

**Inventory of the areas for further study identified in Mimod WP1 (Deciding the mixed-mode design) ; Possible areas for further study are highlighted in yellow**

- The majority of mixed-mode surveys lean on a concurrent design and in 44 % of those surveys, respondents are given the choice for the mode. Mixed-mode strategies (sequential vs concurrent) is a tricky question. Can we conclude that concurrent is required when the duration of the fieldwork is short (such as in LFS wave 2-6) ?

Regarding the recent surveys conducted during the containment, can we consider that CAWI is a natural first mode for sequential designs in cross sectional surveys ? Is partly sequential-partly concurrent a promising third way ?

- The WP1 we focused on survey modes, providing **checklists** that try to structure the mode choice and mode allocation. In these checklists anyway, objectives and risks involved in any decision process implemented by the NSIs are missing

It could be useful to identify the main objectives and risks as viewed by NSIs. It would make clear how well actual implementations meet the objectives and avoid risks; Potential identification of population subgroups for which adaptation can be tried.

- **Adaptive mixed-mode survey** design offers a flexible way to balance quality and budget, especially in sequential designs with more expensive (interviewer) modes as optional. Adaptive mode allocation was still rarely adopted in 2019, probably because too complex and/or too theoretical. Was the sanitary crisis an opportunity to test adaptive design protocols ?

- In an adaptive design, is it relevant to consider longer durations for people used to going on the internet or those with a higher level of education ? Is it relevant to consider self administered modes for people who expressed a higher interest/motivation/commitment (question to ask in the first wave of a panel) ?

- How to deal with uncompleted or inconsistent questionnaires from the web ? Should we consider them as partial non response and treat them after the data collection period (imputation) ? Or should we give the interviewer the responsibility of helping the respondents to complete their questionnaire ?

- When there is a CATI in the mixed-mode design, are the interviewers **gathered** in a single place or do they manage on their own ?

- The MIMOD survey focused on **communication** with the respondent which is the most crucial for response rate, but what about global communication ? Are there efficient experiences in Europe twitter et al., pres release...) ?

Even in CAWI, paper letters seems the most efficient way to convince people to participate. In France, the use of an official logo largely increases the participation.

In sequential protocols, is it relevant to describe the whole modes as soon as the advanced letter or is it preferable to adopt a « push to web strategy » and wait for the reminders to mention the remaining modes (paper or interviewers) ?

- The literature (Edwards et al., 2009) generally states that unconditional **incentives** give the best results to increase participation. For HBS and AES, more than a half of the NSIs use incentives. In some rare countries (Germany, Austria?), a **differentiation** is made to target hard to reach subgroups with a specific incentive. Was it efficient ? Did this raise ethical questions ? Is there a risk that, via the social networks, people discuss this and claims to get incentives ?

## **Inventory of the areas for further study identified in Mimod WP4 (Mixed-mode questionnaire designs):**

### **Conclusions of the WP4 :**

- Eurostat's model questionnaires, technical specifications and guidelines often recommend or require a specific mode. It's difficult to offer recommendations that contradict existing Eurostat requirements and recommendations
- It's necessary to rebuild all model and national questionnaires and documentation with mixed-mode paradigm in mind, starting from scratch instead of continuing on an existing patchwork
- It's necessary to shorten, modularize, simplify the questionnaires
- The omnimode approach consists in combining the different modes into ONE single questionnaire suitable for all modes, compared to the mode-specific approach. We must take **omnimode** as a starting point not only to make it easier to program and administer, but also in order to avoid measurement differences due to mode specific questions (But continue exploring mode specific solutions using cognitive and usability testing, plus piloting).
- Better facilitation of rapid exchange of experiences and recommendations. This could be done for example via a wiki based web page for exchange of examples, test results and discussions for "easy sharing" of experiences and test results (good and bad), since NSIs often struggle with the same issues and problems
- The Campanelli typology is useful, but needs updating, as it must be improved in terms of CAWI specific recommendations

### **Possible areas for further study :**

- Mixed mode surveys lead to a simplification of the questionnaires and of the wording of questions : is it effective in recent surveys ?
- Faced with the generalisation of mixed-mode data collection in Europe, wouldn't it be necessary to change European regulations towards omnimode questionnaires, therefore necessarily simplified/reduced compared to those currently in use and which were designed in a context dominated by face-to-face interviews?
- Are there surveys for which the questionnaire has been divided to be administered in several waves ? In these cases, is there an issue on attrition ?
- Are there mixed-mode surveys including web for which the duration of the questionnaire exceed 20-25 minutes, which is considered as a maximum length in the literature ?