Survey question: Video-sharing sites

Spring Change Assessment Survey 2011

Final Topline

5/25/2011

Data for April 26-May 22, 2011

Princeton Survey Research Associates International for the Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project

Sample: n = 2,277 national adults, age 18 and older, including 755 cell phone interviews Margin of error is plus or minus 2 percentage points for results based on Total [n=2,277]

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on internet users [n=1,701]

Form B (the form used for online phone calling question) [n=846]

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on cell phone users [n=1,914] Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on SNS or Twitter users [n=1,015]

WEB1 Next... Please tell me if you ever use the internet to do any of the following things. Do you ever use the internet to...[INSERT; RANDOMIZE]? / Did you happen to do this **yesterday**, or not?¹

Based on Form B internet users [N=846]

	TOTAL HAVE EVER DONE THIS	DID YESTERDAY	HAVE NOT DONE THIS	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
Watch a video on a video-sharing site like YouTube or Vimeo ²					
Current	71	28	29	*	0
May 2010	66	23	34	0	*
April 2009	62	19	38	0	0
May 2008	52	16	48	1	
December 2007	48	15	52	*	
December 2006	33	8	66	*	

pewinternet.org

_

¹ Prior to January 2005, question wording was "Please tell me if you ever do any of the following when you go online. Do you ever...?/Did you happen to do this yesterday, or not?" Unless otherwise noted, trends are based on all internet users for that survey.

² Prior to May 2011, item wording was "Watch a video on a video-sharing site like YouTube or GoogleVideo." In April 2009, item was asked only of Form B internet users [N=879]. In Dec 2007, results reflect all landline internet users and Form 1 Cell sample internet users [N=1,359].

Methodology

This report is based on the findings of a survey on Americans' use of the Internet. The results in this report are based on data from telephone interviews conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates International from April 26 to May 22, 2011, among a sample of 2,277 adults, age 18 and older. Telephone interviews were conducted in English and Spanish by landline (1,522) and cell phone (755, including 346 without a landline phone). For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 2.4 percentage points. For results based Internet users (n=1,701), the margin of sampling error is plus or minus 2.7 percentage points. In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting telephone surveys may introduce some error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

A combination of landline and cellular random digit dial (RDD) samples was used to represent all adults in the continental United States who have access to either a landline or cellular telephone. Both samples were provided by Survey Sampling International, LLC (SSI) according to PSRAI specifications. Numbers for the landline sample were selected with probabilities in proportion to their share of listed telephone households from active blocks (area code + exchange + two-digit block number) that contained three or more residential directory listings. The cellular sample was not list-assisted, but was drawn through a systematic sampling from dedicated wireless 100-blocks and shared service 100-blocks with no directory-listed landline numbers.

New sample was released daily and was kept in the field for at least five days. The sample was released in replicates, which are representative subsamples of the larger population. This ensures that complete call procedures were followed for the entire sample. At least 7 attempts were made to complete an interview at a sampled telephone number. The calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chances of making contact with a potential respondent. Each number received at least one daytime call in an attempt to find someone available. For the landline sample, interviewers asked to speak with the youngest adult male or female currently at home based on a random rotation. If no male/female was available, interviewers asked to speak with the youngest adult of the other gender. For the cellular sample, interviews were conducted with the person who answered the phone. Interviewers verified that the person was an adult and in a safe place before administering the survey. Cellular sample respondents were offered a post-paid cash incentive for their participation. All interviews completed on any given day were considered to be the final sample for that day.

Weighting is generally used in survey analysis to compensate for sample designs and patterns of non-response that might bias results. A two-stage weighting procedure was used to weight this dual-frame sample. The first-stage weight is the product of two adjustments made to the data – a Probability of Selection Adjustment (PSA) and a Phone Use Adjustment (PUA). The PSA corrects for the fact that respondents in the landline sample have different probabilities of being sampled depending on how many adults live in the household. The PUA corrects for the overlapping landline and cellular sample frames.

The second stage of weighting balances sample demographics to population parameters. The sample is balanced by form to match national population parameters for sex, age, education, race, Hispanic origin, region (U.S. Census definitions), population density, and telephone usage. The White, non-Hispanic subgroup is also balanced on age, education and region. The basic weighting parameters came from a special analysis of the Census Bureau's 2010 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) that included all households in the continental United States. The population density parameter was derived from Census 2000 data. The cell phone usage parameter came from an analysis of the January-June 2010 National Health Interview Survey. Following is the full disposition of all sampled telephone numbers:

Landline Cell 32,909 19,899 Total Numbers Dialed 1,416 364 Non-residential 1,428 35 Computer/Fax 32 Cell phone 16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperating Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3%	Table 2:Sample Disposition				
1,416 364 Non-residential 1,428 35 Computer/Fax 32 Cell phone 16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completion Rate	Landline	Cell			
1,428 35 Computer/Fax 32 Cell phone 16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completion Rate	32,909	19,899	Total Numbers Dialed		
1,428 35 Computer/Fax 32 Cell phone 16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completion Rate					
32 Cell phone 16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completion Rate	•				
16,833 8,660 Other not working 1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligiblity Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completion Rate	· ·	35	·		
1,629 287 Additional projected not working 11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
11,571 10,553 Working numbers 35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	· ·				
35.2% 53.0% Working Rate 543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
543 96 No Answer / Busy 3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	·		The state of the s		
3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	35.2%	53.0%	Working Rate		
3,091 3,555 Voice Mail 53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
53 10 Other Non-Contact 7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	543	96	No Answer / Busy		
7,884 6,892 Contacted numbers 68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	3,091	3,555	Voice Mail		
68.1% 65.3% Contact Rate 489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	53	10	Other Non-Contact		
489 1,055 Callback 5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	7,884	6,892	Contacted numbers		
5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	68.1%	65.3%	Contact Rate		
5,757 4,618 Refusal 1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
1,638 1,219 Cooperating numbers 20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	489	1,055	Callback		
20.8% 17.7% Cooperation Rate 56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	5,757	4,618	Refusal		
56 33 Language Barrier 426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	1,638	1,219	Cooperating numbers		
426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	20.8%	17.7%	Cooperation Rate		
426 Child's cell phone 1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
1,582 760 Eligible numbers 96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	56	33	Language Barrier		
96.6% 62.3% Eligibility Rate 60		426	Child's cell phone		
60 5 Break-off 1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	1,582	760	Eligible numbers		
1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	96.6%	62.3%	Eligibility Rate		
1,522 755 Completes 96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate					
96.2% 99.3% Completion Rate	60	5	Break-off		
			·		
	96.2%	99.3%	Completion Rate		
13.6% 11.5% Response Rate	13.6%	11.5%	Response Rate		

The disposition reports all of the sampled telephone numbers ever dialed from the original telephone number samples. The response rate estimates the fraction of all eligible respondents in the sample that were ultimately interviewed. At PSRAI it is calculated by taking the product of three component rates:

- Contact rate the proportion of working numbers where a request for interview was made
- Cooperation rate the proportion of contacted numbers where a consent for interview was at least initially obtained, versus those refused
- Completion rate the proportion of initially cooperating and eligible interviews that were completed

Thus the response rate for the landline sample was 13.6 percent. The response rate for the cellular sample was 11.5 percent.