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Welcome to the findings of the World Internet Project.

This report represents the fifth published results of the World Internet Project, collaboratively produced by the Center for the Digital Future in the USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism in the USA and partner countries worldwide. This work on the impact of the Internet has evolved during 13 years of exploration and reveals an international picture of change brought about by online technology.

We originally created this project in 1999 because the Internet represents the most important technological development of our generation; the effects of the Internet may surpass those of television and could someday rival those of the printing press.

In little more than a decade, the Internet has become a worldwide phenomenon, transforming entertainment, communication, information-gathering, and education across the globe. The scope of change varies widely from country to country – a prime reason for a comparative international study.

By beginning our study of the Internet early in its evolution, we have built a broad base of knowledge and analyzed the effects of the Internet as it evolves, and not as postscripts after it has matured.

To achieve our objectives, the 39 countries that are partners in the World Internet Project conduct surveys of individuals in thousands of households, compiling the responses of Internet users and non-users*. We explore how online technology affects the lives of those who use the Internet, and how the views and behavior of users differ from those of people who are not online.

The World Internet Project partners are expanding their explorations of Internet use as technology evolves. As new types of access become available – such as the growth of broadband almost a decade ago, wireless access today, or when other methods now unknown come tomorrow – the project will track them.

*Note: Our analysis is based on respondents aged 18 and older
The World Internet Project: why an ongoing study of the Internet?

The research by the global network of partners in the World Internet Project differs from most other studies of online technology in three principal ways:

1. **The World Internet Project looks at the social impact of the Internet**
   Most Internet studies gather data about who is online, how long they are online, and what they do online. The World Internet Project also compiles this information, but then examines the implications of the use of online technology, and links this use to a broad range of values, behavior, attitudes, and perceptions.

2. **The project focuses on Internet non-users as well as users**
   The World Internet Project follows how the behavior and views of Internet users differ from those of non-users.

3. **The World Internet Project engages government and private industry decision-makers who can create policy based on our finding**
   Our work involves public and private organizations that use our results. Many WIP partners work closely with corporations – some of which are direct competitors – and foundations, all of whom are engaged with us in an ongoing dialogue about the issues we explore in our studies.

The World Internet Project: key areas

As you will see in these pages, the World Internet Project includes findings that compare the actions and views of Internet users and non-users. The report is organized into ten general subject areas:

- Internet Users and Non-users
- Information Seeking Online
- Access to Online Services
- The Internet and Social Connections
- Politics and the Internet
- Media Use, Reliability, and Importance
- User-generated Content and Social Media
- Online Entertainment
- Online Purchasing and Personal Privacy
- Online Communication

We hope these findings from the World Internet Project will enlighten you about the many ways in which online technology is transforming our world.

Jeffrey I. Cole, Ph.D.
Director, USC Annenberg School Center for the Digital Future
Founder and Organizer, World Internet Project
WORLD INTERNET PROJECT
International Partners
Status Reports
The Internet in Cyprus

Cyprus University of Technology (CUT)
Department of Communication and Internet Studies
http://www.cut.ac.cy

The economic and political context

In recent years, the Republic of Cyprus has seen momentous changes in its economic environment, which are inevitably reflected in the mode and tempo of adoption and use of Internet technologies in the country.

After more than three decades of unbroken growth, the Cypriot free-market, service-based economy started to contract in 2009. The exposure of Cyprus to the global recession and the Greek debt crisis, as well as a serious explosion at a naval base in July 2011, led to the 2012-2013 Cyprus financial crisis. This led to the downgrading of Cyprus’ credit rating by international rating houses from March to June 2012, negotiations between “the Troika” and the Cypriot government until the end of November 2012, and the final €10 billion bail-in agreement on March 2013. The latter resulted in the closing of Cyprus’ second largest bank and levying uninsured deposits in the two largest banks in the country. These developments caused big protests against the austerity measures in November and December 2012 and against the bail-in terms in 2013. As a result of the crisis, unemployment increased to record levels for Cyprus: by 2012, the Labour Force Survey (LFS) unemployment rate increased to 11.1 percent (from 3.7 percent in 2008) and the long-term unemployment rate (total unemployment) to 20.9 percent.

ICT policy and Internet use

Early in 2012, the Cypriot government established an inclusive plan for development of the “Information Society” and the uptake of ICTs in Cyprus (2012-2020). This plan was entitled “Digital Strategy for Cyprus,” in line with the EU strategy “Digital Agenda for Europe.” The main goals are to achieve universal ultra high-speed access, promote competition and decrease broadband prices, modernize public administration and provide public electronic services (eGovernment, eHealth, Smart City), secure inclusion of all, promote ICT in education, and promote digital entrepreneurship.

At the end of 2012, the online population continues to grow, albeit at a less impressive pace than in the recent past. The percentage of Internet users in the Republic of Cyprus was 61.6 percent. The uptake of the Internet in the business sector also shows upward trends. The percentage of enterprises with fixed broadband access is higher than the EU average, and almost as high is the percentage of enterprises interacting online with public authorities. However, as far as citizens in general are concerned, both the provision and take-up of public services lag significantly behind. A comparative analysis of e-parliaments in countries of Southern Europe from 2004 to 2013 shows that Cyprus’ progress continues to be very slow. In fact, in terms of multi-lateral interactivity (the existence of online tools for consultation and feedback between MPs and citizens), Cyprus is at the bottom with a null score.

The most popular online activities for Greek-Cypriots are finding information about goods or services, exchanging e-mails, reading newspapers and magazines, and posting in social networking sites. The percentage of users looking for news online at least daily almost doubled (65 percent) compared to 2010 (34 percent). This increase can be explained by the proliferation of online sources for news in Cyprus within the last few years, as well as the fact that crisis and uncertainty are often associated with a rise in news consumption due to an increased need for orientation. Social media, especially Facebook, are extremely popular in Cyprus (over 88 percent of Internet users in Cyprus are Facebook users). Almost 30 percent of Internet users in the first quarter of 2012 used mobile phones or smart phones to access the Internet away from home or work, and 25.9 percent used a laptop, notebook, or netbook.
The Internet in Mexico

Tecnológico de Monterrey, Proyecto Internet
www.wip.mx

Mexico has an estimated population of 113 million (INEGI, 2010). It is a federation comprised of thirty-one free and sovereign states and a Federal District, the capital city. After Mexico City, the three most prominent cities are Monterrey, Guadalajara, and Puebla. The nation is also considered the second largest market in Latin America.

The Internet penetration in Mexico (2012) was about 46 percent, which is roughly equivalent to 52.3 million users. Currently, 80 percent of Mexican households have at least one Internet user. Some people access from their homes, while others use the Internet in schools, offices, and other places. A striking feature of the typical Mexican user is youthfulness. As age increases, Internet use decreases.

The composition of the Internet user base by socioeconomic status is as follows: high socioeconomic level (33 percent), middle income range (23 percent), low socioeconomic level (30 percent), and very low socioeconomic level (14 percent). The last two categories have exhibited the most growth over the last year. This is most likely due to the growing penetration of mobile devices in the country, which has in part occurred because of the greater affordability of connection plans.

According to the COFETEL (Federal Telecommunications Commission), Mexican broadband subscriptions grew 49.7 percent from 2011 to 2012. There are now more than 14 million broadband users in Mexico. This growth is directly related to the spread of mobile Internet connections. There are more than 100 million mobile phone lines in Mexico (84.6 million lines are owned by prepaid users, and 16.3 million are postpaid).

Since the arrival of mobile devices (cell phones, media players, and tablets), the use of the Internet has become ubiquitous. Three times as many users accessed the Internet by mobile phone in 2012, compared to 2011. The mobile device penetration and use rates have also significantly contributed to a reconfiguration of family interaction.

The Internet has also had an effect on federal elections. In 2012, sixty percent of users followed the presidential campaign on the Internet (using social media, websites, and e-mail). The Internet was an important tool for organizing and mobilizing voters. For the very first time in Mexico all candidates used the Internet to attract voters and recognized the importance of maintaining a presence in the digital environment.

The Internet is significantly affecting the perceptions, habits, and customs of Mexican society. The economy, the polity, and culture have been altered, and a new ecosystem has been put in place by digital technologies.
The Internet in Poland

Gazeta.pl Research and Analyses Unit
http://badania.gazeta.pl

Growing differences

In Poland the distance between Internet users and non-users is expanding. The 62 percent of the Polish population aged 15 years or more that use the Internet are also becoming more advanced in their use of technology and new media in general. Many of the 38 percent who are non-users are not aware of the practical benefits that the Internet may have for their lives and are afraid of such negative effects as Internet addiction.

The proportion of users has been fairly stable over the last couple of years. The split between users and non-users is strongly correlated with age and education. More than 9 in 10 Poles under 30 years of age are Internet users, while for groups above 60 years of age the Internet penetration rate drops well below 20 percent.

Technology use

The use of technology by Polish Internet users has become more advanced with the growing adoption of mobile devices and laptops. Thirty-one percent of Internet users own a smartphone, 12 percent a tablet, and 13 percent a television set with an Internet connection. Seven percent have at least three devices connected to the Internet in their households.

The laptop is the most popular device used for the Internet in Poland with 67 percent (and growing) penetration among Internet users. The second most popular device is the desktop PC (55 percent), and the third is the smartphone (or feature phone) with exploding popularity, especially for those under 30 years of age (28 percent in the total population and almost 40 percent among users aged 30 and under).

Seventy percent of Polish users go online with one device only, but 22 percent use two Internet-connected devices, and 8 percent use three or more devices for going online.

The time spent on the Internet is growing. Today an average Internet user in Poland spends 2 hours and 14 minutes online daily. The average daily time is more than one hour longer on average for users between the ages of 15 and 19.

Non-users

Today 38 percent of Polish population does not use Internet. This includes 4 percent of the population who have had some experience. The 4 percent of ex-users have a much more positive attitude towards Internet than those who never used it. The main reasons for not using the Web by the ex-users are economic: 36 percent of them have no access to a computer, and 22 percent see the Internet as too expensive for them.
The Internet in Russia
Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities
http://mggu-sh.ru/en

In Russia, the Internet is becoming increasingly important.

Internet users already comprise about 60 percent of Russia's population, and nearly 40 percent go online daily; for most users, the Internet has become routine. The Internet audience is still growing, but the growth rate is slowing. Expansion of the Internet audience in the last two to three years is primarily due to the strong growth of mobile communications. The number of mobile users is approaching 35 million people, accounting for almost 44 percent of the total population. From 2011 to 2012 the Russian Internet's mobile audience grew by 51 percent.

Currently, a majority of Internet users are younger, but the Web's audience is maturing as older people are increasingly going online. A majority of users (53 percent) are women.

The Internet has become an important part of everyday life for Russians. Ninety-seven percent of users go online at home, and 44 percent do so at work. Ninety-two percent of Russians (over 100 million people) have the ability to access the Internet at home, and 70 percent of users have high-speed (broadband) access.

Along with growing Internet penetration, Russians increasingly perceive the Web as an important source of information. The most popular search engine system in Russia is "Yandex," followed by Google and Mail.ru.

The highest rates of Internet penetration are found in Moscow and St. Petersburg. But not far behind are other major cities such as Tyumen, Irkutsk, and Nizhny Novgorod.

The most popular activity on the Internet is use of social networking sites. Virtually all Russian Internet users visit social networking sites. Russian Internet users on average spend more than half of their time online visiting social networking sites. The most popular Russian social networks are Odnoklassniki, VKontakte, and Moi Mir (My World). The popularity of Facebook and Twitter among Russians is growing.

Over the past year, Russian use of e-government has increased significantly. Seventy-eight regions of Russia are connected by a federal portal of public services.

It is estimated that 2.1 percent of Russia's GDP is attributable to the Internet. More than 14 million Russians make purchases on the Internet at least once a year.

In summary, at present there is a rapid development of the Internet in Russia not only as a communication system, but also as a multi-level social and cultural space.
Internet use in South Africa has surged from 15% of the population in 2008 to 34% in 2012. The country’s international connectivity has significantly improved with new high capacity sea cables connecting it to Europe and India, as well as other African countries on the East and West coasts. The cost of connecting, especially on mobile wireless networks, has also fallen considerably.

The Internet is now penetrating the mass population. We find that about two thirds of new users live on less than $150 per month. But our research also indicates that their access is limited by four major factors: the state of the communications infrastructure, availability and cost of devices, costs of data, and literacy.

Communications Infrastructure

Less than one in five households has a fixed line phone connection, and cable or “fiber to the home” connections are exceptionally rare. Most people are dependent on mobile wireless EDGE or 3G networks to get online. As a result, speeds are relatively slow and congestion is common. 4th generation LTE networks began services in 2013, and significant investments have been made in “backbone” fiber infrastructure.

Devices

Less than a quarter of homes have computers. In contrast, almost 85% of the population owns a mobile phone. About half of these devices are capable of connecting online. The costs of higher specification feature phones and smartphones have been falling, and indications are that they could fall substantially in the near future.

Data Costs

Most mobile users do not have phone contracts. They buy (more expensive) pre-paid vouchers for purchasing voice and data services. There are no uncapped services available on a “pre-paid” basis. The cheapest data bought this way costs around $15 per GB, so people ration their Internet use carefully.

Literacy in English

We found that literacy in English strongly correlates with Internet use. Only 3 in 100 people who did not read and write English easily reported using the Internet. This suggests two important areas for further study of the South African and African Internet. First, while Internet use is growing in Africa, content generation online, including content in African languages, may not be growing to the same extent. Second, limitations of bandwidth and relatively high costs may be restricting Internet users to text content – where literacy matters most – and denying people access to video and audio content that would be more useful to them.
**Internet Lite?**

The Internet is becoming a mainstream communications technology in South Africa thanks largely to widespread access to mobile devices and mobile wireless networks. We expect Internet use to continue to diffuse to a majority of the population in the near future. But the “mobile miracle” has its limitations. Relying on mobile as their only or main means of access does not offer South African users the same experience as the “always on, always with you” services available to people in many richer countries where mobile devices and networks have been extending but not replacing fixed-line networks and PC access.

For more information and analysis see “The New Wave” report on Internet use in South Africa by Indra de Lanerolle, University of Witwatersrand, available at http://www.networksociety.co.za
The Internet in Sweden

SE (The Internet Infrastructure Foundation)
World Internet Institute
www.iis.se
www.wii.se

In 2012 Sweden was still ranked first in the World Economic Forum’s Network Readiness Index and in the WWW Foundation’s Web Index. But when it comes to the number of high capacity broadband connections, Sweden is not among the top ten countries (Akamai, 2012).

Sweden, along with the other Nordic countries, has been at the forefront of Internet diffusion. Sweden remains in the leading position and, depending on what age range the estimate is based, 94 percent (where those over the age of 75 are excluded) or 89 percent of adults are online.

Recently there has been special interest in the older generations as 18 percent of the population is older than 65 and most non-users belong to this group. A campaign to increase the digital participation among those who still are non-users has been launched with involvement of libraries and a variety of educational associations.

Even if 97 per cent of the users have access to a broadband connection (86 percent of the population), not everyone, especially in remote areas, has a high capacity (100 MB) connection. The government has set aside money to address this problem.

There have been significant changes in the use of the mobile Internet after the introduction of new smart phones and a new pricing system. The number of users and actual use has increased significantly. Today 54 percent of the population is using smart phones and 20 percent have access to a tablet. Young people, including those as young as eight years old, are the most active users of the mobile Internet.

Those who were surrounded by computers and the Internet from the beginning of their lives are now growing up. At the turn of the century those in their early teen years were beginning to familiarize themselves with the Internet. In the year 2000 half of 13-year-olds had tried the Internet. Four years later, in 2004, half of nine-year-olds had begun to at least occasionally use the Internet. In 2012 this 50 percent online figure applies to those 3 years of age.

Blogging has never been a common activity here (only six percent of all Swedes in 2012), but it has become part of the Internet culture among young Swedish women. This typically begins for females in their early teen years, when boys are still mostly interested in gaming. Already at the age of 12 half of all girls are active on blogs. And among those females between the ages of 16 and 25, two-thirds actively write or have written a blog, and three of four read others’ blogs.

After a steady rise in the percentage of those who share files in the past ten years, this activity seems to have plateaued. Young men dominate in this area. Half of young men between the ages of 16 and 25 share files, and another 25 percent have shared files at some point in the past.

More Internet users are reading newspapers, listening to the radio, and watching television online. But still the traditional platforms dominate the use of the traditional media. Very few are not watching television from a traditional television set and very few are not reading printed newspapers. There is, however, one exception: tabloid newspapers are now mostly read online.
The Internet in Taiwan

Taiwan e-Governance Research Center
Department of Public Administration, National Chengchi University
http://www.teg.org.tw
http://pa.nccu.edu.tw/

Taiwan, a nation with a population of over 23.2 million and ranked twenty-first in 2012 in terms of GDP, is one of the most technologically advanced countries in East Asia. In the 2012 IMD (International Institute for Management Development) World Competitiveness Rankings, Taiwan was ranked seventh.

However, as with most developed nations, Taiwan’s citizens over 65 years of age have been increasing rapidly, from 7 percent in 1993 to 11 percent in 2013. The problem of an aging population, coupled with low birthrates, makes it imperative to recognize the various aspects of the use of the Internet by elderly citizens.

**Internet user characteristics**

Almost half of the elderly Internet users (those age 60 and above) had a college education or above (50 percent), and 61 percent of them were managers or professionals in the private or public sector. The majority of elderly non-Internet users (60 percent) had an elementary school education or less. The majority (57 percent) of younger Internet users (those below age 60) had a college education or above, and many worked as employees in the private sector (30 percent). The majority of younger non-Internet users had an education level of senior/vocational high school graduate or less, and worked at lower level jobs in the private sector (30 percent), or were homemakers (25 percent).

Elderly Internet users were mostly military/public servants or those who worked as supervisors. In other words, the digital divide caused by the difference in occupation in the elderly was more significant than that in the younger population.

**Internet use patterns**

The most frequently used device for both elderly and younger Internet users was the personal computer (79 percent for elderly Internet users, 75 percent for younger Internet users), followed by the laptop (16 percent for elderly Internet users, 18 percent for younger Internet users). The difference in the use of smart phones was significant. Approximately 5 percent of younger Internet users used the smart phone as the main tool for accessing the Internet; however, only 1 percent of elderly Internet users used it to access the Internet.

Television remained the main source of information and leisure entertainment for both elderly Internet users and non-users. The main source of leisure entertainment for young Internet users was the Internet (48 percent); however, their main source of information remained the television (44 percent). For young non-Internet users, the television was still the main source of both information (77 percent) and leisure entertainment (83 percent).
Internet’s impact on interpersonal interaction and happiness

Ninety percent of both elderly and younger Internet users said that Internet use did not affect the time they spent face-to-face with their families. Moreover, most older and younger users did not feel that there was any significant change in the face-to-face time spent with friends. Nevertheless, 10 percent of younger Internet users reported that the time that they spent face-to-face with their friends had decreased due to using the Internet. Another 10 percent of younger Internet users indicated that, owing to the use of the Internet, the time they spent face-to-face with their friends had increased. Internet users were generally happier than non-users, and elderly Internet users’ level of happiness was higher than that of younger Internet users. A total of 39 percent of the elderly Internet users said that they were happier after using the Internet, while only 25 percent of younger Internet users felt that way.

Conclusion

Our research has observed several key findings that we hope will be of use for future policy development. First, the digital divide between elderly Internet users and non-Internet users was more significant than that between younger Internet users and non-users. Second, Internet use frequency and the substitution effect on traditional media was lower for the elderly Internet users than for younger Internet users. Third, the influence of Internet use on the interpersonal interactions of the elderly was lower than that for the younger population. Fourth, Internet users were happier than non-Internet users. Fifth, Internet use increased the level of happiness in the elderly Internet users significantly more than in the younger population. Last, elderly Internet users and younger Internet users shared a similar habit using the PC as the main device for accessing the Internet. In light of these findings we suggest allocating available resources to the elderly caught in the digital divide.
The Internet in the United States of America

Center for the Digital Future
USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism
www.digitalcenter.org

As the Digital Future Project enters its second decade, the smartphone is playing a more important role in people's daily lives and more media consumption has shifted to the online environment. Meanwhile, growth in social media and e-commerce has caused more concern over privacy issues and children's well-being.

The rise of smartphones

Smartphones are now in a majority of U.S. households (54 percent), enjoying a higher penetration rate than digital video recorders (47 percent), e-readers (33 percent) and tablets (31 percent). Its varied use had seen remarkable growth over a short span of two years. In 2010, use of smartphones for taking pictures, playing games, and accessing the Internet stood at 60 percent, 23 percent, and 23 percent, respectively, among smartphone users. In 2012, those numbers increased to 79 percent, 43 percent, and 59 percent, respectively. Most (59 percent) smartphone users considered voice to be the most important function they performed on their device, and 24 percent and 18 percent of smartphone users rated texting and Internet access, respectively, as the most important function for them. The combined 42 percent for texting and Internet access shows that data service has become an important part of smartphone users' communication.

Online media consumption

Among Internet users age 17 and older, the Internet (79 percent) surpassed television (66 percent), radio (55 percent), and newspapers (55 percent) as an important or very important source of information for them. In regard to entertainment, the Internet was considered as an important or very important source for them by the second highest percentage of Internet users age 17 and older (67 percent), second only to television (76 percent). For many Internet users, entertainment activities have thrived in the online environment. For instance, 54 percent of Internet users listened to or acquired paid music online, 53 percent watched television programs online through a free streaming service, and 37 percent watched movies online through a paid service. In addition, Internet users streamed an average of two movies online and bought an average of 1.5 digital songs per week.

Social media

Social media has become well-entrenched in the Internet world, and through it Internet users engage in a variety of activities. In 2012, 65 percent of Internet users visited social networking or video-sharing websites, an increase from 62 percent in 2010. Also, 67 percent of them posted pictures online, and 53 percent updated their personal status on social media. Over one third of the Internet users (37 percent) considered social networking sites important or very important for helping them maintain social relationships. Social media also serves as an important platform for Internet users to connect with brands online. For instance, Internet users friended an average of 3.5 companies or brands on social networking sites, and also followed companies or brands (an average of 0.7) on Twitter.
Online purchasing

In 2012, 76 percent of Internet users age 18 and older purchased online, an increase from the 68 percent in 2010 and 65 percent in 2009. The following items were the most popular, with over 60 percent of online purchasers buying them: books (66 percent), clothes (66 percent), travel arrangements (66 percent), and gifts (60 percent). Looking into the future, over 50 percent of online purchasers said the following benefits would motivate them to make more online purchases: lower shipping costs (61 percent), better prices (58 percent), zero sales tax (52 percent), and fast delivery (51 percent). As a result of e-commerce, 59 percent of online purchasers reported that their Internet purchases had somewhat or significantly reduced their purchase of similar products or services from local retail stores. With the diffusion of smart mobile devices, Internet users are also empowered to have more control over their online shopping and purchase experience. For instance, 30 percent of Internet users compared prices on their mobile device when in the store to find out whether there is a better deal available elsewhere.

Privacy and security: concerns continue

Along with the increasingly diversified use of the Internet for purchasing and social networking in the United States, there have been major concerns about privacy among the general public. In 2012, about nine in ten respondents age 16 and older had some level of concern about the privacy of their personal information when or if they bought something on the Internet. In regard to credit card security, 89 percent of respondents age 18 and older reported concerns. People are also concerned that Internet technology gives companies the ability to track consumers' online behavior and identify their purchase patterns. In 2012, 92 percent of respondents age 16 and older were concerned about the privacy of their personal information as a result of this. In 2012, 96 percent of respondents age 16 and older were also concerned about the privacy of their personal information on social networking sites.

Even though companies have taken steps to protect Internet users' privacy, it seems there is a long way to go before people's concerns are alleviated. Among respondents age 16 and older, 52 percent believed that we are in the era of Big Brother, and 44 percent said they watched every move they make to protect their privacy.

Children online

Children's use of the Internet has always been a concern to parents. In 2012, 32 percent of adults with children in their household who use the Internet said those children spend too much time online, a slight increase from the 28 percent in 2010 and 23 percent in 2009.

With online bullying and other threats on the rise, there are legitimate concerns over children's use of the Internet, and adults have taken an active role in supervision. In 2012, 46 percent of the adults had password access to their children's social networking accounts, and 70 percent of adults monitored their children's activities on social networking sites. In regard to children's use of the Internet, respondents on average considered 15 to be the appropriate age for having a Facebook account, versus age 13 for a mobile phone.
FINDINGS

1 Internet use and non-use
1.1 Internet penetration in the World Internet Project countries

**Overall Internet use**

Five of the six countries reporting findings in the 2013 World Internet Project have a majority of respondents who were Internet users. South Africa reported one-third of respondents are Internet users.

Two countries reported an Internet penetration rate of more than 80 percent: Sweden (87 percent) and the United States (85 percent).

![Internet use - all respondents](chart)

**Internet use among men and women**

Gender disparity in Internet use continues in all of the WIP reporting countries, with higher percentages of men than women going online.

The gender gap is the largest in Cyprus (among Turkish-Cypriots, 15 percent more men than women use the Internet), followed by South Africa (12 percent more men than women go online) and Cyprus (among Greek-Cyriots, 11 percent more men than women use the Internet).

In Poland, Taiwan, and the United States, the gap in Internet use between men and women is four percentage points or less.

![Internet use by gender - all respondents](chart)
Internet use and education levels

Internet use increases as education levels increase.

The Internet is used by more than half of respondents with a high school education in all of the WIP countries. Among respondents with a college degree or higher, the Internet penetration rate is more than 90 percent in all WIP countries except Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots).

![Internet use and education levels - all respondents](image)

Internet use by age

All of the WIP countries reported that in general, Internet use decreases as age increases. Nevertheless, there is a wide range of Internet use reported among the oldest respondents in several countries.

In all of the WIP countries except South Africa, high percentages of respondents under age 35 use the Internet; all of the countries other than South Africa reported at least 90 percent of respondents age 18-24 go online, and all of the countries except Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and South Africa reported at least 85 percent of respondents age 25-34 use the Internet. All of the WIP countries except South Africa reported at least a majority of respondents ages 35-54 go online.

As in previous WIP studies, all of the participating countries continue to report lower percentages of Internet use among older respondents; only Sweden and the United States reported large majorities of respondents age 55 or older who go online. In Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), Poland, South Africa, and Taiwan, Internet use among the oldest respondents (age 65 and older) is below 10 percent.

![Internet use by age - all respondents](image)
Internet use and income level

The WIP countries reported wide disparity in Internet use based on income; in all of the countries, the gap is notable when comparing respondents in the upper 50 percent of household income to the lower 50 percent.

The largest difference in Internet use based on income were reported in Poland (38 percentage points), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 32 percentage points), and South Africa (28 percentage points). The smallest gap in Internet use was in Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 15 percentage points).

1.2 Internet use: at home, work, school, and other locations

Internet use at home

All of the WIP countries reported an average of at least ten hours per week of Internet use at home. Greek Cypriots reported much higher average Internet use at home than the other WIP respondents (18 hours weekly), while Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and Sweden (11.1 hours), and Poland (11 hours) reported the lowest weekly home Internet use.
Internet use at work

With the exception of Poland and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), all of the WIP countries reported more than 10 hours of weekly Internet use on average at work (outside the home). Russia reported the highest average (15.5 hours weekly), followed by Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 12.7 hours).

Q5 | Internet use at work – Internet users who are employed

Internet use at school

All of the WIP countries reported more than 3.5 hours each week online at school on average. Turkish Cypriots reported the lowest level of Internet access at school (3.6 hours), while students in Poland reported slightly more (4 hours).

Q5 | Internet use at school – students who are not employed
Internet use at other locations

Internet use at locations other than home, school, or work is generally low – 1.5 hours or less on average in all of the WIP countries. Russia reported almost no Internet use from locations other than home, school, or work (0.1 hours weekly).

1.3 Wireless Internet: access and use

Internet access through wireless handheld devices

Access to the Internet through wireless handheld devices varies widely among the WIP countries. For example, in South Africa, 72 percent of users access the Internet with a wireless handheld device, while 15 percent of users in Poland go online with a handheld device.

In addition to South Africa, Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), Russia, Sweden, and the United States reported at least 40 percent of users go online with a wireless handheld device.
Internet access by wireless handheld devices: hours per week

While the percentage of users who go online with a wireless handheld device is relatively high (see the previous finding), the weekly time spent online is generally low.

Only Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 12.2 hours weekly) reported more than 10 hours a week of Internet access with handheld wireless devices, with the United States reporting the lowest level (4.8 hours weekly).

1.4 Internet connections at home

In most of the reporting WIP countries, Internet access at home among users is near-universal – 90 percent or more – and Mexico reported 81 percent home online access.

At the other extreme, South Africa reported 38 percent home Internet access.
Connection types at home

Broadband dominates as the primary method of Internet connection used at home in most of the WIP countries. Greek Cypriots reported the highest level of broadband access (89 percent), while Turkish Cypriots, Poland, Russia, Sweden, and the United States have at least 50 percent of users with broadband at home.

Measureable percentages of users in all of the countries continue to report Internet access through a phone modem. Countries reporting that at least 10 percent of Internet users go online through phone modems at home are Cyprus (Greek-Cypriot, 10 percent; and Turkish-Cypriots, 32 percent), and Russia (21 percent).

1.5 Years online

Internet experience varies widely in the WIP countries. Users in Sweden and the United States reported the most years online -- an average of 14.6 years. Taiwan and Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots) were the only other two countries reporting more than eight years on average of online experience.

The least average online experience was reported in Russia (5 years) and South Africa (5.3 years).
1.6 Internet non-users: reasons for not going online

Internet non-users reported a variety of reasons for not going online: no interest or not useful, lack of knowledge or confusion about going online, no computer or Internet connection, the expense, or lack of time.

In the previous WIP study, the primary reason reported in almost all of the reporting countries for not going online was “no interest/not useful.” However, in the current study, the largest reason varied from country to country.

For example, the largest percentage of non-users in Cyprus (both Greek and Turkish) and Mexico said “don’t know how to use,” while in Poland, Russia, Sweden, and Taiwan, the reason cited by the largest percentage of non-users was “no interest.” In the United States, the largest percentage of non-users reported “no computer” as their reason for not being online.

The cost of going online was not a significant factor for non-use in any of the WIP countries; only Mexico reported more than 10 percent of non-users (13 percent) who said that a reason they were not online was it was too expensive. In Cyprus, Poland, Sweden, and Taiwan, three percent or less of non-users cited expense as a reason they were not using the Internet.

Q4 | Reasons for not going online – Internet non-users
2 Information-seeking online
2.1 Searching for product, travel, and health information

Product information

Moderate percentages of Internet users in the current WIP study said they go online at least weekly (several times a day, daily, or weekly) to look for information about products.

Less than 40 percent of users in Poland (35 percent), Sweden (30 percent), and Russia (28 percent) go online at least weekly for product information. By contrast, half of users in the United States go online weekly to look for product information.

Of particular note are the nearly 40 percent of users in Russia who never go online to look for product information (38 percent) – more than twice the percentage of the next-highest reporting country (Poland, with 17 percent).

*Q22A | Searching online for product information – Internet users*
**Travel information**

Perhaps because travel is, for most people, only an occasional event, less than half of Internet users in all of the WIP countries go online at least monthly to look for travel information: Sweden (45 percent), the United States (42 percent), Poland (37 percent), and Russia (31 percent).

All of the countries in the current study reported less than 20 percent of users who look for travel information at least weekly (several times a day, daily, or weekly).

![Travel information chart](chart)

**Health information**

More than half of users access online information about health issues at least monthly in all of the WIP countries except Sweden: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 61 percent), the United States (55 percent), and Poland and Russia (51 percent). In Sweden, 30 percent of Internet users go online for health information at least monthly.

In all of the WIP countries, at least 10 percent of users go online at least weekly to look for health information. Conversely, in Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots), Russia, and Sweden, 20 percent or more of users never access the Internet for health information.

![Health information chart](chart)
2.2  Internet use to look for jobs or work

As with searches for travel information, going online to search for jobs is not typically an everyday activity. While large percentages of Internet users never go online to look for jobs – more than half of users in all of the WIP countries except the United States – surprising percentages of users go online at least weekly to look for jobs or work: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 27 percent), United States (19 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 14 percent), Poland (12 percent), Russia (11 percent), and Sweden (7 percent).

![Q20C](chart)

2.3  Visiting religious or spiritual websites

Very small percentages of users visit religious or spiritual websites – less than 10 percent of users in all of the WIP countries except the United States go online weekly or more.

In all of the WIP countries except the United States, at least 70 percent of users never go online to look at religious or spiritual websites.

![Q21D](chart)
2.4 Finding or checking a fact

Large percentages of Internet users go online to find or check facts – often several times a day.

More than 20 percent of users in three of the countries use the Internet daily or several times a day to find or check a fact: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 36 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 33 percent), and the United States (28 percent). In all of the WIP countries except Russia, at least 40 percent of users go online weekly or more to find or check a fact.

Only Russia reported more than 30 percent of users who never go online to find or check a fact.

![Chart showing percentage of users finding or checking facts online]

2.5 Looking up the definition of a word

Similar to fact finding, large percentages of users go online regularly to look up the definition of a word: reporting online searches to look up the definition of a word at least weekly were the United States (41 percent), Sweden (38 percent), Russia (33 percent), and Poland (28 percent).

Only in Russia did more than 30 percent of users never go online to look up the definition of a word.

![Chart showing percentage of users looking up word definitions online]
2.6  **Internet use for school-related work**

In the WIP countries, students go online extensively for school work. All of the WIP countries reported significant percentages of students who go online at least daily for their school work: the United States (52 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 42 percent), Russia (32 percent), Poland (30 percent), and Sweden (29 percent).

Small percentages of students in all of the WIP countries except Russia (27 percent) never go online for school work.

**Q23C | Using the Internet for school-related work – student users who are not employed**

![Bar chart showing the frequency of internet use for school-related work by students who are not employed in various countries.](image)
### 2.7 Browsing the Web

How often do Internet users in the WIP countries go online to browse without a specific destination? In all of the reporting countries except Russia, majorities of users browse the Web at least weekly: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 87 percent), United States (79 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 79 percent), Poland (75 percent), and Sweden (51 percent).

In four countries, more than a majority browse the Internet without a specific destination daily or several times a day: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 77 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 63 percent), United States (61 percent), and Poland (53 percent).

**Q21G | Going online without a specific destination – Internet users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than Monthly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Greek-Cypriot)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriot)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Access to online services
3.1 Online radio

Only modest percentages of Internet users in the WIP countries listen to online radio. Only in the United States do more than one-quarter of users (26 percent) listen to online radio at least weekly, compared to Poland and Sweden (20 percent), and Russia (12 percent).

In all of the WIP countries except the United States, at least 57 percent of users never listen to online radio.

3.2 Betting online

Internet users in the WIP countries rarely go online to bet, gamble, or enter sweepstakes. In all of the WIP countries, 85 percent or more of users never go online to bet, and in none of the countries do more than seven percent of users go online to bet monthly or more.

The largest percentage of users who bet, gamble, or enter sweepstakes at all was reported in the United States (15 percent total).
3.3 Sexual content

Large percentages of Internet users in the WIP countries said they never go online for sexual content: Sweden (82 percent), Russia (79 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 75 percent), Poland (72 percent), United States (69 percent), and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 65 percent).

However, modest percentages reported going online at least monthly for sexual content: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 29 percent), United States (19 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 16 percent), Poland (15 percent), Russia (12 percent), and Sweden (10 percent).

3.4 Distance learning

Very small percentages of Internet users in the WIP countries go online to participate in distance learning for job training or an academic degree – not surprising given the limited number of users involved in ongoing formal education. However, all of the WIP countries reported some users who are involved in distance learning on an ongoing basis: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 17 percent), Poland (14 percent), United States (11 percent), Russia (9 percent), Sweden (5 percent), and Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 3 percent).

In all of the WIP countries, at least 70 percent of users never go online for distance learning.
### 3.5 Travel reservations or bookings

Using the Internet to make travel reservations varies widely in the WIP countries. For example, in Sweden, 22 percent of users never go online for travel reservations, compared to 82 percent of users in Russia who never use the Internet for travel purposes.

As with going online to find travel information (see page 34), regular use of the Internet for travel reservations is modest. However, all of the WIP countries except Russia reported at least 40 percent of users go online at some point for travel reservations. Moreover, all of the countries except Taiwan also reported going online monthly or more for travel reservations: Sweden (27 percent), United States (17 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 14 percent), Poland (10 percent), Russia (8 percent).

![Bar chart showing travel reservation frequency by country](chart.png)
3.6 Online financial transactions

As financial services move increasingly online, the World Internet Project is exploring how online bill payment, online banking, and online investing are conducted by Internet users in the WIP countries.

Paying bills online

The WIP countries reported wide differences in paying bills online. In three of the reporting countries, paying bills online was reported by many Internet users: more than a majority of users reported using the Internet to pay bills at least monthly (a typical bill paying cycle) in Sweden (84 percent), United States (70 percent), and Poland (52 percent).

However, much smaller percentages of users who go online at least monthly to pay bills were reported in Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 30 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 19 percent), Russia (14 percent), and Taiwan (8 percent).
Online banking

The WIP countries reported wide differences in using banking services on the Internet.

At least 50 percent of Internet users reported going online at least monthly for online banking in Sweden (89 percent), United States (78 percent), Poland (56 percent), and Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 52 percent).

Significantly lower percentages were reported for monthly online banking in Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 25 percent) and Russia (12 percent).

Online investing

Online investing is not a popular online activity in the WIP countries. While 15 percent of Internet users in Sweden and 10 percent of users in the United States said that they invest online at least monthly, even smaller percentages of users in the other three WIP countries said they invest online monthly or more: Poland and Russia (6 percent), and Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 2 percent).
4 The Internet and social connections
4.1  Internet Use: social, political, professional, and religious contact

Internet use: contact with people who share users’ hobbies and recreational activities

The WIP countries reported a range of percentages of users who believe that going online has somewhat or greatly increased their contact with people who share their hobbies or recreational activities: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 54 percent), Mexico (51 percent), Poland (41 percent), Sweden and United States (30 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 28 percent), and Russia (26 percent).

However, even larger percentages reported that going online has no effect on contact with others who share hobbies or recreational interests – more than a majority in five countries.

Q9A | Does going online affect your contact with people who share your hobbies or recreational interests? (Internet users)
Internet use: effect on contact with people who share users’ political views

Most users in all of the WIP countries except Mexico said that going online has no effect on their contact with people who share their political views.

Large majorities of users in Sweden (87 percent), United States and Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots) (both 76 percent), Russia (75 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 64 percent), and Poland (63 percent) said that their use of the Internet does not change their contact with people who share their political views.

In Mexico, 38 percent of users said that Internet use has increased their contact with people who share their political views – this compared to users in Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 28 percent), Poland (24 percent), United States (18 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 17 percent), Russia (14 percent), and Sweden (8 percent) who reported the same response.

Internet use: effect on contact with people who share users’ profession

For many users, going online has a positive effect on users’ contact with others in their profession. In all of the WIP countries except Russia, one-third or more of users said that Internet use increases contact with people who share their profession: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 56 percent), Mexico (55 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 53 percent), Sweden (43 percent), Poland (36 percent), and United States (34 percent).

However, large percentages of users in most of the WIP countries said that the Internet has no effect on their contact with people in their profession; in all of the countries except Mexico, more than 40 percent of users said that the Internet had no effect on their contact with people who share their profession.

Q9F | Does going online affect your contact with people who share your profession? (Employed or retired Internet users)
Internet use: effect on contact with people who share users’ religious beliefs

More than two-thirds of users in all of the reporting countries except Mexico said that using the Internet has no effect on their contact with people who share their religious beliefs.

Only Mexico (27 percent) reported more than 20 percent of users who said that going online has increased their contact with people who share their religious beliefs, compared to Poland (19 percent), United States (15 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 13 percent), Russia (12 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 8 percent), and Sweden (3 percent).

Q9C | Does going online affect your contact with people who share your religious beliefs? (Internet users)
4.2 Internet use: contact and socializing with family and friends

Internet use: effect on contact with users’ families

Using the Internet can have a positive effect on users’ contact with their family members. In all the WIP countries, higher percentages of users said their contact with family members has increased rather than decreased because of Internet use.

The percentages reporting increased contact in each country are: Mexico (51 percent), United States (45 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 44 percent), Poland (39 percent), Sweden (34 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 29 percent), Russia (20 percent), and Taiwan (2 percent).

Large percentages of Internet users also said that the Internet has no effect on their contact with family members; in all of the WIP countries except Mexico and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), more than a majority of users said their Internet use does not change their contact with family members.

Q9D | How does your use of the Internet affect your contact with members of your family? (Internet users)
Internet use: effect on contact with users’ friends

As with views about contact with family members, many Internet users said that going online brings them closer to their friends. In all of the WIP countries except Taiwan, 30 percent or more of users said going online has somewhat or greatly increased their contact with friends: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 76 percent), Mexico (67 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 53 percent), Poland (51 percent), United States (47 percent), Sweden (46 percent), and Russia (30 percent).

However, large percentages in most of the WIP countries said that their Internet use has had no effect on their contact with friends; all of the WIP countries except Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and Mexico reported at least 40 percent of users who said that Internet use did not change their contact with friends.

Q9E | How does your use of the Internet affect your contact with members of your family? (Internet users)

At a glance: Internet use and effects on contact with users’ family and friends

Higher percentages of users in all of the WIP countries said that their use of the Internet has increased their contact with friends, compared to their contact with family.

Q9D and Q9E | Internet use: effects on contact with family and friends – Internet users
4.3 Socializing with family and friends: users vs. non-users

Time spent socializing face-to-face with family

In three of the reporting WIP countries — Cyprus (both Greek and Turkish), Russia, and Sweden -- non-users reported spending more hours on average with family (although in Russia, only marginally more) than users. The largest gap between non-users and users was found in Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots), where non-users spent 6.1 hours more on average than users socializing face-to-face with family. However, in Poland, Taiwan, and the United States, users spent more hours than non-users socializing face-to-face with family.

Q16 | During a typical week, how many hours do you spend socializing with family? (All respondents)

Time spent socializing with friends outside of school or outside of office hours

Users and non-users in most of the WIP countries generally reported spending about the same amount of time socializing with friends outside of school or the office.

In four of the WIP countries, users reported marginally more time, or the same amount of time as non-users socializing with friends.

The biggest gaps were found in countries where users reported spending more hours on average than non-users socializing with friends: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 5.2 more hours for users), and Russia (2.2 more hours for users).

Q15 | During a typical week, how many hours do you spend socializing with friends? (All respondents)
5 Politics and the Internet
5.1 The Internet and the political process

The Internet plays an important role in the political process. But how impactful is this role: does the Internet create political empowerment, help citizens participate in governance, build understanding of politics, and create greater engagement with public officials?

Does the Internet give users more political power?

Views vary across the WIP countries about the role of the Internet in giving users more political power.

In four of the WIP countries, more than 40 percent of users said the Internet gives users more political power: Taiwan (63 percent), Russia (55 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 43 percent), and Mexico (41 percent). However, other countries reported lower agreement: United States (33 percent), Poland (32 percent), Sweden (23 percent), and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 24 percent).

In all of the WIP countries, 30 percent or more of users disagree that the Internet gives users more political power.

Q10A | By using the Internet, people like you can have more political power – Internet users
Does the Internet give people more say about what the government does?

Three of the WIP countries reported 40 percent or more of Internet users who said the Internet gives users more say in what the government does: Mexico, Poland, and Russia all reported 48 percent. The lowest percentages of agreement were reported by United States (28 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 32 percent), and Sweden (33 percent).

Only in two WIP countries did more than 40 percent of Internet users disagree that the Internet gives people more say about what the government does: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 45 percent) and Russia (44 percent).

Q10B | By using the internet, people like you will have more say in what the government does – Internet users

Does the Internet help people better understand politics?

Even though many users in the WIP countries do not believe the Internet will empower them or give them more say in government, more than 40 percent of users in four of the six reporting countries believe that going online helps users better understand politics: Taiwan (62 percent), United States (58 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 53 percent), and Russia (51 percent).

Only in Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 42 percent) and Russia (40 percent) did 40 percent or more of users say the Internet does not help people better understand politics.

Q10C | By using the internet, people like you can better understand politics – Internet users
Does the Internet encourage public officials to care more about what people think?

Does going online encourage public officials to care more about what people think? In most of the WIP countries, users don’t think so.

Only in three countries did 40 percent or more of users say that the Internet encourages public officials to care more about people’s concerns: Taiwan (59 percent), Russia (52 percent), and Mexico (47 percent). Conversely, more than 40 percent of users in three countries disagree that going online encourages public officials care more about what people think: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 63 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 57 percent), Sweden, (44 percent), and Russia (41 percent).

Q10D | By using the Internet, public officials will care more about what people think – Internet users

![Bar chart showing the percentage of internet users in different countries expressing different levels of agreement with the statement that the internet encourages public officials to care more about what people think.](image)
5.2 Freedom of expression online and offline: users and non-users

While large percentages of Internet users and non-users believe in free speech and criticizing the government online, they are less supportive of online expression if the results are “extreme.”

Comfort expressing views about politics

When asked if they would be comfortable saying whatever they think about politics, significant percentages of users and non-users agree; users and non-users reported in near-equal percentages that they would be comfortable saying whatever they think about politics online, with the exception of Russia, where a much larger percentage of users than non-users agree with this concept.

Q24A | In general, I feel comfortable saying whatever I think about politics – all respondents

Feeling safe expressing views about politics while online

Is it safe for users to say whatever they want about politics while on the Internet? Views on this issue are split among the WIP countries, with 30 percent or less of users and non-users in Cyprus and United States agreeing with this concept, while 40 percent or more of users and non-users in Poland and Russians agree.

More users than non-users in all of the WIP countries agree with this concept, with the largest gap being reported in Russia (21 percentage points more users than non-users).

Q24B | On the Internet, it is safe to say whatever you think about politics – all respondents
Criticizing the government on the Internet

More users than non-users in all of the WIP countries said that they should be free to criticize their government while online.

Large majorities of users in all of the reporting countries, and nearly as large percentages of non-users agree that they should have the freedom to criticize their government while online. The gap between users and non-users was largest in Russia (21 percentage points more users than non-users) and United States (15 percentage points more users than non-users).

Expressing ideas on the Internet, even if they are extreme

Although large percentages of users and non-users alike agree that people should have the freedom to criticize the government while online (see the previous question), smaller percentages – typically between 15 and 20 percentage points lower -- agree with that view if the free speech is “extreme.”

All of the WIP countries reported higher percentages of users than non-users who agreed that it is acceptable for people to express their extreme ideas online.
**Government regulating the Internet**

Should the government regulate the Internet more than it does now? Relatively high percentages of users in Cyprus and Russia agree with this concept, and even larger percentages of non-users (or among Turkish-Cypriots, nearly as large) also agree.

In all of the WIP countries except Russia and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), more non-users than users said that their government should regulate the Internet more than it does now.

*Q24E | The government should regulate the Internet more than it does now – all respondents*
6 Media use, reliability and importance
6.1 Use of traditional media: users vs. non-users

Looking at how respondents spend time using traditional media shows that Internet users and non-users in all of the WIP countries spend the most weekly hours watching television, followed by radio; reading newspapers ranked a distant third.

Non-users in all of the WIP countries watch considerably more television than users, spend slightly more time listening to the radio in all of the countries except Cyprus, and read print newspapers marginally more in every country except Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots).

(See charts on the next page)

Watching television offline

In all of the WIP countries, non-users spend considerably more time than users watching television. The gaps between non-users and users were as follows: Russia (8.1 hours), United States (7.3 hours), Poland (6.9 hours), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 6.2 hours), Sweden (5.5 hours), and Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 4.9 hours).

Listening to radio offline

The gap between non-users and users in the amount of time they spend listening to the radio is an hour or less in all of the WIP countries except Sweden (5.9 hours).

Reading newspapers offline

Users and non-users reported similar amounts of time reading print newspapers, with a gap between them of less than an hour per week in all of the countries except Sweden (2.8 hours per week more for non-users than users) and the United States (1.6 hours per week more for non-users than users).
Watching television offline

Listening to radio offline

Reading newspapers offline
6.2 Use of the Internet to look for news

Although Internet users spend small amounts of time reading print newspapers, large percentages of users in all of the WIP countries go online to look for news.

In all of the WIP countries except Poland, more than 40 percent of users said they go online at least daily to look for news: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 65 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and United States (51 percent), Russia (44 percent), and Sweden (43 percent). Poland was only marginally lower at 39 percent.

Small percentages do not go online to look for news — the largest percentage of users who never use the Internet for news was reported by the United States (12 percent).

Q20A | Going online to look for news — Internet users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than Monthly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times a Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Greek-Cypriot)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriot)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Media reliability: information on the Internet

Large percentages of users in all of the WIP countries said they do not trust much of the information they find online.

In all of the reporting countries, less than a majority of users said that most or all of the information they find online is reliable: Mexico (45 percent), Poland and United States (43 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 36 percent), Taiwan (34 percent), Russia (32 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 28 percent), and Sweden (18 percent).

All of the WIP countries except Russia reported at least 40 percent of users who said that about half of the information they find online is reliable. Smaller percentages in most of the WIP countries said only a small portion or none of the information online is reliable, with the exception of Russia (31 percent).

Q11 | How much of the information on the Internet overall is generally reliable? (Internet users)
6.4 Media importance: media as information source (users and non-users)

Large majorities of users consider the Internet as an important or very important source of information in all of the WIP countries – 80 percent or more in three of the five countries. Only in Poland does a larger percentage – and only marginally – consider television an important source compared to the Internet.

Television ranks above or tied with newspapers in all of the WIP countries except Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots).

Among non-users, television ranks above newspapers and radio as important media sources of information in the three WIP countries that reported on non-users for this question.
6.5 Media importance: media as entertainment sources

The Internet ranks high as a source of entertainment in the WIP countries, but television ranks as high or slightly higher in all of the WIP countries except Mexico.

In Cyprus (both Greek and Turkish), Poland, Sweden, and United States, larger percentages or the same percentage of users said television is an important or very important source of information compared to the Internet. Only Mexico reported a higher percentage for the Internet as an important source of entertainment.

**Q13 | Importance of media as entertainment sources – Internet users responding important and very important**

Among non-users, larger percentages consider television an important source of entertainment compared to newspapers and radio.

**Q13 | Importance of media as entertainment sources – Internet non-users responding important and very important**
Multi-tasking while online

Internet users in all of the reporting countries are active multi-taskers.

More than a majority of users said they multi-task, such as listening to music, watching television, or using the telephone, while online sometimes or most of the time: United States (80 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 82 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 71 percent), Sweden (70 percent), Poland (68 percent), and Russia (61 percent).
7 User-generated content and social media
7.1 Working on blogs and reading blogs

Low percentages of Internet users in all of the WIP countries write blogs, but higher percentages read blogs.

Russia reported the largest percentage of users who read blogs monthly or more – 42 percent – compared to 35 percent in the United States, and 28 percent in Poland and Sweden.

Much lower percentages of users write blogs at least monthly; Russia also reported the highest percentage of users who write blogs (15 percent).

7.2 Posting photos or pictures

More than one quarter of Internet users in all of the WIP countries reported posting photos or pictures online at least monthly (monthly, weekly, daily, or several times a day): Russia (49 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 46 percent), United States (38 percent), Sweden (28 percent), and Poland (26 percent).

In two countries – Poland and Sweden -- more than a majority of users never post photos or pictures online.
7.4 Posting messages or comments on discussion boards

Only moderate percentages of Internet users post messages or comments on discussion boards; large majorities of users (or in Russia a near-majority) never do.

All of the WIP countries reported less than 40 percent of users who posted messages or comments on discussion boards at least monthly: Russia (39 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 34 percent), Poland (31 percent), United States (26 percent), and Sweden (20 percent).

Q19I | Internet users who post messages or comments on discussion boards

7.5 Updating personal status

Compared with posting messages or comments on discussion boards, slightly higher percentages of Internet users are more engaged in maintaining their personal status online. The percentages of users updating their online personal status at least monthly were as follows: Russia (41 percent), United States (35 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots) and Sweden (33 percent), and Poland (27 percent).

Q19J | Going online to update personal status – Internet users
7.6 Commenting on other people’s blogs or message boards

Moderate percentages of users in three of the WIP countries comment on other people’s blogs or message boards at least monthly – United States (37 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 28 percent), and Poland (22 percent) – while Russia (48 percent) and Sweden (42 percent) had somewhat higher percentages.

Q19K | Going online to comment on other people’s blogs or message boards – Internet users

7.7 Visiting social networking or video-sharing websites

Compared with other forms of social media (such as blogs and bulletin boards), Internet users in most of the reporting countries are more engaged with social networking or video-sharing websites.

All of the WIP countries reported at least 45 percent of users who go online at least weekly to visit social networking or video-sharing websites: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 71 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 54 percent), Poland and Sweden (52 percent), United States (51 percent), and Russia (47 percent).

However, given the rapid growth of social networking sites such as Facebook, a surprisingly large percentage of users in several countries never go online to visit social networking or video-sharing websites – more than 20 percent in all of the reporting countries, and more than 30 percent in Sweden (38 percent), United States (35 percent), and Russia (34 percent).

Q21I | Visiting social networking or video sharing websites – Internet users
8 Online entertainment
8.1 Online gaming

At least one-quarter of users in all of the reporting countries go online at least monthly for online gaming: Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 69 percent), Russia (48 percent), United States (41 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 40 percent), Poland (38 percent), and Sweden (29 percent).

Q21A | Going online for online gaming – Internet users

8.2 Content consumption

Looking for jokes or humorous content

Moderate percentages of users in all of the WIP countries look for jokes or humor online at least monthly.

Using the Internet to find jokes or humor is particularly popular in Russia and Poland; going online at least monthly were 56 percent of users in Russia and 49 percent of users in Poland. Percentages were somewhat lower in Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 41 percent), United States (36 percent) and Sweden (25 percent).

The WIP countries all reported at least one-quarter of users who never look for jokes or humorous content online, including 58 percent in Sweden and 50 percent in Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots).

Q20E | Going online to search for jokes or humorous content – Internet users
Download or listen to music

Very large majorities of Internet users go online to download or listen to online music, and in all of the WIP countries, at least 30 percent go online for music at least weekly: Russia (49 percent), Sweden (43 percent), Poland (33 percent), and United States (32 percent).

Two WIP countries reported more than 20 percent of users who download or listen to online music at least daily: Russia (24 percent) and Sweden (23 percent).

Q21B | Going online to download or listen to music – Internet users

Download or watch videos

Compared to findings on downloading or listening to music online, slightly lower percentages of users download or watch videos on the Internet.

Percentages going online to download or watch videos at least weekly were as follows: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 55 percent), Russia (48 percent), United States (34 percent), Poland (27 percent), and Sweden (26 percent).

In four of the five countries reporting on this question, 30 percent or more never go online to download or watch videos.

Q21C | Going online to download or watch videos – Internet users
Online purchasing and personal privacy
Online purchasing

In most of the WIP countries, buying online is a regular experience for Internet users; all of the WIP countries except Russia reported at least 25 percent of users who make online purchases at least monthly: United States (57 percent), Sweden (44 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 38 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and Taiwan (31 percent), Poland (30 percent), and Russia (13 percent).

However, significant percentages of users – one-third or more – in Cyprus, Poland, Russia, and Taiwan never buy online. In Russia, more than three-quarters of users (76 percent) do not make online purchases.

Concerns about security of credit card information when buying online

Internet users in all of the WIP countries express very high levels of concern about the security of their credit card information when buying online.

At least 60 percent of Internet users in all reporting countries reported some level of concern when or if they bought something online (somewhat concerned, very concerned, extremely concerned): South Africa (93 percent), United States (89 percent), Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 85 percent), Russia (82 percent), Sweden (78 percent), Taiwan (76 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 73 percent), and Poland (62 percent).
9.3 Concerns about government checking online activities

Internet users are not only concerned about the security of their credit card information, they are also concerned about governments monitoring their online activities.

More than 20 percent of users in all of the WIP countries except Sweden are concerned about the government checking what they do online. In all of the WIP countries except Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots) and Sweden, higher percentages of users agree than disagree that they are concerned about government intrusion into their online behavior.

Q24F | Concerns about government checking of user behavior online – Internet users
9.4 Concerns about corporations checking online activities

Users are not only concerned about government checking their personal information, but are also at least as concerned or more concerned about companies monitoring their online activities for marketing purposes.

In all of the WIP countries except Sweden, at least 39 percent of Internet users are concerned about companies checking their online activity (see the second chart below). In all of the WIP countries except Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots) and Sweden, more users agree than disagree that they are concerned about corporate checking their online behavior.

*Q24G | Concerns about corporations checking user behavior online – Internet users*
9.5 At a glance: government and corporations checking online activities

In all of the WIP countries except Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots), more users or the same percentage of users are concerned about corporations more than governments monitoring their online activities.

Q24G | Comparison: government and corporate checks of user online behavior – Internet users
10 Online communication
10.1 Emails and email attachments

Even though communicating through social networks has become a popular regular activity, using email continues to be a regular daily activity for large percentages of Internet users.

More than half of users in all of the WIP countries except Russia check email daily or several times a day; Russia was only marginally lower at 48 percent.

Moderate percentages of users – less than half in all of the WIP countries -- send attachments with their email at least daily.

10.2 Instant messaging and chat rooms

Compared with sending and receiving email, instant messaging and chat rooms are used less frequently in the WIP countries.

For users in most of the WIP countries, using instant messaging is not a daily experience. Only in Cyprus do more than 40 percent of users go online daily or several times a day for instant messaging; in the other reporting countries, 35 percent or less go online for IM.

Even lower percentages of Internet users participate in chat rooms at least daily; only in Cyprus does chat room use reach 25 percent of users. In four WIP countries, daily chat room use is below 10 percent: Taiwan (9 percent), Poland (6 percent), United States (4 percent), and Sweden (3 percent).
10.3 Online telephone calls

Users in most of the WIP countries go online only occasionally to make or receive phone calls, and in three countries, more than two-thirds never do (Sweden, Taiwan, and the United States).

Three countries reported at least 25 percent of users going online at least weekly to make or receive calls: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 41 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 36 percent), Russia (32 percent), and Poland (27 percent). Three other countries reported lower levels of Internet phone use: Sweden and Taiwan (15 percent), and United States (12 percent).

All of the WIP countries reported low levels of daily Internet use for online phone calls: Cyprus (Greek-Cypriots, 23 percent), Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots, 21 percent), Russia (16 percent), Poland and Taiwan (7 percent), and Sweden and United States (6 percent).

10.4 At a glance: online communication (at least weekly)

Comparing how respondents in the WIP countries use online communication at least weekly (several times a day, daily, or weekly) shows in general that they most frequently use email in all of the countries except Cyprus (Turkish-Cypriots) and blogs least often.
APPENDIX
## APPENDIX 1 | World Internet Project: International Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES</strong></td>
<td>Center for the Digital Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Organizer)</td>
<td>USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.digitalcenter.org">www.digitalcenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td>ARC Center of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation (CCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRIA</strong></td>
<td>Commission for Comparative Media and Communication Studies (CMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austrian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.oeaw.ac.at/cmc">www.oeaw.ac.at/cmc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAZIL</strong></td>
<td>Instituto Brasileiro de Economia e Tecnologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Brazilian Economics and Technology Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.braeti.net">www.braeti.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANADA</strong></td>
<td>Canadian Internet Project (CIP)/Recherche Internet Canada (RIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ciponline.ca">www.ciponline.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPE VERDE</strong></td>
<td>Inove Research, Lda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://research.inove.cv/">http://research.inove.cv/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILE</strong></td>
<td>Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, School of Communications (UC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Engineering/Santiago Chamber of Commerce (CCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.wipchile.cl">www.wipchile.cl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHINA</strong></td>
<td>China Internet Network Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cnnic.cn">www.cnnic.cn</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLOMBIA</strong></td>
<td>Centro de Investigacion de las Telecomunicaciones (CINTEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cintel.org.co">www.cintel.org.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROATIA</strong></td>
<td>Innovnation Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.innovation-institute.eu">www.innovation-institute.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CYPRUS</strong></td>
<td>Cyprus University of Technology (CUT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Communication and Internet Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cut.ac.cy/">http://www.cut.ac.cy/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CZECH REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>Masaryk University, Brno, Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fss.muni.cz/ivdmr">www.fss.muni.cz/ivdmr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECUADOR</td>
<td>Universidad de los Hemisferios (University of the Hemispheres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>Center for Political Research at Sciences-Po (CEVIPOF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>Ilia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>WIK Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>Information Society and Network Research Center (ITHAKA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>School of Journalism and New Media Studies, IGNOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>University of Alzahra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>The Research Center for Internet Psychology (CIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sammy Ofer School of Communications, The Interdisciplinary Center (IDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>SDA Bocconi, Bocconi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>Toyo University, World Internet Project Japan (JWIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACAO</td>
<td>University of Macau, ERS E-Research (Lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macao Internet Project (MIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>Tecnologico de Monterrey, Proyecto Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>Institute of Culture, Discourse and Communication (ICDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUT University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>Gazeta.pl Research and Analyses Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>Lisbon Internet and Networks International Research Programme (LINI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QATAR</td>
<td>Northwestern University in Qatar (NU-Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>Singapore Internet Research Centre (SiRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ntu.edu.sg/sci/sirc">www.ntu.edu.sg/sci/sirc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>The Media Observatory Wits Journalism, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.journalism.co.za">www.journalism.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH KOREA</td>
<td>Yonsei University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.yonsei.ac.kr">www.yonsei.ac.kr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open University of Catalonia (UOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.uoc.edu/in3/pic/eng/communication.html">www.uoc.edu/in3/pic/eng/communication.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>.SE (The Internet Infrastructure Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Internet Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.iis.se">www.iis.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>Media Change &amp; Innovation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPMZ – Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Zurich, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.mediachange.ch">www.mediachange.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIWAN</td>
<td>Taiwan e-Governance Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Public Administration, National Chengchi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED ARAB EMIRATES</td>
<td>American University of Sharjah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Mass Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.aus.edu">www.aus.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>Oxford Internet Institute (OII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/microsites/oxis/">www.oii.ox.ac.uk/microsites/oxis/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URUGUAY</td>
<td>Universidad Catolica del Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ucu.edu.uy">www.ucu.edu.uy</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 | Research Methods

Cyprus

The WIP survey was conducted separately in the Greek and the Turkish communities of Cyprus from September to November, 2012. Telephone interviews were conducted with individual participants selected randomly within households that were selected by a stratified random design from the telephone directory in each community (landline numbers only). The population of interest was defined as all people 15 years of age and above who live in Cyprus (GC/TC communities) and can communicate in Greek, Turkish, or English. One thousand effective interviews were obtained from each population. At the stage of data analysis, the data were weighted by gender, age, and education.

Mexico

The World Internet Project survey in Mexico was conducted by telephone throughout the country in all 32 states in cities with over 50,000 inhabitants. The field work was conducted during the months of June and July, 2012. A total of 2,000 interviews were completed among Internet users and non-users between the ages of 12 and 70. The sample was weighted using statistics from the last official census (INEGI, 2010).

Poland

A random-quota sample of 2,000 was used that was representative of Poland's population aged 15 and above. The data was collected through face-to-face, in-home interviews (using CAPI, i.e., computer-assisted personal interviewing) from April 16 to May 20, 2012.

Russia

A four-level stratified territorial random sampling of respondents in personal formalized street interviews was used. The sample consisted of 1,600 respondents aged 14 and above. The data was weighted based on the Census of Russia to make sure that the sample was representative in terms of gender, age, educational status, and type of settlement where the respondents lived. The data was collected face-to-face from December 21 to December 30, 2012 in all the Federal Districts of Russia.

South Africa

Data was collected in face-to-face interviews from November 2011 to April 2012. The nationally representative sample consisted of 1,589 respondents aged 15 years and above. The sample frame was based on the national census. The sample was 60 percent urban and 40 percent rural. Probabilistic sampling of enumerator areas (EAs) from the national census was employed. A listing was compiled for each selected EA, which then provided a sampling frame for random selection of households. Individuals were chosen randomly from a listing of household members. Individual weights based on inverse selection probabilities were applied. This took account of overweighting of urban areas, selection probability of EA selected, selection probability of household selected, and selection probability of individual selected.
**Sweden**

“Swedes and the Internet” is a survey based on a random selection of the population age 12 and up. Most of the survey was conducted April-July 2012 by telephone, but there was also a questionnaire available on the Internet. The study has been using a revolving panel design for over a decade. The survey has three parts: (1) an adult survey of the population over age 16 (2,616); (2) a parent survey with additional questions relating to children (between the ages of 2 and 13) and their use of the Internet (516 parents interviewed about 881 children); and (3) a young people (between the ages of 12 and 15) survey, including participation by their parents (128 young people with 128 parents).

**Taiwan**

Two telephone interview surveys were used to collect data in August 2012. The population of Survey A was the general public over the age of 15, with a total of 1,144 completed samples (including Internet users and non-Internet users). The population of Survey B was Internet users age 60 and above, with 506 samples successfully interviewed. The survey results were then pooled, and the subjects were divided into four populations: 656 younger Internet users (under age 60), 219 younger non-Internet users, 178 elderly non-Internet users (age 60 and above), and 506 elderly Internet users.

**United States of America**

Interviews were conducted in English and took place between June 5 and September 16, 2012. Data was collected from 1,351 respondents, aged 12 and above, through a combination of telephone and web surveys. For both the original sample drawn in 2000, and the replacement samples selected in subsequent years, a national Random Digit Dial (RDD) telephone sample was used. To correct for discrepancies between the sample data and Census data, the sample data was weighted by gender, age, income, and education.