

Annex II:

Mixed Modes Data Collection Survey

-Basic facts-

18 October 2021, Version V4

1 Part 1 - Analysis of Labour Force Survey (LFS) Wave 1 (Questions 1.1 to 1.6).....	6
1.1 General summary.....	6
1.1.1 Response rates per question.....	6
1.2 Modes in uses.....	7
1.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	7
1.2.2 How often was which mode used?.....	7
1.2.3 Combination of modes (where any).....	7
1.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	8
1.3.1 CATI.....	8
1.3.2 CAPI.....	8
1.3.3 PAP(self-administered).....	9
1.3.4 PAPI(interviewer-administered).....	9
1.3.5 CAWI(self-administered).....	9
1.3.6 CAWI(interviewer- administered).....	9
1.3.7 Other – Modes.....	10

1.4 Response Rates.....	10
1.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	10
1.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates.....	10
1.5 New mode.....	12
1.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	12
1.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)	12
1.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	12
1.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	12
1.7 Keeping the Changes.....	13
1.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	13
1.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	13
1.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	13
1.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?.....	14
2 Part 1 - Analysis of LFS Wave 2 (Questions 2.1 to 2.6).....	14
2.1 General summary.....	14
2.1.1 Response rates per question.....	14
2.2 Modes in uses.....	15
2.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	15
2.2.2 How often was which mode used?.....	15
2.2.3 Combination of modes(where any).....	16
2.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	16
2.3.1 CATI.....	16
2.3.2 CAPI.....	17
2.3.3 PAP (self-administered).....	17
2.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered).....	17
2.3.5 CAWI (self-administered).....	17
2.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered).....	18
2.3.7 Other – Modes.....	18
2.4 Response Rates.....	18
2.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	18
2.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates.....	19
2.5 New modes.....	20
2.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 2 between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	20
2.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)	20
2.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	20
2.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	20
2.7 Keeping the Changes.....	21
2.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	21
2.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	21
2.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	21
2.7.4 Which changes are you going to keep?.....	21
3 Part 1 - Analysis of the Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) Wave 1 (Questions 3.1 to 3.8).....	22
3.1 General summary.....	22
3.1.1 Response rates per question.....	22
3.2 Modes in uses.....	22
3.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	22
3.2.2 How often was which mode used?.....	23
3.2.3 Combination of modes (where any).....	23

3.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	24
3.3.1 CATI.....	24
3.3.2 CAPI.....	24
3.3.3 PAP (self-administered).....	24
3.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered).....	25
3.3.5 CAWI (self-administered).....	25
3.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered).....	25
3.3.7 Other modes.....	26
3.4 Response Rates.....	26
3.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	26
3.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020.....	26
3.5 New modes.....	28
3.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?....	28
3.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s).....	28
3.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	28
3.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	28
3.7 Keeping the Changes.....	29
3.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	29
3.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	29
3.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	29
3.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?.....	30
4 Part 1 - Analysis of SILC Wave 2 (Questions 4.1 to 4.8).....	30
4.1 General summary.....	30
4.1.1 Response rates per question.....	30
4.2 Modes in uses.....	31
4.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	31
4.2.2 How often was which mode used?.....	31
4.2.3 Combination of modes(where any).....	32
4.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	33
4.3.1 CATI.....	33
4.3.2 CAPI.....	33
4.3.3 PAP (self-administered).....	34
4.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered).....	34
4.3.5 CAWI (self-administered).....	34
4.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered).....	35
4.3.7 Other modes.....	35
4.4 Response Rates.....	36
4.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	36
4.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020.....	36
4.5 New modes.....	37
4.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?....	37
4.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)	37
4.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	37
4.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	37
4.7 Keeping the Changes.....	38
4.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	38
4.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	38

4.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	38
4.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?.....	39
5 Part 1 - Analysis of the Household Budget Survey (HBS) (Questions 5.1 to 5.8).....	39
5.1 General summary.....	40
5.1.1 Response rates per question.....	40
5.2 Modes in uses.....	41
5.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	41
5.2.2 How often was which mode used.....	41
5.2.3 Combination of modes (where any).....	42
5.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	42
5.3.1 CATI.....	42
5.3.2 CAPI.....	43
5.3.3 PAP (self-administered).....	43
5.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered).....	43
5.3.5 CAWI (self-administered).....	44
5.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered).....	44
5.4 Response Rates.....	44
5.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	44
5.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020.....	45
5.5 New modes.....	45
5.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in HBS between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	45
5.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)	46
5.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	46
5.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	46
5.7 Keeping the Changes.....	46
5.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	47
5.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	47
5.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	47
5.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?.....	48
6 Part 1 - Analysis of the Information and Communication Technologies survey (ICT) (Questions 6.1 to 6.8).....	48
6.1 General summary.....	48
6.1.1 Response rates per question.....	48
6.2 Modes in uses.....	49
6.2.1 Number of Modes in Use.....	49
6.2.2 How often was which mode used?.....	49
6.2.3 Combination of modes (where any).....	50
6.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode.....	50
6.3.1 CATI.....	50
6.3.2 CAPI.....	51
6.3.3 PAP (self-administered).....	51
6.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered).....	51
6.3.5 CAWI (self-administered).....	52
6.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered).....	52
6.3.7 Other modes.....	52
6.4 Response Rates.....	53
6.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020.....	53

6.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020.....	53
6.5 New modes.....	53
6.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in ICT between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	53
6.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)	54
6.6 Possibility for selecting modes.....	54
6.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?.....	54
6.7 Keeping the Changes.....	54
6.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?.....	54
6.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes.....	55
6.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes.....	55
6.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?.....	55
7 Part 1 - Changes introduced in Household surveys (Questions 7.1 and 7.2).....	55
7.1 General summary.....	55
7.1.1 Response received per question.....	55
7.2 Tables.....	56
7.2.1 Table 2.1. Changes made at least for one household survey(European or National) between March 2020 and April 2021.....	56
7.2.2 Could you provide some details about the changes you made to the method of mode selection. For example, do you plan to keep it/them and why?.....	57
7.2.3 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of administrative data. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?.....	57
7.2.4 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of the sampling frame. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?.....	57
7.2.5 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the channels of contact. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?.....	58
7.2.6 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the non-response correction model. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?.....	58
7.2.7 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the calibration. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?.....	58
8 Part 2 – Broader situation with respect to mixed mode data collection (Questions 8.1 to 8.9).....	59
8.1 Response rates for questions 8.1 to 8.4.....	59
8.1.2 Response rates per question.....	59
8.2 Access to telephone numbers.....	59
8.2.1 Do you have access to telephone numbers for at least some of your sampling frame?.....	59
8.2.2 How did you obtain the telephone numbers? Mark all that apply.....	60
8.2.3 What is the average coverage of telephone numbers (i.e. availability of at least one fixed or mobile number for the reference person in the household) of your survey samples?.....	60
8.2.4 Which of the following did you do to improve your telephone number database between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	60
8.2.5 Please explain any coverage issues with your telephone database, with a special attention to undercoverage.....	61
8.3 Access to e-mail addresses.....	62
8.3.1 Do you have access to e-mail addresses for at least some of your sampling frame?.....	62
8.3.2 How did you obtain the e-mail addresses? Mark all that apply.....	62
8.3.3 What is the average coverage of e-mail addresses (i.e. availability of at least one e-mail address for the reference person in the household) of your survey samples?.....	63
8.3.4 Which of the following did you do to improve your e-mail database between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	63

8.3.5 Please explain any coverage issues with your e-mail database, with special attention to under-coverage.....	63
8.4 Means of contacting persons.....	64
8.4.1 Did your office use the following means for contacting persons (e.g. sending out survey invitations, issuing reminders etc.) in household surveys before March 2020?.....	64
8.5 Channels used to contact respondents.....	64
8.5.1 Question 8.4. What are the channels you modified or newly introduced in order to contact respondents between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	64
8.6 Difficulties & challenges.....	66
8.7 What are the main challenges you faced in the development of mixed modes between March 2020 and April 2021?.....	67
8.8 Actions at European level.....	67

1 Part 1 - Analysis of Labour Force Survey (LFS) Wave 1 (Questions 1.1 to 1.6)

1.1 General summary

32 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions. Where numbers are requested, 31 countries gave at least one answer to LFS Wave1 questions, which leads to an overall response rate of 96,9%.

1.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 31=100 %
1.1 For LFS Wave 1 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the following time periods.	29(93,5%) ^{*)}
1.2 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	1(3,4%) ^{**))}
1.3 What were the overall response rates for LFS Wave 1 over the same period?	29(93,5%) ^{*)}
1.4 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	30(96,8%)
1.5 Please indicate if the respondents in LFS Wave 1 could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact between March 2020 and April 2021 .	30(96,8%)
1.6 Do you intend to keep the changes (in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of LFS Wave 1 after the pandemic?	29(93,5%)

Answers to 1.1 should sum up to 100 %. For one country (out of 31), this was not the case.

*) Answers cover the periods Q1.2019 – Q4.2020.

**) This question is only relevant if there was any other mode in use.

Note: Table above provides information for the 6 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

1.2 Modes in uses

1.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - Q1.2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	29(100%)	29(100%)	26(100%)	29(100%)	29(100%)
1	14(48,3%)	10(34,5%)	14(53,8%)	14(48,3%)	12(41,4%)
2	11(37,9%)	14(48,3%)	8(30,8%)	11(37,9%)	13(44,8%)
3	3(10,3%)	4(13,8%)	3(11,5%)	3(10,3%)	3(10,3%)
4	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,8%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question.

1.2.2 How often was which mode used?

Mode	Number of countries - Q1. 2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	29(100%)	29(100%)	26(100%)	29(100%)	29(100%)
CATI	17(58,6%)	22(75,9%)	23(88,5%)	24(82,6%)	26(89,7%)
CAPI	20(69,0%)	20(69,0%)	9(34,6%)	12(41,8%)	12(41,8%)
PAP (self-administered)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)
PAPI (interviewer-administered)	7(24,1%)	6(20,7%)	5(19,2%)	6(20,7%)	6(20,7%)
CAWI (self-administered)	4(13,8%)	5(17,2%)	5(19,2%)	6(20,7%)	6(20,7%)
CAWI (interviewer-administered)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)
Other	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)

- The cases where the other mode is a variant of CATI (CAPI/PAPI interviewers conducted the interview in telephone mode) were counted to CATI mode.
- The distribution of modes in use changed during the pandemic. Table above shows that the usage of CATI mode has increased.

1.2.3 Combination of modes (where any)

Combination of modes (the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - Q1.2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	11	17	9	12	14
CATI+CAPI	3	8	3	4	7
CAPI+PAPI	4	4	1	4	2

(interviewer-administered)					
CATI+CAWI (self-administered)	3	3	3	4	3
CATI+PAPI (interviewer-administered)	1	0	0	0	1
CAPI+CAWI (self-administered)	0	1	0	0	0
PAPI + Other	0	1	2	0	1

Note: only multi-mode cases are taken into account. In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses.

1.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

1.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	17	22	23	24	26
Median	5,2%	25,8%	100%	96,4%	91,7%
Max	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Min	1,3%	0,5%	8%	1%	1%

- The table underlines the switch to CATI already shown in table 1.2.2. From March 2020 CATI is not only used by more countries but seems to become the predominant mode for the achieved responses.
- Several countries, having CAPI/PAPI mode of collection before the pandemic, conducted interviews via telephone mode by interviewers (using CAPI equipment/paper questionnaire) during the pandemic.

1.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	20	20	9	12	12
Median	98,4%	77,5%	21,5%	64,6%	32,5%
Max	100%	100%	100%	100%	89,7%
Min	16%	14%	3%	6%	8%

- As CATI increased from March 2020 CAPI decreased and lost its position as predominant mode.

1.3.3 PAP(self-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	0	0	0	0	0
Median	-	-	-	-	-
Max	-	-	-	-	-
Min	-	-	-	-	-

1.3.4 PAPI(interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	7	6	5	6	6
Median	75,5%	71,6%	66%	73,3%	72%
Max	100%	91,3%	75,9%	99%	99%
Min	34%	34%	31,1%	34%	34%

1.3.5 CAWI(self-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	4	5	5	6	6
Median	58,5%	53,1%	54,4%	30,3%	34,9%
Max	74%	72%	80%	76%	73%
Min	3%	0,6%	3%	1,8%	2,5%

- Before the pandemic, 3 countries collected data for Wave 1 via CAWI in combination with some other mode, 6 countries introduced CAWI during the pandemic. In all countries except one, CAWI was planned before the pandemic, the one, which introduced CAWI exclusively due to the pandemic, had already implemented CAWI for Wave 2 before the pandemic.

1.3.6 CAWI(interviewer- administered)

	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Indicator	Q1.2019	Q1.2020	Q2.2020	Q3.2020	Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	0	0	0	0	0
Median	-	-	-	-	-
Max	-	-	-	-	-
Min	-	-	-	-	-

- No country used interviewer-administered CAWI.

1.3.7 Other – Modes

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	1	1	1	1	1
Median	3%	6%	14%	5%	13%
Max	3%	6%	14%	5%	13%
Min	3%	6%	14%	5%	13%

- Countries, where collection mode is only CATI or in combination with CAWI, didn't make any changes during the pandemic.

1.4 Response Rates

1.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

Indicator	Response Rate Q1.2019	Response Rate Q1.2020	Response Rate Q2.2020	Response Rate Q3.2020	Response Rate Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	28	28	25	28	28
Mean	59,36%	59,5%	57,9%	61,6%	59,5%
Median	60,00%	58,0%	58,5%	59,5%	60,1%
Max	94,7%	93,3%	94,2%	94,4%	93,8%
Min	24,7%	23,5%	26,0%	23,7%	23,0%

- There were 3 countries that didn't select a sample for wave 1 in Q2 2020, one of these countries used the last (6th) wave and collected data for the 7th time.

1.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates

Period Q1 2020 compared to Q1 2019

Indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	22		6		28	
Mean	-8,0	-12,3	1,8	3,6	-5,9	-8,9
Median	-7,7	-12,8	1,1	1,8	-5,4	-8,5
Max	-0,3	-0,5	4,0	8,9	4,0	8,9
Min	-18,2	-25,4	0,1	0,1	-18,2	-25,4

Period Q2 2020 compared to period Q2 2019

Indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	17		8		25	
Mean	-13,2	-20,3	5,2	11,0	-7,3	-10,3
Median	-10,1	-17,4	3,3	6,3	-5,0	-6,9
Max	-3,1	-5,2	23,8	47,4	23,8	47,4
Min	-37,0	-58,7	0,0	0,0	-37,0	-58,7

Period Q3 2020 compared to period Q3 2019

Indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	15		13		28	
Mean	-7,0	-11,2	3,0	4,8	-2,3	-3,8
Median	-3,0	-6,3	2,0	3,9	-0,4	-0,7
Max	-0,1	-0,2	7,7	13,5	7,7	13,5
Min	-24,0	-40,8	0,7	1,0	-24,0	-40,8

Period Q4 2020 compared to period Q4 2019

Indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	19		9		28	
Mean	-8,7	-13,5	4,1	7,2	-4,6	-6,8
Median	-4,7	-8,8	1,8	2,1	-1,7	-3,8
Max	-0,6	-1,2	16,2	29,2	16,2	29,2
Min	-42,0	-64,6	0,7	0,8	-42,0	-64,6

- More countries reported a decrease than an increase. On average there is a decrease in response rates for all quarters, the largest decrease is in Q1.2020 (the median for absolute changes is 5,4 percentage points), the smallest in Q3.2020 (the median for absolute changes is -0.4 percentage points).
- Some countries reported a large decrease for response rates due to COVID crisis.

1.5 New mode

1.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?

1.1.1

Indicator	Value
Yes	18(60%)
No	12(40%)
Total	30(100%)

- More than a half of the countries introduced a new mode. 13 countries introduced CATI, 6 countries CAWI, one country introduced both – CATI and CAWI.

1.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s) ...

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	4(22,2%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic(e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	1(5,6%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic	13(72,2%)

- The table shows clearly that the pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of new modes.

1.6 Possibility for selecting modes

1.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	8(26,7%)	12(40%)
No	15(50%)	12(40%)
Not relevant	7(23,3%)	6(20%)
Total	30(100%)	30(100%)

- After March 2020 the possibility for the selection of modes did increase. In fact, 5 countries (out of 15) go to YES starting from No; and 2(out of 8) went to NO starting from YES.

1.7 Keeping the Changes

1.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	6
Partly	6
No	10
Not applicable(no change)	7
No answer	1
Total	30

- Among those countries that made changes (22), 12 countries intend to either fully or partly keep those changes.

1.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Pandemic can be expected to return	6
Cost-effectiveness	8
General safety reasons	4
Better data quality	4
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	2
None of the above	1
It is a strategic aim to offer possibility to answer in web in all household surveys	1
In order to achieve a higher response rate, households should be offered already in the first wave to decide how they would like to reply to the LFS questionnaire	1
To keep response rates high for respondents that are addressed to CAPI but are not keen (anymore) on receiving interviewers	1
To improve our response rate, to meet respondents wishes	1
To get responses from persons preferring answer via internet	1
More efficient and lower cost	1

1.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	12

Less efficient fieldwork monitoring	5
Cost-effectiveness	1
None of the above	2
The introduction of the new mode was a response action to the pandemic, it was a strategy to face the impossibility of doing face-to-face interviews but it was more expensive and also the quality monitoring of the interviews was not so efficient	1
1st wave is always F-2-F due to quality data	1
Lower response rates	1
We plan to implement computer assisted interviews(CAPI or/and CATI)	1

1.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
We are still going to use CAWI
All W2 to W5 will be conducted in CATI. Possible retaining of interviewers canvassing and conducting the interview later
CAWI for the 1st interview
Telephone interviewing
CATI as additional mode for 1. wave for those, who don't want to have face-to-face interview (there was an option in the advance letter, that respondents shared their telephone number)
When we cannot interview the household via telephone, we will carry out a CAPI visit

2 Part 1 - Analysis of LFS Wave 2 (Questions 2.1 to 2.6)

2.1 General summary

32 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions. Where numbers are requested, 31 countries give at least 1 answer to LFS Wave1 questions, which leads to an overall response rate of 96,9%.

2.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 31=100 %
2.1 For LFS Wave 2 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the following time periods.	29(93,5%) ^{*)}
2.2 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	4(12,9%) ^{**))}
2.3 What were the overall response rates for LFS Wave 2 over the same period?	29(93,5%) ^{*)}

2.4 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 2 between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	30(96,8%)
2.5 Please indicate if the respondents in LFS Wave 2 could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact between March 2020 and April 2021 .	30(96,8%)
2.6 Do you intend to keep the changes(in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of LFS Wave 2 after the pandemic?	30(96,8%)

Answers to 2.1 should sum up to 100 %. For 1 country (out of 31), this was not the case.

*) Answers covers the periods Q1.2019 – Q4.2020.

**) This question is only relevant if there was any other mode in use.

Remark: Table above provides information for the 6 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

2.2 Modes in uses

2.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - Q1.2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	29(100%)	29(100%)	29(100%)	28(100%)	29(100%)
1	10(34,5%)	9(31%)	13(44,8%)	13(46,4%)	13(44,8%)
2	15(51,7%)	16(55,2%)	13(44,8%)	12(42,9%)	13(44,8%)
3	3(10,3%)	3(10,3%)	2(6,9%)	2(7,1%)	2(6,9%)
4	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,6%)	1(3,4%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question.

2.2.2 How often was which mode used?

Mode	Number of countries - Q1. 2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	29(100%)	29(100%)	29(100%)	28(100%)	29(100%)
CATI	25(86,2%)	26(89,7%)	27(93,1%)	26(92,9%)	27(93,1%)
CAPI	16(55,2%)	16(55,2%)	9(31%)	8(28,6%)	9(31%)
PAP (self-administered)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)	0(0,0%)
PAPI (interviewer-administered)	6(20,7%)	6(20,7%)	6(20,7%)	6(21,4%)	6(20,7%)
CAWI (self-administered)	3(10,3%)	3(10,3%)	4(13,8%)	4(14,3%)	4(13,8%)
CAWI (interviewer-administered)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,4%)	1(3,6%)	1(3,4%)
Other	2(6,9%)	2(6,9%)	2(6,9%)	2(7,1%)	2(6,9%)

- The cases where the other mode is a variant of CATI (CAPI/PAPI interviewers conducted the interview in telephone mode) were counted to CATI mode.
- The distribution of modes in use changed from before March to the time period after March 2020. Table above shows that the usage of CAPI has decreased.

2.2.3 Combination of modes(when any)

Combination of modes(the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - Q1.2019	Number of countries - Q1.2020	Number of countries - Q2.2020	Number of countries - Q3.2020	Number of countries - Q4.2020
Total	18	19	13	13	13
CATI+CAPI	12	12	5	5	5
CAPI+PAPI (interviewer-administered)	1	1	1	1	1
CATI+CAWI (self-administered)	2	2	3	3	3
CATI+PAPI (interviewer-administered)	2	2	1	1	1
CATI+Other	0	0	1	2	2
CATI+CAWI (interviewer-administered)	1	1	1	1	1
PAPI (interviewer-administered) + Other	0	1	1	0	0

Note: only multimode cases are taken into account; In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses.

2.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

2.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	25	26	26	25	26
Median	80,4%	75,4%	99,4%	99,3%	97,1%
Max	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Min	3,5%	3,2%	25,4%	1,6%	1,1%

- From March 2020 CATI is not used by more countries but seems to become the predominant mode for the achieved responses.
- Several countries, having CAPI/PAPI mode of collection before the pandemic, conducted interviews in telephone mode by interviewers (using CAPI equipment/paper questionnaire) during the pandemic.

2.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	16	16	9	8	9
Median	19,8%	24,7%	8,2%	21,8%	18%
Max	96,5%	96,8%	66%	66%	66%
Min	8%	6%	0,9%	10%	4%

- As CATI increased form March 2020 CAPI decreased and lost its position as predominant mode.

2.3.3 PAP (self-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	0	0	0	0	0
Median	-	-	-	-	-
Max	-	-	-	-	-
Min	-	-	-	-	-

2.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	6	6	6	6	6
Median	62,4%	56,6%	54,3%	60,1%	54,6%
Max	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Min	27,3%	20,39%	4,25%	14,85%	11,25%

2.3.5 CAWI (self-administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	3	3	4	4	4
Median	43,1%	48,7%	30,1%	27,9%	26,6%
Max	51,7%	49,6%	51,9%	50,28%	54,1%
Min	7%	8%	0,3%	0,7%	0,9%

2.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered)

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	1	1	1	1	1
Median	36%	29%	31%	33%	35%
Max	36%	29%	31%	33%	35%
Min	36%	29%	31%	33%	35%

2.3.7 Other – Modes

Indicator	Value Q1.2019	Value Q1.2020	Value Q2.2020	Value Q3.2020	Value Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	2	2	2	2	2
Median	15,8%	21,9%	24,3%	21,6%	28,1%
Max	17,6%	25%	30%	22,2%	39%
Min	14%	18,8%	18,6%	21%	17,1%

- Countries, where collection mode is only CATI or in combination with CAWI, didn't make any changes during the pandemic.

2.4 Response Rates

2.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

Indicator	Response Rate Q1.2019	Response Rate Q1.2020	Response Rate Q2.2020	Response Rate Q3.2020	Response Rate Q4.2020
Number of countries > 0	29	29	29	27	29
Mean	72,2%	69,2%	68,5%	69,2%	69,9%

Median	74%	72%	70,8%	70,1%	72,8%
Max	96,2%	94,6%	93,9%	93,9%	94,9%
Min	24,9%	24,8%	24,1%	26,7%	24,4%

- There were 3 countries that didn't select a sample for wave 1 in Q2 2020, one of these countries used the last (6th) wave and collected data for the 7th time.

2.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates

Period Q1 2020 compared to Q1 2019

indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	25		4		29	
Mean	-4,1	-6,0	4,2	5,8	-3,0	-4,4
Median	-2,3	-3,3	4,3	6,1	-2,0	-2,3
Max	-0,1	-0,3	7	9,7	7,0	9,7
Min	-29,4	-40,9	1,2	1,4	-29,4	-40,9

Period Q2 2020 compared to period Q2 2019

indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	20		9		29	
Mean	-7,1	-10,8	9	14,8	-2,1	-2,9
Median	-5,9	-7,1	4,8	8	-1,8	-2,8
Max	-0,1	-0,1	35,4	67,7	35,4	67,7
Min	-19,1	-36	0	0	-19,1	-36

Period Q3 2020 compared to period Q3 2019

indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	17		10		27	
Mean	-5,7	-8,6	3,3	5,8	-2,4	-3,3
Median	-3,7	-4,8	2,1	3	-1	-1,4
Max	-0,8	-1,3	15,36	28,2	15,36	28,2
Min	-24,9	-36,7	0	0	-24,9	-36,7

Period Q4 2020 compared to period Q4 2019

	Decreases	Increases	Change
--	-----------	-----------	--------

indicator	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	16		13		29	
Mean	-5	-7,8	4,5	7,9	-0,8	-0,8
Median	-2,2	-4,6	2,6	3,3	-0,5	-0,7
Max	-0,1	-0,2	25,1	50,1	25,1	50,1
Min	-19,1	-31,7	0,1	0,1	-19,1	-31,7

- More countries reported a decrease than an increase. On average there is a decrease in response rates for all quarters, the largest decrease is in Q1.2020 (the median for absolute changes is -2 percentage points), the smallest in Q4.2020 (the median for absolute changes is -0.5 percentage points).

2.5 New modes

2.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in LFS Wave 2 between March 2020 and April 2021?

Indicator	Value
Yes	10(33,3%)
No	20(66,7%)
Total	30(100%)

- Less than half of countries introduced new mode.

2.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s) ...

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	5(50%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic(e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	1(10%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic	4(40%)

2.6 Possibility for selecting modes

2.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	11(36,7%)	10(33,3%)
No	11(36,7%)	13(43,3%)
Not relevant	8(26,7%)	7(23,3%)
Total	30(100%)	30(100%)

- There were almost no changes for respondents concerning the possibility for the selection of the collection mode.

2.7 Keeping the Changes

2.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	6
Partly	2
No	6
Not applicable(no change)	16
Total	30

- More than half of the countries reported that they didn't implement any changes.

2.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Pandemic can be expected to return	2
Cost-effectiveness	6
General safety reasons	2
Better data quality	2
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	1
It is a strategic aim to offer possibility to answer in web in all household surveys	1
to improve our response rate, to meet respondents wishes	1

2.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	6
Less efficient fieldwork monitoring	4
We plan to implement computer assisted interviews (CAPI or/and CATI)	1

2.7.4 Which changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
We are still going to use CAWI
CATI as additional mode for 2. wave for those, who didn't provide their telephone number and don't want to have face-to-face interview (there was an option in the advance letter, that respondents shared their telephone number)

3 Part 1 - Analysis of the Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) Wave 1 (Questions 3.1 to 3.8)

3.1 General summary

32 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions. Where numbers are requested, 31 countries give the figures, which leads to an overall response rate of 96,9%.

3.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 31=100 %
3.1 For SILC Wave 1 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the last implementation of the survey before March 2020	29(93,5%) ^{*)}
3.2 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	0(0,0%) ^{**)}
3.3 For SILC Wave 1 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the first implementation of the survey between March 2020 and April 2021	24(77,4%) ^{*)}
3.4 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	3(9,7 %) ^{**)}
3.5 How did the overall response rates for SILC Wave 1 change?	27(87,1%)
3.6 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	31(100,0%)
3.7 Please indicate if the respondents in SILC Wave 1 could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact	30(96,8%)
3.8 Do you intend to keep the changes (in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of SILC Wave 1 after the pandemic?	30(96,8%)

*) Answers to 3.1 and 3.3 should sum up to 100 % For 2 countries (out of 29), this was not the case.

**) Answers to 3.2 and 3.4 only relevant if there was any other mode in use.

Note: Table above provides information for the 8 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

3.2 Modes in uses

3.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
--------------------	--	---

1	18(62,1%)	12(50%)
2	9(31,0%)	11(45,8%)
3	0(0%)	1(4,2%)
4	1(3,4%)	0(0%)
5	1(3,4%)	0(0%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question (29 before and 24 after).

- Looking at the percentages it can be observed that there is an increase in number of modes used from uni-mode to a two-mode scenario. More than two modes are practically not existent.

3.2.2 How often was which mode used?

Mode	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI	11(37,91%)	19(79,2%)
CAPI	20(69,0%)	9(37,5%)
PAP (self-administered)	2(6,9%)	8(33,%)
PAPI (interviewer-administered)	9(31,0%)	5(20,8%)
CAWI (self-administered)	3(10,3%)(3(12,5%)
CAWI (interviewer-administered)	0(0%)	0(0.0%)
Other	0(0%)	1(4,2%)

- The distribution of modes in use changed from before March to the time period after March 2020. Table above shows that the modal value switched from CAPI to CATI. Self-administered PAP increased as well significantly while Interview administered PAPI decreased. The “Other” case is indeed a variant of CATI.

3.2.3 Combination of modes (where any)

Combination of modes (the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI+CAPI	4(36%)	7(64%)
CAPI+PAPI	4(36%)	
CATI+CAWI	1(9%)	3(27%)
CATI+PAPI	1(9%)	2(18%)
CAPI+CAWI	1(9%)	

Note: % given with respect to multimode cases (that is 11 before and 11 after); In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses.

- When a combination of modes is used, CAPI and CATI is most often used. After the crisis, the combination is CATI+CAPI, but CAPI, as a mode entering into a combination, is decreasing: on the overall, it was present for 10 out of 11 combination cases before the crisis; after the crisis it is present in 7 combination cases out of 11.

3.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

3.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	11	19
Median	33,0%	86,2%
Max	100%	100%
Min	5,60%	19,2%

- The table underlines the switch to CATI already shown in table 3.2.2. From March 2019 CATI is not only used by more countries but seems to become the predominant mode for the achieved responses.

3.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	20	9
Median	100,0%	31,0%
Max	100%	100%
Min	2,20%	0,7%

- As CATI increased from March 2020 CAPI decreased and lost its position as predominant mode. The decrease in median value and in countries using CAPI is significant.

3.3.3 PAP (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	2	0

Median	0,25%	-
Max	0,3%	-
Min	0,2%	-

- PAP – (self-administered) does not play a big role before March with only 2 countries using it, and these did not achieve many responses.

3.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	9	5
Median	55,1%	100,0%
Max	100,0%	100,0%
Min	2,7%	2,7%

- Interviewer administered PAPI decreased in terms of countries who used it. But those who used it after March 2020 achieved a majority of responses by this mode.

3.3.5 CAWI (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	3	3
Median	14,0%	72,0%
Max	74,0%	80,5%
Min	6,7%	1,6%

- Not many countries are using CAWI in general -only 3 in self-administered way. Interesting is the increase in the responses achieved.

3.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	0

Median	-	-
Max	-	-
Min	-	-

- No country used interviewer- administered CAWI

3.3.7 Other modes

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	1
Median	-	100%
Max	-	100%
Min	-	100%

- Only one country used another mode after March 2020. Explanation: “Interviewers did not interview in a traditional CAPI format from March 2020. Instead, they sent letters to participating households and the household then contacted the interviewer by phone to complete the interview. “
- There were two other answers in the explanation for other modes but not content related.

3.4 Response Rates

3.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

Indicator	Response Rate before March 2020	Response Rate from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	27	24
Mean	59,36%	57,14%
Median	60,00%	58,80%
Max	99,68%	94,37%
Min	24,60%	26,70%

3.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020

	Decreases	Increases
--	-----------	-----------

indicator	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	11(*)		12	
Mean	-6.7	-11.9	3.9	7.7
Median	-5.1	-6.5	3.1	6.8
Max	0.0	0.0	11.8	17.5
Min	-22	-41.5	0.2	0.3

Note: (*) including the equality case.

- Reading of the table: For 11 countries, there is a decrease in response rate after the pandemic with respect to before the pandemic. The mean of the absolute decrease is -6.7 percentage points; the mean decrease relative to the response rate before the pandemic is -11.9%.
- The changes in response rates from before March 2020 and after March 2020 are not unilateral. Approximately half of the countries reported an increase and the other a decrease. On average, decreases are about twice as large, in absolute value, as increases. The distributions on both sides in relative values look more similar.

3.5 New modes

3.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?

Indicator	Value
Yes	16(51,61%) → (50%)
No	15(48,69%) → 16(50%)

Note: one country did not respond. It is considered as “No”.

- Half of the countries introduced a new mode. On the open question requiring a specification of the modes, CATI is always mentioned. CAWI as a supplementary mode is also mentioned in 2 cases(out of 16).

3.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s)

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	1(6,7%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic? (e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	2(13,3%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic?	12(80,0%)

- The table shows clearly that the pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of new modes.

3.6 Possibility for selecting modes

3.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	6(20%)	11(36,7%%)
No	16(53,3%)	14(46,7%%)
Not relevant	8(26,7%)	5(16,7%)

Note: 2 non-responses

- After March 2020 the possibility for the selection of modes did increase. By the way, 4 countries (out of 16) go to YES starting from No; and 2(out of 6) went to NO starting from YES.

3.7 Keeping the Changes

3.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	5(25,0%)
Partly	7(35,0%)
No	8(40,0%)
Not applicable(no change)	10

Note: 2 non-responses

- Keeping the changes fully is only intended by a quarter of countries (5) among those who made changes (20). 35% among the countries who made changes would do it partly.

3.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Pandemic can be expected to return	8
Cost-effectiveness	8
General safety reasons	5
Better data quality	3
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	2
More efficient data collection and lower cost	1
It is noticed that specific number of respondents prefer CATI data collection	1
To provide respondents with the data collection method that best suits them	1

3.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	8
Less efficient fieldwork monitoring	4
We need to limit the breaks in time series. In the future, we will think about switching to multimode	1
It is not intended to keep the CATI mode in the first wave as a personal contact as via CAPI where an interviewer is present at home of the respondent is deemed to be more efficient in a panel to establish a good basis for the years to come	1
Lower response rates	1
Bias in the achieved sample	1
CAPI collection was dropped due to pandemic. Although CAPI	`

collection is not very common (less than 2 % of the achieved sample yearly), we intend to continue them after pandemic to secure the coverage of elderly persons, persons with disabilities and persons with language limitations	1
---	---

3.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
We are going keep both modes (CATI and CAWI) as first option, leaving CAPI only for those not collected by those modes
CATI as additional mode for 1. wave for those, who don't want to have face-to-face interview (there was an option in the advance letter, that respondents shared their telephone number)
CATI
Change of fieldwork period
Possibility of retaining telephone interviews
Giving respondents option of conducting interviews by phone
CATI might be kept (not decided yet) for panel persons. We're also considering the introduction of CAWI mode

4 Part 1 - Analysis of SILC Wave 2 (Questions 4.1 to 4.8)

4.1 General summary

29 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions. Where numbers are requested, 26 countries give the figures, which leads to an overall response rate of 90,6%.

4.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 29=100 %
4.1 For SILC Wave 2 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the last implementation of the survey before March 2020	26(93,5%) ^{*)}
4.2 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	1(3,4%) ^{**))}
4.3 For SILC Wave 2 , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the first implementation of the survey between March 2020 and April 2021	25(86,2%) ^{*)}
4.4 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please	3(10,3 %) ^{**))}

describe the other mode(s) being used.	
4.5 How did the overall response rates for SILC Wave 2 change?	24(82,8%)
4.6 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 2 between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	29(100,0%)
4.7 Please indicate if the respondents in SILC Wave 2 could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact	29(100%)
4.8 Do you intend to keep the changes(in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of SILC Wave 2 after the pandemic?	29(100%)

*) Answers to 3.1 and 3.3 should sum up to 100 % For 2 countries (out of 26), this was not the case.

**) Answers to 3.2 and 3.4 only relevant if there was any other mode in use.

Remark: Table above provides information for the 8 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

4.2 Modes in uses

4.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
1	13(50,0%)	9(23,1%)
2	10(38,5%)	12(52,2%)
3	1(3,8%)	1(4,3%)
4	2(7,7%)	1(4,3%)
5	0(0%)	0(0%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question (26 before and 23 after)

- Looking at the percentages, it can be observed that there is an increase in number of modes used from uni-mode to a two-mode scenario, but not as strong as for SILC Wave 1. More than two modes are practically not existent.

4.2.2 How often was which mode used?

Mode	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI	15(57,7%)	20(87,0%)
CAPI	18(69,2%)	10(43,5%)
PAP(self-administered)	0(0%)	0(0%)
PAPI(interviewer-administered)	6(23,1%)	5(21,7%)

CAWI(self-administered)	5(19,2%)	4(17,4%)
CAWI(interviewer-administered)	0(0%)	0(0.0%)
Other	0(0%)	1(4,2%)

- The distribution of modes in use changed from before March to the time period after March 2020. Table above shows that the modal value switched from CAPI to CATI. The “Other” case is indeed a variant of CATI.

4.2.3 Combination of modes(where any)

Combination of modes(the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI+CAPI	8(61,53%)	8(57,1%)
CAPI+PAPI	4(30,8%)	3(21,4%)
CATI+CAWI	4(30,8%)	4(28,6%)
CATI+PAPI	3(23,1%)	3(21,4%)
CAPI+CAWI	3(23,1%)	1(7,1%)

Note: % given with respect to multi-mode cases (that is 13 before and 14 after); In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses.

- When a combination of modes is used, CAPI and CATI is most often used. No much difference after the crisis, just some decrease in CAPI+CAWI.

4.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

4.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	15	20
Median	67,0%	96,2%
Max	100%	100%
Min	10,0%	22,9%

- The table underlines the switch to CATI already shown in table 4.2.2. From March 2019 CATI is not only used by more countries but seems to become the predominant mode for the achieved responses. The effect is even stronger than in SILC Wave 1

4.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	18	10
Median	91,0%	19,5%
Max	100%	100%
Min	1,5%	3,2%

- As CATI increased from March 2020 CAPI decreased and lost its position as predominant mode. The decrease in median value and in countries using CAPI is significant.

4.3.3 PAP (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	0
Median	-	-
Max	-	-
Min	-	-

4.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	6	5
Median	45,0%	74,8%
Max	88,12%	86,3%
Min	0,7%	0,1%

- Interviewer administered PAPI decreased in terms of countries who used it, but those who used it after March 2020 achieved a majority of responses by this mode.

4.3.5 CAWI (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	5	4
Median	12,7%	9,6%
Max	75,0%	74,0%
Min	3,0%	0,4%

- Not many countries are using CAWI in general -only 3 in a self-administered way. The increase in the responses achieved is interesting.

4.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	0
Median	-	-
Max	-	-
Min	-	-

4.3.7 Other modes

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	1
Median	-	100%
Max	-	100%
Min	-	100%

- Only one country used another mode after March 2020. Explanation: “Interviewers did not interview in a traditional CAPI format from March 2020. Instead, they sent letters to participating households and the household then contacted the interviewer by phone to complete the interview. “
- There were two other answers in the explanation for other modes but not content related.

4.4 Response Rates

4.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

Indicator	Response Rate before March 2020	Response Rate from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	25	23
Mean	77,32%	76,73%
Median	81,96%	78,00%
Max	93,68%	94,64%
Min	28,00%	4200%

4.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020

indicator	Decreases		Increases	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	12(*)		11	
Mean	-7.9	-10.0	8.0	19.5
Median	-7.0	-8.4	2.4	2.7
Max	0.0	0.0	42.0	150.0
Min	-28.0	-40.0	0.2	0.3

Note:(*) including the equality case

- For 11 countries, there is a decrease in the response rate after the pandemic with respect to before the pandemic. The mean of absolute decrease is -7.9 percentage points; the mean decrease relative to the response rate before the pandemic is -10.0%.
- The changes in response from before March 2020 and after March 2020 are not unilateral. Approximately half of the countries reported an increase and the other a decrease.

4.5 New modes

4.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in SILC Wave 1 between March 2020 and April 2021?

Indicator	Value
Yes	12(41,4%)
No	17(58,6%)

Note: one country did not respond, it is considered as “No”.

- 41% of the countries introduced a new mode. On the open question requiring a specification of the modes, CATI is always mentioned. CAWI as a supplementary mode is also mentioned in 1 case (out of 12).

4.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s) ...

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	1(8,3%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic? (e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	2(16,7%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic?	9(75,0%)

- The table shows clearly that the pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of new modes.

4.6 Possibility for selecting modes

4.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	10(34,5%)	11(37,9%)
No	12(41,4%)	14(48,3%)
Not relevant	7(24,1%)	4(13,9%)

- After March 2020 the relevance for the decision of the mode did increase. The distribution of YES/NO without “Not relevant” did not change too much. By the way, 1 country (out of 10) went to YES starting from No; and 2 (out of 12) went to NO starting from YES.

4.7 Keeping the Changes

4.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	4(22,2%)
Partly	4(22,2%)
No	10(55,6%)
Not applicable(no change)	11

Note: 2 non-responses

- To keep the changes fully or partly is intended half of countries (8) among those who made changes (18).
- Among those countries that made changes (18), almost half (8) intended to either fully or partly keep those changes.

4.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey by open answers)	Frequency
Pandemic can be expected to return	2
Cost-effectiveness	2
General safety reasons	1
Better data quality	0
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	0
Response rate seems to improve in wave 2 with CATI. Households are more happy to answer the CATI questionnaire after they have established a relationship with the SILC team in wave 1 in person (CAPI)	1
It is noticed that specific number of respondents prefer CATI data collection	1
To provide respondents with the data collection method that best suits them	1

4.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	3
Less efficient fieldwork monitoring	1
We need to limit the breaks in time series. In the future, we will think about switching to multimode	1
CAPI collection was dropped due to pandemic. Although CAPI collection is not very common(less than 2 % of the achieved sample yearly), we intend to continue them after pandemic to secure the	1

coverage of elderly persons, persons with disabilities and persons with language limitations.	
---	--

4.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
We are going keep both modes (CATI and CAWI) as first option, leaving CAPI only for those not collected by those modes
CATI as additional mode for 1. wave for those, who don't want to have face-to-face interview (there was an option in the advance letter, that respondents shared their telephone number)
CATI
Change of fieldwork period
Possibility of retaining telephone interviews
Giving respondents option of conducting interviews by phone
CATI might be kept (not decided yet) for panel persons. We're also considering the introduction of CAWI mode

5 Part 1 - Analysis of the Household Budget Survey (HBS) (Questions 5.1 to 5.8)

Main facts about HBS:

- Out of the 32 responding countries, 4 countries did not provide information on HBS. Therefore, the respondents to the questions referred to in this survey are 28, with an overall response rate of 87.5%. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.
- Furthermore 12 countries did not respond to all questions referred to for the time period between **March 2020 and April 2021**. For one country data are not yet available, 6 countries clearly stated not to have carried out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021.
- Data show a clear trend after March 2020 towards a mixed mode, with an increasing number of countries moving from uni-mode to mixed mode.
- The distribution of modes in use changed significantly after March 2020. The most used mode switched from CAPI to CATI. The CATI mode was introduced where not already present and covered a very high percentage of the responses.
- The picture of the mixed mode used discloses a wide heterogeneity of mode combinations, where it's very difficult to find the major one. But it's clear that when a combination of modes is used, CAPI is the one most often used before the crisis, while CATI is the one most often used after the crisis.
- On average, the data show a decrease in response rate. The mean decreased from 47,7% to 41,8%. Even if we consider only the countries that carried out the survey in both time periods, the decrease is confirmed with a RR of 42.5%.

- The changes in response from before to after March 2020 are mainly due to a generalised worsening in performance. 11 countries out of 13 reported a decrease and just 2 an increase. In addition, the decreases are larger, in absolute and relative values, than the increases.
- 11 countries introduced a new mode (73,3% of countries that carried out the HBS after March 2020). The most mentioned (9 countries) new mode is CATI or similar (use of the phone for completing the questionnaire on paper).
- Maybe thanks to the spread of mixed mode, after March 2020, more frequently countries gave the possibility for the selection of modes to the sample units.
- The pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of changes in methodology. 10 countries out of 11 introduced them exclusively because of the pandemic.
- The picture is very heterogeneous with respect to the intent to maintain the changes introduced: 8 countries are determined to keep them, but of these 4 only partially. 5 do not intend to do so.
- In some way, the countries seem have been forced by the pandemic to change the survey methodology and now they need to think over the possibility to keep the changes. In some cases, the introduction of CATI seems to be considered as a possible permanent change.

5.1 General summary

Out of the 32 responding countries, 4 countries did not provide information on HBS. Therefore, the respondents are 28, with an overall response rate of 87.5%

5.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 28=87,5%
5.1 For HBS , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the last implementation of the survey before March 2020	28 ^{*)}
5.3 For HBS , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the first implementation of the survey between March 2020 and April 2021	12 ^{**)}
5.5 How did the overall response rates for HBS change?	13 ^{***)}
5.6 Did you introduce new mode(s) in HBS between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	22
5.7 Please indicate if the respondents in HBS could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact	24
5.8 Do you intend to keep the changes(in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of HBS after the pandemic?	23

Note: 12 countries did not respond to all questions referred to the time period between **March 2020 and April 2021**. For one country data are not yet available, 6 countries clearly stated not to have carried out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021. Maybe also the remaining 5 not respondent countries didn't carry out the survey.

^{*)} Answers to 3.1 should sum up to 100 %. For 4 countries(out of 28), this was not the case.

^{**)} Answers to 3.3 should sum up to 100 %. For 4 countries(out of 28), this was not the case.

^{***)} Answers that allow to calculate the change

Remark: Table above provides information for the 8 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

5.2 Modes in uses

5.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021*)
1	19(67,8%)	7(46,6%)
2	5(17,8%)	6(40,0%)
3	2(7,1%)	1(0%)
4	0(0%)	1(13,3%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question (28 before and 15 after)

*) 6 countries didn't carry out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021.

- Data shows a clear trend after March 2020 towards a mixed mode, with an increasing number of countries moving from uni-mode to mixed mode. In fact, 19 countries carried out the HBS using one mode before March 2020, the same happens just for 7 countries during the following time period.

5.2.2 How often was which mode used

Mode	Number of countries - before March before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021*)
CATI**)	2(7,2%)	11(73,3%)
CAPI	16(57,1%)	5(33,3%)
PAP (self-administered)	4(14,3%)	3(20,0%)
PAPI (interviewer- administered)	11(39,3%)	5(33,3%)
CAWI (self-administered)	3(10,7%)	2(13,3%)
CAWI (interviewer- administered)	0(0%)	1(6,7%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question (28 before and 15 after)

*) 6 countries didn't carry out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021. **) The CATI mode includes also 1 case where the "questionnaire was filled in by the household under the supervision of interviewers by telephone", even if there are substantial differences with the CATI mode.

- The distribution of modes in use changed significantly from before March to the time period after March 2020. Table 2.2 above shows that the modal value switched from CAPI to CATI. The CATI mode was introduced where not already present and covered a very high percentage of the responses: it is used by only 1 country before March 2020 and 10 countries during the following time period. The CAPI mode decreased noticeably, concerning 16 countries before

March 2020 and just 5 countries after. Also, PAPI (interviewer administered) decreased, with only half the number of countries using it after March 2021.

5.2.3 Combination of modes (where any)

Combination of modes (the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021*)
CATI+PAPI	2	0
CATI+CAPI	0	2
CAPI+CAWI	2	0
PAP+PAPI	1	1
CATI+CAWI	0	1
CATI+PAP	0	1
CATI+PAPI	0	1
CAPI+PAP+PAPI	1	0
CATI+CAPI+PAP+PAPI	0	1
CATI+CAPI+CAWI	0	1

Note: % given with respect to multimode cases (that is 7 before and 9 after)

In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses

*) 6 countries didn't carry out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021.

- The table above shows a wide heterogeneity of mode combinations, where it's very difficult to find major combinations. When a combination of modes is used, CAPI is the most often used before the crisis, while CATI is the most often used after the crisis. CAPI was present in 5 combination cases out of 6 before March 2020 and only in 2 cases out of 8, after March 2020. CATI instead, as a mode entering into a combination, is increasing: overall, it wasn't present among the combination cases before the crisis, while after the crisis it is present in 7 out of 8 combination cases.

5.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

5.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	2	11
Median	50,3%	80,2%
Max	100,0%	100,0%

Min	0,5%	25,0%
-----	------	-------

- The table underlines the switch to CATI already shown in part 2. From March 2020 CATI is not only used by more countries but seems to become the predominant mode for the achieved responses.

5.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0 *	16	5
Median*	100,0%	24,0%
Max	100,0%	45,0%
Min	25,0%	19,8%

*One country was excluded from the statistics but not from the count of the number of countries.

- As CATI increased, from March 2020 CAPI decreased and lost its position as the predominant mode. The decrease in median value and in countries using CAPI is significant.

5.3.3 PAP (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	4	3
Median	65,0%	25,0%
Max	100,0%	30,0%
Min	29,0%	7,0%

- PAP (self-administered) played a moderate role before March 2020 and the response decreases after.

5.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value* before March 2020	Value* from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	11	5

Median*	100,0%	60,0%
Max	100,0%	75,0%
Min	12,0%	20,0%

* 2 countries were excluded from the statistics before March and one country after, but not from the count of the number of countries

- Interviewer-administered PAPI had a relevant role before pandemic and after March 2020 decreased in terms of countries who used it and the achieved response decreases as well.

5.3.5 CAWI (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021*
Number of countries > 0	3	2
Median	5,3%	100,0%
Max	100,0%	100,0%
Min	3,0%	100,0%

* 1 country was excluded from the statistics but not from the count of the number of countries.

- Not many countries are using CAWI in general - only 3 in a self-administered way. After March 2020 only 1 country keeps this mode.

5.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	1
Median	-	3,0%
Max	-	3,0%
Min	-	3,0%

- No country used interviewer-administered CAWI before March 2020 and only one after.

5.4 Response Rates

5.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

	Response Rate	Response Rate
--	---------------	---------------

Indicator	before March 2020	from March 2020 to April 2021*)
Number of countries > 0	22	14
Mean	47,7%	41,8%
Median	45,0%	35,2%
Max	87,5%	87,1%
Min	9,4%	8,70%

*) 6 countries didn't carry out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021.

- The data show a decrease in response rate. The mean decreased from 47,7% to 41,8%. Even if we consider only the countries that carried out the survey in both time periods, the decrease is confirmed with a response rate of 42.5%.

5.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020

Change indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	11		2		13	
Mean	-5,4	-13,1	3,0	6,9	-4,1	-10
Median	-3,9	-9,3	3,0	6,9	-2,4	-7,5
Max	-0,1	-0,2	5,0	10,2	5,0	10,2
Min	-21,9	-28,6	1,0	3,6	-21,9	-28,6

The data shown in the table above refer to the cases for which RR for both time periods are available.

- On average the data show a decrease in response rate (-4,1 percentage points, -10%). The changes in response from before March 2020 and after March 2020 are mainly due to a generalised worsening in performance. 11 countries out of 13 reported a decrease and just 2 a decrease. In addition, decreases are larger, in absolute and relative values, than increases.
- In more detail, for 11 countries, there is a decrease in response rate after the pandemic ranging from -0,1 to -21,9 percentage points (in 4 countries the response rate has dropped by more than 20 percentage points). The mean of the absolute decrease is -5,4 percentage points; the mean relative decrease in response rate after the pandemic is -13,1%.

5.5 New modes

5.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in HBS between March 2020 and April 2021?

Indicator	Value *)	% out of respondents	% out of all countries
Yes	11	50%	34,4%

No	11	50%	34,4%
N.R.	10*)		31,2%

*) 6 countries didn't carry out the survey from March 2020 to April 2021.

- 11 countries introduced a new mode. On the open question requiring a specification of the modes, the most mentioned (9 countries) mode is CATI or similar (use of the phone for completing the questionnaire on paper). The self-administered questionnaire as an additional mode is mentioned in 2 cases (out of 11): one referred to CAWI and one other to paper questionnaire. Considering the countries that carried out the HBS after March 2020 (15), 73,3% of them introduced a new mode.

5.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s) ...

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	0(0%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic?(e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	1(9,1%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic?	10(90,1%)

- The data show clearly that the pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of new modes. 10 countries out of 11 introduced changes exclusively because of the pandemic.

5.6 Possibility for selecting modes

5.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	2(8,3%)	7(31,8%)
No	13(54,2%)	8(36,4%)
Not relevant	9(37,5%)	7(31,8%)

Note: 8 non-responses for the first time period, 10 non-responses for the second time period

- After March 2020 the possibility for the selection of modes did increase. Maybe countries, also thanks to the spread of mixed mode, used this strategy for encouraging the participation to the survey. By the way, 4 countries (out of 13) go to "Yes" starting from "No"; and 1 country goes to YES starting from "Not relevant". No country went to "No" starting from "Yes". The increase of not respondents is due to the countries that didn't carry out the survey.

5.7 Keeping the Changes

5.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	4(36,4%)
Partly	3(27,3%)
No	4(36,4%)
Not applicable(no change)	10

Note: 10 non-responses

- The picture is very heterogeneous with respect to the intent to maintain the changes introduced: 8 countries are determined to keep them, but of these 4 only partially. 5 do not intend to do so.
- In some way countries have been forced by the pandemic to change the survey methodology and now need to think over the possibility to keep the changes.

5.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Cost-effectiveness	5
Pandemic can be expected to return	4
General safety reasons	3
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	1
Several options allow the individual respondent to choose the solution that suits the household best. This means that more households may choose to participate as they can choose the reporting method by themselves	1
Some respondents want to respond by themselves	1
Saving time on commuting to respondents	1

- Again, the fear of the pandemic and of its return is one of the most often reported reason for keeping the changes introduced. The other reasons are the cost-effectiveness (the most frequent), the general safety reasons and the more efficient fieldwork monitoring

5.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	4
Cost-effectiveness	1
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	1
The setup of HBS survey is CAPI oriented. Phone numbers have to be acquired by visiting the households, given that the availability of phone numbers in the list of households (from which the sample is selected) is very scarce (around 25%). Moreover the change to CATI just consists in administering by phone the CAPI questionnaire and collecting by phone the information of the booklet for the daily spending. Starting from the third	1

quarter of 2020 the data collection has resumed in mixed mode and CATI mode is still prevailing but the general address, at this stage, is to go back to use of CAPI technique for the sample as a whole	
Mode CATI was just introduced because of the pandemic (to offer respondents a further possibility without F2F contact to interviewer) and will hopefully not be necessary in a view years (next fieldwork period) anymore	1
We do not have telephone numbers to all selected households	1

- The reasons for not keeping the changes are mainly the worse data quality (4 countries), cost-effectiveness and more efficient fieldwork monitoring

5.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
Some CATI interviews
CATI
Household collect bills and deliver them to interviewer who complete the diary
CATI

- The introduction of CATI seems to be considered as a possible permanent change.

6 Part 1 - Analysis of the Information and Communication Technologies survey (ICT) (Questions 6.1 to 6.8)

6.1 General summary

31 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions out of 32, which leads to an overall response rate of 96,9%.

6.1.1 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 31=100 %
6.1 For ICT , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the last implementation of the survey before March 2020	28 ^{*)}
6.2 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being used.	0 ^{**))}
6.3 For ICT , please give an estimate of the distribution of the achieved responses per mode for the first implementation of the survey between March 2020 and April 2021	28 ^{*)}
6.4 If some of your distribution above is in the "Other" category, please describe the other mode(s) being	0 ^{**))}

used.	
6.5 How did the overall response rates for ICT change?	30
6.6 Did you introduce new mode(s) in ICT between March 2020 and April 2021 ?	29
6.7 Please indicate if the respondents in ICT could or could not choose the mode of interview, in relation to the initial contact	31
6.8 Do you intend to keep the changes(in the mode or any other aspect of the fieldwork) of ICT after the pandemic?	31

*) Answers to 6.1 and 6.3 should sum up to 100 %. For 3 countries (out of 31), this was not the case before March 2020 and between March 2020 and April 2021.

**) Answers to 6.2 and 6.4 only relevant if there was any other mode in use.

Remark: Table above provides information for the 8 main question groups. For some sub-questions the response rates might be lower.

6.2 Modes in uses

6.2.1 Number of Modes in Use

Number of modes	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
1	8(28,6%)	7(25%)
2	13(46,4%)	15(53,6%)
3	6(21,4%)	5(17,9%)
4	1(3,6%)	0(0%)
5	0(0%)	1(3,6%)

Note: % given with respect to the number of respondents to the question (28 before and 28 after)

- No real change is observed.

6.2.2 How often was which mode used?

Mode	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI	19(67,9%)	23(82,1%)
CAPI	13(46,4%)	7(25,0%)
PAP(self-administered)	3(10,7%)	4(14,3%)
PAPI(interviewer-administered)	4(14,3%)	3(10,7%)
CAWI(self-	17(60,7%)	16(57,1%)

administered)		
CAWI(interviewer-administered)	1(3,6%)	4(14,3%)
Other	0(0%)	0(0%)

- This table shows that there were already a lot of countries using CATI before the pandemic, and even more during the crisis. Some abandoned CAPI for CAWI interviewer-administered since March 2020.

6.2.3 Combination of modes (where any)

Combination of modes (the 2 major ones)	Number of countries - before March 2020	Number of countries - from March 2020 to April 2021
CATI+CAWI	7(35%)	12(66,7%)
CAPI+CAWI	3(15%)	1(4,8%)
PAP+CAWI	1(5%)	2(9,6%)
CATI+PAPI	1(5%)	
CATI+CAPI	2(10%)	
CAPI+PAPI		1(4,8%)
PAP+CAWI+CATI	1(5%)	1(4,8%)
CATI+CAWI+PAPI	1(5%)	
CATI+CAWI+CAPI	4(20%)	3(14,3%)
CATI+CAPI+PAPI		1(4,8%)

Note: % given with respect to multi-mode cases (that is 20 before and 21 after); In case of a combination of modes, we consider here only the main modes, in terms of actual number of responses, up to a maximum of three, provided that each of these modes accounts for more than 5% of the country's actual responses.

- When a combination of modes is used, CATI and CAWI was most often used before March 2020, and even more during the crisis.

6.3 Distribution of achieved responses: values per mode

6.3.1 CATI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	19	23
Median	33,0%	70,5%

Max	100%	100%
Min	7%	6%

- The table underlines the growing importance of CATI already shown in table 6.2.2, knowing that it was already very much used before March 2020

6.3.2 CAPI

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	13	7
Median	60%	17%
Max	100%	64,2%
Min	18,10%	1,2%

- As CATI increased form March 2020, CAPI decreased. The decrease in median value and in countries using CAPI is significant.

6.3.3 PAP (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	3	4
Median	46,3%	38,8%
Max	66,6%	43%
Min	2%	3%

- PAP did not play a big role before March, neither after, except in two countries.

6.3.4 PAPI (interviewer-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	4	3
Median	50%	35,8%
Max	100,0%	100,0%

Min	48%	27%
-----	-----	-----

- No real change observed.

6.3.5 CAWI (self-administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	17	16
Median	40,18%	40,4%
Max	87%	94%
Min	4%	3%

- No real change.

6.3.6 CAWI (interviewer- administered)

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	1	4
Median	1%	33,6%
Max	1%	83%
Min	1%	6%

- A few countries introduced CAWI interviewer-administered during the crisis.

6.3.7 Other modes

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	0	0
Median	-	-
Max	-	-
Min	-	-

6.4 Response Rates

6.4.1 Response rates before and after March 2020

Indicator	Response Rate before March 2020	Response Rate from March 2020 to April 2021
Number of countries > 0	28	27
Mean	64,5%	61%
Median	66%	61%
Max	95,3%	94%
Min	35%	37%

6.4.2 Decreases and increases in response rates for the period from March 2020 to April 2021 compared to before March 2020

Change indicator	Decreases		Increases		Change	
	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)	Absolute (perc. points)	Relative (%)
Number of cases	19		7		26	
Mean	-7.0	-10.6	4.0	6.7	-3.4	-11.4
Median	-4.9	-6.6	1.8	4.0	-2.0	-2.2
Max	-1.0	-1.4	11.7	19.1	11.7	19.1
Min	-28.0	-42.4	0.2	0.4	-28.0	-42.4

Note: The data shown in the table refer to the cases for which response rate for both time periods are available. Reading of the table: For 19 countries, there is a decrease in response rate after the pandemic with respect to before the pandemic. The mean of absolute decrease is -7.0 percentage points; the mean decrease relative to the response rate before the pandemic is -10.6%.

- The changes in response from before March 2020 and after March 2020 are not unilateral. The number of countries for which a decrease is observed is clearly higher than the number of countries for which an increase is observed.

6.5 New modes

6.5.1 Did you introduce new mode(s) in ICT between March 2020 and April 2021?

Indicator	Value
Yes	9(29,1%)
No	22(70,9%)

Note: two countries did not respond: these are counted as “No”.

- One quarter of the countries introduced a new mode. In the open question requiring a specification of the modes, CATI is mentioned by 7 countries, 2 of whom also introduced CAWI; one introduced CAWI only, and the last one (of the 9 countries who introduced a new mode) introduced PAP.

6.5.2 Was the introduction of this/these new mode(s) ...

Indicator	Value
already planned, independent of the pandemic?	1(11,1%)
partly, but not exclusively planned, because of the pandemic? (e.g. emergency release of a mode that was under preparation.)	2(22,2%)
done exclusively because of the pandemic?	6(66,7%)

- The table shows clearly that the pandemic was the main driver for the introduction of new modes.

6.6 Possibility for selecting modes

6.6.1 Could respondents select between modes?

Indicator	Value before March 2020	Value from March 2020 to April 2021
Yes	17(54,8%)	16(53,3%)
No	5(16,1%)	5(16,7%)
Not relevant	9(29,0%)	9(30,0%)

- No change is observed.

6.7 Keeping the Changes

6.7.1 Do you intend to keep the changes after the pandemic?

Indicator	Value
Yes	9(29,0%)

Partly	1(3,2%)
No	3(9,7%)
Not applicable (no change)	18(58,1%)

Note: 2 non-responses

- A third of countries (9) intend to keep fully the changes they made during the crisis (which can be introducing a new mode or changing the proportion of modes already in use).

6.7.2 Reasons for keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Better data quality	5
Cost-effectiveness	5
More efficient fieldwork monitoring	4
Pandemic can be expected to return	2
General safety reasons	1

6.7.3 Reasons for not keeping the changes

Reason (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Worse data quality	3
Less efficient fieldwork monitoring	1

6.7.4 What changes are you going to keep?

Open Answers
Telephone interviews instead of face to face

7 Part 1 - Changes introduced in Household surveys (Questions 7.1 and 7.2)

7.1 General summary

18 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions. Overall response rate 56,3%. Only two countries provided documentation (question 7.2): Apart from question 7.1, all of the other questions in this section were open answers.

7.1.1 Response received per question

Question	Responses 18=100 %
7.1 Please select from the following list any changes that you made for at least one household survey(European or National) between March 2020 and April 2021:	18(100)
7.1.1 Could you provide some details about the changes you made to the method of mode selection. For example, do you plan to keep it/them and why?	7(38,9%) ¹
7.1.2 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of administrative data. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	2(11,1%)
7.1.3 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of the sampling frame. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	3(16,7 %)
7.1.4 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the incentive strategy. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	0(0%)
7.1.5 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the channels of contact. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	7(38,9%)
7.1.6 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the paradata collection. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	0(0%)
7.1.7 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the non-response correction model. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	2(11,1%)
7.1.8 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the calibration. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?	2(11,1%)
7.2 If you have any supporting documentation(in English, or even another language) on any of these changes that you could share, please upload them here:	2(11.1%)

7.2 Tables

7.2.1 Table 2.1. Changes made at least for one household survey(European or National) between March 2020 and April 2021

Changes made at least for one household survey	Frequency(100 % = 18)
the channels of contact	9(50%)
the method of mode selection	8(44,4%)
the use of sampling frame	3(16,7%)
the non-response correction model	2(11,1%)
the calibration	2(11,1%)
the use of administrative data	2(11,1%)
the incentive strategy	0(0%)
the paradata collection	0(0%)

- The most changes related the “channels of contact” and the “method for mode selection”, where half of the responding countries made changes. “the use of sampling frame”, “the non-response correction model”, “the calibration” and the “use of administrative data” forming a second group only relevant for a minority (2 or 3) of countries. The incentive strategy and the paradata

collection do not play a role at all. 13 country ticked one method, for four countries 2 methods were relevant and one country even listed even five.

7.2.2 Could you provide some details about the changes you made to the method of mode selection. For example, do you plan to keep it/them and why?

Open Answers
CATI introduced in more surveys (in addition to the wave 2+ LFS interviews, where it was used as standard before the COVID lockdown situation)
We used new form of data collection in ICT survey (CAWI, CATI). Yes, we have a plan to keep it
From March 2020, CAPI interviewing has been replaced by telephone interviewing carried out by field interviewers
These changes have been made to LFS: web mode and new calibration model. These changes were made at the same time as IESS legislation was implemented
ICT have shift from CATI to mixed-mode
Contact with households was done through letter. This was followed by the interviewer being contacted by the respondent and the interview being conducted by phone

7.2.3 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of administrative data. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?

Open Answers
In addition to the administrative sources already used, we have collected phone numbers from the tax authority in order to enhance CATI
Tax revenue data in order to reduce the income related questions

7.2.4 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the use of the sampling frame. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?

Open Answers
In HBS in 2020 second quarter it was used the Labour Force sampling frame of previous years for the availability of phone numbers, given that from April to June 2020 only phone interviews were carried out
In LFS the frame has changed. The main advantage of the new frame is that the units have a personal identifier number (DNI), what is useful to improve the percentage of telephones obtained when crossing with the source of telephones. The direction of new frame is also geo-referenced. Moreover, it is updated without the need to collect information in the field from the interviewer
We added telephone numbers to population register, sampling frame consisted only of

persons with matched telephone number (approx. 30%).
--

7.2.5 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the channels of contact. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?

Open Answers
We used to start contacts with a letter(paper), during the pandemic we had to start contact by phone. The paper letter will remain the first contact in the future.
CAPI was not used during the pandemic and CATI has become the most relevant mode in almost all household surveys. CAWI, when it was already tested, was enhanced. Regarding HBS, the questionnaires were collected on paper but using the telephone, even using whatsapp for sending photos of the purchase tickets. When possible, E-mail was used more intensively than usual.
We sent letters to households with direct link/QR code to web page - ICT survey.
The interviewers always call the respondent before they visit them due to safety reasons.
CAPI: letter(as usual) with extra informations(to contact household via telephone) -> not planned to keep these changes(except if it allows contact with households in some specific situations)
Contact by e-mail. E-mail contacts received from Social insurance fund board. We have signed contracts with telecommunication companies in order to obtain mobile phone numbers of respondents.
Initiative to adjust legislation, so the NSI can acquire persons telephone number from state institutions (Road Transport Safety Directorate, State Revenue Service, The Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs). This process was successful and that gave opportunity to reach persons without going directly to their home.

7.2.6 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the non-response correction model. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?

Open Answers
Non-response model (selection effect). The country uploaded the document.
For the surveys considered in this report there have not been changes in the non-response correction model. Only for the European Health Survey, whose collection began before COVID and finished in July we changed it. This treatment will not be

7.2.7 Could you provide some details about the changes you made in terms of the calibration. For example, do you plan to keep these changes and why?

Open Answers
The calibration variables have been updated in the LFS due to the new regulation in order to

consider the population aged 15 and over.
Yes, we plan to keep them. With the new calibration model we make the quality better in LFS. The response rate has decreased in LFS which means that less educated persons are not that well represented in LFS. That is why the new calibration uses register information on education level in order to better the quality of the data.

8 Part 2 – Broader situation with respect to mixed mode data collection (Questions 8.1 to 8.9)

8.1 Response rates for questions 8.1 to 8.4

30 countries provided answers to at least one of the questions.

1.1.2 Response rates per question

Question	Responses 30=100 %
8.1 Do you have access to telephone numbers for at least some of your sampling frame?	30(100%)
8.1.3 Please explain any coverage issues with your telephone database, with a special attention to undercoverage.	17(60%)
8.2 Do you have access to e-mail addresses for at least some of your sampling frame?	30(100%)
8.2.3 Please explain any coverage issues with your e-mail database, with special attention to under-coverage.	9(30%)
8.3 Did your office use the following means for contacting persons(e.g. sending out survey invitations, issuing reminders etc.) in household surveys before March 2020?	28(93,3%)

8.2 Access to telephone numbers

8.2.1 Do you have access to telephone numbers for at least some of your sampling frame?

Indicator	Frequency
Yes	25(83,3%)
No	5(16,7%)
Total	30(100%)

8.2.2 How did you obtain the telephone numbers? Mark all that apply.

Method (cells shaded in grey by open answers)	Frequency
Asking the respondents for their phone numbers	17
From commercial providers	17
From public authorities	10
Household after intro letter or passage card in the mailbox(interviewer) via email (interviewer or our contact centre) or telephone (contact centre). Interviewer rings the doorbell (with mask, social distance,...) to ask for phone number	1
We ask the respondents for their phone numbers in notification letter.	1
Searching manually on Internet	1
The proportion of people who can be reached is slightly increased because in telephone surveys, if no telephone number is available, respondents are asked to submit a number via SMS or a pre-franked card.	1
In the initial letter, phone confirmation is requested. Other strategies are sending sms/delivery reports and sending email to request new phone contacts.	
A slight increase of the available telephone numbers derives from the numbers provided by the households interviewed for the population census	1
We collect all phone numbers that are registered at the address of the selected respondent from the commercial provider of the telephone numbers. If we are unable to contact the selected respondent we try to get the phone number by calling the other persons registered at the same address. In some cases we are able to find telephone numbers through the selected respondents place of work. We obtain the place of work through the pay as you earn register (tax-register).	1

Note: multiple answers were possible.

8.2.3 What is the average coverage of telephone numbers (i.e. availability of at least one fixed or mobile number for the reference person in the household) of your survey samples?

Indicator	Value
Number of countries > 0	21
Mean	65%
Median	70%
Max	100%
Min	10%

8.2.4 Which of the following did you do to improve your telephone number database between March 2020 and April 2021?

	Frequency
--	-----------

Actions done by countries (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	
Changes in legal acts	2
Cooperation agreements with service providers	4
Implementation of new protocols	1
Our telephone number database was not improved in any way	13
The new sample frame (called Main Sample Frame) for household surveys has been using from 2020. Population Census 2013 with number of(raw) dwelling units(occupied and not occupied) was the starting point for drawing the first stage – enumeration areas(EAs). Around 10 replicates with 174 EAs and 7 with 156 EAs were selected and will be quarterly (due to predefined scheme) updated with face to face interviews. All demographics information about households and their members in next three years will be collected. For the ICT-HH, households collected basic information on municipalities, type of the settlements, enumeration areas, addresses, name and surname of head of households, telephone numbers and the information that at least one member of the household is in age between 16 and 74 are available	1
If the sample person does not have a telephone number, we add the telephone numbers of household members to the sample	1
A letter/email was sent to the households in the sampling frame for which there were no telephone numbers available, asking for the collaboration of the respondents by sharing their telephone numbers. Additionally, it was performed matching with administrative	1
In addition to the usual sources, phone numbers were collected from the tax authority in the framework of the cooperation agreements already existing between both institutions	1

8.2.5 Please explain any coverage issues with your telephone database, with a special attention to undercoverage

Open answers
Especially, young households do not have a phone number that is registered in the phonebook since this is voluntary for new mobile phone numbers
We could have answered NO to the question 8.1 as we don't have access to phone numbers directly. The interviewers searched in the online phone book, with a coverage of 20%. Other phone numbers are provided by households after the intro letter. About 20% of the households send their contact information. Coverage: households that agree to be in the online phone book or to provide their phone number after the intro letter. Undercoverage: households that are not in the phone book
On the fixed telephone numbers, often not answered in rural areas
The main source of the telephone database is the census of population and thus, there is the issue of outdated information. In addition, in the case of new households added to the frame from administrative sources there is no telephone information available
We only receive from public authorities telephone numbers that the person has used for official purposes. Often these phone numbers do not answer or are out of date

Our sample frame is based on fiscal data and gives 60% of telephone numbers ; it is completed with private phone books
in many cases telephone numbers were not relevant
Do not know yet. Legal basis allows access but discussions with service providers are still ongoing
Non-contact is the biggest problem in all social surveys. We are able to find telephone numbers for over 85% of nationals but only between 40-45% of non-nationals. This problem has increased after 2018 when the new EU Roaming regulation was implemented because now non-nationals keep the telephone number from their country of origin and don't register the phone number in our country which makes it difficult to contact them
The fixed telephone line data base is affected by high undercoverage because an increasing part of the households have no fixed line or do not give consent to insert the number in the frame
For those 67 and older less telephone numbers are available (for 50% and less, when the age group is increasing)
Quality of the telephone numbers is not stable
The coverage rate is low for people over 80 years
About 40% updated because the database is from Census 2011
We have telephone numbers only for persons, who allow publishing their numbers
We get a high coverage. Undercoverage mainly affects the foreign population. We don't collect only those phone numbers which contract holder is the reference person, but any household resident
65% of people and 62% of households can currently be reached by telephone in our country. This is based only on fixed line telephony. This result is the outcome of linking the telephony data with the information from the communal and cantonal population registers. Coverage varies from region to region. On the one hand, it depends on the address quality of the telephony data and the different behaviour of people in the language regions and the urban and rural regions. In addition, there are major differences according to age, nationality and especially household size

- 17 countries out of 25 countries with the access to the telephone numbers reported coverage issues.

8.3 Access to e-mail addresses

8.3.1 Do you have access to e-mail addresses for at least some of your sampling frame?

Indicator	Value
Yes	10(33,3%)
No	20(66,7%)
Total	30(100%)

8.3.2 How did you obtain the e-mail addresses? Mark all that apply.

Method (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency

Asking the respondents for their e-mail addresses	8
From public authorities	6
A letter/email was sent to the households in the sampling frame for which there were no e-mail addresses available, asking for the collaboration of the respondents by sharing their telephone numbers. Additionally, it was performed matching with administrative	1

Note: multiple answers were possible.

8.3.3 What is the average coverage of e-mail addresses (i.e. availability of at least one e-mail address for the reference person in the household) of your survey samples?

Indicator	Value
Number of countries > 0	8
Mean	57%
Median	60%
Max	88%
Min	10%

8.3.4 Which of the following did you do to improve your e-mail database between March 2020 and April 2021?

Actions done by countries (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Changes in legal acts	1
Implementation of new protocols	2
Our telephone number database was not improved in any way	6
We send a notification letter to the e-mail address last added to the official database (latest e-mail address).	1
Additionally to telephone numbers, state institutions (Road Transport Safety Directorate, State Revenue Service, The Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs) also provide person's e-mails they have.	1
Since IV Q 2020 having signed the agreement with the State Social Insurance Fund Board under the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, emails of respondents sampled for the surveys are also available, which are used for sending relevant information and reminders.	1

8.3.5 Please explain any coverage issues with your e-mail database, with special attention to under-coverage.

Open answers
We only have email addresses for panel households who provided themselves their email addresses in a former interview. For first wave interviews in CAPI, we do not have email

addresses, except for some households who contacted our services after the intro letter (about 5%).
We don't have an email database but for some surveys the customer will provide e-mail addresses
We only receive from public authorities the e-mail addresses that the person has used for official purposes. Often these e-mail addresses is no longer in use. Often the household members use a common e-mail address for official communication.
Our sample frame is based on fiscal data and gives 70% of e-mail addresses
Often not very precise.
Since IV Q 2020 having signed the agreement with the State Social Insurance Fund Board under the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, emails of respondents sampled for the surveys are also available, which are used for sending relevant information and reminders.
The coverage rate is low for people over 80 years.
About 40% updated because the database is from Census 2011.
e-mail addresses are only available for Surveys of students and for panels in the follow-up waves

- 9 countries out of 10 countries with access to e-mail addresses reported coverage issues.

8.4 Means of contacting persons

8.4.1 Did your office use the following means for contacting persons (e.g. sending out survey invitations, issuing reminders etc.) in household surveys before March 2020?

Method (cells shaded in grey are the open answers provided)	Frequency
Phone	14
E-mail	8
SMS	8
Mail	10*)
Face to face	1
Introductory COVID situation adjusted letter distributed by the fieldwork staff, with contact details on the interviewer and a request to contact her/him for more information (wave 1)	1
Our main source of contact is "Digital Post". A way for public authorities and others to send important information to citizens 95% of all persons have access to mail/letters in "Digital Post"	1

Note: multiple answers were possible.

*) Countries which described that their initial contact is done by a regular mail were grouped together.

8.5 Channels used to contact respondents

8.5.1 Question 8.4. What are the channels you modified or newly introduced in order to contact respondents between March 2020 and April 2021?

Question	Responses 87=100 %
Message on the webpage of the NSI	10(11,49%)
From commercial providers	1(1,15%)
Posts in social media	6(6,90%)
Outreach through media (television, online, print, etc.)	4(4,60%)
Advance letters sent in e-mail	6(6,90%)
Advance text messages (SMS)	4(4,60%)
Advance call by telephone	4(4,60%)
Advance visit by interviewer (e.g. “knock-to-nudge”)	6(6,90%)
Printed advance letters delivered by interviewer	7(8,05%)
Printed advance letters delivered by post	9(10,35%)
Sending extra advance mails/e-mails	4(4,60%)
Tailoring advance mails to the pandemic(e.g. highlighting health protection thanks to CAWI or CATI responses)	5(5,75%)
Asking respondents to share their phone numbers with the NSI (through e-mail, phone, text-message, etc.)	6(6,90%)
Inserting interviewer contacts in the advance mailing, and asking respondents to contact them	8(9,20%)
None of the above	7(8,05%)

Note: 4 countries did not respond to the question. The countries that responded could mark multiple answers. The following table shows the number and percentage of each response option within the total number of responses (87).

Question 8.4.1. Please describe any other practice you introduced or modified in order to contact respondents between March 2020 and April 2021

This question allowed respondents to indicate any other practice not listed under Question 8.4. 7 respondents sent their answers but only 4 answers covered actual additional practices. The following were highlighted in the answers:

- Interviews by video conferencing (Zoom) were proposed but was not attractive enough for the interviewers and the interviewees.
- Introducing contacts via digital mailboxes for some parts of the sample.
- Adding names to the households in the frame, thereby making contact with householders easier.
- Closer cooperation with local authorities.

Question 8.4.2. Please evaluate the new/modified contact channels and practices in the light of your experiences

Majority of the respondents provided no evaluation, only a few (6) useful responses were received. Based on this result, no general conclusion can be drawn but the individual evaluations could be useful for the community. The feedback received:

- The possibility to start again with advance visit by interviewer in May-June 2020 was important for LFS because the advance visit is necessary in this survey to determine whether an accommodation is a primary residence or not(if it is, it belongs to the scope of the survey; if it is not, it does not belong to its scope).

- The advance letter including references to the health situation and the use of telephone were well-accepted by the respondents, especially in confinement periods, so CATI has become very relevant. In business surveys, the availability of a higher amount of e-mail addresses, besides the phone numbers, has allowed a more flexible communication with respondents. Additional reminder and phone numbers, shared by respondents, have the greatest impact on the response rates. When we ask the respondents to share their telephone numbers in the advance letter and in the additional reminder, we receive the telephone numbers for about 10% of the respondents. However, some of these numbers were already obtained from the telephone directory.
- Considering the measures taken by the government due to the COVID-19 pandemic these approaches have been very effective in securing the cooperation of the households: Printed advance letters delivered by interviewer and Tailoring advance mails to the pandemic (e.g. highlighting health protection thanks to CAWI or CATI responses)
- SMS / e-mail increased the amount of quick replies (for example: e-mail and SMS decreased the time lag between reference week and questionnaire completion)
- It was hard to use only the new/modified channels. However, it may be interesting to include them later in certain situations (e.g. households that are difficult to contact at home).
- Modifying the sample frame to include names had an immediate effect in reducing the volume of returned mail. We also modified the advance letters posted by interviewers and this had a positive effect on responses.

8.6 Difficulties & challenges

Table for Question 8.5. Between March 2020 and April 2021, have you had any difficulties in achieving the prescribed quality for any variables in social surveys, defined by the EU regulations?

Question	Responses 29=100 %
Yes	8(27,59%)
No	21(72,47%)

Note: 3 countries did not respond to the question.

Question 8.5.1. Please describe the difficulties you encountered thoroughly!

Out of the 8 countries that indicated difficulties in achieving the prescribed quality for any variables in social surveys, defined by the EU regulations, the following were reported:

- Due to technical issues and the pandemic, the response rate was significantly lower than anticipated.
- There seem to be increased hesitance by respondents to answer surveys, especially in the last few months, maybe because of Covid fear / tiredness.
- Not being able to carry out survey at all(2020 EUSILC or ICT in 2020).
- Positional missing data rates increased.
- Additional sample had to be selected for LFS to achieve prescribed accuracy for unemployment rate.
- Field work interruptions due to the pandemic and deteriorating response rates.
- Unsatisfactory completeness of the data obtained from telephone interviews

8.7 What are the main challenges you faced in the development of mixed modes between March 2020 and April 2021?

Majority of the respondents (17) reported main challenges in the dedicated period. The challenges can be grouped into the following 3 different topics:

Questionnaire adaptation to different modes / Questionnaire length challenges:

- Failure to adjust the scope of the survey to the phone interview method.
- Conversion of the questionnaire into the mixed mode and the necessary adjustments(shortening). There are mode effects and the comparability (time series) to be considered.
- The duration of the questionnaires that were supposed to be done in CAPI and had to be done by phone.
- The development of the modes used were already developed in previous years but due to the pandemic the implementation has proven to be a lot more difficult.
- Due to health issues, we have suppressed face-to-face interviews, and the challenge has been to replace them by phone interviews. Another challenge has been the introduction of CAWI. Finally, it is difficult to keep the attention of the respondent in long phone interviews, what makes the qualification of the interviewer very important.
- Length of the interview, especially Wave 1 EU-SILC.

Contact / frame / phone number challenges:

- Had to stop collecting data through CAPI mode and changed mode to CATI mode. The coverage with phone numbers is low and biased (too high percentage of elderly people).
- Contacting CAPI respondents in general.
- The rate of phone numbers obtained from commercial providers are decreasing over time.
- Facing a lack of telephone number in the LFS. So the households had to be asked in the introducing letter to deliver their numbers. Not so many households have sent their telephone or mobile numbers.
- The main challenge encountered is that the sampling frame does not have email addresses or phone numbers on it and therefore CAPI had to be carried out first before another mode. This became particularly challenging when, like other NSIs, we stepped down our field force in March 2020. We were solely reliant on respondents taking the initiative and contacting our interviewers.

Quick reaction time / management challenges:

- Prompt reaction to changes regarding state of emergency (COVID-19).
- Lack of quick deployment solutions in case of emergency, such as COVID-19.
- More work for the interviewers and for the interviewers' supervisors.
- Simultaneous management of multiple data collection channels.
- Continuous improvement of content management systems.

8.8 Actions at European level

Table for Question 8.7. Please identify possible actions at European level suited to improve your organisation's capabilities to better implement new designs for household surveys, with special focus on methodological improvements!

Question	Responses
----------	-----------

	47=100 %
Monobeneficiary grant	5(10,64%)
Multibeneficiary grant	7(14,89%)
Dedicated Task Force	9(19,15%)
Dedicated training	9(19,15%)
Other action(e.g. good practices, workshops, etc.)	17(36,17%)

Note: 9 countries did not respond to the question. The countries that responded could mark multiple answers. The following table shows the number and percentage of each response option within the total number of responses(47).

Summary table for Questions 8.7.1-8.7.5. Exact recommendations for each option indicated for Question 8.7

Focus point	Mono-beneficiary grant	Multi-beneficiary grant	Dedicated Task Force	Dedicated Training	Other action
<i>Methodological analysis</i> (mixed-mode designs, adaptation of questionnaires to different modes, new developments, quick reaction solutions, etc.)	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Experience sharing:</i> workshops or other forms			X	X	X
<i>Preparation of guidelines</i> (web survey, questionnaire design, good practices, incentives, etc.)		X	X		

- The table provides a matrix indicating the most frequently mentioned focus points and allocating them to different forms of actions. The response rates for these 5 sub-questions were very low so no general conclusions can be drawn but the most frequently requested topics are interesting for future actions.

Open answers : questions 8.7.1 to 8.7.5
methodological analysis
To promote pilot study using new survey methods (i.e. CAVI), and the use of AI in data collection (for the interviews, the help on line, etc.)
To share experiences in new survey methods (CAVI) and in the integration of data deriving from different sources
exchange and mutualise experiments
provide guide lines based on specific research work

Training is always needed. In this case, it should cover how to adapt questionnaires to different modes, new information sources, a better use of technologies (smartphones).
Compiling good practices from all countries would be important for general topics, like new information sources or the use of mixed modes, but also more specific issues (for instance, about using SMS or the use of smartphones not only for calls).
Preparation of Guidelines for introduction of web surveys.
Questionnaire design (focus on modalities of questionnaires on web), Survey methodology, mixed mode approach, Sampling and standard error estimation, Non-response and mode-effect analysis
Dedicated workshops (on mixed-mode, introduction to web, questionnaire design) with focus on exchange of experiences/views of MS
Mixed-mode with "CAWI first" has proven to be an effective strategy
Hands-on training on existing case-studies / solutions, rather than theoretical courses.
Workshops with case studies and exchange on existing solutions / experience.
Methodological and technical aspects of conducting mixed mode surveys
Quality effects of multimode surveys
How to organize multimode surveys, what has to be obeyed?
Developing/testing new incentives, frame designs, multimode scenarios for different household surveys.
Developing methodological guidance to Member States on how to migrate the core ESS household survey questionnaires to web or telephone modes.
Developing methodological guidelines and sharing best practices for improving data quality
Sharing of good practices/use cases on use of new incentives/changed incentives strategies for household surveys / Sharing of good practices on new designs for household surveys mixing data collection, use of administrative data sources and smart data.
Sharing practical experiences with other countries, for example new forms of data collection.
How to motivate the respondents and how to negotiate.
Mixed mode, CAWI, CATI
Using information from registers as much as possible.
Addressing challenges of collecting data during pandemic
Training interviewer trainers on remote data collection
sharing good practices for using mixed mode
Exploring mode effects for different types of respondents and different types of questions, Exploring the impact of mixed-mode on weight calculations and variance estimations, Exploring the impact of different modes on respondent burden and respondent satisfaction
Innovation: developing the organization's capability to organize smart surveys: inclusion of external data (geolocation, receipt scanning), installation of a platform that can handle more statistical domains (tus, hbs, labor, travel, media) ,security, privacy
Smart surveys: further develop platforms, develop microservices that are shareable and flexible to include in the data collection strategy, increase shareability, increase comparability, define EU levels on security, define EU levels on privacy
Discussing about several mixed-mode survey designs and their(dis)advantages e.g. first CAWI then CATI then CAPI as waterfall system versus targeted subpopulations for different modes e.g. using

modes sequential or simultaneously, e.g. combining multiple modes for the same respondents
Sharing of best practices in contact procedures, in communication of results and in mixed-mode survey designs
Creating guidelines/suggestions to give an overview of possibilities to inspire other MS
Focus on the questionnaire and length of the surveys. Prioritise register use in definitions and concepts
Sharing of good practices would be useful
mixed-mode data collection strategies
follow up MIMOD
arenas for sharing
Workshops around population register development.
good practices, workshops

Note: 21 countries provided some complements to **questions 8.7.1 to 8.7.5**. The verbatim are given in the following table.