

July 2015

*SailWise*

# Sailing activities for people with a disability

---

A FOLLOW UP STUDY ABOUT THE EVALUATION  
FORMS OF SAILWISE



ACADAMIC CONSULTANCY TRAINING – EXTRA ASSIGNMENT

YMC 60809

Mentor: dr.ir. G. Casimir

Nynke de Jong  
930523404070

Contact details of mentor

Dr. ir. Gerda Casimir

Telephone number: 0317 482566

Email: gerda.casimir@wur.nl

Contact details of the student

Nynke de Jong

Telephone number: 0649276170

Email: nynke1.dejong@wur.nl

*Source of the SailWise logo: <http://www.sailwise.nl/>*

# Preface

---

In front of you lies my extra assignment for the course Academic Consultancy Training (ACT). The past three weeks I have been working on this assignment, creating a valuable evaluation form. It is already summer holidays for my peers and I also have a 'holiday job', which appeared not to be a perfect combination. However, I am still very really grateful for the opportunity to do this extra assignment and worked on it with pleasure because the topic really interests me.

I want to thank my mentor Gerda Casimir for her help, feedback and quick responses. Also I want to show my gratitude to Menne Scherpenzeel, the director of SailWise, for his time and help, to make the evaluation form really fitting to the organization SailWise. Lastly I want to thank the coordinators of ACT, Valentina Tassone and Tjeerd Jan Stomph for the exception they made for me and the chance I received to be able to complete ACT this academic year.

Wageningen, July 2015

Nynke de Jong

# Contents

---

- Preface..... 4
- Introduction..... 6
- 1. Background..... 7
  - 1.1 How should an evaluation form be constructed? ..... 7
  - 1.2 What does SailWise want to know? ..... 7
  - 1.3 What kind of information is SailWise looking for? ..... 7
  - 1.4 How is the data collected? ..... 7
  - 1.5 Who is involved in the evaluations?..... 8
- 2. Development of the evaluation forms ..... 9
  - 2.1 Likert scale..... 9
  - 2.2 Semantic Differential Technique ..... 10
  - 2.3 The composition of the questions..... 10
  - 2.4 Procedure ..... 11
    - Digital or hard copy ..... 11
    - Moment..... 12
    - Analysis..... 12
- 3. Discussion ..... 12
  - Inter-tester reliability ..... 12
  - Face validity ..... 13
  - Content validity ..... 13
  - Predictive validity ..... 13
  - Comparability ..... 13
- 4. Conclusion ..... 14
- Bibliografie ..... 15
- Appendix 1..... 16

# Introduction

---

Due to societal changes, people with a disability are increasingly participating in society. It is argued that this inclusive society has an added value to the lives of disabled people. Accessible tourism is a type of tourism that follows this trend of a more inclusive society, as it allows disabled people to participate in leisure activities and holidays. SailWise is an organization which makes accessible tourism possible: SailWise offers water sport activities to disabled people, mainly to those who are physically disabled. SailWise wishes to understand the added value of their water sport activities, as it is assumed that access to such information will enable the organization to optimize their sailing activities in relation to the needs of their participants, to maximize the potential added value of SailWise activities for the daily lives of disabled people, and to ensure a sustained existence for SailWise as an organization.

SailWise evaluates their activities themselves by evaluation forms distributed among their participants. However, according to SailWise these do not give much insight into the added value of their activities. In order to get more information about and scientific proof of this added value, SailWise asked the Science Shop of Wageningen UR (later referred to as Science Shop) to start up a research. This research will last until December 2016, consisting of multiple smaller research projects.

In period 6 of the academic year 2014/2015 I worked, together with my ACT- team, on one of these smaller projects. Our project was split into two parts. It aimed to give insights on (1) how to explore the added value of- and (2) the evaluation of water sport activities for people with a disability, organized by SailWise. Our project was an exploratory study and was seen as a stepping stone for the Science Shop in order to proceed with the big research project.

We (the ACT group) had several recommendations which were mostly related to measure the added value of the water sport activities. These recommendations will be elaborated by a PhD student and two master students. However one of our recommendations was focusing on the evaluation of the water sport activities. The activities are currently evaluated with the use of an online evaluation form, developed by SailWise themselves. The main reason of SailWise for developing this evaluation forms, was to assess the satisfaction of the participants and to look for possible improvements (M. Meijers, personal communication, June 11, 2015). SailWise also has a second reason for spreading the evaluation forms: by covering specific themes, such as how the participants wish to be approached or how participants finance their holiday, SailWise can adapt their marketing policy. SailWise indicated that the evaluation forms do not have any scientific basis. It is however important that these evaluation forms give SailWise the correct information, as this information is assumed to enable the organization to optimize their sailing activities to meet the needs of their participants. Likewise a sustained existence of the organization is ensured, by using this information as prove for their (future) financial supporters and future participants.

Therefore it is necessary to create a valid and reliable evaluation form, with a scientific bases, which can be used for several years. Consequently, the purpose of this project was: to provide SailWise with a reliable and valid evaluation form to measure the added value of SailWise's water sport activities.

This report is constructed as follows. First the theoretical background is discussed. On this theory the report has been build. After the theory, the motivation for the questions and the used technique of asking questions is described. Subsequently the procedure on how to conduct the evaluation forms has been stated. To be concluded with a conclusion of this report.

# 1. Background

---

In this chapter the findings of the ACT study have been taken into account. These findings are used to build on, during the creation of the evaluation forms.

## 1.1 How should an evaluation form be constructed?

There is no strict rule in literature how an evaluation form should be constructed. However, according to Shapiro (2011), an evaluation form should have the following themes which could guide the organization to make sense of the data that will be collected:

- What the organization wants to know (what indicators are needed)
- What kind of information that is required (qualitative information or quantitative information)
- How is the information or data going to be collected (there are several options e.g. survey questionnaires, focus group, interviews etc.)
- Who will be involved in the evaluation design and analysis

## 1.2 What does SailWise want to know?

According to Shapiro (2011) an evaluation should include indicators to address both internal (e.g. challenges) issues and external (e.g. funding) issues. When asked to indicate the (internal) reason for conducting the evaluations, the interviewee indicated that, the evaluations were meant to check for the satisfaction of their clients. The results from the evaluations were also to be used to improve their activities, to serve as a basis for prioritizing issues and to use as proof for financial supporters.

The funders of SailWise however want to see more scientific evidence of the contribution of its activities, which is an external issue that should be addressed. SailWise so far has not collected data based on scientific evidence to draw valid conclusions about the added value of their water sport activities. Such information is essential for the organization in order to produce the statistical proof about what participants say is the benefit of water sport holidays, which is wanted by funding organizations. Availability of such statistical information to the organization is also essential as it could help SailWise to make strong statements about how valuable these activities are to the participants and hence the need for donors to keep providing funds to support the participants.

## 1.3 What kind of information is SailWise looking for?

Is SailWise interested in qualitative information or quantitative information? The evaluation process requires a combination of both quantitative and qualitative information in order to be comprehensive. Qualitative data tells the organization how people feel about a situation, how things are done, and how people behave (people's opinions). Qualitative information can be obtained by asking, observing, and interpreting (Shapiro, 2011). On the other hand quantitative information tells the organization how often or how many people are participating. For example such data could tell the organization how often (many times) a particular participant has been on such trips, the age categories of their participant etcetera. Analysis from a quantitative evaluation gives outcomes in absolute figures or percentages which could serve as evidence for impacts and issues that need to be addressed (Shapiro, 2011). A combination of these two kinds of information for example could help the organization to determine who their participants are, where they are coming from, and why certain categories (e.g. youngsters) are not participating.

## 1.4 How is the data collected?

Any organization conducting an evaluation must ensure that the information gathered means something to them; there is no need to collect information just to keep someone busy. According to

Shapiro (2011) evaluations should more importantly be conducted to find out what the organization wants to know, and then make sure that the information is stored in such a way that it is easy to access by different people. The evaluations are based generally on memories of participants and therefore need to be conducted when memories are still fresh in the participant's minds (immediately after the experience or trip). When evaluations are conducted several weeks after the trip, the responses could be affected.

### 1.5 Who is involved in the evaluations?

Literature indicates that everybody in an organization could be involved in conducting evaluations. However, this depends on the kind of information that needs to be obtained and the part of the organization that needs the data. Some organizations could also have special teams tasked with the responsibility to carry out evaluations and report back to the whole team on how much progress has been made and where improvements are needed (Shapiro, 2011). For SailWise this could be done internally by giving the assignment to the employees of marketing and communication. Or SailWise could look for external help and use the experience and expertise of the Science Shop or students. This last option is preferred. Hughes and Niewenhuis (2005) argue for example that evaluations could be conducted more efficiently by people who are external to the organization. Such people are of more objective minds and could interpret results more openly without prejudices. Also when there are positive outcomes, these results obtain more credit than if the outcomes were determined by the organization itself. Lastly, it saves the organization time, since they do not have to evaluate the data themselves.

## 2. Development of the evaluation forms

---

In this chapter the justification of developing the questions and the used method has been written. When constructing an evaluation form, several things have to be taken into account as discussed in chapter one. Whereas the information needed by SailWise is hard to quantify, an appropriate technique is needed to develop the questions. Several psychometric scale measures have been taken into account but both, the Likert Scale and the semantic differential technique appeared to be possible as a basis for the questions of the evaluation forms for SailWise.

### 2.1 Likert scale

The Likert scale, named after Rensis Likert, who published the first report describing the use of the scale. This scale is probably the most widely applied form of attitude measurement in survey research. Like nearly all psychometric scale measures, the Likert scale includes multiple items. This produces a more reliable outcome than would be the case if one single item would be measured. The Likert scale uses multiple ordered-category rating items and can be distinguished from other scales by the following aspects:

- Each item uses response categories indicating levels of disagreement or agreement with a specific statement, expressing an attitude or opinion (e.g., bananas are delicious).
- The response category points for each item are individually labelled (most often used categories are: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree).
- The descriptive text of these labels is chosen so that gradations between each pair of following points seem similar.

To make sure that respondents interpret the steps between two points as equal, the response categories are often numbered. Technically the response format used for Likert scale items is at an ordinal level of measurement. However researches traditionally have used parametric statistics (which assumes an interval level of data) to analyse Likert scales (Lavrakas, 2008).

Although the Likert scale is argued to be the most commonly used measurement scale, it became clear from the literature that results of surveys, which used a Likert scale, are often biased. Due to central tendency, acquiescence or social desirability bias, which are all closely associated (Lavrakas, 2008).

Central tendency bias often occurs when respondents hesitate to select extreme response categories. The tendency is to score every statement around the midpoint of the scale, and not use the extremes. As a result the evaluation form fails to distinguish adequately between the statements (Oxford reference, 2015.a).

Acquiescence response bias is the tendency of an interviewee to agree with the questioner, regardless of the content of the question. It often overestimates the true results (Oxford reference, 2015.b). Acquiescence bias could be explained by the social norm to be polite. Another explanation could be that although survey researchers hope respondents will answer their questions thoughtfully and carefully, respondents may not always be motivated to do so. Instead they may shift their response actions to minimize the effort while providing a satisfactory response to the survey questions (Lavrakas, 2008).

For these problems researchers found a solution to reduce these effects, by stating the statements in both positive and negative forms. So when answering 'agree', this indicates half of the time that they

agree with the statement, the other half of the questions is stated in a negative way, so they actually disagree when answering 'agree'. Lavrakas (2008) used as an example this question: "It is important for the president to be a person of high moral character." Later the question was formulated the other way around; "it is not important for the president to be a person of high moral character." If respondents present acquiescence response bias and agree with both statements, their answers to these two questions cancel each other out (Lavrakas, 2008).

These extra questions are however not very easy applicable in the evaluation forms of SailWise. Firstly because it requires a very large evaluation form, with a number of unnecessary questions. This will probably be frustrating to the respondents. Besides the frustrations, it might be confusing as well. Because in the question formulated earlier, respondents are asked to agree or disagree with a negative statement. This involves a double negative (if the respondent disagrees) which is not interpreted by every person in the same way (Lavrakas, 2008).

Dealing with acquiescence response bias was also a problem for Friborg, Martinussen and Rosenvinge (2006). In their study they found the semantic differential response format as an alternative.

## 2.2 Semantic Differential Technique

The semantic differential measurement technique is a form of a rating scale that is designed to identify the connotative meaning of objects, words and concepts. This technique was created in 1950 by Charles E. Osgood. The technique measures an individual's unique, perceived meaning of an object, a word or an experience (Lavrakas, 2008). It is not a specific test but, rather, a general technique of measurement that can be adapted to a wide variety of problems. It tries to identify emotional meaning of words, making these words more objective (Kang & Zhang, 2010). The semantic differential technique could be seen as an adapted Likert scale. It uses two opposite terms, the respondent has to choose which fits better. It is common to use a 7-point rating scale. The 0 position means 'neutral,' 1 means 'slightly,' 2 means 'quite' and 3 is 'extremely.' The scales are designed such way that the left side is generally positive and the right side is generally negative (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1967).

In developing and measuring the Sense of Coherence (SOC) theory, the semantic differential technique is also used (Antonovsky, 1993).

So the technique is commonly used and it appears to deal with the acquiescence response bias. It reduces this bias, without lowering psychometric quality because of the different answer categories. These categories appear to be less confusing than the positive and negative formulations of the statements of the Likert scale (Friborg, Martinussen & Rosenvinge, 2006).

## 2.3 The composition of the questions

The complete evaluation form is presented in appendix 1. The first three questions are based on the semantic differential technique. The subjects which need to be covered by these questions are first of all if the ambition of SailWise is met. This includes; participants are equal to the crew, the adaptations made to the accommodation and boats are sufficient and create a safe feeling, the food and hygiene during the holidays are good. SailWise assumes that there is an added value of the water sport activities, more than just having a nice holiday. This added value is assumed to be: an increase of the self-esteem of the participants, overcoming of barriers towards their disability, discovering

that they are able to do more than they thought they would be able to do and meeting new people or 'fellow sufferers'. These points are intended to be pointed at with the first three questions.

The open questions (4, 5, 6) followed are meant to give an overall view of the opinion of the participant, since they are now able to highlight what they find important. These questions are open because it is interesting to see what spontaneously comes up with the participants (Hart, Boeije & Hox, 2005). It could be different than what SailWise expects.

The questions 7 till 10 are included because SailWise wants to learn how the participants preferably book and finance their holidays. This is important to know, because by getting the answers, SailWise can adapt their marketing policy.

Subsequently there are questions (12 till 15) about the use of internet and social media. The first questions are asked in order to get a baseline. It will give an insight into whether participants don't use the internet at all or if it is just the website and social media of SailWise they don't use. For SailWise it is important to know how they can reach their participants, how to stay in touch and make sure the participants will come again. This is why it is interesting to see whether they use the internet.

The last questions (16 till 25) are general questions, to give SailWise an overview on what kind of people are participating on their holidays. If it appears that a group is not participating (e.g. youngsters), SailWise can focus on promoting their holidays to this group more extended.

## 2.4 Procedure

### Digital or hard copy

When conducting this survey, it is highly recommended to use a computer-assisted self-administered interview technique. Which means that the participants do get an email with the link to the form and they can digitally fill it out. This has several advantages for researchers according to Hart, Boeije and Hox (2005):

- *the velocity*, the answers of the questions are directly digital and can be analysed immediately.
- *to avoid mistakes*, the questions are on a screen, so they have to be answered one by one, the interviewee has to answer each question before continuing with the next question. This guarantees that there are no questions overlooked
- *conducting inspections*; The computer program is developed to check whether the answers an interviewee gives, are consistent. For example; a five year old child cannot be married.
- *Cheaper, better for the environment*; printing all the copies costs a lot of paper. And postage costs a lot of money.

It also has an advantage for the interviewee, since they do not have to go to the post office to hand in the evaluation form. It is easier accessible and it does not get lost, which could happen with a hard copy of an evaluation form.

Conducting an online evaluation also has disadvantages which have to be taken into account. In the case of SailWise there are also participants with a mental or a visual disability. For those people it is less easy to get access to an online form. That is why people should also get the opportunity to get the form by post or in a Word file. Since the majority of the participants of SailWise have a physical disability, they will be able to fill in the digital form. The minority which has problems with filling out the form can send an email to SailWise, which is explicitly stated in the introduction of the evaluation form, and receive the form in a way which is accessible for them. Those answers ask for extra time

from the researchers because they have to adapt these answers manually. As it became clear from the high response rate of the previous evaluation forms of SailWise, this is assumed to be a small category of all the participants, so it will be manageable.

Since SailWise has an account at Survey Monkey, this seems to be a suitable option for conducting the evaluations.

### Moment

There is no scientific evidence for the perfect moment of sending the link with the evaluation form. However, it is wise to send the form soon after the activities, so the participants have their experiences fresh in mind. To achieve a high response rate (70-80%) the survey needs to be online for about ten days. This period of time includes one workweek with two weekends. Researchers have found that most respondents complete their surveys over the weekend (Schonlau, Fricker & Elliot 2002).

### Analysis

When the participants have filled in the digital forms, the results can be analysed. This can be done when the summer season of 2015 is finished. The analysis of the data can be done by any person. Preferably by a person who has no specific interest in a positive outcome. Because this appears to be more valuable than if an employee of SailWise finds a positive outcome. It is recommended to hire another ACT team to do this analysis. Students are relatively cheap and have easy access to the knowledge of the Wageningen University. It also spares SailWise time if they do not have to do the analysis by themselves. To make it possible to compare the results of the evaluations across years, it is important that this evaluation form remains the same for several years.

## 3. Discussion

---

As discussed in the ACT report the key features of a good evaluation tool are the reliability, validity, comparability, replicability, transferability, credibility, practicality. The key features which were threatened in the old evaluation forms, according to the review of the ACT team, are taken into account in this study. The intention of adapting the evaluation forms, is to overcome these threatened key features, to make sure the evaluation forms are valuable for a longer period of time. In this chapter those features are discussed, first in italic the points of the ACT team and after the indentation a part about how this is solved.

### Inter-tester reliability

*It became clear from the ACT report that the inter-tester reliability of the old evaluation forms was threatened. This was due to different answer categories for the same question throughout the years, which could cause different conclusions by different evaluators. Also the Likert scale which was used for the questions were not matching all the questions. There were questions which required a simple yes/no, however the answer category was a scale.*

These points have been taken care of by implementing the semantic differential technique. The answer category now matches the questions. Also this evaluation forms are meant to use several years in a row. So when analysing the data there will not be a difference (e.g. in question numbers) which could cause confusion.

### Face validity

*With regard to face validity, the tool serves the goal of evaluation as it allows SailWise to get input from their participants on what they would like to see improved. SailWise spreads their evaluation forms digitally by using Survey Monkey. This makes it easier for the participants to fill out the forms. However, digital forms may be a problem for the older or mentally disabled participants which may result in the fact that they do not fill out the form or do not fully understand how to fill it out well.*

These points have been considered during the development of the procedure. Participants receive an email with the question if they would like to fill out the evaluation form and the link to this online form. This email contains information about why it is important to fill out this form, but also if they are having problems with completing this form (e.g. because of the digital format), they can contact SailWise. Then SailWise can send them the evaluation form in a word document or hard copy by post, dependent on the nature of the problem.

### Content validity

*As for content validity, the content (satisfaction and improvements) is measured according to questions about for example hygiene and how the participants felt on board. Also throughout the years, these questions and scales have been changed. The questions did not measure what SailWise really wanted to measure.*

This point has been taken care of, by interviewing the director of SailWise and using the interviews with the employees of the ACT group. This has been done in order to make sure that both SailWise and my own interpretation were at the same level. To verify that with this form we will measure what needs to be measured.

### Predictive validity

*As the evaluation can be conducted under different conditions its predictive validity is good. This means that people who joined different activities from SailWise can fill out the same evaluation form. Also, organizations that are similar to SailWise, such as Sailability, might be able to use the form for their participants, since the questions are quite general.*

### Comparability

*The evaluation system was found not to be comparable. As stated by Hughes and Niewenhuis (2005), comparable reports are particularly important if the project is trying to compare performance across years. Comparable outcomes are furthermore valuable because it serves as a basis to make changes in the processes and activities of the organization. Since the evaluation system used by SailWise was not consistent and varied from year to year, it was found not to be comparable.*

This problem can be solved if the evaluation form remains the same for several years. Since the other features are taken care of, this should be possible.

### Credibility

*The evaluation system was found not credible due to the inconsistencies in its structure. The forms may create room for doubts and questioning from stakeholders, for example about the progress and contributions of the project to the participants. Hughes and Niewenhuis (2005) suggest that if one group of stakeholders (1) questions the rigour of the evaluation process, (2) doubts the outcome of the evaluation report, or (3) challenges its validity, then the evaluation system loses credibility and is not worth using it.*

This is an important point made. The structure is now consistent and logically so there is not much space for doubts or questioning of the stakeholders.

#### Practicality

*On the practicality of the evaluation system it was found that the evaluations were not practical in terms of length of questions and time needed to complete it. The ambiguity in some of the questions was seen as a hindrance for the participants to practically complete the evaluation form without needing assistance.*

In the adapted evaluation form, there are some questions removed and the questions are stated differently to reduce the ambiguity. After letting several persons of my own social network (N=10) filling out the evaluation form, it can be concluded that the ambiguity is reduced. The questions are understandable and it is possible to complete the form within 15 minutes.

## 4. Conclusion

---

The main purpose of this study was: to provide SailWise with a reliable and valid evaluation form to measure the added value of SailWise's water sport activities.

The questions of the evaluation forms of SailWise which were used in 2014, were a good basis to work on. With help from the review of the ACT team and interviews with employees of SailWise comparing with the literature, the questions could be reformulated in a more scientific and coherent manner. The semantic differential scale appears to be an appropriate technique to get rid of several internal issues. To let people also free in their answering, which fits perfectly with SailWise, the freedom, there are also some open questions, which are more difficult to analyze, but very valuable for further research. Also several questions have been taken out and other questions, mostly related to the added value are combined. This results in a valuable evaluation form, which is presented in appendix 1.

When SailWise will use this evaluation form for several years, the inconsistencies between the years will be removed. When the data of a few years is available, a scientific analysis with the use of for example SPSS can be done, which will lead to a valid conclusion for the areas for improvements and the measurement of the added value of the water sport activities.

## Bibliografie

---

- Antonovsky, A. (1993). The structure and properties of the sense of coherence scale. *Social Science & Medicine*, 36 (6), 725-733.
- Ciabuca, A. (2015). The development of a Semantic Differential Scale for assessing the perceived image of citizens about Romanian Police Forces. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 187, 28-33.
- Friborg, O., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J. H. (2006). Likert-based vs. semantic differential-based scorings of positive psychological constructs: A psychometric comparison of two versions of a scale measuring resilience. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 873-884.
- Hughes, J. & Niewenhuis, L. (2005). *A project manager's guide to evaluation: Evaluate Europe handbook series volume 1*. Bremen, Germany: Perspektiven-Offset-Druck.
- Hart, 't, H., Boeije, H., Hox, J. (2005). *Onderzoeksmethoden*. Den Haag: Boom onderwijs pp. 224-252.
- Kang, J., Zhang, M. (2010). Sementic differential analysis of the soundscape in urban open public spaces. *Building and Environment* (45) 1, 150-157.
- Lavrakas, P.J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. London: Sage pp. 427-429.
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G. J., Tannenbaum, P. H. (1967). *The measurement of meaning* Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Oxford reference. (2015a). *Central tendency bias*. Retrieved at July 20 via <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095558737>.
- Oxford reference. (2015b). *Acquiescence bias*. Retrieved at July 20 via <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803095347972>.
- Ryan, C., Garland, R. (1999). The use of a specific non-response option on Likert-type scales. *Tourism management*, 20, 107-113.
- Schonlau, M., Fricker, R.D., Elliot, M.N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Shapiro, J. (2011). *Monitoring and Evaluation*. Retrieved at July 10, via <http://www.civicus.org/new/media/Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation.pdf>.

# Appendix 1

---

Enkhuizen, zomer 2015

Hallo Watersporter,

Je bent dit seizoen met SailWise op vakantie geweest en we hopen dat alles naar wens is geweest. Omdat we streven naar het best mogelijke aanbod, is jouw feedback erg belangrijk. Zo kunnen de gasten van SailWise volgend jaar een nóg mooiere vakantie beleven. Wij zouden het daarom erg op prijs stellen als je bijgaande enquête wilt invullen. De enquête bestaat uit 25 vragen, afwisselend open en gesloten, over jouw beleving van de vakantie. Het invullen duurt ongeveer 15 minuten. De enquête is volledig anoniem.

Mocht je moeite hebben met het invullen van de enquête via deze link, neem dan even contact met ons op via de mail, zodat wij je hiermee verder kunnen helpen.

We willen je alvast bedanken voor je tijd om de enquête in te vullen en hopen je volgend jaar weer te mogen ontvangen op één van onze locaties!

Met hartelijke groet,

Namens SailWise,

Marketing & Communicatie  
Geeske Meems  
g.meems@sailwise.nl

p.s.

Ben je meerdere keren op vakantie geweest op verschillende locaties? Wil je de enquête dan twee keer invullen? Dit kan door opnieuw op de link te klikken en de enquête opnieuw in te vullen.

Als eerste is een aantal vragen over de accommodatie, de activiteiten en de begeleiding. Bij de eerste drie vragen worden telkens twee begrippen tegenover elkaar gezet.

Wanneer je 0 kiest, is dit neutraal, het cijfer 1 staat voor een beetje en 2 voor helemaal.

Bijvoorbeeld bij vraag 1.1; waren je verwachtingen helemaal juist, dan kies je de meest rechter 2 en helemaal onjuist kies je de linker 2. Zit het er tussenin dan kies je een 1, afhankelijk van of je het meer bij juist of onjuist vindt passen. Aan jou willen we vragen welk begrip je het beste vindt passen bij de vraag.

## 1. De watersportactiviteiten

### 1.1 Mijn verwachtingen van de watersportactiviteiten waren;

Onjuist            2            1            0            1            2            juist

### 1.2 De mogelijkheid om deel te nemen aan het programma was voor mij;

Slecht            2            1            0            1            2            heel goed

### 1.3 Voor mij/mijn beperking zijn de aanpassingen van het vaarmateriaal;

Slecht            2            1            0            1            2            heel goed

### 1.4 Tijdens de watersportactiviteiten voelde ik mij;

Onveilig           2            1            0            1            2            veilig

### 1.5 Ik heb het gevoel dat mijn zelfvertrouwen door de watersportactiviteiten is;

Gedaald           2            1            0            1            2            Gestegen

### 1.6 Voor het overwinnen van barrières ten aanzien van mijn beperking, waren de activiteiten van SailWise;

Zinloos            2            1            0            1            2            Zinvol

### 1.7 Het gezelschap (deelnemers) wat mee was met de activiteiten was;

Onaangenaam    2            1            0            1            2            Aangenaam

### 1.8 Door de activiteiten van SailWise heb ik nieuwe sociale contacten opgedaan/lotgenoten leren kennen, dit was voor mij;

Waardeloos      2            1            0            1            2            waardevol

## 2. De accommodatie

### 2.1 De verwachtingen die ik had van de accommodatie waren;

Onjuist            2            1            0            1            2            juist

### 2.2 Voor mij/mijn beperking zijn de aanpassingen van de accommodatie;

Slecht            2            1            0            1            2            heel goed

### 2.3 De hygiëne van de faciliteiten op de accommodatie was;

Slecht            2            1            0            1            2            goed

### 2.4 Het eten tijdens de vakantie was

Slecht            2            1            0            1            2            goed

## 3. De begeleiding

**3.1 De begeleiding van de bemanning heb ik ervaren als**

Onprettig    2       1       0       1       2       prettig

**3.2 De houding van de bemanning was gedurende de activiteiten;**

Onverschillig    2       1       0       1       2       betrokken

**3.3 Wanneer ik vragen of wensen aan de bemanning stelde, voelde ik me**

Oncomfortabel    2       1       0       1       2       comfortabel

**3.4 De vrijheid die ik van de bemanning kreeg tijdens de activiteiten om actief deel te nemen, was;**

Te weinig       2       1       0       1       2       te veel

**3.5 De zeil- en vaar instructies die ik van de bemanning kreeg, waren**

Onduidelijk    2       1       0       1       2       duidelijk

**3.6 Gedurende de vakantie voelde ik mij ten opzichte van de bemanning**

Ongelijkwaardig    2       1       0       1       2       gelijkwaardig

**3.7 Ben je tevreden over de assistentie bij de algemene dagelijkse verzorging?**

Ja

Niet van toepassing, ik verzorg mezelf

Nee

Omdat,

**4. Wat vond je het leukst tijdens de vakantie? (open vraag)**

**5. Wat vond je minder leuk tijdens de vakantie? (open vraag)**

**6. Wat kan er verbeterd worden? (open vraag)**

Nu volgt er een aantal vragen omtrent de boekingsprocedure.

**7. Wie heeft je vakantie uitgekozen**

Ikzelf

Mijn partner

Mijn ouders

Mijn begeleiding

Anders, namelijk

**8. Wie heeft je vakantie geboekt?**

Ikzelf

Mijn partner

Mijn ouders

Mijn begeleiding

Anders, namelijk

**9. Hoe boek je het liefst je vakantie?**

Telefonisch

Per post

Mail

Via de website

Anders, namelijk

**10. Heb je je individueel ingeschreven of ben je met een groep mee geweest?**

Individueel

Groep

**11. Heb je de vakantie met behulp van een externe financier betaald?**

Nee, ik heb de vakantie volledig zelf betaald

Ja, met hulp van persoonsgebonden budget

Ja, met hulp van mijn ouders

Ja, met hulp van sponsoractiviteiten

Anders, namelijk

Nu volgt er een aantal vragen over het gebruik van sociale media en internet.

**12. Hoe vaak gebruik je het internet?**

Meer dan 1x per week

1x per week

1x per maand

Minder dan 1x per maand

Nooit

**13. Hoe actief ben je op de volgende kanalen? (aanvinken wat van toepassing is)**

	Meer dan 1x per week	1x per week	1x per maand	Minder dan 1x per maand	nooit
Facebook					
Twitter					
YouTube					
LinkedIn					

**14. Kijk je wel eens op de Facebook, Twitter, LinkedInpagina of het YouTube kanaal van SailWise?**

Nooit

1x per week

Alleen als er een bericht op mijn startpagina komt

Iedere dag

1x per maand

Minder dan 1x per maand

**15. Op welke manier zou je het liefst op de hoogte willen worden gehouden van SailWise?**

E-mail

Website

Sociale media ( Facebook, Twitter)

De post

Als laatste volgt er nog een aantal algemene vragen.

**16. Wat is je geslacht?**

Man

Vrouw

**17. Wat is je leeftijd?**

Tussen 16 – 26 jaar

Tussen 27 – 40 jaar

Tussen 41- 55 jaar

Ouder dan 56 jaar

**18. Wat voor type beperking heb je? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)**

Lichamelijk

Zintuigelijk

Verstandelijk

Niet aangeboren hersenletsel

Chronische ziekte

Meervoudig

**19. In hoeverre heeft je beperking invloed op activiteiten van het dagelijks leven (ADL).**

Weinig, ik kan alles zelfstandig.

Matig, ik heb hulp nodig bij bepaalde activiteiten van de ADL, maar kan ook veel zelf.

Veel, ik heb intensieve hulp nodig bij de ADL.

**20. Hoe ben je met SailWise in contact gekomen?**

Zoekmachine (bijvoorbeeld [www.google.nl](http://www.google.nl))

Via de website [www.sailwise.nl](http://www.sailwise.nl)

Kennis/familie/begeleider

Folder van SailWise

Sociale media (bijvoorbeeld Facebook of Twitter)

Beurzen

Blauwe gids

Ik weet het niet meer

**21. Op welke accommodatie ben je dit jaar geweest?**

Beatrix

Lutgardina

Robinson Crusoe

**22. Hoeveel keer ben je in totaal met SailWise op watersport vakantie geweest?**

1 keer

2 keer

3 keer

4 keer

5 keer of meer

**23. Wat voor cijfer zou je SailWise geven?**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Omdat,

**24. Ben je van plan om in de toekomst weer een watersport vakantie bij SailWise te boeken?**

Ja

Nee

Weet ik nog niet

Omdat,

**25. Mogen wij je benaderen naar aanleiding van deze vragenlijst, indien wij nog aanvullende vragen hebben?**

Ja

Nee

**Zou je hier dan je gegevens achter willen laten? (N.B. de gegevens van de enquête worden niet aan je naam gekoppeld)**

Naam:

Adres:

Plaats:

Postcode:

Emailadres:

Telefoonnummer:

Dit is het einde van deze vragenlijst. Door op de knop gereed te drukken, wordt de enquête naar ons verstuurd. Wij stellen het zeer op prijs dat je deze hebt ingevuld. Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking.

Met vriendelijke groet,

SailWise

p.s. Mocht je nog vragen of onduidelijkheden hebben met betrekking tot deze enquête, neem dan contact op met SailWise via [g.meems@sailwise.nl](mailto:g.meems@sailwise.nl)