direktur)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xogħol ta’ middle management, xogħol ieħor ta’ maniġer (kap ta’ dipartiment, junior manager, ghalliem/a, technician)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impjegat, b’pożizzjoni f’uffiċċju</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impjegat, b’pożizzjoni barra mill-uffiċċju (salesman, xufier, ecc.)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impjegat, f’pożizzjoni li joffri/toffri xi servizz (fi sptar, jew restorant, pulizjott/a, ma’ tat-tifi tan-nar, ecc.)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xogħol ta’ sengħa</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xogħol ieħor tal-idejn, seftur/a</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20.5 In-Nazzjonalità
Awestrijak/a, Belġjan/a, mill-Brittanja, mill-Bulgarija, Čiprijott/a, Ček/a, Daniż/a, Olandiż/a, mill-Estonija, mill-Finlandja, Franciż/a, Germaniż/a, Grieg/a, mill-Ungarija, Irlandiż/a, Taljan/a, mil-Latvja, mil-Litwanja, Mali/ja, Pollakk/a, Portuguese, mir-Rumanija, Slovak/a, mis-Slovenja, Spanjolj/a, Svediż/a, Pajjiż ieħor

20.6 Ir-Residenza f’pajjiż
L-Awestrija, il-Belġju, il-Bulgarija, Čipru, Ir-Repubblika Čeka, Id-Danimarka, L-Estonja, Il-Finlandja, Franza, Il-Ġermanja, Il-Grecja, L-Ungerija, L-Irlanda, L-Italja, Il-Litwanja, Malta, l-Olanda, il-Polonja, il-Portugal, ir-Rumanija, is-Slovakja, Is-Slovenja, Spanja, l-Isvezja, Ir-Renju Unit, Pajjiż ieħor

20.7 Fejn toqghod int hu post: Urban/Rurali/fis-subborg?

20.8 Il-lingwa l-aktar mitkellma d-dar
L-ilsien Basque, il-Bulgaru, il-Katalan, ič-Čeki, id-Daniż, l-Olandiż, l-Ingliż, l-Estonian, il-Finlandiż, il-Franciż, il-Galician, il-Germaniż, il-Grieg, l-Ungeriz, l-Irlandiż, it-Taljan, il-Latvian, il-Lithuanian, il-Luxembourghish, il-Multi, il-Pollakk, il-Portugiz, ir-Rumen, is-Slovak, is-Sloven, l-Ispanjol, is-Svediż, Lingwa oħra <jekk jogħġbok agħti d-dettalji>

20.9 Ir-Reliġjon tiegħek 1= Buddist/a, 2= Kristjan/a, 3= Hindu, 4= Lhudi/ija, 5=Musulman/a, 6= Sikh, 7= Ebda religjon, 8= Religjon ieħor <jekk jogħġbok agħti d-dettalji>