



Data Article

Dataset of the COVID-19 lockdown survey conducted by GIPEyOP in Spain

Virgilio Pérez^a, Cristina Aybar^a, Jose M. Pavía^{b,*}^a GIPEyOP, Department of Applied Economics, University of Valencia, Spain^b GIPEyOP, UMMICS, Department of Applied Economics, University of Valencia, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 8 October 2021

Revised 8 November 2021

Accepted 8 December 2021

Available online 10 December 2021

Keywords:

SARS-CoV-2

Confinement

Online surveys

Chain sampling

Social impacts

Political assessment



ABSTRACT

This article introduces a dataset that captures relevant information about the living conditions, feelings, and habits of residents in Spain during ninety nine days of home confinement. This and other measures, imposed by the Government of Spain to mitigate the impact of the pandemic on the population, have brought with them important economic, labor, and social changes, which have been accompanied by various modifications (some only temporary) in Spaniards habits and behaviours.

Data collection was carried out through the implementation of a questionnaire with 33 questions, which was sent by email to the collaborators of GIPEyOP (Elections and Public Opinion Research Group from the University of Valencia). These collaborators, in turn, forwarded the questionnaire to their acquaintances using email and social networks, mainly WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter. This non-probabilistic methodology has generated a total of 8387 valid responses.

The resulting dataset may be (re)used by sociologists, political scientists, economists, or psychologists, among others, to identify how household chores were distributed among family members during the lockdown, what impact the confinement had on the labor performance of workers, the extent of teleworking and on some (physical and psychological) health issues linked to the confinement, including relationships with the place of residence during confinement.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: pavia@uv.es (J.M. Pavía).Social media:  (V. Pérez),  (C. Aybar)

The data also provides information on how social networks spread geographically or what Spaniards thought of the management of the crisis by local, national, and international authorities.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Specifications Table

Subject	Social Science, Sociology, Political Science, Health, Economy
Specific subject area	Social Science (general), Public Opinion, Political Science, Health, Economics
Type of data	Table (spreadsheet)
How the data were acquired	Data were collected using a self-administered online questionnaire. The questionnaire is provided in Spanish (original) and English (translated) as a supplementary file (word format). A snowball or chain sampling method was used to recruit respondents.
Data format	Raw
Description of data collection	The survey was carried out during the period of home confinement decreed by the Spanish government from mid-March, 2020, motivated by the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic. The survey data were collected over seventeen days (between 28th April and 14th May, 2020).
Data source location	Country: Spain
Data accessibility	Data file (spreadsheet) is supplied as supplementary material with this article.

Value of the Data

- This dataset offers information on various aspects, not directly observable, related to the Spanish population, how they lived and felt as well as their perceptions while in lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Social scientists, including sociologists, economists, and political scientists could use this data to assess gender theories of behavior within the home in a scenario of the blurring of traditional gender roles.
- Economists and psychologists could use these data to assess issues related to the performance of workers (and students) under stressful conditions and the extent of teleworking.
- These data are also of value for political scientists to assess governments and the evolution of public opinion from a comparative perspective.

1. Data Description

This document describes the data collected through a survey conducted between 28/04/2020 and 14/05/2020 on the Spanish population. The dataset contains 122 variables and a total of 8387 rows. The questionnaire, available as supplementary material to this article in Spanish and translated to English, is divided into 6 sections and consists of 33 questions.

Table 1 shows a brief description of the 122 variables available in the dataset. The mismatch between the number of questions (33) and of variables (122) comes from the fact that there are many questions for which more than a variable is extracted. For instance, in one of the questions of the second section of the questionnaire, the respondent is asked to list the outdoor spaces its living place during confinement has (variable OUTDOOR). The respondent could choose up to five available options. This generates 5 variables from a single question, a circumstance that is repeated several times throughout the questionnaire.

Table 1
Description of variables.

Section	Question code	Question	Values
I	1001	Respondent identification number	Number between 1 and 8387
		When the questionnaire was started	Date and time
		When the questionnaire was finished	Date and time
	1002	Respondent's province of residence	See Table A1 (Appendix file)
			Size of the municipality where the respondent resides
	1003	Gender of the respondent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Male 2. Female
1004	Year of birthday	Number between 1919 and 2003	
1005	Highest education level achieved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Without studies 2. Primary education 3. Secondary education 4. Job training 5. Baccalaureate 6. University studies 7. Doctorate 	
II	2001	Complete the sentence: during the state of alarm, I live in...	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My usual residence 2. Second residence 3. Another situation
	2002	What is the size of the home where you live?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less than 35m² 2. Between 35 and 50m² 3. Between 50 and 100m² 4. More than 100m²
	2003	Indicate the outdoor spaces available in your home. <i>Note: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not have any outdoor space 2. Balcony 3. Terrace 4. Garden 5. Other
	2004	How many people do you live with in this state of alarm?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. One 3. Two 4. Three 5. Four 6. Five or more
	2004A	Could you please indicate the number of dependents you live with?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. One 3. Two 4. Three 5. Four 6. Five or more
	2004B	Could you please indicate the number of high-risk people you live with?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. One 3. Two 4. Three 5. Four 6. Five or more

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Section	Question code	Question	Values
III	3001	Employment situation of the respondent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am salaried and telework. I work from home 2. I am a salaried employee and I leave home to work 3. I am self-employed and telework. I work from home 4. I am self-employed and I leave home to work 5. I am temporarily laid-off from work 6. I am a salaried employee with no possibility of working 7. I am self-employed without the possibility of working 8. I have been fired during the state of alarm period 9. Sick leave/pregnancy 10. I am unemployed or on leave of absence 11. Retired 12. Student 13. Unpaid work at home 14. Other
	3001A	Do you feel that your productivity at work has been affected by the new situation? <i>Note: only to be answered by respondents who chose 1, 2, 3 or 4 in question 3001.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No
	3001B	What is your experience of working at home? <i>Note 1: only to be answered by respondents who chose 1 or 3 in question 3001.</i> <i>Note 2: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am making better use of my time than in my workplace 2. It is difficult to reconcile work and family life 3. I would not mind continuing to telework 4. I prefer to commute to the workplace 5. I would like to alternate between the two options
	3001C	Do you think your work will be affected when the state of alarm ends? <i>Note 1: only to be answered by respondents who chose 1 or 3 in question 3001.</i> <i>Note 2: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, because of a lack of economic activity due to the crisis 2. Yes, due to staff cuts 3. Yes, due to salary cuts 4. Yes, because of having to help in the family environment and having underperformed at work 5. No, everything will stay the same
	3001D	Do you think your work will be affected when the state of alarm ends? <i>Note 1: only to be answered by respondents who chose 2 or 4 in question 3001.</i> <i>Note 2: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, because of a lack of economic activity due to the crisis 2. Yes, due to staff cuts 3. Yes, due to salary cuts 4. No, everything will stay the same
	3001E	Do you feel that your productivity in your studies has been affected by the new situation? <i>Note: only to be answered by respondents who answered 12 in question 3001.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Section	Question code	Question	Values
	3001F	If you have experienced difficulties in continuing your studies during this confinement, could you indicate which ones? <i>Note 1: only to be answered by respondents who chose 12 in question 3001.</i> <i>Note 2: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not have a computer now 2. I have to share a computer 3. Internet connection problems 4. I do not have a quiet space at home to study 5. Lack of motivation 6. Lack of time to combine studies with obligations at home/family 7. Disorganisation of online classes 8. Lack of material 9. None of the above
	3001G	Which of the following statements do you identify with? <i>Note 1: only allowed to be answered by respondents who answered 12 in question 3001.</i> <i>Note 2: you can indicate more than one option.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This situation motivates me to push forward with my course 2. I have lost my enthusiasm for the course 3. I can prepare the subjects with the resources provided by the teacher 4. I am organised and I will succeed 5. I am not used to studying on my own and I will not succeed
IV	4001	Weekly frequency of the corresponding task (15 tasks and 2 moments in time). <i>Note: tasks and moments in time are shown in Fig. 1.</i>	0 times to 7 times; No proceed to response
V	5001	Fear of leaving the home	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have not been out for the entire period of confinement, and I am afraid to do so 2. I have not been out for the whole period of confinement, but I am not afraid to do so 3. I go out to do chores (walking the dog, shopping, work, care...) and I do it with fear 4. I have gone out just enough to shop and/or work and I am not afraid 5. I have gone out whenever I can, and I have no fear
	5002	Weekly frequency of exercise at home	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 7 days 2. Between 4 and 6 days 3. Between 2 and 3 days 4. Once 5. Never
	5003	Have you been monitoring your diet in any way?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, I am eating less 2. No, being at home I eat more often 3. I eat the same as usual
	5004	Have you had or do you have symptoms related to coronavirus?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, I tested positive with symptoms and isolated myself at home 2. Yes, I tested positive while asymptomatic and isolated myself at home 3. Yes, I have spent days in hospital 4. Yes, I have been in a hotel on medication 5. I think so, in these days of confinement

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Section	Question code	Question	Values
			6. I think so, before I was confined 7. I have/had no symptoms, but I have not been tested
	5005	In general, are you sleeping as well as before the current crisis?	1. Yes 2. No
VI	6001	Valuation of the national government in terms of the health crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		Valuation of the national government in terms of the economic crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		Valuation of the regional government in terms of the health crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		Valuation of the regional government in terms of the economic crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		Valuation of the local government in terms of the health crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		Valuation of the local government in terms of the economic crisis management.	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
	6002	PSOE and UP act in the same direction.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		The government is reporting transparently.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		The government is being resolute.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		The government declared a state of alarm at the right time.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		I have confidence in the government's management of the health crisis.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		I have confidence in the government's handling of the economic crisis.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
		The government is getting international recognition for its handling of this pandemic.	1 (totally disagree) to 5 (total agreement)
	6003	How would you rate PP performance in this crisis?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you rate VOX performance in this crisis?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
	6004	If PP were in government, what do you think their (health) management of this crisis would have been like?	1. Better 2. Same 3. Worse
		If PP were in government, what do you think their (economic) management of this crisis would have been like?	1. Better 2. Same 3. Worse
	6005	If VOX were in government, what do you think their (health) management of this crisis would have been like?	1. Better 2. Same 3. Worse
		If VOX were in government, what do you think their (economic) management of this crisis would have been like?	1. Better 2. Same 3. Worse
	6006	How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in EU?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in Germany?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in China?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Section	Question code	Question	Values
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in the United States?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in France?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in the Netherlands?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in Italy?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in Portugal?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in the United Kingdom?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
		How would you assess the overall response to the COVID-19 crisis in Sweden?	0 (very bad) to 10 (very good)
	6007	Could you tell me which party you voted for in the last General Election?	1. List of parties in Table A2 (Appendix file) 2. Others 3. I was not old enough to vote 4. Abstention 5. I voted blank
	6008	If a congressional election were held today, which party would you vote for?	1. List of parties in Table A2 (Appendix file) 2. I would not vote
		Time taken to complete the questionnaire	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section I	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section II	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section III	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section IV	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section V	Numbers of seconds taken
		Time needed to complete section VI	Numbers of seconds taken

The dataset and the dictionary of variables are supplied as supplementary material. In the dataset (spreadsheet) two types of missing values can be distinguished: blank cells, corresponding to non responses, and cells with the value N/A (Not Applicable) which refer to those questions not applicable for those surveyed for whom a certain question did not need answering due to their answers in previous questions. For instance, some of the questions in Section III (dedicated to the work/educational environment) depend on which answer is given to the first question of this section (see [Table 1](#)).

In the first section, Section I, which consists of five questions, data are collected on the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents. For reasons of space, the detail of the values for the PROV variable, the Spanish province to which the respondent's municipality of residence belongs, is provided in [Table A1](#) (Appendix file) and not in [Table 1](#). Section II of the survey, with 6 questions, asks about the conditions of the residence in which the respondent was confined during the lockdown. Section III investigates the employment situation of the respondents. Some of the questions in the third section, made up of 8 questions about the work environment (or studies), depend on which answer is given to the first question in that block (see [Table 1](#)).

Section IV consists of a single question, which constitutes one of the central questions of the questionnaire and has led to the research reported in [1]. [Fig. 1](#) provides a summary of the responses to this question based on mean values. The question asks how often different domestic tasks, 15 examples in total, are carried out weekly at two points in time (before and during confinement), thus generating 30 variables. [Table 2](#) shows the frequency distributions




Fig. 1. Weekly frequency (average number of days) of the respondent performing certain household tasks (before and during confinement).

Table 2
Section V questions distribution.

Variable	Category	f (%)
FEAR	I have not been out for the entire period of confinement, and I am afraid to do so.	535 (7.17)
	I have not been out for the whole period of confinement, but I am not afraid to do so.	649 (8.69)
	I go out to do chores (walking the dog, shopping, work, care...) but I am afraid.	2286 (30.62)
	I have gone out just enough to shop and/or work and I am not afraid.	279 (3.74)
	I have gone out whenever I can, but I am afraid.	3717 (49.79)
EXERCISE	7 days	1245 (16.54)
	Between 4 and 6 days	1800 (23.92)
	Between 2 and 3 days	1776 (23.60)
	Once	1144 (15.20)
	Never	1561 (20.74)
DIET	Yes, I am eating less.	1528 (20.30)
	No, being at home I eat more often.	1784 (23.70)
	I eat the same as usual.	4214 (55.99)
COVID	Yes, I tested positive with symptoms and isolated myself at home.	55 (0.82)
	Yes, I tested positive while asymptomatic and isolated myself at home.	8 (0.12)
	Yes, I have spent days in hospital.	22 (0.33)
	Yes, I have been in a hotel on medication.	0 (0.00)
	I think so, during the confinement period.	341 (5.09)
	I think so, before the confinement period.	567 (8.47)
SLEEP	I have/had no symptoms, but I have not been tested.	5705 (85.17)
	Yes	3827 (50.64)
	No	3730 (49.36)

Table 3

Average assessment rating of governments by respondents regarding the management of the health and economic dimensions of the crisis.

Region of residence	Health assessment			Economic assessment			Country	Rating
	National	Regional	Local	National	Regional	Local		
Spain (whole sample)	5.07	5.50	5.65	4.94	5.08	5.19	European Union	3.97
Andalucía	4.83	4.43	5.21	4.71	3.68	4.75	Germany	6.18
Aragón	4.59	4.99	5.38	4.52	4.77	4.97	China	4.97
Canarias	6.68	7.20	6.16	6.85	6.68	5.77	United States	1.60
Cantabria	3.91	4.55	5.86	3.40	4.00	5.20	France	4.61
Castilla-La Mancha	4.25	2.91	4.55	4.03	3.03	4.20	Netherlands	4.45
Castilla y León	5.47	4.38	4.64	5.64	3.86	4.53	Italy	4.12
Cataluña	4.14	4.34	4.69	3.79	3.56	3.92	Portugal	7.21
Ceuta y Melilla	4.38	2.71	2.86	4.50	2.86	2.86	United Kingdom	2.75
Comunidad de Madrid	4.78	4.09	5.64	4.71	3.72	4.93	Sweden	5.66
C. Foral de Navarra	3.59	4.94	3.86	3.63	4.33	3.45		
Comunitat Valenciana	5.18	5.91	5.82	5.06	5.53	5.40		
Extremadura	2.78	3.81	5.48	3.25	3.88	4.78		
Galicia	5.72	4.53	5.19	5.12	3.45	4.23		
Illes Balears	5.25	6.45	6.26	5.32	5.98	5.45		
La Rioja	4.89	5.85	5.06	4.00	4.38	3.73		
País Vasco	5.76	5.83	5.30	5.85	5.47	5.41		
Principado de Asturias	5.29	6.06	5.23	5.22	5.00	4.49		
Región de Murcia	4.89	5.65	5.86	4.44	4.39	5.07		

Table 4

Sample size by autonomous community.

Region	Sample size	Region	Sample size
España	8387	Comunidad de Madrid	606
Andalucía	266	C. Foral de Navarra	21
Aragón	235	Comunitat Valenciana	6014
Canarias	55	Extremadura	27
Cantabria	11	Galicia	100
Castilla-La Mancha	216	Illes Balears	54
Castilla y León	184	La Rioja	26
Cataluña	372	País Vasco	59
Ciudad de Ceuta	2	Principado de Asturias	69
Ciudad de Melilla	7	Región de Murcia	63

associated with the five questions that make up Section V, focused on respondent feelings and daily habits during the lockdown.

The last section, Section VI, is dedicated to the assessment of political management of the pandemic and questions related to the electoral debate. [Table 3](#) summarises the results achieved for some of the variables of this block. Specifically, it offers the assessment, on average, that respondents make about how effectively the government has managed the situation at local, regional, and national levels, and also offers information on the perception that Spaniards have of how the crisis was being managed in other countries.

To complement part of the information contained in the responses collected, [Table 4](#) shows the distribution of the sample size by autonomous communities and [Table 5](#) presents a broad summary of the profile of the respondents in the survey. This explains the composition of the sample in terms of the main socio-economic-demographic characteristics, variables that in conjunction with R.VOTE (see [Table A2](#) in Appendix file) can be used to correct biases by applying calibration or post-stratification techniques.

Table 5Respondent characteristics ($n = 8387$).

Characteristics	Category	Frecuency (%)
Gender	Male	3834 (45.70)
	Female	4553 (54.30)
Age (years)	< 20	66 (0.79)
	20–25	446 (5.32)
	26–30	405 (4.83)
	31–35	531 (6.33)
	36–40	602 (7.18)
	41–45	834 (9.94)
	46–50	908 (10.83)
	51–55	1136 (13.54)
	56–60	1120 (13.35)
	61–65	1065 (12.70)
	66–70	753 (8.98)
	>70	514 (6.13)
	<i>in blank</i>	7 (0.08)
Employment situation	I am salaried and telework. I work from home.	2183 (26.03)
	I am a salaried employee and I leave home to work.	1136 (13.54)
	I am self-employed and telework. I work from home.	301 (3.59)
	I am self-employed and I leave home to work.	248 (2.96)
	I am temporarily laid-off from work.	556 (6.63)
	I am a salaried employee with no possibility of working.	160 (1.91)
	I am self-employed without the possibility of working.	320 (3.82)
	I have been fired during the state of alarm period.	124 (1.48)
	Sick leave/pregnancy.	214 (2.55)
	I am unemployed or on leave of absence.	475 (5.66)
	Retired	1623 (19.35)
	Student	428 (5.10)
	Unpaid work at home	178 (2.12)
Education	Other	338 (4.03)
	<i>in blank</i>	103 (1.23)
	Without studies	13 (0.16)
	Primary education	351 (4.19)
	Secondary education	366 (4.36)
	Job training	984 (11.73)
	Baccalaureate	1023 (12.20)
	University studies	4934 (58.83)
	Doctorate	631 (7.52)
	<i>in blank</i>	85 (1.01)
Residence municipality size (inhabitants)	Less than 2,000 inhabitants	386 (4.60)
	Between 2,001 and 10,000	1018 (12.14)
	Between 10,001 and 50,000	2215 (26.41)
	Between 50,001 and 100,000	794 (9.47)
	Between 100,001 and 400,000	839 (10.00)
	Between 400,001 and 1,000,000	1697 (20.23)
	More than 1,000,000 de inhabitants	1255 (14.96)
	<i>in blank</i>	183 (2.18)
Home size (squared meters)	Less than de 35 m ²	44 (0.52)
	Between 35 and 50 m ²	362 (4.32)
	Between 50 and 100 m ²	3889 (46.37)
	More than 100 m ²	4025 (47.99)
	<i>in blank</i>	67 (0.80)

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

2.1. Data collection

At the beginning of 2020, the world suffered a tremendous shock, caused by the health crisis of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. On March 11, the World Health Organization officially declared this

situation a pandemic. Three days later, the government of Spain established, through a Royal Decree, a state of alarm that came into force the following day, implementing a series of restrictive measures that had to be complied with [2]. One of these measures was strict home confinement, which was extended until the beginning of May when it was relaxed. The data described in this paper collect the responses from the Spanish population to a series of questions during this period. The valuable information provided explains several aspects related to the situation and the perception that the Spanish population had of the confinement and the state of alarm which for 99 days substantially restricted their freedom.

Between April 28 and May 14, 2020, the Research Group on Electoral Processes and Public Opinion of the University of Valencia (GIPEyOP) collected information from different social strata. The survey, organised into six blocks or sections, attained 8387 valid responses through a snowball sample design, initiated from a file of GIPEyOP collaborators (3236 at the time of the survey). GIPEyOP collaborators are people who selflessly participate with the research group by voluntarily answering and forwarding, at their convenience, the surveys generated by GIPEyOP. When we finish an investigation, a report is sent to them with the results obtained, in gratitude for their collaboration. If a person wishes to be part of this group of collaborators, they must fill in the form available on the group website <gipeyop.uv.es>. The link to this form is also available at the end of all our surveys to enrol more collaborators. Of course, a collaborator can unsubscribe at any time, via personal communication or by filling in another form available on GIPEyOP website.

The survey distribution process starts by sending by email a message to the GIPEyOP collaborators' list. Included in this message is a URL through which to access the online survey. They are asked to fill in the survey and to share it with their contacts. The forwarding of the survey is very simple to carry out, since the collaborators, in addition to completing the survey, can forward the received message to their contacts. But not only that. They can also share the URL with their acquaintances using social networks, with WhatsApp, Facebook, and Twitter being the most used. The survey has specific utilities to do that. In this way, starting from the initial list of collaborators, we managed to get the survey to a much larger segment of the population.

The URL that gave access to the survey was accompanied by the following message: "From the GIPEyOP research group of the University of Valencia we are studying the effects of the COVID19 crisis. We ask you for 10 min of your time to answer the survey and also that, please, share it with people over 17 around you. We appreciate that you disseminate the survey through social networks and among your contacts. The success of the research depends on you, and the variety and amount of information that we can collect. Thank you". In this way, the receiver of the link decided whether to access the questionnaire and/or resend it at that time, leave it for later or discard it definitively.

As mentioned above and can be inferred from the above explanation, a snowball, non-probabilistic method was used to select the sample. This technique does not guarantee the representativeness of the sample, among other issues, the sample obtained is partially conditioned to the place of work or residence of the person/people who initiate the process, as can be seen in Table 4. However, this procedure has some advantages over other sampling techniques: (i) it is an inexpensive and simple process, which has been described in some detail in the previous paragraph; (ii) it makes it possible to exploit the possibilities offered by new information technologies, mainly virtual social networks; (iii) it requires few human resources since interviewers are not necessary and the interviewed subjects themselves help to enrol new respondents; and (iv) makes it possible to sample populations that are difficult to access [3,4]. Furthermore, despite the biases in the data collected, when conditional inferences are made, the results of the modelling usually lead to conclusions equivalent to those obtained with representative samples [4,5].

To analyse the survey data, the individual responses obtained are weighted using post-stratification/calibration techniques to correct for biases in the collected sample [6]. To do that, we use two-class calibration approaches when we consider two variables to compute the sampling weights and marginal calibration (post-stratification) approaches when either one or more than two variables are employed. In our reports and models, we typically combine, in some

cases, two or more of the following variables: province of residence, habitat size, gender, age, and education level. In other cases, we use the combination of the variables R.VOTE (party voted in last elections) and province of residence. With these methods, we can compensate for the over-representation of some provinces or sociodemographic profiles in the sample.

Each of the questionnaires received was subjected to an intense filtering process to select only those questionnaires with minimum requirements in quality (internal consistency) and quantity of the available information. On the one hand, those questionnaires that did not contain a minimum number of responses were discarded. For example, as a rule, all samples that did not meet Section III were discarded. Questionnaires in which some sociodemographic variables, such as gender or province of residence, were not answered were also discarded. On the other hand, consistency tests were used, crossing pairs of variables, such as the size of the habitat and the province of residence. These actions led to 2636 responses being discarded. The validated dataset contains, as previously stated, a total of 8387 observations of 122 variables.

2.2. Questionnaire design and value of the data

As previously mentioned, the survey is structured in six sections or thematic blocks: (i) sociodemographic variables; (ii) residence during confinement; (iii) employment status; (iv) household chores; (v) health; and (vi) politics. The information collected in the first part of the study helps define the social and demographic profile of the respondents in the survey, information that is extremely relevant when analysing the results. The questions posed in the second section are aimed at assessing the conditions in which the population lived during that period and considering this to the respondent's perception of management of the crisis and health [7,8]. In addition, questions such as whether the home was the normal residence, its size, whether it had outdoor spaces, the number of people who lived together, and whether they were dependent can help draw conclusions about the consequences confinement has had for cohabitants, and how this could lead to a change in future habits, for example, valuing outdoor spaces more or even moving to rural areas [9]. The results of this survey, together with those of the research study [10], offer some of the key points that lead us to the conclusions reached in [11].

Section III of the survey is dedicated to the work/educational environment of the respondent to better understand how confinement has affected the performance of the population. The feelings that a person who works may have might be different from that of a student, a retiree, or someone unemployed with limited possibilities of finding work. In this sense, it is important to know how confinement affected studies or work performance, as well as to identify what new habits are likely to remain once this exceptional situation has ended. Some authors have already shown that women have seen their work performance affected by having to telework and complete household chores without having that spatial border between home and the workplace and that during confinement there has been no spatial or time delineation separating work from housework and the care of dependents [12–15].

The fourth part of the study focused on the tasks carried out by the respondent at home (before and during confinement). In this case, knowing how the fall of external services and formal and informal networks of care changed the usual way of distributing household chores and caring for minors or elderly dependents would indicate whether the gap between men and women has widened again, leading to a greater burden of work for women as they are the ones who usually assume the role of caregivers [1]. Some studies suggest that lack of mobility has had a greater impact on women than men [12,16–18]. This part of the study allows us to delve into the impact that the pandemic is having on the distribution of domestic tasks, and the widening of the gender gap.

The fifth section of the survey focused on the feelings and daily habits that the respondent had during confinement: fear of leaving the house, physical exercise, eating, sleep disorders, and symptoms that may indicate COVID-19 infection. Health care has been paramount throughout the pandemic. Numerous studies show that all the questions posed in this block are important

to the health of the immune system and, consequently, the ability to cope with this period in the best possible way [19].

In the last section of the survey, eight questions with a political profile were posed which tell us how the population feels about the way the health and economic crises have been managed by those in charge [20]. Respondents were asked which political party they voted for in the last elections, and what would be their choice if an election were held at the current time. By crossing these responses with the other variables, relations can be drawn, among other issues, between political ideology, sociodemographic variables, and perceptions related to work and conditions at homes.

Ethics Statement

At the beginning of the questionnaire, participants were informed that the survey was anonymous, voluntary, and confidential, as established in the current regulations on Personal Data Protection and Guarantee of Digital Rights. It was also indicated that the conclusions drawn from the survey would only be presented in aggregate form.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

CRedit Author Statement

Virgilio Pérez: Data curation, Investigation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Cristina Aybar:** Data curation, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Jose M. Pavía:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank an anonymous referee for its values comments and suggestions and all the GIPEyOP team, and mainly Alfredo Rubio and Rosa Roig, for their first-rate support and help on several phases of this research. Thanks are also due to Marie Hodkinson for translating the text of the paper into English and the SUPERA COVID-19 FUND, a joint tender offered by CRUE (Conference of Rectors of Spanish Universities), CSIC (the Spanish National Research Council), and Banco Santander (Santander Bank), for their financial support. The authors also acknowledge the support of Generalitat Valenciana through project AICO/2021/257 (Conselleria d'Innovació, Universitats, Ciència i Societat Digital).

Funding: This work was supported by the SUPERA COVID-19 FUND [Grant Number ROCOGIS (The Faces of Covid-19. Gender and Socioeconomic Impacts)].

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:[10.1016/j.dib.2021.107700](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2021.107700).

References

- [1] B. Larraz, R. Roig, C. Aybar, J.M. Pavía, COVID-19 and the gender division of housework. Traditional or new gender patterns?, (under review).
- [2] Ministerio de la Presidencia, Relaciones con las Cortes y Memoria Histórica, Real Decreto 463/2020, de 14 de marzo, por el que se declara el estado de alarma para la gestión de la situación de crisis sanitaria ocasionada por el COVID-19, Boletín Oficial del Estado 67 sec. I (2020) 25390-25400. <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2020/03/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2020-3692.pdf>.
- [3] J. Kirchherr, K. Charles, Enhancing the sample diversity of snowball samples: recommendations from a research project on anti-dam movements in Southeast Asia, *PLoS ONE* 13 (2018) 1–17, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201710.
- [4] J.M. Pavía, I. Gil-Carceller, A. Rubio-Mataix, V. Coll, J.A. Alvarez-Jareño, C. Aybar, S. Carrasco-Arroyo, The formation of aggregate expectations: wisdom of the crowds or media influence? *Contemp. Soc. Sci.* 14 (2019) 132–143, doi:10.1080/21582041.2017.1367831.
- [5] J.M. Pavía, C. Aybar, Field rules and bias in random surveys with quota samples. An assessment of CIS surveys, *SORT* 42 (2018) 183–206, doi:10.2436/20.8080.02.74.
- [6] R. Valliant, J.A. Dever, F. Kreuter, *Practical Tools for Designing and Weighting Survey Samples*, Springer International Publishing AG, Cham, 2018.
- [7] M. Salvador-Ferrín, Transformación de la arquitectura desde el COVID-19, *Rev. Científica y Arbitr. Del Obs. Territ. Artes y Arquít.* 3 (2020) FINIBUS - ISSN 2737-6451 <https://publicacionescd.uleam.edu.ec/index.php/finibus/article/view/148>.
- [8] J.L. Nemecio, S. Tobón, Urbanización sustentable y resiliente ante el COVID-19: nuevos horizontes para la investigación de las ciudades, *Univ. y Soc.* 13 (2021) <https://rus.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/rus/article/view/1906>.
- [9] C.F. Sexto, Cidades dispersas e aldeias virtuais no pós-pandemia da COVID-19, *Finisterra* 55 (2021) 243–248, doi:10.18055/Finis20279.
- [10] V. Pérez, C. Aybar, J.M. Pavía, Dataset of the COVID-19 post lockdown survey conducted by GIPEyOP in Spain, (under review).
- [11] V. Pérez, C. Aybar, J.M. Pavía, COVID-19 and changes in social habits. Restaurant terraces, a booming space in cities. The case of Madrid, *Mathematics* 9 (2021), doi:10.3390/math9172133.
- [12] C. Collins, L.C. Landivar, L. Ruppanner, W.J. Scarborough, COVID-19 and the gender gap in work hours, *Gender Work Organ.* 28 (2021) 101–112, doi:10.1111/gwao.12506.
- [13] B.W. Cowan, Short-run effects of COVID-19 on U.S. worker transitions, *Natl. Bur. Econ. Res.* (2020) *Work. Pap. Ser. No. 27315*, doi:10.3386/w27315.
- [14] S. Schieman, P.J. Badawy, M.A. Milkie, A. Bierman, Work-life conflict during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Socius* 7 (2021) 2378023120982856, doi:10.1177/2378023120982856.
- [15] R. Roig, Teletrabajo y conciliación ante la igualdad de género. Una mirada desde las políticas públicas, in: A.I. Marades Puig (ed.), *Los Cuid. En La Era Covid-19 Análisis Jurídico, Económico y Político*, Tirant, 2021: pp. 299–314.
- [16] V.B. Catalá, *La crisis de la COVID-19 y su impacto en los trabajos*, *Anu. IET Trab. y Relac. Labor.* (2021) 187–209.
- [17] K. Hank, A. Steinbach, The virus changed everything, didn't it? Couples' division of housework and childcare before and during the Corona crisis, *J. Fam. Res.* (2021) 33, doi:10.20377/jfr-488.
- [18] C. Hupkau, C. Victoria, Covid-19 y desigualdad de género en España, *EsadeEcPol.* (2020). <https://dobetter.esade.edu/es/covid-19-desigualdad-genero>.
- [19] E. Andreu Cabrera, Actividad física y efectos psicológicos del confinamiento por COVID-19, *Rev. INFAD Psicol. Int. J. Dev. Educ. Psychol.* 2 (2020) 209–220, doi:10.17060/ijodaep.2020.n1.v2.1828.
- [20] M.H. Kim, W. Cho, H. Choi, J.Y. Hur, Assessing the South Korean model of emergency management during the COVID-19 pandemic, *Asian Stud. Rev.* 44 (2020) 567–578, doi:10.1080/10357823.2020.1779658.