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**Executive Summary**

The graduation assignment is written for the organization Movies that Matter Foundation, specifically for the Movies that Matter Festival. The research is commissioned by Marie-Pierre Furnée, head of the marketing and communication department of the Movies that Matter Foundation.

Previous years, Movies that Matter Foundation tried to evaluate the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR by spreading a questionnaire amongst the visitors of the festival. However, feedback by the use of questionnaires is very difficult to receive. Over the past few years, the amount of visitors increased, whereas the response rate of the questionnaires decreased. Therefore, the main problem of the research project is the low response rate of the questionnaires. Research will provide an answer to the following research question:

‘How can Movies that Matter stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate from its festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR strategy?’

Based on Baruch & Holtom (2008), the main problem of a low response rate includes two sub problems. First of all, ‘the failure to deliver the questionnaire to the target group’. Research on this sub problem provides insights from the company perspective. The second sub problem is ‘the reluctance of the target group to respond.’ This research will provide insights into the festival visitors’ perspective, including the motivational, psychological and decision making process of a potential respondent. Research will be based on the research objective, which can be described as: ‘Producing communication recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation in order to stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate for the evaluation of the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR. This will be done by identifying features of questionnaires influencing the response rate, analysing the festival visitors and their attitude and behaviour towards questionnaires, and by identifying contextual factors influencing the response rate.’

The study on increasing the questionnaire response rate from festival visitors is based on consultation of theoretical literature in the areas of questionnaires, target groups and contextual factors influencing the response rate, by means of which views from Ms. Furnée, volunteers spreading the questionnaire, research centers/call centers and by observation during the the Movies that Matter festival 2013, are analyzed.

From this research it can be concluded that many factors influence the response rate, which makes it impossible to directly evaluate what has influenced the response rate during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013. Nevertheless, all factors influencing the behavior and decision process of potential
respondents can be optimized in order to get a higher response rate on future questionnaires, in which it is most important to minimize the costs (e.g. how much time respondents need to respond), maximize the benefits (e.g. showing appreciation, incentives) and to build trust (e.g. authority, safety).

Based on the conclusion, recommendations are given, specifically for the Movies that Matter Festival 2014. The most important recommendation is to provide the questionnaire to everyone. This has the advantages of reaching a higher amount of people, resulting an increase in the response rate. Moreover, it will create a more accurate sample of the festival visitors, as no selection will be made by the interviewees. Secondly, the questionnaire itself should be reconsidered. It is recommended to make the distinction between receiving basic information via the questionnaire and to stimulate excessive feedback through other channels. Both hardcopy and online should be used for spreading the questionnaire. However, more focus should go to spreading the questionnaire online, considering the characteristics of the festival visitors. In both modes, the address should be separated from the questionnaire, allowing for safety and respect. Finally, incentives should be used and promoted in order to motivate potential respondents to respond. Tickets for films during the festival would be recommended.
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1. Introduction
This graduation assignment is written within the Institute of Communication and Media (ICM) at the Hanze University in Groningen. The graduation assignment is meant to fulfil the professional role of a junior communication consultant, and thus to deliver customised advice. This is a practical, feasible solution on an existing communication problem for the client’s organisation, meeting the organization’s objective.

The graduation assignment is written for the organization Movies that Matter Foundation, specifically for the Movies that Matter Festival. The research is commissioned by Ms. Furnée, head of the marketing and communication department of the Movies that Matter Foundation.

The outcome of this research will result in communication recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation on how to increase the questionnaire response rate from festival visitors, applicable to the Movies that Matter Festival 2014.
2. The Project Context

2.1. The Organization
The organizational context will include a description of the organization and will provide relevant insights into the organization with respect to the research problem and context.

The Movies that Matter Foundation, an initiative of Amnesty International, is meant to open people’s eyes for human rights and social justice. The Foundation uses wide ranging film programmes to promote the human right dialogue, influence the public opinion and to encourage people to stand up for human rights. Amnesty International describes that “we are at our most powerful when we stand together for human rights” and “We will not stop until everyone can live in dignity; until every person’s voice can be heard; until no one is tortured or executed” (Amnesty International, 2013). This is needed as many human right issues are still unknown, little discussed, and action is needed by the society. The Movies that Matter Foundation includes different programmes spreading the word of these films and documentaries. One of these programmes is the Movies that Matter Festival, which has this year taken place from the 21st until the 27th of March, 2013. The Movies that Matter Festival presents around seventy human rights feature films and documentaries from all over the world. The movies are carefully selected on quality, content and urgency. In addition to the movies, the program provides an in-depth program, including talk shows and debates.

For the Movies that Matter Festival 2013, the goal of reaching 19.250 visitors was set (Festivalplan MtMF, 2013), which was reached with more than 20.000 visitors. Besides an increase in the amount of visitors, the goal was set to increase the response rate of the questionnaire, meant as an evaluation tool for the Movies that Matter Festival. There was a small increase with a response rate of 278 in 2012 and 338 in 2013 (Appendix 1). The results of the questionnaire from previous years can be found in the annual reports as provided on the Movies that Matter website (MoviesthatMatter, 2013). The annual reports provide an elaborate evaluation of the previous years, including an evaluation of the Festivals with the questionnaire results.

2.2. The Research Context
The following section will include a description of the project context, including the research problem and background elements contributing to the research problem.

Previous years, Movies that Matter Foundation tried to evaluate the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR by spreading a questionnaire amongst the visitors of the festival. The questionnaire has been spread as an evaluation tool, because it is not known what people actually think about the festival, the movies, the organization and its PR. Ms. Furnée notes during the intake interview that this feedback from the questionnaire and other types of feedback are valuable information in order to
optimize the quality of the festival and its PR (Appendix 2, interview 1). This is motivated by Watson and Noble (2007), describing that evaluation should be seen as an integrated and integral part of event management. The process of planning, implementation and evaluation are seen as a never ending cycle, leading to a process of continuous improvements (Allen et al., 2008) and as a Continuing Model (Watson, 2001 in Watson & Noble, 2007). However, this feedback is very difficult to get. Over the past few years, the amount of visitors increased, whereas the response rate of the Questionnaires decreased. The response rate of the questionnaire is very low, indicated by the decrease of the response rate of 1000 in 2009 to 278 in 2012 as shown in the documents of the questionnaire data from the previous years (Appendix 1).

It is Movies that Matters’ interest to increase the feedback from the visitors related to the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR (Appendix 2, interview 3). According to Ms. Furnée, feedback is needed to:

- Have an overview of the public and its characteristics in order to optimize the communication with its public.
- Know the opinion of the public about the Festival in order optimize the quality of the festival.
- Know the effectiveness of the PR tools used by Movies that Matter Foundation in order to increase the awareness and attendance. Moreover, it is important for the Movies that Matter Foundation to know whether the PR budget is spent on the most effective PR tools.

This information is gathered from questionnaires spread during the festival. However, the main problem is the low response rate of the questionnaires.

Ms. Furnée mentioned that the low response rate is possibly caused by the fact that visitors are generally not willing to answer questionnaires, because visitors prefer watching the movies without any additional effort. People are tired of all the questionnaires of different companies and visitors do not feel committed to provide feedback. Based on Baruch & Holtom (2008), the main problem of a low response rate includes two sub problems, which are:

1. Failure to deliver the questionnaire to the target group
2. Reluctance of the target group to respond

These two sub problems will have a guiding role during this research, as it covers two different, but important perspectives on the main problem.
3. Theoretical Framework
This section will explain different models and theories and its corelation, relevant for the research process.

Based on the subproblem and the research objective, the research can be divided into three research areas, which are:

1. The questionnaire
2. The festival visitors (target audience)
3. Contextual factors

A more elaborate overview of the research areas is included in the Topic Web (Appendix 3). The research areas are chosen due to its interrelated relationship; a connection needs to be made between the delivery of the questionnaire, the reluctance of people to response, and the contextual factors influencing the response rate. Verschuren & Doorewaard (2010) describe this type of research by having an interaction effect of two variables (the questionnaire and the festival visitors) with an interacting variable (Contextual factors), as shown in the following conceptual model:

The following section will include relevant scientific literature related to the three research areas, with the goal of solving the two research problems:

- Failure to deliver the questionnaire to the target group

**The questionnaire:** First of all, the questionnaire itself is very important in influencing whether people will respond to a questionnaire, take the questionnaire seriously or even if people will finish the questionnaire. The non-response error (Sivo et al., 2006) is frequently related to the questionnaire itself, as people leave questions open, or finish the questionnaire before the official end. This also relates Saunders et al. (2009) stating that ‘the design of your data questionnaire will affect the response rate and the reliability and validity of the data collection’. It can be maximized by the design of the individual questions, the layout of the questionnaire, an explanation of the purpose and pilot testing. Sivo et al.(2006) and Saunders et al. (2009) have a guiding function within this research, as Sivo et al. (2006) focuses on the non-response error and Saunders et al. (2009) outlines the characteristics of the relation between the questionnaire in total and the response rate.
Incentives: Important in delivering the questionnaire to the target group is the motivating the target group to respond. For this purpose, often incentives are used. Theories explaining the effect of using incentives for motivation are the ‘Social Exchange Theory’ (Adua & Sharp, 2010), the norm of ‘Reciprocity’ and the cost-benefit calculation (Ryu et al. 2005). Those theories are used to explain the impact of incentives, as they are supportive to each other. In addition, the use of incentive could highlight the benefits over other costs, this can be explained with the ‘leverage-salience model’ (Groves et al. 2004), which will be explained in the next section. Nevertheless, it should be considered that the use of incentive involves intended and unintended consequences.

Mode: When spreading the questionnaire, the most suitable mode of spreading should be considered. As the Movies that Matter Foundation uses both the interviewer-administered questionnaires and online questionnaires, both modes will be discussed. Theories of Baruch & Holtom, (2008), Wright (2005) and Saunders et al. (2009) will be used in order to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both modes. This will create a base for the empirical research providing evidence in practice.

Context: Not only the questionnaire itself is of importance influencing the response rate, also the context in which the questionnaire is spread can have an impact. When using interviewer-administered questionnaires, the communication between the interviewer and the potential respondents is very important. The Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984) will be conducted to explain the impact of the contextual factors on the decision making process of the potential respondent. This theory is relevant as it explains the two different routes from the receiver perspective, but also provides insight in how to influence this process from the sender perspective.

Elaboration Likelihood Model (Seedandsprout, 2011):
Reluctance of the target group to respond

The target group: In order to provide an advise on stimulating festival visitors to response to a questionnaire, the festival visitors profile needs to be analyzed. For this analysis, desk research will be applied to observational notes during the festival. It will provide insight into the needs and wants, motivation and attitude of the festival visitors, with the focus on response and nonresponse to questionnaires. Moreover it will provide insight in which mode would be most applicable for the characteristics of the target group. Research on the target group is necessary in order to clarify and tackle the problem of the low questionnaire responds rate from the festival visitors’ perspective.

Decision making process: Many factors are involved in the decision making process of potential respondents. This is well described by Groves et al. (2004), stating that: ‘The decision to participate in a survey as the interactive and additive resultant of a series of factors (some survey-specific, such as topic and sponsorship, others person specific, such as concerns about privacy, still others specific to the respondent’s social and physical environment) each of which is associated with a weight of direction for given person’s decision, moving him or her towards or away from cooperation with a specific survey request.’ These different factors will be outlined as the different factors are interrelated in the decision making process.

When analyzing the behavioral characteristics and the decision making process of the festival visitors, the ‘leverage-salience model’ should be considered, as proposed by Groves et al. (2004). The Leverage-salience theory describes the underpinnings of individual behavior when choosing to cooperate or not to cooperate with the questionnaire request. It posits that different people place different levels of importance to various attributes related to the questionnaire request. Examples of attributes are: topic, the characteristics of the questionnaire or the use of incentives. Including this theory provides the opportunity to analyze what aspects of a questionnaire would be most important in the questionnaire, and should therefore be focused on in order to influence a potential respondent.

Psychological and motivational factors: In addition, psychological factors should be discussed as the psychological background of an individual has an enormous impact on the decision making process. The psychological and motivational factors will be discussed, based on the ‘Compliance Principles’ (Cialdi 1988 in Sivo et al. 2006). These compliance principles analyze the decision making process specific for the respondents social and physical environment.
4. Research Design
This section will examine the scope of the research, including the intervention cycle, research objective, research framework, research questions, research objects and the methods for the data collection.

4.1. Intervention Cycle
Having the problem defined, the following research question will guide to a possible solution:

‘How can Movies that Matter stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate from its festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR strategy?’

Answering this research question will lead to recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation. The research follows the first two stages of the intervention cycle, ‘problem analysis’ & ‘diagnosis’ (Verschuren and Doorewaard, 2010). The analysis stage includes research on discovering the problem within the context. The second stage, the diagnosis, will include recommendations on how the Movies that Matter Foundation could increase the questionnaire response rate. Therefore, research will contribute to the solution by providing an analysis of the situation and drawing a diagnosis.

4.2. Research Objective
Answering the research questions will be done having the following research objective in mind:

Producing recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation in order to stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate for the evaluation of the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR.

This will be done by identifying features of questionnaires influencing the response rate, analysing the festival visitors and their attitude and behaviour towards questionnaires, and by identifying contextual factors influencing the response rate.

4.3. Research Framework
The research objective will be applied within the research framework as shown below. It includes:

A study of increasing the questionnaire response rate from festival visitors, based on consultation of theoretical literature in the areas of questionnaires, target groups and contextual factors influencing the response rate, by means of which views from Ms. Furnée, volunteers spreading the questionnaire, research centers/call centers and by observation during the festival, will be analyzed.
The theoretical literature will be based on the three research areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Area</th>
<th>Theoretical Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Questionnaire</td>
<td>Theories/research on features of questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Visitors</td>
<td>Theories/research on target groups and their behavior, attitude, motivation and decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Factors</td>
<td>Theories/research on contextual factors influencing the response rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis produces recommendations on how to stimulate an increase in response to the questionnaire from Movies that Matter Festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR.

The research objects are ‘people’ with whom interviews whom interviews will be held. Moreover, these people and their behavior will be observed during the festival. These people are: Marie-Pierre Furnéé, volunteers related to the questionnaire and research centers/call centers. The objects are chosen as they will provide insights from different perspectives related to the problem.

Schematic representation of the Research Framework:
4.4. Research Questions

Based on the research objective and preliminary research, the following focus question and research questions are designed. These are structured according to their theoretical, empirical and analytical nature, based on the research framework.

Main Problem: Low Questionnaire response rate from Movies that Matter Festival visitors

Initial Focus Question: ‘How can Movies that Matter stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate from its festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR strategy?’

Theoretical central question: What is known from theory and preliminary research about the influence of questionnaire features and contextual features on the response rate and about the willingness of people to respond to a questionnaire?

- What characteristics of a questionnaire influence a response rate?
- What motivates people to respond to questionnaires?
- What effect do incentives connected to the questionnaire have on people?
- What contextual factors influence the questionnaire response rate?

Empirical central question: What can be observed during the Movies that Matter Festival, what are the opinions of the volunteers and Ms. Furnée, and what are similar experiences, concerning influencing the response rate?

- What are the characteristics of the application of the questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival?
- What features of the questionnaire have an effect on the questionnaire response rate?
- What are the characteristics of the target group of the Movies that Matter festival?
- What are the characteristics of the communication flow and relationship between Movies that Matter and its target group?
- What is the attitude from the volunteers towards spreading the questionnaire?
- What contextual factors influence the questionnaire response rate during the Movies that Matter Festival?

Analytical central question: What are the most important features which could influence and increase in the questionnaire response rate for the Movies that Matter Festival?
• What features of the questionnaire influence the response rate from festival visitors?
• What mode of spreading the questionnaire would be most suitable for the Movies that Matter festival?
• What can Movies that Matter change in order to create willingness to respond to a questionnaire?
• What contextual factors of the Movies that Matter Festival could be optimized in order to influence the questionnaire response rate?

4.5. Research Approach
Research will be conducted following an inductive research approach (Saunders et al, 2009). This inquires that data will be collected, an analysis will be derived, from which a theory will be developed. Therefore, mainly an exploratory study will be applied. Finding out what is happening, to seek new insights and to assess the phenomena in a new light (Saunders et al, 2009). In this practice oriented research, a case study will be used in order to identify the problems and possibilities for the evaluation, which is beneficial in order to thoroughly understand the context of the research, as stated by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009).

4.6. Research Strategy
Through research strategy triangulation a combination of different research techniques will be used.

Different qualitative data collection methods will be applied only. This implies a multi-method qualitative study (Saunders et al, 2009). First of all, the research is based on empirical desk research, which involves reviewing existing literature to identify features of questionnaires, response rates, contextual factors influencing the response rate and the motivation of people to respond to a questionnaire. Desk research is chosen as a major research method, because it may provide new insights, applicable for the Movies that Matter Festival.

Secondly, information will be gathered by observation and semi-structured interviews during the current process of spreading and processing questionnaires related to the Movies that Matter Festival 2013. Therefore, purposive sampling will be used when selecting the interviewees.

Semi-structured interviews will be held with research centers/call centers. This will create insight in experiences with response rates and can provide new possibilities, which can be of an advantage for the Movies that Matter Foundation.

During and after the Movies that Matter festival 2013, semi structured interviews will be held with people involved in spreading the questionnaire. Semi-structured interviews with volunteers who spread the questionnaire is necessary in order to find out the problem in spreading the
questionnaire. Problems as ‘volunteers might feel bad asking festival visitors to respond to a questionnaire’ (Appendix 2, interview 3), can be researched by the use of a semi-structured interview. It will give insight into their attitude to the questionnaire and how visitors react to their question to respond to a questionnaire.

In addition observation will be used when spreading the questionnaires during the festival. The actual spread and processed questionnaires will be analysed in order to define the target group. Observational notes will including comments people make, behavioral characteristics and facial expressions. Using parameters, data will be structured.

These parameters are related to the elements as shown in the topic web (Appendix 3), including the following assessment criteria in the field of:

- Features of the questionnaire
- Timing
- Location
- Communication flow
- Relationship
- Incentives
- Mode
- Topic

4.7. Delivery of Product
The final product will include recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation on how to increase the questionnaire response rate in order to optimize the festival and its PR strategy. These recommendations will be divided into two categories, which are:

- Failure to deliver the questionnaire to the target group

These recommendations will be made from an organizational perspective. The questionnaire and its delivery will be covered.

- Reluctance of the target group to respond

This category will cover the issue from the target group perspective. It will create insight in the attitude an behavioural characteristics from the target group and its influencing contextual factors.

The recommendations will be made applicable for the Movies that Matter Festival 2014.
4.8. Limitations
When designing this research, several limitations should be considered. First of all evaluation is very complex, having a large number of variables involved. Watson & Noble (2007) mention that it is difficult to control variables, the timescale can affect the process and results, the danger of subjective judgment or distortion of results and different techniques could be used in different situations.

Moreover, the research method holds the limitation of the subjective influences of the choice to use observation. Observation is chosen as it was inappropriate to ask people to fill out a questionnaire and afterwards ask for an interview about the questionnaire. Moreover, interviewing the visitors had the disadvantage that it only provides a perspective from the visitors who are already willing to participate and not the non-response. In order to cover the lack the visitors perspective, observation and desk research will be used. In addition, research centers will be analyzed. However, only one research center will be interviewed, as only a few features are relevant for this research, since most research centers make use of a fixed panel in which participants are being paid.

Another limitation is that the low response rate can be seen as a general problem, and not only a problem for MTMF. However, it should be researched how to increase the response rate in the best possible way.

The final limitation holds that the research in form of a case study might have a relatively small research sample validity. This is compensated by the fact that the recommendations are meant for the exact same festivals in the upcoming years.
5. Research Results

The following section will present the research results as based on the initial focus question: ‘How can Movies that Matter stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate from its festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR strategy?’

Answering the initial focus question will be done by including theoretical research and empirical research.

5.1. Theoretical Research

Introduction

The following section will include a discussion on the decision of an individual to participate in a questionnaire, both from the participant and organizational perspective. This is based on the theoretical central question: What is known from theory and preliminary research about the influence of questionnaire features and contextual features on the response rate and about the willingness of people to respond to a questionnaire?

Groves, Singer, and Corning (1999, in Singer, 2002) state that: “The decision to participate in a survey as the interactive and additive resultant of a series of factors (some survey-specific, such as topic and sponsorship, others person specific, such as concerns about privacy, still others specific to the respondent’s social and physical environment) each of which is associated with a weight of direction for given person’s decision, moving him or her towards or away from cooperation with a specific survey request.” This statement already mentions the many different factors involved in the decision making. This section will be discuss all these different factors from both the organizational or sender perspective and the decision making process of the potential respondent.

Features of the questionnaire influencing the response rate

The questionnaire itself is very important in influencing whether people will respond to a questionnaire, take the questionnaire seriously or even if people will finish the questionnaire. The non-response error (Sivo et al., 2006) is frequently related to the questionnaire itself, as people leave questions open, or finish the questionnaire before the official end. This is also related to Saunders et al. (2009) arguing that “the design of your data questionnaire will affect the response rate and the reliability and validity of the data collection.” The reliability and validity can be maximized by the design of the individual questions, the layout of the questionnaire, an explanation of the purpose and pilot testing. First of all the layout is of importance. The questionnaire should be designed with the purpose of making reading the questions and answering the questions as easy as possible. It should not be too long and the layout should encourage people to respond. However, in general people prefer questions spread over more pages over many questions on one page. Secondly, it is of
importance to explain the purpose of the questionnaire, often done with a covering letter. Research has shown that covering letters in self-administered questionnaires will affect the response rate (Dillman, 2007, in Saunders et al. 2009). In the cover letter it should be clearly stated why you want the respondent to complete the questionnaire. Using an interviewer-administered questionnaire, the interviewer should phrase this information briefly to the potential respondent. This information can be written out beforehand, so interviewees can communicate the same information to all potential respondents. When closing the questionnaire, the questionnaire should include an explanation on where the respondent can deposit the questionnaire and thank the respondent for taking time to respond. Finally pilot testing is often used in order to make sure that people understand the questions, to make sure there will be no problem recording data, and to test how much time it takes for respondents. Pilot testing provides an idea for the reliability and suitability of the questionnaire.

Additionally, the Tailored Design Method of Dillman (1999) suggests four different phases, which are: “the identification of the population, questionnaire design, pre-testing, and administration of the questionnaire.” Dillman (1999) argues that two main instruments in maximizing the responds rate are: the cover letter and the follow-up mailings. The cover letter should stress the importance and usefulness of the questionnaire and the total study, followed by the costs implied in completing and finally stating the confidentiality. The follow-up mailings are related to the determination of the sample size.

According to Sivo et al (2006) it is important to minimize the number of people that are needed to respond. First of all it saves costs and resources. Second, it provides the research the opportunity to contact the non-respondents for a second or third time, like follow-up mailings. At the end, the amount of respondent might by lower. However, it makes the representation of the target group more valid as characteristics of early and late respondents are included. It therefore becomes a true ‘random sample’.

When spreading the questionnaire, the most suitable mode of spreading should be considered. As the Movies that Matter Foundation uses both the interviewer-administered questionnaires and online questionnaires, both modes will be discussed. First of all, using the interviewer-administered questionnaires has the advantages of asking people directly and therefore motivating potential participants to respond to the questionnaire. The disadvantage holds that the random sampling is less valid, as the interviewees might not as everyone, but only go to people to whom they feel comfortable asking it. In addition, the timing and location may not add to the most comfortable situation. Another option is the online questionnaire. Even though the response rate might sometimes relatively low when spreading the survey online, the electronic version should be
considered for the future. The population is changing fast and technology plays an increasing role (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). However, the current audience should be analysed in order to decide which mode is most appropriate for this current generation, as the audience should have access to and feel comfortable with using the internet for responding to a questionnaire. The online questionnaire has several advantages and disadvantages, having an influence on the response rate. It has the advantages of reaching people from a long distance location and it has the possibility to reach difficult to contact people. Moreover, it has the advantage that people can decide themselves what moment to participate, the respondents are in their own comfortable environment and an online questionnaire provides the researcher to send a reminder (Wright, 2005). Online questionnaires also hold several disadvantages. First of all the ‘self-selection bias’, as some individuals are more likely to participate and complete a questionnaire than others.

To summarize: The questionnaire itself is of importance as it influences the non-response error and the response rate. Considering the questionnaire, it is important to focus on the design, layout, purpose and the pilot testing. Moreover, it is important to minimize the number of people to respond in order to get a true sample. Finally, the mode of spreading the questionnaire should be considered, which should be most applicable to the target group.

Motivation of (non) respondents
It is difficult to research what exactly motivates people to respond to a questionnaire, as many different factors are involved. However, different decision making models provide insight in motivational and decision making behavior of (non) respondents. First of all, the leverage-salience model should be considered, as proposed by Groves, Singer, & Corning (2000, in Marcus et al., 2007). The Leverage-salience theory describes the underpinnings of individual behavior when choosing to cooperate or not to cooperate with the questionnaire request. It posits that different people place different values and levels of importance to various attributes related to the questionnaire request. The influence of different components depends on the value in the view of the sampled individuals (Leverage) and on the prominence of the request to participate (Salience). With this theory, one could decide to respond to a questionnaire when an incentive is offered, even though the questionnaire has an uninteresting topic. So, if attributes that are viewed positively by an individual are made salience (and all other things being equal) during the questionnaire request, there is a higher change of response. Also, when a negatively viewed attribute is made salient during the questionnaire request, the likelihood of participation decreases (Adua & Sharp, 2010).

In addition, it is useful to analyze psychological and motivational models explaining the motivation of people to respond to a questionnaire, within the respondents social and physical environment. The
model or principles which should be considered for this purpose are the ‘Compliance Principles’ (Cialdi 1988 in Sivo et al., 2006). The following section will explain these principles, as all principles are of importance in the decision making process.

The first principle hold the ‘Reciprocation’, arguing that “People are more willing to comply with a request to the extent that it constitutes the repayment of a perceived gift, favor, or concession” (Gouldner, 1960). This concept will be further explained in the section on ‘incentives’. The second principle is ‘Consistency’. One feels comfortable when the world is consistent with the perceptions or the predictions of it. Related to this idea, Festinger (1962 in Sivo et al., 2006) created the cognitive dissonance theory, which describes ‘the distressing mental state that people feel when they find themselves doing things that don’t fit with what they know, or having opinions that do not fit with other opinions they hold’. Moreover, ‘After committing oneself to a position, one is more willing to comply with requests for behaviors that are consistent with that position’ (Festinger, 1966 in Sivo et al., 2006). It should feel good, or consonant, to participate in a questionnaire. The third principle is ‘Social Validation’, which includes that ‘People frequently use the beliefs, attitudes and actions of similar as standards of comparison for their own beliefs, attitudes and actions’ (Festinger, 1962 in Sivo et al., 2006). This implies that an individual is more willing to respond to a questionnaire request, as the individual beliefs that similar others would act the same. It requires a lot when one has to do something different then the people around. One has to step out of ones ‘comfort zone’. Another principle is ‘Authority’ including that “People are more likely to comply with a request if it comes from a properly constituted authority” (Bickman 1971 in Sivo et al. 2006). An example is that people are more willing to reply to a questionnaire when a person working for a company asks someone to fill out a questionnaire, then someone who is not involved in the company, from which the position is unknown. ‘Scarcity’ is the principle which holds that “people are more willing to comply with requests to secure opportunities that are scarce” (Mazis, 1975 in Sivo et al. 2006). If the questionnaire are spread often, people will consider replying next time and people don’t see the questionnaire as an opportunity anymore to give feedback. The final principle is ‘Liking’. People are more favorable inclined towards those individuals that they like and of liked others, as sponsoring organizations. This concept is also related to the way the interviewer asks a potential respondent to reply. Creating some sort of relationship will increase the likeability.

To summarize: It is difficult to find out what motivates people to respond to a questionnaire. However, the Leverage-salience model can be used in order to predict what aspects add value in the motivation of a potential respondent. Moreover there are several psychological factors which should be considered: reciprocation. consistency / cognitive dissonance theory. social validation, authority, scarcity and liking.
The influence of incentives on the response rate
Incentives are often used to encourage individuals to participate in a questionnaire. Incentives are often used with the idea that the use of incentives has a positive impact on the response rate. When using incentives, a distinction can be made between monetary and non-monetary incentives. Besides the higher expected response rate, the use of incentives also has effects on the non-response error. Therefore, a distinction can be made between intended effects on the response rates and the unintended consequences of the use of incentives.

Intended effects on response rates
Using incentives for the purpose of motivating potential participants can be related to the Social Exchange Theory, which “assumes that people’s actions are primarily motivated by the returns they expect or obtain from engaging in an activity” (Adua & Sharp, 2010). When people put effort in replying to a questionnaire, they expect something in return. An incentive can fulfil this expectation directly. This can be further explained by the earlier mentioned concept of reciprocity. The norm of reciprocity takes two demands from people: “People should help those who have helped them” and ‘people should not injure those who have helped them” (Ryu et al. 2005). Relatively small gestures can evoke reciprocation in terms of willingness to participate in a questionnaire. Moreover, the choice of participation can be explained by the participant making a rational cost-benefit calculation in which the potential respondent calculates the benefits (incentives) against the degree of effort and other cost attached. These reasons are related to the earlier described Leverage-Salience Model, as incentives are an inducement offered by the questionnaire designer to compensate for absence of factors that could have stimulated cooperation, as for example topic interest (Singer, 2002).

The type of incentive also influences the willingness of people to reply to a questionnaire. Ryu et al. (2005) state that “in general, non-monetary incentives (gifts) are less effective than monetary gifts” (Church, 1993; Singer et al., 1999), and “prepaid incentives are more effective than promised incentives” (Singer, 2002). This can be explained with the concept of ‘Economic Exchange’. Monetary gifts, cash, is a universally understood value, whereas the value of a non-monetary incentive may differ to people. This may cause that some potential participants might not be interested in that specific incentive, so the benefitting value is lower. According to Lyu et al. (2005), using the type of cash incentives also has a larger effect in lower-income communities.
Unintended consequences of incentives

Even though many studies have confirmed the important relationship between the use of incentives and the encouragement of questionnaire participation, the verdict on the relationship between incentives and questionnaire participation is by no means unanimous (Adua & Sharp, 2010). The Leverage-Salience Model helps to explain why incentives not always work and why this relationship can’t be proven as one main factor. The effects of incentives are moderately mixed with other influencing factors. It is depending on how the individual assesses the importance of receiving incentives over other influencing factors.

Also, the use of incentives to motivate people to respond to a questionnaire can have an influence on the answers to the questionnaire itself. Using persuasion such as incentives has the potential harm that the questionnaire might receive information from respondents who are careless an uninterested when answering the questions. This might damage the quality of the information. However, other research shows that incentives does not seriously harm response quality and that incentives do not generate a higher nonresponse. However, they do report that individuals receiving incentives tend to provide more optimistic answers and more pessimistic answers in other, depending on different variables (Adua & Sharp, 2010).

To summarize: Incentives are often used to motivate people to respond to a questionnaire. The effectiveness of using incentives is motivated by the social exchange theory, the concept of reciprocity and the cost benefit calculation. These theories mainly include that the respondent expects something in return when responding to a questionnaire. The Leverage Salience model is also applicable, as incentives can have added value over other questionnaire aspects. However, this is dependent on the values of an individual. It can be concluded that monetary incentives are generally more effective, explained with the Economic Exchange theory. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that the incentives can influence the answers to the questionnaire, as responding to the questionnaire may not be the main motivation to respond.

Contextual factors influencing the response rate
When spreading a questionnaire, not only the questionnaire itself is important for the response rate, but also the context in which the questionnaire is spread. First of all the communication between the person spreading the questionnaire and the potential respondent is of importance. Within this communication, the potential respondent should feel that the interviewee is minimizing the costs (e.g. effort or time) and maximizes the benefits (e.g. incentives, or showing appreciation) for the potential respondent. Moreover, the interviewee should build trust (explaining the purpose of the questionnaire), which is closely related to the contextual factor of privacy. The idea of privacy has
been an increasing issue in this current information or digital age. Personal information can be easily made available for a wide audience. Therefore, people get more careful about providing personal details.

The influence of the context on the decision making process can be explained by the use of the ‘Elaboration Likelihood Model’ (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). It is a dual process theory on how behaviour and attitudes can be changes. The model defines two different routes, which are the central route and the peripheral route. People following the central route are able to act under conditions that require high elaboration. The individual uses their own thoughts in processing the message. In order to influence this individual, careful communication is needed, with well-formed arguments. The other processing route, the peripheral route, does not involve elaboration of the message high cognitive processing of the actual arguments presented. However, the elaboration often depends on the environmental or contextual characteristics of the message, as for example the credibility of the source, the way the message is sent or incentives. When considering the Elaboration Likelihood Model within the context of spreading the questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival, it can be assumed that many visitors make their decision according to the peripheral route. Only a few people would really consider the questionnaire itself and the effects of the questionnaire.

A factor which might limit the response rate is the idea of ‘over surveying’ (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). People are flooded with questionnaires in growing numbers of areas. Large numbers of target individuals are fatigued and therefore refuse to respond to questionnaires that seem non-essential. This is especially a problem when sending questionnaires online. People receive many online questionnaire, and online questionnaires do not have the added value of motivating the potential respondent in person. This is especially a problem among the younger generation.

To summarize: When spreading the questionnaire, the context can influence the response rate. First of all the conversation between the interviewee and the potential respondent is of importance. The conversation should motivate the potential respondent. Moreover, safety can play a role in the decision making process, as the potential respondent should get the feeling that the information will be processed adequately. The Elaboration Likelihood model can explain the impact of the context on the decision making process, as the impact of the context might be different for each person. Finally, the idea of over-surveying might hamper the decision to participate.
5.2. Empirical Research

The following section will include a discussion on the features and the application of the questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013 influencing the response rate. This will be based on the empirical central question: *What can be observed during the Movies that Matter Festival, what are the opinions of the volunteers and Ms. Furnée, and what are similar experiences, concerning influencing the response rate?*

The application of the questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival

During the Movies that Matter Festival 2013, the questionnaire was spread in both, hardcopy and online. A combination of hardcopy and online was chosen as it gives people the opportunity to choose between responding directly and responding at one’s own time in one’s own environment. The following section will describe the application of the questionnaire, with the distinction of hardcopy and online:

*Hardcopy Questionnaire*

In Filmhuis Den Haag and Theater aan het Spui, visitors had the possibility to respond to hardcopy questionnaires. The finished questionnaires could be posted at the questionnaire box, next to the information desk. In total 311 Hardcopy questionnaires were returned, from which 290 were useful for research. The hardcopy questionnaires were spread throughout the Filmhuis Den Haag, Theater aan het Spui and Nutshuis on tables with provided pencils of Amnesty International. This offered people the opportunity to reply to a questionnaire when having a drink or other moments when having time to respond. However, not many people were using these questionnaires, as the motivation had to come from themselves. If the a questionnaire and pen lays in front of someone, one has time to think whether to respond or not. Also, it provides the opportunity to read the questionnaire before responding, which causes more questionnaire related factors influencing the decision to respond.

In addition, the hardcopy questionnaire was spread by volunteers in different shifts. The first shift for spreading the questionnaires was from 15.00-18.00 and the second shift from 16.00-21.00. Those hours were chosen as the afternoon and evening had the largest audience. One volunteer was spreading the questionnaire at the time, and they could ask for help at the information desk. The most important moments for spreading the questionnaires were after the films. Spreading the questionnaire through the volunteers had the opportunity that volunteers were able to state a short motivation to potential respondents. The advantages and goal of the questionnaire could this way be highlighted.
Online Questionnaire

An online questionnaire was spread by using a link on the Movies that Matter Foundation website to the online questionnaire. 50 questionnaires were returned via the online questionnaire, from which 48 were useful. In order to promote the link on the website, A4 posters were placed throughout the building with the link of the website. Also, after the Festival, an email was spread within the network of the Movies that Matter Foundation with the request to participate in the questionnaire as shown on the MTM website.

The features of the questionnaire having an effect on the response rate

In total, 381 questionnaires were returned, from which 338 were useful. The questionnaires were useful when most questions were answered. The questionnaire spread during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013 (Appendix 4) was based on the questionnaires from previous years, but adapted to the current situation. The questionnaire starts with a brief introduction including an appreciation of effort, stating how little effort it takes concerning time and that the participant can win a VVV voucher worth €30. In order to win this voucher, the participant has to add its address. This is followed by the official questions of the questionnaire. The final question is an open question asking for suggestions. The questionnaire is closed with the sentence “thank you once more for your kind cooperation.” The layout of the questionnaire was yellow in the colour of Movies that Matter, showing their symbol in the right top corner. All questionnaires are printed double sided, as the questionnaires include a Dutch and English side.

First of all the language was a motivating factor for potential participants to participate in a questionnaire. Potential respondents often reacted with the comment “Sorry, I cannot respond to the questionnaire, I do not speak Dutch” (Appendix 5). In total, 82% of the questionnaires was returned in Dutch and 18 % in English. The language should be considered when designing the questionnaire and when approaching potential respondents. As people only take a quick look at the questionnaire, some did not notice that the questionnaire was printed in both languages. This was shown as 21 questionnaires were replied in English, when the respondent was Dutch, showing that people don’t take time to read both sides. In addition, it can be said that those respondents did not mind to respond in English, while having Dutch as their native language.

The incentives were for 86% of the participants a good motivation, as they added their address to the questionnaire. This shows that those people did still enter their address, even though the address was asked on top of the questionnaire. Safety was not a big issue. 12 questionnaires only included the address, without answering further questions. This shows to motivation to receive the incentive, but not the commitment to participate in a questionnaire.
Certain questions can cause a non-response error. Since the purpose of the questionnaire did not include measuring relationships between the questionnaire, the questions were measured and evaluated individually. Therefore, each question had a different response rate. From this difference in response rate for each question, and therefore looking at the non-response error, it can be noticed which questions are suitable (appendix 7). From those findings it can be told that the highest non-response error can be found in the section where people have to state their opinion about different aspects of the festival on a scale from 1-5. The difficulty within this question is that people can have different associations to the different aspects and might be unsure about what is meant with that specific aspect.

This is caused by the fact that some questions could have been asked better, or easier, because people do not take time to read the questions carefully. This causes that people answer different from what has been asked (use scale 1-10 instead of 1-5), or people don’t answer those questions at all. Another factor of non-response error is that respondents feel that some questions might feel inappropriate. An example is when asking for the respondents’ age. Some respondents have answered this question by providing a scale (e.g. 50-60) instead of providing the exact age (e.g. 56). Others did not answer this question at all.

The final noticeable factor causing the non-response error is that people did not find it appropriate the personal details were asked within the questionnaire. One respondent even commented that it was inappropriate, as it was impossible to fill out the questionnaire anonymous.
The characteristics of the target group of the Movies that Matter Festival

The characteristics of the Movies that Matter Festival should be researched, as it could influence the features and application of a questionnaire and its response rate.

First of all, the age of the visitors should be analysed as the age categories have different characteristics (Appendix 6). The highest percentages are within the categories 21-25, 26-30 & 31-35. Those numbers connect with the observation of Ms. Furnée (Appendix 5). However, the data also present high percentages in higher age categories. This ratio is not as observed during the festival. From those results it can be said that the age is considerably young (21-35). This should be kept in mind when deciding on how to approach the festival visitors.

A second characteristic is that 31% of the festival visitors is a member of Amnesty International (Appendix 6). Movies that Matter has continued in the footsteps of the Amnesty International Film Festival and is still closely connected to Amnesty International. This shows that there is already a certain commitment from the Amnesty International members to participate and to be involved in activities from Amnesty International. Members of Amnesty International are therefore easier to approach, as the commitment is already there. Moreover, this knowledge provides insight in how the Movies that Matter Festival came to their attention, and how this part of the audience can possibly be approached.

Another characteristic of importance is that 53% of the festival visitors visited the Movies that Matter Festival for the first time (Appendix 6), showing a short term or new relationship with the Movies that Matter Festival. This indicates that there is no long term commitment yet, which is related to the willingness of festival visitors to interact with the organization.
The final characteristic of the Movies that Matter Festival visitors is that visitors noticed different communication tools of MTM, with highest percentage (15%) mentioning the MTM website. 
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This indicates that festival visitors are looking for Movies that Matter online. In addition, this provides knowledge on via which mode the festival visitors can be approached best.

**The attitude from the volunteers towards spreading the questionnaire**

The attitude from volunteers towards spreading the questionnaire was very different for each person. First of all, it could be observed that the way volunteers think about spreading the questionnaire depends on how they normally interact with people and with what ease contact can be made. Comments were made about feeling “uncomfortable” or “guilty” (Appendix 2, interview 5). In contrast, others found it “not too bad” (Appendix, interview 6). The volunteers also reacted very differently when telling the volunteers that their tasks was to spread questionnaires. Some volunteers were commenting: “that’s easy” or other comments showing positive attitude. Others were less positive, commenting: “Only questionnaires?” or some volunteers were insecure on how to approach potential respondents.

Moreover, the different attitudes of volunteers depends on how volunteers think about the principle of spreading a questionnaire. When volunteers had a negative attitude towards responding to a questionnaire themselves, a negative attitude was taken towards spreading the questionnaire themselves. It took effort from the volunteers to approach the potential respondents. People would for example take another route to walk around the volunteers when seeing the questionnaire. As it requires a lot of effort from the volunteers, it is important that volunteers do not have the task to spread the questionnaires for too long. The volunteers like being involved in different aspects from the festival, and not only in spreading the questionnaire (appendix 2). Moreover, it is more effective
to switch tasks as spreading questionnaires includes a lot of waiting. Many films are taking place at the same time, which causes that it is very busy only at certain moments.

It was observed that potential participants reacted different to the different volunteers. When volunteers were very motivated and open, potential respondents were more willing to respond. A volunteer commented that “People can say themselves if they want to participate or not. So you can ask it very open, so people feel free in their choice” (Appendix 2, interview 6). In contrast, when the volunteers were not very motivated themselves, this had an effect on the potential respondents. This attitude can be motivated by the following example: “I tried to ask the visitors as positive as possible. However, I felt a bit a shame, which caused a barrier when interacting” (Appendix 2, interview 5).

It was noticeable that different volunteers chose different people to ask to respond. They would ask people to whom they would feel most comfortable asking it to. One volunteer understated this by commenting the following: “I feel very guilty when I have to ask older people. They take a lot of time for the questionnaire, whereas younger people go quickly through it” (Appendix 2, interview 5).

**Contextual factors influencing the questionnaire response rate during the Movies that Matter Festival**

First of all, the timing and place of spreading the questionnaire had a significant influence on the response rate. Also, a volunteer mentioned that “the response was different in where I was standing” (appendix 2, interview 4). The moment when people exit the film, most potential respondents can be reached. However, most films have a loaded message, which have an impact on people. People need time to reflect on the movie and the adjust to the environment again. Therefore comments as “not now” were given by visitors. Moreover, the exit from the films was not the right timing as the visitors also have to return the VARA voting leaflet. Also asking visitors to respond to a questionnaire right after they returned their voting leaflet would be too much for the visitors (Appendix 2, interview 3)

Places that worked well for spreading the questionnaire was the exit of the building. The disadvantage of standing next to the exit was that it is unknown if people had been asked to respond before, and people might have the intention to leave the building. Another good place was the in front of the wardrobe in the theater. People had to wait in line and actually had time to respond to a questionnaire.

When spreading the questionnaire, people also often made the comment “yes, I will respond during my coffee” (Appendix 5). Therefore, offering the questionnaire when people order a drink might be effective as well.
Another contextual factor is that some people do not want to respond to a questionnaire, related to the fact that they do not get the idea that something will be done with their complains. Another reason is that it takes time to write it down compared to telling it to someone face to face. The location manager mentioned that people come to the information desk with their complains. However, they don’t want to write it down on a questionnaire.

**Tactics of research centres**

Research centres have to show the response rate and non-response error to their client. It is difficult to compare the use of a questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival with research from research centres, as most research centres have a fixed panel. The research centre has certain information about the members of the panel in their database, from which a sample can be made for a specific research study. Research centres motivate those panel members by the use of incentives. However, those incentives are offered for each question, preventing non-response error or the possibility that people answer as little as possible or invalid in order to gain their incentive. When the questionnaire is related to a certain product, it is recommended to link the incentive to that specific product, as people already made the choice for that product.

Currently, the most common mode for spreading a questionnaire is online. Also, mixed methods are often used. For example, calling people asking for their email address for the use of a questionnaire. This saves time for the researcher and the data is easier to process.

It is important that people trust that their data will not be abused. Research centres do this by showing certain certifications. Moreover, proper use of data can be guaranteed by analysing the data separately from the personal information of the respondent. The research should not be able to find out which respondent has said what on a questionnaire.
6. Conclusion
By analysing the research results, the primary research question can be answered: ‘How can Movies that Matter stimulate an increase in feedback from its festival visitors in order to evaluate and optimize the festival and its PR strategy?’

Answering the primary research question will be done while keeping the research objective in mind:

A. Producing recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation in order to stimulate an increase in the questionnaire response rate for the evaluation of the Movies that Matter Festival and its PR,

B. by identifying features of questionnaires influencing the response rate, analysing the festival visitors and their attitude and behaviour towards questionnaires, and by identifying contextual factors influencing the response rate.

This section will include a conclusion from section B, divided over the two main problems of this research. This conclusion will be followed by the section with recommendations.

Failure to deliver the Questionnaire to the target group
Features of the questionnaire having an effect on the response rate

Saunders et al. (2009) argue that “the design of your data questionnaire will affect the response rate and the reliability and validity of the data collection.” Therefore, first the survey specific features of the questionnaire as applied during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013 will be analyzed, based on specific features according to Saunders et al. (2009):

(Green showing features which were well applied, red showing features which could be improved.)

| Layout                  | • The color of the questionnaire was prominent
|                        | • The logo of the Movies that Matter Festival was clearly shown
|                        | • The questionnaire had a clear structure
| Questions              | • Questions were sometimes too long. Respondents do not take time to read the questions. Therefore other answers are given that expected or required.
|                        | • Some questions were found inappropriate, for example age
|                        | • The address should be separated from the questions
| Length                 | • The length was fine
|                        | • However, people think that the questionnaire is long as it is double sided
| Purpose (covering letter) | • The purpose is stated clearly
|                        | • The questionnaire does not include on where the results can be found (e.g. yearly overview)
As shown in the table above, especially the questions and the interviewee conversation can be improved. Each question shows a different response rate, from which can be told whether people misunderstood or did not want to take time to answer that question. Questions need to be very clear in order to make sure that the respondent understands the question, but also that the question is answered in the expected way.

The application of the questionnaire during the Movies that Matter Festival

The questionnaire was spread both in hardcopy questionnaires and online. Both modes will be discussed.

- Interviewer-administered questionnaires

As described in the theoretical section, using the interviewer-administered questionnaires (Saunders et al. 2009) has the advantages of asking people directly and therefore motivating potential participants to respond to the questionnaire. However, the way the interviewer-administered questionnaires are applied is very important, having an effect on the response rate. This was noticed during the Movies that Matter Festival, as the attitude from volunteers towards spreading the questionnaire was very divers. It can be said that the attitude from the volunteers towards spreading the questionnaire had a huge impact on the response rate, as potential respondents clearly reacted on the volunteer and their approach. It is of importance for the response rate that volunteers are very motivating towards potential respondents.

Another important factor in the application which had a significant impact on the response rate is the timing of spreading a questionnaire. Spreading questionnaires at the end of a film was not very effective, as most visitors first had to reflect on the film. However, standing in front of the wardrobe, or at the exit was effective.
The disadvantage of interviewee-administered questionnaires holds that the random sampling is less valid, as the interviewees might not as everyone. It is impossible to ask everyone when standing at one place at the time. Moreover, volunteers only go to people to whom they feel comfortable asking it. This has been evident during the Movies that Matter Festival, as volunteers asked different people to respond, which might cause that the sample taken with the questionnaire is not accurately representing the Movies that Matter Festival visitors. Moreover, the response rate increases when all visitors have the same opportunity to respond to a questionnaire. As for an example, the age of the festival visitors should be considered. As observed during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013, the visitors were considerably young (Appendix 6). However, according to the data derived from the questionnaire, there was a large audience from a higher age category presented. This might relate to the earlier mentioned fact that many young people are not willing to respond to a questionnaire, because of over surveying. In contrast, people in a higher age category, generally take more time answering the questions (Appendix 2, interview 5). It is important that all ages respond to the questionnaire equally, as this provides a better sample of the reality. However, it can be concluded that different factors influence this sample negatively.

- **Online Questionnaires**

  Considering the age, the mode of spreading the questionnaire can be evaluated. The population is changing fast and technology plays an increasing role (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). In addition, the highest number (15%) noticing the website as the communication tool of MTM. The MTM website should be seen as a very important medium to spread information and to gain feedback from the visitors. Therefore, spreading the questionnaire online might become increasingly important. Moreover, spreading the questionnaire online is easier and faster to evaluate by the researcher. Nevertheless, it should be considered that only 14% of the questionnaires have been returned online. Therefore, the way the online questionnaire is used should be considered.

**Reluctance of the target group to respond**

It is important to discuss the motivational and decision making behavior of (non) respondents. First of all, the leverage-salience model should be considered, as proposed by Groves, Singer, & Corning (2000, in Marcus et al., 2007). Applying this model, there should be looked at the most stimulating factors for a (non) respondent, as other factors remain salient.

Applying this model, it can be concluded that using incentives is influencing the response rate, as incentives are an inducement offered by the questionnaire designer to compensate for absence of factors that could have stimulated cooperation, as for example topic interest (Singer, 2002). Research shows that topic interest and the use of incentives have a significant influence in causing a higher
response rate. Moreover, using incentives for this purpose of motivating potential participants can be related to the Social Exchange Theory, which ‘assumes that people’s actions are primarily motivated by the returns they expect or obtain from engaging in an activity’ (Adua & Sharp, 2010). In addition, the norm of reciprocity is involved, which takes two demands from people: ‘People should help those who have helped them’ and ‘people should not injure those who have helped them’ (Ryu et al. 2005). Empirical research showed that 86% of the festival visitors had entered their address for the incentive. The type of incentive can be argued. A monetary incentive, as the VVV-voucher of the current questionnaire, works according to the concept of ‘Economic Exchange’. Monetary gifts, cash, is a universally understood value, whereas the value of a non-monetary incentive may differ to people. However, the option of using a product related incentive could also be effective, as the respondents are already interested in this product. Moreover, this could function as a promotion of the product.

Moreover, the psychological and motivational models explaining the motivation of people to respond to a questionnaire, within the respondents social and physical environment should also be considered when spreading the questionnaire. First of all, the concept of social validation (Festinger, 1962) should be considered implying that an individual is more willing to respond to a questionnaire request, as the individual beliefs that similar others would act the same. Therefore, it is important to ask everyone, instead of only a few people. Specific behavior from potential respondents was noticed as they would take another route when seeing a volunteer with a questionnaire (appendix 5). In addition, when spreading or designing the questionnaire, ‘Authority’ should be considered, including that ‘People are more likely to comply with a request if it comes from a properly constituted authority’ (Bickman, 1971). An example would be that Amnesty International would be involved as the authority, which is a well-known organization among the festival visitors. 31 % of the visitors are even member of Amnesty International, which also resembles some sort of relationship.

Moreover, the concept ‘Scarcity’ should be considered, which is the principle which holds that ‘People are more willing to comply with requests to secure opportunities that are scarce’ (Mazis, 1975). Answering a questionnaire should be seen as an opportunity to provide the organization with feedback. This is closely related to the problem of ‘over-surveying’ (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). This attitude should also come from the volunteers, as some volunteers mentioned the negative attitude towards spreading the questionnaire (appendix 2).

Another decision from non-respondents not to respond is safety. The address of the respondent is asked at the beginning of the questionnaire, which could imply that the questionnaire is not
anonymous, which is also commented on a questionnaire. It is important to gain trust. Therefore, the lack of privacy should be considered as a negative influence on the response rate.

It can be concluded that many factors influence the response rate, which makes it impossible to directly evaluate what has influenced the response rate during the Movies that Matter Festival 2013. Nevertheless, all factors influencing the behavior and decision process of potential respondents can be optimize in order to get a higher response rate on future questionnaires, in which it is most important to minimize the costs (e.g. how much time respondents need to respond), maximize the benefits (e.g. showing appreciation, incentives) and to build trust (e.g. authority, safety). The following section ‘Recommendations’ will include an advice on applying these findings to the Movies that Matter Festival 2013.

**Limitations**

It should be considered that the conclusion has some limitations. First of all, the research is partly based on assumptions. The theoretical research provides several theories on the decision making process. This was not possible to include in the empirical research. Nevertheless, observational notes and the analysis of the questionnaires include data on this matter. Moreover, it was difficult to compare the results with other research, as not much research has been done on this topic, and because most research centers have a research panel.
7. Recommendations

The section will include recommendations for the Movies that Matter Foundation on how to increase the questionnaire response rate in order to optimize the festival and its PR strategy. These recommendations will consider the two earlier mentioned perspectives, which are:

1. Failure to deliver the questionnaire to the target group

These recommendations will be made from an organizational perspective. The questionnaire and its delivery will be covered.

2. Reluctance of the target group to respond

This category will cover the issue from the target group perspective. It will create insight in the attitude and behavioural characteristics from the target group and its influencing contextual factors. The recommendations are applicable for the Movies that Matter Festival 2014.

Mode

*Hardcopy Questionnaire*

First of all, the problem of inaccurate sampling by the use of interviewer-administered questionnaires should be tackled. In order to reach an accurate sample, representing all festival visitors, the questionnaire should be provided to everyone. This will also lead to an increase in the response rate. **Providing the questionnaire to everyone** can be done by placing the questionnaire on the chairs, together with the VARA voting leaflet. When people are inside, they have time to fill out the questionnaire before the movie starts, but the visitors can also take the questionnaire outside to respond another time. Another possibility is to provide the questionnaire together with the tickets at the entrance.

In order to do this, the questionnaire itself should be changed. First of all, the questionnaire should be made **shorter**. The questionnaire should include only a few **multiple choice** questions, which are easy to answer. It should only include the questions that provide useful information about the characteristics of the audience. For example: age, nationality, city, amount of visits to the Movies that Matter Festival, tickets online or offline and the relation with Amnesty International.

The **layout** of the questionnaire should be attractive. For example a postcard, which respondents will post in the post box. If the questionnaire does not have a typical layout of a questionnaire, the potential respondent might not directly have the negative associations as attached to questionnaires. The side of the postcard will have a part which can be ripped of the rest of the card. On this part, the **address** of the respondent is separated from the information of the questionnaire. This way, proper use of data can be guaranteed by analysing the data separately from the personal information of the respondents.
respondent. The researcher should not be able to find out which respondent has said what on a questionnaire. An idea would be two boxes, one to which respondents can post their address and one for the questionnaire itself. As for an online questionnaire, the data can be split automatically. However, this should be stated in the beginning of the questionnaire, in order to make respondents aware of the fact that their personal details will not be linked with the questionnaire.

As the questionnaire online includes basic information about the festival visitors, actual feedback should be gained via another source. An example would be to place a big, visible tree (made of wood, or from paper on the wall) in the building. Next to the tree, festival visitors can find leaflets. On this leaflet, festival visitors can post their comments about the festival. This can be both positive and constructive. The tree resembles the opportunity of the festival to grow by the provided comments. Other ways of walls were people can post their ideas are possible as well, but this should be made very attractive, in order to make people curious. In addition, all comments from visitors given at the information desk should be noted down. Positive and negative comments, but also questions which were often asked, as these often asked questions can lead to improvements for the future.

**Online Questionnaire**

Considering the relatively young generation visiting the Movies that Matter Festival, the online questionnaire should be promoted more actively. First of all, the questionnaire should be very visible on the website. It is advisable not to name the questionnaire a ‘questionnaire’. It can for example be a link stating ‘we need your feedback’. Secondly, it should be clear for the festival visitors that a link to the questionnaire can be found on the website. A possibility in showing the link to the questionnaire is to post a QR code. This can be done on posters, but also by posting the QR code in the festival paper or at the overview of the program.

As the online questionnaire should have the same length as the hardcopy questionnaire, additional feedback from festival visitors should be gained through other online means. Examples are: a discussion forum on the website. This discussion forum could for example include the question to people ‘how the Movies that Matter Festival could be improved’ or ‘what communication tools came to their attention’, ‘comments about the films and different aspects of the festival program’, and ‘what their ideas are about the communication between the Movies that Matter Festival and the festival visitors’, or by stimulating comments on Facebook or Twitter. When choosing this way of gaining feedback, one should always be aware of what is posted online, in order to react when unwanted comments are posted.
**Incentives**

Research showed that motivation is very important when responding to a questionnaire. Potential respondents can be motivated by stating the **purpose** of the questionnaire on top of the questionnaire. Moreover, **appreciation** is of importance, which should be combined with providing the feeling the feedback given by the respondent will be taken seriously.

During the festival it is advisable to offer the opportunity to win a **ticket for another film** of free choice. This possibility to watch a film for free should also be usable the year after, so people can also still respond to the questionnaire and win the price after the festival. Most people would be interested in this price, as they are already going to the festival to watch films. The price could be handed out several times during the festival, to which much **publicity** should be given. This way, people get triggered to fill out a questionnaire, in order to win that same price.
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9. Appendix

9.1. Visitors vs. Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount of Visitors</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17.500</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17.500</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2. Interview File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview file nº: 1</th>
<th>Date: 20-12-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year / Semester / block: year 4, block 2</td>
<td>Time: 14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Topic: Primary research question</td>
<td>Duration: 1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: MTMF Office, Amsterdam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer: Lotte Aalberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewee: Marie-Pierre Furnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of interviewee: Head of Marketing MTMF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-topics: The organization, Research Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for interviewing:** To get to know each other, the organization and to get a general idea about the problem which needs to be researched.

**Description: summary of transcript and comments (IN ENGLISH)**

1. General information about the organization is given (also described on the website)
2. Previous years we have spread a questionnaire in order to gain insight in the festival public and the effectiveness of the used (communication) tools. Partly on the base of these findings, our communication strategy/mix is adapted every year. Therefore, the findings of this yearly research are very valuable for us.
3. Up until now we have done this mainly by spreading questionnaires during the festival, and in addition an online version.
4. However, we get less response than we would like to have.
5. It would be very welcome if a more effective way would be developed in order to receive the valuable information of the festival public on a larger scale.
1. A decrease in response rate from approximately 1000 to 300.
2. Questionnaire important for: Receiving information about the festival, the opinion of people about the program, facilities etc. and about the PR. Are the right PR tools used? The budget spent right? What communication tools did people notice?
3. The questionnaire is made without any research on questionnaires. However, it is not known whether this is the right structure, format or order.
4. Last year there was an online questionnaire on the website. However, it is hardly used. People are very passive.
5. Little motivation of visitors to fill out a questionnaire.
6. People who respond to a questionnaire can win a VVV-voucher. This tools is used to stimulate people to response to the questionnaire. A VVV-voucher is chosen, because people can choose themselves where to spend this voucher, whereas people might be less motivated as a present is chosen beforehand.
Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire
- Decrease of response rate
- Receiving information about the festival (program, facilities)
- Research on questionnaire

Main topic 2 or primary research question 2: Visitors
- Little motivation
- Passive

Main topic 3 or primary research question 3: Contextual Factors
- VVV voucher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for interviewing:</th>
<th>To go more into depth researching the problem. Some information can’t be found in the communication plans or yearly overviews.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible reasons for low response rate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Festival has grown massively, which makes it more difficult to spread out questionnaires (more job duties, busier, more visitors who walk out of the movie theatre, which makes it harder to reach them)  
• People are tired of replying to questionnaires. The amount of questionnaires used by organizations increased over the years  
• People get a voting voucher and the questionnaire at the same time, so a lot to fill out. Timing might be questioned.  
• Volunteers might feel bad asking people to respond to a questionnaire. | |
| **Up until 2010 the questionnaire was combined with the VARA publieksprijs (on which people can vote which movie should win a price). However, VARA requested to do this separately, as more attention should go to the publieksprijs.** | |
| **Whereas the amount of visitors reduplicated since 2008, the response rate became half as much. This means a less representative insight on the characteristics of the festival visitors. Moreover the opinion of the public will represented less valid.** | |
| **Evaluation doesn’t costs any money, as the questionnaires are copied at the office and volunteers hand out the questionnaire, processed by MTMF.** | |
| **Willing to spend more money on the evaluation. However, the costs should be clear against the benefits.** | |
| **Amount of visitors 2012: 17000** | |
| **Communication plan in 2012 almost the same as 2011. No communication plan, as it takes a lot of time and MS Furnée has it in her head. However, there was a new focus on youth ambassadors.** | |
| **Difference 2012–2013: 2013 focused on expats as a new target group, including new communication tools (English language: news special at the times, international organizations, expats events)** | |
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Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire
- Difficult to spread questionnaires

Main topic 2 or primary research question 2: Visitors
- Tired of questionnaires

Main topic 3 or primary research question 3: Contextual Factors
- 2012: Youth Ambassadeurs
- 2013: Expats
- Timing
- Volunteers
- Publieksprijs
- Costs vs benifits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview file nº: 4</th>
<th>Date: 22/03/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year / Semester / block: year 4, block 2</td>
<td>Time: 18:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Topic: Spreading a Questionnaire</td>
<td>Duration: 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: Volunteers Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer: Lotte Aalberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewee: Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of interviewee: Volunteer during the Movies that Matter Festival. The Volunteer has different shifts, on different spots. Spreading the questionnaire is one shift of 3 hours.

Sub-topics: Relationship MTMF and the volunteer, Spreading questionnaires, interaction volunteer & visitor, Other ideas of gaining feedback

Reason for interviewing: To gain insight in the volunteer’s experience in spreading the questionnaire, and the response from visitors to the volunteers.

Description: summary of transcript and comments

1. Reason to become a volunteer: Noticed the posters outside. Interested in culture and socially involved. MTM specifically, because it is a good combination of enjoying the festival and spreading a good message.

2. Spreading the questionnaire: The amount of people coming out of the film was sometimes disappointing. Waiting for the film to end, while not many people are in there.

3. People take the questionnaires easily and I’m not afraid to speak to someone, so that combination worked well.

4. Timing: standing in front of the door was good for during the day, but might not be as effective during the evenings. It might be too busy, because people need to find a place where they can write, which should take more facilitation.

5. Spreading more effective: Maybe make better agreement on who is standing where, so you won’t miss anyone. Maybe encourage people to respond to a questionnaire at the end of the film. However, the way the questionnaire is spread now is more non-committal/optional.

6. Interaction volunteers & visitors: depends for each person. It works to first start a nice conversation and then ask the visitors the respond.

7. Response: People generally react positive. People have a certain interest in the films and the festival, so when people ask them to do something back for the organization, they are willing to do that. It’s some sort of interaction people feel comfortable with.

8. More effective/different way: There are already many debates in the program, from which the organization could already receive the opinion from people who are willing to share their view. Or a drink afterwards when people can talk about the program. You have that often in theaters as well, called round table conversation, to which people interested in the program get questions about the show and they also get the opportunity to ask questions themselves, to create interaction. A questionnaire is very structured and type of conversation can go all directions.
Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire
  - Opinion by conversation

Main topic 2 or primary research question 2: Visitors
  - Positive reaction
  - Amount of visitors walking out of the film sometimes disappointing
  - Taking the questionnaire easily

Main topic 3 or primary research question 3: Contextual Factors
  - Agreement who is standing where
  - Effective during the evening
  - Volunteering: Combination of enjoying the festival and spreading a good message
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview file nº: 5</th>
<th>Date: <strong>24/3/2013</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year / Semester / block: year 4, block 2</td>
<td>Time: 19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Topic: Spreading a Questionnaire</td>
<td>Duration: 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: Filmhuis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer: Lotte Aalberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewee: Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of interviewee: Volunteer during the Movies that Matter Festival. The Volunteer has different shifts, on different spots. Spreading the questionnaire is one shift of 3 hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-topics: Relationship MTMF and the volunteer, Spreading questionnaires, interaction volunteer &amp; visitor, Other ideas of gaining feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for interviewing:</strong> To gain insight in the volunteer’s experience in spreading the questionnaire, and the response from visitors to the volunteers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description: summary of transcript and comments**

1. **Reason to become a volunteer:** Has been visitor of the festival for two years. Became a volunteer as the festival was promoted very well. Especially the Trouw stood out. It is an interesting festival, you get to know people and you get to see movies (for free).
2. **Spreading the questionnaire:** I find it very uncomfortable, especially because I wouldn’t like it when someone would ask me to fill out a questionnaire.
3. **You get the question very often,** for example when you walk outside.
4. **Often people want to raise money with it.**
5. **I feel very guilty when I have to ask older people.** They take a lot of time for the questionnaire, whereas younger people go quickly through it.
6. **I don’t like spreading the questionnaire,** but it helps the festival.
7. **Spreading more effective:** Maybe by making a voting booth, where people can go to if they really want to give their opinion.
8. **Interaction volunteers & visitors:** I tried to ask the visitors as positive as possible. However, I felt a bit a shame, which caused a barrier when interacting.
9. **Response:** The response was different in where I was standing. In front of the wardrobe was a good place. People were waiting and actually had time to fill out a questionnaire.
10. **More effective/different way:** Maybe it could be better shown online. A lot of people ask for this possibility.
11. **Maybe more active spreading the questionnaire towards the end of the festival.** People commented that they wanted to wait in order to get a better overview of the festival.
Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire

- Online
- It helps the festival

Main topic 2 or primary research question 2: Visitors

- Uncomfortable spreading
- Get the question often
- Would not like to be asked myself
- Guilty
- Older people

Main topic 3 or primary research question 3: Contextual Factors

- Wardrobe
- Timing: end of the festival
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Interview file nº: 6

Date: 25/3/2013

Year / Semester / block: year 4, block 2

Time: 16:00

Main Topic: Spreading a Questionnaire

Duration: 15 minutes

Place: Filmhuis

Name of interviewer: Lotte Aalberts

Name of interviewee: Volunteer

Role of interviewee: Volunteer during the Movies that Matter Festival. The Volunteer has 3 shifts planned on spreading the questionnaires.

Sub-topics: Relationship MTMF and the volunteer, Spreading questionnaires, interaction volunteer & visitor, Other ideas of gaining feedback

Reason for interviewing: To gain insight in the volunteer’s experience in spreading the questionnaire, and the response from visitors to the volunteers.

Description: summary of transcript and comments

1. Reason to become a volunteer: 2 years ago I came in contact with the Movies that Matter Festival, as I had to search festivals for my study CMV. We had to make a culture booklet, including different festivals, movies and theater/dancing shows. In January I stopped my study, so now I have some time to do volunteer work.

2. I really like that I can help this festival, as I support the goal of this festival. I think raising awareness about human rights is very important.

3. It is very nice to be totally involved in the festival, a big difference from being a visitor.

4. I would have liked to do different shifts with different tasks, instead of doing only the questionnaires.

5. It is very quiet, because we have a lot of time in between the movies. I would prefer the work to be busier.

6. Spreading the questionnaire: It is oke, and not bad. People can say themselves if they want to participate or not. So you can ask it very open, so people feel free in their choice.

7. Features: The questionnaire looks very long, because they are printed both sides (Dutch & English). Maybe two different versions would be helpful, so people don’t think they have to fill out two pages.

8. Spreading more effective: The timing is difficult. I don’t want to disturb people when they sit at a table for a break.

9. If the movie is intense, people don’t like to fill out a questionnaire.

10. It is the best timing when people come out of a movie, so you know that people are actually involved in the festival. However, not directly at the door. People need time to adjust.

11. Response: In general people react positive. It is a way that people can help the festival. Showing what they liked or found positive or complain, then people start writing a lot.

12. More effective/different way: When I was active in a festival myself, I used a board with post–its. The idea is that you have a big board in the colors of the organization. People can write their experiences (positive & negative) on the board in order to share it with other people. The disadvantage is that people also share their negative experiences. However, this provides a valid overview. This way you keep it very free for people to comment.

13. Maybe it is an idea to use social media very active after the festival. Not only by posting the questionnaire, but also by the use of posts. Stimulating people to post their ideas online. It also has risks of having negative comments, but posts can be deleted.
Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire

- Online media
- Questionnaire looks long
- Helps the festival

Main topic 2 or primary research question 2: Visitors

- Preferably different shifts
- Quiet
- Oke, not bad
- Positive reaction

Main topic 3 or primary research question 3: Contextual Factors

- Adjusting after the film
Stimulating an increase in feedback from the Movies that Matter Festival visitors’

Lotte Aalberts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview file nº: 7</th>
<th>Date: 02/5/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year / Semester / block: year 4, block 4</td>
<td>Time: 09:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Topic: Response Rate</td>
<td>Duration: 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer: Lotte Aalberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewee: Steven Noorman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of interviewee: Director of research center ‘Kein’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-topics: Sampling, Response rate, Incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for interviewing: To gain insight in the way research centers reach their response rate and motivate people to participate in a questionnaire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description: summary of transcript and comments**

1. About Kien: Mainly quantitative research, online. Based in Groningen, but also provides services in the rest of the Netherlands.
2. Working together with Panelwizard; a panel of 20.000 members, representing the Netherlands.
3. There is a monetary incentive for each answered question, the participant can decide afterwards if the person keeps the money, or offers it to someone else, or an organization.
4. Participants get money for each question, instead of one questionnaire. This avoids that participants go through the questionnaires quickly and answer everything with no to finish the questionnaire.
5. It is very difficult to do market research without a panel, as not everyone has one set telephone in their house. The new generation all have a mobile phone. Therefore it is difficult to get a good sample.
6. 80% is online. It saves money, easier to contact and it is better for the research to process, it is visual.
7. Using phone for business to business. Also to call people to ask if they are willing to participate, ask their email address and directly sent a link to the email address with the questionnaire.
8. No privacy issues. They are ICO certified, so people from the database trust that. It is very important that the researcher can never connect the data with the participant. It should stay anonymous.
9. The form is very important, especially with an event. For example provide them with a card or something. Or with a QR code, so they can do it very quickly when waiting somewhere. Moreover, the motivation is very important. People want an incentive. It is advisable to use the product they are coming for as an incentive. It doesn’t take you time, and people get something they are already motivated for.
Main topic 1 or primary research question 1: Questionnaire

- 80 % Online
- Phone for business to business
- Form
- ICO certified
- Panelwizard
- Monetary incentive each question
- QR Code
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9.3. Topic Web

Area: Questionnaire

- Topic
- Features
- Questions
- Contextual factors
- Incentives
- Decision making process
- Profile
- Type
- Result
- Trust
- Safety
- Relationship with MTF
- Commitment
- Motivation
- Age
- Demography
- Behavioral characteristics
- Background
- Attitudes
- Decision making
-_faces to face
- Questionnaire response rate

Area: Festival Visitors

- Motivation
- Relationship with MTMF
- Commitment
- Trust
- Safety
- Questions

Area: Questionnaire

- Motivation
- Relationship with MTMF
- Commitment
- Trust
- Safety
- Questions

Face to face

Online

Area: Contextual factors

- Language
- Layout
- Structure

Area: Festival visitors

- From movies that Matter Festival
- Low Questionnaire response rate

Application

- Location
- Communication
- Timing
- Time spend
- Effort spend
- Person handing out the questionnaire

Decision making process

- Location
- Communication
- Timing
- Time spend
- Effort spend
- Person handing out the questionnaire

Area: Questionnaire

- Motivation
- Relationship with MTMF
- Commitment
- Trust
- Safety
- Questions
9.4. Questionnaire

MOVIES THAT MATTER ENQUÊTE

Om het Movies that Matter Festival ieder jaar aantrekkelijker te maken voor onze bezoekers, is uw mening van groot belang en zijn tips zeer welkom. Het invullen van deze enquête zal slechts langer dan 5 minuten duren en u maakt kans op een VVV Bon t.w.v. €30,- Alvast hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking!

Naam ........................................................................................................................................ M/V
Adres ................................................................................................................................................
Postcode en plaats .................................................................................................................................
Leeftijd ....................................................................................................................................................

1. Voor de hoeveelste keer bezoekt u het Movies that Matter Festival?

2. Bezoekt u wel eens andere Movies that Matter-activiteiten?
   Indien u deze vraag met ja beantwoordt: welke?
   ○ Movies that Matter On Tour
   ○ Movies that Matter @ IDFA
   ○ anders, ...

3. Met welke communicatie-uitingen van het festival bent u in aanraking gekomen? (u kunt meerdere mogelijkheden aankruisen)
   ○ Movies that Matter media:
     ○ Movies that Matter website
     ○ U ontvangt een e-mail/de nieuwsbrief
     ○ Movies that Matter op Facebook/Twitter/YouTube
     ○ U krijg de festivalnacht thuisgestuurd
     ○ Daily Matters digitale daginust
     ○ Movies that Matter Ambassadeur(s)
   ○ Binnen- en buitenreclame:
     ○ Binnenreclame: posters en/of flyers
     ○ Buitenreclame: posters, trans en/of banieren
   ○ Het festivalpromotiefilmpje:
     ○ Festivalpromotiefilmpje in bioscopen
     ○ Festivalpromo online
   ○ Anders media en organisaties:
     ○ Amnesty International
     ○ Filmhuis Den Haag en/of Theater aan het Spui
     ○ Dagblad Trouw
     ○ VARA, TV en/of VARA website
     ○ Holland Doc
     ○ Gemeente Den Haag
     ○ Bibliotheek Den Haag
     ○ Haagse Hogeschool
     ○ Adressenties in tijdschriften/online
     ○ Anders, namelijk
   ○ Netwerken
     ○ Vrienden/kennis/familie
     ○ Werkgelaterde organisatie, nl
     ○ Studievereniging/studentenvereniging, nl
     ○ Opleiding
     ○ Social media, nl
     ○ Anders, nl

4. Hoeveel filmvertoningen heeft u bezoekt of bent u van plan te bezoeken?

5. Welk cijfer geeft u de volgende aspecten van het festival? (1= heel slecht – 5= heel goed)
   a. Filmprogramma
   b. Talkshows/debatte/ChiK/ex
   c. Organisatie
   d. Locaties
   e. Reserveringsmogelijkheden
   f. Communicatie rond het festival

6. Heeft u online tickets gekocht?
   Ja/nee
   Indien u de vraag met ja beantwoordt:
   a. via Filmhuisdenhaag.nl
   b. via moviesthatmatter.nl (omcirkel a en/of b)

7. Bent u lid van Amnesty International?
   Ja/nee

8. Bent u van plan vaker Movies that Matter-activiteiten te bezoeken?
   Ja/nee

9. Heeft u tips of opmerkingen?

   ...

NOGMAALS HARTELIJK DANK VOOR UW MEDEWERKING!
# 9.5. Observational Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/3/13</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Manager Volunteers</td>
<td>Every day around 15.00 &amp; 19.00, one volunteer will be responsible for the questionnaires. These moments are chosen because of the highest amount of visitors.</td>
<td>Short introduction conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/3/13</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>Communication Department</td>
<td>Posters are spread around the building with the message of the online possibility (on the website) of answering the questionnaire.</td>
<td>Filmhuis/Theater ‘t Spui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/13</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Own observation</td>
<td>Many movies are meant for a closed/special public, which is not suitable for questionnaires.</td>
<td>Filmhuis/Theater ‘t Spui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/13</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Own observation</td>
<td>When visitors see the volunteers handing out the questionnaire, some visitors try to find another way to walk in order to go around the volunteers.</td>
<td>Filmhuis/Theater ‘t Spui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/13</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>Location Manager</td>
<td>The Movies are playing at the same time, which makes it difficult as many people are coming out at the same time. Moreover, there is time that volunteers don’t have to do anything.</td>
<td>Fast conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/13</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>A volunteer notes that some people are emotional because of the movie. Therefore, it might not be the right timing/place to stand in front of the door right after the movie.</td>
<td>Filmhuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/3/13</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>It would be better to stand at the exit. Also next to the restaurant works, as people have time when they sit down.</td>
<td>Filmhuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/3/13</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>When asking a volunteer to spread the questionnaires, the volunteers reaction was negative. Things were said as: ‘Only questionnaires?’ ‘So do I ask everyone?’ . The facial expression looked disappointed.</td>
<td>Filmhuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/3/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Own observation</td>
<td>People want to fill out the questionnaire as fast as possible. You could also tell that from the answered questionnaires. Only some people put effort in it.</td>
<td>Filmhuis/’t Spui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24/3/13    |        | Quotes Visitors                   | ‘Not now, I first need to process the movie’
‘I’ll do it online’
‘Yes, during my coffee’                                                                                                                                                                                  | Filmhuis         |
| 24/3/13    | 17:00  | Own observation                   | Standing in front of the wardrobe Works                                                                                                                                                                      | Theater ‘t Spui  |
| 25/3/13    | 19:00  | Location Manager                  | People come to the information desk with their complains. However, they don’t want to write it down on a questionnaire. Therefore I write them on questionnaires on behalf of the guests. | Filmhuis         |
| 27/3/13    | 12:00  | Volunteers at the information desk | Guests gave comments about that there are too little people working at the bar. Therefore, guests have to wait very long in order to get their drinks. This is especially a problem in the theater, as guests are not allowed to take drinks inside. | Filmhuis         |
| 29/04      | 16:00  | Conversation with Ms. Furnée      | Ms. Furnée notes that the age of the festival visitors observed during the festival seemed lower than the age as shown in the questionnaire results.                                                            | Phone conversation |
9.6. Characteristics Festival Visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81&lt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total answered</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amnesty- member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Festival Visit</strong></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e x</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e x</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e x</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e x</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5e x</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totaal amswered</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Communication/ PR</strong></th>
<th>142</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email/Nieuwsbrief</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook/Twitter/Youtube</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivalkrant thuisgestuurd</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Matters digitale krant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English MTM festival special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Camera Justitia Flyer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Flyer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies that Matter Ambassadeurs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor: Posters/Flyers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Promo Cinema</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Promo Online</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmhuis/Theater</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouw</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Doc</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemeente Den Haag</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliotheek</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haagse Hogeschool</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertenties</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrienden/Familie</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werk gerelateerd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studie gerelateerd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opleiding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal</strong></td>
<td><strong>963</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.7. Characteristics of the questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total returned questionnaires</th>
<th>361</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total useful returned questionnaires</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned hardcopy</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful hardcopy</td>
<td>290 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned online</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful online</td>
<td>48 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Returned Hardcopy | 290 100% |
| Returned in Dutch | 233 80% |
| Returned in English | 57 20% |
| Returned in English, but Dutch nationality | 18 |
| Returned in Dutch, but international | 1 |
| Adress | 247 85% |
| Adress, but no answers | 12 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returned Online</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned in Dutch</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in English, but Dutch nationality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in Dutch, but international</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adress</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adress, but no answers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Returned</th>
<th>338</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned in Dutch</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in English</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in English, but Dutch nationality</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned in Dutch, but international</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adress</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adress, but no answers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3 (Can’t be evaluated as respondents can enter more options)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5a (Filmprogramming)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5b (Parallel programme)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5c (Organisation)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5d (Location)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5e (Reservation)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5f (Communication)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5g (Promotion)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>