



Co-funded by the European Union



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

Technical Report and User Guide: The 2010 EU Kids Online Survey

A report on the design and implementation of the
EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and
their parents in 25 countries



**Sonia Livingstone, Leslie Haddon, Anke Görzig
and Kjartan Ólafsson, with members of the *EU
Kids Online* network**

ISSN 2045-256X

www.eukidsonline.net

Technical Report and User Guide: The 2010 EU Kids Online Survey. This technical report describes the design and implementation of the EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year old internet using children and their parents in 25 European countries. It has been produced on behalf of the project Coordinator by Sonia Livingstone, Leslie Haddon, Anke Görzig and Kjartan Ólafsson, with members of the *EU Kids Online* network (Annex 2), as advised by the International Advisory Panel (Annex 1). It builds on the technical survey report delivered by the fieldwork agency Ipsos MORI as part of their contract with the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

Cite this report as: Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A. and Ólafsson, K. (2011). *Technical Report and User Guide: The 2010 EU Kids Online Survey*. LSE, London: EU Kids Online.

Note that the dataset is archived in the UK Data Archive and available for public (but not commercial use). See <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/>

Previous reports and publications from *EU Kids Online* include:

Final recommendations for policy, methodology and research (O'Neill, B., Livingstone, S. and McLaughlin, S., 2011)

Disadvantaged children and online risk (Livingstone, S., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K., 2011)

EU Kids Online Final Report (Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K., 2011)

Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children. Full findings (Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., and Ólafsson, K., 2011)

Risky communication online (Livingstone, S., and Ólafsson, K., 2011)

Digital literacy and safety skills (Sonck, N., Livingstone, S., Kuiper, E., and de Haan, J., 2011)

Social networking, age and privacy (Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K., and Staksrud, E., 2011)

Patterns of risk and safety online. In-depth analyses from the EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and their parents in 25 countries (Hasebrink, U., Görzig, A., Haddon, L., Kalmus, V. and Livingstone, S., 2011)

Cross-national comparison of risks and safety on the internet: Initial analysis from the EU Kids Online survey of European children (Lobe, B., Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K. and Vodeb, H., 2011)

Who bullies and who is bullied online? A study of 9-16 year old internet users in 25 European countries (Görzig, A., 2011)

Comparing children's online opportunities and risks across Europe: Cross-national comparisons for EU Kids Online (2nd edn) (Hasebrink, U., Livingstone, S., Haddon, L. and Ólafsson, K., 2009)

What do we know about children's use of online technologies? A report on data availability and research gaps in Europe (2nd edn) (Staksrud, E., Livingstone, S., Haddon, L. and Ólafsson, K., 2009)

Best practice research guide: How to research children and online technologies in comparative perspective (Lobe, B., Livingstone, S., Ólafsson, K. and Simões, J.A., 2008)

EU Kids Online II: Enhancing Knowledge Regarding European Children's Use, Risk and Safety Online

This project has been funded by the EC Safer Internet Programme from 2009-11 (contract SIP-KEP-321803). Its aim is to enhance knowledge of European children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies in order to inform the promotion among national and international stakeholders of a safer online environment for children.

Adopting an approach that is child-centred, comparative, critical and contextual, EU Kids Online II has designed and conducted a major quantitative survey of 9-16 year olds experiences of online use, risk and safety in 25 European countries. The findings will be systematically compared to the perceptions and practices of their parents, and they will be disseminated through a series of reports and presentations during 2010-12.

For more information, and to receive project updates, visit www.eukidsonline.net

CONTENTS

Contents	3	5. Data entry and quality control	29
1. Introduction	5	5.1. DATA ENTRY AND PROCESSING.....	29
1.1. THE EU KIDS ONLINE PROJECT.....	5	5.2. QUALITY CONTROL	29
1.2. THE RESEARCH CONTEXT	5	5.3. DATA EDITING	30
1.3. THE AIM OF EU KIDS ONLINE II	6	6. Data weighting and design effects	33
1.4. THE SURVEY AT A GLANCE	7	6.1. THE USE OF WEIGHTS.....	33
1.5. FIELDWORK AGENCY	8	6.2. APPROACHES TO WEIGHTING.....	33
1.6. MAIN LIMITATIONS.....	9	6.3. STAGES OF WEIGHTING	34
1.7. ACCURACY OF THE FINDINGS	9	6.4. SAMPLING TOLERANCES	36
2. Survey development and piloting	11	6.5. DESIGN EFFECTS	36
2.1. QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT.....	11	6.6. ANALYSING DATA ON THE COUNTRY LEVEL	39
2.2. COGNITIVE TESTING	11	7. The data set	41
2.3. SURVEY PILOT.....	12	7.1. THE DATA SET	41
2.4. THE INTERVIEWS	13	7.2. SES MEASUREMENTS.....	42
2.5. TRANSLATION.....	14	7.3. EDUCATION	42
3. Sampling	15	7.4. ROUTING AND HANDLING OF MISSING VALUES	45
3.1. SELECTION OF SAMPLE POINTS AND ADDRESSES.....	15	7.5. TREATMENT OF MISSING VALUES BY EU KIDS ONLINE ..	46
3.2. RANDOM WALK METHOD.....	18	List of figures	49
3.3. OTHER METHODS USED	18	List of tables	49
3.4. RESPONDENT SELECTION	18	Annex 1: EU Kids Online	51
3.5. CONTACT SHEETS AND THE SCREENING PROCESSES	18	Annex 2: The network	52
4. Fieldwork	21	Annex 3: Ethics review	54
4.1. FIELDWORK OVERVIEW.....	21	Annex 4: Translation of difficult words	77
4.2. USE OF INCENTIVES	21		
4.3. INTERVIEWERS.....	22		
4.4. SURVEY MODE AND INTERVIEW LENGTH.....	23		
4.5. SUPPORT FOR RESPONDENTS	24		
4.6. CONTEXT EFFECTS AND CHILD COMPREHENSION	24		
4.7. ETHICS AND CHILD PROTECTION	24		
4.8. FIELDWORK OUTCOMES AND RESPONSE RATES	26		

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The EU Kids Online project

The *EU Kids Online* project was organised as a direct follow-up from the previous EU Kids Online I project which was carried out in the years 2006 to 2009¹. That project examined research carried out in 21 European countries into how people, especially children and young people, use new media. In this three-year collaboration, researchers across a diverse range of countries worked together, through meetings, networking and dissemination activities, to identify, compare and evaluate the available evidence.

Key questions included:

- What research exists, is ongoing or, crucially, is still needed?
- What risks exist, for which technologies, and in relation to which (sub)populations?
- How do social, cultural and regulatory influences affect the incidence and experience of, and the responses to, different risks?
- Further, in accounting for current and ongoing research, and anticipating future research, what factors shape the research capability of European research institutions and networks?

The aim was to identify comparable research findings across member states on the basis of which recommendations for child safety, media literacy and awareness could be formulated. The project members invited communications from the wider community, practitioners and researchers in order to achieve this goal.

1.2. The research context

The rapidity with which children and young people are gaining access to online, convergent, mobile and networked media is unprecedented in the history of technological innovation. Parents, teachers and children are acquiring, learning how to use and finding a purpose

¹ See Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009) *EU Kids Online: Final Report*. LSE, London: EU Kids Online. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/24372/>

for the internet within their daily lives. Stakeholders – governments, schools, industry, child welfare organisations and families – seek to maximise online opportunities while minimising the risk of harm associated with internet use.

Diverse and ambitious efforts are underway in many countries to promote digital technologies in schools, e-governance initiatives, digital participation and digital literacy. As many families are discovering, the benefits are considerable. New opportunities for learning, participation, creativity and communication are being explored by children, parents, schools, and public and private sector organisations.

The previous *EU Kids Online* research identified a complex array of online opportunities and risks associated with children's internet use.² Interestingly, the risks of concern to children often are not those that lead to adult anxiety.³ Also, it appears that the more children go online to gain the benefits, the more they may encounter risks, accidentally or deliberately.⁴

Risks may arise when children are sophisticated, confident or experimental internet users, as observed in 'high use, high risk' countries or when, as in 'new use, new risk' countries, children gain internet access in advance of an infrastructure of awareness-raising, parental understanding, regulation and safety protection. So, although the popular fear that the internet endangers all children has not been supported by evidence, there are grounds for concern and intervention.

Further, despite the popular rhetoric of 'digital natives', many children still lack resources to use the internet sufficiently to explore its opportunities or to develop vital

² See Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009) *EU Kids Online: Final Report*. LSE, London: EU Kids Online. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/24372/> See also Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009a). *Kids online: Opportunities and risks for children*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

³ Optem (2007) *Safer Internet for Children: Qualitative Study in 29 European Countries*. Luxembourg: EC.

⁴ Livingstone, S. & Helsper, E. (2010) Balancing opportunities and risks in teenagers' use of the internet. *New Media & Society*, 12(2): 309-329.

digital literacy skills.⁵ Thus it is important to encourage and facilitate children's confident and flexible internet use. A difficult balancing act faces stakeholders: promoting online opportunities without careful attention to safety may also promote online risk, but measures to reduce risk may have the unintended consequence of reducing opportunities.⁶

1.3. The aim of EU Kids Online II

A major conclusion in the *EU Kids Online I* project was that a robust, comparable and up to date portrait of online risks encountered by European children was lacking. The available evidence base regarding users and their needs clearly had many serious gaps; the methods used in the existing research were often non-comparable across projects or countries; also the available research in this field dates quickly, given the pace of both technological and social change. To rectify this lack would clearly require a substantial investment, both in terms of funding – given the scale, sensitivity and quality of the evidence required, and in terms of collaborative effort among experts in each country – given the task of interpreting and exploiting the evidence produced.

The project aims were framed in accordance with Action 3.2 (Strengthening the knowledge base) of the 2008 Safer Internet plus programme, namely *To enhance the knowledge base regarding children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies in Europe, in order to inform the promotion of a safer online environment for children.*

Enhancing the knowledge base is here understood as (i) producing new, relevant, robust and comparable findings regarding the incidence of online risk among European children; (ii) pinpointing which children are particularly at risk and why, by examining vulnerability factors (at both individual and country levels); and (iii) examining the operation and effectiveness of parental regulation and awareness strategies, and children's own coping responses to risk, including their media literacy.

Building on existing knowledge and experience, this aim was operationalized in the *EU Kids Online* project as specific objectives:

- To design a thorough and robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying the nature of children's online access, use, risk, coping and safety awareness.
- To design a thorough and robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying the nature of parental experiences, practices and concerns regarding their children's internet use.
- To administer the survey in a reliable and ethically-sensitive manner to national samples of internet users aged 9-16, and their parents, in member states.
- To analyse the results systematically so as to identify both core findings and more complex patterns among findings on a national and comparative basis.
- To disseminate the findings in a timely manner to a wide range of relevant stakeholders nationally, across Europe, and internationally.
- To identify and disseminate key recommendations relevant to the development of safety awareness initiatives in Europe.
- To identify any remaining knowledge gaps and methodological lessons learned, to inform future projects regarding the promotion of safer use of the internet and new online technologies.
- To benefit from, sustain the visibility of, and further enhance the knowledge generated by, the *EU Kids Online* network.


In brief the main aims of the *EU Kids Online* project was thus to enhance knowledge of European children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies, and thereby to inform the promotion of a safer online environment for children.

It has generated a substantial body of new data – rigorously collected and cross-nationally-comparable – on European children's access, use, opportunities, risks and safety practices regarding the internet and online technologies. Significantly, findings come from interviews conducted directly with children from 25 countries across Europe (Figure 1).

⁵ Helsper, E., & Eynon, R. (2010) Digital natives: where is the evidence? *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(3), 502-520.

⁶ Livingstone, S. (2009) *Children and the Internet: Great Expectations, Challenging Realities*. Cambridge: Polity.

Figure 1: Countries surveyed by EU Kids Online



Throughout this report and in various network outputs the countries participating in the survey are referred to by a two letter country code (see Table 1). These are the same as used by Eurostat and almost the same as the ISO 3166-1 two letter code. The only difference between the ISO two letter code and the two letter codes used by Eurostat is that the United Kingdom is referred to as UK (rather than GB) and Greece is referred to as EL (rather than GR).

Table 1: Countries and two letter country codes

Country	Country code	Country	Country code
Austria	AT	Ireland	IE
Belgium	BE	Italy	IT
Bulgaria	BG	Lithuania	LT
Cyprus	CY	Netherlands	NL
Czech Republic	CZ	Norway	NO
Germany	DE	Poland	PL
Denmark	DK	Portugal	PT
Estonia	EE	Romania	RO
Greece	EL	Sweden	SE
Spain	ES	Slovenia	SI
Finland	FI	Turkey	TR
France	FR	United Kingdom	UK
Hungary	HU		

1.4. The survey at a glance

A total of 25,142 children who use the internet were interviewed, as was one of their parents, during Spring/Summer 2010, across 25 European countries.

Full details of the project's methods are provided in the accompanying Annexes (which are online at www.eukidsonline.net).

Key features include:

- Two rounds of cognitive testing, in addition to piloting, to check thoroughly children's understandings of and reactions to the questions.
- Random stratified survey sampling of some 1000 children (9-16 years old) per country who use the internet.
- Survey administration at home, face-to-face, with a self-completion section for sensitive questions.
- A detailed survey that questions children themselves, to gain a direct account of their online experiences.
- Equivalent questions asked of each type of risk to compare across risks.
- Matched questions to compare online with offline risks, to put online risks in proportion.
- Matched comparison questions to the parent most involved in the child's internet use.
- Measures of mediating factors – psychological vulnerability, social support and safety practices.
- Follow up questions to pursue how children respond to or cope with online risk.
- The inclusion of the experiences of young children aged 9-10, who are often excluded from surveys.

The design is comparative in several ways, comparing:

- Children's experiences of the internet across locations and devices.
- Similarities and differences by children's age, gender and SES.
- A range of risks experienced by children online.
- Children's perception of the subjective harm associated with these risks.
- Children's roles as 'victim' and 'perpetrator' of risks.
- Accounts of risks and safety practices reported by children and their parents.
- Data across countries for analysis of national similarities and differences.

The population interviewed in the *EU Kids Online* survey is children aged 9-16 years old who use the internet at all.

Note that, in countries where nearly all children use the internet, internet-using children are almost the same as the population of children aged 9-16 years in those countries. But in countries where some children still do not have access, or for whatever reason do not use the internet, internet-using-children (the population sampled for this project) is not the same as all children.

In section 6.2 there is an estimate of the proportion of internet-using children out of all children in each country. It is particularly important to keep this in mind when interpreting cross-country differences.

Additionally, to pinpoint the support children can call on at home, the *EU Kids Online* survey interviewed the parent 'most involved in the child's internet use', while also recording the existence of other adults in the household. The term 'parent' is used to refer to the parent or carer most involved in the child's internet use. This was more often mothers/female carers (some three in four) than fathers (in a quarter of cases).

1.5. Fieldwork agency

Following a public procurement procedure conducted in accordance with EC guidelines, *Ipsos MORI* was commissioned to work with *EU Kids Online* (coordinated by LSE – the London School of Economics and Political Science) to provide support with questionnaire design and testing, and to conduct the fieldwork and produce the data sets. *Ipsos MORI*, in turn, contracted with fieldwork agencies in each country (see Table 2), in order to ensure a standard approach across Europe.

In each of 24 European countries, around 1,000 children aged 9-16 who use the internet were interviewed, as was one of their parents. (In the 25th country, Cyprus, it proved problematic to achieve this sample size and so 800 children were interviewed.) Households were selected using random sampling methods and interviews were carried out face-to-face in homes using CAPI (Computer Administered Personal Interviewing) or PAPI (Paper Administered Personal Interviewing).

The LSE Research Ethics Committee approved the methodology and appropriate protocols were put in place to ensure that the rights and wellbeing of children and families were protected during the research process. At the end of the interview, children and families were provided with a leaflet providing tips on internet safety and details of relevant help lines.

The *EU Kids Online* network worked closely with Ipsos MORI at both national and pan-European levels to ensure the quality of the research.

- The *EU Kids Online* network is entirely responsible for the survey questionnaire design, the sampling decisions, and all data analysis.
- The network worked with Ipsos MORI on finalising and implementing the survey questionnaire, cognitive and pilot testing, translation, fieldwork procedures and implementation, and data editing.

Table 2: List of fieldwork agencies

	Country
AT	SPECTRA
BE	IPSOS BELGIUM
BG	MARKET TEST
CY	CYPRONETWORK
CZ	IPSOS TAMBOR CZ
DE	IPSOS GmbH
DK	DMA/RESEARCH A/S
EE	TURU UURINGUTE A.S
EL	OPINION S.A.
ES	IPSOS SPAIN
FI	TALOUSTOUKIMUS OY
FR	ALTERNATIVE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH (OBJECTIF MARKETING)
HU	IPSOS SZONDA
IE	IPSOS MORI
IT	IPSOS ITALY
LT	RAIT
NL	IBT
NO	IPSOS NORWAY
PL	IPSOS POLAND
PT	IPSOS PORTUGAL
RO	MERCURY RESEARCH
SE	IMRI
SI	IPSOS PULS SLOVENIA
TR	IPSOS KMG
UK	ROSSLYN RESEARCH

1.6. Main limitations

Every effort was made in designing and administering the survey to provide the best account possible of children's internet use in Europe. Also the data set containing the responses has been thoroughly checked for consistency. Inevitably, however, the project has limitations, and these should be borne in mind when using the data set and interpreting the results.

- *Limits on sampling* – despite repeated return visits to sampled households and every effort made to encourage participation, it must be acknowledged that the recruitment process may not have reached the most vulnerable or marginalised children.
- *Questionnaire limits* – the questionnaire was designed to take, on average, 30 minutes for children to complete (and 10 minutes for parents), although in practice, it took rather longer than this (just under one hour for the child and parent interviews combined). It is difficult to hold children's attention for longer than this, and so difficult decisions had to be taken about which questions to include or exclude.
- In over half the countries, the self-completion section of the questionnaire was completed by pen and paper – this limited *the degree of routing* (i.e. the degree to which questions could follow up on children's answers). Last, for ethical reasons (as confirmed by cognitive testing and pilot interviews), intimate, embarrassing or certain explicit questions could not be asked.
- *Survey context* – every effort was made to encourage honest answers, to promise anonymity and privacy (including reassuring children that their parents would not see their answers). However, any survey takes place within some social context. Here, the fact that it was conducted in homes with parents in the vicinity may have influenced the answers of some children, meaning they gave more 'socially desirable' answers. As detailed in the online technical report, in two thirds of cases, interviewers reported that parents were wholly uninvolved in the child's interview; in a fifth of cases they were 'not very much' involved, and in one in seven cases they were more involved.

1.7. Accuracy of the findings


To judge the accuracy of numbers in studies like the one carried out in the *EU Kids Online* project it is first necessary to distinguish between two types of error: random error and systematic error (or bias). All numbers calculated from the *EU Kids Online* data set are to some extent affected by these and are thus essentially estimates of some true (but unknown) values.

Systematic error (or bias) occurs when the estimates provided in the study are systematically higher or lower than the true value. This can for example be the result of sampling procedures or measurements (e.g. question wording). The *EU Kids Online* survey was carefully designed to avoid such error. The cognitive testing of the survey instruments is an example of efforts taken to minimise systematic bias.

Random error is the result of the fact that not all children in all of the 25 countries have been interviewed. The results obtained from the samples of approximately one thousand children in each country will invariably depart slightly from the findings that would have been obtained had it been possible to interview all children in these countries. In most cases this difference is small and gets smaller the more children there are in the sample. At the same time however, the smaller the group that is being analysed, the greater the random error. Another property of the random error is that very small (or very large) percentages (such as when a small number of children have experienced a particular risk) are more accurate than percentages that are closer to 50%.

The figure below shows how the random error behaves for three typical kinds of groups in the *EU Kids Online* study. The lowest line shows approximately how the margin of error varies for estimates based on the whole data set (all children in all countries). The middle line shows how the margin of error varies for estimates based on data from all children in a single country. The top line shows how the margin of error varies for analysis based on small groups (for example just children that have experienced a certain kind of risk and been bothered). In general it is not advisable to conduct analysis of children who have experienced a risk and been bothered within a single country by using simple cross tabulation as the base number will become very low.

Figure 2: Estimated margin of error for findings based on the EU Kids Online data set



particular risk factors (such as the 14% who have seen sexual images on any websites) and then go on and answer questions about that experience.

To illustrate how this works it is possible to look at the number of children who have seen sexual images on any websites which is estimated at 14% (as estimated by using the weighted data set). This estimate is based on answers from over 23 thousand respondents and thus has a very small margin of error (only around ± 0.4 percentage points). In Turkey approximately the same number of children (13%) say that they have seen sexual images on any websites but as this estimate is based on answers from about one thousand respondents in Turkey the margin of error becomes larger (around ± 2.4 percentage points). The margin of error is then lower for Germany (5% ± 1.6 percentage points) but higher for Estonia (30% ± 3.4 percentage points) where the same number of respondents has participated in the survey in each country but where the lower figure (5%) has a lower margin of error than the higher figure (30%).

These examples show that that when working with the overall findings from all children in all countries or for all children within each country the random error is in most cases very small. For analysis of some parts of the data set, however, the groups that are being examined can get quite small. For the findings that are presented in the report due care has been taken not to exceed the analytical possibilities of the data but readers of the report should also take care not to over generalise from any findings based on small subsets of the data. This applies for example about those children that have experienced

2. SURVEY DEVELOPMENT AND PILOTING

The questionnaires used in the survey were developed by *EU Kids Online* network in collaboration with the fieldwork agency Ipsos MORI. They were then tested and refined through a two-phase process of cognitive interviewing and pilot testing.

- Phase one cognitive testing involved 20 cognitive interviews (14 with children and six with parents) in England using an English language questionnaire. Several refinements were then made to the questionnaires.
- The amended master questionnaires were then translated and cognitively tested via a total of 113 interviews across the remaining 24 countries (at least 4 in each country), to ensure testing in all main languages. Again, amendments to the questionnaires were made for the final versions.
- Prior to main-stage fieldwork, a pilot survey was conducted to test all aspects of the survey including sampling, recruitment and the interview process. A total of 102 pilot interviews (43 with children aged 9 and 10 years and 59 with children aged 11 to 16 years) were carried out across five countries: Germany, Slovenia, Ireland, Portugal and the UK.

2.1. Questionnaire development

In terms of the scope and topics the questionnaire was based on previous work carried out in the *EU Kids Online* network⁷. This involved amongst other things a comprehensive review of existing research on children's internet use in Europe both in terms of findings and the questionnaires used.

An initial draft of the questionnaire was made by the LSE, as project coordinator, in close conjunction with the *EU Kids Online* network in the autumn of 2009. This development stage took the research design from a

⁷ See Livingstone, S., & Haddon, L. (2009) *EU Kids Online: Final Report*. LSE, London: EU Kids Online. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/24372/>

scoping of the theoretical framework and pressing research and policy issues, through to a draft questionnaire to children and to parents that encompassed the key issues to be addressed, and seeking to optimise question formats and response options so as to be readily comprehensible by children.

Following this early development work, the fieldwork agency (Ipsos) was involved in numerous revisions of the draft questionnaires, making recommendations with regards to ensuring question wordings conformed to best practice for generating accurate and meaningful answers from respondents, and in particular making recommendations for the approach to child question elements.

2.2. Cognitive testing

Cognitive testing is a diagnostic technique that explores the processes employed by people when they answer survey questions, such as comprehension, recognition, recall and decision-making/response (e.g. how do they respond to being asked potentially sensitive questions and/or how suitable are the pre-code lists for capturing all types of valid response)⁸.

By exploring in a qualitative way the processes by which people interpret and respond to questions, we can identify potential sources of measurement error and ideally address them via appropriate revisions to the questionnaire to ensure it measures what we want it to measure as accurately as possible. This can be particularly helpful for surveys among children, given the difference in cognitive ability between adult researchers who are designing the questionnaire, and the child informants completing them. In the context of international surveys, cognitive testing can help to ensure that the

⁸ R. Groves, F. Fowler Jr, M. Couper, J. Lepkowski, E. Singer and R. Tourangeau, *Survey Methodology*, (2004), p. 202.

wording of questions and response options generate and capture the same meaning across all countries.

Findings can also be useful when interpreting findings in the sense that they provide extensive qualitative data on the types of aspects respondents are thinking about when they give particular answers to particular questions.

Two rounds of cognitive testing were conducted for this study by Ipsos and local fieldwork agencies. The first stage involved 20 cognitive interviews (14 with children and six with parents) in England. Four of the children were aged 9-10, four aged 11- 12, five were aged 13-14 and one was aged 15-16. There were eight girls and six boys. In terms of social economic status, three parents were from social groups ABC1 (households where the chief income earner is in a professional, managerial or clerical position) and three were from social groups C2DE (households where the chief income earner is a skilled manual worker, semi-skilled or unskilled or not working).

This stage of testing tested all key aspects of the main questionnaire, including respondent comprehension, the layout of the self completion module, and the acceptability and suitability of approaches for sensitive subject matter.

A significant amount of refinement was implemented following this wave. Many changes were made in order to increase clarity and comprehension and ensure consistent and unambiguous interpretation. For example, further clarification was given regarding specific timeframes to think about when asking children about frequency of internet based activities; more specific definitions and supporting examples were given to describe generic internet terms and concepts, such as social networking.

Some changes were also made to increase ease of completion of the self-completion elements, such as reducing complexity of routing, and making instructions for navigation more prominent through the use of colour for younger children. The questionnaire was then translated into all languages relevant to the 25 country study

The second stage involved cognitive interviews (113 in total) in the remaining 24 countries, to ensure testing across different languages and cultural contexts. Four or more interviews were conducted with children in each country, and a small number of parent interviews were also conducted. Whilst a range of age groups were included, 9-10 year olds were over-sampled to ensure that the questionnaire was sufficiently tested among the age group likely to have most difficulties with completing it.

This stage of testing was designed to assess the suitability and efficacy of questioning approaches used and comparability of meaning generated from the translated questionnaires across countries, languages and cultures. It also tested the effectiveness of the questionnaire following amendments made after stage one testing.

The testing identified a range of country specific translation issues, which were then addressed. It also highlighted differing issues in different countries relating to the sensitivity of some questions, and concerns about the length and complexity for younger age groups. As a result, the length of the questionnaire and level of filtering was reduced for all children, and some further sensitive items cut out for 9-10 year olds, especially detailed questions relating to online content of a sexual or violent nature.

A particular challenge emerged for generating comparable meanings across countries for questions measuring negative emotional impact of risk exposure on children. A challenge lay in identifying a wording that generated meaning of the same *level* of harm in each country. The wording finalised for use in the survey focused on whether the children were 'bothered' by an experience, together with related words like 'upset', 'worried' or 'uncomfortable.' However, users of the data set should note that there remain some differences in interpretation across countries.

2.3. Survey pilot

Before the main fieldwork, a dress rehearsal pilot survey was conducted to test key aspects of implementation, in as close to "live conditions" as possible. A total of 102 pilot interviews were carried out across five countries: Germany, Slovenia, Ireland, Portugal and the UK (43 with children aged 9-10 and 59 with children aged 11-16).

The pilot study checked the efficacy of random walk sampling procedures, contact and screening procedures, fieldwork materials, and all protocols for how to communicate about the survey, gain informed respondent consent and respondent co-operation. It also tested the length and effectiveness of the survey tools themselves in "live" conditions.

As a result of the pilot, some final minor modifications were made to the questionnaire, mainly to reduce length.



Refinements were also made to the screening contact sheets to make them more user-friendly for interviewers, taking into account the large quantity of addresses that needed to be screened to identify eligible households.

The pilot also identified challenges relating to respondent engagement in communicating the survey and parental concern about the sensitivity of the subject matter. The guidance already provided to interviewers on how to handle this during fieldwork was therefore expanded on for the main stage, taking into account learning from the pilot.

2.4. The interviews

The questionnaires for the children consisted of three main components which were administered in a sequence. The children were interviewed face to face to obtain responses to questions in most sections of the questionnaire, and then were given the most sensitive questions in a questionnaire form for them to complete on their own. For each child, one parent/carer was administered a questionnaire with a selection of questions that matched to the questions in the child survey. The sections in these three questionnaires are outlined below. Items with matched child-parent questions are marked with an asterisk. An additional screening questionnaire was used to obtain socio-demographic information about the household and its internet use.

1. Interviewer administered (face-to-face) the child questionnaire, covering:
 - Patterns of child's internet usage *
 - Activities online
 - Digital skills
 - Perceptions of parent's/carer's, teachers' and friends' mediation of online risks *.
2. Child questionnaire for self-completion (simple version for 9–10 year olds, more complex version for 11–16 year olds), covering:
 - Psychological factors
 - Risky offline activities
 - Experience of online risks *
 - Coping with online risks
 - Sources of education, advice and support.
3. Interviewer administered parent questionnaire, covering:
 - Additional and repeated household demographics and internet access

- Parental patterns of internet usage *
- Perceptions of the child's internet usage and exposure to online risks *
- Parental mediation of the child's online risks *
- Sources of parental education, advice and support.

The "contact sheets" used by interviewers to introduce the survey, screen for eligible households, and gain informed respondent consent to the study was also designed to collect a small amount of demographic information about screened households where possible (i.e. before respondent refusal, for example).

The survey was carried out face to face in home, rather than by telephone, for example, due to the sensitivity of the subject matter and the need to gain rapport with families to engage them in the survey work. Questionnaires were administered either using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) or on paper (PAPI), depending on local practice in each country (see Table 7). Furthermore, whilst the first two survey tools were administered by interviewers face to face with the respondent, a self completion mode was used among children to help ensure confidentiality of responses to sensitive questions, and to minimise the potential of social desirability bias – e.g. under-reporting of exposure to online risks – that might be caused by the presence of the interviewer or other household members.

Children were carefully briefed by interviewers about how to complete the self-completion questionnaire, and were also provided with clear written instructions about how to do so. All children were given an envelope in which to place their completed forms, to help reassure them about the confidentiality of their responses. Two versions of the self completion tool were developed, one for 9-10 year olds and one for 11-16 year olds.

The version for 9-10 year olds excluded some questions relating to sex and violence related to online risks that were thought to be less appropriate for this age group. To keep the length to an acceptable minimum for this age group, some of the follow-up questions relating to the detail of specific risks experienced were also omitted and asked only of 11-16 year olds. This version was also divided into five separate documents so that the interviewer could provide more guidance at each step of the way about how each one should be completed. For this age group, text that gave instructions about routing through the questionnaire was also shown in red font to help ensure that it was not missed.

2.5. Translation

A master questionnaire was finalised in English. National versions were then produced in appropriate languages (see Table 3). After the master questionnaire was finalised and approved the translation process progressed as follows:

- (i) The master questionnaire was sent to the national agencies using a specific format designed for multilingual questionnaires. It was easy to understand as the source language and the target language could be simultaneously viewed.
- (ii) In the national agencies, two researchers that had at least two years of experience of opinion surveys independently translated the questionnaire into their mother tongue. After this, they met to compile the two translations into one which was then sent to the Ipsos coordination centre.
- (iii) The core team in the coordination centre verified that everything had been translated, after which the questionnaires were sent to back-translation. A native English speaker with a sufficient level of the source language then translated it back to English.
- (iv) The back-translated documents were returned to the coordination centre where the team checked them against the original English master. Each country was given feedback based on this exercise and all necessary adjustments were made to the final questionnaire by the national agencies.
- (v) The national agencies sent the final national questionnaires to the coordination centre.

Academic representatives in every country in the *EU Kids Online* network also reviewed translations to double check that the meaning of key terms was as intended. In particular, a list of concepts for which there were challenges ensuring translation generated identical meaning across countries was drawn up (“upset” is one example) and network members input to ensure the most comparable terminologies were used (see Annex 4). Network members also helped to provide nationally relevant examples to support communication of key concepts, such as social networking.

Table 3: Languages provided in the *EU Kids Online* survey in each of the participating countries

	Country	Language(s)
AT	Austria	German
BE	Belgium	Dutch, French
BG	Bulgaria	Bulgarian
CY	Cyprus	Greek
CZ	Czech Republic	Czech
DE	Germany	German
DK	Denmark	Danish
EE	Estonia	Estonian, Russian
EL	Greece	Greek
ES	Spain	Spanish (Castilian), Catalan
FI	Finland	Finnish
FR	France	French
HU	Hungary	Hungarian
IE	Ireland	English
IT	Italy	Italian
LT	Lithuania	Lithuanian, Russian
NL	Netherlands	Dutch
NO	Norway	Norwegian
PL	Poland	Polish
PT	Portugal	Portuguese
RO	Romania	Romanian
SE	Sweden	Swedish
SI	Slovenia	Slovene
TR	Turkey	Turkish, Kurdish
UK	United Kingdom	English

3. SAMPLING

A representative sample of ~1,000 internet using children aged 9–16 and one of their parents or carers, from each of the 25 European countries, was selected. The overall sample size was 25,142. A three-stage (sampling points, addresses, and individuals), random probability clustered sample was achieved. Details of the sampling process are outlined below. The sampling for the project followed a robust approach, for example, reflecting processes and standards common for many large scale Europe-wide surveys conducted by and on behalf of the European Commission.

3.1. Selection of sample points and addresses

An official and complete register of geographical units was used as the sampling frame for each country. However, in some countries, certain areas were excluded from the sampling frame for reasons of practicality, reflecting standard approaches to fieldwork in the country concerned. These regions included Mount Athos in Greece, The Wadden Eilanden in the Netherlands, Madeira and Azores Islands in Portugal, Ceuta and Melilla in Spain and The Channel Islands, Isle of Man, and the area north of the Caledonian Canal in the UK. In all countries where small geographical areas have been excluded, population coverage is still extremely high (e.g. over 95%) meaning negligible impact on survey estimates. The approach taken reflects standard approaches to survey work in each country in this regard. Prior to selection of sampling points, the list of geographical units was stratified (ordered) by:

- (i) Region (NUTS⁹ 2, 3 or 4, or other nationally appropriate system of regional classification)
- (ii) Population density or degree of urbanisation, where data was available.

⁹ Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, see see Eurostat, 2010 Eurostat (2010) 'Introduction', in *NUTS – Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics*, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/nuts_nomenclature/introduction

Table 4 below outlines the method of stratification (region and degree of urbanisation) used in each country for both.

In all countries sampling points were then selected with Probability Proportionate to Size (PPS). This means that the chance of selection is equivalent to the number of children living there. For example, if the total population of children aged 9-16 is 2 million, the probability of selecting an area with 50,000 children is 0.025 and the probability of selecting an area with 10,000 children is 0.005. The number of sampling points varied by country, according to local circumstances (see Table 4).

All addresses were selected using random probability sampling approaches, but the precise approach varied by country reflecting different circumstances on the ground, the nature of sample frames available, and cultural differences with regards to whether initial contact was thought to be most appropriate by telephone or face to face, bearing in mind the sensitive subject matter. In most cases “random walk” sampling and face to face recruitment was used. In a small number of countries, households were selected from national population registers (either households in general, or households with children) and pre-selected addresses were visited in person, or contacted by telephone in the first instance.

Table 5 below shows the number of sampling points selected in each country, along with the address-selection method used. More detailed information about the different methods then follows.

It should be noted that the relatively low number of sampling points in Norway does not indicate a lower quality of the sample in Norway. Typically, a larger number of sampling points is preferred since they reduce the risk of homogenous responses within clusters which has the potential to reduce a survey’s effective sample size, (the extent to which there are systematic differences in findings between survey clusters). However, the lower number of sample points in Norway has not caused a problem in this regard: despite the relatively small number of sampling points, the effective sample size for Norway is estimated at 729 which is in line with other countries (see Table 12). This means that the smaller number of sample points used

in Norway did not have a larger negative impact on the reliability of Norway's findings.

Table 4: Method of stratification by region and urbanisation

	Type of Primary Sampling Unit	Indicator for stratification by region	Indicator for stratification by degree of urbanisation
AT	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality and number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
BE	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality and number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
BG	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality and number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
CY	Municipalities	by district (Nicosia, Limassol, Larnaca, Pafos, Famagusta)	Municipalities defined as Urban/Rural by the Department of town Planning and Housing in Cyprus.
CZ	Municipalities and postal districts for the cities with over 50 thousands inhabitants.	NUTS 3	Total number of inhabitants in municipalities or postal districts
DE	Postal district	ADM sampling points	ADM (Arbeitskreis deutscher Marktforscher) sample points have urban/rural indicators
DK	Postal district	NUTS 2	Number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
EE	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 3	Number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
EL	Administrative district	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
ES	Administrative area	NUTS 2	Number of children aged 10-15 living in locality
FI	Postal district	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
FR	Locality (village/town/city)	UDA 5 (regions)	Population Density
HU	Locality (village/ town/ city/districts of the capital)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality and number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
IE	Electoral district	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
IT	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
LT	Locality (village/town/city)	Counties	Population density
NL	Locality (village/town/city) and postal for larger cities	NUTS 1	Number of addresses per km2
NO	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
PL	Administrative areas - Gminas	NUTS 2	Population density and number of children aged 9-16 living in locality
PT	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total population resident in the locality
RO	Locality (village/town/city)	NUTS 2	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
SE	Administrative area	NUTS 2	Number of children aged 10-15 living in locality
SI	Administrative areas defined by Slovenian statistical office	NUTS 3	City size (number of inhabitants) and percentage of agricultural population
TR	Administrative district	NUTS 1	Total number of inhabitants living in locality
UK	NUTS 4	NUTS 1	Number of children aged 9-16 living in locality

Table 5: Sampling information

	Methodology	Type of national register used	Sampling points
AT	Random Walk		125
BE	Random Walk		102
BG	Random Walk		290
CY	Random Walk		84
CZ	Pre-selected households - telephone recruitment	Registered directory of fixed line telephones. Held by Nexos.	140
DE	Random Walk		212
DK	Pre-selected households of children aged 0-17, telephone recruitment	Sample was purchased from "Forbrugerviv" a company owned by Jyllands-Posten Holding AS (the largest media-provider of Denmark)	148
EE	Random Walk		137
EL	Random Walk		125
ES	Random Walk		140
FI	Random Walk		100
FR	Random Walk		120
HU	Pre-selected households with children aged 9-16	Addresses were selected from the Citizens' Personal Data and Address Register, held by The Central Office for Administrative and Electronic Public Services (Hungary).	163
IE	Random Walk		170
IT	Random Walk		103
LT	Random Walk		101
NL	Pre-selected households - telephone recruitment	Addresses were selected from the Nationale Telefoongids, published by KPN Telecom.	125
NO	Pre-selected households - telephone recruitment	Addresses were purchased from "Norstat" using the "EasyConnect" database – the largest database of private households and telephone numbers in Norway	16
PL	Pre-selected households of children aged 9-16	PESEL - Universal Electronic System for Registration of the Population . Addresses were selected by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Administration	218
PT	Random Walk		128
RO	Random Walk		135
SE	Pre-selected households with children aged 9-16 - telephone recruitment	Addresses were selected from a random sample of households with children aged 9-16. The sample was provided by PAR (Postens Adressregister, the postal office address register, which itself is drawn from SPAR, the Swedish Population register.	40
SI	10% Random Walk – 90% national register of households with 9-16s	Central Population Register	350
TR	Random Walk		115
UK	Random Walk		179

3.2. Random walk method

In each of the selected sampling points, one address was drawn at random from the register of households or from the listing of streets in the geographical area of the sampling point. This 'seed' address is the first in the sample and acts as the start point for the random walk.

The remaining addresses in the sample point were selected using a strict pre-defined random-walk procedure which makes the selection independent of the interviewer's decision. Specifically, the interviewer selected a batch of five addresses before counting five on their route and then selecting another batch of five. The procedure is as follows:

- Standing at the seed address, the interviewer faced the street and turns left. He/she identifies the next four immediately neighbouring addresses as the next in the sample – a batch of five addresses has been selected together.
- The interviewer then continued along the route counting houses/flats/apartments, leaving five addresses before identifying the next five neighbouring addresses as the next in the sample.
- When turning at the end of the street, the interviewer did not stop counting housing units/addresses.

Every effort was made to screen each sampled address and achieve an interview at eligible households, with the following fieldwork requirements followed:

- At least 4 attempts to make contact at each address.
- Contact attempted at different times of day (including evenings), and at weekends as well as weekdays.
- No substitution of selected addresses – this means that if an address is unproductive or appears unsuitable from the outside, the interviewer still had to make contact there; they could not choose a neighbour to try instead.

3.3. Other methods used

In-home recruitment from national registers: In Hungary, Poland and Slovenia¹⁰ a sample of households with children aged 9-16 were drawn from population

¹⁰ In Slovenia, the survey began with a random walk methodology, but the approach was switched to this method early in on in fieldwork due to difficulties identifying eligible households using random walk methods.

sample frames as the sample to be issued. In each of these countries, all selected addresses were sent a copy of the letter in advance. This served to notify them of the survey and inform them to expect an interviewer to call. The selected household was then visited by an interviewer and screened on the doorstep following exactly the same contact procedure as in countries using Random Walk (and discussed further below).

Telephone recruitment from national registers: Sweden used a register which identified households (in the selected sampling points) with children aged 9-16 and Denmark used a register that identified households with 0-17s. Czech Republic, Norway and the Netherlands used national registers of households in general. In each case, households (in the selected sampling points) were randomly selected from the register for contact and screening. In all four of these countries, the pre-selected households were initially contacted and screened by telephone with an interviewer then visiting responding households to conduct the interviews in person after appointments had been made. In the Netherlands, in cases where an appointment with a respondent was broken and could not be rescheduled, the interviewer had the option of sampling/screening new households using strict random walk methods.

3.4. Respondent selection

Each selected household was screened to identified eligible households (with a child aged 9-16 who uses the internet). An interview with one child and one parent/carer was required. Where there was more than one eligible child present, one child per household was selected using the last birthday method.

The parent/carer interview was conducted with the parent/carer who knew the most about the child and their internet use. In around three-quarters of households, the mother was interviewed, around one-fifth, the father, and in around one-in-twenty households another household member (step parent, grandparent, or other) was interviewed.

3.5. Contact sheets and the screening processes

Two types of contact sheet were provided to interviewers, guiding them through the screening process, and on which

key screening and sample outcome information was recorded.

First, a summary contact sheet was used to check if the property was residential/occupied and if so, to identify if a child aged 9-16 was present in the household.

Secondly, at households with a 9-16 year old present, fuller screening processes were carried out using a more detailed follow-up contact sheet:

- completing eligibility screening (identifying children using the internet)
- identifying and selecting the appropriate child and parent/carer respondent
- securing co-operation and informed consent from parents and children (see section below: 6. Ethics and child protection)
- capturing some profile information about all households with children that could be used for profiling and weighting purposes: age, gender and internet use of all children in the household, and education and employment status of the chief income earner in the household.

In order to support communication of the survey requirements and gain respondent co-operation, a letter from the LSE was shown to the respondents, emphasising the importance and value of the study. A copy of the English version of the letter is provided in annex 3. In countries using face to face recruitment from pre-selected addresses, the letter was posted in advance.

4. FIELDWORK

4.1. Fieldwork overview

Fieldwork started in April 2010 and was completed by October 2010 (week 26); however, more than half of the countries completed by early July (week 11). Fieldwork was shortest in Romania and Hungary (6 weeks) and longest in Norway (23 weeks).

4.2. Use of incentives

The decision whether or not to use incentives was taken at the local agency level. Using their experience of conducting in home surveys with parents and children within their market, agencies considered whether they thought the offer of incentives would increase response rates enough to offer value for money. In some cases, incentives were introduced part way through fieldwork to help improve response rates. Incentives were offered in the following countries:

- **Austria:** A 5 EUR Amazon voucher given to the child upon completion
- **Belgium:** A 5 EUR voucher for the child, conditional on taking part.
- **Bulgaria:** Stationery for the child (coloured pencils, ruler, pocket books worth approximately €1.5).
- **Czech Republic:** Incentives given to the parent: a gift bought by the interviewer – most often some kind of premium coffee, chocolate or tea costing on average 4 EUR. The children were given a flash disk costing 8 EUR. Both conditional on participation
- **Denmark:** Each responding household received an incentive of 100 DKR. Normally the child was offered the incentive. Each respondent could choose between a gift-card and donating the amount to a Child Welfare Organisation. 42% of respondents chose charity donation.
- **Finland:** A small chocolate or candy bar was provided to the child as a gift after the interview was completed (worth approximately €2).
- **Netherlands:** The original incentive was a lottery with prizes as follows (or cash equivalent); 5x weekend in a bungalow park (worth approximately €400 each); 5x game consoles (worth approximately €250 each); 10x Nintendo DS (worth approximately €200 each); 1x

weekend EuroDisney (family max. 4 persons €450 per person); To boost response rates part way through fieldwork, a conditional incentive of 10 EUR was given

- **Norway:** Every family received 300 NOK
- **Poland:** Chocolate was given to one of the parents conditional on participation (worth approximately €3)
- **Romania:** A key holder or a pocket calculator for the child on completion (worth approximately €3)
- **Spain:** An incentive of 6 EUR (gift card) was given to parents as a gift for the children. The incentive was provided upon completing the interview
- **Sweden:** A gift voucher of SEK 100 (ca €10), signed for by the parent but aimed at the child; this incentive was later increased to two cinema tickets (value ca €18).
- **Turkey:** A notebook and a pen were given to the child upon completion (worth approximately 2TL)
- **UK:** £10 per household upon completion of the survey

Incentives were higher in those countries where fieldwork took longer; alternatively, when fieldwork seemed to be progressing slowly, the level of incentives was raised. It appeared that incentives were lower when there were more sampling points. This finding might be a methodological artefact due to both sample points and incentives being related to the number of interviewers. An unexpected finding was that interviews took longer when incentives were higher. In addition, in those countries where addresses were pre-selected, (higher) incentives were more likely because interview times were longer. To explain these findings, three regression analyses were conducted¹¹ with response rates, incentives, and fieldwork length as the dependent variables and all other sampling and fieldwork variables as well as country size area and number of children as predictors. None of the predictors reached statistical significance suggesting that the

¹¹ Source: Görzig, A. (in press) Methodological framework: the EU Kids Online project. In Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., and Görzig, A. (Eds.) *Children, Risk and Safety on the Internet: Kids online in comparative perspective*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

relations become meaningless when other variables are held constant.

Table 6: Fieldwork dates, incentives and number of interviewers

	Start	End	Incentives used	Number of interviewers
AT	24.04	25.07	Yes	45
BE	06.05	14.07	Yes	44
BG	06.05	24.06	Yes	133
CY	17.05	20.09	No	39
CZ	21.05	02.07	Yes	146
DE	20.05	07.07	No	400
DK	30.04	14.06	Yes	160
EE	10.05	14.07	No	70
EL	10.05	02.07	No	52
ES	10.05	15.07	Yes	60
FI	28.04	02.07	Yes	54
FR	06.05	03.07	No	83
HU	10.05	15.06	Yes	123
IE	05.05	24.07	No	103
IT	28.04	03.07	No	56
LT	23.04	06.07	No	52
NL	03.05	05.08	Yes	100
NO	21.05	19.10	Yes	90
PL	06.05	26.07	Yes	149
PT	29.04	30.07	No	47
RO	16.05	25.06	Yes	67
SE	27.05	20.09	Yes	64
SI	03.05	27.08	No	200
TR	03.05	17.06	Yes	27
UK	01.05	21.06	Yes	105

4.3. Interviewers

All countries recruited interviewers based on their experience, not just in research, but more specifically with face-to-face surveys and random walk procedures where appropriate, and experience of research with children. Agencies acknowledged the complexity and sensitive nature of the questionnaires and allocated the individuals they thought would achieve the best results. As detailed in Table 4, the number of interviewers working on the project ranged from 27 in Turkey, to 400 in Germany.

All interviewers received intensive project-specific training and briefings and written guidance materials, covering all aspects of survey implementation, including guidance on how to conduct sensitive interviews with children.

All project managers and interviewers were supplied with detailed and uniform instructions supplied by the Ipsos coordination centre. These Training Booklets and Interviewer Packs covered the following topics:

- Overall briefing on *EU Kids Online* Survey:
- Detailed description of the sampling procedures and random walk methodology where applicable
- Full questionnaire review, clarifying terminology and data collection
- Review of ESOMAR ethical rules and other ethical issues and protocols associated with this project, including relating to child protection, and informed respondent consent
- Briefings on key techniques and protocols for interviewing children and parents
- Fieldwork management rules
- Specific techniques to convert refusals and maximise the response rate
- A reminder of how the quality of their work will be supervised and managed, including back-checking procedures.

Interactive telephone briefings with the project managers from each country were led by the Ipsos Coordination centre during early April 2010. Further to discussing the information detailed in the Training Booklets above, briefings also gave guidance on data processing and how project managers should deliver local interviewer briefings. Finally, country specific interviewer briefings were then conducted locally. These half-day or one-day sessions are organised centrally or at regional level and often included role plays where interviewers worked in pairs to practice delivering the questionnaire.



4.4. Survey mode and interview length

Questionnaires were administered either using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) or on paper (PAPI). As mentioned earlier, some sections were interviewer-administered, whilst sensitive questions among children were administered via a self interviewing in a self-completion questionnaire.

The interview length was measured per household, encompassing the length of time it took to complete the parent, child face-to-face and child self-completion questionnaires. The average across all countries was 55.8 minutes.

Table 7 gives an overview of the survey mode for each country, and summarises the range in interview duration across the countries and provides a comparison between households where a child aged 9-10 was interviewed and those where a child aged 11-16 was interviewed. The interview duration covers the period of time taken to complete the questionnaire tools, not the full time spent in the household.

Table 7: Survey mode and interview length

	Survey mode	Average interview time for child and parent combined		
		All	With 9-10 year olds	With 11-16 year olds
AT	PAPI	59.4	61.8	58.6
BE	PAPI	53.3	51.9	53.8
BG	PAPI	56.2	56.2	56.2
CY	PAPI	42.4	40.6	42.7
CZ	PAPI	58.0	59.5	57.5
DE	CAPI	49.0	47.7	49.4
DK	CAPI	63.8	62.1	64.4
EE	CAPI	68.1	69.9	67.6
EL	PAPI	52.9	54.3	52.2
ES	CAPI	56.3	51.7	57.7
FI	CAPI	54.6	50.8	55.8
FR	PAPI	47.3	58.5	56.7
HU	PAPI	63.6	64.5	63.4
IE	CAPI	53.5	52.1	53.9
IT	CAPI	53.3	53.5	53.2
LT	PAPI	56.9	56.8	57.0
NL	PAPI	65.6	66.8	65.2
NO	CAPI	66.4	67.4	66.1
PL	PAPI	57.8	60.6	57.0
PT	PAPI	49.8	51.0	49.3
RO	PAPI	53.5	52.1	53.9
SE	CAPI	61.2	59.7	61.8
SI	CAPI	48.4	45.2	49.3
TR	CAPI	55.3	54.9	55.5
UK	PAPI	48.6	48.8	48.5
All		55.8	55.9	56.3

4.5. Support for respondents

It was important to ensure that where possible, children and parents were not excluded from the research due to language or communication difficulties. In cases where child or parent did not speak the main language(s) of the country well enough to complete the survey, another household member was asked to provide support. If a child had communication difficulties, where appropriate, the parent or interviewer provided support. However, for the self-completion element of the study, interviewers were instructed to ensure that support was kept to a minimum, to avoid biasing the findings. Types of support received by respondents were recorded by interviewers, and this information is included in the data set (see section 5.4 below).

4.6. Context effects and child comprehension

As part of the survey's quality procedures, interviewers were asked to record details relating to the child's comprehension of survey questions and who was present in the room during the child's interview. The detail below comments on the overall average and maximum and minimum findings across all countries; further detail, by country, can be found in the data set (QC343-QC348). It should be noted that the figures outlined below are based on all unweighted data.

Interviewers were asked to observe how well they thought the child understood the questions asked during the interview. Overall, more than nine in ten children were thought to have understood the interview questions very or fairly well (93%), rising to as much as 98% in Greece and Italy. Comprehension was less proficient in Belgium and Turkey where 13% of children were thought to understand questions not very well/not at all well.

In total, one in ten children had some form of help (language or communication) from a family member in order to answer the survey questions (10%). Overall, two per cent of adults and three percent of children required language help to take part in the survey; five per cent of children required some form of communication help.

Showing the importance of the self-completion sections of the questionnaire, more than three in five child interviews were conducted with the parent respondent present in the room (63%); a further three per cent had another adult present other than the parent respondent. The proportion

of households where the parent respondent was present ranged from 29% in the Czech Republic to 80% in Spain and Romania, and 83% in Turkey.

As well as noting adult presence during the child survey, interviewers were also asked to observe the extent to which the parent respondent tried to involve themselves in the child interview (for example, if they were concerned about the sensitivity of some of the subject matter). In the vast majority of cases this was not an issue: overall, two-thirds of parents made no attempt to be involved (66%), with a further fifth having made little attempt (21% not very much); equating to 87% of parents overall. In contrast, four per cent of parents attempted to be involved a great deal with a further one in ten a fair amount (10%). Parents in Spain were the most fervent, with around three in ten attempting to be involved a great deal/a fair amount (29%). Interviewers were fully briefed on how to manage these types of situation, for example, explaining the importance of confidentiality, reassuring that the child could skip any question they did not like, and allowing the parent to see a blank copy of the questionnaire before the child interview took place.

4.7. Ethics and child protection

Children's exposure to risks on the internet is a particularly sensitive topic; it was therefore paramount that fieldwork was conducted in an appropriately ethical manner. The project received ethical clearance from LSE's Research Ethics Committee and all aspects of methodology and approaches to survey implementation were developed with child and respondent wellbeing in mind (See: Research Ethics review questionnaire in Annex 3). Key points are described below.

An essential requirement was to gain informed consent from both the parent and the child. Several, several mechanisms were put in place to ensure that parents and children had all the information necessary to make an informed judgement about taking part in the survey.

- Each house was presented with written information about the study, as well as interviewers explaining this carefully to parents and children verbally. The letter contained both LSE and Ipsos branding and was translated into the relevant local languages and was available online on the *EU Kids Online* website. The key points covered including the funding and purposes of the project, the nature of the interview, the value of the project to policy makers seeking to

improve internet safety for children, and contact details for the national fieldwork organisation (contracted by Ipsos), the national *EU Kids Online* network representative, and the project director (Sonia Livingstone for *EU Kids Online* at LSE). Where a parent wished for more time to consider taking part, the information letter was left with the household for several days before the interviewer returned at a later date.

- A signature was required from parents confirming consent to their own interview and consent to us approaching the child to invite their participation in the child interview in all countries except from Germany, where local laws prohibited written signatures being obtained and where instead interviewers were asked to sign to confirm that the parent had given their permission for the interview to take place. Child consent was also recorded by the interviewer signing in writing that this had been given verbally by the child.
- Particular attention was taken to ensure that the text and words spoken in the letter and consent form were age appropriate. Across all languages, separate versions of the text were tailored for parents and children of different ages (A copy of the information letter, safety tips leaflet and consent form can be found in Annex 3).
- Anonymity and confidentiality of responses were guaranteed to both parents and children, with the exception that if the child reported that they are being harmed in some way, this would limit the promise of confidentiality and action would be taken (see below).

All fieldwork was conducted in line with stipulated ESOMAR ethical guidelines for conducting research with children and young people, as well as those specified by the LSE Research Ethics Committee.

Interviewers were selected on their experience of working with children and further training and briefing was provided as outlined above in section 4.3. Relevant security checks were carried out on interviewers where appropriate according to country specific legal requirements.

Confidentiality and anonymity was guaranteed to survey questions but at the same time interviewers were instructed to ensure that parents remained in the vicinity within the household whilst the children interview was being conducted (with the door open, for example).

Whilst in the field, all children were advised of the fact that it was their right to stop the interview at any point and that

they could choose not to answer a question if they felt uncomfortable doing so.

In designing the questionnaire, several measures were also put in place to make the child as comfortable as possible.

- The most sensitive questions relating to risky behaviour were asked in a self completion format where children were assured that neither the interviewer nor the parent would be able to see their answers, since (for CAPI) the screen was turned so only they could see it or (for PAPI) a pen-and-paper questionnaire was provided for their answers along with a sealed envelope for the child to use.
- Discretion was used to consider whether questions were suitable for the youngest participants, the most sensitive and more mature themed questions were only asked to those aged 11 years and above.
- A *Prefer not to say* option was also included in those questions where a child might feel uncomfortable about disclosing their behaviour.
- The routing and introduction to questions ensured that the interview does not introduce the child for the first time to ideas or material that may be ethically problematic. For example, children were immediately routed out of sections about risky behaviour if it became apparent that they had not experienced the risk, and introductory wording was used where appropriate to forewarn of the nature of the subsequent questions.

All respondents, parents and children, were provided with an information leaflet at the end of the survey visit, containing tips and advice about online risk and safety. The leaflet was tailored for each country and included the contact details of local help lines (or other appropriate provision for children identified through the conduct of the survey as in some way 'at risk'), whereby the respondent can access private, confidential help and advice. These leaflets were developed for the project by the national Insafe nodes of the EC's Safer Internet Programme, with input also from Child Helpline International (see www.childhelplineinternational.org).

Given the topics considered in this project, it was important to establish an agreed approach to intervention prior to fieldwork, as to what would happen if it became apparent that a child was at risk of harm. This approach was agreed between Ipsos and the LSE and cleared by the LSE Research Ethics Committee.

To ensure guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity, intervention from fieldworkers was only considered on the basis of relatively serious harm being identified, i.e. on the

broad principle that the risk identified was “something any reasonable person could not ignore”. The notes below outline the agreed approach of dealing with identified risk, although it is important to note that a different approach was considered depending on whether or not the risk was identified within the survey questions.

- The questionnaire design and methodology meant that risk of current harm would not be identifiable from the study at the time of the interview. First, survey questions ask about exposure to risks in the *past* and do not directly identify current issues; secondly questions on risk were asked within self completion modules and as such interviewers were not aware of the child’s responses. We therefore took a universal approach to responding to possible risk for all children.
- Interviewers explained to all children that if they have they have experienced harm, they should tell a trusted adult;
- As mentioned above, the interviewer left a leaflet with helpline numbers and ‘top-tips’ for online safety.
- In addition, fieldwork agencies abided by any local laws regarding actions required to protect children.

A protocol was in place for actions to be taken if a participant made a disclosure to the interviewer outside their response to a survey question and/or the interviewer witnessed something in the household suggesting that a child was at risk.

- If the interviewer became aware of risk of harm to a child that no reasonable person could ignore, or that required action within national laws, they were to follow specific agreed protocols as below.
- Given that disclosure of harm in this scenario is outside the main interview questions, this approach does not conflict with guarantees of respondent confidentiality with regards to survey responses.
- The interviewer was instructed to report the “incident” to the project manager/field supervisor for action to be taken by the Institute, according to national law. Where institutes are not competent to make a decision of this kind, a legal person was to be consulted before action is decided upon.
- In such cases, the interviewer was also instructed to tell the child that they are concerned and talk to them about the action that they will be taking.
- As mentioned above, the interviewer was also briefed to encourage the child to talk to a trusted adult (if they have not already done so) and provide them with the leaflet of top tips/help line support services.

Importantly, and reassuringly, there were no such incidents reported during fieldwork.

Finally, confidentiality and anonymity was guaranteed during the data processing stage of the project by removing key identifiers from the data set.

4.8. Fieldwork outcomes and response rates

The interviewers needed to complete the following steps to achieve an interview:


- Make contact at the selected address (up to four attempts)
- Obtain consent for the screening questionnaire and establish whether at least one child aged 9–16 years old lived at the address and was using the internet
- Obtain consent for the child and parent/carer interviews.

Contact, cooperation and response rates were calculated in accordance with standard definitions¹². It was estimated that in 53% of interviewers’ attempts to contact an eligible address (i.e., a residential address with at least one child age 9–16 that uses the internet), this was successful (contact rate). Contact rates ranged from 31% in Germany to 89% in Romania. In 79% of the estimated eligible cases, when contact was made, the interviews were completed (cooperation rate), with a rate of 36% in the Netherlands to 100% in Poland¹³ and Greece. The estimated overall response rate was 42% of all potentially eligible cases (regardless of successful contact). Response rates ranged from 17% in the Netherlands to 83% in Romania (see Table 8).

¹² American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) (2008) *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys* (5th edn)

¹³ In Poland households were preselected using the ‘Universal Electronic System for Registration of the Population’, which perhaps explains the high cooperation rate.

Figure 3: Field work steps and respondent mortality



Source: Görzig, A. (in press) Methodological framework: the *EU Kids Online* project. In Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., and Görzig, A. (Eds.) *Children, Risk and Safety on the Internet: Kids online in comparative perspective*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Differences in response rates may be related to differences in sampling methodology and unexplained or unmeasured cultural differences. In Sweden, for example, respondents were pre-selected and recruited via the phone, possibly explaining the high contact rate in that country (80%). However, the same methodology was used in Norway, and this had one of the lowest contact rates (34%). The low cooperation rate in Cyprus might be due to a lack of respondent incentives, but, on the other hand, the average incentive of €10.50 per respondent, among the highest in the sample, resulted in a low rate of cooperation in the Netherlands; a finding that is in line with past research^{14,15}. Note that incentives were offered in 13 countries, in the course of all or part of the fieldwork. The monetary value of these incentives ranged from an average of €1 (Turkey) to €38 (Norway) per household, with a range of €3 to €12 in those countries within the two centre quartiles (middle 50%). Methodological issues mostly explain cross-country differences in response

rates, but not in all cases, which suggests unmeasured cultural differences played a role.

Table 8: Contact, cooperation and response rates, by country

	Contact rate (%)	Cooperation rate (%)	Response rate (%)
AT	54	91	49
BE	54	98	53
BG	85	75	64
CY	36	69	25
CZ	38	70	27
DE	31	100	30
DK	66	48	32
EE	88	89	78
EL	74	100	74
ES	64	85	54
FI	79	86	68
FR	45	90	41
HU	62	100	61
IE	39	65	25
IT	53	77	40
LT	79	100	79
NL	48	36	17
NO	34	61	21
PL	38	100	38
PT	78	97	76
RO	89	93	83
SE	80	89	70
SI	33	88	29
TR	62	99	61
UK	71	92	66
ALL	53	79	42

¹⁴ De Heer, W. (1999) 'International response trends, results of an international survey', *Journal of Official Statistics*, vol 15, no 2, pp 129–42

¹⁵ De Leeuw, E., and de Heer, W. (2002) 'Trends in household survey non-response: a longitudinal and international comparison', in R.M. Groves, D.A. Dillman, J.L. Eltinge and R.J.A. Little (eds) *Survey nonresponse*, New York: Wiley, pp 41–54

5. DATA ENTRY AND QUALITY CONTROL

5.1. Data entry and processing

As noted above in section 4.4 some countries administered surveys using CAPI, others used PAPI. CAPI captures respondents' answers electronically during fieldwork, so no data entry is required. For countries using PAPI, the data from paper questionnaires were either scanned or the data were entered by local data processing teams. Industry standard quality control and back check procedures were carried out to ensure a high quality of data.

Although all local agencies processed their own data, a uniform collection of data across all countries was ensured through the use of a single data map provided centrally by the core survey team. Raw data sets were uploaded by agencies to - a centralised online data processing platform - with each case containing contact sheet, screening, parent and child questionnaire data for one household.

To ensure that data were processed correctly, local agency data sets had to pass a series of basic quality checks before being accepted by the online platform. Such checks included considering if responses were valid and whether ID variables were consistent. A range of further quality, consistency and edits checks were considered centrally by the core project team using Initial data - more detail about the edits applied to the data set is provided below.

At all times, and in line with data protection legislation and professional industry standards (ESOMAR), data were held securely and kept confidential. Furthermore, only anonymised data were uploaded via the online platform for anonymised central analysis.

5.2. Quality control

Strict quality measures were implemented at every stage of the data collection and production process. This tight monitoring allowed for the early detection of any potential

problems which could be addressed in a timely way, thus maintaining quality of data throughout.

Checks for all returned materials included:

- Check of returned Summary Contact Sheets: to ensure that the pre-defined random-walk procedure was strictly applied and that a summary outcome was coded for the addresses contacted.
- Check of returned Follow-Up Contact Sheets: to ensure that the birthday method for random-child selection was correctly used, to ensure that the parent and child consent was obtained for all interviews and that the interviewers had completed the child and head of household profile information for all households with a child aged 9-16.
- Check of returned interview packs: to ensure that the correct survey forms were used and none were missing.

In a small number of cases in the final data set, a non-selected child had been interviewed. However, the profile by age and gender was reviewed and addressed in the overall approach to non-response weighting.

In total 15% of interviews for each interviewer received a quality back check, focused on either the contact sheet or the interview itself: for around five per cent, local supervisors checked contact sheet processes were implemented correctly on the ground during fieldwork. For around 10%, telephone call backs to respondents checked the following:

- Respondent's memory of the interview (gender of interviewer, day, time and duration, mode of interviewing, use of show cards, topics of the survey)
- Answers to some key questions (mainly screener questions about the parent and child).

Checks on early completed questionnaires check:

- If filtering and routing was working correctly and was being respected.
- If questions had been missed out due to interviewer error.

- The general quality of the data.

Each agency completed a quality-check monitoring form (provided by central project team) early on in fieldwork confirming that the appropriate checks had been completed, and any issues rectified.

At the data entry stage, for a proportion of cases in each country, data entry was back-checked to verify that data entry was set up according to the data map provided and to check if responses were captured exactly in the way they were recorded by interviewers and respondents. Checks required by local agencies included:

- Ensuring filtering has been set up correctly
- No questions missed
- No responses miss-keyed
- If there were blanks or don't knows in the demographic section, the fieldwork department was encouraged to contact the interviewer or interviewee in order to complete the missing information.
- If Contact sheet ID numbers were missing, they had to be identified and entered for 100% of cases
- If there were multiple blanks or don't knows across the entire questionnaire and/or sections of the questionnaire are not filled in or filters/routings are not respected properly, the questionnaire was not retained for subsequent processing. A data count was run checking for instances where more than 30% of responses to the parent and the child questionnaire were not valid, and this enabled the survey team order to consider whether such instances should be treated as incompletes and potentially removed from the data set. There were no cases where both the parent and child interview had over 30% invalid responses and needed to be removed.

5.3. Data editing

A wide range of automatic routing and edit checks (i.e. checks to disallow out of range responses) are built into CAPI to ensure accuracy of completion.

However, for paper-based surveys this is not possible, and as for all PAPI studies it was necessary to carry out edit checks on the data to identify and address errors on a small proportion of cases for some questions. Inconsistencies are particularly likely to occur with any self-completion questionnaire due to the lack of interviewer administration.

Therefore particular attention was paid to the child self completion questionnaires.

The first step was to investigate any inconsistencies found with fieldwork agencies to identify possible courses and solutions – for example, checking for any data entry errors that could be corrected, or raising issues with interviewers to establish why issues might have occurred. Where inconsistencies still remained, data editing was considered, and applied where logical to support data quality and consistency. Importantly, edits were also applied in ways that supported consistency with edit checks and routing implemented in CAPI. The level of editing required was low reflecting that children had a good level of understanding of the questionnaire. The edits applied were as follows.

Routing: A check was carried out to identify instances where questions with filtered bases routed from responses to previous questions had been answered by the respondents whose previous responses indicated eligibility to proceed. Based on a review of the responses to those follow-up questions, edits were applied to route respondents out of later questions where earlier responses indicated that the questions were not relevant to them. For example, a review of follow-up responses identified that in many cases respondents had coded response options such as “don't know” or “not very much,” or “not applicable”. This approach also provided consistency between PAPI and the routing built into CAPI.

Inappropriate multi-coding: There were some instances where multiple codes were selected at single code questions. In these cases it is not possible to know which is the “correct” answer, so items were coded as “no answer” for cases where this applied. There were also some instances of multi-code questions, where a respondent had chosen one or more answer options – and also a “don't know” or “prefer not to say” option. In these cases, based on a review of the data it seemed appropriate to edit out the “don't know/prefer not to say” response, because the main response codes coded seemed likely to be valid.

Addressing inconsistent responses: A range of consistency checks were carried out to check responses that were illogical based on responses to other questions, or general reasonableness. The table below details the checks carried out, and any edits which were applied to address these.

Table 9: Details of non-routing based edits

Questions	Approach and edits applied
<p>Child age: Checking contact sheet: SCR.3b/4b Age of selected child against the child age question in the parent questionnaire: Q.201 What is the age of your child?</p>	<p>The age of the interviewed child in the contact sheet was edited, where necessary, to ensure it referenced the child who had completed the questionnaires.</p> <p>If there was more than one possible match (among the children recorded in the contact sheet data) then the child that uses the internet (SCR3D) was identified as the selected child. If both/all (or neither/none) used the internet then one child was selected at random. In order to avoid confusion, the contact sheet selected child age variable was not included in the main survey data set (just in the contact sheet data set). This ensured that all data users will use the same variable for analysis on child age (as recorded during the main interview). All selected children were then coded as internet users at SCR3D for consistency (as per the profile of survey participants desired).</p>
<p>Child gender: Checking contact sheet: SCR.3c/4c Gender of selected child against the child gender question in the parent questionnaire: Q.201b Gender1 of child?</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Number of children living in house: Checking contact sheet: SCR.2 Number of children aged 9-16 living in the household against parent questionnaire variable: Q202 number of children aged 0-17 living in the household.</p>	<p>If more children were reported at SCR2 than Q202, Q202 was edited to be equal to the response at SCR2. If there was no valid response at Q202 and SCR2, answers were back-coded from SCR3. If there was no data recorded at SCR2, SCR3 and Q202 responses were edited to refer to 1 child.</p>
<p>Child use of communication media on the internet: Q324a-f asked children which of a range of activities they had done in the last year. This was checked against answers at Q308a-f which asked how often they had done the same activities in the past month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) email usage b) visited a social networking profile c) Visited a chat room d) used instant messaging e) Played games with other people on the internet f) Spent time in a virtual world 	<p>If a child had coded "no" (not done in the past year) at Q324 for activities they had reported doing in the past month at Q308, the response at Q324 was edited to show that they had participated in it</p>

6. DATA WEIGHTING AND DESIGN EFFECTS

6.1. The use of weights

The data set has three kinds of weights. The weights are applied to the data to improve the representativeness of the achieved sample. There are three forms of weighting applied to the data set:

- country-specific design weights which adjust for unequal probabilities of selection; for example, these correct for the fact that children in households with two eligible children only had half the chance of selection as one-child households;
- country-specific non-response weights which correct for bias caused by varying response rates across different types of respondent within each country. These weights correct for differences between the achieved profile of respondents and the population profile on key demographic variables – age, gender, region and education of the chief income earner in the household;
- a European level weight which adjusts for country level contribution to the overall results. This weight corrects for the fact that the same number of interviews were conducted per country, despite the fact that the population of (internet-using) 9-16 year olds in each country is different. This weight adjusts each country's contribution to the European-level results in proportion to the actual population size of internet-using children.

There are five variables in the SPSS file: Weight, Weightb, Weightc, Weightd, and Weighte. The *EU Kids Online* network generally follows a consistent approach to weighting: for descriptive statistics weights are applied to make them representative of the population, for statistical significance testing weights are not applied to avoid biased standard errors.

The first main weighting variable ('Weight' in the SPSS file) is generally used for all European level analysis as it incorporates individual respondent weights as well as the country-level adjustment. As a function of the survey design – i.e. equal numbers of interviews in all European countries, irrespective of their population size –

the final European adjustment weights are large for some countries. For example, respondents in Turkey have large up-weights because the country has a large population. This variable was used for overall results, and analysis at the European level by age, gender, and socioeconomic status.

The second main weighting variable ('Weightb' in the SPSS file) is generally used for country by country analysis, and for analysis looking at any single country. This weight incorporates the individual within-country weights which combine any non-response and design weights that were calculated.

Note that the SPSS file contains three additional weighting variables ('Weightc', 'Weightd' and 'Weighte'). These should not be used for data analysis. These are intermediate weights that cover the first stages of the weighting calculations. 'Weighte' includes the Design Weight, 'Weightd' the Non-response 1 weight, and 'Weightc' the Non-response 1 and design weights. These variables are included for users to judge the impact of the final stage of non-response weighting has had (in some cases very little).

As a rule of thumb, for descriptive statistics the variable 'Weight' is used for analysis on the whole data set but 'Weightb' is used when analysing data within each country or comparing two or more countries with one another.

6.2. Approaches to weighting

Non-response weights were calculated separately for each country. Most survey designs would require only one stage of non-response weighting: the achieved sample would be weighted back to the profile of either the issued sample or the survey population. However, with this survey the achieved sample is purposively different from the issued sample, since the entire issued sample has been screened to identify a sub-set of households in the

population (i.e. those containing at least one child aged 9-16 who used the internet).

The sample issued in each country was representative of the country's population, while the population we interviewed was children who use the internet. As such, the issued sample includes households which were ineligible for the survey: i.e. households which did not include children, and households which included children who were not internet users. Given the specific nature of the population the survey represents – i.e. children aged 9-16 who use the internet – there is no accurate population data available to use for weighting.

Instead, the non-response weights are based on data collected during the screening process on contact sheets and combined with general population data relating to households with children at national level. This has been done based on data from two stages of the sampling and recruitment process. First our screened sample (consisting of all children in screened households including both internet users and non-users) was weighted according to the known population data for all children aged 9-16 (users + non-users) by age, gender and region.

Once the first stage of weights had been applied, the non-internet users were excluded to provide a sample of internet users that is representative of the population of internet-using children in terms of age, gender and region. It is this that was used to weight the interviewed sample back to. By weighting the screened sample first, we can be confident that the starting point (the screened sample of children) is representative of the population in terms of these variables and therefore when the sample of users is extracted, we can be confident that the profile used to weight the interviewed sample is also representative.

6.3. Stages of weighting

The three types of weighting, with non-response weighting being split into two, meant that weights are calculated and applied in four stages (see below). However they are combined to give a single weight for analysis:

Together, the design weights and the two stages of non-response weighting, produce an individual weight for each respondent. This weight should be applied whenever any analysis is conducted for a single country (for example, looking at results and sub-group differences for Denmark). This weight is labelled 'Weightb' in the SPSS file.

The final European adjustment is calculated at the country level, which means that every respondent in the same country will be given the same final adjustment factor. This factor is combined with the individual weight to give a single weight which should be applied when analysis of the whole data set is conducted (for example, looking at results and sub-group differences for Europe). This weight is labelled 'weight' in the SPSS file.

Further information about the construction of the individual weight is provided below.

Non-response weights 1 – applied to the sample of all screened children (i.e. this will include not only those who completed an interview, but those who were eligible but were not interviewed and those who were ineligible non-users of the internet). For each country, population distributions of the population of children aged 9-16 by age, gender and region were identified by local agencies. These are used as targets for rim weighting for each country. Rim weighting is a process whereby the population figures are fed into a piece of software which iteratively runs through different possibilities until it comes to the best fit weights for the data.

With this approach, rather than interlocking all weighting variables, each is treated on a marginal basis. For example breaking the sample down into cells by age within sex within region is usually impractical due to limitations on the sample size. All that rim weighting requires is the distribution for each of these variables. The computer then calculates the 'best' fit for the data across all the variables included in the weighting. The advantages to this approach are that the weighting can include a greater number of variables, and it is not necessary to have targets for all the interlocked cells. As such, rim-weighting is the preferred option in most situations.

Profiles for the rim weights were created for each country based on age x gender, and region. The regions used were those corresponding to the region variables in the final data set, and are typically the regions used at the sampling stage.

Design weights – applied to the sample of all eligible children (all children aged 9-16 who use the internet). Design weights adjust for unequal probabilities of selection during sampling: at eligible addresses one child per household was selected for interview from all those who were eligible. This introduces unequal probabilities of

selection whereby a child from a household with a number of eligible children has a lower chance of selection than a child from a household with only one eligible child. We applied design weights to correct for these unequal probabilities of selection.

The weights are calculated as the inverse of the selection probability, for example where there are 3 eligible children (aged 9-16 who use the internet) the weight would be $1/(1/3) = 3$.

Non-response weights 2 – applied to the final sample of all interviewed children. The weighted profile (i.e. with NR1 x DW already applied to the data) of all eligible children – distributions of children by age, gender, region and education of the chief income earner in the household – are used as targets for rim weighting for each country. The regions used for weighting are the same as those used for Non-response weights 1, as described above.

These three stages are then combined to produce one single weight for each respondent. Weights are capped (a maximum of 6 times the average weight is set) to avoid any extreme weights which could cause peculiarities in the data as well as large design effects. The weights were then rescaled (divided by the average weight for each country); a purely aesthetic process which means the weighted base reflects the number of respondents interviewed. Since these individual weights are calculated separately for each respondent based on household make-up and demographic profile of the country, the range and average weight varies from one country to the next.

European weights – applied to the full aggregate dataset (all countries) as the last stage of the weighting process, in order to adjust the contribution each country makes to the data at the European level

This is a final weight for European level analysis which adjusts for country level contribution to the overall results relative to population size. Respondents in countries with a large population of child internet users are given a greater weight than those in countries with a smaller population which means that the larger countries contribute more to the total figures than smaller ones.

As there is no available data on the population of children aged 9-16 who use the internet by country to use for this stage these figures have been estimated using a combination of data from a range of sources. For most

countries data from the Eurobarometer and Eurostat has been used.

Figures for internet penetration are estimated from a combination of data from the Eurobarometer (% children using the internet in 2008) and Eurostat (change in internet penetration, as measured among 16-24s 2008-2009).

Table 10: Estimated number of children aged 9-16 who use the internet, by country

	Children in population 9-16 years (N)	Estimated children online (%)	European internet-using children per country (%)
AT	739,722	86%	1.49%
BE	974,461	78%	1.78%
BG	554,032	91%	1.2%
CY	82,059	68%	0.13%
CZ	809,443	90%	1.71%
DE	6,419,300	86%	12.95%
DK	558,236	97%	1.27%
EE	105,460	96%	0.24%
EL	862,481	59%	1.19%
ES	3,401,338	80%	6.38%
FI	501,387	98%	1.15%
FR	6,005,850	87%	12.26%
HU	854,406	93%	1.86%
IE	458,260	93%	1.00%
IT	4,516,646	55%	5.83%
LT	320,821	96%	0.72%
NL	1,582,903	96%	3.57%
NO	503,160	98%	1.16%
PL	3,490,271	97%	7.94%
PT	871,444	78%	1.59%
RO	1,821,471	78%	3.33%
SE	861,183	98%	1.98%
SI	154,063	95%	0.34%
TR	10,297,791	65%	15.70%
UK	5,861,598	98%	13.20%

Internet penetration for 2010 was estimated by taking the actual penetration in 2008 and extrapolating the rate of growth in internet use measured by Eurostat across 2009-2010. As 2009 data was unavailable for the UK and Belgium, estimates for UK and Belgium are based on 2008 data, scaled up by the average population change across the countries where 2009 data are available. Eurostat gives figures for the changing proportion of 16-24 year olds who have used the internet in the past year, and those who have ever used the internet. The change in internet penetration was estimated at being between these two figures. Where data on the change in internet penetration among 16-24 year olds was unavailable, the average rate of change of 2 percentage points was assumed. Generally figures were rounded up rather than down, since the change in internet use among 9-16s was assumed to be higher than among 16-24 year olds. Note that figures for Norway were unavailable and so were estimated based on the data for Sweden. Figures for Turkey were estimated from two local sources: the Ministry of Social and Family Research, whose data showed 67.2% children age 13-18 use the Internet, and results from the 'ICT Usage in Households, 2004-2010' from the Turkish Statistical Institute (2010) which showed 62.9% 16-24 had used the internet in the last 3 months. An average of these two figures was taken and used as the internet penetration rate for 9-16 year olds.

These figures were used to generate an estimate of the total number of 9-16 year old internet-users in the population of each country. These figures were then used to calculate the proportion of internet users across the 25 countries covered by the survey that fall within each country. For example, 4% of all internet users across the countries covered by the survey are in Belgium, and therefore results from Belgium are weighted down to account for only 4% of the total 25,000 interviews. The EU relative weights therefore adjust the data to be representative of the internet-using 9-16 year old population of the 25 countries covered by the survey.

6.4. Sampling tolerances

When interpreting the findings it is important to remember that the results are based on a sample of children aged 9-16 who use the internet, and not the entire population of 9-16 year olds in each country. Therefore, we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if the whole population of 9-16 year olds in

each participating jurisdiction had been interviewed (the 'true' values).

The "margin of error" is a common summary of sampling error, which quantifies uncertainty about (or confidence in) a survey result. Usually, one calculates a 95 percent confidence interval of the format: survey estimate +/- margin of error.

The margin of error depends on the size of the sample: the more interviews conducted (sample size), the smaller the margin of error. It also depends on the study design: any sample design that departs from a simple random design, and any weighting applied to the data set normally results in a "design effect" that reduces the effective sample size (the size that is effective for statistical reliability tests), and a higher margin of error.

6.5. Design effects

Design effects are 'the ratio of the sampling variance for a static computed using a [particular design] divided by the sampling variance that would have been obtained from a [Simple Random Sample] of exactly the same size'¹⁶. The design effect statistic can be usefully applied to indicate the loss of precision in survey results derived using a particular methodology compared with the reliability of results derived using a Simple Random Sampling method. This loss of precision is often indicated by showing how the margin of error for each survey statistic is widened as a result of the survey design. Each statistic in a survey has its own design effect.

Design effects apply to the methodology used for *EU Kids Online* in a number of ways:

- Clustering of interviews: because a face-to-face fieldwork methodology was used, interviews in each country were clustered in geographical areas (rather than being spread randomly across the country). This clustering leads to a loss of precision, insofar as variance in survey results differs between rather than across clusters.
- Weighting: as described above, several stages of weights were applied to adjust country-level estimates. All weights applied are associated with a design effect.

¹⁶ Groves, R. M. (2004) *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, New Jersey, Wiley.



In addition, at the European level: disproportionate stratification of samples: rather than being sampled in proportion to the population of children within each country, 1,000 interviews were conducted per country. This has the advantage of producing reliable estimates per country. At the aggregate level, however, this design requires corrective weighting (so that each country's results are weighted back to reflect that country's relative population size within the 25 participating countries). These weights are also associated with a design effect.

For example, whilst ca. 1,000 interviews are being conducted in both Ireland and Germany, in the European data set as a whole, Ireland cases will be weighted down, whilst Germany cases will be weighted up, reflecting the smaller and larger sizes of the eligible population in each, respectively. As would be the case for any study generating European estimates, design effects arising from this are large, due to the considerable variability in population size between each country. The variables used to create the design are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Variables used to calculate design effects

Country	Language(s)
QP215: Do you personally use the internet? Yes/No	QC301a: Please tell me where you use the internet these days? Your bedroom (or other private room) at home. Yes/No
QP220a: Which of the following things, if any, do you (or your partner/ other carer) sometimes do with your child? Talk to him/her about what he/she does on the internet. Yes/No/Don't know	QC303: How often do you use the internet? Every day/ almost every day/ Once or twice a week/ Once or twice a month/ less than once a month/ Don't know
QP220b: Which of the following things, if any, do you (or your partner/ other carer) sometimes do with your child? Sit with him/her while s/he uses the internet (watching what s/he is doing but not really joining in). Yes/No/Don't know	QC110: In the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you seen or experienced something on the internet that has bothered you in some way? For example, made you feel uncomfortable, upset, or feel that you shouldn't have seen it? Yes/No/Prefer not to say/ Don't know
QP224a: Do you (or your partner/carers) make use of any of the following for the computer that your child uses MOST OFTEN at home? Parental controls or other means of blocking or filtering some types of website. Yes/No/Don't know	QC106a: How true is this of you? I am easily distracted and find it difficult to concentrate. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP224b: Do you (or your partner/carers) make use of any of the following for the computer that your child uses MOST OFTEN at home? Parental controls or other means of keeping track of the websites they visit. Yes/No/Don't know	QC106b: How true is this of you? Other people my age often treat me as if I wasn't there. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP224c: Do you (or your partner/carers) make use of any of the following for the computer that your child uses MOST OFTEN at home? A service of contract that limits the time your child spends on the internet. Yes/No/Don't know	QC106c: How true is this of you? If I am in trouble I can usually think of something to do. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP228: As far as you are aware, in the past year, has your child seen or experienced something on the internet that has bothered them in some way? For example, made them feel uncomfortable, upset, or feel they shouldn't have seen it? Yes/No/Prefer not to say/Don't know	QC106d: How true is this of you? I take things that are not mine from school, home or elsewhere. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP235a: Please tell me whether or not your child has done [each of the following] in the PAST YEAR, as far as your are aware: Gone to a meeting with someone face to face (in person) that he or she first met on the internet. Yes/No/Don't know.	QC106e: How true is this of you? I get on better with adults that with people my own age. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP235b: Please tell me whether or not your child has done [each of the following] in the PAST YEAR, as far as your are aware: Seen images on the internet that are obviously sexual – for example, showing people naked or people having sex. Yes/No/Don't know.	QC106f: How true is this of you? I can generally work out how to handle new situations. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true
QP235f: Please tell me whether or not your child has done [each of the following] in the PAST YEAR, as far as your are aware: Sent someone else sexual messages (e.g. words, pictures of videos) on the internet. By this we mean images of people naked or having sex. Yes/No/Don't know.	QC106g: How true is this of you? I have many fears, and I am easily scared. Not true/ A bit true/ Very true

Since every estimate in a survey has a different design effect, design effects were calculated in STATA on a range of survey variables. These variables were selected purposively to cover a range of different types of question, and therefore to give an indication of the range of design effects that may apply to different types of question. These questions were also selected to cover some of the key measures of interest from the survey (including of

internet use, parental monitoring and knowledge, exposure to risks online and child self-sufficiency) and to provide an indication of the psychological profile of children from different sampling points.

Table 12 below shows the results by country, and for the European sample as a whole, giving the unweighted sample size for each country – i.e. the actual number of interviews conducted – as well as the design effects

Table 12: Design effects and effective sample sizes by country

	Actual sample size	Approximate design effect	Approximate effective sample size	Approximate effective sample efficiency	Approximate design factor
AT	1,000	1.79	591	59%	1.34
BE	1,006	1.68	644	64%	1.30
BG	1,088	1.56	711	65%	1.25
CY	806	1.79	591	73%	1.34
CZ	1,009	1.60	668	66%	1.27
DE	1,023	1.67	626	61%	1.29
DK	1,001	1.45	723	72%	1.20
EE	1,005	1.51	688	68%	1.23
EL	1,000	1.75	616	62%	1.32
ES	1,024	1.69	640	62%	1.30
FI	1,017	1.38	830	82%	1.17
FR	1,000	1.36	744	74%	1.17
HU	1,000	1.57	662	66%	1.25
IE	990	1.31	784	79%	1.14
IT	1,021	2.05	533	52%	1.43
LT	1,004	1.62	651	65%	1.27
NL	1,004	1.79	591	59%	1.34
NO	1,019	1.47	729	72%	1.21
PL	1,034	1.75	634	61%	1.32
PT	1,000	1.63	661	66%	1.27
RO	1,041	1.71	663	64%	1.31
SE	1,000	1.40	771	77%	1.18
SI	1,000	1.51	682	68%	1.23
TR	1,018	2.39	473	46%	1.55
UK	1,032	1.52	694	67%	1.23

The easiest way to interpret the design effect is with reference to the effective sample size (calculated as: actual sample/design effect). The effective sample size shows the amount of confidence we have in the reliability of our figures, after adjusting for the impact of the survey design – for example, although 1,005 children in Estonia were interviewed, we have as much confidence in the results as we would have from a simple random sample of 688 children in Estonia.

The European level design effect in particular is inevitably large with this type of design: equal numbers of interviews were conducted in all countries, despite the very large differences in population size, and then large weights were applied to weight the contribution of each country appropriately within the aggregate figures. The main contributing factor to these large design effects is the large European weights. While the total number of interviews conducted was over 25,000 therefore, this equates to an effective sample of 8,509 (i.e. the same level of reliability applies to our achieved sample of 25,000 using a clustered and disproportionately stratified design, as to a sample of 8,509 using a simple random sample).

6.6. Analysing data on the country level

When analysing the *EU Kids Online* data set on a country level and wanting to maintain claims of representativeness, it is necessary to take care not to extent beyond the analytical possibilities of the data and to pay attention to base numbers in the analysis. To take an example, let us look at the UK data set, which has 1,032 responses. When making inferences about all children who use the internet this is roughly the base number that defines the standard error for point estimates in the data. For percentages the standard error can be obtained by the following formula:

$$SE = \sqrt{\frac{P(100-P)}{n-1}}$$

As can be seen the standard error will be bigger for numbers close to 50% than for numbers close to 0 or 100 (due to the multiplication of the percentage times 100 minus the percentage). A confidence interval for the percentage can then be calculated by multiplying the

standard error with the appropriate Z value (usually 1.96 for a 95% confidence interval). To estimate the accuracy of percentages it is therefore only necessary to know the percentage itself and the correct base on which that percentage is calculated. Let us take an example.

In the UK data set there are 93 children who claim to have seen sexual images on any websites. This is based on the unweighted data set and to obtain the correct point estimate it is necessary to apply weighting and deduct individuals with missing values on this particular variable but let us for the moment imagine that in the UK sample 93 out of 1,032 respondents have seen sexual images on any websites or some 9% (let us also ignore the fact that there is a clustering effect in the data set that reduces the effective sample size a bit). To estimate the accuracy of this finding we would calculate a 95% confidence interval in the following way:

$$CI = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{P(100-P)}{n-1}} = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{9(100-9)}{1.032-1}} = 1.75$$

Then we conclude that some 9% (± 1.75) of UK children have seen sexual images on any websites. If we want to compare boys and girls then we must split the group by gender and then the accuracy of the point estimate for the boys will be based on the number of boys in the sample and similarly the accuracy for the point estimate for the girls will depend on the number of girls in the UK sample. In the UK sample there are 510 boys and of those some 56 have seen sexual images on any websites or about 11%. As can be seen from the formula that we use to calculate the standard error the accuracy of the 11% figure for boys in the UK sample is affected by both the 11% number itself and the n which in this case is 510 (as there are 510 boys in the sample). The confidence interval for our estimate of how many UK boys have seen sexual images on any websites thus becomes:

$$CI_{boys} = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{P(100-P)}{n-1}} = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{11(100-11)}{510-1}} = 2.72$$

Note that by going from estimating how many UK children have seen sexual images on any websites and to estimating how many UK boys have seen such images the confidence interval goes from 1.75 to 2.72 and the difference is almost exclusively the result of going from the group of all UK children and to the group of UK boys. But note at the same time that it is not problematic here

that only 56 UK boys have seen sexual images on any websites.

To further demonstrate this, let us look at our estimate for a very rare activity like sending sexual messages. In the UK sample only some 22 children admit (or claim) to have sent such messages or only some 2% of the UK sample of 1.032 children. As before we can calculate a 95% confidence interval for our estimate that 2% of UK children have sent sexual messages:

$$CI = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{P(100-P)}{n-1}} = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{2(100-2)}{1.032-1}} = 0.85$$

Note that as with sexual images for all children in the UK sample this estimate is based on 1.032 children but the confidence interval becomes smaller as there are fewer children who have sent sexual messages than have seen sexual images. As mentioned before, this is because there is less uncertainty for numbers close to zero or 100% than numbers close to 50% and as 2% is a smaller number than 9% the confidence interval is smaller.

If we wish to see how many UK boys have sent sexual messages we will see that 12 out of 510 UK boys admit (or claim) to have done so or roughly 2%. We can calculate a confidence interval as follows and becomes larger than the confidence interval because it is based only on the 510 boys in UK but not the whole UK sample.

$$CI = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{P(100-P)}{n-1}} = 1.96 \times \sqrt{\frac{2(100-2)}{510-1}} = 1.22$$

So far we have looked at how the confidence intervals change when moving from the overall data set of c.a. 1,000 respondents and down to the subset of boys only (or girls only) where one could expect around 500 respondents. It is possible to break the data down even further and look for example at two age groups by gender (going down to roughly one fourth of the overall data) or even further. However, as one goes into smaller sub groups the standard errors for the point estimates will grow increasingly large (splitting a group in half will result in a standard error that is roughly 50% bigger than the standard error for the overall group).

The small number of children who have experienced most of the risks asked about in the *EU Kids Online* survey becomes a limitation if there is desire to look at only those who have experienced a certain risk. It might be possible to look at the group of 93 UK children who have seen sexual images on any websites and see for example how

many of them have been bothered or upset by it (the base number for that analysis would be 93 minus perhaps some small internal mortality if not all of those 93 respondents have responded to the question that is then being analysed within the group of 93). However it is questionable if it is possible to look at gender differences within the group of 93 UK children who have seen sexual images on any websites as that analysis would be based on only 56 boys and 37 girls. Also it would be impossible to look any further at the 22 UK children who claim to have sent sexual messages.

For analysis of this kind where there is interest in looking at specific aspects of online experience it is however possible to use the whole data set with answers from all countries in a multivariate analysis where country differences are either controlled for or estimated along with other independent variables.

7. THE DATA SET

7.1. The data set

One of the main objectives of the *EU Kids Online* project was to make data available – to the *EU Kids Online* network and the wider research community. Attention was paid to ensuring that the variables in the data set were consistently labelled and coded. The main types of variables are screening, core and derived variables. Screening variables contain selected socio-demographic information about the household and its members; core variables provide data on the survey questions; and derived variables are created or computed from the information derived from the other variables.

All variables were labelled according to a similar structure containing a prefix, a root and a suffix. Core variables were named according to which questionnaire and question they referred to (see Table 13).

Table 13: Variable names of core variables

Core variables	Prefix Origin of variable	Root Question number	Suffix Response option
Screening form	SCR	1	b
Child interview (f2f)	QC	300	d
Child interview (self completion)	QC	100	a
Parent interview	QP	200	c

Derived variables were named according to which variables they were derived from, which concept they incorporated and/or what calculation was used to derive them (see Table 14).

Table 14: Variable names of derived variables

Derived variables	Prefix Origin of variable	Root Concept / group	Suffix Variable type
Child interview	DC	e.g.: SES age	e.g.: MN: Mean NM: Count 2: Number of categories
Parent interview	DP	webuse	
Reversed items	RC or RP	Original question number	Response option

The exact naming, labelling and coding of variables can be found in the data dictionary (downloadable as an excel file from the UK Data Archive).

Education and occupation of the household's main wage earner were obtained from the screening questionnaire. Country-specific codes were standardised to obtain comparable variables across countries. Socio-economic status indicators were derived based on a combination of the occupation and education variables (see SES pack). Socio-economic status is not evenly distributed across countries; the proportion of respondents with a high socio-economic background ranges from 12% in Turkey to 82% in Norway, for medium socio-economic background the range is 16% in Norway to 67% in Italy, and low socio-economic background ranges from 2% in Norway to 54% in Portugal and Turkey. Finding related to socio-economic status could be an indicator of between country differences and vice versa.

Psychological differences were measured on scales derived or adapted from existing measures for self-efficacy¹⁷, the Strength and Difficulty Questionnaire (SDQ)¹⁸, sensation-seeking¹⁹, and internet addiction²⁰.

¹⁷ Schwarzer, R. and Jerusalem, M. (1995) 'Generalized self-efficacy scale', in J. Weinman, S. Wright, and M. Johnston (eds),

The data set also contains paradata, metadata and auxiliary data²¹. Paradata give information on data collection processes, in this case variables for interview mode (CAPI, PAPI), screening outcome, interview completion, property type, interviewer observations and identifiers for each respondent, household, sample point and country. This technical report accompanying the data set provides information on questionnaire duration times and incentives per country. Metadata are data on the data, such as sample design and question coding, which are contained in the data set variables on sample points, in the questionnaires and in the interviewer briefing documents which contain introductory texts, coding instructions and definitions of complex terms; they are also provided in this technical report which provides information on actual numbers of interviewers per country. In addition, socio-economic status and education packs (downloadable as excel files from the UK data archive) provide information on national coding and recoding procedures concerning educational levels and occupational status into cross-national variables. Auxiliary data are data from external sources and include variables for information such as regions, population density and area size.

Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs, Windsor: NFER-Nelson, pp 35–7.

¹⁸ Goodman, R. (1997) 'The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: a research note', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, vol 38, pp 581–86; Goodman, R.R., Ford, T.T., Simmons, H.H., Gatward, R.R. and Meltzer, H.H. (2003) 'Using the strengths and difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) to screen for child psychiatric disorders in a community sample', *International Review of Psychiatry*, vol 15, nos 1–2, pp 166–72.

¹⁹ Stephenson, M.T., Hoyle, R.H., Palmgreen, P. and Slater, M.D. (2003) 'Brief measures of sensation seeking for screening and large-scale surveys', *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, vol 72, no 3, 279–86.

²⁰ Šmahel, D., Vondráčková, P., Blinka, L. & Godoy-Etcheverry, S. (2009). Comparing addictive Behavior on the Internet in the Czech Republic, Chile and Sweden. In G. Cardoso, A. Cheong, J. Cole (Eds.), *World wide internet: Changing societies, economies and cultures* (pp. 544-582). Macao : University of Macau.

²¹ Nicolaas, G. (2011) 'Survey paradata: a review. ESRC National Centre for Research Methods review paper, London: National Centre for Research Methods.

For a list of key measurements used in the analysis of the data see Annex 5.

7.2. SES measurements

Information relating to the chief income earner's level of education and occupation was collected during the screening process. As outlined in Table 12, responses to level of education and employment were then grouped and cross-referenced with each other to calculate one of three levels of SES: low, middle and high.

However, it should be noted that, as is often the case with European research, a uniform approach was taken to the calculation of SES across all 25 countries, and therefore SES is not relative to the differences between the socio-demographic make up of each country.

7.3. Education

Derived variables were also created to consider the level of education within the household. Information on the education of parents came from three questions.

- SCR6orig comes from the screening interview and asks about the highest education level of the head of household.
- QP209 is in the parent questionnaire and asks about the highest education level completed by the parent (or carer) that is being interviewed.
- QP210 is in the parent questionnaire and asks about the highest level of education completed by the other parent (or carer) if there is such a person.

One of the challenges for the project was to create a central understanding of the different levels of education - that could be applied across all countries - whilst taking into account the different education systems that exist across Europe.

Table 12: Socio-Economic Status of the Chief Income Earner

Occupation of Main wage earner (SCR7)	Education of Main Wage Earner (SCR6orig)			
	Less than primary	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
General management / Self employed professional	Low	Middle	High	High
Employed professional / Middle management / Business prop	Low	Low	High	High
Farmer / Fisherman	Low	Low	High	High
Employed desk position / Owner of shop, craftsmen	Low	Low	Middle	High
Employed position, not at a desk / Supervisor, skilled manual worker	Low	Low	Middle	High
Unskilled manual worker, servant	Low	Low	Low	Low
Non active (housework, student, unemployed)	Low	Low	Low	Middle
Non active retired	Low	Low	Middle	Middle

Therefore although respondents answered a question that was specific to their country, and reflected the different levels within their system of education, responses to SCR6orig, QP209 and QP210 were all later mapped into the derived variable DPEDUHH comprising a central model of seven different levels of education in line with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED; UNESCO, 2006):

- Not completed primary education
- Primary or first stage of basic
- Lower secondary or second stage of basic
- Upper secondary
- Post secondary, non tertiary
- First stage of tertiary
- Second stage of tertiary

The mapping of individual education systems to these seven central codes was undertaken in consultation with the relevant academics from the *EU Kids Online* network; however there remained several challenges. For example several education systems have courses or levels that fall in between or transcend across two of the seven variables; or for cultural differences such as in Germany, respondents underrepresented their tertiary education because not all gained qualifications at the end of their study.

A further difficulty in interpreting level of education is that the level of education profile of the survey population is

unknown. Although Eurostat data²² of adults 25-64 is used to generate an indicative comparison below, the adults in the *EU Kids Online* project take a different profile: namely they are parents (not aged 25-64 per se), of children 9-16, and whose children use the internet. Crucially, information about respondents' level of education has been collected in different ways by Eurostat and *EU Kids Online*. It is therefore not possible to use level of education as a variable in weighting the data, and **comparisons of the population data and the survey profile should be treated with caution.**

The difficulty in translating and mapping different education systems together and the inability to weight the data to a known population profile for education help explain why the level of education appears under- or overrepresented in some countries. Table 15 shows the education level as measured in the *EU Kids Online* data for the head of household and by Eurostat in the adult population aged 25-64 years²³. In the *EU Kids Online* data set the estimated percentage of households where the head of household has completed tertiary education ranges from 9 percent in Turkey to 82 percent in Norway.

²² Eurostat can be found here:

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/education/data/database#>

²³ The highest education level of the household (the variable DPEDUHH) is calculated by taking the highest level of education across SCR6, Q209 and Q210.

The Eurostat figures for the individual adult population range from 12 percent to 38 percent.


Table 15: Level of education as measured in the EU Kids Online data and by Eurostat

	Percent with a tertiary education				Difference between DPEDUHH and Eurostat 2010
	As measured in the EU Kids Online data		As estimated by Eurostat for the adult population		
	SCR6	DPEDUHH	2009	2010	
AT	13	17	19	19	-2
BE	35	41	33	35	6
BG	25	33	23	23	10
CY	21	24	34	36	-12
CZ	20	24	16	17	7
DE	7	12	26	27	-15
DK	52	54	34	34	20
EE	23	31	36	35	-4
EL	20	24	23	24	0
ES	15	19	30	31	-12
FI	18	26	37	38	-12
FR	32	38	29	29	9
HU	16	20	20	20	0
IE	21	26	36	37	-11
IT	9	15	15	15	0
LT	25	32	31	33	-1
NL	51	61	33	32	29
NO	76	82	36	37	45
PL	19	22	21	23	-1
PT	9	10	15	15	-5
RO	15	19	13	14	5
SE	38	54	33	34	20
SI	28	33	23	24	9
TR	8	9	12	12	-3
UK	16	19	33	35	-16

As demonstrated in Figure 4 below, the correlation between the percentages obtained in the EU Kids Online

data set and the Eurostat figures is perhaps lower than expected.

Figure 4: Education as measured in the EU Kids Online survey and as estimated by Eurostat



It could be hypothesised that the EU Kids Online figure should be slightly higher than that of the Eurostat adult population, especially considering that the EU Kids Online figure accounts for the highest level of education across the household as a whole rather than just individual adults. Looking at Table 15, it therefore appears that the level of education is overestimated in three countries: Norway (+45), Netherlands (+29), Denmark (+20) and Sweden (+20); in contrast, the level of education seems to be underrepresented in the UK (-16), Ireland (-11), Finland (-12), Germany (-15) and Cyprus (-12). However it is worth noting that although comparisons between some countries should be treated with caution, the level of education variable provides a useful indication of the variation in education between households within the same country for which additional country specific variables can be found in the data set (ATeduc to UKeduc) and the education pack.

To allow analyses on the European level and country comparisons which include the education variable the EU Kids Online network took the following approach:

Following the suggestion of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU, 2010) the derived variable *DPEDUHH4* was created for cross-country analyses that include education. The variable contains a



www.eukidsonline.net

four-way classification of education using ISCED97 as follows:

1. Primary education or lower – no formal education, pre-primary (ISCED 0) or primary education (ISCED 1);
2. Lower secondary education (ISCED 2);
3. Upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary (ISCED 3, 4); and
4. Tertiary (ISCED 5, 6).

7.4. Routing and handling of missing values

The use of routing in the questionnaire calls for special care in handling of missing values in the analysis of the *EU Kids Online* data set. The following is the question on bullying experienced in past 12 months:

Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes **Answer question on next page**
- No
- Don't know **Go straight to section C**
- Prefer not to say

This is the frequency table in SPSS showing that some 93% of the children (16.6+73.6) give a definite answer to this question. The remaining 7% say that they don't know (coded as -98), that they prefer not to say (coded as -97) or simply do not answer the question (coded as -99).

QC112 Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the past 12 months?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid -99	48	,2	,2	,2
-98 Don't know	1126	4,8	4,8	5,0
-97 Prefer not to say	416	1,8	1,8	6,8
1 Yes	4587	19,6	19,6	26,4
2 No	17243	73,6	73,6	100,0
Total	23420	100,0	100,0	

Only those who answer with a definite yes continue to answer the following question on how often bullying has been experienced in the past 12 months.

How often has someone acted in this kind of way towards you in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Every day or almost every day
- Once or twice a week
- Once or twice a month
- Less often
- Don't know

Below is the frequency table in SPSS and here a new missing value has been introduced (-96) for those who were routed out of the section in the previous question. It is important to note however that this value contains a mixture of answers from the previous question and thus can't be seen as representing those who have not experienced bullying in the past 12 months (although this group is the vast majority of those ending up in the -96 category). As in the question on if the children had been bullied at all they can also in the question on how often choose to say that they don't know (coded as -98 as before) or skip the question (coded as -99).

QC113 How often has someone acted in this kind of way towards you in the past 12 months?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid -99	18	,1	,1	,1
-98 Don't know	387	1,7	1,7	1,7
-96	18833	80,4	80,4	82,1
1 Every day or almost every day	345	1,5	1,5	83,6
2 Once or twice a week	659	2,8	2,8	86,4
3 Once or twice a month	870	3,7	3,7	90,1
4 Less often	2308	9,9	9,9	100,0
Total	23420	100,0	100,0	

The table below shows how the answers from question 113 on how often bullying has been experienced map onto the answers from question 112 on whether bullying has been experienced at all in the past 12 months. This shows how all the missing values from question 112 have been put together into one missing value in question 113 (the -96 group). This shows also how some 9% of those who said in question 112 that they had experienced bullying in the past 12 months do not give a valid answer in question 113 on how often this has happened.

QC112 Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the past 12 months?

	-99 Missing	-98 Don't know	-97 Prefer not to say	1 Yes	2 No	Total
QC113 How often has someone acted in this kind of way towards you in the past 12 months?	-99 Missing	-98 Don't know	-97 Routed out	18	387	18
	48	1126	416	4587	17243	18833
				4182		4182
	Total	48	1126	416	4587	17243
						23420

Internal mortality

9%

The next question presents a new issue to think about. Here the children are asked how bullying has happened in the past 12 months and as this can happen in more than one way they can tick as many boxes as they want.

At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ... ?

PLEASE TICK AS MANY BOXES AS NEEDED

- In person face to face
- By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts
- Some other way
- Don't know

The frequency table for question 114a shows that there are two kinds of missing values. Those who do not tick any of the response options are coded as -99 and those who were routed out in question 112 have been coded as -96. Those who ticked the box for 'In person face to face' are coded as 'Yes' and everyone else is coded as 'No'.

QC114a At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: In person face to face

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid -99	45	,2	,2	,2
-96	18833	80,4	80,4	80,6
0 No	1518	6,5	6,5	87,1
1 Yes	3024	12,9	12,9	100,0
Total	23420	100,0	100,0	

As before in comparing questions 112 and 113 the same thing can happen here that children who have said in question 112 that they have been bullied do not give a valid answer in question 114. The table below shows how the first option in question 114 maps onto question 112.

QC112 Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the past 12 months?

	-99 Missing	-98 Don't know	-97 Prefer not to say	1 Yes	2 No	Total
QC114a At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: In person face to face	-99 Missing			45	0	18
	-98 Don't know			0		387
	-96 Routed out	48	1126	416	17243	18833
	Valid answer			4542		4182
	Total	48	1126	416	4587	17243
Internal mortality						1%

The internal mortality between question 112 and question 114 is much lower than between questions 112 and 113. The reason is that in the variable holding the information

from response option 114a the only missing values are those who do not pick any response option in question 114 and those who tick the 'Don't know' option are all coded as 'No' in the other response options.

QC114a At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: In person face to face
* QC114d At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: Don't know
Crosstabulation

Count	QC114d At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: Don't know				Total	
	-99	-96	0 No	1 Yes		
QC114a At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened ...?: In person face to face	-99	45	0	0	0	45
	-96	0	18833	0	0	18833
	0 No	0	0	1128	390	1518
	1 Yes	0	0	3024	0	3024
Total		45	18833	4152	390	23420

It should be stressed that the issues related to missing values in the *EU Kids Online* data are more complex than in many other surveys. The preferred setting of missing values depends however on the nature of the analysis and is by no means default or natural in the data set. However, as a recommendation it is advised to follow the approach taken by the *EU Kids Online* network.

7.5. Treatment of missing values by EU Kids Online

The exact number of percentages reported will be dependent on how missing values are treated and which of them are included or excluded from the base.

The base determines which respondents were included for reporting percentages of a particular variable. In other words, the base is the actual number that makes up 100% of the reported data. There are different ways in defining the base dependent on how non-responses (-96 and -99), 'don't know' (-98), and 'prefer not to say' (-97) responses are treated. In the *EU kids online II* project we decided to exclude all of the above from the base, that is,

we defined the base as: All respondents, who have given a valid answer to a question, such as 'yes', 'no' or any response option that is not 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say'

The assumption underlying this decision was that the likelihood of each missing respondent for one of the response options equals the likelihood which with that

response option was chosen in the sample (missing at random).

Two exceptions to this rule were made:

1) When the response 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say' was considered meaningful to report – e.g., due to the topic in question or because a large number of respondents had chosen them – then these responses were included in the base. This was, for example, the case when we reported parental awareness of their child experiencing a risk. Here we reported the percentages of parents who had said 'yes', 'no' and 'don't know' to the question whether they thought their child had encountered a particular risk.

2) When not applicable was assigned because a respondent was not routed to a question due to having given a response at a previous question that made him/her not receive that particular question AND the respondent should still be included in the base for percentage reporting. This was mainly the case when percentages were reported for follow up questions of online risks.

An example for the second case would be, when reporting the percentage of *all children who use the internet* who have bullied others online (i.e. said 'yes' to QC125 and QC127c). Now those children who have not said 'yes' to the question whether they have bullied others at all (QC125) will not have been routed to the follow up question which asked them in which mode they have bullied others (QC127) and therefore been coded as 'not applicable' (-96) for this question.

However, we can assume that those who have said 'no' to whether they have bullied at all (QC125) would also have said 'no' to whether they have bullied online (QC127c). Hence, for those who have said 'no' to whether they have bullied at all (QC125) the 'not applicable' will need to be recoded into 'no' if the base for percentage reporting are intended to be *all children who use the internet*.

Have you acted in a way that **might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else** in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes Answer questions on next page
- No -96 → no
- Don't know -96 } Go straight to section D
- Prefer not to say -96

In which of the following ways have you acted like this in the PAST 12 MONTHS? ...

PLEASE TICK AS MANY BOXES AS NEEDED

- In person face to face no
- By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts no
- On the internet yes
- Other way(s) no
- Don't know -98

A similar approach was taken for other follow up questions when the intention was to include those that were routed out into the base for percentage reporting.

A different procedure would be taken if we would like to report the percentage of those who have bullied others online (i.e. said 'yes' to QC127c) of all children *who have bullied in general*. In this case the base for calculation would be all those who said 'yes' to the question of whether they have bullied in general (QC125) and have been routed to the question whether they have bullied online (QC127c). In this case the complete base has been routed to the variable in question and no recoding of missing values would be needed.

Have you acted in a way that **might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else** in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes Answer questions on next page
- No -96 → no
- Don't know -96 } Go straight to section D
- Prefer not to say -96

In which of the following ways have you acted like this in the PAST 12 MONTHS? ...

PLEASE TICK AS MANY BOXES AS NEEDED

- In person face to face -96
- By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts
- On the internet
- Other way(s)
- Don't know

Have you acted in a way that **might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else** in the PAST 12 MONTHS?

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

- Yes Answer questions on next page
- No -96
- Don't know -96 } Go straight to section D
- Prefer not to say -96

In which of the following ways have you acted like this in the PAST 12 MONTHS? ...

PLEASE TICK AS MANY BOXES AS NEEDED

- In person face to face no
- By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts no
- On the internet yes
- Other way(s) no
- Don't know -98

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Countries surveyed by <i>EU Kids Online</i>	7
Figure 2: Estimated margin of error for findings based on the <i>EU Kids Online</i> data set.....	10
Figure 3: Field work steps and respondent mortality	27
Figure 4: Education as measured in the <i>EU Kids Online</i> survey and as estimated by Eurostat.....	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Countries and two letter country codes.....	7
Table 2: List of fieldwork agencies	8
Table 3: Languages provided in the <i>EU Kids Online</i> survey in each of the participating countries	14
Table 4: Method of stratification by region and urbanisation	16
Table 5: Sampling information	17
Table 6: Fieldwork dates, incentives and number of interviewers.....	22
Table 7: Survey mode and interview length	23
Table 8: Contact, cooperation and response rates, by country.....	27
Table 9: Details of non-routing based edits.....	31
Table 10: Estimated number of children aged 9-16 who use the internet, by country.....	35
Table 11: Variables used to calculate design effects	37
Table 12: Design effects and effective sample sizes by country.....	38
Table 13: Variable names of core variables.....	41
Table 14: Variable names of core variables.....	41
Table 13: Level of education as measured in the <i>EU Kids Online</i> data and by Eurostat	44



ANNEX 1: EU KIDS ONLINE

Overview

EU Kids Online II: Enhancing Knowledge Regarding European Children's Use, Risk and Safety Online is funded from 2009-2011 by the EC's Safer Internet Programme.

The project aims to enhance knowledge of European children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies, in order to inform the promotion of a safer online environment for children among national and international stakeholders.

Adopting an approach that is child-centred, comparative, critical and contextual, *EU Kids Online* has conducted a major survey of children's experiences (and their parents' perceptions) of online risk in 25 European countries. The findings will be disseminated through a series of reports and presentations during 2010-12.

Objectives

- To design a robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying the nature of children's online access, use, risk, coping and safety awareness.
- To design a robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying parental experiences, practices and concerns regarding their child's internet use.
- To administer the survey in a reliable and ethically-sensitive manner to national samples of internet users aged 9-16 and their parents in Europe.
- To analyse the results systematically to identify core findings and more complex patterns among findings on a national and comparative basis.
- To disseminate the findings in a timely manner to a wide range of relevant stakeholders nationally, across Europe, and internationally.
- To identify and disseminate key recommendations relevant to the development of safety awareness initiatives in Europe.
- To identify remaining knowledge gaps and methodological guidance to inform future projects on the safer use of online technologies.

Work packages

- WP1: Project Management and Evaluation: ensure effective conduct and evaluation of work packages.
- WP2: Project Design: design a robust survey instrument and sampling frame for children and parents.
- WP3: Data Collection: tender, select and work with the subcontractor appointed to conduct the fieldwork.
- WP4: Data Reporting: cross-tabulation, presentation and report of core findings.
- WP5: Statistical Analysis of Hypotheses: analysis and hypothesis testing of relations among variables.
- WP6: Cross-National Comparisons: interpretation of similarities and differences across countries.
- WP7: Recommendations: guide awareness and safety initiatives and future projects in this field.
- WP8: Dissemination of Project Results: dissemination to diverse stakeholders and the wider public.

International Advisory Panel

- María José Cantarino, Corporate Responsibility Manager, Telefonica, Spain.
- Dieter Carstensen, Save the Children Denmark, European NGO Alliance on Child Safety Online.
- Professors David Finkelhor and Janis Wolak, Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, USA.
- Will Gardner, CEO of Childnet International, UK.
- Dr Ellen Helsper, Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics, UK.
- Amanda Lenhart, Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Prof Eileen Munro, Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics, UK.
- Annie Mullins, Global Head of Content Standards, Vodafone, UK.
- Kjartan Ólafsson, University of Akureyri, Iceland.
- Janice Richardson, project manager at European Schoolnet, coordinator of Insafe, Brussels, Belgium.
- Agnieszka Wrzesień, Project Coordinator, Polish Safer Internet Node, Nobody's Children Foundation.

ANNEX 2: THE NETWORK

Country	National Contact Information	Team Members
Austria (AT)	Ingrid Paus-Hasebrink ingrid.paus-hasebrink@sbg.ac.at Department of Audiovisual Communication, University of Salzburg, Rudolfskai 42, A-5020 Salzburg, Austria	Ingrid Paus-Hasebrink Andrea Dürager
Belgium (BE)	Leen D'Haenens Leen.DHaenens@soc.kuleuven.be Centrum voor Mediacultuur en Communicatietechnologie (OE), OE Centr. Mediacult.& Comm.technologie, Parkstraat 45 – bus 3603, 3000 Leuven, Belgium	Leen d'Haenens Verónica Donoso Sofie Vandoninck Joke Bauwens Katia Segers
Bulgaria (BG)	Jivka Marinova gert@mbox.contact.bg Gender Education, Research and Technologies foundation, P.O.B. 963, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria	Jivka Marinova Diana Boteva
Cyprus (CY)	Yiannis Laouris laouris@cni.org.cy Cyprus Neuroscience & Technology Institute Science Unit of the Future Worlds Center 5 Promitheos, 1065 Lefkosia, Cyprus	Yiannis Laouris Tatjana Taraszow Elena Aristodemou Aysu Arsoy
Czech Republic (CZ)	David Šmahel smahel@fss.muni.cz Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University Joštova 10, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic	David Šmahel Štěpán Konečný Lukáš Blinka Anna Ševčíková Petra Vondráčková Alena Černá
Denmark (DK)	Gitte Stald stald@itu.dk IT University of Copenhagen, Ruud Langgaards Vej 7, 2300 Copenhagen, Denmark	Gitte Stald
Estonia (EE)	Veronika Kalmus Veronika.Kalmus@ut.ee Institute of Journalism and Communication, University of Tartu, 18 Ülikooli St., 50090 Tartu, Estonia	Veronika Kalmus Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt Pille Runnel Andra Siibak Kadri Ugur Lennart Komp
Finland (FI)	Reijo Kupiainen reijo.kupiainen@uta.fi Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Tampere, 33014 Finland	Reijo Kupiainen Kaarina Nikunen Annikka Suoninen Riitta Kauppinen
France (FR)	Dominique Pasquier Dominique.Pasquier@ehess.fr Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications 46 rue Barrault, 75013 Paris, France	Dominique Pasquier Sylvie Octobre Elodie Kredens Pauline Reboul
Germany (DE) (Management Group)	Uwe Hasebrink u.hasebrink@hans-bredow-institut.de Hans Bredow Institute for Media Research Warburgstr. 8-10, D - 20354 Hamburg, Germany	Uwe Hasebrink Claudia Lampert
Greece (EL)	Liza Tsaliki etsaliki@media.uoa.gr Department of Mass Media and Communications National and Kapodistrian University of Athens 5 Stadiou Street, Athens 105 62, Greece	Liza Tsaliki Despina Chronaki Eleni-Revekka Staiou Kalpaki Kornilia Konstantina Michalopoulou
Hungary (HU)	Bence Ságvári bence.sagvari@ithaka.hu Information Society and Network Research Center – ITHAKA, Perc u. 8, Budapest, 1036 Hungary	Anna Galác Bence Ságvári Erik Gerhradt Zsófia Rét

Ireland (IE) (Management Group)	Brian O'Neill brian.oneill@dit.ie College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Rathmines Road, Dublin 6, Ireland	Brian O'Neill Nóirín Hayes Simon Grehan	Sharon McLaughlin
Italy (IT)	Giovanna Mascheroni giovanna.mascheroni@unicatt.it OssCom, Università Cattolica del S. Cuore Largo Gemelli, 1, 20123 Milano, Italy	Fausto Colombo Piermarco Aroldi Barbara Scifo	Giovanna Mascheroni Maria Francesca Murru
Lithuania (LT)	Alfredas Laurinavičius allaur@mrui.lt Department of Psychology, Mykolas Romeris University, Ateities st. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania	Alfredas Laurinavičius Laura Ustinavičūtė Rita Žukauskiene	
Netherlands (NL)	Jos de Haan j.de.haan@scp.nl Netherlands Institute for Social Research SCP P.O. Box 16164, 2500 BD Den Haag, The Netherlands	Jos de Haan Patti M. Valkenburg Marion Duimel Els Kuiper	Linda Adrichem Jochen Peter Maria Koutamanis Nathalie Sonck
Norway (NO)	Elisabeth Staksrud elisabeth.staksrud@media.uio.no Dept. of Media and Communication, University of Oslo Boks 1093 Blindern, 0317 Oslo, Norway	Elisabeth Staksrud Ingunn Hagen Jørgen Kirksæther	
Poland (PL)	Lucyna Kirwil lucyna.kirwil@swps.edu.pl Department of Psychology Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities ul. Chodakowska 19/31, 03-815 Warsaw, Poland	Lucyna Kirwil Aldona Zdrodowska	
Portugal (PT) (Management Group)	Cristina Ponte cristina.ponte@fcs.unl.pt Departamento de Ciências da Comunicação Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (UNL) Av. de Berna, 26-C, 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal	Cristina Ponte José Alberto Simões Daniel Cardoso Ana Jorge	
Romania (RO)	Monica Barbovschi moni.barbovski@gmail.com Babes-Bolyai University, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, 21 Decembrie 1989 st. no.128-130, Cluj-Napoca, Romania	Monica Barbovschi Maria Diaconescu Eva Laszlo	George Roman Valentina Marinescu Anca Velicu
Slovenia (SL) (Management Group)	Bojana Lobe bojana.lobe@fdv.uni-lj.si Centre for Methodology and Informatics Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana Kardeljeva pl. 5, Ljubljana, Slovenia	Bojana Lobe Sandra Muha	
Spain (ES)	Maialen Garmendia maialen.garmendia@ehu.es Depto. de Sociología, Universidad del País Vasco, Apartado 644, 48.080 Bilbao, Spain	Carmelo Garitaonandia Maialen Garmendia	Gemma Martínez Fernández Miguel Angel Casado
Sweden (SE)	Cecilia von Feilitzen cecilia.von.feilitzen@sh.se The International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media, Nordicom, Goteborg University, Box 713, 405 30 Goteborg, Sweden	Cecilia von Feilitzen Elza Dunkels Olle Findahl	
Turkey (TR)	Kursat Cagiltay kursat@metu.edu.tr Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Middle East Technical University, 06531, Ankara, Turkey	Kursat Cagiltay Engin Kursun Duygu Nazire Kasikci	Christine Ogan Turkan Karakus
United Kingdom (UK) (Coordinator, Management Group)	Leslie Haddon leshaddon@aol.com Department of Media and Communications London School of Economics and Political Science Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK	Sonia Livingstone Leslie Haddon Anke Görzig Daniel Kardefelt-Winther	

ANNEX 3: ETHICS REVIEW

Questionnaire submitted to the LSE Research Ethics committee

Researchers should consider the following questions when devising research proposals involving human participants, personal, medical or otherwise sensitive data or methodologically controversial approaches. N.B. not all of these questions will be relevant to every study. These questions provide pointers to direct researchers' thinking about the ethical dimensions of their research. It is expected that researchers will already have addressed the academic justification for the project in their proposal; the guidance questions set out below aim to help researchers address specific ethical issues in so far as they relate to participants or data.

In particular, consideration of risks to the research participants versus benefits need to be weighed up by researchers. It is important to think through carefully the likely impact on participants or vulnerable groups of any data collection methods. Certain groups are particularly vulnerable, or will be placed in a vulnerable position in relation to research, and may succumb to pressure; for example children or people with learning disability, or students when they are participating in research as students. Some participants will have diminished capacity to give consent and are therefore less able to protect themselves and require specific consideration (see further guidance given on the RPDD web pages regarding informed consent). The Research Ethics Committee (REC) recognizes that it is not only research with human participants that raises relevant ethical concerns. Researchers may be assessing sensitive information, the publication or analysis of which may have direct impact on agencies, communities or individuals. For example, collection and use of archive, historical, legal, online or visual materials may raise ethical issues (e.g for families and friends of people deceased), and research on provision of social or human services may impact user provision. Similarly, use of other people's primary data may need clearance or raise concerns about its interpretation. The Research Ethics Committee will assess whether the relevant questions have been adequately addressed when it scrutinises proposals. Please ensure that each answer provides the Committee with enough information to make an informed decision on the ethical dimensions of the proposal.

The LSE Research Ethics Policy and guidance will be reviewed annually and may be subject to further development.

I. Project Details

Project Title: EU Kids Online II: Enhancing knowledge regarding European children's use, risk and safety online
--

II. Applicant Details

Name:	Sonia Livingstone
Status (delete as applicable)	Professor, Department of Media and Communications
Email address:	s.livingstone@lse.ac.uk
Room number/contact address:	S105/ 7710



III. Research Aims

Please provide *brief* details of the research aims and the scientific background of the research. A full copy of the proposal should be attached to this document.

During 2008, the European Commission's 2005-8 Safer Internet Plus Programme called for "knowledge enhancement projects that aim to increase the knowledge relevant to the issue of safer online technologies", specifically to strengthen the knowledge base by conducting "a comparable quantitative study of children's use of online technologies, with a mapping of parents' views of their children's use of online technologies". See http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/index_en.htm

The London School of Economics and Political Science, as Coordinator of the multinational EU Kids Online network (see www.eukidsonline.net), has been awarded a contract for this work from 1/7/2009 to 30/6/2011. The aim is to enhance the knowledge base for children's and parents' experiences and practices in relation to risky and safer use of the internet and new online technologies in Europe, in order to inform the promotion of a safer online environment for children.

The objectives are as follows:

- To design a thorough and robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying the nature of children's online access, use, risk, coping and safety awareness.
- To design a thorough and robust survey instrument appropriate for identifying the nature of parental experiences, practices and concerns regarding their children's internet use.
- To administer the survey in a reliable and ethically-sensitive manner to national samples of internet users aged 9-16, and their parents, in member states.
- To analyse the results systematically so as to identify both core findings and more complex patterns among findings on a national and comparative basis.
- To disseminate the findings in a timely manner to a wide range of relevant stakeholders nationally, across Europe, and internationally.
- To identify and disseminate key recommendations relevant to the development of safety awareness initiatives in Europe.
- To identify any remaining knowledge gaps and methodological lessons learned, to inform future projects regarding the promotion of safer use of the internet and new online technologies.
- To benefit from, sustain the visibility of, and further enhance the knowledge generated by, the EU Kids Online network.

These objectives will be achieved through the design and conduct of a comparable quantitative survey of children's use of online technologies across member states, together with a survey of parents' experiences, practices and concerns regarding their children's online risk and safety. The survey questionnaires will be conducted in home, face to face, with one parent and then the selected child.

Pilot research and cognitive testing with children will inform the design of the survey questionnaire, as will the detailed literature review conducted by the Safer Internet programme's previous grant to the EU Kids Online network (2006-9). The network comprises experienced social researchers in 25 countries - member states, EEA and candidate countries that vary in geography (north/south, urban/rural), wealth, culture (language, religion), position in Europe (EU15, recent entrants from Eastern Europe) and internet history and penetration. 1000 children will be interviewed in each country, drawn using a random stratified sampling procedure (see the attached statement from Ipsos Mori on detailed sampling procedures).

The countries included are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom and, on a self-paying basis, Finland. In each country, the research teams are paired with the national node for the EC's Insafe network of awareness-raisers, educators and policy/government stakeholders, to ensure the evidence is used to inform policy (see www.saferinternet.org). These nodes are also producing the safety information to be left with each child during fieldwork.

As is the norm for a multi-country study, ethics approval is sought by the Coordinator at the LSE for the whole study, rather than seeking approval from each participating member of the consortium. This was specified in the Description of Work which forms the technical annex to the contract between LSE and the EC; it also serves as an annex to the Network Members' Agreement, signed by each institutional (university or research institute) member of the network and countersigned by LSE. Additionally, the contracted fieldwork company, Ipsos Mori, is bound by the ethical requirements of its professional market research association, ESOMAR, see <http://www.esomar.org/index.php/codes-guidelines.html>.

In all that follows, everything will take place in the national (official) language(s) of the country concerned. Thus there will be careful translation into all languages of the interviewer protocols, the letter of project introduction, the parent and child survey questionnaires, the information leaflet and the final posting of accessible findings on the project website. The EU Kids Online national teams will check translations provided by Ipsos Mori. The survey questionnaires will be both translated and back translated, according to international procedures and standards governing such survey translation processes.

1. Informed consent.

1.1 Will potential participants be asked to give informed consent in writing and will they be asked to confirm that they have received and read the information about the study? If not, why not?

The fieldwork will be conducted by Ipsos MORI - a highly reputable market research (polling) organisation appointed following a European tender process. A requirement for the award of the contract was that data collection will be conducted in a timely, efficient, rigorous and ethically sensitive manner by interviewers trained to deal with children, so as to ensure high quality results that will command widespread respect. Accordingly, informed consent and confirmation of receipt of information about the study will be a requirement for participation.

The survey will be conducted face-to-face in the child's home, as this permits optimal sampling of individual children, the convenience of obtaining parental permission, a parent interview and a child interview, and best ensures a reliable and valid interview with the child. Consent from both parents and children will be a prerequisite of both the main fieldwork and also the prior phases of cognitive and pilot testing.

The process of gaining consent

- Ipsos Mori fieldwork interviewers will present written information about the project to participating parents (where 'parent' refers to a person legally responsible for the child, and so could be the step-parent, foster-parent).
- This letter will explain the funding and purposes of the project, the nature of the interview, the value of the project to policy makers seeking to improve internet safety for children, and contact details for the national fieldwork organisation (contracted to Ipsos Mori), the national EU Kids Online network representative, and the project director (Sonia Livingstone for EU Kids Online at LSE).
- Those parents who agree to participate in the survey will be asked to sign a written consent form stating the purpose and nature of the project (see Annex 2), this giving informed consent to their own interview and consent to us approaching the child to invite their participation in the child interview.
- The child will also be asked to give informed consent to the child for their own interview. Ipsos Mori's experience leads them to recommend that the child is asked to confirm their consent verbally rather than in writing. Asking children to sign a formal document is not necessarily conducive to engaging participation and putting them at ease for the interview. Instead, the interviewer is asked to sign to confirm that they have obtained informed consent verbally (see Annex 2).
- Both parent and child will be clearly informed that they may leave any question unanswered and they may stop the interview at any point. The interviewers are trained to provide a calm and confidential context within which children can express hesitation and be reassured or permitted to withdraw as appropriate.
- The consent process includes introductory wording tailored for parents and for children of different ages; however, interviewers will also be instructed to tailor their approach for each respondent and work to ensure that each respondent understands the nature of research in their own terms.
- Anonymity and confidentiality of responses is guaranteed to both parents and children, with one exception.

As shown in Annex 2, the small but possible risk that the child reports that they are being harmed in some way will be handled as an explicit condition limiting the promise of confidentiality.

- If either parent or child denies consent, the interview will not take place. The interviewer will not enter a home without a parent present and without express parental permission.

1.2. How has the study been discussed or are there plans to discuss the study with those likely to be involved, including potential participants or those who may represent their views?

The study has been extensively discussed by those who represent the views and experiences of children in relation to the internet. This includes meetings of the EU Kids Online network and with the EC's Safer Internet Programme. It has been designed partly in response to a series of focus groups the EC Safer Internet Programme held with children (aged 9-10 and 12-14) during 2007. INSAFE (on the advisory panel, below) maintains a Youth Panel which also advises the Safer Internet Programme, including EU Kids Online.

EU Kids Online's International Advisory Panel has been fully involved at all stages from the initial proposal draft to the design of the survey and thereafter. Its purpose is to ensure that the project benefits from the best research practice internationally and that its findings can be of maximum benefit to children. Its members are:

- Will Gardner, of Childnet International, the leading UK child welfare charity focused on internet-related risk and safety issues;
- Professors David Finkelhor and Janis Wolak, of the Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire, USA – they conduct the leading American surveys examining internet-related risks to children;
- Dr Ellen Helsper, formerly of the Oxford Internet Institute, now at the Department of Media and Communications, LSE, experienced in the World Internet Project;
- Amanda Lenhart, Senior Research Specialist in teens and social networking at the Pew Internet & American Life Project;
- Annie Mullins, Corporate Social Responsibility, Vodafone;
- Janice Richardson, director of INSAFE, the network of safety awareness-raising nodes for the Safer Internet Programme, EC;
- Dieter Carstensen, Save the Children Denmark, and director of ENASCO, the European network of child welfare NGOs in relation to internet safety;
- Agnieszka Wrzesień, of the Nobody's Children Foundation, Poland;
- Maria José Cantarino, Corporate Social Responsibility, Telefonica;
- Professor Eileen Munro, Professor of Social Policy, LSE, expert in risk assessment and management in child protection and welfare.

Now that the survey questionnaire is finalised and the sampling procedures and processes of administration are determined, the development of the questionnaire will undergo cognitive testing with parents and children from a range of ages across all of those countries involved in the survey. This will explore question wording, responses, themes and the process of the interview including interpretations of the consent form. Furthermore the fieldwork will undergo a piloting phase which will assess the success of the recruitment process and methods for conducting the questionnaire.

1.3. Has information (written and oral) about the study been prepared in an appropriate form and language for potential participants? (see Informed Consent guidance which lists questions to be considered). At what point in the study will this information be offered?

As noted in section 1.3, information about the study has been prepared in an appropriate form and language for potential participants. Information about the study will be provided orally and in written form as a letter to the parent when the fieldwork interviewer from Ipsos Mori first visits the home to invite participation in the study.

If the parent wishes for more time to decide or if the timing is inconvenient for an interview, the interviewer will leave a copy of the information letter with them and re-visit them on another day.

The letter will contain both LSE and Ipsos branding, plus contact details of the local fieldwork agency and the local EU Kids Online network representative. It will also (as noted below) contain a url and date by which an accessible summary of the findings will be posted.

An explanation of the nature and purposes of the study will be given orally to the child by the fieldworker. The child will be left also with an information leaflet on useful child-friendly sources of help and guidance on matters concerning online risk and safety.

As noted earlier, everything will take place in the national (official) language(s) of the country concerned. Thus there will be careful translation into all languages of the interviewer protocols, the letter of project introduction, the parent and child survey questionnaires, the information leaflet and the final posting of accessible findings on the project website.

1.4 How will potential participants be informed of whether there will be adverse consequences of a decision not to participate? Or of a decision to withdraw during the course of the study?

There are no adverse consequences of participating in the study. It is purely voluntary, there is no incentive payment, and the survey is entirely anonymous.

At the point when the researcher first visits, potential participants will be advised that there will be no adverse consequences if they decide not to participate and they can withdraw at any point, or choose not to answer specific questions. Interviewers will be sensitive to the child's mood or possible hesitation, and will remind the child of their right to omit a question or to withdraw if appropriate.

1.5 What provision has been made to respond to queries and problems raised by participants during the course of the study?

During the interview, the fieldwork interviewer will be the main point of contact for any explanation needed or to address any concerns regarding the study. The letter of introduction, to be left with parents, will provide clear contact details of national (and Coordinating) team of EU Kids Online II, plus contact details for the national fieldwork agency (contracted by Ipsos Mori).

At the end of the interview, the child's attention will be carefully drawn to further sources of information (in the form of a child-friendly leaflet containing advice, contact information to national agencies and the national child helpline for confidential advice).

The child will also be urged to discuss with a parent or trusted adult any concerns they have regarding things that may have or could happen in relation to the internet (see end of Child Survey, attached to this application).

As explained below, interviewers are carefully trained, will be briefed on the particularities of this project, and are supervised closely by the approved national fieldwork agency contracted to Ipsos Mori. They remain in close contact with their supervisors and are required to report any problems to their supervisor.

In turn, the national fieldwork agency remains in close contact with the coordinating agency, Ipsos Mori in Belgium. Ipsos Mori has appointed one key contact, Rosario Spadaro, to remain in weekly contact with the LSE coordinating

team (see Ipsos Mori's proposal regarding fieldwork processes, attached to this application, for details of line management and team coordination both within the Ipsos Mori network across Europe and for their communication with LSE.).

It is anticipated that most if not all ethical issues (regarding sensitive questions or survey administration) will be resolved during the cognitive testing and piloting phases of the research process. However, Ipsos Mori and LSE (Sonia Livingstone) will remain in close contact throughout fieldwork, with weekly reporting and discussion planned and more frequent or immediate communication possible if needed.

2. Research methodology.

2.1. How does the research methodology justify the use deception?

Not applicable

2.2. If the proposed research involves the deception of persons in vulnerable groups, can the information sought be obtained by other means?

Not applicable

2.3. How will data be collected during the project? Please provide details of data analysis.

The data to be collected is largely quantitative survey responses from parents (plus one or two open ended questions addressed to children). CAPI interview data is uploaded daily by fieldworkers to a national data base. PAPI interview data is entered by the fieldworkers manually into the database. National fieldwork agencies will upload the national data sets using a secure password-protected intranet, especially built for this project, to a single multinational data set held by the Brussels coordinator (Ipsos Mori) shared with LSE. This means that weekly reports on progress (and any problems) with data collection and fieldwork are shared with LSE and we are alerted early to any issues.

As explained in the original research proposal (see the Description of Work attached to this application), it was decided that in home face to face interviews with children, in the comfort and privacy of their own home, offered the best chance of obtaining reliable and valid information on sensitive issues.

Thus, data will be collected by face-to-face interviews conducted in home with parents and children in each of the countries participating in the project.

The project will be explained in turn to the parent and the child, and informed consent will be obtained from the child and young person and the parent for their own interviews.

Interviewers will be fully trained to ensure that consent is fully informed, in line with ESOMAR guidelines and the core principles contained in LSE informed consent guidance.

Interviews will last, on average, 10 minutes for the parent and 30 minutes for the child.

Every effort will be made to ensure respondents are at ease in their domestic setting and the interviewer will be at pains to create a comfortable situation in which questions can be asked, explained and/or refused without awkwardness.

Interviews will be administered via CAPI where possible, and by PAPI otherwise, with the highest priority given to collection of high quality data in an ethical and sensitive manner. Specifying these requirements was central to the public call for tender issued in spring 2009. As a result of this process, Ipsos Mori was appointed to conduct the fieldwork in all 25 countries.

This process of selecting and approving Ipsos Mori is detailed below for it is important: though LSE is the coordinator of the project, the fieldwork is entirely contracted out to Ipsos Mori. Hence the quality control process adopted by LSE to make this contract, and the expertise of Ipsos Mori themselves is noted below. A full record of the tender process is maintained by Margaret Newson, purchasing manager at LSE and will be reported to the European Commission. A

lengthy document detailing the curriculum vitae of Ipsos Mori staff working on the project, plus their prior experience in this field, was submitted to LSE as part of the tender process. Both documents are available to the REC on request.

The group evaluating the public tender process which appointed Ipsos Mori ensured ethical considerations were a key criterion in awarding the contract. Those on the evaluation panel were:

- Professor George Gaskell, Deputy Director and Academic Governor, LSE;
- Professor Uwe Hasebrink, Hans Bredow Institute For Media Research, Hamburg;
- Dr Cristina Ponte, New University of Lisbon, Portugal;
- Dr Bojana Lobe, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia;
- Dr Brian O'Neill, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland;
- Margaret Newson, Finance Department, LSE;
- Bhimla Dheerjee, Research and Project Development Division, LSE
- Professor Sonia Livingstone, Project Director for EU Kids Online, LSE;
- Dr Leslie Haddon, Senior Research Fellow, EU Kids Online, LSE.

Ipsos MORI, successful winners of the tender, has a long and established tradition of social and government research. They have a large team of around 200 experienced, specialist researchers in our Social Research Institute. Ipsos MORI works extensively for both central and local government, conducting more research for this sector than any other UK company. This, together with their national reputation among the public from our work as opinion pollsters, means that they have additional credibility among a wide range of audiences. The UK based team from this project is drawn from our specialist children and families research team.

They have considerable expertise in delivering large-scale random probability government surveys for numerous government departments – including Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), Home Office, Department for Communities and Local Government, Department for Trade and Industry, Department for Work and Pensions, Scottish Executive and the Welsh Assembly as well as for Agencies such as the Commission for Racial Equality and Child Support Agency. Projects for DCSF involving similar surveys with children and/or parents include the Longitudinal Survey of Young People in England; evaluation of Play Pathfinders, the Extended Schools Survey, the evaluation of Find Your Talent. Much of their work has included researching those living in deprived communities and those who are perceived as 'hard-to-reach' – experience which is key for enabling us to minimise non-response bias and reach groups that are key for policy.

They also have a strong track record in delivering large scale surveys to target, time and to budget and their approach is supported by the work of the Quantitative Research Methods Unit, chaired by Patten Smith, which not only supports best practice internally, but contributes new methodological thinking of value industry wide regarding best practise approaches to survey. Furthermore, IPSOS MORI has large experience in the coordination of international surveys. Below, we offer examples of international research they have conducted in connection with children/parents, family, young people and also use of internet.

- Particularly pertinent to the current research, the following surveys were carried out within the framework of the Eurobarometer (15 Member States). Eurobarometer surveys were conducted by IPSOS (previously INRA) among the population aged 15+; n=1.000 face-to-face interviews (except Germany: 2000, Luxembourg: 600, United Kingdom 1300 including 300 in Northern Ireland).
- 'Illegal and harmful content on the Internet' (Eurobarometer 60.2) : This Eurobarometer 60.2 focused on the following: places locations where child uses the Internet, setting rules for child on the use of various entertainment applications, rules guidelines set for children on the use of Internet, the need for information on protecting child from illegal and harmful content and contact on the Internet, awareness of amongst children on what to do in case ain the event a situation on the Internet make him or her feel uncomfortable, preferred sources and format of information on the safe use of the Internet, preferred information format on safe use of the Internet, and awareness of where to report illegal or harmful content on the Internet.
- 'Youth and drugs: TO YOUNG PEOPLE aged 15-24 only' (Eurobarometer 57.2): This Eurobarometer 57.2 focused on: main reasons for experiencing experimenting with drugs, main reasons to find it hard to stop using drugs, barriers to giving up drug use, Consequences of drugs using drugs, most effective ways of tackling drug-related problems, how information is obtained on drugs, obtaining information about drugs;, personal situation in relation to drugs, dangerousness of drugs, whether respondent personally takes drugs

and perceived dangers of drug use.

- 'Internet usage' (Eurobarometer 56.2): This Eurobarometer 56.2 focused on the use of Internet and the periodicity of internet usage and frequency of usage.
- 'Young Citizens: TO YOUNG PEOPLE aged 15-24 only' (Eurobarometer 55.1): This Eurobarometer 55.1 focused on: reasons why young people live longer in their parent's home, leisure time activities, source of money and use of ICT equipment.

In terms of data analysis, the EU Kids Online network, coordinated by LSE, bears sole responsibility for analysing and disseminating the findings. LSE has appointed a postdoctoral survey research officer, from January 2010 to June 2011 (the official end of the project) to implement the analysis, as led by Sonia Livingstone and Leslie Haddon and as advised by a team of survey experts within the network (and its international advisors).

The initial reporting of top line findings is timed for the EC's major meeting of stakeholders in Luxembourg at the Safer Internet Forum in October 2009. Thereafter, a series of reports, focusing on pan European similarities and differences, is planned as specified in the Description of Work (attached to this application). The purpose is to balance academic and policy ambitions by maximising the value of this unique and large data set in as timely a manner as possible. This means prioritising policy and public dissemination in the short term and academic publication in the longer term.

Three months after the final report (June 2011), the full data set will be deposited in a public archive (in October 2011) to ensure maximum exploitation of the data set in the future. The project is intended not only to report on the state of European children's internet risk and safety experiences in 2010-11 but also to establish a benchmark against which future trends can be measured.

2.4. How have ethical concerns arising from data collection been addressed?

The project participants and advisors have compared research practice across a series of recent projects focused on asking children about risk and safety matters on the internet.

Our approach is set out in detail in section 3.1 below. Our intention is to draw on the best practice available in relation to three research challenges – working with children, working in multiple countries and languages, and addressing sensitive matters of risky experience.

These have been a core focus of the early network discussions which shaped the research proposal, a central theme in the project's kick off meeting (in a discussion led by Professor Eileen Munro, LSE, advisor to the project, along with Dr Janis Wolak, who conducts the leading American surveys on internet risk to children. Since then, in addition to lively electronic communication within the network, the network has met in full, with its advisors and with Ipsos Mori, in a workshop in Hamburg in October 2009, at which survey sampling, design, administration, sensitive questions and research ethics were all central topics. The advisors to the project are all active, expert and constructive.

The EC's Safer Internet Programme also takes a close interest in the progress and design of the project and Sonia Livingstone visits them in Luxembourg regularly and remains in frequent contact with the Project Officer.

3. Research design.

3.1 What concerns have been taken into account with regard to the design of the research project? If agencies, communities or individuals are directly affected by the research (e.g. participants, service users, vulnerable communities or relations), what means have you devised to ensure that any harm or distress is minimized and/or that the research is sensitive to the particular needs and perspectives of those so affected?

Research importance

We note first, that at present there is no comparable, reliable data on children's experience of online risks in Europe. Indeed, there is no survey of children's use of the internet in Europe that asks questions of any kind. At present, the research and policy community is guided by existing surveys conducted in America, by pan-European surveys of parents who then report on (their perceptions of) their child's internet use, and by piecemeal surveys conducted with

children that ask similar but not identical questions in different ways and to different samples in some countries only.

Hence, we address the ethical issues that arise in asking children about online risk in a wider context in which robust evidence is almost wholly lacking, and in which a sizeable policy community of multi sector stakeholders, is developing educational, industry, awareness raising and other initiatives which sorely need an evidence base to guide them.

Survey design

The survey questionnaires (attached to this proposal) will ask a range of questions of children and parents, a central aim being to develop a realistic assessment of the risks (range, severity, responses) experienced by children online. A further aim is to identify the subset of children who are in some sense vulnerable –whether in their lives generally and/or in their experiences of the internet in particular.

The areas covered in the children’s interview that relate to sensitive areas are:

- Range of activities engaged in online/varieties of sites and services used;
- The child’s experience of a wide range of specific risks;
- The nature, severity and consequences of specific risks experienced, including child’s risk responses and/or coping;
- Possible mediators of risk (for example, measures of self-esteem, skills, vulnerability).

The areas covered in the parent’s interview that relate to sensitive areas will be:

- Their child’s experience of a wide range of specific risks;
- Parental regulation strategies (social, technical) in relation to perceived online risks experienced by children.

A crucial part of the project design is to ask matched questions of children and parents (particularly regarding assessment of risk and nature of parental mediation). This will permit interesting forms of analysis comparing parents and children who see things similarly or differently. It will also provide a much needed check on the widespread use of parents to report on their children’s experience.

The purpose of the measures of child vulnerability (mainly here relying on the internationally used SDQ) is to permit the study to go beyond standard demographic measures of risk. It is expected that, for a range of online experiences, most children are sufficiently resilient to encounter risk with no distress. It is also expected that the minority of children who do encounter distressing content or contact on the internet, their identification will be better pinpointed with a subtle combination of social and psychological vulnerability factors rather than a simple demographic characterisation. This, however, remains to be discovered.

It is also an important part of the research that we identify the incidence of online risk in relation to possible risks encountered elsewhere (through other media or face to face experiences), the purpose being to enable a proportionate response to online risk in the future by putting online risk in the context of other risky experiences.

Last, the project team are committed to identifying ways in which children may be resilient, to cope well, or to support each other in addressing online risk. A series of questions will permit findings on these possibilities insofar as they do exist, thus enriching public and policy discussions which are, at times, too simplistic in portraying all children as naïve or vulnerable.

Interviewer training

Ipsos Mori is a member of ESOMAR and all local agencies also work within national industry ethical and legal codes. All fieldwork will be conducted in line with stipulated ethical guidelines for conducting research with children and young people, as well as those specified by the LSE Research Committee.

All fieldworkers will be experienced interviewers, including specific experience with conducting interviews with children. They will receive a project-dedicated briefing, overseen by national members of the EU Kids Online network, regarding specific issues for this project. CRB checks or equivalent (in line with local procedures, such as police certificates of character and documents stating no criminal convictions in the past) will be required of all fieldworkers (see also Ipsos Mori’s agreed proposal to LSE for details of interviewer training and experience with children, attached

to this proposal).

Before the interview takes place, respondents will be notified of their right to withhold answers to particular questions or stop the interview at any point with no adverse consequences. This will also be reiterated at key stages during the interview process. Confidentiality/anonymity will be guaranteed where there is not a disclosure of risk of harm.

To reassure both parents and children that it is safe for an adult interviewer to interview the child, the interview itself the survey is administered in the child's home with the parents in the vicinity, whilst care will also be taken to avoid physical contact with children.

Sensitive questions

The flow of questions and use of gateway questions will aim to ensure that the interview does not introduce the child for the first time to ideas or material that may be ethically problematic. Specifically, questions which ask about 'risky' behaviour will have introductory wordings where appropriate to forewarn of the nature of the next questions and to clarify that the research does not condone such behaviour but that we are not passing any judgement on their response.

All questions will undergo thorough cognitive testing in each country – this means that while the survey is planned to take 30 minutes on average, in cognitive testing fieldworkers will take up to two hours per child in order to clarify misunderstandings, understand any hesitations, and so identify any problems. Only after this has been completed in all languages/countries will the survey questionnaire be finalised. The network is, during November, constructing a table of sensitive terminology by language to guide the translators and fieldworkers).

Further, to minimise distress, some questions will only be asked of children aged 11-16 and not those aged 9-10. If required, more questions will be restricted to the older age groups only, as revealed by pilot testing.

In some countries the survey will be administered via CAPI and CASI (Computer Assisted Personal Interview and Computer Assisted Self interview) whilst in other countries the interview will be completed on paper (by interviewer and respondent). The interviewer will ask many questions in person, but participants will be asked to complete the most sensitive questions (identifying their own risky behaviour) in a self-completion format and thus will not be asked to disclose this information to the interviewer. This will help reassure the respondent of confidentiality and anonymity thereby encouraging honest answers.

The CASI approach will involve the interviewer handing the computer to the respondent, explaining what they need to do and then allowing them to complete the section. The self completion script will be user friendly, using formats tried and tested with children and parents. It will start with a practice question. Answers will be stored electronically so that it is clear to the respondent that they do not see their answers afterwards. The paper self-completion approach will be similar, except that the respondent will be provided with a paper form, and an envelope into which they will put their completed form to help reassure of confidentiality and that the interviewer won't see the answers. The interviewer will be on hand to answer queries if the respondent gets stuck at any point.

Since the survey will collect data from parents and children, it is important to ensure confidentiality within as well as beyond the family. Hence, it is important that, as far as possible, the parent does not oversee the child's answers to sensitive questions. Such privacy may be achieved by asking the parent to leave the room, by occupying the parent in conversation while the child completes a self-completion portion of the questionnaire (written or on the computer) for sensitive items, or by requesting the child to complete the self-completion portion and return to the interviewer in a sealed envelope (or closing that section of a computer-assisted interview). The interview will note if the parent (or other household members) are present or intrusive.

We will encourage parents to be absent from the room, but on hand near by during interviews, but the comfort and wellbeing of children and parents will be paramount, and we will be flexible on this. If the parent does remain present we will ask them to keep as low a profile as possible, and refrain from prompting the child or inputting into the survey responses in any way.

Where there is a disclosure of a child being at a risk of serious harm that 'no reasonable person could ignore' steps will be undertaken – considered on a case by case basis - by the research team to follow local procedures, laws and contact national agencies.

After the interview

The interviewer will thank the respondent and reassure/clarify once again about confidentiality, but also the value of the study in helping policies to improve children's safety on the internet.

The interviewer will also explain to the child that if they have experienced anything that has upset or worried them on the internet that they should talk to a parent or other trusted adult so that they can help.

All respondents, parents and children, will be provided with information about online risk and safety, including local help lines (or other appropriate provision for children identified through the conduct of the survey as in some way 'at risk'), whereby the respondent can access private, confidential help and advice.

If a child is considered possibly at risk

Given the important non-interventionist principles of social research, intervention will only be triggered on the basis of relatively serious harm being identified. In general we will work according to the broad principle that this is "something any reasonable person could not ignore". Importantly we will follow national laws regarding the types/levels of harm that should be acted upon.

Below we have summarised our approach to responding to (potential) harm if identified (i) from survey questions and (ii) during the wider fieldwork process.

(i) Action that will be taken if a participant's response to a survey question indicates that they may be potentially at risk from harm.

- Some questions on experience of risks are included in the questionnaire. However, they ask about exposure to risks in the past and do not directly identify current issues, although they may indicate the possibility of current potential risk.
- Questions on risk will be asked within self completion modules and as such interviewers will not know the child's responses. We will therefore take a universal approach to responding to possible risk for all children. The interviewer will explain to all children interviewed that if they have they have experienced harm, they should tell a trusted adult,
- The interviewer will leave with the child a leaflet with helpline numbers and 'top-tips' to safety. These leaflets are being developed for the project by the national Insafe nodes of the EC's Safer Internet Programme, with input also from Child Helpline International (see www.childhelplineinternational.org). The leaflet (attached to this application) will provide safety tips, contact information (phone, email, url) for the national Insafe node (the national child/internet safety organisation) and the main national child helpline (members of the Child Helpline International Organisation).
- In addition, fieldwork agencies will abide by local laws regarding actions required to protect children.

(ii) Action that will be taken if a participant makes a disclosure to the interviewer outside their response to a survey question and/or the interviewer witnesses something in the household suggesting that a child is at risk.

- If the interviewer becomes aware of risk of harm to a child that no reasonable person could ignore, or that requires action within national laws, appropriate action will be taken.
- Given that disclosure of harm in this scenario is outside the main interview questions, this approach does not conflict with guarantees of respondent confidentiality with regards to survey responses.
- The interviewer will report the "incident" to the project manager/field supervisor. Action will be taken by the Institute, according to national law. Where institutes are not competent to make a decision of this kind, a legal person will be consulted before action is decided upon.
- In such cases, the interviewer will also tell the child that they are concerned and talk to them about the action that they will be taking. It will be preferable to gather the child's consent, although in cases of serious cause for concern there are exemptions (in some countries) where it appropriate to act with out this.
- As mentioned above, the interviewer will also encourage the child to talk to a trusted adult (if they have not already done so) and provide them with the leaflet of top tips/help line support services.

3.2. How has the methodology addressed how sensitive information, data or sources will be handled?

Data from the parent will not be revealed to the child. Data from the child will not be revealed to the parent. The sensitive portion of the questionnaire to the child, which is to be asked using self-completion methods (if a CAPI interview, the screen is turned to the child only; if a PAPI interview, the child completes a paper and pen questionnaire and places it themselves in a sealed envelope to give to the interviewer) is kept confidential to the child (ie neither parent nor fieldwork knows of their responses).

The participants themselves will be advised during the introductory stages that data will be held securely and kept confidential, and that the final data will stored, analysed and reported in a completely anonymised format. The contact details of respondents will be kept linked to the survey data for just a very short time after the interview, to enable some quality control call backs (15% of parent respondents are recontacted by telephone to check the conduct and content of the interview, for purposes of quality control). However, after this process, all personal identifiers will be removed and deleted on finalisation of the complete data set. The details of each interview case will be fully anonymised so that anyone analysing that database will not be able to trace the participants.

All data will be held securely in line with data protection legislation and professional industry in each country. Appropriate mechanisms for ensuring secure transfer of data between local agencies and the co-ordination centre and in turn with the LSE will also be in place.

The data set to be delivered to LSE (EU Kids Online) will therefore be wholly anonymised. The quantitative data could not be traced back to any individual. The inclusion of open-ended questions is currently subject to timing (i.e. the length of the questionnaire overall) but should this be included still in the final version, all text will be checked by the national EU Kids Online members so that any identifying information is removed. Only the wholly anonymised version of the data set will be retained.

3.3. Have you been able to devise a timetable of research?

The project timetable as planned is set out in the Description of Work (attached) on p.30.

The timetable that follows provides a more detailed breakdown of fieldwork tasks to be completed by Ipsos Mori.

Since the cognitive testing phase, designed to ensure the questionnaire is thoroughly understood by children, was added during contract negotiations with Ipsos Mori, the cognitive testing begins earlier than initially planned, and the main fieldwork phase begins later than initially planned.

Overall, the timetable is very tight, but the 'real' deadline is to report key findings at the EC's Safer Internet Forum in October 2010, an event which all stakeholders across Europe and beyond attend each year.

Milestones	Sub-tasks	Number of weeks	Start date	End date
Contract start date				4th week of September
Set-up meeting with LSE project team in London				29th September
Finalisation of the questionnaire and sampling schemes		3 weeks	1st October	22nd October
	Meeting in Hamburg		16th October	18th October
	LSE send out new draft of questionnaire			20th October
	Input from Ipsos sent to LSE			22nd October
	Final questionnaire			23rd October
	LSE communicate questions that need testing			23rd October
Cognitive testing including feedback from LSE and questionnaire finalisation		13 weeks	23rd October	22nd Jan 2010
	Design of interview guide for cognitive testing		23rd October	29th October
	Feedback from LSE on cognitive testing guide			4th November
	Final cognitive testing guide			6th November
	Briefing of interviewers			6th November
	Recruitment in the UK		28th October	6th November
	Fieldwork cognitive testing phase 1		7th November	16th November
	Analysis and reporting		17th November	23rd November
	Report sent to LSE			23rd November
	Feedback from LSE			27th November
	New version of questionnaire after 1st phase of cognitive testing		27th November	4th December
	Translation of questionnaire		4th December	18th December
	Recruitment in 23 countries		4th Jan 2010	7th Jan 2010
	Briefing of interviewers		4th Jan 2010	7th Jan 2010
	Fieldwork cognitive testing phase 2		8th January	13th January
	Analysis and reporting		14th January	21st January
	Report sent to LSE			21st January
	Feedback from LSE			25th January
	New version of questionnaire after 2nd phase of cognitive testing		26th January	28th January
CAPI Scripting		1.5 weeks	29th January	5th February
Pilot testing		3 weeks	5th February	1st March
	Briefing of interviewers			5th February
	Fieldwork pilot testing		6th February	22nd February
	Pilot report		23rd February	1st March
	Pilot report sent to LSE			1st March
	Feedback from LSE on the pilot			8th March
Finalisation of the national questionnaires		2 weeks	9th March	18th March
	Amendments to national questionnaires		9th March	15th March

4. Ethical questions arising from financial support/the provision of incentives

4.1 Are there any real or perceived conflicts of interest which could compromise the integrity and/or independence of the research due to the nature of the funding body?

No, none

4.2 Have any incentives to the investigator been declared?

No, none apply



4.3 Are there any restrictions on the freedom of the investigator(s) to publish the results of the research?

No, none

4.4 Are any incentives being offered to participants?

No, none

5. Research Subjects

5.1 Who do you identify as the participants in the project? Are other people who are not participants likely to be directly impacted by the project?

The participants will be children aged 9-16 who use the internet and one of their parents. Other people who are not participants are not likely to be impacted by the project.

The decision to define the sample of children as those from 9 to 16 years old has been carefully taken. Ever younger children are now accessing the internet – across the EU27, 75% of 6-17 year olds now uses the internet, this including 60% of 6-10 year olds.

Almost nothing is known of young children's use, so it would be preferable to start with qualitative rather than quantitative research methods for younger children. In a previous project, Children and their Changing Media Environment, a 12 nation comparison conducted by Sonia Livingstone a decade ago, the youngest children surveyed were 9 years old. This proved satisfactory in terms of the collection of reliable and valid data, though questions were carefully pretested in terms of their comprehensibility and the appropriateness of response options provided.

Other researchers' experience in this field concurs that interviews with those as young as nine are feasible (for example, the SAFT - Safety Awareness Facts and Tools - project funded by the EC Safer Internet Programme as the precursor of the present survey).

5.2 What arrangements have been made to preserve confidentiality for the participants or those potentially affected?

This has been addressed in detail in sections 3.1 and 3.2 above.

Confidentiality and anonymity will be guaranteed for participants in the survey, only limited in cases where a young person makes a disclosure of risk or harm (see above and below). Participants' names will not be recorded so it will not be possible to link responses to individual children.

It may be that the questions will uncover a child possibly at risk. Such an eventuality must be anticipated when briefing the interviewers and when obtaining informed consent from respondents. While generally confidentiality will be preserved, in such cases specific actions appropriate to the circumstances would then be taken in line with the relevant child protection policy of the country. The interviewers will be instructed to bring such situations to the attention of their supervisor at the national fieldwork organisation who will then review the nature of the risks and options. If the latter determines the risk is real, the appropriate agencies will be contacted.

The level and nature of any such contacts will be included in the full field work report to be submitted as part of its work by Ipsos Mori to LSE.

5.3. What are the specific risks to research participants or third parties?

We identify four possible risks, and have addressed these in the foregoing:

- The risk that the child will be distressed by sensitive questions – addressed in 3.1.
- The risk that the parent will find out the answers given by the child - addressed in 3.1.
- The risk that others will find out answers given by the parent and the child – addressed in 3.1 and 3.2.
- The situation where the child is ‘at risk’ – addressed in 3.1 and 5.2.

5.4. If the research involves pain, stress, physical or emotional risk, please detail the steps taken to minimize such effects? Explain why this is reasonable within the context of the project?

Although we do not anticipate ‘unacceptable stress’, since we may uncover or occasion some stress, the following procedures will be in place.

The interviewer will ensure that the child is genuinely happy to take part and that the child is entirely clear they don’t have to answer any questions they don’t wish to answer and can end the interview at any time.

The interviewers will be trained to be very neutral and phrase questions in a way that make the children feel comfortable. They will reassure the child that the survey is informal, non-judgemental and that there are no right or wrong answers.

In their training organised by the national survey firm interviewers will be advised on the signs of any discomfort they should be aware of (e.g. in terms of body language) when dealing interviewing the children and on how to cope with any immediate distress shown by the child.

Interviewers’ experience and training

For a survey of this size, the quality of interviewing will be absolutely vital, and there is no substitute for interviewers who are thoroughly experienced with this kind of work. Ipsos MORI is one of the most experienced organisations when it comes to large scale social surveys, and we regard the experience of the field force used in each country to be as critical as that of the executive teams.

Each fieldwork institute member of the Ipsos MORI network is committed to allocate to this project experienced professional interviewers in opinion face to face interviewing, with a very minimum of six months experience. In most cases, interviewers are considerably more experienced, usually at least one year and often over 10 years experience. In addition, to general survey research experience, interviewers selected to conduct fieldwork will have particular skills in conducting public opinion research among children.

New interviewers are hired after having successfully passed a strict selection procedure:

- Analysis of the applicant’s curriculum vitae.
- Face to face discussion with the fieldwork manager about the applicant’s professional background, motivation and skills are carefully analysed.
- The interviewer’s skills are tested through a role play.

In addition to Ipsos MORI’s standard vigorous interviewer training, before an interviewer works on this project, they will have to go through intensive project-specific training via a thorough combination of both written and classroom based briefings, further details of which are outlined below.

Briefing of the interviewers

Ipsos MORI Coordination Centre will provide all national operators with detailed and uniform instructions for conducting fieldwork. The Coordination Centre will prepare these instructions, with the assistance of the Quality Control Committee.

In addition to these procedures, we will set up, for the attention of Project Managers in each country, a Training Book which will comprise all instructions regarding the survey and instructions on how to brief interviewers. In addition, individual project managers from each country will also receive an interactive telephone briefing. The aim of these

measures is to further ensure the uniformity of fieldforce training across all countries covered by the survey.

The briefing given to interviewers will cover the following main topics:

- Overall brief on EU Kids Online Survey:
 - o background
 - o purpose
 - o importance of the survey
 - o international dimension, ensuring the essential consistency of fieldwork across countries.
- Detailed description of the random route sampling procedures:
 - o Definition of the population to be sampled
 - o Concept of starting address, location on a map
 - o Focus on random-walk rules
 - o Child and parent selection: implementation of the ‘next birthday’ procedure
 - o Management of failed contacts: recall procedure (number and timing of visits), letter in mailbox when relevant, etc.
 - o Sampling follow-up: review of contact sheets and how to use them
 - o Explanation of over-sampling when relevant
 - o Contact sheet procedures.
- Full questionnaire review:
 - o Overall structure of the questionnaire
 - o Review of the various topics
 - o Explanation of complex questions, concepts or words
 - o Detailed presentation of questionnaire routine and specifics: filters, split samples, show cards, etc.
- Briefings on key aspects of approach relevant to interviewing children, including consent, ethics, child protection, and interviewing techniques
- Fieldwork management rules:
 - o Reminder of interviewing techniques: general behaviour and presentation, contact techniques to limit/avoid refusals and maximise the response rate, interview flow, techniques to maintain respondents’ attention, techniques for interviewing children and young people, etc.
 - o Handling of survey materials
 - o Survey schedule: fieldwork dates and hours
 - o Detailed and thorough reminders of the importance and procedures of reporting (requirements and how to meet them): mode and frequency of contacts with the survey supervisor or manager, interim returns of questionnaires and contact sheets, rules of replacement of interviews if quality controls reveal mistakes made, mode and date of debriefing at the end of fieldwork.
- Specific techniques to convert refusals and maximise the response rate
- Review of ESOMAR ethical rules
- A reminder of how the quality of their work will be supervised and managed, including back-checking procedures

In summary, in each country/territory, the following briefing methods will be used:

- Detailed briefings on paper as outlines above, detailing objectives, usage of show cards, specific backgrounds per topic (if deemed necessary), using examples of completed questionnaires (if deemed necessary). Interviewers will receive these written instructions in their Interviewing Pack.
- Local supervisors and interviewers attend face-to-face briefing sessions. These half-day or one-day sessions are organised centrally or at regional level. These briefing sessions end with role plays where interviewers work in pairs on the questionnaire.
- The country coordinator at the coordination centre will have a debriefing session over the phone with the project managers and fieldwork supervisors to clarify any problem/question raised during the interviews

briefing.

- Continuous availability of the field management team and supervisors for whenever questions arise. A dedicated phone line will be available to the interviewers.

6. Risk to researchers

6.1 Are there any risks to the researcher(s)? Please provide details if risk identified.

We do not foresee any risks for the interviewers. However, some cities/neighbourhoods are safer for male interviewers than for women. In some areas, there may be a concentration of ethnic minorities who could be less inclined to let someone from another community entering their homes.

In these cases, Ipsos Mori pays particular attention to allocating the right interviewer to the right area (e.g. try to match the ethnic origin of the interviewer to that of the surveyed area).

In addition, in the interviewers' briefing, all interviewers are reminded of elementary rules of behaviour such as neutrality, respect, politeness. All stay in close contact with their supervisor and with the national field work agency which monitors their quality of their work, including consideration of their personal safety.

7. Confidentiality

7.1 Explain the mechanisms in place to ensure confidentiality, privacy and data protection.

See 3.2

8. Dissemination

8.1 Will the results of the study be offered to those participants or other affected parties who wish to receive them? If so, what steps have been taken to minimize any discomfort or misrepresentation that may result at the dissemination level.

The project is designed to inform multiple stakeholders, including children and parents as well as educators, awareness raisers, child welfare workers, governments and industry.

The participants in the study will be offered access to the findings and resulting recommendations. Specifically, in the LSE letter introducing the project to each household, the name a url will be provided as well as the date by which we will post a family-friendly summary of the results (November 2010).

The leaflet to be left with all interviewees will include helpful safety information and further sources of information for them in their country.



Information letter to parents



April 2010

Dear Parent

EU Kids Online survey

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in our survey. At the London School of Economics we lead this important project for the European Commission's Safer Internet Programme.

We are working with university researchers in 25 different countries, plus international expert advisors who make sure that the results will be useful for initiatives to make the internet safer for children. These advisors include Save the Children, European Schoolnet, and a European network for safety awareness - raising (Insafe).

We have designed this survey for parents and children from all over Europe, and the findings will be important for advising schools, child welfare, youth workers and others who work to enable children to get the best out of the internet while minimising online risks.

For example, knowing what children do online can help teachers to devise cyberbullying programmes. It will also help governments in deciding whether parts of the internet should be better regulated. Youth workers and other professionals who work with children also need to know what to warn or advise children about. And our work will also provide guidance for parents, so they can learn ways to help and support their children when using the internet.

The survey also aims to get the risks faced by some children into perspective, by discovering the beneficial things children do on the internet and the great ways children are learning to use the internet sensibly and well. This is why our survey asks lots of questions – so that we can understand the different kinds of experiences that children of different ages and backgrounds may have in different countries.

Information about the researchers and advisors in each country is available on our website at www.eukidsonline.net. The findings will be reported by the European Commission on 21st October 2010 in Luxembourg. We will post the findings on our website on that date – please visit the website if you would like to know the results.

Again, many thanks for participating in this survey.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Sonia Livingstone'.

Professor Sonia Livingstone
Director, EU Kids Online project
Department of Media and Communications
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK
Telephone +44(0)2079557710 Email s.livingstone@lse.ac.uk

Parental consent letter

LOGO's – university and agency

Date

Dear Parent/Guardian

Research to help make the internet safe for children and young people

I am writing to ask for your help with an important study that is being conducted with children aged 9-16 who use the internet and their parents across <INSERT COUNTRY NAME> as well as in twenty three other countries across Europe. The Independent research organisations Ipsos and <INSERT FIELD AGENCY NAME> are carrying out this research on behalf of the London School of Economics, funded by the European Commission.

I would like to invite both you and your child to take part in an interview about your views and experiences of your child's use of the internet. Your household has been selected at random to take part in the research. The questionnaire will ask about your own experiences of the internet and your child's experiences – this will include discussions about how often your child uses the internet, where they go online, how they spend time on the internet, and their exposure to potentially harmful or inappropriate material and behaviour. The survey results will be used by governments across Europe to help ensure that children are safe when they go online and to support parents in helping to protect their children from online risks.

The interviews will be relaxed and informal and you and your child would be free to skip questions that you don't feel comfortable with, but whatever information you feel able to provide will really help the governments across Europe to understand the risks that children currently face and how best they can work with parents to protect children.

Your survey answers would be treated in absolute **confidence**, in accordance with the Data Protection Act. Your name or personal details will not be passed on to anyone outside the Ipsos/LOCAL AGENCY research team nor be identified in any research findings. Once the research is complete, your responses will be anonymised, and your name and address will be securely deleted from Ipsos's/LOCAL AGENCY records.

The interviews would take place in your home at a time convenient for you. We would like to talk to your child for around 30 minutes and to you for around 10 minutes. Taking part is voluntary but we hope that you will take part so we can hear the views of a range of people.

The interviewer will carry a photo identification card.

If you have any questions about the research or do not want to take part please call XXXX at Ipsos on **XXXX** or **<LOCAL AGENCY>** who will be happy to answer any questions you might have. If you do get in touch, please remember to give your name and the reference number at the top of this letter.

I do hope that you will be able to take part in this important survey.

Yours sincerely,

<NAME OF MANAGER>, Study Manager, <COUNTRY NAME>



Consent forms

This consent form is usually integrated into the contact sheet so that the interview completes a single form for each household at the stage of initial contact.

Introduction

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is from Ipsos MORI, the independent research company.

I would like to ask your help with a survey we are carrying out among young people and their parents - the survey is about young people using the internet safely. The questionnaire will ask about your own experiences of the internet and your child's experiences – this will include discussions about how often they use the internet, where they go online, how they spend time on the internet, and their exposure to potentially harmful or inappropriate material and behaviour, such as content that would normally be for adults. The survey results will be used by governments across Europe to help ensure that children are safe when they go online and support parents in helping to protect their children from online risks.

Your household has been selected completely at random from a list of addresses in this area. All information will be treated in the strictest of confidence; the reporting of findings will not identify individuals or families and the names of those who take part will not be passed on to anyone outside Ipsos MORI and <Local agency>, or used for any purpose other than this research project. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to and you can stop the interview at any point.

Screening

If more than one parent, select parent to take part (random method).

If more than one child, select child to take part (random method).

We would like to carry out an interview with you that will last 10 minutes and an interview with your child/one of your children that will last around 30 minutes.

Parent consent

If necessary, repeat intro to parent to gain parent consent/participation:

Are you able to take part in this research?

Yes – would it be convenient to conduct the interview now (If not arrange appointment)?

No (close)

I would also like to conduct an interview with [selected child] are you happy for me to invite him/her to take part?

Yes (proceed to consent)

No (close)

Complete if consent given

Parent name

Signature.....

Relationship to young person.....

Intro for 9-12 year olds

Hello, my name is XXX and I am from Ipsos MORI, a company that asks people questions about lots of different things.

We'd like to ask you what you think about using the internet and the types of things you do and see online including things you have liked but also things that you have not liked. We are speaking to lots of other young people like you, from across lots of different counties.

The findings will be used to help make the internet safer for young people to use. There aren't any right or wrong answers, and nobody will know what you have said - we just want to find out what you think. If there's a question you don't like, you don't have to answer it and you can stop the interview at any time. The only thing we would have to tell someone about is if you said that you or someone else was being hurt, but we would talk to you about that first, ok?

Would you be able to help us? It will take about 30 minutes.

Yes

No

Interviewer to sign that *informed* consent has been obtained

Signature.....

Intro for 13-16 year olds

Hello, my name is XXX and I am from Ipsos MORI, the research company (we find out what people think about things using questionnaires and surveys). We'd like to ask you what you think about using the internet and the types of things you do and see online including things you have liked but also things that you have not liked.

The research is being carried out across Europe and the findings will be used help make the internet safer for young people to use.

There aren't any right or wrong answers, and nobody will know what you have said - we just want to find out what you think. If there's a question you don't like, you don't have to answer it and you can stop the interview at any time. The only thing we would have to tell someone about is if you said that you or someone else was being hurt, but we would talk to you about that first, ok?

Would you be able to help us? It will take about 30 minutes.

Yes

No

Interviewer to sign that *informed* consent has been obtained

Signature.....

Information leaflet to be given to the child at the end of an interview

EU Kids Online template for information leaflet to be left following interviews



EU KIDS AND INSAFE

WORKING TOGETHER TO HELP YOU STAY SAFE ONLINE



TOP TIPS

The internet is a great place to learn, discover, communicate and have fun. But just as in the real world, there are some risks as well as great benefits. Take note of the tips below to help you and your family to stay safe online.



1. **What does your digital footprint look like?** Think before you post! Everything you put online stays there and becomes your digital footprint which can be seen by anyone. Remember that something you post today may be read by someone in 5 or 10 years time. Will it paint the best picture of you?

2. **I h8 u** Always treat others as you would like them to treat you. If you are the victim of cyberbullying, tell a trusted adult – someone who can help you. Don't suffer in silence and if you do receive a nasty text or IM, keep the evidence!



3. **Who are you talking to?** Be a responsible net citizen – remember that people who you only know online are still really strangers. It is important to keep online friends online – don't meet up with online friends in the real world without talking to an adult you trust first.

4. **How can you report a problem?** If something goes wrong and you feel uncomfortable or upset when you are online, there are things you can do. Tell your parents or carers or another trusted adult. You can always click the report abuse button and contact the helpline. There is more information about this on the back of this leaflet.



5. **Do you believe everything you see online?** <http://zapatopi.net/treeoctopus>
Remember that anyone can create online content – you can't always believe everything that you find on the internet. When you use the internet for homework or research, remember to check the information you find carefully. Use another website and see if it gives the same information – ask who the website was created by. Don't forget – if it sounds too good to be true, then it probably is!



EU Kids Online template for information leaflet to be left following interviews



insafe is a European network of Awareness Centres promoting safe, responsible use of the Internet and mobile devices to young people. It is co-funded by the [Safer Internet Programme](#). Further information is available from www.saferinternet.org

EU Kids Online II is a new project designed to examine children's and parents' experiences and practices regarding use, risk and safety online. Between 2009 and 2011, EU Kids Online II is conducting original empirical research across member states with national samples of children aged 9-16 years old and their parents. Further information is available from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EUKidsOnline/>



For further information about any online safety issues, please don't hesitate to contact the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre who are the safer internet awareness centre for the UK. Their website can be found at www.thinkuknow.co.uk or you can call 0870 000 3344



Q. Where can I report illegal content?

A. Illegal content can be reported to the Internet Watch Foundation which is the hotline in the UK. www.iwf.org.uk



Q. Who can I speak to if I have concerns about something that is happening online?

A. Speak to your parents or a trusted adult or call the helpline. In the UK you can call Childline on 0800 1111 and speak to someone in confidence.



Q. Where can I find out more information about how to keep my family safe online?

A. Visit your safer internet awareness centre's website at www.thinkuknow.co.uk or use our online family esafety kit at

You can also find more information at www.saferinternet.org



ANNEX 4: TRANSLATION OF DIFFICULT WORDS

Academic representatives in every country in the *EU Kids Online* network also reviewed translations to double check that the meaning of key terms was as intended. In particular, a list of concepts for which there were challenges ensuring translation generated identical meaning across countries was drawn up (“upset” is one example) and network members input to ensure the most comparable terminologies were used. The list of these concepts can be found below for each country.

Austria

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	beunruhigt
Upset	beschäftigt
Social worker	Sozialarbeiter
Adviser	Berater
Try to get back at the other person	Ich habe versucht, mich an der anderen Person zu rächen
Privacy settings	Einstellungen für die Privatsphäre
Contact settings	Einstellungen für die Kontakte
face to face	persönlich
Sexual image	Bilder mit sexuellem Inhalt
Sexual message	Nachrichten mit sexuellem Inhalt
Sexual act	Geschlechtsverkehr
An adult/X-rated website	Eine Seite für Erwachsene
Peer to peer file-sharing	Auf einer Seite, wo Daten mit anderen Personen geteilt werden
Private parts	Geschlechtsteile
Social networking site	sozialen Netzwerk-Seite
Instant messaging	Sofortnachrichtendienst
Chatroom	Chatroom
Gaming website	Spiele-Seite
Pop-up	Fenster, das auf einmal aufgegangen ist (per Zufall)
Desktop computer	Computer am Schreibtisch
Virtual world	virtuelle Welt
Filter preferences	Filtereinstellungen
Parental controls	Kindersicherung
Spam/junkmail	Spam

Belgium - French

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Tracassé
Upset	Perturbé
Social worker	Travailleur social
Adviser	conseiller
Try to get back at the other person	essayer de se venger de l'autre personne
Privacy settings	paramètres de confidentialité
Contact settings	coordonnées
face to face	Face à face
Sexual image	image à caractère sexuel
Sexual message	Message à caractère sexuel
Sexual act	relation sexuelle
An adult/X-rated website	Site pornographique
Peer to peer file-sharing	Site d'échange de fichier
Private parts	Sexe
Social networking site	Site de réseau social
Instant messaging	Messagerie instantanée
Chatroom	Chat
Gaming website	Site de jeux
Pop-up	Fenêtre qui s'ouvre sur l'écran
Desktop computer	ordinateur de bureau
Virtual world	monde virtuel
Filter preferences	Filtres de préférence
Parental controls	Contrôle parental
Spam/junkmail	spam/mail indésirable

Belgium - Flemish

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Je zorgen maken
Upset	Geschokt zijn
Social worker	Sociaal werker
Adviser	hulplijn voor kinderen
Try to get back at the other person	Proberen het de andere persoon betaald te zetten
Privacy settings	Privacy instellingen
Contact settings	
face to face	persoonlijk
Sexual image	sexueel getint beeld
Sexual message	sexueel getinte boodschap
Sexual act	sexuele handeling
An adult/X-rated website	een site voor volwassenen/niet geschikt voor kinderen
Peer to peer file-sharing	bestanden die je deelt met andere internet gebruikers
Private parts	intieme lichaamsdelen
Social networking site	site waar je een sociaal netwerkprofiel hebt
Instant messaging	instant messaging (MSN, Windows Live Messenger,...)
Chatroom	Chatroom
Gaming website	spelletjeswebsite
Pop-up	pop-ups (kleine venstertjes die opeens op je scherm verschijnen)
Desktop computer	PC
Virtual world	virtuele wereld
Filter preferences	Instellingen veranderen
Parental controls	ouderlijke controle
Spam/junkmail	ongewenste e-mail (spam)

Bulgaria

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Притеснен(а)
Upset	Разстроен(а)
Social worker	Социален работник
Adviser	Съветник
Try to get back at the other person	Опитах се да си го върна на другия човек
Privacy settings	Настройки за поверителност и защита
Contact settings	Настройки за поверителност и защита
face to face	Лице в лице
Sexual image	Сексуално изображение
Sexual message	Сексуално съобщение
Sexual act	Правене на секс
An adult/X-rated website	Забранен за под 18 г. сайт
Peer to peer file-sharing	Торент сайт
Private parts	Интимни части на тялото
Social networking site	Онлайн социална мрежа
Instant messaging	Програма за разговори в реално време
Chatroom	Чат-рум
Gaming website	Геймърски сайт
Pop-up	Поп-ъпс (нещо, което се появява случайно)
Desktop computer	РС (настолен компютър)
Virtual world	Виртуален свят
Filter preferences	Предпочитания за филтриране
Parental controls	Родителски контрол
Spam/junkmail	Нежелана поща/спам

Cyprus

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Ενοχλημένος
Upset	Αναστατωμένος
Social worker	Κοινωνική λειτουργός
Adviser	Σύμβουλος
Try to get back at the other person	Προσπαθώ να εκδικηθώ
Privacy settings	ρυθμίσεις ασφαλείας
Contact settings	ρυθμίσεις επαφών
face to face	πρόσωπο με πρόσωπο
Sexual image	εικόνα σεξουαλικού περιεχομένου
Sexual message	Μήνυμα σεξουαλικού περιεχομένου
Sexual act	σεξουαλική συνεύρεση
An adult/X-rated website	site (ιστοσελίδα) ενηλίκων
Peer to peer file-sharing	site ανταλλαγής αρχείων
Private parts	γεννητικά όργανα
Social networking site	site (ιστοσελίδα) κοινωνικής δικτύωσης
Instant messaging	στιγμιαίο μήνυμα
Chatroom	Chatroom (ηλεκτρονικό δωμάτιο συζητήσεων)
Gaming website	ιστοσελίδα παιχνιδιών
Pop-up	εικόνες που εμφανίζονται ξαφνικά (pop up)
Desktop computer	Υπολογιστής (επιτραπέζιος)
Virtual world	εικονικός κόσμος
Filter preferences	ρυθμίσεις φιλτραρίσματος
Parental controls	Γονικός έλεγχος
Spam/junkmail	ενοχλητική αλληλογραφία

Czech Republic

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	rozrušený
Upset	rozhozený
Social worker	sociální pracovník
Adviser	linka bezpečí
Try to get back at the other person	snažit se pomstít
Privacy settings	nastavení soukromí
Contact settings	kontaktní údaje
face to face	osobně, tváří v tvář
Sexual image	něco se sexuální tematikou
Sexual message	zpráva se sexuální tematikou
Sexual act	sex
An adult/X-rated website	stránky pro dospělé přístupné od 18 let
Peer to peer file-sharing	stránky pro sdílení souborů
Private parts	intimní partie
Social networking site	stránka sociální sítě
Instant messaging	komunikační aplikace
Chatroom	chatovací místnost
Gaming website	stránky pro hráče
Pop-up	pop-up webové okno (okno, které se objeví samo)
Desktop computer	stolní počítač
Virtual world	virtuální svět
Filter preferences	nastavení filtru
Parental controls	rodičovská kontrola
Spam/junkmail	spam

Denmark

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Bekymret over/føles sig generet af
Upset	Chokeret eller rystet
Social worker	Socialrådgiver
Adviser	Rådgiver
Try to get back at the other person	Forsøger at hævne sig på den anden person
Privacy settings	Personlige indstillinger
Contact settings	Kontaktoplysninger
face to face	Ansigt til ansigt (personligt)
Sexual image	Seksuelle billeder
Sexual message	Seksuelle beskeder
Sexual act	Gøre noget seksuelt
An adult/X-rated website	Hjemmesider kun for voksne
Peer to peer file-sharing	Ven-til-ven fildeling (f.eks. Limewire)
Private parts	Kønsdele
Social networking site	Sociale netværkssteder
Instant messaging	Messenger/MSM
Chatroom	Chatroom
Gaming website	Hjemmeside med spil
Pop-up	Pop-up vindue (noget, der vises tilfældigt)
Desktop computer	PC (stationær PC)
Virtual world	Virtuel verden
Filter preferences	Foretrukne filterindstillinger
Parental controls	Forældrekontrol
Spam/junkmail	Spam

Estonia - Estonian

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	häiritud olema
Upset	endast väljas olemine
Social worker	sotsiaaltöötaja
Adviser	nõustaja
Try to get back at the other person	Teisele inimesele samaga vastata proovima/ tagasi teha
Privacy settings	privaatsusseaded
Contact settings	kontaktandmed
face to face	silmast silma
Sexual image	seksipilt
Sexual message	Seksisõnum
Sexual act	seksakt
An adult/X-rated website	täiskasvanute veebileht
Peer to peer file-sharing	isikult isikule faili jagamine
Private parts	initiimsed kehaosad
Social networking site	suhtlusportaal
Instant messaging	MSN, messenger
Chatroom	jututuba
Gaming website	mängulehekülg
Pop-up	hüpikaken
Desktop computer	lauaarvuti
Virtual world	virtuaalmaailm
Filter preferences	filtrieelistused
Parental controls	vanemakontroll
Spam/junkmail	spämm/rämpsmail

Estonia - Russian

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	быть обеспокоенным, обескураженным
Upset	расстроиться, огорчиться
Social worker	социальный работник
Adviser	консультант, советчик
Try to get back at the other person	ответить другому человеку тем же, отомстить
Privacy settings	Настройки безопасности
Contact settings	Контактные данные
face to face	с глазу на глаз
Sexual image	изображение сексуального характера
Sexual message	сообщение сексуального характера
Sexual act	половой акт
An adult/X-rated website	вебсайт только для взрослых, X-вебсайт
Peer to peer file-sharing	обмен файлами между пользователями
Private parts	интимные части тела
Social networking site	социальная сеть
Instant messaging	MSN, мессенджер
Chatroom	чат
Gaming website	игровой сайт
Pop-up	всплывающее окно
Desktop computer	настольный (стационарный) компьютер
Virtual world	виртуальный мир
Filter preferences	настройки фильтра
Parental controls	родительский контроль
Spam/junkmail	спам

France

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Tracassé
Upset	Perturbé
Social worker	Travailleur social
Adviser	conseiller
Try to get back at the other person	essayer de se venger de l'autre personne
Privacy settings	paramètres de confidentialité
Contact settings	coordonnées
face to face	Face à face
Sexual image	image à caractère sexuel
Sexual message	message à caractère sexuel
Sexual act	relation sexuelle
An adult/X-rated website	site web classé X/ Pornographique
Peer to peer file-sharing	Site d'échange de fichier
Private parts	parties intimes /sexe
Social networking site	Site de réseau social
Instant messaging	Messagerie instantanée
Chatroom	Chat
Gaming website	Site de jeux
Pop-up	Une fenêtre qui s'est ouverte sur l'écran sans que tu le veuilles
Desktop computer	ordinateur de bureau
Virtual world	monde virtuel
Filter preferences	Filtres de préférence
Parental controls	Contrôle parental
Spam/junkmail	Spam/courrier indésirable

Finland

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	vaivata / vaivaantunut
Upset	järkyttää / järkyttynyt
Social worker	sosiaalityöntekijä
Adviser	nuorisoneuvoja
Try to get back at the other person	Yritin kostaa tälle henkilölle
Privacy settings	yksityisyysasetukset
Contact settings	yhteydenottoasetukset
face to face	kasvokkain
Sexual image	seksuaalinen kuva
Sexual message	seksuaalinen viesti
Sexual act	seksuaalisten asioiden tekeminen
An adult/X-rated website	aikuisten/lapsilta kielletty sivusto
Peer to peer file-sharing	vertaisverkon tiedostojen jako
Private parts	intiimit alueet
Social networking site	verkkoyhteisö
Instant messaging	pikaviesti
Chatroom	chat-huone
Gaming website	pelisivusto
Pop-up	pop-up/ponnahdusikkuna
Desktop computer	pöytäkone
Virtual world	virtuaalimaailma
Filter preferences	filteri-/estoasetukset
Parental controls	suodatinohjelma /lapsilukko-ohjelma
Spam/junkmail	roskaposti

Germany

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	beunruhigt
Upset	unangenehm berührt
Social worker	Sozialarbeiter
Adviser	Betreuer
Try to get back at the other person	Habe versucht, mich an der anderen Person zu rächen
Privacy settings	Privatsphäre-Einstellungen
Contact settings	Kontaktdaten-Einstellungen
face to face	"persönlich" or "von Angesicht zu Angesicht"
Sexual image	Bilder sexueller Art
Sexual message	Nachrichten sexueller Art
Sexual act	sexuelle Dinge/Handlungen
An adult/X-rated website	Internetseite für Erwachsene / nicht jugendfreien Internetseite
Peer to peer file-sharing	Peer-to-peer-Netzwerken oder Tauschbörsen (z.B. RapidShare)
Private parts	Geschlechtsteile
Social networking site	Soziales Netzwerk
Instant messaging	Instant messaging
Chatroom	Chatroom
Gaming website	Spiele Webseite
Pop-up	Pop-up
Desktop computer	PC (Festinstallierter PC)
Virtual world	Zeit in einem virtuellen Raum verbracht (z.B. Second Life, SIMS usw.)
Filter preferences	Filtereinstellungen
Parental controls	Elterliche Kontrollen
Spam/junkmail	Spam oder Junk-Mail

Greece

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	ενόχλησε/ αναστάτωσε/ απασχόλησε
Upset	στεναχώρησε/ ανησύχησε
Social worker	κοινωνικός λειτουργός
Adviser	σύμβουλος
Try to get back at the other person	προσπάθησε να εκδικηθεί το άλλο άτομο
Privacy settings	ρυθμίσεις ιδιωτικότητας
Contact settings	στοιχεία επικοινωνίας
face to face	πρόσωπο με πρόσωπο
Sexual image	εικόνες με σεξουαλικό περιεχόμενο
Sexual message	μήνυμα με σεξουαλικό περιεχόμενο
Sexual act	σεξουαλική πράξη
An adult/X-rated website	ιστοσελίδες που είναι μόνο για ενήλικες
Peer to peer file-sharing	προγραμμάτων ανταλλαγής αρχείων από υπολογιστή σε υπολογιστή
Private parts	γεννητικά όργανα
Social networking site	ιστοσελίδα κοινωνικής δικτύωσης
Instant messaging	άμεσα μηνύματα
Chatroom	δωμάτια επικοινωνίας
Gaming website	ιστοσελίδας με διαδικυακά παιχνιδιών
Pop-up	Από εικόνες που εμφανίζονται ξαφνικά στην οθόνη
Desktop computer	σταθερό/ προσωπικό υπολογιστή
Virtual world	εικονικός κόσμος
Filter preferences	επιλογές φίλτρων
Parental controls	γονικός έλεγχος
Spam/junkmail	ανεπιθύμητες διαφημίσεις ή ανεπιθύμητη αλληλογραφία

Hungary

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	felzaklat, zavar, valami rossz történik
Upset	felzaklat, zavar
Social worker	családsegítő
Adviser	tanácsadó szakember
Try to get back at the other person	bosszút áll
Privacy settings	személyes biztonsági beállítások
Contact settings	személyes biztonsági beállítások
face to face	személyesen
Sexual image	szexuális tartalmú felvételek, képek
Sexual message	szexuális tartalmú üzenetek
Sexual act	szex
An adult/X-rated website	korhatáros (felnőtteknek szóló) honlap
Peer to peer file-sharing	peer-to-peer fájlmegosztó
Private parts	nemi szervek
Social networking site	közösségi oldal
Instant messaging	üzenetküldő program (msn)
Chatroom	chat
Gaming website	játék oldal
Pop-up	felugró ablak
Desktop computer	asztali számítógép (PC)
Virtual world	virtuális világ
Filter preferences	családsegítő
Parental controls	tanácsadó szakember
Spam/junkmail	bosszút áll

Italy

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Infastidito
Upset	turbato
Social worker	assistente sociale
Adviser	tutor (9-10)/educatori (11-16)
Try to get back at the other person	Cercare di vendicarsi dell'altra persona
Privacy settings	Impostazioni sulla privacy
Contact settings	Impostazioni del mio contatto
face to face	Faccia a faccia
Sexual image	Immagine a sfondo sessuale
Sexual message	Messaggio a sfondo sessuale
Sexual act	Cose a sfondo sessuale/attività sessuale
An adult/X-rated website	Sito per adulti/ vietato ai minori
Peer to peer file-sharing	Programma di condivisione di file
Private parts	Parti intime
Social networking site	(Sito di) social network
Instant messaging	messaggi istantanei
Chatroom	Chat
Gaming website	Sito di giochi
Pop-up	Pop-up
Desktop computer	Computer da tavolo
Virtual world	Mondo virtuale
Filter preferences	Cambiare le preferenze dei filtri
Parental controls	Controllo genitori/ parental control
Spam/junkmail	spam

Lithuania

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Sunerimęs (QA6; QF12); sukėlė nerimą (QA7); sutrikiti/sutrikdyti (QD8; QD9, QD15, QF11, QF21, QG5)
Upset	Nuliūsti
Social worker	Socialinis darbuotojas
Adviser	
Try to get back at the other person	Mėginau atsilyginti tuo pačiu tam asmeniui
Privacy settings	slaptumo nustatymai
Contact settings	kontaktiniai duomenys
face to face	tiesioginis bendravimas
Sexual image	seksualinio turinio atvaizdas
Sexual message	seksualinio turinio žinutė
Sexual act	seksualiniai dalykai (QG3 C), užsiiminėti seksu (QG3 e), seksualiniai veiksmai (QH3)
An adult/X-rated website	Suaugusiems skirtas puslapis
Peer to peer file-sharing	Per P2P (peer to peer) keitimąsi duomenimis (pvz., „Torrent“, „Linkomanija“, RC)
Private parts	Intymios kūno dalys or intymios kūno vietos in different questions
Social networking site	Socialinis tinklas
Instant messaging	Naudotis tiesioginio susirašinėjimo programomis (pvz. Skype, Google talk, MSN...)
Chatroom	Pokalbių svetainė (pvz. Chat.lt, zebra.lt)
Gaming website	Žaidimų puslapis
Pop-up	Iškylantys reklaminiai langai (pop – ups)(kurie kartais netikėtai iškyla)
Desktop computer	stalinis kompiuteris
Virtual world	virtualus/virtualusis pasaulis
Filter preferences	Filtrų nustatymai
Parental controls	Tėvų kontrolė
Spam/junkmail	Brukalas (SPAMas)-decided to leave SPAM as it is called like that pretty much often than "brukalas", junkmail-nepageidaujama reklama

Netherlands

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	van streek zijn
Upset	van slag, geschrokken
Social worker	maatschappelijk werker
Adviser	adviseur
Try to get back at the other person	iemand terugpakken
Privacy settings	instellingen voor mijn privacy
Contact settings	contact gegevens
face to face	persoonlijk
Sexual image	seksuele foto/ plaatje of video
Sexual message	seksueel bericht
Sexual act	seksuele handeling
An adult/X-rated website	niet geschikt voor minderjarigen
Peer to peer file-sharing	file sharing sites gebruikt (peer to peer)
Private parts	intieme lichaamsdelen
Social networking site	sociale netwerk site
Instant messaging	instant messaging (MSN)
Chatroom	Chatroom
Gaming website	spelletjes website
Pop-up	pop-up
Desktop computer	computer
Virtual world	virtuele wereld
Filter preferences	filter voorkeuren
Parental controls	not translated literally
Spam/junkmail	Spam

Norway

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	plaget
Upset	lei seg
Social worker	sosialarbeider
Adviser	rådgiver (skolerådgiver)
Try to get back at the other person	Prøv å komme tilbake til den andre personen
Privacy settings	Personvern innstillinger
Contact settings	kontakt innstillinger
face to face	ansikt til ansikt
Sexual image	seksuelt bilde
Sexual message	seksuell melding
Sexual act	seksuell handling
An adult/X-rated website	pronoside
Peer to peer file-sharing	fildeling mellom datamaskiner
Private parts	kjønnsorganer
Social networking site	sosialt nettverksted
Instant messaging	Direktemeldinger
Chatroom	Chattested/ pratested
Gaming website	Nettside for dataspill
Pop-up	pop-up
Desktop computer	Skrivebord på datamaskin/ bord datamaskin
Virtual world	virtuell verden
Filter preferences	filter innstillinger
Parental controls	Foreldrekontroll
Spam/junkmail	Spam/søppelmail

Poland

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	zaniepokojony
Upset	przejąć się czymś, w innym miejscu: zrobiło Ci się nieprzyjemnie
Social worker	pracownik socjalny
Adviser	doradca
Try to get back at the other person	zemścić się, odegrać na tej osobie
Privacy settings	ustawienia prywatności
Contact settings	ustawienia kontaktów
face to face	twarzą w twarz
Sexual image	obraz, zdjęcie lub film związany z seksem
Sexual message	wiadomość związana z seksem
Sexual act	czynność seksualna
An adult/X-rated website	strona przeznaczona dla dorosłych
Peer to peer file-sharing	portale umożliwiające dzielenie się plikami (tzw. peer-to-peer)
Private parts	intymne części ciała
Social networking site	portal społecznościowy
Instant messaging	komunikator
Chatroom	czat (chatroom)
Gaming website	strona z grą/grami
Pop-up	wyskakujące okienko (pop-up)
Desktop computer	komputer stacjonarny
Virtual world	świat wirtualny
Filter preferences	ustawienia filtrów
Parental controls	programy kontroli rodzicielskiej
Spam/junkmail	spam/niechciane wiadomości

Portugal

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Incomodado
Upset	Perturbado, Chateado;
Social worker	Assistente Social
Adviser	Conselheiro
Try to get back at the other person	Vingar-se
Privacy settings	Definições de Privacidade
Contact settings	Definições de Contactos
face to face	Cara-a-Cara
Sexual image	Imagem de teor sexual/ imagem sexual
Sexual message	Mensagem de teor sexual / mensagem sexual
Sexual act	Acto Sexual / Fazer sexo
An adult/X-rated website	Website Conteúdos para Adultos
Peer to peer file-sharing	Partilha de Ficheiros PtP
Private parts	Zonas intimas / partes intimas
Social networking site	Site de Rede Social
Instant messaging	Mensagens Instantâneas
Chatroom	Sala de Chat
Gaming website	Jogos Online
Pop-up	Janelas Pop-Up
Desktop computer	Computador de secretária
Virtual world	Mundo Virtual
Filter preferences	Preferências de Filtragem
Parental controls	Controlo Parental
Spam/junkmail	Correio Electrónico Não Solicitado/Lixo Electrónico

Romania

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Deranjat
Upset	Supărat
Social worker	Asistent social
Adviser	Persoană a cărei ocupație este să dea sfaturi
Try to get back at the other person	A încerca să te răzbuni pe persoana respectivă
Privacy settings	Setări de protecție a identității
Contact settings	Setări de contact
face to face	față în față
Sexual image	Imagine cu conținut sexual
Sexual message	Mesaj cu conținut sexual
Sexual act	Act sexual
An adult/X-rated website	Un site pentru adulți
Peer to peer file-sharing	Site-uri de "share-uit" fișiere , adica puse la comun (dc++, odc, torrente)
Private parts	Părți intime
Social networking site	Rețea socială
Instant messaging	Messenger
Chatroom	Cameră de chat
Gaming website	Site de jocuri
Pop-up	Pop-up
Desktop computer	Calculator (desktop)
Virtual world	Lume virtuală
Filter preferences	Preferințe de filtrare
Parental controls	Control parental
Spam/junkmail	Spam

Slovenia

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	vznemirjen
Upset	razburiti
Social worker	socialni delavec
Adviser	svetovalec
Try to get back at the other person	maščevati se
Privacy settings	nastavitve zasebnosti
Contact settings	kontaktne informacije
face to face	osebno, v živo
Sexual image	podoba s spolno vsebino
Sexual message	sporočila s spolno vsebino
Sexual act	spolni odnos, spolno početje
An adult/X-rated website	vsebine za odrasle
Peer to peer file-sharing	stran za izmenjavo dokumentov
Private parts	spolovila, intimni deli
Social networking site	spletna stran za socialno mreženje
Instant messaging	takojšnje sporočanje
Chatroom	klepetalnica
Gaming website	spletna stran z igrami
Pop-up	pop-up okno, nekar kar se pojavi samo od sebe
Desktop computer	namizni računalnik
Virtual world	virtualni svet
Filter preferences	lastnosti filtrov
Parental controls	starševski nadzor
Spam/junkmail	nezaželjena pošta, spam

Spain –Castilian

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Molestar
Upset	Disgustar
Social worker	Asistente social
Adviser	Asesor
Try to get back at the other person	Reaccionar en contra de otra persona
Privacy settings	Condicones de privacidad
Contact settings	Condiciones de contacto
face to face	Cara a cara
Sexual image	Imágenes de contenido sexual
Sexual message	Mensajes de contenido sexual
Sexual act	Acto sexual
An adult/X-rated website	Página calificada como X / para adultos
Peer to peer file-sharing	Redes P2P para compartir archivos
Private parts	Partes intimas
Social networking site	Red social
Instant messaging	Mensajería instantánea - Messenger
Chatroom	Chat
Gaming website	Página de juegos
Pop-up	Pop up o ventana emergente
Desktop computer	Ordenador de sobremesa
Virtual world	Mundo virtual
Filter preferences	Preferencias de filtrado
Parental controls	Controles paternos
Spam/junkmail	E-mail spam o no deseado

Spain - Catalan

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Molestar
Upset	Disgustar
Social worker	Assistent social
Adviser	Assessor
Try to get back at the other person	Reaccionar en contra d'una altra persona
Privacy settings	Condicions de privacitat
Contact settings	Condicions de contacte
face to face	Cara a cara
Sexual image	Imatges de contingut sexual
Sexual message	Missatges de contingut sexual
Sexual act	Acte sexual
An adult/X-rated website	Pàgina qualificada com X/ per a adults
Peer to peer file-sharing	Xarxes P2P per a compartir arxius
Private parts	Parts íntimes
Social networking site	Xarxa social
Instant messaging	Missatgeria instantània - Messenger
Chatroom	Xat
Gaming website	Pàgina de jocs
Pop-up	Pop up o finestra emergent
Desktop computer	Ordinador de sobretaula
Virtual world	Món virtual
Filter preferences	Preferències de filtratge
Parental controls	Controls paternals
Spam/junkmail	E-mail spam o no desitjat

Sweden

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Oroad
Upset	Upprörd
Social worker	Socialarbetare
Adviser	Rådgivare
Try to get back at the other person	Försöka ge igen
Privacy settings	Sekretessinställningar
Contact settings	Kontaktinställningar
face to face	öga mot öga
Sexual image	Erotisk bild
Sexual message	Erotiskt meddelande
Sexual act	Sex
An adult/X-rated website	En barnförbjuden webbplats
Peer to peer file-sharing	Fildelning
Private parts	Könsdelar
Social networking site	Hemsidor för socialt nätverkande", t.ex. Hamsterpaj eller Facebook
Instant messaging	Snabbmeddelanden, chattmeddelande
Chatroom	Chattrum
Gaming website	Spelwebbplats
Pop-up	Poppuppfönster
Desktop computer	Stationär dator
Virtual world	Virtuell värld
Filter preferences	Filterinställningar
Parental controls	Spärrfunktion
Spam/junkmail	Skräppost

Turkish

Concept	TRANSLATION
Bothered	Rahatsız etmek
Upset	Üzücü
Social worker	sosyal görevli
Adviser	danışman
Try to get back at the other person	Diğer kişiden öç almak
Privacy settings	Gizlilik ayarları
Contact settings	İletişim bilgileri
face to face	Yüz yüze
Sexual image	Cinsel içerikli resim
Sexual message	Cinsel içerikli mesaj
Sexual act	Cinsel içerikli davranış
An adult/X-rated website	Yetişkinlere yönelik site
Peer to peer file-sharing	Dosya paylaşım sitesi aracılığıyla (örn. Kazaa, Limewire, Rapidshare)
Private parts	Vücuttaki mahrem /ayıp yerler
Social networking site	Sosyal paylaşım sitesi (Facebook gibi)
Instant messaging	Hızlı/anlık ileti (MSN gibi)
Chatroom	Sohbet odası
Gaming website	Oyun sitesi
Pop-up	Kazara açılan pencereler (Pop-ups)
Desktop computer	Masaüstü bilgisayar
Virtual world	Sanal dünya
Filter preferences	Filtre seçenekleri
Parental controls	Aile kontrolü
Spam/junkmail	İstenmeyen reklam ya da e-posta, spam

ANNEX 5: KEY VARIABLES

Use and activities

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Number of places where the internet is used	At school or college Living room (or other public room) at home At a friend's home Own bedroom (or other private room) at home At a relative's home In an internet café In a public library or other public place When 'out and about'	The number out of eight response options/ DPplaceNM
Number of devices used to access the internet	Shared PC Own PC Television set Mobile phone Games console Own laptop Shared laptop Other handheld or portable device (e.g. iPod Touch, iPhone or Blackberry)	The number out of eight response options/ DPdeviceNM
Estimated minutes online each day	About how long do you spend using the internet on a normal school day / normal non-school day?	DCtimeuse

Digital literacy

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Digital skills	Bookmark a website Block messages from someone you don't want to hear from Find information on how to use the internet safely Change privacy settings on a social networking profile Compare different websites to decide if information is true Delete the record of which sites you have visited Block unwanted adverts or junk mail/spam Change filter preferences	The number out of eight response options/ DPskillsNM
Range of online activities	Used the internet for school work Played internet games on your own or against the computer Watched video clips Visited a social networking profile Used instant messaging Sent/received email Read/watched the news on the internet Played games with other people on the internet Downloaded music or films Put (or posted) photos, videos or music to share with others Used a webcam Put (or posted) a message on a website Visited a chatroom Used file sharing sites Created a character, pet or avatar Spent time in a virtual world Written a blog or online diary	The number out of 17 response options/ DCactNM
Belief about internet abilities	I know lots of things about using the internet. 1 (not true) to 3 (very true)	DCwebableB

Risky activities

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Risky offline activities (adapted from the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children survey; Currie et al., 2008)	Missed school lessons without my parents knowing Been in trouble with my teachers for bad behaviour Been in trouble with the police Had so much alcohol that I got really drunk (only asked of children aged 11+) Had sexual intercourse (only asked of children aged 11+)	The number out of three response options for 9-10 year olds and out of five response options for children aged 11+ / DCROB1NM DCROB2NM
Risky online activities (adapted from the UK Children Go Online survey; Livingstone & Helsper, 2010).	Looked for new friends on the internet Added people to my friends list or address book that I have never met face-to-face Pretended to be a different kind of person on the internet from what I really am Sent personal information to someone that I have never met face-to-face Sent a photo or video of myself to someone that I have never met face-to-face	The number out of five response options/ DCriskactNM

Online risks

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Online contacts		
Online contacts	Can I just check, have you ever had contact on the internet with someone you have not met face to face before? yes/no	QC147
Meeting online contacts offline	And have you ever gone on to meet anyone face to face that you first met on the internet in this way? yes/no	QC148
Number of online contacts met offline	And how many new people have you met in this way in the last 12 months, if any? 1 to 2, 3 to 4, More than 10	QC149
Seeing and receiving sexual messages		
Receiving sexual messages	In the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you seen or received sexual messages of any kind on the internet? yes/no	QC167
Frequency of receiving sexual messages	How often have you seen or received sexual messages of any kind on the internet in the PAST 12 months? Every day or almost every day Once or twice a week Once or twice a month Less often	QC168
Types of sexual messages received The number out of five response options	I have been sent a sexual message on the internet, I have seen a sexual message posted where other people could see it on the internet, I have seen other people perform sexual acts, I have been asked to talk about sexual acts with someone on the internet, I have been asked on the internet for a photo or video showing my private parts	The number out of five response options/ QC169A-E

Sexual images		
Seeing sexual images	Have you seen these kinds of things [images that are obviously sexual] on any websites in the past 12 months? yes/no	QC131
Types of sexual images	Which types of website have you seen things like this [ANY KIND OF SEXUAL IMAGES] on in the LAST 12 MONTHS? Images or video of someone naked, Images or video of someone's 'private parts', Images or video of someone having sex, Images or video of movies that show sex in a violent way, Something else	The number out of five response options/ QC133A-E
Bullying		
BULLYING (introduction)	Sometimes children or teenagers say or do hurtful or nasty things to someone and this can often be quite a few times on different days over a period of time, for example. This can include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teasing someone in a way this person does not like • hitting, kicking or pushing someone around • leaving someone out of things When people are hurtful or nasty to someone in this way, it can happen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • face to face (in person) • by mobile phones (texts, calls, video clips) • on the internet (e-mail, instant messaging, social networking, chatrooms) 	
Cyberbullying (victim of)...		
Being cyberbullied	Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the past 12 months? At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened...By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts? yes/no [AND/OR] At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened on the internet? yes/no	QC114B and/or QC115
Online bullying (victim of)...		
Being bullied online	Has someone acted in this kind of hurtful or nasty way to you in the past 12 months? At any time during the last 12 months, has this happened on the internet? yes/no	QC115
Types of being bullied online	And in which ways has this [SOMEONE HAS DONE NASTY OR HURTFUL THINGS TO YOU ON THE INTERNET] happened to you in the LAST 12 MONTHS? Nasty or hurtful messages were sent to me, Nasty or hurtful messages about me were passed around or posted where others could see, I was left out or excluded from a group or activity on the internet, I was threatened on the internet, Other nasty or hurtful things on the internet	The number out of five response options/ QC117A-E



Number of items reflecting negative user generated content	Hate messages that attack certain groups or individuals Ways to be very thin (such as being anorexic or bulimic) Ways of physically harming or hurting themselves Talk about or share their experiences of taking drugs Ways of committing suicide	The number out of five response options/ DC142NM
Number of items reflecting data misuse	Somebody used my password to access my information or to pretend to be me Somebody used my personal information in a way I didn't like I lost money by being cheated on the internet	The number out of three response options/ DC143NM
Has experienced any of seven online risks	Online contacts, Meeting online contacts offline, Receiving sexual messages, Seeing sexual images, Being bullied online, Has come across one or more negative user generated content, Has experienced personal data misuse of any kind	DCirisk2

Online perpetrators

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Cyberbullying others	Have you acted in a way that might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else in the PAST 12 MONTHS? In which of the following ways have you acted like this in the past 12 months...? By mobile phone calls, texts or image/video texts [AND/OR] On the internet yes/no	QC127B and/or QC127c
Online bullying others	Have you acted in a way that might have felt hurtful or nasty to someone else in the PAST 12 MONTHS? In which of the following ways have you acted like this in the past 12 months...? On the internet yes/no	QC127c
Sending sexual messages	In the PAST 12 MONTHS, have you sent or posted a sexual message (example: words, pictures or video) of any kind on the internet? This could be about you or someone else. yes/no	QC179
Has done either of the two things associated with being a perpetrator	Online bullying others, Sending sexual messages	DCiperp2

Harm from online risks

(overall, sexual images, sexual messages, meeting online contacts offline, being bullied online)

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Experience of harm on the internet (overall)	In the past 12 months, have you seen or experienced something on the internet that has bothered you in some way? For example, made you feel uncomfortable, upset, or feel that you shouldn't have seen it. Yes/no	QC110
Experience of harm (specific risk)	And in the LAST 12 MONTHS has [the risk] bothered you in any way? For example, made you feel uncomfortable, upset [...]yes/no	QC134, QC152, QC171
Intensity of harm (specific risk)	Thinking about the last time you were bothered by [experiencing the risk], how upset did you feel about it (if at all)? 0 (not at all upset) to 3 (very upset)	QC118, QC135, QC160, QC172
Duration of harm (sexual images, sexual messages, being bullied online)	How long did you feel like this [upset] for? 1 (I got over it straight away) to 4 (I thought about it for a couple of months or more).	QC119, QC136, QC173
Duration of harm (meeting online contacts offline)	How long did you feel like this [upset] for? 1 (<i>I got over it straight away</i>) to 3 (<i>I felt like that for a few weeks</i>).	QC161
Harm index (sexual images, sexual messages, being bullied online)	Intensity x duration0 (low) – 12 (high)	QC118*QC119, QC135* QC136, QC172* QC173
Harm index (meeting online contacts offline)	Intensity x duration0 (low) – 9 (high)	QC160* QC161

Mediation

Concept	Questions / Response options	Summaries / variable names
Active mediation of internet use	<p><i>Does your parent/do either of your parents sometimes... sit with you while you use the internet?</i></p> <p>stay nearby when you use the internet?</p> <p>encourage you to explore and learn things on the internet on your own?</p> <p>do shared activities together with you on the internet?</p> <p><i>Does your parent/do either of your parents sometimes.../ Have any teachers at your school ever done any of these things?</i></p> <p>talk to you about what you do on the internet?</p>	<p>Either number of available response options OR if at least one of them was chosen or not/</p> <p>DC327NM</p> <p>DP220NM</p>
Active mediation of internet safety	<p><i>Does your parent/do either of your parents sometimes.../ Have any teachers at your school ever done any of these things? Have your friends ever done any of these things?</i></p> <p>Helped you when something is difficult to do or find on the internet</p> <p>Explained why some websites are good or bad</p> <p>Suggested ways to use the internet safely</p> <p>Suggested ways to behave towards other people online</p> <p>Helped you in the past when something has bothered you on the internet</p> <p><i>Does your parent/do either of your parents sometimes.../ Have any teachers at your school ever done any of these things?</i></p> <p>In general, talked to you about what to do if something on the internet bothered you</p>	<p>Either number of available response options OR if at least one of them was chosen or not/</p> <p>DC329NM</p> <p>DP222NM</p>
Restrictive mediation	<p><i>Parents CURRENTLY allow them to do them only with permission/supervision, or never allow.</i></p> <p>Use instant messaging</p> <p>Download music or films on the internet</p> <p>Watch video clips on the internet</p> <p>Have your own social networking profile</p> <p>Give out personal information to others on the internet</p> <p>Upload photos, videos or music to share with others</p> <p><i>Have any teachers at your school ever done any of these things?</i></p> <p>Made rules about what you can do on the internet at school</p>	<p>Either number of available response options OR if at least one of them was chosen or not/</p> <p>DC328NM</p> <p>DP221NM</p>
Parental monitoring	<p><i>Does your parent/either of your parents sometimes check any of the following things afterwards?</i></p> <p>Which websites you visited</p> <p>The messages in your email or instant messaging account</p> <p>Your profile on a social networking or online community</p> <p>Which friends or contacts you add to your social networking profile/instant messaging service</p>	<p>Either number of available response options OR if at least one of them was chosen or not/</p> <p>DC330NM</p> <p>DP223NM</p>

Parents Technical mediation	<i>Does your parent/do your parents make use of any of the following...?:</i> Parental controls or other means of blocking or filtering some types of website Parental controls or other means of keeping track of the websites you visit A service or contract that limits the time you spend on the internet Software to prevent spam or junk mail/viruses	Either number of available response options OR if at least one of them was chosen or not/ DC331NM DP224NM
-----------------------------------	--	---



Psychological measures

SELF-EFFICACY (variable: DCSEMN)

Adapted from Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995; 4 items, $\alpha = .65$)

Item Property Analyses, Selection and Re-phrasing for the Adapted Self-Efficacy Scale

Item	Original item phrasing	ITC original items	ITC selected items	Adapted item phrasing for EU Kids Online II
1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	.39	-	-
2	If someone opposes me, I can find means and ways to get what I want.	.54	-	-
3	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	.62	.60	It's easy for me to stick to my aims and achieve my goals.
4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	.58	.60	I am confident that I can deal with unexpected problems.
5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	.59	.64	I can generally work out how to handle new situations.
6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	.31	-	-
7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	.54	-	-
8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	.53	-	-
9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of something to do.	.55	.51	If I am in trouble I can usually think of something to do.
10	No matter what comes my way, I'm usually able to handle it.	.62	.61	I can generally work out how to handle new situations.
<i>Cronbach's α</i>		.84	.80	

Notes: A 3-point response scale was used (1 = *Not true*, 2 = *A bit true*, 3 = *Very true*), ITC: Corrected item-total correlation, original items 5 and 10 were combined for adapted item phrasing, all analyses were performed on selected cases of children 12- 15 years from a public data set (Schwarzer, 2006; $N = 1254$).

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES (variable: DCSDQMN)

Adapted from Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1998; 16 items, $\alpha = .71$) using items measuring psychological difficulties only.

Item Property Analyses and Selection for the Psychological Difficulties Scale (adapted from SDQ)

Item	Item phrasing and variable names by subscale	ITC Pilot	ITC selected items in
Emotional symptoms (DCSDQepMN)			
1	I get a lot of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness.	.40	.36
2	I worry a lot.	.48	.35
3	I am often unhappy, sad or tearful.	.34	.48
4	I am nervous in new situations, I easily lose confidence.	.36	.37
5	I have many fears, and I am easily scared.	.23	.40
Conduct problems (DCSDQcpMN)			
1	I get very angry and often lose my temper.	.61	.42
2	I usually do as I am told. (reversed)	.07	.06
3	I fight a lot, I can make other people do what I want.	.17	.27
4	I am often accused of lying or cheating.	.40	.41
5	I take things that are not mine from home, school or elsewhere.	.48	.26
Peer relationship problems (DCSDQppMN)			
1	I am usually on my own, I generally play alone or keep to myself.	.43	.26
2	I have at least one good friend. (reversed)	.20	.12
3	Other people my age generally like me. (reversed)	.32	.21
4	Other children or young people pick on me.	.52	.42
5	I get on better with adults than with people my own age.	.40	.28
Hyperactivity (DCSDQhpMN)			
1	I am restless, I cannot stay still for long.	.36	-
2	I am easily distracted, I find it difficult to concentrate.	.46	.37
3	I think before I do things. (reversed)	.34	-
4	I finish the work I'm doing, my attention is good. (reversed)	.19	-
<i>Cronbach's α</i>		.77	.71

Notes: A 3-point response scale was used (1 = *Not true*, 2 = *A bit true*, 3 = *Very true*); ITC: Corrected item-total correlation; ITCs and Cronbach's α s were computed for the full psychological difficulties scale; the full sample of 9-16 year olds was used for both analyses ($N_{Pilot} = 76$, $N_{Data} = 25142$).

SENSATION SEEKING (variable: DCsensationMN)

From Stephenson, Hoyle, Palmgreen, and Slater (2003; 2 items, $r = .64$, $p < .001$).

Item	Item phrasing
1	I do dangerous things for fun
2	I do exciting things, even if they are dangerous

Notes: A 3-point response scale was used (1 = *Not true*, 2 = *A bit true*, 3 = *Very true*)



EXCESSIVE USE (variable: DCaddictMN)

Adapted from Šmahel, Vondráčková, Blinka, and Godoy-Etcheverry (2009; 5 items, $\alpha = .77$).

Item	Item phrasing
1	I have gone without eating or sleeping because of the internet
2	I have felt bothered when I cannot be on the internet
3	I have caught myself surfing when I'm not really interested
4	I have spent less time than I should with either family, friends or doing schoolwork because of the time I spent on the internet
5	I have tried unsuccessfully to spend less time on the internet

Notes: A 4-point response scale was used (1 = *Never/almost never*, 2 = *Not very often*, 3 = *Fairly often*, 4 = *Very often*); items were only asked of 11-16 year olds.

References:

Currie, C., Gabhainn, S. N., Godeau, E., Roberts, C., Smith, R., Currie, D., Pickett, W., Richter, M., Morgan, A., & Barnekow, V. (Eds.). (2008). *Inequalities in young people's health: Health behaviour in school-aged children (HBSC) international report from the 2005/2006 survey*. Copenhagen, Denmark: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

Goodman R., Meltzer H., Bailey V. (1998) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 7, 125-130. doi:10.1007/s007870050057

ITU (2010). *Partnership on measuring ICT for development, core ICT indicators*. http://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-d/opb/ind/D-IND-ICT_CORE-2010-PDF-E.pdf

Livingstone, S., and Helsper, E. J. (2007) Taking risks when communicating on the internet: The role of offline social-psychological factors in young people's vulnerability to online risks. *Information, Communication and Society*, 10(5), 619-643.

Šmahel, D., Vondráčková, P., Blinka, L. & Godoy-Etcheverry, S. (2009). Comparing addictive Behavior on the Internet in the Czech Republic, Chile and Sweden. In G. Cardoso, A. Cheong, J. Cole (Eds.), *World wide internet: Changing societies, economies and cultures* (pp. 544-582). Macao : University of Macau.

Schwarzer, R. (2006). *SPSS RAW DATA WITH 18,000 Participants*. Retrieved from http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/world_24nations_25nov2006.sav

Schwarzer, R. & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.

Stephenson, M. T., Hoyle, R. H., Palmgreen, P., & Slater, M. D. (2003). Brief measures of sensation seeking for screening and large-scale surveys. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 72(3), 279-286. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2003.08.003

UNESCO (2006). *International Standard Classification of Education I S C E D 1997, Re-edition*. <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Pages/DocumentMorePage.aspx?docIdValue=144&docIdFld=ID>