

## Phone application for gamified smart fieldwork: New horizons of interviewer motivation and supervision at the Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Ferenc Mújdricza, Hungarian Central Statistical Office (lead author, speaker)

Linda Mohay, Hungarian Central Statistical Office (co-author)

Rozália Kalácska, Hungarian Central Statistical Office (co-author)

Mátyás Gerencsér, Hungarian Central Statistical Office (co-author)

Mária Zanatyné Fodor, Hungarian Central Statistical Office (co-author)

**17<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Labour Force Survey Methodology, 25–26. April 2024, Neuchâtel (Switzerland)**

### I. Introduction

Survey methodology literature thoroughly discusses interviewer effects, which may affect coverage error, response rate, measurement error as well as paradata. Interviewer personality traits, such as positive attitude, optimism and self-confidence were found to increase respondent cooperation (see West & Blom, 2017). Some issues experienced at the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) are, presumably, related to these factors: high administrative burden of field interviewers, high risk of burnout and high attrition rates of field interviewer staff. Smart technologies open up new opportunities for addressing such issues. Funded by the LFS 2024 module grant, our early stage project focuses on developing a dedicated smartphone application for fieldwork-related tasks in the *Hungarian Labour Force Survey* (HU-LFS), questionnaire administration excluded.

### II. Study background and goals

WP5 of the ESSnet MIMOD (Mixed-Mode Designs for Social Surveys) project investigated the opportunities of employing mobile devices in ESS surveys, specifically, the fitness of ESS surveys for smartphones (Schouten et al., 2018; Gravem et al., 2019), and the possible use of mobile sensor data (Mussmann & Schouten, 2019). The recently concluded European project on developing and testing smartphone applications for the *Household Budget Survey* and the *Time Use Survey* is a salient example of migrating complex ESS data collections to smartphone self-completion (see e.g. Sabbe et al., n.d.; Oerlemans et al., 2022).

However, MIMOD or other European subject-matter specific endeavours did not investigate the similarly promising perspective of harnessing the potential of smartphone applications to enhance data collection on the field interviewers' and field supervisors' side. Opportunities of migrating some administrative tasks of the interviewer (such as recording disposition codes and details on nonresponse cases), interviewer training and motivation modules as well as real-time fieldwork monitoring features to a simple, easy-to-use and safe smartphone application are a promising new way to improve data quality, reduce interviewer burden, and improve interviewer safety, satisfaction, motivation and training. Reduction of interviewer burden in itself may improve contact and persuasion attitude and efficiency (see Wuyts & Loosveldt, 2018), not to mention their motivation, task satisfaction, training, and perceived safety.

One of the major components of our survey interviewer smartphone application will be the embedding of other components in a gamified environment. Gamification is "the use of game design elements in non-game contexts" (Deterding et al., 2011, pp. 2) in order to enhance user experience, engagement,

loyalty and entertainment (Richter et al., 2015). Concerning our study, the motivation-increasing potential of gamification is key. Participants may have extrinsic (instrumental) or intrinsic (self-rewarding) motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Gamification is assumed to combine the two types of motivation. First, it applies external rewards to increase engagement by levels, points, badges, etc. Second, gamification is intended to create a sense of autonomy, competence and belonging (Muntean, 2011). Apart from game components, game structures, rules and mechanisms are equally important features of a gamified environment, as their presence distinguish the dimensions of playing and gaming (see Deterding et al., 2011; Keusch & Zhang, 2017). Gamified systems usually rely on reward mechanisms: they reward progress and expected behaviour/performance predictably (Juhász, 2020). Instead of penalties or retributions, they apply positive reinforcements. Instant and positive feedback appears to be essential for the users to feel motivated, engaged, supported (Kiryakova et al., 2014) and experience a sense of success during the activity. It is also important to incorporate self-assessment and self-reflection components in the system, which may increase the sense of autonomy in and responsibility for the activity (Juhász, 2020). As Keusch and Zhang (2017, pp. 148) notes, “gamification of surveys is a hot topic” in the struggle against the general decline of survey participation. They also note that its usefulness might be limited by “pointsification” (reducing gamification to points, badges, etc.) and that gamification might merely be an overhyped trend already past its zenith (Keusch & Zhang, 2017). Gamification in surveys is commonly understood as a technique to increase the engagement of respondents, mainly in web surveys. The use of gamification to enhance the survey interviewer’s experience, however, receives much less attention. Our smartphone application will enable the implementation of gamified features in survey interviewer fieldwork. One of the main goals of our project is to better motivate HU-LFS field interviewers by gamification and to study its impact on their attitudes and performance.

Three main modules will be available for interviewers. The first will include fieldwork assistance components, such as smart case management, visit/call planner, route planning, intuitive nonresponse administration, case-specific notebook, visit history, etc. in order to reduce interviewer burden and optimise performance. The second module will be a contact and assistance centre: live chat with supervisors, interviewer forum, technical assistance surface, panic button, etc. for prompt feedback and support.

The third module will be a complex education and motivation module. This module will provide the gamified environment for the entire fieldwork experience (except questionnaire administration), including an education refresher component to keep interviewers’ knowledge up to date. The gamified environment will give interviewers feedback, rewards and positive reinforcements for a better overall experience and to improve motivation and attitudes. Gamified tasks and challenges may also facilitate better fieldwork in neighbourhoods where interviewer performance is usually less efficient, such as the fringes of settlements, very high/very low status areas, etc.

Apart from these, additional benefits over similar systems on larger devices are the ease of use and inconspicuousness. In contrast with having to handle a tablet or laptop in open space, using a phone on the street can go virtually unnoticed. Interviewers can thus “keep a low profile” and are less likely to encounter adverse reactions from locals, especially in less safe areas.

For fieldwork supervision, monitoring and management, the application provides more granular data on what happens in the field, opportunity for more efficient supervision and targeted interventions or development of tailored visit protocols to assist interviewers.

### III. Study design

One of the largest continuous voluntary participation data collection of the HCSO is the HU-LFS (*Munkaerő-felmérés*): approximately 12 000 households in 684 settlements are invited to respond per month, and about 240 interviewers collect their responses. The HU-LFS sample has a simple rotation pattern. New addresses remain in the sample for six consecutive quarters. A previous study on interviewer effects in the HU-LFS found significant differences across interviewers (Horváth, 2010).

Response rates of the HU-LFS follow European trends (see the quality report of European LFSs: Eurostat, 2022): it is characterised by increasing nonresponse over time. As the HU-LFS does not offer self-completion (e.g. CAWI) modes, interviewers are key actors of the data collection. To avoid bias caused by the sample composition of respondents (selection bias), it is essential that ample resources are dedicated to successfully interview all sample members rather than focusing fieldwork efforts on collecting easy responses (“low-hanging fruits”).

The present project is a multi-phase project of needs assessment, application development, testing, piloting, updating, and re-piloting. Major phases of the project are the following:

1. Needs assessment: individual and group consultations with interviewers and supervisors (currently ongoing).
2. Detailed specification of functions and development of a beta application.
3. 1<sup>st</sup> round live fieldwork test, followed by feedback consultations with interviewers and supervisors.
4. Application updates, bug fixes, etc.
5. 2<sup>nd</sup> round live fieldwork test.
6. Analysis of the results, reporting.

In order to choose suitable game components and motivation mechanisms, we have to gather information on the target population of the game (Sailer et al., 2013). Therefore, the first phase of the project is a needs assessment of field interviewers as well as of departments managing the data collection to reveal their motivations, needs, current attitudes, etc. As this is the currently ongoing phase of the project, we share further details and some preliminary results of the needs assessment study in the following sections of the paper.

The needs assessment research is a comprehensive mixed-method study of a series of qualitative investigations followed by a quantitative feedback survey. For the qualitative interviews and focus groups, we evaluated the fieldwork quality of the interviewers in the LFS over the past year, assessing performance based on survey data (suspiciously high number of skips, suspiciously high number of DK/NA, other serious errors) and paradata (visit time, suspiciously short interview lengths, very low performance or suspiciously high performance). A discrete scoring system was developed for each performance indicator, the higher the score the worse the performance. As a result of the analysis, interviewers were classified into two groups: “bad” (high total score) and “good” (low total score) interviewers.

The name, gender and age of interviewers were not available, only the interviewer ID, settlements assigned to them, the duration of being employed at the HCSO and the name of assigned regional fieldwork supervisors.

Samples were selected based on performance scores and the auxiliary information. The qualitative stages of the study were conducted in the following order:

- *In-depth interviews with fieldwork supervisors (6 interviews):* sample selection based on the performance of interviewers under their supervision. Two regional fieldwork supervisors with predominantly high-performing interviewers, two with predominantly low-performing interviewers were selected and one from the capital city because of the special nature of this unique field.
- *In-depth interviews with field interviewers (5 interviews):* the most reliable interviewer overall (lowest total score in bad performance indicators), the interviewer who follows visiting protocols the best (lowest total score by indicators of disregarding protocols of visiting respondents), a mediocre interviewer by all indicators, a mediocre interviewer by visiting protocols, and (probably) the biggest cheater (with the highest total score).
- *Focus group interviews with Household Surveys Data Collection Department experts (8 participants: data pre-processing, fieldwork monitoring and interviewer training experts):* due to the relatively small staff, no specific selection criteria were applied – we asked that the Department to assigns 8 experts, the main criterion was that all data collection-related fields of the Department should be represented. A special request was that colleagues whom interviewers complain about be represented in the group.
- *Two focus group interviews with field interviewers (8 participants per group):* One of the focus groups consisted of interviewers with high, the other of low total bad performance score (“bad” and “good” interviewers). 8 interviewers were invited in each group.

Selection criteria were the same for both groups: equal number of

- o interviewers who work in several small settlements and who work only in large towns,
- o long-serving, medium service duration and recently hired interviewers were invited, and
- o number of interviewers under the supervision of the same fieldwork supervisor was limited to two participants per group.

For each interviewer, a substitute was arranged to prepare for cancellations (in case an interviewer could not attend the focus group).

The interviews covered a range of topics from the perceived value of the interviewer work, interviewer training, experiences with fieldwork instruments, fieldwork experiences, good and bad practices, support and feedback opportunities, motivation, good and bad opportunities and practices of motivating interviewers, etc. The focus group interviews also included participant-specific role-plays to facilitate the sharing of experiences and practices.

The problems, needs, good and bad practices, etc. discovered in the qualitative phase will feed in the design of the questionnaire for the next stage: an interviewer feedback, needs and attitudes survey. Completing the questionnaire will be mandatory for all HU-LFS interviewers, therefore, needs and attitudes data will be available on the full population. It enables the smartphone application components and features to be finetuned and tailored to actual needs.

#### IV. Results – interviewer motivation

The project is in the first, needs assessment phase. Qualitative interview and focus group data are currently being analysed. In this chapter, a condensed summary of results on the topic of interviewer motivation are presented, as one of the major aims of using gamification is to increase interviewer motivation in all areas of interviewer activity – that is, preparation for and execution of fieldwork,

administrative tasks, etc. Therefore, the gamification module on the whole and its specific components should be designed with the interviewers' motivational issues, attributes and needs in the focus.

Several aspects of interviewer motivation were analysed: the perceived value/appreciation of interviewers' work, current as well as potential motivators of the field interviewer job, etc. The results are presented in the following chapters.

#### Perceived value/appreciation – (e)valuation discrepancy

There is a palpable discrepancy between the perceived objective value of and externally attributed value to the interviewers' work. From an objective perspective, survey interviewing is generally perceived essential, as without the work of the interviewers, "there would be no data" – in fact, it is hard to argue with this position, at least with regards to data collected directly from households. At the same time, however, there is a strong sense of a general unappreciation of their work by a variety of other agents.

First, based on adverse respondent reactions, the social prestige of the survey interviewer job is perceived very low: "even the postman is more appreciated, and makes more money, too". Second, within-organisation appreciation of their work is perceived similarly poor. The following experiences send a clear message about value the organisation attributes to them and their work:

- piece rate wages (payment only for successful interviews),
- worn and outdated devices equipped with often malfunctioning survey software,
- general lack of feedback consultations and neglect of interviewer-initiated feedback,
- no apparent improvement in long-standing, oft-indicated fieldwork problems,
- lack of technical support beyond normal working hours, when respondents are usually unavailable, i.e. when the need for support would most probably arise. Although fieldwork supervisors are usually available when interviewers need support, a lot of the issues are beyond their expertise.

Interviewers generally feel "left behind" by the organisation, despite the importance of the data they collect. It may be in part due to the organisational structure: fieldwork, fieldwork supervision and payment are managed by an external firm, owned entirely and contracted for data collection solely by the HCSO, whereas other areas, such as IT and device support, fieldwork monitoring, interviewer training, etc. belong to HCSO subject-matter departments. Cooperation between the actors appears to be way below optimal, the effects of which seems to have a great impact on the commitment and motivation of field interviewers.

#### Current motivators of interviewers

Several major motivators were identified, which reveal the reasons for why HCSO interviewers do this job (at present).

##### **Extrinsic or instrumental (opportunistic) motivators:**

- **Financial motivation (income):** for some interviewers, survey interviewing for the HCSO is their main source of income. For others, interviewing is only an auxiliary source of income: as a side job for active age interviewers due to the low wage or some extra money for pensioners. Low wages were, however, mentioned in negative context, which hints at a weak motivating power of the current payment structure.
- **Vulnerability in the labour market:** for interviewers who cannot find other, better jobs, their vulnerability in the labour market is a motivating factor for doing this job.

- **Being legally employed:** some older interviewers who will reach pension age within a couple of years do this job only to be legally employed, presumably so they can complete the required work years for retirement.
- **Secondary usage of extant social capital:** interviewers working with people in their main jobs (e.g. general practitioners) can use their existing relationships, i.e. social capital to do a side-job as survey interviewers.

#### **Intrinsic motivators:**

- **Human connections:** there were distinct types of human connections that are motivating for field interviewers:
  - o Preference of dealing with people in their work: field interviewing provides interviewers who prefer connecting with people with a good opportunity for that. This appeared as a relatively strong motivator: their morale and enthusiasm are much harder to break down.
  - o Good personal relationship with the fieldwork supervisor
  - o Community: a good regional interviewer community can be motivating for the interviewers.
- **Fondness of the interviewing job:** some interviewers do field interviewing because they like this kind of work. Ideally, this would probably be the most advantageous, intrinsic motivation, assuming an interviewer motivated for and taking delight in quality fieldwork, questionnaire administration and survey data collection in general. Considering the long-standing, established issues of survey fieldwork at the HCSO, though, caution is advised. As a current motivator, “liking” the job may as well pertain to current fieldwork run with suboptimal protocols.
- **Non-monotonous job:** the diversity (lack of monotony) of the tasks and the job is another motivating factor (communicating with various people, working in various environments, etc.).
- **Independence:** a sense of independence related to the piece rate job also appeared – although it was, at the same time, labelled as self-exploitation.
- **Serving the public good:** this intrinsic motivation also appeared, but with little emphasis.

It is important to note that income appeared as a relatively weak motivator in comparison with others. Probably at least in part due to the low and piece rate wages, human connections were deemed much more important motivators of field interviewing. An analytic interpretation of the palpable emphasis on intrinsic motivation might assume a certain degree of (self-)validation: to resolve the discrepancy of doing survey interviewing despite the low wages. It might also in part be a façade to appear in better light and avoid an opportunistic/materialistic sense of self-portrayal.

However, a characteristic problem of more intrinsically motivated (human connections, serving the public good) interviewers was also reported. In case they are successful at interviewing, they get assigned exponentially more addresses, which, combined with their experiences of bad IT background, overly high expectations, etc. are highly demotivating. According to the reports, it tends to result in their leaving the organisation or losing their original motivation over time.

Another strong impression during the analysis of the reports was that the current general level of interviewer motivation appears rather low, but this impression should be treated with caution and may not be generalised due to the nonprobability sample. The quantitative interviewer feedback, needs & attitudes survey should provide general(isable) information on this issue.

## Potential de/motivators

Interviewees were asked to give feedback on potential ways of interviewer motivation as well as the motivating potential of current practices. Some practices appeared to have a controversial or straight out demotivating effect on interviewers.

### Potential intrinsic motivators

- **Human appreciation, importance, belonging:** the need to be “treated like human beings” reveals a deep-running issue in attitudes towards field interviewers. Demonstrating human appreciation, attributing appropriate importance and facilitating a sense of belonging to the HCSO, personal contact with the management are areas in which lie a lot of untapped potential for increasing interviewer motivation. It may well counter the current, highly demotivating perception of organisational and human neglect of interviewers.
- **Actual consideration of interviewer feedback:** closely related to the previous motivator, regularly asking and actually considering interviewer feedback would be another option. At the moment, there is no organised collection of interviewer feedback, and interviewees reported any interviewer-initiated feedback utterly neglected – a highly demotivating ‘practice’. It is due to the lack of established internal protocols for handling interviewer feedback, such as interviewer-reported information of wrong addresses (e.g. due to renaming streets, re-numbering buildings, etc.): channel of reporting, validation process, type of information to report, etc. are not developed.
- **Positive feedback and reinforcements:** an overarching theme, the need for positive feedback and reinforcing communication could be another effective motivator. At present, criticism of interviewers’ work was perceived abundant, without any positive, motivating gestures. Critique was not deemed generally unjust, only the lack of positive words from actors beyond fieldwork supervisors (HCSO subject-matter experts included) was resented. An appropriate balance of critique (when necessary) and reinforcing feedback should be struck for better motivation of interviewers. By contrast, the current practice of some fieldwork supervisors shows the potential of this assumption: a proper combination of fair critique and positive feedback appeared to be a key motivator of top-quality interviewer performance.

### Potential extrinsic motivators

- **Continuous expert support:** to maintain motivation and help correcting mistakes.
- **Positive respondent attitudes:** interestingly, respondent attitudes towards interviewers was mentioned as a special motivator: “a kind and sweet respondent can make the interviewer’s day”. It might appear beyond the HCSO’s range of control, but two indirect ways are possible to positively influence respondent attitudes towards interviewers: 1) improving HCSO communication and actual credibility & trustworthiness; 2) improving interviewer recruitment and communication training for more engaging interviewer personalities. These would also have a significant positive impact on respondent satisfaction, which may trigger a virtuous circle by its advantageous repercussions on interviewers.
- **Improving the whole data collection process, fixing its issues:** improving fieldwork conditions, instruments, devices, interviewer training, supervision, reimbursement, etc. and fixing obvious issues would all contribute to higher interviewer motivation.
- **Anonymised comparison of interviewer performance, without consequences:** a current practice of some fieldwork supervisors, regularly providing their interviewers with

anonymised lists of performance may be motivating to higher-performing interviewers. In turn, it may be demotivating for underperforming interviewers, giving them a sense of comfort that/if there are worse performances than theirs.

- **Financial motivators:**
  - Better wages: a relatively obvious material motivator, but surprisingly, it appeared less important than intrinsic motivators such as feeling appreciated.
  - Income safety and social insurance: a current motivating feature is the reliability of wages and social insurance in comparison with the perceived conduct of other survey organisations in Hungary.
  - Extra addresses upon request: as an indirect financial motivator, field supervisors sometimes assign extra addresses to interviewers who request it. However, this appeared to motivate lower-quality performance.
  - Public transport pass: it was mentioned as a potentially motivating, useful benefit in contrast with the monetary travel compensations currently received.
- **Nonfinancial material motivators:**
  - Some recently introduced benefits such as uniform interviewer clothes (not *actual* uniforms) and an interviewer bag were reported good motivators, probably due to their usefulness: these solved actual problems interviewers experienced in the field.
  - Work phone and mobile data: an interviewee considered these a major motivator.

### **Demotivating and controversially motivating practices**

Apart from the low, piece rate wages, a number of further problematic practices were reported.

- **Financial:**
  - Competitions: a current practice, high-performing interviewers are awarded a significant bonus. It is framed as a country-wide competition among interviewers, with rankings based simply on their number of successful interviews. The effects of it are controversial. It may be motivating to those few who are close to an awarded position (1–6<sup>th</sup> rank). However, there are significant problems with these competitions:
    - unfair comparison across interviewers: interviewers with less assigned addresses have no chance of being awarded;
    - unfair regional comparison: regional differences in respondent cooperation reduces the chances of interviewers of certain regions (e.g. the capital);
    - risk of low quality ‘successful’ interviews;
    - risk of focusing on ‘low hanging fruits’ and neglecting (potentially) harder cases;
    - risk of forged interviews;
    - clashes with mentor programme: mentoring new recruits is not in the mentors’ interest, as they risk the mentee taking an award from them.

In sum, competitions seem to be more demotivating than motivating, with further serious risks, especially in the present format – without appropriately refined differentiation and ranking criteria.

- Extra monetary incentives for interviewers introduced late into the data collection period: probably as a countermeasure to low response rates. However, its motivating effect is controversial. It only motivates a few interviewers who take on too much addresses and work them superficially, but others consider it literally pointless. It may also risk low quality or forged interviews.



- Bonus for visits in the reference period: if the interviewer visits respondents in the reference week, they are entitled a bonus. However, it was framed negatively as a demotivator: if the visit does not take place in the reference week (as is usual...), they *lose* this amount.
- **Material:** the recently provided electric scooters were mentioned as controversial effect benefits. At the countryside, their usefulness is rather limited due to the lack of suitable roads.
- **Being pressured to work:** an indicator of generally low motivation, a sense of being pressured to work in surveys less 'attractive' to work in was reported as a strong demotivator. Although contracted interviewers are bound by their contract, the sense of compulsion and pressure may well damage the already low general motivation further.
- **Lack of consequences:** even if an interviewer makes significant mistakes or apparently forges interviews, consequences rarely follow – e.g. long-known forgers are not sacked. Probably due to recruitment difficulties. The general lack of consequences clearly motivates against following fieldwork standards.
- **Other demotivating factors:**
  - Suboptimal survey instruments (questionnaires): interviewers perceive the questionnaires insufficiently designed (language, logic, interpretability, etc.) and way too long for successful administration. It appeared as a significantly demotivating feature even to high-performing interviewers.
  - Malfunctioning devices and software: see above.
  - Overburdening/pressurising high-performing interviewers: see above.

Once again, immaterial and intrinsic motivators, mainly support, positive feedback, appreciation, human connections etc. seem to be better potential motivators than material/financial options. One of the key takeaways was that if an intended motivator/incentive does not work in practice, it not only runs the risk of wasting resources but seems to act as an outright demotivator.

#### Motivating potential of gamification features

In the focus groups of interviewers, some general gamification features were discussed:

- awards, badges, honours: they seemed to motivate lower quality fieldwork;
- direct feedback on collected data quality: it seemed to motivate lower quality fieldwork;
- fieldwork progress indicator: a generally motivating feature;
- monthly/weekly expected earnings balance indicator: it seemed to motivate higher quality fieldwork and *demotivate* lower quality fieldwork.

#### V. Conclusions, limitations, questions

In sum, a pattern emerged that higher fieldwork quality seems to be motivated by immaterial, intrinsic motivators, whereas stronger motivation by material motivators may be related to lower fieldwork quality. As personal, human motivators (feedback, appreciation, etc.) were quite emphasised in connection with higher quality fieldwork, a smartphone application may not be enough to counter the current motivation deficit. Impersonal, gamified in-app feedback and appreciation features might be motivating to lower quality fieldwork. Gamified components directly linked to fieldwork progress and, especially financial rewards may, in turn, be motivating to higher quality fieldwork. A warning sign, however, is that a gamification-like incentive: interviewer competitions appear to be a blunder in current HCSO practice – probably (at least in part) due to the rather basic ranking rule.

It has to be noted that the qualitative nature of the data only allows hypotheses at this stage, to be tested in the next, quantitative stage (interviewer feedback, needs & attitudes survey).

Gamification is not without drawbacks, either. Juhász's (2020) summary listed the following major critiques:

- using a point system may be too superficial, simplifying (see the problem of "pointsification" above),
- gamification may give a false game-like experience to actual work while expecting higher performance from the employees/participants than without the gamified context,
- it motivates with fictions instead of actual incentives (raise, better working conditions, etc.),
- it may harm the experience of enjoyment experienced in work, that is, the delight that may come from the activity itself.

It is essential to design the gamified system with keeping all of these factors in mind. In line with theory as well as the interviews, the game should not attempt to substitute/replace proper human and work conditions and optimal work experience. Rather, it should be a complementary extra feature to enhance survey interviewer fieldwork experience.

Apart from improving interviewer attitudes and motivation by gamified components, more prompt feedback and positive reinforcements, further expected benefits of the application are the following:

1. Improved fieldwork quality, real-time monitoring and timely interventions.
2. Simpler and more accurate recording of nonresponse details by the easy-to-use smartphone application.
3. More efficient monitoring and correction of recorded disposition codes and giving feedback on these to interviewers may result in more accurate use of disposition codes on the long run.
4. Increase in response rates in settlements and neighbourhoods that perform below average at present – for example, interviewing respondents who live in segregated areas may be more efficient.
5. Reducing field interviewer burden by the direct feedback and assistance functions of the application.
6. Proposal for an optimal protocol of fieldwork pace (timing of visits) and testing this proposed protocol based on interim disposition codes and paradata collected on the visits.

Given the early stage, we would appreciate attendants' feedback and possible experiences with such endeavours, e.g. gamification in interviewer training and fieldwork, especially in the *Labour Force Survey*. Best practices of and unexpected results in interviewer motivation schemes for staff retention and to prevent burnout, with a particular focus on novel solutions would also be useful.

#### **Questions for the workshop:**

- Do you use gamification in interviewer training or to improve fieldwork performance (e.g. competitions)?
- Do you have any experience of adverse/controversial effects of newly introduced fieldwork standards or reward schemes?
- What motivation practices do you have in place to reduce fieldwork interviewer attrition and to prevent burnout?

## VI. References

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. Springer Science+Business Media.
- Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L. (2011, September 28–30). From game design elements to gamefulness: Defining “gamification”. In A. Lugmayr, H. Franssila, C. Safran, & I. Hammouda (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning future media environments* (pp. 9–15). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2181037.2181040>
- Eurostat (2022). *Quality report of the European Union Labour Force Survey 2020: 2022 edition*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/7870049/14455112/KS-FT-22-003-EN-N.pdf/1010df35-96f3-f7b3-b13b-e10888f96552?t=1647961382032>
- Gravem, D., Meertens, V., Luiten, A., Giesen, D., Berg, N., Bakker, J., & Schouten, B. (2019). *Final methodological report presenting results of usability tests on selected ESS surveys and Census: Smartphone fitness of ESS surveys – case studies on the ICT survey and the LFS*. Cooperation on Multi-Mode Data Collection (MMDC), Mixed Mode Designs for Social Surveys – MIMOD WP5, Deliverable 4. <https://www.istat.it/it/files//2011/07/WP5-deliverables.zip>
- Horváth B. (2010) On the nature of nonresponse and interviewer effects in the Hungarian Labour Force Survey. *Hungarian Statistical Review*, 88(SN14). pp. 125–147. [https://www.ksh.hu/statszemele\\_archive/2010/2010\\_K14/2010\\_K14\\_125.pdf](https://www.ksh.hu/statszemele_archive/2010/2010_K14/2010_K14_125.pdf)
- Juhász V. (2020). A gamifikáció mint eszközrendszer és motivációs módszer az oktatásban. *Neveléstudomány: Oktatás – Kutatás – Innováció*, 8(2), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.21549/NTNY.29.2020.2.3>
- Keusch, F., & Zhang, C. (2017). A Review of Issues in Gamified Surveys. *Social Science Computer Review*, 35(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439315608451>
- Kiryakova, G., Angelova, N., & Yordanova, L. (2014). Gamification in education. In Bülbül, T., & Çakici, Y. (Eds.), *9th International Balkan Education and Science Conference Proceedings* (pp. 679-683). <https://dosyalar.trakya.edu.tr/egitim/docs/Kongreler/FProceedings.pdf>
- Muntean, C. I. (2011). Raising engagement in e-learning through gamification. In *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Virtual Learning ICVL* (Vol. 1., pp. 323–329).
- Mussmann, O., & Schouten, B. (2019). *Final methodological report discussing the use of mobile device sensors in ESS surveys: Sensor data for ESS surveys: a first inventory*. Cooperation on Multi-Mode Data Collection (MMDC), Mixed Mode Designs for Social Surveys – MIMOD WP5, Deliverable 3. <https://www.istat.it/it/files//2011/07/WP5-deliverables.zip>
- Oerlemans, T., de Wolf, N., Schouten, B. (2022). *@HBS2: An app-assisted approach for the Household Budget Survey: Deliverable 2.1 – HBS app*. Project 2020-NL-INNOV (@HBS2). <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/54431/16767656/2020-NL-INNOV-Report-on-the-action-%26-Deliverables.pdf/92b9f47d-d060-c58f-7463-f2df697227f3?t=1684144414464>
- Sabbe, K., Olsen, J., Bizter, E., Nagel, E., Lenuweit, B., Knapp, D., März, C., Sommer, A., Brecht, P., Minnen, J., Beyens, P., & Cortebeeck, E. (n.d.). *Innovative tools and sources for diary-based surveys: Household Budget Survey and Time Use Survey: Test and maintain*. CROESS: CROSS-domain & ESS (European Statistical System).

[https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/9986036/16669467/2020-BE-INNOV\\_FinalReport\\_MainDocument.pdf/d3cfa4c4-e793-0bf9-1a70-6a1c91dd363e?t=1683014951291](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/9986036/16669467/2020-BE-INNOV_FinalReport_MainDocument.pdf/d3cfa4c4-e793-0bf9-1a70-6a1c91dd363e?t=1683014951291)

- Sailer, M., Hense, J., Mandl, H., & Klevers, M. (2013). Psychological perspectives on motivation through gamification. *Interaction Design & Architecture(s) Journal*, 19(1), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.55612/s-5002-019-002>
- Schouten, B., Blanke, K., Gravem, D., Luiten, A., Meertens, V., Paulus, O. (2018). *Assessment of fitness of ESS surveys for smartphones*. Cooperation on Multi-Mode Data Collection (MMDC), Mixed Mode Designs for Social Surveys – MIMOD WP5, Deliverable 1. <https://www.istat.it/it/files//2011/07/WP5-deliverables.zip>
- West, B. T. & Blom, A. G. (2017). Explaining interviewer effects: A research synthesis. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*, 5(2): 175–211. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smw024>
- Wuyts, C., & Loosveldt, G. (2018): *Interviewers' willingness to spend time and effort on the survey: Workload and the contact process*. Paper presentation at the 2018 Workshop on Household Survey Nonresponse.