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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.2 Table 9: Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Social Perspectives** | | | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | Points of Agreement | | Points of Disagreement | |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief   * Inclusive participation [S&C:S31] is considered as valid [S&C:S16] with general representation [S&C:S32].   Secondary Belief   * 1. Public participation does not necessarily require consensus made decisions [S&C:S25]. | Consensus Statements across factors:  [S&C:S21] Adequate assistance was provided to vulnerable and disadvantaged persons to enable them to participate effectively.  [F1 0; F2 0; F3 -1; F4 0; F5 -1] | | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [S&C:S35] Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important – ie. what I am able to do to influence and control my environment. 2. [S&C:S13] Participants did not attend meetings regularly. 3. [S&C:S2] Constructive collaboration among participants was established. 4. [S&C:S26] Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda. 5. [S&C:S30] The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [S&C:S32] Some affected parties could not participate for reasons that could have been overcome. 2. [S&C:S14] Participants should be able to deal with complex technical issues. 3. [S&C:S15] Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best. 4. [S&C:S31] The process did not exclude those less able to articulate their opinion. | |
| Factor 2:  Core Belief   1. Knowledge can be manipulated [S&C:S26] and used to control discussions and/or the process [S&C:S15].   Secondary Belief   1. Economic concerns [S&C:S28] override environmental intergenerational agendas [S&C:S30]. |
| Factor 3:  Core Belief   1. Constructive collaboration [S&C:S2] and collaborative learning [S&C:S23] within shared power moments [S&C:S23] that allowed for improved understanding of others beliefs and values [S&C:S22] promoted a sense of accountability and sincerity [S&C:S3].   Secondary Belief   1. Consistently high participant turn out [S&C:S13]. 2. Participants trust the technical teams decisions and solutions [S&C:S14]. |
| Factor 4:  Core Belief   * Despite valid group representation [S&C:S16] irregular attendance [S&C:S13] of individual participants is coupled with the exclusion of those less able to articulate their opinions [S&C:S31].   Secondary Belief:   * Strong faith that knowledge is not being manipulated [S&C:S26]. * Social concerns are fore grounded [S&C:S27] by participants. * Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [S&C:S35]. |
| Factor 5:  Core Belief   * Discussions were not controlled by those who understood the process best [S&C:S15] yet more capacitating could have been done to develop participants understanding of the project [S&C:S19] and to be able to deal with complex and technical issues [S&C:S14].   Secondary Belief   * Irregular attendance [S&C:S13] coupled with lack of constructive collaboration [S&C:S2]. * Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [S&C:S35]. |
| **5.3 Table 10: Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Social Perspectives** | | | | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | | Points of Agreement | | Points of disagreement | |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief:   * Public participation does provide a potential platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [S&C:S35], yet most participants do not consider the composite nor intergenerational aspects of the environment [S&C:S29].   Secondary Belief:   * Transparency, trust [S&C:S5] and ideal role taking [S&C:S4] did not occur. * Democratic decision making is not always appropriate [S&C:S25]. * Participation decreased with time [S&C:S17]. | | Consensus Statements across factors:  [S&C:S20] Adequate opportunity was given to develop the participants’ skills and capacity necessary for achieving equal participation.  [F1 -3; F2 -2; F3 -2; F4 -1; F5 -3] | | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [S&C:S34] Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment. 2. [S&C:S11] Some participants do not see beyond their individual interests to what is good for the larger community. 3. [S&C:S27] Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants. 4. [S&C:S29] Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants. 5. [S&C:S17] Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [S&C:S35] Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important – i.e. what I am able to do to influence and control my environment. 2. [S&C:S5]It is difficult to build trust among the different participants during the process. 3. [S&C:S30] The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants. 4. [S&C:S28] Mainly the economic issues are considered by the participants. | |
| Factor 2:  Core Belief:   * Ideal role taking is hampered by participants not seeing beyond their individual (environmental [S&C:S29]) interests to understand the social needs [S&C:S27] of the community [S&C:S11].   Secondary Belief:   * A disconnect between the substantive outcomes of public participation [S&C:S19; S&C:S6; S&C:S7] and the agendas of the conflicting stakeholder agendas [S&C:S11]. | |
| Factor 3:  Core Belief:   * The economic concerns of the developer [S&C:S11; S&C:S4; S&C:S3] did not allow for transparency [S&C:S15] and the ideal role taking accommodation of stakeholder interests [S&C:S28; S&C:S4; S&C:S3].   Secondary Belief:   * Lack of power neutrality [S&C:S11; S&C:S4; S&C:S3; S&C:S28] hindered the understanding others beliefs and values [S&C:S22]. * Participation decreased with time [S&C:S17]. | |
| Factor 4:  Core Belief:   * The sustainability of democratic control of the environment [S&C:S34] is restricted by the following:   + Difficulty in building trust amongst participants [S&C:S5].   + Educated participants’ manipulation of knowledge [S&C:S26].   + Participants not considering the composite and intergenerational aspects of the environment [S&C:S30]. | |
| Factor 5:  Core Belief:   * The economic considerations [S&C:S28] did not allow for some participants to see beyond their individual interests [S&C:S11] to the social [S&C:S4] needs of the community.   Secondary Belief:   * Participants are not good ideal role takers [S&C:S10]. * Power neutrality in deliberations compromised for those less able to articulate their opinion [S&C:S31]. | |
| **5.4 Table 11: DEA&DP staff ‘Skills and Capacities’ Social Perspectives** | | | | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | Points of Agreement | | Points of disagreement | | |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief:   * The process is controlled [S&C:S15] and manipulated [S&C:S26] by those with process knowledge [S&C:S15] and higher education levels [S&C:S26] and excludes those unable to articulate their opinion [S&C:S31].   Secondary Belief:   * The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are not considered by all the participants [S&C:S30]. | Consensus Statements across factors:  [S&C:S29] Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants.  [F1 -3; F2 -3; F3 -2]  [S&C:S35] Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important – i.e. what I am able to do to influence and control my environment.  [F1 1; F2 2; F3 3] | | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [S&C:S15] Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best. 2. [S&C:S27] Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants. 3. [S&C:S30] The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants. 4. [S&C:S24] Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholders’ knowledge. 5. [S&C:S22] The process does not improve participants’ understandings of others’ beliefs, values, and perspectives.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [S&C:S11] Some participants do not see beyond their individual interests to what is good for the larger community. 2. [S&C:S34] Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment. 3. [S&C:S26] Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda. 4. [S&C:S28] Mainly the economic are considered by the participants. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.5 Table 12: Main Road ‘Process’ Social Perspectives** | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | Points of Agreement | Points of disagreement |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief:   * Generality [Pr:S23], Power Neutrality [Pr:S6] and Autonomy [Pr:S3] in deliberation occurred without instances of manipulation [Pr:S37] or placation [Pr:S48] of the participants.   Secondary Belief:   * The best available science [Pr:S18] was used. * Although tiresome [Pr:S4] the process did not unnecessarily slow down the development [Pr:S13]. | Consensus Statements across factors:  [Pr:S19] Uncertainties were acknowledged and explored.  [F1 +1; F2 +2; F3 +2; F4 +3]  [Pr:S41] Negotiation and trade-offs were not possible for all stakeholders.  [F1 -3; F2 0; F3 -1; F4 -1]  [Pr:S43] Citizens made decisions with more influence than the developer.  [F1 0; F2 -3; F3 -2; F4 -3] | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [Pr:S45] No participation is allowed in the formal decision-making process or even considered. 2. [Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation. 3. [Pr:S11] The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people. 4. [Pr:S2] There are clear ground rules that govern how people should interact. 5. [Pr:S36] The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [Pr:S37] The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input. 2. [Pr:S33] The outcomes are personally desirable to me (…or my organization or the interest group I am representing). 3. [Pr:S23] All important stakeholders are taking part in the process. 4. [Pr:S31] One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promise. |
| Factor 2:  Core Belief:   * Time extensions [Pr:S14] allowed for citizen acceptance of developer solutions [Pr:S49].   Secondary Belief:   * Process challenged on grounds of elements of manipulation [Pr:S37], exclusion [Pr:S20] and inequality of power to participate [Pr:S21] for participants. * Generality [Pr:S6] alone does not necessarily result in equitably distributed costs, remedies and benefits [Pr:S32]. |
| Factor 3:  Core Belief:   * Unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] is imperative to providing the ideal atmosphere [Pr:S1; Pr:S36], administrative support [Pr:S15] and substance of deliberation [Pr:S31; Pr:S11; Pr:S35; Pr:S36].   Secondary Belief:   * Involvement of the local community [Pr:S11] reinforces the exclusion of bullying [Pr:S36] and manipulation [Pr:S37; Pr:S45] of the project. |
| Factor 4:  Core Belief:   * Unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] enabled generality [Pr:S6] and autonomy [Pr:S11] despite the absence of clear ground rules that govern how people interact [Pr:S2].   Secondary Belief:   * Citizen power is undefined yet excludes notions of bullying [Pr:S36] manipulation [Pr:S37] and informing [Pr:S45; Pr:S46]. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.6 Table 13: Saldanha ‘Process’ Social Perspectives** | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | Points of Agreement | Points of disagreement |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief:   * Unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] aided the quality of analysis [Pr:S27; Pr:S5] and the substance of deliberation [Pr:S31].   Secondary Belief:   * Citizen power is considered to be no lower than consultation [Pr:S24; Pr:S36; Pr:S37; Pr:S45]. | Consensus Statements across factors:  [Pr:S3] The discussion format allowed inclusive participation.  [F1 0; F2 0; F3 +1; F4 +2; F5 -1]  [Pr:S28] The developer responds in a timely way to all questions, comments, and requests.  [F1 -1; F2 +1; F3 +1; F4 0; F5 +2]  [Pr:S50] Participants shared planning and decision making responsibilities with the developer.  [F1 -2; F2 -3; F3 -1; F4 -1; F5 -3] | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation. 2. [Pr:S27] Every recommendation is justified with evidence. 3. [Pr:S46] Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation. 4. [Pr:S1] Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings. 5. [Pr:S22] The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [Pr:S48] Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval. 2. [Pr:S24] The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decision. 3. [Pr:S32] Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably. 4. [Pr:S33] The outcomes are personally desirable to me (…or my organization or the interest group I am representing). 5. [Pr:S36] The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input. |
| Factor 2:  Core Belief:   * Unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] is imperative to providing the ideal atmosphere [Pr:S1] and enabled superficial generality [Pr:S6 qualified by Pr:S21] in deliberation.   Secondary Belief:   * Citizen power is considered to be reduced to tokenism [Pr:S48] and manipulation [Pr:S47], limited generality [Pr:S21] with a lack of both power neutrality in deliberation [Pr:S22] and support from the community [Pr:S34]. |
| Factor 3:  Core Belief:   * Public participation is a top down initiative [Pr:S38] with placative feedback and negotiation [Pr:S34; Pr:S35] restricted by limited generality [Pr:S6] ownership [Pr:S35] and token citizen power [Pr:S38].   Secondary Belief:   * Citizen power is restricted but not considered to be manipulative [Pr:S47]. |
| Factor 4:  Core Belief:   * Citizen power considered as Consultation and Placation [Pr:S40; Pr:S44; Pr:S50; Pr:S24].   Secondary Belief:   * The validity of the decisions regarding the accountability of the developer [Pr:S31; Pr:S24] and evidence given [Pr:S27] is challenged by lack of power neutrality [Pr:S21; Pr:S16; Pr:S17] in the quality of analysis. |
| Factor 5:  Core Belief:   * Developer accountability is of paramount importance [Pr:S32; Pr:S31].   Secondary Belief:   * Evidence for decisions questioned [Pr:S27]. * Citizen power is limited in generality [Pr:S22] and no significant participation occurred [Pr:S46; Pr:S38]. * Independence of the EAP seen as impossible yet not a necessary requirement [Pr:S8]. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.7 DEA&DP Staff: Process** | | |
| Factor Description (Social Perspectives) | Points of Agreement | Points of disagreement |
| Factor 1:  Core Belief:   * The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [Pr:S1]. * Although an outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises [Pr:S31], the costs, remedies and benefits of the development are not distributed equitably [Pr:S32].   Secondary Belief:   * Generality must not be limited [Pr:S22] but the topics of discussion must be limited [Pr:S7]. * Citizen power in decision making above non-participation [Pr:S48] and manipulation [Pr:S36] but below delegated power [Pr:S51]. | Consensus Statements across factors:  [Pr:S1] Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings.  [F1 +5; F2 +5]  [Pr:S7] The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order to avoid getting too bogged down.  [F1 +4; F2 +3]  [Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation.  [F1 +5; F2 +5]  [Pr:S31] One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises.  [F1 +4; F2 +3]  [Pr:S32] Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably.  [F1 -5; F2 -5]  [Pr:S50] Participants shared planning and decision making responsibilities with the developer.  [F1 -2; F2 -4]  [Pr:S51] Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making.  [F1 -4; F2 -4] | Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4 ] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):  Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement   1. [Pr:S22] The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way. 2. [Pr:S16] Participants are involved in deciding what studies should be done. 3. [Pr:S17] Participants are involved in deciding how studies should be done. 4. [Pr:S48] Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval. 5. [Pr:S24] The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions.   Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)   1. [Pr:S40] Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to. 2. [Pr:S39] Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to. 3. [Pr:S42] Citizens were delegated decision making power above what the developer liked. |
| Factor 2:  Core Belief:   * The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [Pr:S1].   Secondary Belief:   * Citizen power in decision making above informing [Pr:S39] and consultation [Pr:S4] but below partnership [Pr:S50] and delegated power [Pr:S51]. * The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people [Pr:S11]. * Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are not distributed equitably [Pr:S32]. |

### **9.4 QAnalyze Results Appendices**

##### Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’**

**Correlation Matrix between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17**

1 1MRBV 100 25 22 34 10 16 13 35 27 34 27 33 41 32 48 43 20

2 2MRBS 25 100 28 50 21 48 18 14 49 41 20 40 39 37 24 30 10

3 3MRDD 22 28 100 34 38 3 31 46 46 50 55 39 50 -17 -10 49 -4

4 4MRDSF 34 50 34 100 7 38 35 58 46 60 35 47 57 27 36 20 26

5 5MRFP 10 21 38 7 100 -14 21 30 12 40 16 3 2 -5 -5 24 -18

6 6MRGM 16 48 3 38 -14 100 4 19 41 31 9 35 41 38 30 27 41

7 7MRHM 13 18 31 35 21 4 100 42 27 50 38 19 20 12 7 24 7

8 8MRIM 35 14 46 58 30 19 42 100 37 55 28 24 60 5 37 22 23

9 9MRJH 27 49 46 46 12 41 27 37 100 49 55 76 68 35 34 52 39

10 10MRJC 34 41 50 60 40 31 50 55 49 100 32 48 49 27 32 39 25

11 11MRLA 27 20 55 35 16 9 38 28 55 32 100 65 41 32 10 53 10

12 12MRMJ 33 40 39 47 3 35 19 24 76 48 65 100 56 40 43 54 40

13 13MRMB 41 39 50 57 2 41 20 60 68 49 41 56 100 20 44 49 45

14 14MRPD 32 37 -17 27 -5 38 12 5 35 27 32 40 20 100 56 36 42

15 15SLCMRS 48 24 -10 36 -5 30 7 37 34 32 10 43 44 56 100 26 60

16 16MRTT 43 30 49 20 24 27 24 22 52 39 53 54 49 36 26 100 30

17 17MRVM 20 10 -4 26 -18 41 7 23 39 25 10 40 45 42 60 30 100

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_8\_\_**

1 1MRBV 0.5412 -0.1015 0.1146 -0.4004 0.2399 -0.3690 -0.4417 0.2296

2 2MRBS 0.5778 -0.0480 -0.0325 0.6161 0.2932 -0.1811 -0.1447 -0.0270

3 3MRDD 0.5566 0.6622 -0.1539 -0.0089 -0.2212 -0.1824 0.0221 0.0661

4 4MRDSF 0.7111 0.0270 0.3555 0.2482 -0.1088 0.1129 -0.3187 -0.1441

5 5MRFP 0.2249 0.5937 0.1216 -0.0034 0.5127 -0.2506 0.3747 -0.2139

6 6MRGM 0.5029 -0.4313 0.0393 0.4996 -0.0991 -0.0761 0.1407 0.3545

7 7MRHM 0.4352 0.3770 0.2283 -0.0479 0.1531 0.6456 0.0073 0.2903

8 8MRIM 0.6163 0.2732 0.5536 -0.1952 -0.2071 -0.0167 0.0173 -0.0309

9 9MRJH 0.8044 -0.0089 -0.2772 0.1333 -0.1675 0.0238 0.1089 -0.1708

10 10MRJC 0.7391 0.2491 0.2945 0.1027 0.1690 0.0764 0.1548 -0.0079

11 11MRLA 0.6252 0.2812 -0.4850 -0.1880 -0.0283 0.2811 -0.1946 -0.0822

12 12MRMJ 0.7775 -0.1026 -0.3902 -0.0036 -0.1039 0.0750 -0.0393 -0.2730

13 13MRMB 0.7963 -0.0295 0.0739 -0.0323 -0.3995 -0.2025 -0.0046 0.0265

14 14MRPD 0.4932 -0.5410 -0.1436 -0.0381 0.4907 0.2273 -0.0434 -0.0399

15 15SLCMRS 0.5585 -0.5588 0.2746 -0.3176 0.1453 -0.0705 0.0187 -0.2105

16 16MRTT 0.6626 0.0848 -0.4166 -0.2307 0.1499 -0.1720 0.1869 0.3509

17 17MRVM 0.4915 -0.5713 0.0988 -0.2200 -0.2019 0.0862 0.4253 0.0204

Eigenvalues 6.3735 2.2984 1.3750 1.1603 1.0963 0.9264 0.7720 0.6159

% expl.Var 37 14 8 7 6 5 5 4

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Matrix with an**

**X Indicating a Defining Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2 3 4 5

1 1MRBV -0.0666 0.2689 0.2346 -0.8779X 0.0224

2 2MRBS -0.2722 0.2465 0.0629 -0.0782 -0.1563

3 3MRDD 0.2735 0.1579 0.5001 -0.0821 -0.5083

4 4MRDSF -0.2711 0.2473 0.5770X -0.1294 -0.1866

5 5MRFP 0.7735X 0.0552 0.1016 -0.0253 0.0644

6 6MRGM -0.6329X 0.3904 0.1618 0.1158 0.1905

7 7MRHM 0.0667 0.2192 0.2093 -0.0036 -0.0258

8 8MRIM 0.1456 0.2052 0.8197X -0.1639 0.0686

9 9MRJH -0.0861 0.6889X 0.3062 0.0840 -0.3878

10 10MRJC 0.1510 0.4105 0.4659 -0.0537 0.0325

11 11MRLA 0.1052 0.5353 0.0611 -0.1740 -0.6627X

12 12MRMJ -0.0799 0.7448X 0.1716 -0.0426 -0.4768

13 13MRMB -0.1991 0.4999 0.6755X -0.1371 -0.1881

14 14MRPD -0.2061 0.6880X -0.3131 -0.2495 0.1494

15 15SLCMRS -0.0875 0.6305 0.2421 -0.3289 0.3411

16 16MRTT 0.0951 0.6533 0.0305 -0.3263 -0.1528

17 17MRVM -0.2077 0.7388X 0.2566 0.1138 0.3713

% expl.Var. 8 24 14 7 9

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Correlations Between**

**Factor Scores**

1 2 3 4 5

1 1.0000 -0.2529 0.0232 -0.0075 -0.0932

2 -0.2529 1.0000 0.4768 -0.3623 -0.5247

3 0.0232 0.4768 1.0000 -0.4189 -0.3797

4 -0.0075 -0.3623 -0.4189 1.0000 0.2714

5 -0.0932 -0.5247 -0.3797 0.2714 1.0000

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their members regular 16 1.759

31 The process did not exclude those less able to articulate 31 1.727

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA PP 36 1.606

30 The social, economic and environmental needs of current and 30 1.574

1 Participants were courteous and respectful of other stake 1 1.508

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

32 Some affected parties could not participate for reasons tha 32 -1.541

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when power is willi 23 -1.574

25 The only valid decision is that which is democratically ag 25 -1.694

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

26 Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate 26 1.827

15 Discussions were controlled by those who understood the pr 15 1.601

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33 The process required literacy levels that were not appropri 33 -1.504

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA PP 36 -1.616

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of others beliefs 22 -1.743

30 The social, economic and environmental needs of current and 30 -2.094

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 3**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

2 Constructive collaboration among participants was est 2 2.099

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when power is willi 23 1.832

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 -1.657

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and technical issues 14 -1.882

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of others beliefs 22 -2.098

M**ain Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 4**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their members regular 16 2.041

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 1.633

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants 27 1.633

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

31 The process did not exclude those less able to articulate 31 -1.633

35 PP better enables me to influence what i consider valuable 35 -1.633

26 Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate 26 -2.041

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 5**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 2.041

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and technical issues 14 1.633

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop the Ps understa 19 1.633

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2 Constructive collaboration among participants was est 2 -1.633

35 PP better enables me to influence what i consider valuable 35 -1.633

15 Discussions were controlled by those who understood the pr 15 -2.041

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

30 The social, economic and environmental nee 30 1.574 -2.094 3.667

36 Understanding democratic rights is not esse 36 1.606 -1.616 3.223

33 The process required literacy levels that w 33 0.743 -1.504 2.247

29 Mainly the environmental needs of present 29 0.896 -1.174 2.070

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically 34 -0.798 1.245 -2.042

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expect 4 -1.049 1.24 -2.289

26 Those with higher education levels are able 26 -0.525 1.827 -2.351

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 1 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and 14 0.525 -1.882 2.407

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of 22 0.033 -2.098 2.130

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expect 4 -1.049 1.285 -2.334

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when 23 -1.574 1.832 -3.406

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 1 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

31 The process did not exclude those less ab 31 1.727 -1.633 3.360

35 PP better enables me to influence what i c 35 1.202 -1.633 2.835

36 Understanding democratic rights is not 36 1.606 -0.816 2.423

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to deve 19 -0.831 1.225 -2.055

25 The only valid decision is that which is 25 -1.694 0.816 -2.510

32 Some affected parties could not partici 32 -1.541 1.225 -2.766

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 1 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

2 Constructive collaboration among participan 2 1.355 -1.633 2.988

35 PP better enables me to influence what i co 35 1.202 -1.633 2.835

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 -0.339 2.041 -2.380

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop 19 -0.831 1.633 -2.464

32 Some affected parties could not participate 32 -1.541 1.225 -2.766

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

26 Those with higher education levels are ab 26 1.827 -0.689 2.515

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[Zero negative statements]

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 2 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

26 Those with higher education levels are able 26 1.827 -2.041 3.868

35 PP better enables me to influence what i con 35 1.187 -1.633 2.820

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically s 34 1.245 -1.225 2.469

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expec 4 1.240 -1.225 2.465

6 P builds peoples faith in government and st 6 1.267 -0.816 2.084

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop 19 -0.811 1.225 -2.035

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their 16 0.005 2.041 -2.037

32 Some affected parties could not participat 32 -0.854 1.225 -2.079

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of 22 -1.743 0.408 -2.151

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 2 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

15 Discussions were controlled by those who und 15 1.601 -2.041 3.642

26 Those with higher education levels are able 26 1.827 -1.225 3.051

35 PP better enables me to influence what i cons 35 1.187 -1.633 2.820

6 P builds peoples faith in government and str 6 1.267 -1.225 2.492

2 Constructive collaboration among participant 2 0.681 -1.633 2.314

24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakehol 24 1.008 -1.225 2.232

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically sha 34 1.245 -0.816 2.061

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

32 Some affected parties could not participate f 32 -0.854 1.225 -2.079

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 -0.268 2.041 -2.310

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and te 14 -0.709 1.633 -2.342

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essent 36 -1.616 0.816 -2.433

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop th 19 -0.811 1.633 -2.444

30 The social, economic and environmental needs 30 -2.094 0.816 -2.910

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 3 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

35 PP better enables me to influence what i con 35 1.372 -1.633 3.005

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when 23 1.832 -0.816 2.649

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expecta 4 1.285 -1.225 2.509

2 Constructive collaboration among participant 2 2.099 -0.408 2.507

6 P builds peoples faith in government and str 6 1.246 -0.816 2.063

31 The process did not exclude those less able 31 0.384 -1.633 2.017

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by th 27 -0.647 1.633 -2.280

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and t 14 -1.882 0.408 -2.290

32 Some affected parties could not participate 32 -1.235 1.225 -2.460

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of 22 -2.098 0.408 -2.506

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 -1.657 1.633 -3.290

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 3 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

2 Constructive collaboration among participants 2 2.099 -1.633 3.732

35 PP better enables me to influence what i cons 35 1.372 -1.633 3.005

6 P builds peoples faith in government and stren 6 1.246 -1.225 2.471

15 Discussions were controlled by those who unde 15 0.214 -2.041 2.255

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of o 22 -2.098 0.000 -2.098

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop t 19 -0.766 1.633 -2.399

32 Some affected parties could not participate f 32 -1.235 1.225 -2.460

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and te 14 -1.882 1.633 -3.515

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 -1.657 2.041 -3.698

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 4 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the 27 1.633 -0.816 2.449

15 Discussions were controlled by those who under 15 0.000 -2.041 2.041

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their me 16 2.041 0.000 2.041

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

31 The process did not exclude those less able t 31 -1.633 1.225 -2.858

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Q-Sort**

**Values for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

1 Participants were courteous and respectful of 1 3 0 2 1 -1

2 Constructive collaboration among participants w 2 3 2 5 -1 -4

3 The Stakeholder interactions promoted a sense 3 0 0 4 0 3

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expectat 4 -3 3 3 -3 0

5 It is difficult to build trust among the di 5 -1 -1 -1 0 2

6 P builds peoples faith in government and stre 6 -1 3 3 -2 -3

7 P does not make any preexisting conflicts wor 7 -2 1 0 -2 1

8 P builds the confidence and self esteem of th 8 0 2 2 -1 -1

9 P helps to create new and lasting interest gr 9 -3 1 1 2 0

10 Ps were good listeners and open minded to con 10 2 0 -1 3 -1

11 Some participants do not see beyond their ind 11 -2 1 0 -3 1

12 Ps had reasonable expectations about what the 12 1 -2 -1 1 -1

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 0 -1 -4 4 5

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and te 14 1 -2 -4 1 4

15 Discussions were controlled by those who unde 15 0 4 1 0 -5

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their me 16 5 0 0 5 0

17 P from different stakeholders increases as th 17 -3 -1 2 -1 1

18 To take part effectively Ps need skills like 18 -1 -3 0 0 1

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop t 19 -2 -2 -2 3 4

20 Adequate opportunity was given to develp Ps s 20 0 -1 1 2 0

21 Adequate assistance was provided to vulnerable 21 0 0 -1 0 -1

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of o 22 1 -4 -5 1 0

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when 23 -4 1 4 -2 0

24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakehol 24 1 2 -3 -1 -3

25 The only valid decision is that which is demo 25 -5 -1 -2 2 -2

26 Those with higher education levels are able t 26 -1 5 -2 -5 -3

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the 27 1 1 -2 4 -2

28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by 28 -1 4 1 2 2

29 Mainly the environmental needs of present and 29 2 -3 0 1 -2

30 The social, economic and environmental needs o 30 3 -5 0 -1 2

31 The process did not exclude those less able to 31 4 0 1 -4 3

32 Some affected parties could not participate fo 32 -4 -2 -3 3 3

33 The process required literacy levels that were 33 2 -3 -3 0 1

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically sha 34 -2 3 2 -3 -2

35 PP better enables me to influence what i consi 35 2 2 3 -4 -4

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essenti 36 4 -4 -1 -2 2

Variance = 5.833 St. Dev. = 2.415

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Q-Sort Values**

**for Statements sorted by Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

21 Adequate assistance was provided to vulnerab 21 0 0 -1 0 -1

12 Ps had reasonable expectations about what th 12 1 -2 -1 1 -1

20 Adequate opportunity was given to develp Ps 20 0 -1 1 2 0

18 To take part effectively Ps need skills like 18 -1 -3 0 0 1

5 It is difficult to build trust among the diffe 5 -1 -1 -1 0 2

7 P does not make any preexisting conflicts wor 7 -2 1 0 -2 1

8 P builds the confidence and self esteem of the 8 0 2 2 -1 -1

28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by 28 -1 4 1 2 2

3 The Stakeholder interactions promoted a sense 3 0 0 4 0 3

17 P from different stakeholders increases as t 17 -3 -1 2 -1 1

9 P helps to create new and lasting interest gr 9 -3 1 1 2 0

11 Some participants do not see beyond their ind 11 -2 1 0 -3 1

1 Participants were courteous and respectful o 1 3 0 2 1 -1

10 Ps were good listeners and open minded to con 10 2 0 -1 3 -1

29 Mainly the environmental needs of present a 29 2 -3 0 1 -2

25 The only valid decision is that which is dem 25 -5 -1 -2 2 -2

24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakehol 24 1 2 -3 -1 -3

33 The process required literacy levels that wer 33 2 -3 -3 0 1

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by th 27 1 1 -2 4 -2

16 Ps who represent groups check in with their m 16 5 0 0 5 0

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically sh 34 -2 3 2 -3 -2

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of o 22 1 -4 -5 1 0

6 P builds peoples faith in government and stre 6 -1 3 3 -2 -3

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expec 4 -3 3 3 -3 0

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop 19 -2 -2 -2 3 4

23 Collaborative learning is only possible when 23 -4 1 4 -2 0

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essent 36 4 -4 -1 -2 2

31 The process did not exclude those less able t 31 4 0 1 -4 3

15 Discussions were controlled by those who und 15 0 4 1 0 -5

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and te 14 1 -2 -4 1 4

32 Some affected parties could not participate f 32 -4 -2 -3 3 3

30 The social, economic and environmental needs 30 3 -5 0 -1 2

26 Those with higher education levels are able 26 -1 5 -2 -5 -3

2 Constructive collaboration among participant 2 3 2 5 -1 -4

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 0 -1 -4 4 5

35 PP better enables me to influence what i con 35 2 2 3 -4 -4

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Characteristics**

Factors

1 2 3 4 5

No. of Defining Variables 2 4 3 1 1

Average Rel. Coef. 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800

Composite Reliability 0.889 0.941 0.923 0.800 0.800

S.E. of Factor Z-Scores 0.333 0.243 0.277 0.447 0.447

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Standard Errors for**

**Differences in Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2 3 4 5

1 0.471 0.412 0.434 0.558 0.558

2 0.412 0.343 0.368 0.509 0.509

3 0.434 0.368 0.392 0.526 0.526

4 0.558 0.509 0.526 0.632 0.632

5 0.558 0.509 0.526 0.632 0.632

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

28 Mainly the econo ... 28 -1 -0.56 4 1.32 1 0.37 2 0.82 2 0.82

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

26 Those with highe... 26 -1 -0.52 5 1.83\* -2 -0.69 -5 -2.04 -3 -1.22

15 Discussions wer ... 15 0 -0.07 4 1.60\* 1 0.21 0 0.00 -5 -2.04

24 Expert knowledg ... 24 1 0.19 2 1.01 -3 -0.98 -1 -0.41 -3 -1.22

14 Ps should be ab ... 14 1 0.52 -2 -0.71 -4 -1.88 1 0.41 4 1.63

30 The social, eco ... 30 3 1.57 -5 -2.09\* 0 -0.25 -1 -0.41 2 0.82

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

23 Collaborative l ... 23 -4 -1.57 1 0.20 4 1.83\* -2 -0.82 0 0.00

13 Ps did not atte ... 13 0 -0.34 -1 -0.27 -4 -1.66\* 4 1.63 5 2.04

14 Ps should be ab ... 14 1 0.52 -2 -0.71 -4 -1.88\* 1 0.41 4 1.63

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

27 Mainly the socia... 27 1 0.03 1 0.47 -2 -0.65 4 1.63 -2 -0.82

25 The only valid d... 25 -5 -1.69 -1 -0.43 -2 -0.59 2 0.82 -2 -0.82

31 The process did ... 31 4 1.73 0 0.11 1 0.38 -4 -1.63\* 3 1.22

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 5**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

15 Discussions were... 15 0 -0.07 4 1.60 1 0.21 0 0.00 -5 -2.04\*

**Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience

than [+/- 3] listed in this summary

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

21\* Adequate assist... 21 0 0.00 0 -0.06 -1 -0.34 0 0.00 -1 -0.41

##### Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Correlation Matrix**

**between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17**

1 SACMSC1 100 34 35 36 42 59 5 48 37 22 13 20 25 22 44 35 40

2 SACSC1 34 100 -4 16 59 36 22 17 23 12 20 20 -11 24 45 29 35

3 MRATPr1 35 -4 100 49 14 40 -1 37 3 19 9 25 -1 30 26 26 50

4 SCOSC1 36 16 49 100 37 31 23 9 37 19 54 1 -14 19 44 33 61

5 MRDDPr1 42 59 14 37 100 49 4 38 16 22 56 32 22 30 59 52 50

6 MRDOPr1 59 36 40 31 49 100 10 47 6 10 27 29 8 7 56 56 37

7 SDKSC1 5 22 -1 23 4 10 100 -25 36 18 39 33 -21 30 36 5 21

8 SHWMSC1 48 17 37 9 38 47 -25 100 -10 45 10 26 28 -3 28 33 33

9 SMRSC1 37 23 3 37 16 6 36 -10 100 10 31 29 -8 23 43 14 32

10 SNNSC1 22 12 19 19 22 10 18 45 10 100 29 4 -9 4 20 11 45

11 SBCSC1 13 20 9 54 56 27 39 10 31 29 100 24 19 21 52 50 47

12 SBNSC1 20 20 25 1 32 29 33 26 29 4 24 100 -5 29 32 15 1

13 SJWSC1 25 -11 -1 -14 22 8 -21 28 -8 -9 19 -5 100 4 9 25 11

14 SSRSC1 22 24 30 19 30 7 30 -3 23 4 21 29 4 100 31 13 32

15 SSBSC1 44 45 26 44 59 56 36 28 43 20 52 32 9 31 100 52 59

16 SSVSC1 35 29 26 33 52 56 5 33 14 11 50 15 25 13 52 100 52

17 SVMSC1 40 35 50 61 50 37 21 33 32 45 47 1 11 32 59 52 100

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_8\_\_**

1 SAC 0.6556 -0.2665 -0.0319 0.2522 -0.0795 -0.1674 0.4283 -0.2621

2 SACSC1 0.5307 0.1383 -0.4265 0.0659 0.3763 -0.3634 0.1744 0.3148

3 MRATPr1 0.4865 -0.2140 0.5673 0.3731 -0.3547 -0.0093 -0.1590 0.1348

4 SCOSC1 0.6297 0.2123 0.4915 -0.2079 -0.1570 -0.2604 -0.0699 -0.0695

5 MRDDPr1 0.7558 -0.1195 -0.3442 -0.1626 0.1098 -0.0164 -0.0222 0.2521

6 MRDOPr 0.6830 -0.3160 -0.1435 0.2041 -0.0171 -0.2983 -0.2881 -0.1600

7 SDKSC1 0.3192 0.7263 -0.0324 0.0879 0.0962 0.1886 -0.1437 -0.1045

8 SHWMSC1 0.4837 -0.6732 0.0499 0.2482 0.2577 0.2307 0.0220 -0.0589

9 SMRSC1 0.4336 0.5241 -0.0107 0.0492 -0.0771 -0.0274 0.4289 -0.4565

10 SNNSC1 0.3906 -0.0711 0.4162 0.0031 0.6476 0.4085 0.1302 0.0270

11 SBCSC1 0.6457 0.2618 -0.0380 -0.4770 -0.0030 0.3003 -0.2691 -0.0724

12 SBNSC1 0.3988 0.1940 -0.3291 0.5953 -0.0720 0.3565 -0.2885 -0.1322

13 SJWSC1 0.1496 -0.4909 -0.3072 -0.3598 -0.3998 0.4234 0.2686 -0.0971

14 SSRSC1 0.4065 0.3301 -0.0412 0.2316 -0.3871 0.2185 0.2522 0.5658

15 SSBSC1 0.8132 0.1456 -0.1507 -0.0421 -0.0087 -0.0586 -0.0340 -0.0815

16 SSVSC1 0.6754 -0.2273 -0.1401 -0.2958 -0.1299 -0.0917 -0.2673 -0.0404

17 SVMSC1 0.7791 0.0002 0.3644 -0.2232 0.0261 -0.0140 0.1467 0.1650

Eigenvalue 5.5470 2.0847 1.4435 1.2943 1.1443 1.0300 0.9351 0.8913

% expl.Var. 33 12 8 8 7 6 6 5

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Matrix with an X**

**Indicating a Defining Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2 3 4 5

1 SACMSC1 0.5810X -0.1949 0.2912 0.3281 0.0622

2 SACSC1 0.5519 0.1607 0.4272 -0.3285 0.0879

3 MRATPr1 0.2587 -0.0644 0.0855 0.8893X 0.0107

4 SCOSC1 -0.0666 0.1469 0.6492X 0.5503 -0.0266

5 MRDDPr1 0.4951 -0.2186 0.6577X -0.1133 0.0648

6 MRDOPr1 0.6298X -0.2541 0.3326 0.2158 0.1027

7 SDKSC1 0.1382 0.6280X 0.3725 -0.0492 -0.3047

8 SHWMSC1 0.5611X -0.3450 0.0859 0.2565 0.5573X

9 SMRSC1 0.1775 0.3818 0.4250 0.0947 -0.3229

10 SNNSC1 0.1310 0.3264 0.3242 0.1853 0.6980X

11 SBCSC1 0.0072 0.0210 0.8400X -0.0132 -0.0907

12 SBNSC1 0.7237X 0.2125 0.0004 0.0485 -0.3054

13 SJWSC1 0.0077 -0.7688X 0.1853 -0.0616 -0.1337

14 SSRSC1 0.2912 0.1446 0.2321 0.2777 -0.4927

15 SSBSC1 0.4614 0.0305 0.6868X 0.1027 -0.1050

16 SSVSC1 0.2577 -0.3931 0.6334X 0.0981 0.0109

17 SVMSC1 0.1223 0.0132 0.7350X 0.4471 0.1873

% expl.Var. 16 10 23 10 8

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Correlations**

**Between Factor Scores**

1 2 3 4 5

1 1.0000 -0.0546 0.4811 0.4529 0.4709

2 -0.0546 1.0000 0.0064 0.0034 -0.0363

3 0.4811 0.0064 1.0000 0.3375 0.3713

4 0.4529 0.0034 0.3375 1.0000 0.2970

5 0.4709 -0.0363 0.3713 0.2970 1.0000

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

35 PP better enables me to influence what i consider valuable 35 2.177

5 It is difficult to build trust among the different particip 5 1.758

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expectations of input 4 1.686

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

25 The only valid decision is that which is democratically ag 25 -1.640

29 Mainly the environmental needs of present and future gener 29 -2.003

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

11 Some participants do not see beyond their individual intere 11 1.894

17 P from different stakeholders increases as the final decis 17 1.644

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6 P builds peoples faith in government and streng 6 -1.463

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants 27 -1.860

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 3**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

11 Some participants do not see beyond their individual intere 11 2.324

28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by the Ps 28 1.998

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expectations of input 4 1.535

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

30 The social, economic and environmental needs of current and 30 -1.567

25 The only valid decision is that which is democratically ag 25 -1.848

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 4**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

5 It is difficult to build trust among the different particip 5 2.041

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and technical issues 14 1.633

26 Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate 26 1.633

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

30 The social, economic and environmental needs of current and 30 -1.633

25 The only valid decision is that which is democratically ag 25 -1.633

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically share control of 34 -2.041

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 5**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by the Ps 28 2.190

27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants 27 1.893

35 PP better enables me to influence what i consider valuable 35 1.773

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically share control of 34 1.541

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

36 Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA PP 36 -1.541

10 Ps were good listeners and open minded to consider all poss 10 -1.596

31 The process did not exclude those less able to articulate 31 -1.837

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

35 PP better enables me to influence what 35 2.177 -0.953 3.129

27 Mainly the social needs are considered 27 0.509 -1.860 2.368

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

17 P from different stakeholders increase 17 -1.346 1.644 -2.990

29 Mainly the environmental needs of prese 29 -2.003 1.497 -3.500

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of**

**Differences Between Factors 1 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

[Zero positive statements]

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

15 Discussions were controlled by thos 15 -1.278 1.345 -2.623

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 1 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

34 PP is a sustainable way to democr 34 1.331 -2.041 3.373

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[Zero negative statements]

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 1 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

11 Some participants do not see beyond 11 0.964 -1.476 2.440

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

29 Mainly the environmental needs of p 29 -2.003 0.362 -2.364

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

17 P from different stakeholders incre 17 1.644 -1.467 3.112

22 The p does not improve Ps understand 22 1.202 -1.207 2.409

12 Ps had reasonable expectations abou 12 1.316 -0.804 2.120

29 Mainly the environmental needs of pr 29 1.497 -0.508 2.005

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

28 Mainly the economic needs are cons 28 -0.363 1.998 -2.361

27 Mainly the social needs are consider 27 -1.860 0.518 -2.378

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 2 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratic 34 1.384 -2.041 3.425

17 P from different stakeholders increa 17 1.644 -0.816 2.461

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

27 Mainly the social needs are conside 27 -1.860 1.225 -3.085

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 2 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

11 Some participants do not see beyond t 11 1.894 -1.476 3.370

17 P from different stakeholders increase 17 1.644 -0.826 2.471

36 Understanding democratic rights is no 36 0.510 -1.541 2.051

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to d 19 -1.202 0.947 -2.149

28 Mainly the economic needs are consider 28 -0.363 2.190 -2.553

35 PP better enables me to influence what 35 -0.953 1.773 -2.725

27 Mainly the social needs are considered 27 -1.860 1.893 -3.753

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 3 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratic 34 1.272 -2.041 3.313

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

22 The p does not improve Ps understandin 22 -1.207 0.816 -2.024

5 It is difficult to build trust among t 5 -0.107 2.041 -2.149

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex 14 -0.957 1.633 -2.590

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 3 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

11 Some participants do not see beyond ti 11 2.324 -1.476 3.799

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

30 The social, economic and environmental 30 -1.567 0.594 -2.161

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 4 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

11 Some participants do not see beyond th 11 0.816 -1.476 2.292

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex 14 1.633 -0.417 2.050

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

30 The social, economic and environmental 30 -1.633 0.594 -2.227

34 PP is a sustainable way to democratica 34 -2.041 1.541 -3.582

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor**

**Q-Sort Values for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

1 Participants were courteous and respectfu 1 -2 0 -1 -2 0

2 Constructive collaboration among particip 2 -2 0 -1 0 -2

3 The Stakeholder interactions promoted a 3 -3 1 -2 -3 -1

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable ex 4 4 1 4 2 2

5 It is difficult to build trust among the 5 4 0 0 5 1

6 P builds peoples faith in government and 6 0 -4 0 -3 -1

7 P does not make any preexisting conflicts 7 1 -4 -1 -1 0

8 P builds the confidence and self esteem o 8 2 -3 -2 0 1

9 P helps to create new and lasting interes 9 -2 -1 1 1 -2

10 Ps were good listeners and open minded t 10 -1 0 -3 0 -4

11 Some participants do not see beyond their 11 2 5 5 2 -3

12 Ps had reasonable expectations about what 12 2 3 -2 0 1

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 1 3 2 0 2

14 Ps should be able to deal with complex an 14 1 1 -3 4 -1

15 Discussions were controlled by those who 15 -3 -1 3 -1 0

16 Ps who represent groups check in with the 16 -1 2 1 2 1

17 P from different stakeholders increases a 17 -4 4 -4 -2 -2

18 To take part effectively Ps need skills 18 3 -1 1 0 -1

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to devel 19 0 -3 1 1 2

20 Adequate opportunity was given to develp 20 -3 -2 -2 -1 -3

21 Adequate assistance was provided to vulne 21 -1 -3 0 -2 -3

22 The p does not improve Ps understandings 22 2 2 -3 2 0

23 Collaborative learning is only possible 23 1 -2 0 1 2

24 Expert knowledge is valued more than sta 24 -2 -1 2 -2 -1

25 The only valid decision is that which is 25 -4 -2 -5 -4 -2

26 Those with higher education levels are 26 0 0 3 4 0

27 Mainly the social needs are considered b 27 1 -5 2 3 4

28 Mainly the economic needs are considered 28 3 0 4 3 5

29 Mainly the environmental needs of present 29 -5 4 -1 -1 1

30 The social, economic and environmental n 30 -1 1 -4 -4 2

31 The process did not exclude those less 31 0 -2 -1 -1 -5

32 Some affected parties could not participa 32 -1 2 1 1 0

33 The process required literacy levels that 33 0 2 0 3 3

34 PP is a sustainable way to democraticall 34 3 3 3 -5 3

35 PP better enables me to influence what i 35 5 -2 2 1 4

36 Understanding democratic rights is not es 36 0 1 0 -3 -4

Variance = 5.833 St. Dev. = 2.415

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Standard Errors for Differences**

**in Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2 3 4 5

1 0.343 0.412 0.314 0.509 0.412

2 0.412 0.471 0.389 0.558 0.471

3 0.314 0.389 0.283 0.490 0.389

4 0.509 0.558 0.490 0.632 0.558

5 0.412 0.471 0.389 0.558 0.471

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Q-Sort Values for**

**Statements sorted by Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

20 Adequate opportunity was given to dev 20 -3 -2 -2 -1 -3

2 Constructive collaboration among par 2 -2 0 -1 0 -2

1 Participants were courteous and resp 1 -2 0 -1 -2 0

25 The only valid decision is that whi 25 -4 -2 -5 -4 -2

32 Some affected parties could not part 32 -1 2 1 1 0

9 P helps to create new and lasting int 9 -2 -1 1 1 -2

21 Adequate assistance was provided to 21 -1 -3 0 -2 -3

13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 1 3 2 0 2

16 Ps who represent groups check in wi 16 -1 2 1 2 1

23 Collaborative learning is only possi 23 1 -2 0 1 2

33 The process required literacy level 33 0 2 0 3 3

7 P does not make any preexisting con 7 1 -4 -1 -1 0

4 The developer needs to hav reasonable 4 4 1 4 2 2

6 P builds peoples faith in government 6 0 -4 0 -3 -1

3 The Stakeholder interactions promote 3 -3 1 -2 -3 -1

8 P builds the confidence and self est 8 2 -3 -2 0 1

31 The process did not exclude those le 31 0 -2 -1 -1 -5

18 To take part effectively Ps need ski 18 3 -1 1 0 -1

10 Ps were good listeners and open min 10 -1 0 -3 0 -4

24 Expert knowledge is valued more than 24 -2 -1 2 -2 -1

19 Inadequate opportunity was given to 19 0 -3 1 1 2

12 Ps had reasonable expectations abou 12 2 3 -2 0 1

26 Those with higher education levels a 26 0 0 3 4 0

36 Understanding democratic rights is n 36 0 1 0 -3 -4

22 The p does not improve Ps understand 22 2 2 -3 2 0

15 Discussions were controlled by those 15 -3 -1 3 -1 0

14 Ps should be able to deal with comple 14 1 1 -3 4 -1

5 It is difficult to build trust among 5 4 0 0 5 1

28 Mainly the economic needs are consid 28 3 0 4 3 5

30 The social, economic and environmenta 30 -1 1 -4 -4 2

35 PP better enables me to influence wh 35 5 -2 2 1 4

17 P from different stakeholders increa 17 -4 4 -4 -2 -2

29 Mainly the environmental needs of pr 29 -5 4 -1 -1 1

27 Mainly the social needs are conside 27 1 -5 2 3 4

11 Some participants do not see beyond 11 2 5 5 2 -3

34 PP is a sustainable way to democrati 34 3 3 3 -5 3

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Characteristics**

Factors

1 2 3 4 5

No. of Defining Variables 4 2 6 1 2

Average Rel. Coef. 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800

Composite Reliability 0.941 0.889 0.960 0.800 0.889

S.E. of Factor Z-Scores 0.243 0.333 0.200 0.447 0.333

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

18 To take part ef.. 18 3 1.19 -1 -0.54 1 0.42 0 0.00 -1 -0.54

16 Ps who represent 16 -1 -0.57 2 0.66 1 0.34 2 0.82 1 0.42

30 The social, econ 30 -1 -0.62 1 0.29 -4 -1.57 -4 -1.63 2 0.59

29 Mainly the envir 29 -5 -2.00\* 4 1.50 -1 -0.51 -1 -0.41 1 0.36

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

17 P from differ ... 17 -4 -1.35 4 1.64\* -4 -1.47 -2 -0.82 -2 -0.83

29 Mainly the en ... 29 -5 -2.00 4 1.50 -1 -0.51 -1 -0.41 1 0.36

3 The Stakehol ... 3 -3 -0.89 1 0.54 -2 -0.87 -3 -1.22 -1 -0.41

28 Mainly the eco... 28 3 1.30 0 -0.36\* 4 2.00 3 1.22 5 2.19

35 PP better en ... 35 5 2.18 -2 -0.95 2 0.92 1 0.41 4 1.77

19 Inadequate op ... 19 0 -0.10 -3 -1.20\* 1 0.14 1 0.41 2 0.95

27 Mainly the soc... 27 1 0.51 -5 -1.86\* 2 0.52 3 1.22 4 1.89

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

15 Discussions we ... 15 -3 -1.28 -1 -0.48 3 1.35\* -1 -0.41 0 -0.06

24 Expert knowled ... 24 -2 -0.67 -1 -0.62 2 1.00\* -2 -0.82 -1 -0.47

22 The p does not ... 22 2 0.62 2 1.20 -3 -1.21\* 2 0.82 0 0.00

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

14 Ps should be a... 14 1 0.19 1 0.33 -3 -0.96 4 1.63 -1 -0.42

34 PP is a sustai... 34 3 1.33 3 1.38 3 1.27 -5 -2.04\* 3 1.54

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 5**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

11 Some participa... 11 2 0.96 5 1.89 5 2.32 2 0.82 -3 -1.48\*

31 The process di... 31 0 0.15 -2 -0.69 -1 -0.68 -1 -0.41 -5 -1.84

**Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience than [+/- 3]

listed in this summary

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

1 Participant... 1 -2 -0.85 0 0.15 -1 -0.38 -2 -0.82 0 0.00

2 Constructiv... 2 -2 -0.81 0 0.03 -1 -0.39 0 0.00 -2 -0.83

13 Ps did not ... 13 1 0.36 3 1.35 2 0.51 0 0.00 2 0.95

20\* Adequate op... 20 -3 -1.22 -2 -0.91 -2 -0.80 -1 -0.41 -3 -1.07

##### DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’
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**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Correlation Matrix**

**between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

1 DEDPTCsc 100 37 60 50 48 -1 73 62 49

2 DEDPKRsc 37 100 57 34 19 -14 9 34 16

3 DEDPGGsc 60 57 100 49 24 -15 48 43 30

4 DEDPAAsc 50 34 49 100 28 3 44 25 43

5 DEDPHJsc 48 19 24 28 100 -10 51 34 24

6 DEDPMHsc -1 -14 -15 3 -10 100 -7 5 -5

7 DEDPAMsc 73 9 48 44 51 -7 100 38 42

8 DEDPAGsc 62 34 43 25 34 5 38 100 33

9 DEDPWAsc 49 16 30 43 24 -5 42 33 100

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS \_ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_8\_\_**

1 DEDPTCsc 0.8901 -0.1444 0.0159 -0.0926 0.0688 -0.1599 -0.0461 -0.2434

2 DEDPKRsc 0.5259 0.6783 0.2849 -0.1286 -0.0911 0.2592 -0.1944 -0.2036

3 DEDPGGsc 0.7546 0.3950 0.1315 0.0342 -0.0686 -0.3247 -0.1274 0.3564

4 DEDPAAsc 0.6756 0.0079 0.1908 0.4750 -0.3564 0.0924 0.3809 -0.0254

5 DEDPHJsc 0.5861 -0.2475 -0.3768 -0.3817 -0.3487 0.3990 -0.0436 0.1519

6 DEDPMHsc -0.0972 -0.5482 0.7887 -0.1015 -0.1693 0.0308 -0.1608 0.0444

7 DEDPAMsc 0.7631 -0.3521 -0.2695 0.0172 -0.1200 -0.3331 -0.1308 -0.1284

8 DEDPAGsc 0.6711 -0.0525 0.2091 -0.4418 0.4423 0.0261 0.3149 0.0542

9 DEDPWAsc 0.6072 -0.2237 -0.0482 0.4949 0.4313 0.3201 -0.1969 0.0804

Eigenvalues 3.8491 1.1755 1.0180 0.8483 0.6912 0.5810 0.3840 0.2793

% expl.Var. 43 13 11 9 8 6 4 3

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Matrix with an X**

**Indicating a Defining Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2 3

1 DEDPTCsc 0.8814X -0.1905 0.0110

2 DEDPKRsc 0.5721 0.6677X -0.2113

3 DEDPGGsc 0.7730X 0.3281 -0.1938

4 DEDPAAsc 0.6948X 0.0533 0.0855

5 DEDPHJsc 0.5266 -0.4709 -0.2186

6 DEDPMHsc -0.0037 0.0117 0.9653X

7 DEDPAMsc 0.7140X -0.5112 -0.0882

8 DEDPAGsc 0.6916X 0.0148 0.1356

9 DEDPWAsc 0.5911X -0.2658 0.0321

% expl.Var. 42 13 12

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Correlations Between Factor Scores**

1 2 3

1 1.0000 0.4313 -0.0419

2 0.4313 1.0000 -0.1381

3 -0.0419 -0.1381 1.0000

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

11 11 Some participants do not see beyond their individual I 11 1.955

26 26 Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate 26 1.823

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

31 31 The process did not exclude those less able to articulate 31 -1.485

30 30 The social, economic and environmental needs of present and 30 -1.622

25 25 The only valid decision is that which is democratically 25 -1.703

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

34 34 Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically 34 2.041

5 5 It is difficult to build trust among the different participa 5 1.633

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholders knowledge 24 1.633

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are considered by the Ps 27 -1.633

28 28 Mainly **the economic** needs are considered by the particip 28 -1.633

36 36 Understanding of democratic rights is not essential to 36 -2.041

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 3**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are considered by the Ps 27 2.041

6 6 Participation builds people’s faith in government and 6 1.633

30 30 The social, economic and environmental needs of present 30 1.633

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

22 22 The process does not improve participants’ understandings of 22 -1.633

36 36 Understanding of democratic rights is not essential to 36 -1.633

15 15 Discussions were controlled by those who understood the 15 -2.041

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

11 11 Some participants do not see beyond their 11 1.955 -0.408 2.363

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are considered by 27 0.623 -1.633 2.256

28 28 **Mainly the economic** are considered by the pa 28 0.450 -1.633 2.083

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14 14 Participants should be able to deal with c 14 -0.806 1.225 -2.031

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 1 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

15 15 Discussions were controlled by those who u 15 1.494 -2.041 3.535

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeh 24 1.316 -1.225 2.541

26 26 Those with higher education levels are able 26 1.823 -0.408 2.232

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6 6 Participation builds people’s faith in gover 6 -0.418 1.633 -2.051

30 30 The social, economic and environmental needs 30 -1.622 1.633 -3.255

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Descending Array of Differences**

**Between Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

15 15 Discussions were controlled by those who 15 1.225 -2.041 3.266

22 22 The process does not improve participants’ 22 1.225 -1.633 2.858

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stak 24 1.633 -1.225 2.858

14 14 Participants should be able to deal with 14 1.225 -1.225 2.449

34 34 Public participation is a sustainable way 34 2.041 0.000 2.041

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are considered by 27 -1.633 2.041 -3.674

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Q-Sort Values**

**for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2 3

1 1 Participants were courteous and respectful of oth 1 -3 0 -1

2 2 Constructive collaboration among participants 2 0 -2 1

3 3 The Stakeholder interactions promoted a sense of 3 0 0 1

4 4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expectation 4 3 0 3

5 5 It is difficult to build trust among the differen 5 3 4 0

6 6 P builds peoples faith in government and streng 6 -1 0 4

7 7 P does not make any preexisting conflicts worse 7 -2 -1 -1

8 8 P builds the confidence and self esteem of the Par 8 0 -1 1

9 9 P helps to create new and lasting interest groups 9 -1 2 0

10 10 Ps were good listeners and open minded to consid 10 -2 -3 1

11 11 Some participants do not see beyond their indivi 11 5 -1 3

12 12 Ps had reasonable expectations about what the 12 -1 1 2

13 13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 1 1 -2

14 14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and tech 14 -2 3 -3

15 15 Discussions were controlled by those who underst 15 4 3 -5

16 16 Ps who represent groups check in with their memb 16 -1 1 2

17 17 P from different stakeholders increases as the 17 0 0 -1

18 18 To take part effectively Ps need skills like pro 18 0 -1 0

19 19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop the 19 2 1 0

20 20 Adequate opportunity was given to develp Ps ski 20 -2 -2 0

21 21 Adequate assistance was provided to vulnerable 21 -3 -2 2

22 22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of othe 22 1 3 -4

23 23 Collaborative learning is only possible when po 23 2 2 2

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholde 24 3 4 -3

25 25 The only valid decision is that which is democr 25 -5 -3 -2

26 26 Those with higher education levels are able to 26 4 2 -1

27 27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the pa 27 2 -4 5

28 28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by the 28 1 -4 -3

29 29 Mainly the environmental needs of present and fu 29 -3 -3 -2

30 30 The social, economic and environmental needs of 30 -4 0 4

31 31 The process did not exclude those less able to a 31 -4 -2 1

32 32 Some affected parties could not participate for 32 1 1 -2

33 33 The process required literacy levels that were 33 2 -1 -1

34 34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically share 34 0 5 0

35 35 PP better enables me to influence what i conside 35 1 2 3

36 36 Understanding democratic rights is not essential 36 -1 -5 -4

Variance = 5.833 St. Dev. = 2.415

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Statements**

**sorted by Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2 3

23 23 Collaborative learning is only possible when powe 23 2 2 2

3 3 The Stakeholder interactions promoted a sense of 3 0 0 1

18 18 To take part effectively Ps need skills like prob 18 0 -1 0

29 29 Mainly the environmental needs of present and fut 29 -3 -3 -2

17 17 P from different stakeholders increases as the fin 17 0 0 -1

7 7 P does not make any preexisting conflicts worse 7 -2 -1 -1

8 8 P builds the confidence and self esteem of the Par 8 0 -1 1

25 25 The only valid decision is that which is democrati 25 -5 -3 -2

19 19 Inadequate opportunity was given to develop the Ps 19 2 1 0

35 35 PP better enables me to influence what i consider 35 1 2 3

9 9 P helps to create new and lasting interest group 9 -1 2 0

16 16 Ps who represent groups check in with their member 16 -1 1 2

20 20 Adequate opportunity was given to develp Ps skill 20 -2 -2 0

1 1 Participants were courteous and respectful of othe 1 -3 0 -1

2 2 Constructive collaboration among participants was e 2 0 -2 1

36 36 Understanding democratic rights is not essential t 36 -1 -5 -4

32 32 Some affected parties could not participate for 32 1 1 -2

13 13 Ps did not attend meetings regularly 13 1 1 -2

4 4 The developer needs to hav reasonable expectation 4 3 0 3

12 12 Ps had reasonable expectations about what the de 12 -1 1 2

5 5 It is difficult to build trust among the differen 5 3 4 0

33 33 The process required literacy levels that were no 33 2 -1 -1

10 10 Ps were good listeners and open minded to consider 10 -2 -3 1

31 31 The process did not exclude those less able to a 31 -4 -2 1

21 21 Adequate assistance was provided to vulnerable an 21 -3 -2 2

6 6 P builds peoples faith in government and stren 6 -1 0 4

28 28 Mainly the economic needs are considered by the 28 1 -4 -3

26 26 Those with higher education levels are able to 26 4 2 -1

34 34 PP is a sustainable way to democratically share c 34 0 5 0

11 11 Some participants do not see beyond their individu 11 5 -1 3

14 14 Ps should be able to deal with complex and technic 14 -2 3 -3

22 22 The p does not improve Ps understandings of others 22 1 3 -4

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholder k 24 3 4 -3

30 30 The social, economic and environmental needs of cu 30 -4 0 4

27 27 Mainly the social needs are considered by the part 27 2 -4 5

15 15 Discussions were controlled by those who understo 15 4 3 -5

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Standard Errors for Differences**

**in Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2 3

1 0.283 0.490 0.490

2 0.490 0.632 0.632

3 0.490 0.632 0.632

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_

26 26 Those with higher education levels 26 4 1.82 2 0.82 -1 -0.41

33 33 The process required literacy lev 33 2 1.03\* -1 -0.41 -1 -0.41

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are consi 27 2 0.62\* -4 -1.63 5 2.04

28 28 **Mainly the economic** are considered 28 1 0.45\* -4 -1.63 -3 -1.22

12 12 Participants had reasonable expe 12 -1 -0.76 1 0.41 2 0.82

30 30 The social, economic and environ 30 -4 -1.62\* 0 0.00 4 1.63

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_

34 34 Public participation is a sustaina 34 0 0.19 5 2.04\* 0 0.00

14 14 Participants should be able to deal 14 -2 -0.81 3 1.22\* -3 -1.22

30 30 The social, economic and environme 30 -4 -1.62 0 0.00\* 4 1.63

11 11 Some participants do not see beyo 11 5 1.95 -1 -0.41\* 3 1.22

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are consid 27 2 0.62 -4 -1.63\* 5 2.04

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_

27 27 **Mainly the social** needs are consid 27 2 0.62 -4 -1.63 5 2.04\*

6 6 Participation builds people’s faith 6 -1 -0.42 0 0.00 4 1.63\*

30 30 The social, economic and environm 30 -4 -1.62 0 0.00 4 1.63\*

21 21 Adequate assistance was provided 21 -3 -1.07 -2 -0.82 2 0.82\*

10 10 Participants were good listeners 10 -2 -0.94 -3 -1.22 1 0.41\*

5 5 It is difficult to build trust amo 5 3 1.04 4 1.63 0 0.00

24 24 Expert knowledge is valued more 24 3 1.32 4 1.63 -3 -1.22\*

22 22 The process does not improve part 22 1 0.31 3 1.22 -4 -1.63\*

15 15 Discussions were controlled by tho 15 4 1.49 3 1.22 -5 -2.04\*

**DEA&DP ‘Skills and Capacities’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience than [+/- 3]

listed in this summary

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_

1 1 Participants were courteous and 1 -3 -1.20 0 0.00 -1 -0.41

2\* 2 Constructive collaboration among 2 0 -0.05 -2 -0.82 1 0.41

3\* 3 The stakeholder’s interactions p 3 0 0.07 0 0.00 1 0.41

4 4 The developer needs to have reas 4 3 1.22 0 0.00 3 1.22

7\* 7 Participation does not make any pr 7 -2 -1.03 -1 -0.41 -1 -0.41

8\* 8 Participation builds the confiden 8 0 0.08 -1 -0.41 1 0.41

9\* 9 Participation helps create new an 9 -1 -0.14 2 0.82 0 0.00

13 13 Participants did not attend meet 13 1 0.37 1 0.41 -2 -0.82

16 16 Participants should be able to 16 -1 -0.21 1 0.41 2 0.82

17\* 17 Participation from different 17 0 0.27 0 0.00 -1 -0.41

18\* 18 To take part effectively 18 0 -0.01 -1 -0.41 0 0.00

19\* 19 Inadequate opportunity was given 19 2 0.91 1 0.41 0 0.00

20 20 Adequate opportunity was given 20 -2 -1.06 -2 -0.82 0 0.00

23\* 23 Collaborative learning is only 23 2 0.93 2 0.82 2 0.82

25\* 25 The only valid decision is that 25 -5 -1.70 -3 -1.22 -2 -0.82

29\* 29 **Mainly** the **environmenta**l needs 29 -3 -1.40 -3 -1.22 -2 -0.82

32 32 Some affected parties could not 32 1 0.31 1 0.41 -2 -0.82

35\* 35 Public participation better 35 1 0.31 2 0.82 3 1.22

36 36 Understanding of democratic 36 -1 -0.80 -5 -2.04 -4 -1.63

QANALYZE was completet at 11:44:44

Main Road ‘Process’

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

Main Road ‘Process’ Summary of results from QANALYZE

PQMethod2.33

**Main Road ‘Process’ Correlation Matrix between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17**

1 1MRBVPr 100 55 74 67 27 -24 64 38 81 60 52 45 77 -6 62 70 37

2 1MRBSPr 55 100 60 63 33 -24 55 42 62 72 43 62 64 -8 95 55 44

3 3MRDDPr 74 60 100 61 41 -15 68 46 81 70 62 57 75 5 69 60 61

4 4MRDSFPr 67 63 61 100 32 -24 59 20 62 73 38 49 61 -15 62 62 59

5 5MRFPPr 27 33 41 32 100 14 39 45 21 38 22 46 26 6 39 19 35

6 6MRGMPr -24 -24 -15 -24 14 100 -15 3 -16 -21 5 -17 -31 -8 -19 -5 -19

7 7MRHMPr 64 55 68 59 39 -15 100 31 64 64 58 59 65 -1 59 51 42

8 8MRIMPr 38 42 46 20 45 3 31 100 41 37 31 37 33 13 54 30 18

9 9MRJHPr 81 62 81 62 21 -16 64 41 100 70 59 51 83 0 71 65 50

10 10MRJCPr 60 72 70 73 38 -21 64 37 70 100 46 66 64 -10 76 57 55

11 11MRLAPr 52 43 62 38 22 5 58 31 59 46 100 47 60 -2 47 55 47

12 12MRMJPr 45 62 57 49 46 -17 59 37 51 66 47 100 55 1 62 38 42

13 13MRMBPr 77 64 75 61 26 -31 65 33 83 64 60 55 100 8 68 72 58

14 14MRPDPr -6 -8 5 -15 6 -8 -1 13 0 -10 -2 1 8 100 -4 8 13

15 15MRSLCP 62 95 69 62 39 -19 59 54 71 76 47 62 68 -4 100 56 47

16 16MRTTPr 70 55 60 62 19 -5 51 30 65 57 55 38 72 8 56 100 47

17 17MRVMPr 37 44 61 59 35 -19 42 18 50 55 47 42 58 13 47 47 100

**Main Road ‘Process’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_8\_\_**

1 1MRBVPr 0.8183 -0.1975 0.0362 0.1937 -0.2083 0.0258 0.3500 -0.0641

2 1MRBSPr 0.8089 0.0073 -0.2337 -0.2604 -0.1811 -0.1662 -0.2960 -0.0924

3 3MRDDPr 0.8751 0.0428 0.1163 0.0978 0.0191 0.0730 0.1051 0.1732

4 4MRDSFPr 0.7785 -0.2167 -0.1942 -0.0465 0.2491 -0.2506 0.1784 -0.1207

5 5MRFPPr 0.4542 0.6691 -0.0768 -0.1963 0.2969 -0.0100 0.3435 -0.0254

6 6MRGMPr -0.2272 0.6079 -0.1455 0.6335 0.0860 -0.2152 -0.1454 -0.1814

7 7MRHMPr 0.7789 0.0260 -0.0257 0.0795 0.1108 0.3738 0.1168 -0.2199

8 8MRIMPr 0.5030 0.5602 0.0862 -0.1184 -0.4763 -0.0637 0.1133 0.2839

9 9MRJHPr 0.8682 -0.1426 0.0799 0.1929 -0.1712 0.0073 0.0434 0.0659

10 10MRJCPr 0.8461 -0.0254 -0.2045 -0.1399 0.0955 -0.0650 -0.0595 -0.0775

11 11MRLAPr 0.6725 0.0783 0.1224 0.4430 0.0800 0.2995 -0.2900 0.1847

12 12MRMJPr 0.7139 0.2079 -0.1229 -0.2528 0.1198 0.3426 -0.1992 -0.1787

13 13MRMBPr 0.8676 -0.2091 0.2016 0.0732 -0.0550 0.0450 0.0059 0.0220

14 14MRPDPr 0.0003 0.1882 0.8962 -0.2407 -0.0062 -0.0651 -0.0886 -0.2605

15 15MRSLCP 0.8601 0.0941 -0.1713 -0.2085 -0.2244 -0.1488 -0.2233 -0.0158

16 16MRTTPr 0.7468 -0.1434 0.1718 0.3143 -0.0578 -0.2991 0.0012 -0.2031

17 17MRVMPr 0.6536 -0.0445 0.2143 -0.0794 0.5457 -0.2201 -0.1204 0.3464

Eigenvalues 8.7225 1.4003 1.1691 1.1061 0.8870 0.6643 0.6201 0.5260

% expl.Var. 51 8 7 7 5 4 4 3

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a**

**Defining Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2 3 4

1 1MRBVPr 0.0797 -0.1748 0.6845X 0.1775

2 1MRBSPr 0.2478 -0.2343 0.6694X 0.4909

3 3MRDDPr -0.0541 -0.0200 0.8330X 0.1766

4 4MRDSFPr 0.2085 -0.3058 0.7857X -0.0197

5 5MRFPPr -0.3538 0.0944 0.5388 0.3449

6 6MRGMPr -0.8870X -0.1552 -0.1916 -0.0216

7 7MRHMPr -0.0412 -0.1353 0.7601X 0.1161

8 8MRIMPr -0.2395 0.1776 0.3281 0.7747X

9 9MRJHPr 0.0377 -0.1274 0.7499X 0.1839

10 10MRJCPr 0.1572 -0.2525 0.8006X 0.2399

11 11MRLAPr -0.3340 -0.0856 0.6615X -0.0341

12 12MRMJPr 0.0534 -0.0725 0.7027X 0.3328

13 13MRMBPr 0.1490 0.0066 0.8032X 0.0894

14 14MRPDPr -0.0009 0.9373X 0.1027 0.0029

15 15MRSLCP 0.1559 -0.1795 0.7099X 0.5455

16 16MRTTPr -0.0681 -0.0640 0.6843X 0.0071

17 17MRVMPr 0.0508 0.1377 0.8215X -0.2444

% expl.Var. 8 8 45 9

**Main Road ‘Process’ Correlations Between Factor Scores**

1 2 3 4

1 1.0000 0.0818 0.2289 -0.0333

2 0.0818 1.0000 -0.0030 0.1303

3 0.2289 -0.0030 1.0000 0.4326

4 -0.0333 0.1303 0.4326 1.0000

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

3 The dicussion format allowed inclusive participation 3 1.946

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns 6 1.946

4 P was difficult and riresome 4 1.557

13 The process did not unecessarily slow down the development 13 1.557

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the dev 31 1.557

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

45 No participation is allowed in the formal decision making 45 -1.557

23 All important stakeholders are taking part in the process 23 -1.557

37 The process served to manipulate the public into accepting 37 -1.557

48 Public meetings are just to rubber stamp public approval 48 -1.946

18 The best available science was not used in the analysis 18 -1.946

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if 14 1.946

49 The developer devises solutions that are eventually authori 49 1.946

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns 6 1.557

7 The P has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order 7 1.557

10 All participants have equal access to information 10 1.557

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

21 Financial resources were provided to enable people to part 21 -1.557

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the dev are distributed equ 32 -1.557

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and places so no 20 -1.557

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 -1.946

45 No participation is allowed in the formal decision making 45 -1.946

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 3**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 2.224

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 1.509

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback 46 -1.680

45 No participation is allowed in the formal decision making 45 -1.851

15 There was inadequate notification of meetings, comment per 15 -1.861

36 The process served to bully the public into accepting a pro 36 -2.106

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 4**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns 6 1.946

7 The P has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order 7 1.946

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local p 11 1.557

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes 30 1.557

45 No participation is allowed in the formal decision making 45 1.557

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

44 Citizens influenced the decision taking process effectively 44 -1.557

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is used to make decis 26 -1.557

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers of formal decision makin 51 -1.557

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 -1.946

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how pple interact 2 -1.946

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

21 Financial resources were provided to enable 21 0.778 -1.557 2.335

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the dev are 32 0.778 -1.557 2.335

13 The process did not unecessarily slow down 13 1.557 -0.778 2.335

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to 31 1.557 -0.778 2.335

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and 14 -0.389 1.946 -2.335

10 All participants have equal access to 10 -0.778 1.557 -2.335

23 All important stakeholders are taking 23 -1.557 1.168 -2.725

37 The process served to manipulate the public 37 -1.557 1.168 -2.725

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-]2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

36 The process served to bully the public into 36 0.778 -2.106 2.884

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking their oppini 47 1.168 -1.174 2.341

4 P was difficult and riresome 4 1.557 -0.698 2.255

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

23 All important stakeholders are taking part in 23 -1.557 0.756 -2.313

11 The process taps the knowledge and 11 -1.168 1.272 -2.439

8 The P requires unbiased and independent faci 8 -1.168 2.224 -3.392

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-]2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how 2 1.168 -1.946 3.114

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9 The purposes and goals of the process are clear 9 -1.168 1.168 -2.335

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences 11 -1.168 1.557 -2.725

45 No participation is allowed in the formal 45 -1.557 1.557 -3.114

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-]2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

37 The process served to manipulate the public 37 1.168 -1.477 2.644

36 The process served to bully the public into 36 0.389 -2.106 2.495

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance 46 0.778 -1.680 2.458

15 There was inadequate notification of meetings, 15 0.389 -1.861 2.251

12 There is inadequate administrative support 12 0.778 -1.243 2.022

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences 11 -0.778 1.272 -2.050

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure 31 -0.778 1.348 -2.126

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and 20 -1.557 0.588 -2.145

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 -1.946 0.699 -2.645

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facile 8 -1.168 2.224 -3.392

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-]2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

49 The developer devises solutions that are 49 1.946 -0.778 2.725

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is used 26 1.168 -1.557 2.725

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how 2 0.389 -1.946 2.335

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences 11 -0.778 1.557 -2.335

45 No participation is allowed in the formal deci 45 -1.946 1.557 -3.503

**Main Road ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 3 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-]2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 0.699 -1.946 2.645

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how 2 0.530 -1.946 2.476

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

45 No participation is allowed in the formal 45 -1.851 1.557 -3.408

**Main Road Process Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe at meetin 1 -1 1 5 2

2 There are clear ground rules that govern 2 3 1 1 -5

3 The dicussion format allowed inclusive partic 3 5 3 4 1

4 P was difficult and riresome 4 4 -1 -2 0

5 Ps values and oppinions were discussed 5 -2 2 2 2

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their 6 5 4 3 5

7 The P has to be able to limit topics of discu 7 3 4 0 5

8 The P requires unbiased and independent faci 8 -3 -3 5 2

9 The purposes and goals of the process are cle 9 -3 0 0 3

10 All participants have equal access to informat 10 -2 4 1 1

11 The process taps the knowledge and experien 11 -3 -2 4 4

12 There is inadequate administrative support 12 0 2 -3 -1

13 The process did not unecessarily slow down 13 4 -2 1 0

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and 14 -1 5 0 3

15 There was inadequate notification of meetin 15 -2 1 -5 -2

16 Ps are involved in deciding what studies 16 -1 1 -1 0

17 Ps are involved in deciding how studies 17 3 2 -1 0

18 The best available science was not used in 18 -5 -2 -2 -1

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and explored 19 1 2 2 3

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and 20 1 -4 1 1

21 Financial resources were provided to enable 21 2 -4 0 0

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone 22 -1 -2 -2 1

23 All important stakeholders are taking part 23 -4 3 2 1

24 The process gives recommendations to the 24 2 0 2 2

25 All important decisions are make 25 0 -2 -1 -1

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is 26 1 3 -1 -4

27 Every recommendation is justified with 27 1 -3 1 0

28 The developer responds in a timely way 28 0 -1 3 1

29 The broader public was informed about what 29 1 0 2 0

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement 30 -1 1 0 4

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to 31 4 -2 4 -1

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the dev 32 2 -4 0 1

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to 33 -2 -5 2 -5

34 The outcomes have broadbased support within 34 1 0 3 3

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in the outcomes 35 0 -1 3 2

36 The process served to bully the public 36 2 1 -5 -3

37 The process served to manipulate the public 37 -4 3 -4 -2

38 Public participation is a top down 38 -1 -1 1 2

39 Although all had the chance to be heard, 39 -1 2 -3 -1

40 Although all had the chance to discuss and 40 -2 0 -2 -1

41 Negotiation and tradeoffs were not possible 41 -3 0 -1 -1

42 Citizens were delegated decision making 42 2 -3 -2 -3

43 Citizens made decisions with more influence 43 0 -3 -2 -3

44 Citizens influenced the decision taking 44 0 -1 -1 -4

45 No participation is allowed in the formal 45 -4 -5 -4 4

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -2 2 -4 -2

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking their 47 3 1 -3 -2

48 Public meetings are just to rubber stamp 48 -5 -1 -3 -2

49 The developer devises solutions that are 49 0 5 1 -2

50 Ps shared planning and decision making 50 2 0 0 -3

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers of formal 51 1 -1 -1 -4

Variance = 6.471 St. Dev. = 2.544

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Statements sorted by**

**Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4

25 All important decisions are make according 25 0 -2 -1 -1

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and explored 19 1 2 2 3

16 Ps are involved in deciding what studies 16 -1 1 -1 0

40 Although all had the chance to discuss and 40 -2 0 -2 -1

24 The process gives recommendations to the dev 24 2 0 2 2

29 The broader public was informed about what 29 1 0 2 0

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their 6 5 4 3 5

41 Negotiation and tradeoffs were not possible 41 -3 0 -1 -1

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone who 22 -1 -2 -2 1

43 Citizens made decisions with more influence 43 0 -3 -2 -3

34 The outcomes have broadbased support within 34 1 0 3 3

38 Public participation is a top down initiative 38 -1 -1 1 2

3 The dicussion format allowed inclusive partic 3 5 3 4 1

28 The developer responds in a timely way to 28 0 -1 3 1

7 The P has to be able to limit topics of 7 3 4 0 5

18 The best available science was not used in 18 -5 -2 -2 -1

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in the outcomes 35 0 -1 3 2

48 Public meetings are just to rubber stamp 48 -5 -1 -3 -2

44 Citizens influenced the decision taking 44 0 -1 -1 -4

27 Every recommendation is justified with 27 1 -3 1 0

5 Ps values and oppinions were discussed 5 -2 2 2 2

39 Although all had the chance to be heard, 39 -1 2 -3 -1

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe at 1 -1 1 5 2

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement 30 -1 1 0 4

50 Ps shared planning and decision making 50 2 0 0 -3

17 Ps are involved in deciding how studies 17 3 2 -1 0

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers of 51 1 -1 -1 -4

12 There is inadequate administrative support 12 0 2 -3 -1

15 There was inadequate notification of 15 -2 1 -5 -2

42 Citizens were delegated decision making 42 2 -3 -2 -3

10 All participants have equal access to 10 -2 4 1 1

9 The purposes and goals of the process are 9 -3 0 0 3

13 The process did not unecessarily slow down 13 4 -2 1 0

21 Financial resources were provided to enable 21 2 -4 0 0

4 P was difficult and riresome 4 4 -1 -2 0

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and 20 1 -4 1 1

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -2 2 -4 -2

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and 14 -1 5 0 3

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the dev are 32 2 -4 0 1

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking their 47 3 1 -3 -2

49 The developer devises solutions that are 49 0 5 1 -2

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is 26 1 3 -1 -4

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to 31 4 -2 4 -1

23 All important stakeholders are taking part 23 -4 3 2 1

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to m 33 -2 -5 2 -5

37 The process served to manipulate the public 37 -4 3 -4 -2

36 The process served to bully the public into 36 2 1 -5 -3

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how 2 3 1 1 -5

11 The process taps the knowledge and experien 11 -3 -2 4 4

8 The P requires unbiased and independent fac 8 -3 -3 5 2

45 No participation is allowed in the formal 45 -4 -5 -4 4

**Main Road ‘Process’ Factor Characteristics**

Factors

1 2 3 4

No. of Defining Variables 1 1 13 1

Average Rel. Coef. 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800

Composite Reliability 0.800 0.800 0.981 0.800

S.E. of Factor Z-Scores 0.447 0.447 0.137 0.447

**Main Road ‘Process’ Standard Errors for Differences in**

**Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2 3 4

1 0.632 0.632 0.468 0.632

2 0.632 0.632 0.468 0.632

3 0.468 0.468 0.194 0.468

4 0.632 0.632 0.468 0.632

**Main Road ‘Process’ Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 2 3 4

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR

4 P was difficult an 4 4 1.56 -1 -0.39 -2 -0.70 0 0.00

13 The process did not 13 4 1.56 -2 -0.78 1 0.52 0 0.00

42 Citizens were 42 2 0.78\* -3 -1.17 -2 -0.93 -3 -1.17

5 Ps values and 5 -2 -0.78 2 0.78 2 0.72 2 0.78

23 All important 23 -4 -1.56\* 3 1.17 2 0.76 1 0.39

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2**

1 Factor 2 3 4

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR

49 The developer 49 0 0.00 5 1.95\* 1 0.44 -2 -0.78

37 The process 37 -4 -1.56 3 1.17\* -4 -1.48 -2 -0.78

46 PP is a top down 46 -2 -0.78 2 0.78 -4 -1.68 -2 -0.78

21 Financial resources 21 2 0.78 -4 -1.56 0 0.02 0 0.00

32 Costs, remedies 32 2 0.78 -4 -1.56\* 0 0.11 1 0.39

20 Meetings were held 20 1 0.39 -4 -1.56\* 1 0.59 1 0.39

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3**

1 2 Factor 3 4

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR

8 The P requires 8 -3 -1.17 -3 -1.17 5 2.22\* 2 0.78

33 The outcomes are 33 -2 -0.78 -5 -1.95 2 0.70\* -5 -1.95

15 There was inadequate 15 -2 -0.78 1 0.39 -5 -1.86 -2 -0.78

36 The process served 36 2 0.78 1 0.39 -5 -2.11 -3 -1.17

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4**

1 2 3 Factor 4

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR

45 No participation 45 -4 -1.56 -5 -1.95 -4 -1.85 4 1.56\*

8 The P requires 8 -3 -1.17 -3 -1.17 5 2.22 2 0.78\*

36 The process served 36 2 0.78 1 0.39 -5 -2.11 -3 -1.17

26 Consensus is used 26 1 0.39 3 1.17 -1 -0.36 -4 -1.56

2 There are clear 2 3 1.17 1 0.39 1 0.53 -5 -1.95\*

**Main Road ‘Process’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience than

[+/- 3] listed in this summary

Factors

1 2 3 4

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_\_-SV Z-SCR

3 The dicussion 3 5 1.95 3 1.17 4 1.22 1 0.39

6 Everyone has an 6 5 1.95 4 1.56 3 1.02 5 1.95

18 The best available 18 -5 -1.95 -2 -0.78 -2 -1.02 -1 -0.39

19\* Uncertainties were 19 1 0.39 2 0.78 2 0.61 3 1.17

34 The outcomes have 34 1 0.39 0 0.00 3 1.17 3 1.17

41\* Negotiation and 41 -3 -1.17 0 0.00 -1 -0.67 -1 -0.39

43\* Citizens made 43 0 0.00 -3 -1.17 -2 -0.82 -3 -1.17

44 Citizens influence 44 0 0.00 -1 -0.39 -1 -0.39 -4 -1.56

48 Public meetings 48 -5 -1.95 -1 -0.39 -3 -1.29 -2 -0.78

##### Saldanha ‘Process’

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Correlation Matrix between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17**

1 SACMPr1 100 85 21 39 25 55 8 47 38 11 11 56 27 2 50 44 21

2 SACPr1 85 100 19 50 11 64 12 62 51 6 8 61 17 -5 55 33 13

3 SATPr1 21 19 100 45 9 32 12 49 45 14 8 21 4 -2 38 12 25

4 SCOPr1 39 50 45 100 30 63 15 67 58 30 10 62 7 3 62 39 32

5 SDDPr1 25 11 9 30 100 31 38 14 8 22 48 45 30 53 46 55 31

6 SDDOPr1 55 64 32 63 31 100 29 63 38 -2 22 62 10 8 64 47 30

7 SDKPr1 8 12 12 15 38 29 100 25 17 12 39 8 22 27 22 27 25

8 SHWMPr1 47 62 49 67 14 63 25 100 52 25 6 49 -10 -15 70 31 26

9 SMRPr1 38 51 45 58 8 38 17 52 100 32 6 38 23 -9 40 18 18

10 SDNNPr1 11 6 14 30 22 -2 12 25 32 100 14 31 14 20 21 17 15

11 SBCPr1 11 8 8 10 48 22 39 6 6 14 100 11 1 61 14 31 25

12 SBNPr1 56 61 21 62 45 62 8 49 38 31 11 100 15 17 65 48 21

13 SJWPr1 27 17 4 7 30 10 22 -10 23 14 1 15 100 7 18 25 11

14 SSRPr1 2 -5 -2 3 53 8 27 -15 -9 20 61 17 7 100 15 15 20

15 SSBPr1 50 55 38 62 46 64 22 70 40 21 14 65 18 15 100 44 38

16 SSFPr1 44 33 12 39 55 47 27 31 18 17 31 48 25 15 44 100 27

17 SVMPr1 21 13 25 32 31 30 25 26 18 15 25 21 11 20 38 27 100

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_8\_\_**

1 SACMPr1 0.7083 -0.1951 -0.4610 0.0267 0.0238 0.1902 0.2394 0.1519

2 SACPr1 0.7416 -0.3495 -0.3634 -0.0678 0.0216 0.3213 0.1165 0.1511

3 SATPr1 0.4698 -0.2024 0.5524 -0.0036 0.2195 -0.0476 0.2517 -0.4083

4 SCOPr1 0.7849 -0.1988 0.2453 0.0078 -0.1358 -0.1068 -0.0628 -0.1052

5 SDDPr1 0.5295 0.6585 -0.1141 0.0628 -0.0908 -0.2078 -0.0730 -0.1996

6 SDDOPr1 0.7956 -0.1056 -0.1365 -0.3334 0.1082 -0.0192 -0.0611 -0.0748

7 SDKPr1 0.3648 0.4488 0.1710 -0.0464 0.5110 0.2368 -0.4532 0.1535

8 SHWMPr1 0.7588 -0.3677 0.2581 -0.1898 -0.0133 0.0505 -0.2073 0.0865

9 SMRPr1 0.6124 -0.3004 0.2815 0.3405 0.1318 0.2916 0.0867 -0.0552

10 SDNNPr1 0.3255 0.1643 0.3697 0.5811 -0.4587 0.1250 -0.1452 0.2784

11 SBCPr1 0.3140 0.6922 0.1097 -0.2634 0.0054 0.3743 0.1269 -0.0197

12 SBNPr1 0.7753 -0.0506 -0.2062 0.0519 -0.3771 -0.0979 -0.0276 -0.0790

13 SJWPr1 0.2586 0.1977 -0.3368 0.6903 0.4399 -0.0868 0.1098 -0.1342

14 SSRPr1 0.1915 0.7805 0.0461 -0.0895 -0.2393 0.2058 0.2821 -0.1006

15 SSBPr1 0.8234 -0.0426 0.0187 -0.0734 -0.0608 -0.2254 -0.0118 -0.0437

16 SSFPr1 0.6184 0.2798 -0.2780 0.0069 -0.0091 -0.2630 -0.2810 -0.0481

17 SVMPr1 0.4468 0.2528 0.2739 -0.0911 0.2313 -0.4383 0.3620 0.5115

Eigenvalue 6.0549 2.4134 1.3761 1.1827 1.0269 0.8675 0.7428 0.6814

% expl.Var. 36 14 8 7 6 5 4 4

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining**

**Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2 3 4 5

1 SACMPr1 -0.1719 0.0941 0.8234X 0.1455 -0.1268

2 SACPr1 -0.2910 0.0698 0.8376X -0.0231 -0.1326

3 SATPr1 -0.3393 0.4764 0.0472 -0.4109 -0.3192

4 SCOPr1 -0.1930 0.5202 0.5342 -0.3670 -0.0792

5 SDDPr1 0.5779X 0.4367 0.3696 0.1670 -0.2240

6 SDDOPr1 -0.0577 0.1201 0.7377X -0.2607 -0.3945

7 SDKPr1 0.1856 0.3282 0.0077 0.0673 -0.6930X

8 SHWMPr1 -0.3273 0.3423 0.5409 -0.5081 -0.1967

9 SMRPr1 -0.4722 0.5915X 0.2859 -0.0895 -0.1235

10 SDNNPr1 0.0821 0.8011X 0.0272 0.0069 0.4106

11 SBCPr1 0.6548X 0.2501 0.1066 -0.1152 -0.3784

12 SBNPr1 0.0610 0.3573 0.7947X -0.0881 0.1429

13 SJWPr1 -0.1649 0.3714 0.1426 0.8015X -0.2481

14 SSRPr1 0.7825X 0.2977 0.0571 0.0100 -0.0950

15 SSBPr1 -0.0364 0.4036 0.6584X -0.2239 -0.2035

16 SSFPr1 0.2464 0.2581 0.5835X 0.1449 -0.2222

17 SVMPr1 0.1128 0.3776 0.1164 -0.1717 -0.4494

% expl.Var. 12 16 25 9 9

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Correlations Between Factor Scores**

1 2 3 4 5

1 1.0000 0.1828 0.1951 0.1199 -0.3853

2 0.1828 1.0000 0.2993 0.1940 -0.1611

3 0.1951 0.2993 1.0000 0.2270 -0.1844

4 0.1199 0.1940 0.2270 1.0000 -0.2152

5 -0.3853 -0.1611 -0.1844 -0.2152 1.0000

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 2.287

27 Every recommendation is justified with evidence 27 1.798

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the dev 31 1.570

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

24 The process gives recommendations to the developer who then 24 -1.534

45 No participation is allowed in the formal decision making 45 -1.829

36 The process served to bully the public into accepting a pro 36 -2.059

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

48 Public meetings are just to rubber stamp public approval 48 2.296

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 1.898

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 1.704

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking their oppinions count towa 47 1.571

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

17 Ps are involved in deciding how studies should be done 17 -1.511

34 The outcomes have broadbased support within the community 34 -1.643

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone who want to parti 22 -1.765

21 Financial resources were provided to enable people to part 21 -1.970

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 3**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 2.373

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 1.921

37 The process served to manipulate the public into accepting 37 1.828

38 Public participation is a top down initiative but allows fo 38 1.540

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback 46 -1.713

34 The outcomes have broadbased support within the community 34 -1.757

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in the outcomes of the process 35 -1.887

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 4**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

27 Every recommendation is justified with evidence 27 1.946

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the dev 31 1.946

24 The process gives recommendations to the developer who then 24 1.557

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 1.557

40 Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their poin 40 1.557

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

43 Citizens made decisions with more influence than the develo 43 -1.557

21 Financial resources were provided to enable people to part 21 -1.557

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers of formal decision makin 51 -1.557

17 Ps are involved in deciding how studies should be done 17 -1.946

16 Ps are involved in deciding what studies should be done 16 -1.946

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 5**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the dev are distributed equ 32 1.946

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback 46 1.946

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone who want to parti 22 1.557

24 The process gives recommendations to the developer who then 24 1.557

31 One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the dev 31 1.557

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if 14 -1.557

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes 30 -1.557

38 Public participation is a top down initiative but allows fo 38 -1.557

27 Every recommendation is justified with evidence 27 -1.946

8 The P requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 -1.946

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

27 Every recommendation is justified 27 1.798 -0.786 2.584

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13 The process did not unnecessarily 13 -0.978 1.184 -2.162

24 The process gives recommendations 24 -1.534 0.653 -2.187

37 The process served to manipulate 37 -1.405 1.051 -2.456

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking 47 -0.946 1.571 -2.517

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 -0.785 2.296 -3.081

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

[Zero positive statements]

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 -0.785 1.312 -2.097

13 The process did not unnecessarily 13 -0.978 1.284 -2.262

36 The process served to bully the 36 -2.059 0.738 -2.797

37 The process served to manipulate the 37 -1.405 1.828 -3.233

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

2 There are clear ground rules that 2 1.175 -1.168 2.343

30 There is a clear plan for how to 30 1.045 -1.168 2.213

16 Ps are involved in deciding what 16 0.194 -1.946 2.140

23 All important stakeholders are 23 0.947 -1.168 2.115

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33 The outcomes are personally 33 -1.145 1.557 -2.702

36 The process served to bully the pub 36 -2.059 0.778 -2.837

24 The process gives recommendations to 24 -1.534 1.557 -3.091

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

8 The P requires unbiased and indepen 8 2.287 -1.946 4.234

27 Every recommendation is justified w 27 1.798 -1.946 3.745

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe 1 1.471 -1.168 2.639

30 There is a clear plan for how to im 30 1.045 -1.557 2.602

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues 14 0.978 -1.557 2.535

29 The broader public was informed abou 29 1.077 -1.168 2.244

38 Public participation is a top down 38 0.493 -1.557 2.050

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13 The process did not unnecessarily sl 13 -0.978 1.168 -2.146

45 No participation is allowed in the 45 -1.829 0.389 -2.219

36 The process served to bully the pu 36 -2.059 0.389 -2.448

24 The process gives recommendations t 24 -1.534 1.557 -3.091

46 PP is a top down initiative with n 46 -1.242 1.946 -3.188

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -1.242 1.946 -3.189

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 2 and 3**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice 6 1.306 -1.082 2.387

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4 P was difficult and tiresome 4 -0.907 1.133 -2.040

7 The P has to be able to limit topics 7 -0.774 1.322 -2.096

22 The process cannot be open to just 22 -1.765 1.266 -3.031

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 2 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 2.296 -0.389 2.685

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers 51 0.846 -1.557 2.403

2 There are clear ground rules that g 2 1.112 -1.168 2.280

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

31 One outcome of the process is a plan 31 -0.205 1.946 -2.151

40 Although all had the chance to di 40 -0.725 1.557 -2.282

27 Every recommendation is justified 27 -0.786 1.946 -2.732

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 2 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

8 The P requires unbiased and indepe 8 1.704 -1.946 3.650

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe 1 1.898 -1.168 3.065

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 2.296 -0.389 2.685

38 Public participation is a top down 38 0.653 -1.557 2.210

30 There is a clear plan for how to im 30 0.459 -1.557 2.016

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -0.061 1.946 -2.007

17 Ps are involved in deciding how stu 17 -1.511 1.168 -2.678

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -0.858 1.946 -2.804

22 The process cannot be open to just 22 -1.765 1.557 -3.322

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 3 and 4**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

[Zero positive statements]

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

40 Although all had the chance to d 40 -0.585 1.557 -2.142

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voic 6 -1.082 1.168 -2.250

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in th 35 -1.887 0.389 -2.276

33 The outcomes are personally desira 33 -1.053 1.557 -2.610

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 3 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

8 The P requires unbiased and indepen 8 2.373 -1.946 4.319

38 Public participation is a top down 38 1.540 -1.557 3.097

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe 1 1.921 -1.168 3.089

27 Every recommendation is justified w 27 0.410 -1.946 2.356

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues 14 0.458 -1.557 2.015

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -0.667 1.946 -2.613

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -1.713 1.946 -3.659

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 4 and 5**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

27 Every recommendation is justified 27 1.946 -1.946 3.892

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues 14 1.168 -1.557 2.725

33 The outcomes are personally desirab 33 1.557 -1.168 2.725

8 The P requires unbiased and indepe 8 0.778 -1.946 2.725

40 Although all had the chance to dis 40 1.557 -0.778 2.335

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

16 Ps are involved in deciding what 16 -1.946 0.389 -2.335

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -0.389 1.946 -2.335

23 All important stakeholders are tak 23 -1.168 1.168 -2.335

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -0.778 1.946 -2.725

17 Ps are involved in deciding how st 17 -1.946 1.168 -3.114

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe 1 4 5 5 0 -3

2 There are clear ground rules that g 2 3 3 -1 -3 0

3 The dicussion format allowed inclus 3 0 0 1 2 -1

4 P was difficult and tiresome 4 3 -2 2 -2 -2

5 Ps values and oppinions were discus 5 4 1 -1 3 0

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voic 6 0 4 -3 3 2

7 The P has to be able to limit topics 7 1 -1 4 3 -1

8 The P requires unbiased and indepen 8 5 4 5 2 -5

9 The purposes and goals of the process 9 1 0 0 1 -2

10 All participants have equal access 10 0 -1 -2 0 -2

11 The process taps the knowledge and 11 1 -3 2 -1 2

12 There is inadequate administrative 12 -1 0 1 2 -2

13 The process did not unecessarily 13 -2 3 3 0 3

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues 14 2 0 1 3 -4

15 There was inadequate notification 15 -2 -3 2 2 -1

16 Ps are involved in deciding what 16 0 -3 -1 -5 1

17 Ps are involved in deciding how stud 17 -1 -4 -1 -5 3

18 The best available science was not 18 -3 1 1 2 0

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and 19 2 2 -2 1 1

20 Meetings were held at appropriate 20 2 0 -3 1 1

21 Financial resources were provided 21 -1 -5 0 -4 0

22 The process cannot be open to just 22 -1 -5 3 -1 4

23 All important stakeholders are taki 23 2 0 -2 -3 3

24 The process gives recommendations 24 -4 2 0 4 4

25 All important decisions are make 25 -2 -2 0 -3 1

26 Consensus is used to decide what 26 -4 -2 -1 1 -1

27 Every recommendation is justified 27 5 -2 1 5 -5

28 The developer responds in a timely 28 -1 1 1 0 2

29 The broader public was informed 29 3 1 -2 -2 -3

30 There is a clear plan for how to 30 2 1 0 -3 -4

31 One outcome of the process is a pla 31 4 -1 1 5 4

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -3 -2 -2 -1 5

33 The outcomes are personally desirable 33 -3 2 -3 4 -3

34 The outcomes have broadbased support 34 0 -4 -5 -2 0

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in the 35 0 -1 -5 1 -1

36 The process served to bully the pub 36 -5 -3 2 2 1

37 The process served to manipulate the 37 -4 3 4 1 0

38 Public participation is a top down 38 1 2 4 0 -4

39 Although all had the chance to be 39 3 1 -2 0 -2

40 Although all had the chance to dis 40 2 -1 -1 4 -2

41 Negotiation and tradeoffs were not 41 0 3 3 0 2

42 Citizens were delegated decision 42 1 -1 2 -1 2

43 Citizens made decisions with more 43 -1 -1 -4 -4 1

44 Citizens influenced the decision 44 1 1 0 -2 3

45 No participation is allowed in the 45 -5 -4 -4 -2 1

46 PP is a top down initiative with 46 -3 0 -4 -2 5

47 Ps are manipulated into thinking 47 -2 4 2 -1 0

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 -1 5 3 -1 -1

49 The developer devises solutions 49 1 2 0 1 2

50 Ps shared planning and decision 50 -2 -3 -1 -1 -3

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers 51 -2 2 -3 -4 -1

Variance = 6.471 St. Dev. = 2.544

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Statements sorted by**

**Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2 3 4 5

50 Ps shared planning and decision ma 50 -2 -3 -1 -1 -3

49 The developer devises solutions tha 49 1 2 0 1 2

28 The developer responds in a timely 28 -1 1 1 0 2

3 The dicussion format allowed inclus 3 0 0 1 2 -1

10 All participants have equal access 10 0 -1 -2 0 -2

9 The purposes and goals of the proce 9 1 0 0 1 -2

41 Negotiation and tradeoffs were not 41 0 3 3 0 2

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and 19 2 2 -2 1 1

25 All important decisions are make 25 -2 -2 0 -3 1

26 Consensus is used to decide what 26 -4 -2 -1 1 -1

20 Meetings were held at appropriate 20 2 0 -3 1 1

12 There is inadequate administrative 12 -1 0 1 2 -2

5 Ps values and oppinions were discu 5 4 1 -1 3 0

42 Citizens were delegated decision 42 1 -1 2 -1 2

18 The best available science was not 18 -3 1 1 2 0

11 The process taps the knowledge and 11 1 -3 2 -1 2

44 Citizens influenced the decision 44 1 1 0 -2 3

43 Citizens made decisions with more 43 -1 -1 -4 -4 1

15 There was inadequate notification 15 -2 -3 2 2 -1

45 No participation is allowed in the 45 -5 -4 -4 -2 1

39 Although all had the chance to be 39 3 1 -2 0 -2

35 Ps feel a sense of ownership in the 35 0 -1 -5 1 -1

34 The outcomes have broadbased support 34 0 -4 -5 -2 0

21 Financial resources were provided to 21 -1 -5 0 -4 0

31 One outcome of the process is a plan 31 4 -1 1 5 4

51 Ps had genuine and specific powers 51 -2 2 -3 -4 -1

7 The P has to be able to limit topics 7 1 -1 4 3 -1

16 Ps are involved in deciding what 16 0 -3 -1 -5 1

47 Ps are manipulated into thinkin 47 -2 4 2 -1 0

29 The broader public was informed abou 29 3 1 -2 -2 -3

13 The process did not unecessarily 13 -2 3 3 0 3

6 Everyone has an equal chance to 6 0 4 -3 3 2

23 All important stakeholders are takin 23 2 0 -2 -3 3

2 There are clear ground rules that 2 3 3 -1 -3 0

40 Although all had the chance to dis 40 2 -1 -1 4 -2

4 P was difficult and tiresome 4 3 -2 2 -2 -2

30 There is a clear plan for how to im 30 2 1 0 -3 -4

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues 14 2 0 1 3 -4

38 Public participation is a top down 38 1 2 4 0 -4

37 The process served to manipulate th 37 -4 3 4 1 0

17 Ps are involved in deciding how 17 -1 -4 -1 -5 3

36 The process served to bully the pub 36 -5 -3 2 2 1

33 The outcomes are personally desira 33 -3 2 -3 4 -3

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the 32 -3 -2 -2 -1 5

24 The process gives recommendations 24 -4 2 0 4 4

48 Public meetings are just to rubber 48 -1 5 3 -1 -1

22 The process cannot be open to just 22 -1 -5 3 -1 4

1 Ps should feel comfortable and safe 1 4 5 5 0 -3

46 PP is a top down initiative with no 46 -3 0 -4 -2 5

27 Every recommendation is justified 27 5 -2 1 5 -5

8 The P requires unbiased and indepe 8 5 4 5 2 -5

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Factor Characteristics**

Factors

1 2 3 4 5

No. of Defining Variables 3 2 6 1 1

Average Rel. Coef. 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800 0.800

Composite Reliability 0.923 0.889 0.960 0.800 0.800

S.E. of Factor Z-Scores 0.277 0.333 0.200 0.447 0.447

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Standard Errors for Differences in Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2 3 4 5

1 0.392 0.434 0.342 0.526 0.526

2 0.434 0.471 0.389 0.558 0.558

3 0.342 0.389 0.283 0.490 0.490

4 0.526 0.558 0.490 0.632 0.632

5 0.526 0.558 0.490 0.632 0.632

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

40 Although 40 2 0.52 -1 -0.72 -1 -0.58 4 1.56 -2 -0.78

37 The process 37 -4 -1.40\* 3 1.05 4 1.83 1 0.39 0 0.00

24 The process 24 -4 -1.53\* 2 0.65 0 0.00 4 1.56 4 1.56

36 The process 36 -5 -2.06 -3 -0.97 2 0.74 2 0.78 1 0.39

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

48 Public meet 48 -1 -0.78 5 2.30 3 1.31 -1 -0.39 -1 -0.39

47 Ps are ma 47 -2 -0.95 4 1.57 2 0.66 -1 -0.39 0 0.00

51 Ps had ge 51 -2 -0.79 2 0.85 -3 -1.11 -4 -1.56 -1 -0.39

27 Every reco 27 5 1.80 -2 -0.79 1 0.41 5 1.95 -5 -1.95

36 The proce 36 -5 -2.06 -3 -0.97 2 0.74 2 0.78 1 0.39

22 The proce 22 -1 -0.32 -5 -1.76 3 1.27 -1 -0.39 4 1.56

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

37 The process 37 -4 -1.40 3 1.05 4 1.83 1 0.39 0 0.00

38 Public part 38 1 0.49 2 0.65 4 1.54 0 0.00 -4 -1.56

48 Public mee 48 -1 -0.78 5 2.30 3 1.31 -1 -0.39 -1 -0.39

27 Every reco 27 5 1.80 -2 -0.79 1 0.41\* 5 1.95 -5 -1.95

19 Uncertain 19 2 0.75 2 0.71 -2 -0.65 1 0.39 1 0.39

20 Meetings w 20 2 0.79 0 0.27 -3 -0.84 1 0.39 1 0.39

6 Everyone h 6 0 -0.13 4 1.31 -3 -1.08\* 3 1.17 2 0.78

35 Ps feel a 35 0 0.00 -1 -0.59 -5 -1.89\* 1 0.39 -1 -0.39

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

40 Although al 40 2 0.52 -1 -0.72 -1 -0.58 4 1.56 -2 -0.78

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 5**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

32 Costs, reme 32 -3 -1.24 -2 -0.86 -2 -0.67 -1 -0.39 5 1.95\*

46 PP is a to 46 -3 -1.24 0 -0.06 -4 -1.71 -2 -0.78 5 1.95\*

17 Ps are in 17 -1 -0.36 -4 -1.51 -1 -0.33 -5 -1.95 3 1.17\*

14 Time was a 14 2 0.98 0 -0.19 1 0.46 3 1.17 -4 -1.56

38 Public par 38 1 0.49 2 0.65 4 1.54 0 0.00 -4 -1.56

27 Every reco 27 5 1.80 -2 -0.79 1 0.41 5 1.95 -5 -1.95

8 The P requ 8 5 2.29 4 1.70 5 2.37 2 0.78 -5 -1.95\*

**Saldanha ‘Process’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience than [+/- 3] listed in this summary

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3 Factor 4 Factor 5

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR\_ Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

3\* The dicuss 3 0 0.06 0 0.13 1 0.17 2 0.78 -1 -0.39

9 The purpose 9 1 0.30 0 0.27 0 -0.23 1 0.39 -2 -0.78

10 All partic 10 0 0.07 -1 -0.72 -2 -0.67 0 0.00 -2 -0.78

25 All import 25 -2 -0.82 -2 -0.79 0 -0.27 -3 -1.17 1 0.39

28\* The develop 28 -1 -0.20 1 0.33 1 0.06 0 0.00 2 0.78

49 The develop 49 1 0.23 2 0.72 0 -0.05 1 0.39 2 0.78

50\* Ps shared 50 -2 -0.82 -3 -0.92 -1 -0.58 -1 -0.39 -3 -1.17

##### DEA&DP ‘Process’

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

DEA&DP ‘Process’ Summary of results from QANALYZE:

PQMethod2.33

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Correlation Matrix between Participant Sorts**

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

1 DEDPTCpr 100 38 19 32 -2 20 60 44 33

2 DEDPKRPr 38 100 48 60 29 42 41 25 57

3 DEDPGGPr 19 48 100 48 33 24 26 28 35

4 DEDPAOPr 32 60 48 100 9 20 38 20 30

5 DEDPHJPr -2 29 33 9 100 57 22 23 37

6 DEDPMHPr 20 42 24 20 57 100 31 21 40

7 DEDPAMPr 60 41 26 38 22 31 100 39 41

8 DEDPAGPr 44 25 28 20 23 21 39 100 44

9 DEDPWAPr 33 57 35 30 37 40 41 44 100

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Unrotated Factor Matrix**

Factors

**SORTS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7\_\_**

1 DEDPTCpr 0.5172 -0.5404 0.4315 0.1422 0.0184 0.0213 0.0034

2 DEDPKRPr 0.7605 0.2571 0.1040 0.2631 0.0663 0.0661 0.0164

3 DEDPGGPr 0.5580 0.2202 0.0764 0.1087 0.0099 0.1252 0.0479

4 DEDPAOPr 0.5492 0.0244 0.0028 0.5339 0.4829 0.0607 0.0162

5 DEDPHJPr 0.4351 0.3269 0.1690 -0.4913 0.3540 -0.2971 0.1938

6 DEDPMHPr 0.5397 0.2020 0.0652 -0.2672 0.0767 -0.2380 0.0910

7 DEDPAMPr 0.6552 -0.3513 0.1016 0.0209 0.0001 -0.1279 0.0153

8 DEDPAGPr 0.5194 -0.2365 0.0348 -0.1266 0.0171 0.1509 0.0684

9 DEDPWAPr 0.6996 0.0018 0.0006 -0.1700 0.0305 0.1740 0.0919

Eigenvalues 3.1280 0.7342 0.2472 0.7444 0.3705 0.2385 0.0621

% expl.Var. 35 8 3 8 4 3 1

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining**

**Participant Sort for a Factor:**

Factor Loadings

QSORT 1 2

1 DEDPTCpr 0.3147 0.6786X

2 DEDPKRPr 0.8028X 0.0026

3 DEDPGGPr 0.5993X -0.0280

4 DEDPAOPr 0.5276 0.1545

5 DEDPHJPr 0.5174 -0.1686

6 DEDPMHPr 0.5760X -0.0167

7 DEDPAMPr 0.5064 0.5442X

8 DEDPAGPr 0.4150 0.3917

9 DEDPWAPr 0.6626X 0.2245

% expl.Var. 32 11

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Correlations Between Factor Scores**

1 2

1 1.0000 0.4647

2 0.4647 1.0000

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 1**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

8 The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 2.375

1 Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 1.987

31 One outcome of the pr to ensure the dev is accountable for 31 1.799

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone, restricted 22 -1.522

48 Public meetings are just to rubberstamp public approval 48 -1.714

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the deve are dist equitably 32 -1.884

25 All important decisions are make according to concensus 25 -2.058

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Factor Scores**

**(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 1.500) -- For Factor 2**

No. Statement No. Z-SCORES

8 The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 2.159

1 Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 1.994

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

25 All important decisions are make according to concensus 25 -1.563

51 P's had genuine and specifi formal decision making powers 51 -1.624

42 Citizens were delegated decision making power above dev lik 42 -1.830

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the deve are dist equitably 32 -2.159

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Descending Array of Differences Between**

**Factors 1 and 2**

* **(Selected at Z- Score > [+/-] 2.000)**

No. Statement No. Type 1 Type 2 Diff.

16 Participants are involved in 16 1.021 -1.028 2.049

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

22 The process cannot be open to just 22 -1.522 1.131 -2.653

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Each Statement**

Factor Arrays

No. Statement No. 1 2

1 Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 5 5

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how people intera 2 1 0

3 The discussion format allowed for inclusive participation 3 2 -1

4 Participation was difficult and tiresome 4 0 2

5 People's values and oppinions were discussed 5 3 -1

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns 6 2 -1

7 The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion 7 4 3

8 The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 5 5

9 The purposes and goals of the process are clear to all inv 9 -1 -1

10 All participants have equal access to information 10 1 -3

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local p 11 4 4

12 There was inadequate administraive support 12 -2 1

13 The pr did not unnessesarily slow down the development plan 13 -1 -2

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if 14 1 -2

15 There was inadequate notification of meetings, comment per 15 -1 0

16 Participants are involved in deciding WHAT studies done 16 3 -3

17 Participants are involved in deciding HOW studies done 17 2 -3

18 The best available science was not used in the analysis 18 -1 1

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and explored 19 3 -1

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and places 20 -1 -1

21 Financial resources were provided to enable people to P eff 21 0 -3

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone, restricted 22 -4 3

23 All important stakeholders are taking part in the process 23 1 1

24 The process gives recommendations to the developer who then 24 -3 2

25 All important decisions are make according to concensus 25 -5 -4

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is used in making dec 26 -3 -2

27 Every recommendation is justified with evidence 27 2 3

28 The developer responds in a timely way to all questions, co 28 -1 -2

29 The broader public was informed about what decisions are be 29 3 0

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes 30 1 1

31 One outcome of the pr to ensure the dev is accountable for 31 4 3

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the deve are dist equitably 32 -5 -5

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 2 0

34 The outcomes have broad based support in the community 34 0 0

35 Participants feel a sense of ownership in the out of e pr 35 0 -1

36 Pr served to bully the public into accepting a project alre 36 -3 1

37 Pr served to manipulate the public in accepting a proj that 37 -2 0

38 PP is a top down initiative but allows for feed back or neg 38 2 2

39 Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assur 39 1 4

40 Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their poin 40 0 4

41 Negotiations and tradeoffs were not posisble or all stakeho 41 0 2

42 Citizens were delegated decision making power above dev lik 42 -2 -5

43 Citizens made decisions with more influence than the dev 43 -1 -3

44 Citizens influenced the decision taking process effectively 44 -2 -1

45 No participation is allowed in the formal deicsion making p 45 0 -2

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback 46 -3 1

47 Participants are manipulated into thinking that their oppin 47 -2 2

48 Public meetings are just to rubberstamp public approval 48 -4 0

49 The dev devises solutions that are eventually authorised 49 1 2

50 P's shared planning and decision making resp with the dev 50 -2 -4

51 P's had genuine and specifi formal decision making powers 51 -4 -4

Variance = 6.471 St. Dev. = 2.544

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Factor Q-Sort Values for Statements sorted by**

**Consensus vs. Disagreement**

**(Variance across Factor Z-Scores)**

No. Statement No. 1 2

1 Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings 1 5 5

9 The purposes and goals of the process are clear to all inv 9 -1 -1

35 Participants feel a sense of ownership in the out of e pr 35 0 -1

7 The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion 7 4 3

34 The outcomes have broad based support in the community 34 0 0

11 The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local p 11 4 4

26 Consensus is used to decide what rule is used in making dec 26 -3 -2

44 Citizens influenced the decision taking process effectively 44 -2 -1

20 Meetings were held at appropriate times and places 20 -1 -1

30 There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes 30 1 1

8 The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation 8 5 5

32 Costs, remedies and benefits of the deve are dist equitably 32 -5 -5

23 All important stakeholders are taking part in the process 23 1 1

2 There are clear ground rules that govern how people intera 2 1 0

51 P's had genuine and specifi formal decision making powers 51 -4 -4

45 No participation is allowed in the formal deicsion making p 45 0 -2

38 PP is a top down initiative but allows for feed back or neg 38 2 2

28 The developer responds in a timely way to all questions, co 28 -1 -2

13 The pr did not unnessesarily slow down the development plan 13 -1 -2

25 All important decisions are make according to concensus 25 -5 -4

31 One outcome of the pr to ensure the dev is accountable for 31 4 3

49 The dev devises solutions that are eventually authorised 49 1 2

18 The best available science was not used in the analysis 18 -1 1

4 Participation was difficult and tiresome 4 0 2

15 There was inadequate notification of meetings, comment per 15 -1 0

33 The outcomes are personally desirable to me 33 2 0

27 Every recommendation is justified with evidence 27 2 3

50 P's shared planning and decision making resp with the dev 50 -2 -4

42 Citizens were delegated decision making power above dev lik 42 -2 -5

41 Negotiations and tradeoffs were not posisble or all stakeho 41 0 2

3 The discussion format allowed for inclusive participation 3 2 -1

43 Citizens made decisions with more influence than the dev 43 -1 -3

6 Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns 6 2 -1

39 Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assur 39 1 4

37 Pr served to manipulate the public in accepting a proj that 37 -2 0

14 Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if 14 1 -2

12 There was inadequate administraive support 12 -2 1

29 The broader public was informed about what decisions are be 29 3 0

21 Financial resources were provided to enable people to P eff 21 0 -3

5 People's values and oppinions were discussed 5 3 -1

47 Participants are manipulated into thinking that their oppin 47 -2 2

40 Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their poin 40 0 4

46 PP is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback 46 -3 1

10 All participants have equal access to information 10 1 -3

36 Pr served to bully the public into accepting a project alre 36 -3 1

19 Uncertainties were aknowledged and explored 19 3 -1

24 The process gives recommendations to the developer who then 24 -3 2

48 Public meetings are just to rubberstamp public approval 48 -4 0

17 Participants are involved in deciding HOW studies done 17 2 -3

16 Participants are involved in deciding WHAT studies done 16 3 -3

22 The process cannot be open to just anyone, restricted 22 -4 3

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Standard Errors for Differences in Factor Z-Scores**

(Diagonal Entries Are S.E. Within Factors)

Factors 1 2

1 0.343 0.412

2 0.412 0.471

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Distinguishing Statements of Factors**

**Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1**

* (P < .05 ; Asterisk (\*) Indicates Significance at P < .01)
* Both the Factor Q-Sort Value (Q-SV) and the Z-Score (Z-SCR) are shown.

Factor 1 Factor 2

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR \_

29 The broader public was infor 29 3 1.22\* 0 0.00

5 People's values and opinion 5 3 1.19\* -1 -0.10

19 Uncertainties were aknowledg 19 3 1.15\* -1 -0.43

16 Participants are involved i 16 3 1.02\* -3 -1.03

17 Participants are involved in 17 2 0.96\* -3 -1.03

3 The discussion format allowe 3 2 0.81 -1 -0.10

6 Everyone has an equal chance 6 2 0.60 -1 -0.41

14 Time was allowed to revisit 14 1 0.37\* -2 -0.70

10 All participants have equal 10 1 0.33\* -3 -1.19

39 Although all had the chance 39 1 0.33\* 4 1.40

41 Negotiations and tradeoffs 41 0 0.13 2 1.03

21 Financial resources were pr 21 0 0.08\* -3 -1.19

40 Although all had the chance 40 0 -0.02\* 4 1.40

43 Citizens made decisions with 43 -1 -0.43 -3 -1.40

12 There was inadequate admin 12 -2 -0.61\* 1 0.49

47 Participants are manipulate 47 -2 -0.62\* 2 0.74

37 Pr served to manipulate the 37 -2 -0.97\* 0 0.10

42 Citizens were delegated dec 42 -2 -0.98 -5 -1.83

24 The process gives recommend 24 -3 -1.13\* 2 0.66

36 Pr served to bully the publ 36 -3 -1.13\* 1 0.43

46 PP is a top down initiative 46 -3 -1.14\* 1 0.37

22 The process cannot be open 22 -4 -1.52\* 3 1.13

48 Public meetings are just to 48 -4 -1.71\* 0 0.10

**DEA&DP ‘Process’ Consensus Statements**

* **Those That Do Not Distinguish Between ANY Pair of Factors.**
* All Listed Statements are Non-Significant at P>.01,
* Those Flagged With an \* are also Non-Significant at P>.05.
* Only those including statements ranked with more salience than

[+/- 3] listed in this summary

Factor 1 Factor 2

No. Statement No. Q-SV Z-SCR Q-SV Z-SCR

1\* Participants feel comfortab 1 5 1.99 5 1.99

2\* There are clear ground rule 2 1 0.32 0 0.00

3 The discussion format 3 2 0.81 -1 -0.10

4\* Participation was 4 0 0.12 2 0.70

6 Everyone has an equal chanc 6 2 0.60 -1 -0.41

7\* The process has to be able 7 4 1.37 3 1.30

8\* The process requires unbias 8 5 2.38 5 2.16

9\* The purposes and goals of 9 -1 -0.34 -1 -0.33

11\* The process taps the know 11 4 1.28 4 1.36

13\* The pr did not unnessesari 13 -1 -0.19 -2 -0.60

15\* There was inadequate notify 15 -1 -0.57 0 0.10

18\* The best available science 18 -1 -0.30 1 0.27

20\* Meetings were held at appro 20 -1 -0.40 -1 -0.27

23\* All important stakeholders 23 1 0.24 1 0.53

25\* All important decisions are 25 -5 -2.06 -4 -1.56

26\* Consensus is used to decide 26 -3 -1.06 -2 -0.97

27\* Every recommendation is ju 27 2 0.39 3 1.13

28\* The developer responds in 28 -1 -0.21 -2 -0.60

30\* There is a clear plan for 30 1 0.37 1 0.16

31\* One outcome of the pr to e 31 4 1.80 3 1.30

32\* Costs, remedies and benefit 32 -5 -1.88 -5 -2.16

33\* The outcomes are personally 33 2 0.71 0 0.00

34\* The outcomes have broad bas 34 0 -0.13 0 -0.06

35\* Participants feel a sense o 35 0 -0.17 -1 -0.10

38\* PP is a top down initiative 38 2 0.96 2 0.60

41 Negotiations and tradeoffs 41 0 0.13 2 1.03

42 Citizens were delegated dec 42 -2 -0.98 -5 -1.83

43 Citizens made decisions wit 43 -1 -0.43 -3 -1.40

44\* Citizens influenced the dec 44 -2 -0.59 -1 -0.47

45\* No participation is allowed 45 0 -0.18 -2 -0.53

49\* The dev devises solutions t 49 1 0.17 2 0.70

50\* P's shared planning and dec 50 -2 -0.65 -4 -1.46

51\* P's had genuine and specifi 51 -4 -1.30 -4 -1.62

QANALYZE was completet at 10:40:09

### 9.5 Final Sets of Factors: Factor Interpretation and Description

As described in the methodology chapter, following the instruction of Webler et al. (2009) the final set of factors (idealised correlated social perspectives) were decided based on four main criteria of simplicity, clarity, distinctiveness and stability and informed by the Z-scores given to the factors and Q statements qualifying their statistical validity.

The results of the QMethod Factor analysis below shows the following statements that characterise the Factors identified. It also includes those statements that distinguish that factor statistically significantly at P < 0.01 (Flagged in the Appendices by an asterisk). Statements with +4 or +5 are statements that are in strong agreement with that factor (‘social perspective’) and those with -4 and -5 are statements that the factor (‘social perspective’) strongly disagrees with.

Social Perspectives for ‘Skills and Capacities’ Q method results

* EIA 1: Main Road - 5 ‘social perspectives’
* EIA 2: Saldanha - 5 ‘social perspectives’
* DEA&DP staff - 3 ‘social perspectives’

Social Perspectives for ‘Process’ Q method results

* EIA 1: Main Road - 4 ‘social perspectives’
* EIA 2: Saldanha - 5 ‘social perspectives’
* DEA&DP staff - 2 ‘social perspectives’

***Main Road: Skills and Capacities Factors***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 1 Statements (Main Road: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 16 | Participants who represent groups check in with their members regularly | +5 |
| 23 | Collaborative learning is only possible when power is willingly shared | -4 |
| 25 | The only valid decision is that which is democratically agreed upon | -5 |
| 31 | The process did not exclude those less able to articulate their opinion | +4 |
| 32 | Some affected parties could not participate for reasons that could have been avoided | -4 |
| 36 | Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA PP | +4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
|  | None |  |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Inclusive participation [31] is considered as valid [16] with general representation [32] 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Public participation does not necessarily require consensus made decisions [25]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 2 Statements (Main Road: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the process best | +4 |
| 22 | The participation does not improve participant’s understandings of others beliefs and values | -4 |
| 26 | Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda | +5 |
| 28 | Mainly the economic needs are considered by the participants | +4 |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of current and future generations are considered by the participants. | -5 |
| 36 | Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA PP | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 26 | Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda | +5 |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the process best | +4 |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of current and future generations are considered by the participants | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Knowledge can be manipulated [26] and used to control discussions and/or the process [15] 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Economic concerns [28] override environmental intergenerational agendas [30] | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 3 Statements (Main Road: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 2 | Constructive collaboration among participants was established | +5 |
| 3 | The stakeholder interactions promoted a sense of accountability and sincerity | +4 |
| 13 | Participants did not attend meetings regularly | -4 |
| 14 | Participants should be able to deal with complex and technical issues | -4 |
| 22 | The participation does not improve participant’s understandings of others beliefs and values | -5 |
| 23 | Collaborative learning is only possible when power is willingly shared | +4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 3 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 23 | Collaborative learning is only possible when power is willingly shared | +4 |
| 13 | Participants did not attend meetings regularly | -4 |
| 14 | Participants should be able to deal with complex and technical issues | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Constructive collaboration [2] and collaborative learning [23] within shared power moments [23] that allowed for improved understanding of others beliefs and values [22] promoted a sense of accountability and sincerity [3]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Consistently high participant turn out [13]    2. Participants trust the technical teams decisions and solutions [14] | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 4 Statements (Main Road: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 13 | Participants did not attend meetings regularly | +4 |
| 16 | Participants who represent groups check in with their members regularly | +5 |
| 26 | Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda | -5 |
| 27 | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | +4 |
| 31 | The process did not exclude those less able to articulate | -4 |
| 35 | Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 4 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 31 | The process did not exclude those less able to articulate | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Despite valid group representation [16] irregular attendance [13] of individual participants is coupled with the exclusion of those less able to articulate their opinions [31]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Strong faith that knowledge is not being manipulated [26].    2. Social concerns are foregrounded [27] by participants.    3. Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [35]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 5 Statements (Main Road: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 2 | Constructive collaboration among participants was established | -4 |
| 13 | Participants did not attend meetings regularly | +5 |
| 14 | Participants should be able to deal with complex and technical issues | +4 |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the process best | -5 |
| 19 | Inadequate opportunity was given to develop the participants understanding of the project | +4 |
| 35 | Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 5 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the process best | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Discussions were not controlled by those who understood the process best [15] yet more capacitating could have been done to develop participants understanding of the project [19] and to be able to deal with complex and technical issues [14]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Participation characterised by irregular attendance [13] coupled with a lack of constructive collaboration [2].    2. Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [35]. | | |

***Saldanha Skills and Capacities***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 1 Statements (Saldanha: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 4 | The developer needs to have reasonable expectations of stakeholder input | +4 |
| 5 | It is difficult to build trust among the different participants | +4 |
| 17 | Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer | -4 |
| 25 | The only valid decision is that which is democratically agreed upon | -4 |
| 29 | Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants | -5 |
| 35 | Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important | +5 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 29 | Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Public participation does provide a potential platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [35], yet most participants do not consider the composite nor intergenerational aspects of the environment [29]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Transparency, trust [5] and ideal role taking [4] did not occur.    2. Democratic decision making is not always appropriate [25].    3. Participation decreased with time [17]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 2 Statements (Saldanha: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 6 | Participation builds people’s faith in government and strengthens democracy | -4 |
| 7 | Participation does not make any pre-existing conflicts worse | -4 |
| 11 | Some participants do not see beyond their individual interest to those of the larger community | +5 |
| 17 | Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer | +4 |
| 27 | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | -5 |
| 29 | Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants | +4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 17 | Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer | +4 |
| 19 | Inadequate opportunity was given to develop the participants understanding of the project | -3 |
| 27 | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Ideal role taking is hampered by participants not seeing beyond their individual (environmental [29]) interests to understand the social needs [27] of the community [11]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. A disconnect between the substantive outcomes of public participation [19; 6; 7] and the agendas of the conflicting stakeholder agendas [11]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 3 Statements (Saldanha: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 4 | The developer needs to have reasonable expectations of stakeholder input | +4 |
| 11 | Some participants do not see beyond their individual interest to those of the larger community | +5 |
| 17 | Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer | -4 |
| 25 | The only valid decision is that which is democratically agreed upon | -5 |
| 28 | Mainly the economic needs are considered by the participants | +4 |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of current and future generations are considered by the participants. | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 3 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the process best | +3 |
| 22 | The participation does not improve participant’s understandings of others beliefs and values | -3 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The economic concerns of the developer [11; 4; 30] did not allow for transparency [15] nor for the ideal role taking accommodation of stakeholder interests [28; 4; 3]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Lack of power neutrality [11; 4; 3; 28] hindered the understanding others beliefs and values [22]    2. Participation decreased with time [17]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 4 Statements (Saldanha: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 5 | It is difficult to build trust among the different participants | +5 |
| 14 | Participants should be able to deal with complex and technical issues | +4 |
| 25 | The only valid decision is that which is democratically agreed upon | -4 |
| 26 | Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda | +4 |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of current and future generations are considered by the participants. | -4 |
| 34 | Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment | -5 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 4 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 34 | Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The sustainability of democratic control of the environment [34] is restricted by       1. The difficulty in building trust amongst participants [5]       2. Educated participants’ manipulation of knowledge [26]       3. Participants not considering the composite and intergenerational aspects of the environment [30]. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 5 Statements (Saldanha: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 10 | Ps were good listeners and open minded to consider all possibilities | -4 |
| 27 | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | +4 |
| 28 | Mainly the economic needs are considered by the participants | +5 |
| 31 | The process did not exclude those less able to articulate their opinion | -5 |
| 35 | Public participation better enables me to influence what I consider valuable/important | +4 |
| 36 | Understanding democratic rights is not essential to EIA public participation | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 5 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 11 | Some participants do not see beyond their individual interest to those of the larger community | -3 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The economic considerations [28] did not allow for some participants to see beyond their individual interests [11] to the social [4] needs of the community. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Participants are not good ideal role takers [10]    2. Generality and autonomy in deliberations compromised for those less able to articulate their opinion [31]. | | |

***DEA&DP Staff Skills and Capacities***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 1 Statements (DEA&DP: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 11 | | Some participants do not see beyond their individual interests to what is good for the larger community | +5 |
| 15 | | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best | +4 |
| 25 | | The only valid decision is that which is democratically agreed upon by the stakeholders | -5 |
| 26 | | Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda | +4 |
| 30 | | The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants | -4 |
| 31 | | The process did not exclude those less able to articulate their opinion | -4 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants | | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The process is controlled [15] and manipulated [26] by those with process knowledge [15] and higher education levels [26] and excludes those unable to articulate their opinion [31]. ] 2. Secondary Belief:    1. The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are not considered by all the participants [30]. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 2 Statements (DEA&DP: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 5 | | It is difficult to build trust among the different participants during the process | +4 |
| 24 | | Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholders knowledge | +4 |
| 27 | | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | -4 |
| 28 | | Mainly the economic needs are considered by the participants | -4 |
| 34 | | Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment | +5 |
| 36 | | Understanding of democratic rights is not essential to EIA public participation | -5 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 34 | Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment | | +5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment [34], however it is difficult to build trust among the different participants [5] and the social [27] and economic [28] needs are often not considered. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholder’s knowledge [24].    2. Understanding of democratic rights is essential to EIA public participation [36]. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 3 Statements (DEA&DP: Skills and Capacities)** | **Column** |
| 6 | | Participation builds people’s faith in government and strengthens democracy | +4 |
| 15 | | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best | -5 |
| 22 | | The process does not improve participants’ understandings of others’ beliefs, values, and perspectives | -4 |
| 27 | | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | +5 |
| 30 | | The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants | +4 |
| 36 | | Understanding of democratic rights is not essential to EIA public participation | -4 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 3 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 27 | Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants | | +5 |
| 6 | Participation builds people’s faith in government and strengthens democracy | | +4 |
| 30 | The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants | | +4 |
| 24 | Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholders knowledge | | -3 |
| 22 | The process does not improve participants’ understandings of others’ beliefs, values, and perspectives | | -4 |
| 15 | Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best | | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Mainly the social needs are fore fronted [27] but economic and environmental needs are also considered [30]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Discussions were not controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best [15].    2. Participation builds people’s faith in government and strengthens democracy [6] but does not improve participants understandings of others beliefs, values and perspectives [22]. | | | |

***Main Road Process***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 1 Statements (Main Road: Process)** | **Column** |
| 3 | | The discussion format allowed inclusive participation | +5 |
| 4 | | Participation was difficult and tiresome | +4 |
| 6 | | Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns | +5 |
| 13 | | The process did not unnecessarily slow down the development | +4 |
| 18 | | The best available science was not used in the analysis | -5 |
| 23 | | All important stakeholders are taking part in the process | -4 |
| 31 | | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +4 |
| 37 | | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -4 |
| 45 | | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -4 |
| 48 | | Public meetings are just to rubber stamp public approval | -5 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 23 | All important stakeholders are taking part in the process | | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Generality [23], Power Neutrality [6] and Autonomy [3] in deliberation occurred without instances of manipulation [37] nor placation [48] of the participants. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. The best available science [18] was used.    2. Although tiresome [4] the process did not unnecessarily slow down the development [13] | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 2 Statements (Main Road: Process)** | **Column** |
| 6 | | Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns | +4 |
| 7 | | The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order to avoid getting too bogged down | +4 |
| 10 | | All participants have equal access to information | +4 |
| 14 | | Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if it meant extending the timetable | +5 |
| 20 | | Meetings were held at appropriate times and places so no one was excluded from participating | -4 |
| 21 | | Financial resources were provided to enable people to participate effectively | -4 |
| 32 | | Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are distributed equitably | -4 |
| 33 | | The outcomes are personally desirable to me | -5 |
| 45 | | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -5 |
| 49 | | The developer devises solutions that are eventually authorized by the participants | +5 |
|  | | | |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 49 | The developer devises solutions that are eventually authorized by the participants | | +5 |
| 37 | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | | +3 |
| 32 | Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are distributed equitably | | -4 |
| 20 | Meetings were held at appropriate times and places so no one was excluded from participating | | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Time extensions [14] allowed for citizen acceptance of developer solutions [49]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Process challenged on grounds of elements of manipulation [37], exclusion [20] and inequality of power to participate [21] for participants.    2. Generality [6] alone does not necessarily result in equitably distributed costs, remedies and benefits [32]. | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 3 Statements (Main Road: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at meetings | +5 |
| 3 | The discussion format allowed inclusive participation | +4 |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 11 | The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people | +4 |
| 15 | There was inadequate notification of meetings, comment period etc. | -5 |
| 31 | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +4 |
| 36 | The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -5 |
| 37 | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -4 |
| 45 | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -4 |
| 46 | Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 3 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] is imperative to providing the ideal atmosphere [1; 36], administrative support [15] and substance of deliberation [31; 11; 35; 36]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Involvement of the local community [11] reinforces the exclusion of bullying [36] and manipulation [37; 45] of the project. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 4 Statements (Main Road: Process)** | **Column** |
| 2 | There are clear ground rules that govern how people interact | -5 |
| 6 | Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns | +5 |
| 7 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 11 | The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people | +4 |
| 26 | Consensus is used to decide what rule is used to make decisions | -4 |
| 30 | There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes | 4 |
| 33 | The outcomes are personally desirable to me | -5 |
| 44 | Citizens influenced the decision taking process effectively determining the environmental authorization | -4 |
| 45 | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | 4 |
| 51 | Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 4 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 45 | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | 4 |
| 2 | There are clear ground rules that govern how people interact | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] enabled generality [6] and autonomy [11] despite the absence of clear ground rules that govern how people interact [2]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Citizen power is undefined yet excludes notions of bullying [36] manipulation [37] and informing [45; 46]. | | |

***Saldanha Process***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 1 Statements (Saldanha: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at meetings | +4 |
| 5 | | Participants values and opinions were discussed | +4 |
| 8 | | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 24 | | The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions | -4 |
| 26 | | Consensus is used to decide what rule is used to make decisions | -4 |
| 27 | | Every recommendation is justified with evidence | +5 |
| 31 | | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +4 |
| 36 | | The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -5 |
| 37 | | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -4 |
| 45 | | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -5 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
| 37 | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief: 2. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] aided the quality of analysis [27; 5] and the substance of deliberation [31]. 3. Secondary Belief:    1. On the continuum or rung, citizen power is considered to be no lower than consultation [24; 36; 37; 45]. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 2 Statements (Saldanha: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at meetings | +5 |
| 6 | | Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns | +4 |
| 8 | | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +4 |
| 17 | | Participants are involved in deciding how studies should be done | -4 |
| 21 | | Financial resources were provided to enable people to participate effectively | -5 |
| 22 | | The process cannot be open to just anyone who want to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way | -5 |
| 34 | | The outcomes have broad based support within the community | -4 |
| 45 | | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -4 |
| 47 | | Participants are manipulated into thinking their opinions count towards the decision making | +4 |
| 48 | | Public meetings are just to rubber stamp public approval | +5 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
|  | None | |  |
| 1. Core Belief: 2. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] is imperative to providing the ideal atmosphere [1] and enabled superficial generality [6 qualified by 21] in deliberation. 3. Secondary Belief: 4. Citizen power is considered to be reduced to tokenism [48] and manipulation [47], limited generality [21] with a lack of both power neutrality in deliberation [22] and support from the community [34]. | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 3 Statements (Saldanha: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at meetings | +5 |
| 7 | The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order to avoid getting too bogged down | +4 |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 34 | The outcomes have broad based support within the community | -5 |
| 35 | Participants feel a sense of ownership in the outcomes of the process | -5 |
| 37 | The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was going ahead regardless of participant input/responses | -4 |
| 38 | Public participation is a top down initiative but allows for feedback and negotiation | +4 |
| 44 | Citizens made decisions with more influence than what the developer liked | -4 |
| 45 | No participation is allowed in the formal decision making | -4 |
| 46 | Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 3 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 6 | Everyone has an equal chance to voice their concerns | -3 |
| 35 | Participants feel a sense of ownership in the outcomes of the process | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief: 2. Public participation is a top down initiative [38] with placative feedback and negotiation [34; 35] restricted by limited generality [6] ownership [35] and token citizen power [38]. 3. Secondary Belief: 4. Citizen power is restricted but not considered to be manipulative [47]. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 4 Statements (Saldanha: Process)** | **Column** |
| 16 | | Participants are involved in deciding what studies should be done | -5 |
| 17 | | Participants are involved in deciding how studies ought be done | -5 |
| 21 | | Financial resources were provided to enable people to participate effectively | -4 |
| 24 | | The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions | +4 |
| 27 | | Every recommendation is justified with evidence | +5 |
| 31 | | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +5 |
| 33 | | The outcomes are personally desirable to me | +4 |
| 40 | | Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point there was no assurance that their views would be listened to | +4 |
| 44 | | Citizens made decisions with more influence than what the developer liked | -4 |
| 51 | | Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making | -4 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 4 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
|  | None | |  |
| 1. Core Belief: 2. Citizen power considered as Consultation and Placation [40; 44; 50; 24]. 3. Secondary Belief: 4. The validity of the decisions regarding the accountability of the developer [31; 24] and evidence given [27] is challenged by lack of power neutrality [21; 16; 17] in the quality of analysis. | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 5 Statements (Saldanha: Process)** | **Column** |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | -5 |
| 14 | Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if it mean extending the timetable | -4 |
| 22 | The process cannot be open to just anyone who want to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way | +4 |
| 24 | The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions | +4 |
| 27 | Every recommendation is justified with evidence | -5 |
| 30 | There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes | -4 |
| 31 | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +4 |
| 32 | Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are distributed equitably | +5 |
| 38 | Public participation is a top down initiative but allows for feedback or negotiation | -4 |
| 46 | Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation | -5 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 4 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 32 | Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are distributed equitably | +5 |
| 46 | Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation | +5 |
| 17 | Participants are involved in deciding how studies should be done | +3 |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | -5 |
| 1. Core Belief: 2. Developer accountability is of paramount importance [32; 31] 3. Secondary Belief: 4. Evidence for decisions questioned [27]. 5. Citizen power is limited in generality [22] and no significant participation occurred [46; 38]. 6. Independence of the EAP seen as impossible yet not a necessary requirement [8]. | | |

***DEA&DP Staff Process***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Factor 1 Statements (DEA&DP: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings | +5 |
| 7 | The process has to be able to limit topics of discussion in order to avoid getting too bogged down | +4 |
| 8 | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 11 | The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people | +4 |
| 22 | The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way | -4 |
| 25 | All important decisions are made according to consensus (including the agenda) | -5 |
| 31 | One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises | +4 |
| 32 | Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably | -5 |
| 48 | Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval | -4 |
| 51 | Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making | -4 |
|  | | |
|  | **Factor 1 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** |  |
| 29 | The broader public was informed about what decisions are being considered and made | +3 |
| 5 | People’s values and opinions were discussed | +3 |
| 19 | Uncertainties were acknowledged and explored | +3 |
| 16 | Participants are involved in deciding what studies should be done | +3 |
| 24 | The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions | -3 |
| 36 | The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input | -3 |
| 46 | Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation | -3 |
| 22 | The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way | -4 |
| 48 | Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval | -4 |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [1].    2. Although an outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises [31], the costs, remedies and benefits of the development are not distributed equitably [32]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Generality must not be limited [22] but the topics of discussion must be limited [7].    2. Citizen power in decision making is considered above non-participation [48] and manipulation [36] but below delegated power [51] | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | | **Factor 2 Statements (DEA&DP: Process)** | **Column** |
| 1 | | Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings | +5 |
| 8 | | The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation | +5 |
| 11 | | The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people | +4 |
| 25 | | All important decisions are made according to consensus (including the agenda) | -4 |
| 32 | | Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably | -5 |
| 39 | | Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to | 4 |
| 40 | | Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to | 4 |
| 42 | | Citizens were delegated decision making power above what the developer liked | -5 |
| 50 | | Participants sharedplanning and decision making responsibilities with the developer | -4 |
| 51 | | Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making | -4 |
|  | | | |
|  | **Factor 2 Statistically Significant Distinguishing Statements** | |  |
|  | None | |  |
| 1. Core Belief:    1. The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [1]. 2. Secondary Belief:    1. Citizen power in decision making above informing [39] and consultation [4] but below partnership [50] and delegated power [51].    2. The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people [11].    3. Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are not distributed equitably [32]. | | | |