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DIFFERENT MODES IN COMPANY SURVEYS
Mixed modes approach

- Sinking response rates (Bronner/Kuijlen, 2007; Schnell, 2012)
- Strategy especially for household surveys: Mixed-Mode approaches (de Leeuw, 2005)
- Different modes have advantages and disadvantages
  - **Web**
    - Pro interactive use, low-cost,
    - Con low response
  - **Face-to-face**
    - Pro high response, complicated content,
    - Pro expensive, socially desired answers
  - ...
- combining modes may lead to better data results (e.g. response rates)
- BUT: only little experience with mode effects in company surveys
The IAB Establishment survey, wave 2018

- IAB Establishment Panel
  - German Establishments with at least one employee of different size and industry sectors
  - stratified sample by industrial branch and company size
  - running since 1993 (25 waves)
  - interview mode: face-to-face with self-administered paper option
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- IAB Establishment Panel
  - German Establishments with at least one employee of different size and industry sectors
  - stratified sample by industrial branch and company size
  - running since 1993 (25 waves)
  - interview mode: face-to-face with self-administered paper option

- Modernizing panel: Mode experiment (2018)
  - Experiment with refreshment sample

Does a preceding push to WEB mode influence response rates in IAB Establishment Panel?
Mode Experiment IAB Establishment Panel

Survey Group: Control
Mode 1: F2F
Mode 2: F2F (SA)
Mode Experiment IAB Establishment Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>F2F (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS
Response Rates by experimental group

- WEB/F2F: 19.5
- F2F: 20.7

Proportion (response)

Experimental group

N: 11.423
## Different modes used by companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>F2F (self-completion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,3%</td>
<td>5,4%</td>
<td>79,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>5.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,6%</td>
<td>13,9%</td>
<td>80,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Rates by experimental group and number of employees

![Graph showing response rates by experimental group and number of employees.](image-url)
Results logistic regression

Completed interview?

Web F2F
Number Employees
Number Employees²

Coefficient Estimate

N: 11.423
R² adj: 0.026
AIC: 11.183

Dependent variable: response
Treatment (Web,F2F) in comparison to control (F2F) has no significant influence
Response is dropping with growing number of employees
Results logistic regression

- Dependent variable: response
- Treatment (Web,F2F) in comparison to control (F2F) has no significant influence
- Response is dropping with growing number of employees
Conclusion

• Introducing WEB followed by F2F did neither enhance nor reduce response rates

• About 29% of respondents in the treatment group answered online and avoided an interviewer visit (cost savings)

• Next steps: data quality checks, item non response, time spent answering questions
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### CAPI/CAWI Software (gess)

#### Beschäftigungstrends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altersstruktur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>49. Wie verteilen sich die Beschäftigten in diesem Betrieb/dieser Dienststelle laut Frage 30 auf die folgenden Altersgruppen? Bitte geben Sie entweder die Anzahl oder den prozentualen Anteil an. Falls genaue Angaben nicht möglich, schätzen Sie bitte!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Falls „keine“: Bitte „0“ eintragen!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die folgenden Angaben zur Altersstruktur der Beschäftigten beziehen sich auf...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... die Anzahl der Beschäftigten ODER ... den Anteil der Beschäftigten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bis unter 30 Jahre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 bis unter 50 Jahre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50 bis unter 60 Jahre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60 Jahre und älter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesamtzahl der Beschäftigten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zurück**  **Weiter**