

Working Group Position Paper

on mixed-mode data collection in household surveys

Minutes of the 3rd meeting

March 30th, 2021

Participants: Fiona O’Riordan (Ireland), Fiona O’Callaghan (Ireland), Andreja Smukavec (Slovenia), Martina Stare (Slovenia), Clelia Romano (Italy), Claudia Devitiis (Italy), Nadja Lamei (Austria), Thomas Burg (Austria), François Beck (France), Patrick Sillard (France), Ferenc Mújdricza (Hungary), Zoltán Vereczkei (Hungary)

P. Sillard recalls that the group decided at the first meeting to divide the work into two sets:

- Review of the Mimod material, and especially inventory of the areas for further study identified in Mimod:
 - WP1 & 4: draft prepared by F. Beck and F. O’Riordan
 - WP2: draft prepared by C. Devitiis and P. Sillard
 - WP3: to be prepared by end of April by A. Smukavec and M. Stare
 - WP5: draft prepared by F. Mújdricza and Z. Vereczkei
- Questionnaire: If we want to use the collected information for the position paper, we need the questionnaire to be returned by countries by the end of May at the latest. Therefore, the deadline for completing the questionnaire (including the development) is the end of April, so that it can be sent to countries by that date. Then priority in time should be put on the questionnaire. P. Sillard proposed to postpone the study of Mimod WPs reviews to the end of the April meeting and to focus today's meeting on the questionnaire itself. The group agreed.

Discussion on the questionnaire

N. Lamei introduces the subject, with respect to the draft, explaining that we need to define what we aim to collect. Basically at this stage, we have two sets of questions: general questions about multimode and Covid19 related questions. She underlines that there is no question on administrative data. However, this topic can be connected to multimode in two ways: on the one hand, it can reduce the number of questions that need to be asked and, on the other hand, it can favour certain modes, for example, if telephone numbers or e-mail addresses are available in some administrative database available to the NSI. Another issue is not tackled at the moment in the draft questionnaire: when we speak about web mode, is it desktop computer web mode or in the broader sense of mobile devices?

N. Lamei also insists that the work done on Mimod and the questionnaire must correspond in some way, i.e. the questionnaire must collect information that is not already in Mimod. We also need to ask ourselves who will fill in the questionnaire.

Concerning the general aspects of the questionnaire, the introduction of the questionnaire prepared by **Z. Vereczkei** and **F. Mújdricza** is fine, for **P. Sillard**: it is consistent with the idea that the questionnaire should update our knowledge about countries' experience of multimode, as recorded in Mimod, in the light of the Covid crisis.

Z. Vereczkei does think that we should focus on the pandemic, before and after, rather than on general issues. This is how the introduction puts it. Secondly the questionnaire could be a bit reduced, especially by focusing on Covid aspects and avoiding too general questions.

T. Burg agrees with **Z. Vereczkei** and adds that, as is written in the introduction, current and future challenges will be an important issue in the position paper. This should therefore also be addressed in the questionnaire. Maybe through some generic questions. **P. Sillard** underlines that the two options are compatible.

F. Beck was wondering about the questions on administrative data. We could ask a kind of open question trying to catch if the countries have some specific points to express on this aspect of administrative data. It could be a solution to let the door open. At this stage, the subject of administrative data is touched in the questionnaire through the sample frame and the contact information we have on the sampled people.

T. Burg suggests to minimize the number of opened questions because it may be time consuming to answer and to postcode.

P. Sillard wants to know if everybody agree with a goal of 15 minutes questionnaire. **T. Burg** agrees with that. Of course the limit is not strict, but it is the idea. **C. Devitiis** says that we should also have in mind that the questionnaire should be filled in by two experts, one from methodology and one from social statistics. First, it should be written somewhere in the introduction. And secondly, with respect to duration, it may be unclear to set a duration.

Z. Vereczkei thinks that the internal coordination of the NSI is the problem of the NSI, then we should send it the international coordination officer, and suggest that questionnaire should be filled in by experts from methodology and social statistics. And he also favours an open generic question on administrative data, in addition to more surveys-specific questions on mixed-mode topics. Concerning the duration topic, **F. Mújdricza** thinks we may go a bit beyond the 15 minutes: he would not cut off an important question just to respect this limit. 30 minutes would still be acceptable. **P. Sillard** concludes that the target should then be about 15 to 20 minutes, especially as it is also our interest, in order to limit the time we have to devote to the analysis, not to extend the questionnaire too much.

The group agreed on the following principle for validating the questionnaire. The aim of the questions, in the end, is to provide input for the position paper. For each question (or group of questions if the subject is subdivided into a set of questions), we have to ask ourselves whether it will provide useful information for the position paper, i.e. information that we did not have before, particularly with Mimod.

The purpose of the questions is not to know, in absolute terms, the country's practice, but rather to know how they approach multimode and whether they feel comfortable with the knowledge they already have. And if they don't feel comfortable, we should know their opinion on what could be done at European level to improve the situation. Of course it can be useful to describe the current situation in order to know how the country approaches multimode. But this is not, in itself, the purpose of the questionnaire.

The group then proceeded to discuss the details of the draft questionnaire. The details are written in **N. Lamei** working version of the questionnaire, given in annex. The group also tried to prioritize questions P1 (priority max)-P3 (low priority).

On the basis of the notes taken by **N. Lamei**, a new version of the questionnaire was drawn up by **N. Lamei**, **F. Beck** and **P. Sillard** and circulated to the group on April 8, 2021, for discussion at the meeting on April 14.

Conclusions

- **N. Lamei** prepares a cleaned version of the questionnaire following the discussion of this 3rd meeting (in annex of these minutes)
- **F. Beck** and **P. Sillard** will send the minutes and a new working version of the questionnaire based on the version sent by **N. Lamei**, by April 8.
- An additional specific meeting will be organized on April 14 to discuss this new version of the questionnaire. Those who are able to attend are welcome.
- Written comments on the new version of the questionnaire should be sent in by the day before the mid-April additional specific meeting.
- In terms of schedule, the goal is to finalize all the issues concerning the questionnaire & the survey, including the development, by the end of April. The end of April group meeting will be the final point of discussion on this questionnaire. We then will send the questionnaire to the NSIs at the beginning of May, at the latest.
- Some presentations will be made at the next DSS meeting (the 14th and the 15th of April - by **F. O’Riordan**) and the Methodology Working Group (April 28 by **P. Sillard**). It will be occasion to announce the survey.

Annex: Session notes on the draft questionnaire by N. Lamei

