The task of 2010

- Do a Europe-wide survey of internet using children and their parents
- The survey to cover access, use, activities, risks (sexual images, sexual messages, bullying, meeting strangers), parental mediation, coping, vulnerability
- The design, data collection and reporting to take no more than two years

Timetable

- **June 2009**   **Kick-off meeting**
- **July 2009**   **Tender for fieldwork subcontractor**
- **Oct 2009**   **Workshop 1: Survey questionnaire/sample design**
- **Nov 2009-Mar 2010**   **Survey development, translation, piloting, finalising**
- **Mar-Nov 2010**   **Fieldwork**
- **May 2010**   **Consult stakeholders about analysis and dissemination**
- **July-Nov 2010**   **Data cleaning, top line analysis**
- **July 2010**   **Workshop 2: Core findings and emerging messages**
- **Oct 2010**   **TOPLINE REPORT at Safer Internet Forum**
- **Winter 2010**   **Statistical analysis – patterns, hypotheses, comparisons**
- **Nov 2010**   **Consult stakeholders about analysis and recommendations**
- **Jan 2011**   **Workshop 3: Analysis, recommendations, dissemination**
- **June 2011**   **REPORT: Patterns of risk and safety online**
- **June 2011**   **REPORT: Cross-national comparisons + recommendations**
- **Sept 2011**   **Conference and FINAL REPORT**

Survey development

⬇ Literature review to identify themes and gaps, previous questionnaires

    - from the work of EU Kids Online I, 2006-9

⬇ Scope themes and hypotheses, sampling decisions, research ethics

    - network meeting with international advisors, June 2009

    - draft survey questionnaire, Nov 2009

⬇ Iterative drafting and validation process, with network and experts:

    - cognitive testing in UK, Jan 2010

    - translation (and back translation) into 24 languages, Feb 2010

    - cognitive testing in 24 countries, March 2010

    - pilot testing in 5 countries, April 2010

⬇ Fieldwork in 25 countries, *May-Oct 2010*

Survey challenges and solutions

- Ethics of research – esp. for risky experiences, vulnerable children

  → **Careful procedures, institutional approval, age versions, routing, advice leaflet**

- Translation – comparability of meaning of key terms (e.g. 'upset', 'bully')

  → **Back translation, checking by network, cognitive testing . . .**

- Children's understanding (e.g. of technical terms, platforms, services)

  → **Cognitive testing limited what was asked, especially in self-completion section**

- Children's availability, concentration, interest

  → **Complexity and length of questionnaire, pilot testing, lower age limit, age versions**

- Standardisation

  → **Standardisation (after wide discussion) preferred over contextual variations**

- Sampling representativeness

  → **3 stage stratified random sampling for national representativeness, weighted**

A few key points

- Consciously aiming to draw on best practices in cross national survey design e.g. the ESS, HBSC
- The network included as much as possible in the design of the survey to have national contexts reflected in the questionnaire design
- Attention was paid to the difficulty of translating certain concepts already at the design stage so before the actual translation process there was already an idea of how these concepts and words would be dealt with
- The network mobilized in quality checks throughout the design process and during fieldwork
- Cognitive interviewing carried out in all participating countries.
- Working with a single fieldwork agency which allowed for considerable control over details in the survey process
- Using a single fieldwork agency meant that the data collection was being carried out within an existing infrastructure which probably reduced the number of practical issues to be solved