ETHICS REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESEARCHERS

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.
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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 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 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 database. PAPI interview data is entered 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 dataset 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\(^1\) 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.

---

\(^1\) Ipsos MORI and all its Network of national fieldwork institutes are members of ESOMAR, the European Society for Opinion and Market Research. The Society encourages the highest technical standards and levels of professional conduct by imposing all its members obedience to the codes of ethical practice and professional standards established by the Society.
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 Dheermojee, 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 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 reputation among the public from our work as opinion pollsters, means that they have 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 to numerous government departments – including Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF), Home Office, Department for Communities and Local Government, Department of 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. DCSF involving similar surveys with children and/or parents include the Longitudinal 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 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. 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 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 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 of 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 additional 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 be 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 respond of confidentiality and anonymity thereby encouraging honest answers.

The CASI approach will involve the interviewer handing the computer to the respond, 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 without 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 dataset 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 dataset 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Sub-tasks</th>
<th>Number of weeks</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract start date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-up meeting with LSE project team in London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of the questionnaire and sampling schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting in Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>16th October</td>
<td>18th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSE send out new draft of questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input from Ipsos sent to LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSE communicate questions that need testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive testing including feedback from LSE and questionnaire finalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of interview guide for cognitive testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>23rd October</td>
<td>29th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from LSE on cognitive testing guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final cognitive testing guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of interviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment in the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>28th October</td>
<td>6th November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork cognitive testing phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis and reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>17th November</td>
<td>23rd November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report sent to LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New version of questionnaire after 1st phase of cognitive testing</td>
<td>27th November</td>
<td>4th December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation of questionnaire</td>
<td>4th December</td>
<td>18th December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment in 23 countries</td>
<td>4th Jan 2010</td>
<td>7th Jan 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing of interviewers</td>
<td>4th Jan 2010</td>
<td>7th Jan 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork cognitive testing phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8th January</td>
<td>13th January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and reporting</td>
<td>14th January</td>
<td>21st January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sent to LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>21st January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>25th January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New version of questionnaire after 2nd phase of cognitive testing</td>
<td>26th January</td>
<td>28th January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPI Scripting</td>
<td></td>
<td>29th January</td>
<td>5th February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot testing</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>5th February</td>
<td>1st March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of interviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork pilot testing</td>
<td>6th February</td>
<td>22nd February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot report</td>
<td>23rd February</td>
<td>1st March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot report sent to LSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from LSE on the pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>8th March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of the national questionnaires</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>9th March</td>
<td>18th March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to national questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>9th March</td>
<td>15th March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>16th March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of interviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td>17th March</td>
<td>18th March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>19th March</td>
<td>19th May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intermediary file sent to LSE 3rd week April)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing (local and central data processing)</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>20th May</td>
<td>10th June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local data processing</td>
<td></td>
<td>20th May</td>
<td>27th May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central data processing</td>
<td></td>
<td>28th May</td>
<td>11th June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of SPSS file and data tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14th June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical report, including details of response rates, non-response bias analysis, and effective sample sizes/design effects etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25th June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 phase 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 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 executive teams.

Each fieldwork institute member of the Ipsos MORI network is committed to allo
project experienced professional interviewers in opinion face to face interviewing, a 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 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:**
  - background
  - purpose
  - importance of the survey
  - international dimension, ensuring the essential consistency of fieldwork across countries.
- **Detailed description of the random route sampling procedures:**
  - Definition of the population to be sampled
  - Concept of starting address, location on a map
  - Focus on random-walk rules
  - Child and parent selection: implementation of the ‘next birthday’ procedure
  - Management of failed contacts: recall procedure (number and timing of visits), letter in mailbox when relevant, etc.
  - Sampling follow-up: review of contact sheets and how to use them
  - Explanation of over-sampling when relevant
– Contact sheet procedures.

- Full questionnaire review:
  - Overall structure of the questionnaire
  - Review of the various topics
  - Explanation of complex questions, concepts or words
  - 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:
  - 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.
  - Handling of survey materials
  - Survey schedule: fieldwork dates and hours
  - 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 interviewers 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.
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,

XXXX, Study Manager, <COUNTRY NAME>

ANNEX 2 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is … from Ipsos MORI, the independent research company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &lt;Local agency&gt;, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screeninng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If more than one parent, select parent to take part (random method).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If more than one child, select child to take part (random method).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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…………………………………………………………

Thank you for agreeing to let your son/daughter take part in the research. All information provided for the survey including personal information such as names and address and responses to the questions will be held securely by Ipsos MORI and will be kept in the strictest confidence.

Young person consent

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?2

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

2 Example of limited confidentiality that could be used here or later in the questionnaire. Adapted from Williamson et al ‘Confidentiality and Child protection in Research’.
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 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…………………………………………………………………..