

Results of MPhil Q method reseach

Research Title: Effective EIA Public Participation in the Western Cape, South Africa: Stakeholders' opinions of the participation process and the skills and capacities needed to realise NEMA-required effective participation.

Author/Researcher: Nicholas Pihilip Simpson

Institution: University of Cpae Town, South Africa.

5.2 Table 9: Main Road ‘Skills and Capacities’ Social Perspectives

Factor Description (Social Perspectives)	Points of Agreement	Points of Disagreement
<p><u>Factor 1:</u> <u>Core Belief</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusive participation [S&C:S31] is considered as valid [S&C:S16] with general representation [S&C:S32]. <u>Secondary Belief</u> a. Public participation does not necessarily require consensus made decisions [S&C:S25].</p>	<p>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]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement): <u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u> 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.</p>
<p><u>Factor 2:</u> <u>Core Belief</u> 2. Knowledge can be manipulated [S&C:S26] and used to control discussions and/or the process [S&C:S15]. <u>Secondary Belief</u> 3. Economic concerns [S&C:S28] override environmental intergenerational agendas [S&C:S30].</p>		
<p><u>Factor 3:</u> <u>Core Belief</u> 4. 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]. <u>Secondary Belief</u> 5. Consistently high participant turn out [S&C:S13]. 6. Participants trust the technical teams decisions and solutions [S&C:S14].</p>		<p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u> 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.</p>
<p><u>Factor 4:</u> <u>Core Belief</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <u>Secondary Belief:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. </p>		
<p><u>Factor 5:</u> <u>Core Belief</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <u>Secondary Belief</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. </p>		

5.3 Table 10: Saldanha ‘Skills and Capacities’ Social Perspectives

Factor Description (Social Perspectives)	Points of Agreement	Points of disagreement
<p><u>Factor 1:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 	<p>Consensus Statements across factors:</p> <p>[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]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):</p> <p><u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [S&C:S34] Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment. [S&C:S11] Some participants do not see beyond their individual interests to what is good for the larger community. [S&C:S27] Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants. [S&C:S29] Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants. [S&C:S17] Participation from different stakeholders increases as the final decision gets closer.
<p><u>Factor 2:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 		<p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [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. [S&C:S5] It is difficult to build trust among the different participants during the process. [S&C:S30] The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants. [S&C:S28] Mainly the economic issues are considered by the participants.
<p><u>Factor 3:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 		
<p><u>Factor 4:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sustainability of democratic control of the environment [S&C:S34] is restricted by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 		
<p><u>Factor 5:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p><u>Factor 1:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are not considered by all the participants [S&C:S30]. 	<p>Consensus Statements across factors:</p> <p>[S&C:S29] Mainly the environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by the participants. [F1 -3; F2 -3; F3 -2]</p> <p>[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]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):</p> <p><u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [S&C:S15] Discussions were controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best. [S&C:S27] Mainly the social needs are considered by the participants. [S&C:S30] The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are considered by all the participants. [S&C:S24] Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholders’ knowledge. [S&C:S22] The process does not improve participants’ understandings of others’ beliefs, values, and perspectives. <p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [S&C:S11] Some participants do not see beyond their individual interests to what is good for the larger community. [S&C:S34] Public participation is a sustainable way to democratically share control of the environment. [S&C:S26] Those with higher education levels are able to manipulate knowledge to suit their agenda. [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
<p><u>Factor 1:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The best available science [Pr:S18] was used. Although tiresome [Pr:S4] the process did not unnecessarily slow down the development [Pr:S13]. 	<p>Consensus Statements across factors:</p> <p>[Pr:S19] Uncertainties were acknowledged and explored. [F1 +1; F2 +2; F3 +2; F4 +3]</p> <p>[Pr:S41] Negotiation and trade-offs were not possible for all stakeholders. [F1 -3; F2 0; F3 -1; F4 -1]</p> <p>[Pr:S43] Citizens made decisions with more influence than the developer. [F1 0; F2 -3; F3 -2; F4 -3]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):</p> <p><u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S45] No participation is allowed in the formal decision-making process or even considered. [Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation. [Pr:S11] The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people. [Pr:S2] There are clear ground rules that govern how people should interact. [Pr:S36] The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input.
<p><u>Factor 2:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time extensions [Pr:S14] allowed for citizen acceptance of developer solutions [Pr:S49]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 	<p>[Pr:S41] Negotiation and trade-offs were not possible for all stakeholders. [F1 -3; F2 0; F3 -1; F4 -1]</p> <p>[Pr:S43] Citizens made decisions with more influence than the developer. [F1 0; F2 -3; F3 -2; F4 -3]</p>	<p>[Pr:S2] There are clear ground rules that govern how people should interact.</p> <p>[Pr:S36] The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input.</p>
<p><u>Factor 3:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement of the local community [Pr:S11] reinforces the exclusion of bullying [Pr:S36] and manipulation [Pr:S37; Pr:S45] of the project. 		<p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S37] The process served to manipulate the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input. [Pr:S33] The outcomes are personally desirable to me (...or my organization or the interest group I am representing). [Pr:S23] All important stakeholders are taking part in the process. [Pr:S31] One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promise.
<p><u>Factor 4:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p><u>Factor 1:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] aided the quality of analysis [Pr:S27; Pr:S5] and the substance of deliberation [Pr:S31]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citizen power is considered to be no lower than consultation [Pr:S24; Pr:S36; Pr:S37; Pr:S45]. 	<p>Consensus Statements across factors:</p> <p>[Pr:S3] The discussion format allowed inclusive participation. [F1 0; F2 0; F3 +1; F4 +2; F5 -1]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):</p> <p><u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation. [Pr:S27] Every recommendation is justified with evidence. [Pr:S46] Public participation is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback or negotiation. [Pr:S1] Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings. [Pr:S22] The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way.
<p><u>Factor 2:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 	<p>[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]</p> <p>[Pr:S50] Participants shared planning and decision making responsibilities with the developer. [F1 -2; F2 -3; F3 -1; F4 -1; F5 -3]</p>	<p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S48] Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval. [Pr:S24] The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decision. [Pr:S32] Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably. [Pr:S33] The outcomes are personally desirable to me (...or my organization or the interest group I am representing). [Pr:S36] The process served to bully the public into accepting a project that was already going ahead regardless of participant responses/input.
<p><u>Factor 3:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citizen power is restricted but not considered to be manipulative [Pr:S47]. 		
<p><u>Factor 4:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citizen power considered as Consultation and Placation [Pr:S40; Pr:S44; Pr:S50; Pr:S24]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
<p><u>Factor 5:</u> <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer accountability is of paramount importance [Pr:S32; Pr:S31]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Factor 1:</u></p> <p><u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 	<p>Consensus Statements across factors:</p> <p>[Pr:S1] Participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings. [F1 +5; F2 +5]</p> <p>[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]</p> <p>[Pr:S8] The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation. [F1 +5; F2 +5]</p>	<p>Contrasting [+5, +4, -5, & -4] statistically significant statements across factors (drawn from Appendix: statements sorted by variance of Consensus vs. Disagreement):</p> <p><u>Top 5 Statements of greatest disagreement</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S22] The process cannot be open to just anyone who wants to participate, participation has to be restricted in some way. [Pr:S16] Participants are involved in deciding what studies should be done. [Pr:S17] Participants are involved in deciding how studies should be done. [Pr:S48] Public meetings are just to rubber-stamp public approval. [Pr:S24] The process gives recommendations to the developer who then makes the final decisions.
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Factor 2:</u></p> <p><u>Core Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [Pr:S8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [Pr:S1]. <p><u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. 	<p>[Pr:S31] One outcome of the process is a plan to ensure that the developer is accountable for their promises. [F1 +4; F2 +3]</p> <p>[Pr:S32] Costs (pollution), remedies (clean up) and benefits of the development (employment etc.) are distributed equitably. [F1 -5; F2 -5]</p> <p>[Pr:S50] Participants shared planning and decision making responsibilities with the developer. [F1 -2; F2 -4]</p> <p>[Pr:S51] Participants had genuine and specific powers of formal decision making. [F1 -4; F2 -4]</p>	<p><u>Statements of significant disagreement (listed in order of progressive difference between factors)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> [Pr:S40] Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to. [Pr:S39] Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assurance that their views will be listened to. [Pr:S42] Citizens were delegated decision making power above what the developer liked.

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	68	48	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

SORTS	Factors							
	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	0.2509
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:

QSORT	Factor Loadings				
	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

Main 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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor Arrays				
			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 develop 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

No. of Defining Variables	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		Q-SV Z-SCR	Q-SV Z-SCR	Q-SV Z-SCR	Q-SV Z-SCR	Q-SV Z-SCR
26 Those with high...	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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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

SORTS	Factors							
	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 MRDOPr1	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:

QSORT	Factor Loadings				
	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 consid	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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor Arrays				
			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 develop	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

No. of Defining Variables	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5					
		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'

Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

DEA&DP 'Skills and Capacities' Summary of results from QANALYZE: PQMethod2.33

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

sorts	Factors							
	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	0.0924	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:

QSORT	Factor Loadings		
	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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor Arrays		
1	1 Participants were courteous and respectful of oth	1	-3	2	-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 consid	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 develop 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.

No.	Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
26	26 Those with higher education levels 26	26	4 1.82	2 0.82	-1 -0.41
33	33 The process required literacy lev 33	33	2 1.03*	-1 -0.41	-1 -0.41
27	27 Mainly the social needs are consi 27	27	2 0.62*	-4 -1.63	5 2.04
28	28 Mainly the economic are considered 28	28	1 0.45*	-4 -1.63	-3 -1.22
12	12 Participants had reasonable expe 12	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.

No.	Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
34	34 Public participation is a sustaina 34	34	0 0.19	5 2.04*	0 0.00
14	14 Participants should be able to deal 14	14	-2 -0.81	3 1.22*	-3 -1.22
30	30 The social, economic and environme 30	30	-4 -1.62	0 0.00*	4 1.63
11	11 Some participants do not see beyo 11	11	5 1.95	-1 -0.41*	3 1.22
27	27 Mainly the social needs are consid 27	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.

No.	Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
27	27 Mainly the social needs are consid 27	27	2 0.62	-4 -1.63	5 2.04*
6	6 Participation builds people's faith 6	6	-1 -0.42	0 0.00	4 1.63*
30	30 The social, economic and environm 30	30	-4 -1.62	0 0.00	4 1.63*
21	21 Adequate assistance was provided 21	21	-3 -1.07	-2 -0.82	2 0.82*
10	10 Participants were good listeners 10	10	-2 -0.94	-3 -1.22	1 0.41*
5	5 It is difficult to build trust amo 5	5	3 1.04	4 1.63	0 0.00
24	24 Expert knowledge is valued more 24	24	3 1.32	4 1.63	-3 -1.22*
22	22 The process does not improve part 22	22	1 0.31	3 1.22	-4 -1.63*
15	15 Discussions were controlled by tho 15	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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	1 Participants were courteous and 1	1	-3 -1.20	0 0.00	-1 -0.41
2*	2 Constructive collaboration among 2	2	0 -0.05	-2 -0.82	1 0.41
3*	3 The stakeholder's interactions p 3	3	0 0.07	0 0.00	1 0.41
4	4 The developer needs to have reas 4	4	3 1.22	0 0.00	3 1.22
7*	7 Participation does not make any pr 7	7	-2 -1.03	-1 -0.41	-1 -0.41
8*	8 Participation builds the confiden 8	8	0 0.08	-1 -0.41	1 0.41
9*	9 Participation helps create new an 9	9	-1 -0.14	2 0.82	0 0.00
13	13 Participants did not attend meet 13	13	1 0.37	1 0.41	-2 -0.82
16	16 Participants should be able to 16	16	-1 -0.21	1 0.41	2 0.82
17*	17 Participation from different 17	17	0 0.27	0 0.00	-1 -0.41
18*	18 To take part effectively 18	18	0 -0.01	-1 -0.41	0 0.00
19*	19 Inadequate opportunity was given 19	19	2 0.91	1 0.41	0 0.00
20	20 Adequate opportunity was given 20	20	-2 -1.06	-2 -0.82	0 0.00
23*	23 Collaborative learning is only 23	23	2 0.93	2 0.82	2 0.82
25*	25 The only valid decision is that 25	25	-5 -1.70	-3 -1.22	-2 -0.82
29*	29 Mainly the environmental needs 29	29	-3 -1.40	-3 -1.22	-2 -0.82
32	32 Some affected parties could not 32	32	1 0.31	1 0.41	-2 -0.82
35*	35 Public participation better 35	35	1 0.31	2 0.82	3 1.22
36	36 Understanding of democratic 36	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 5MRFFPr	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 10MRJCPPr	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 14MRPDPPr	-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 17MRVMPPr	37	44	61	59	35	-19	42	18	50	55	47	42	58	13	47	47	100

Main Road 'Process' Unrotated Factor Matrix

SORTS	Factors							
	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 5MRFFPr	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 10MRJCPPr	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 14MRPDPPr	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 17MRVMPPr	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:

QSORT	Factor Loadings			
	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 5MRFFPr	-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 10MRJCPPr	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 14MRPDPPr	-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 17MRVMPPr	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 ariresome	4	1.557
13	The process did not unnecessarily 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 unnecessarily 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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor Arrays				
			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 unnecessarily 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 acknowledged 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 unnecessarily 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.

No.	Statement	No.	Factor 1		2		3		4	
			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

No.	Statement	No.	Q-SV	Z-SCR	Q-SV	Z-SCR	Factor 3	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

No.	Statement	No.	Q-SV	Z-SCR	Q-SV	Z-SCR	Factor 4	Q-SV	Z-SCR	
45	No participation	45	-4	-1.56	-5	-1.95	4	1.56*	-5	-1.95
8	The P requires	8	-3	-1.17	-3	-1.17	2	0.78*	-3	-1.17
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

No.	Statement	No.	Factors							
			1	2	3	4				
3	The discussion	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							
		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 s1	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)

[Zero positive statements]

No.	Statement	No.	Type 1	Type 2	Diff.
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

No.	Statement	No.	Factor Arrays				
			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 unnecessarily	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 acknowledged 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 acknowledged 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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
		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 DEDPAMPPr	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

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 DEDPAMPPr	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:

QSORT	Factor Loadings	
	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 DEDPAMPPr	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

No.	Statement	Factor Arrays		
		No.	1	2
1	Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings	1	5	5
2	There are clear ground rules that govern how people interact	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 opinions 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 involved	9	-1	-1
10	All participants have equal access to information	10	1	-3
11	The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people	11	4	4
12	There was inadequate administrative support	12	-2	1
13	The process did not unnecessarily 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 period	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 acknowledged 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 participate effectively	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 made according to consensus	25	-5	-4
26	Consensus is used to decide what rule is used in making decisions	26	-3	-2
27	Every recommendation is justified with evidence	27	2	3
28	The developer responds in a timely way to all questions, comments	28	-1	-2
29	The broader public was informed about what decisions are being made	29	3	0
30	There is a clear plan for how to implement the outcomes	30	1	1
31	One outcome of the process to ensure the developer is accountable for	31	4	3
32	Costs, remedies and benefits of the developer are distributed 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 outcome of the process	35	0	-1
36	The process served to bully the public into accepting a project already	36	-3	1
37	The process served to manipulate the public in accepting a project that	37	-2	0
38	The process is a top down initiative but allows for feedback or negotiation	38	2	2
39	Although all had the chance to be heard, there was no assurance	39	1	4
40	Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point	40	0	4
41	Negotiations and tradeoffs were not possible or all stakeholders	41	0	2
42	Citizens were delegated decision making power above developer likelihood	42	-2	-5
43	Citizens made decisions with more influence than the developer	43	-1	-3
44	Citizens influenced the decision taking process effectively	44	-2	-1
45	No participation is allowed in the formal decision making process	45	0	-2
46	The process is a top down initiative with no allowance for feedback	46	-3	1
47	Participants are manipulated into thinking that their opinions	47	-2	2
48	Public meetings are just to rubberstamp public approval	48	-4	0
49	The developer devises solutions that are eventually authorised	49	1	2
50	The developer's shared planning and decision making response with the developer	50	-2	-4
51	The developer had genuine and specific 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	2
1	Participants feel comfortable and safe at meetings	1	5	5
9	The purposes and goals of the process are clear to all involved	9	-1	-1
35	Participants feel a sense of ownership in the outcome of the process	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 people	11	4	4
26	Consensus is used to decide what rule is used in making decisions	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 developer are distributed 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 interact	2	1	0
51	The developer had genuine and specific formal decision making powers	51	-4	-4
45	No participation is allowed in the formal decision making process	45	0	-2
38	The process is a top down initiative but allows for feedback or negotiation	38	2	2
28	The developer responds in a timely way to all questions, comments	28	-1	-2
13	The process did not unnecessarily slow down the development plan	13	-1	-2
25	All important decisions are made according to consensus	25	-5	-4
31	One outcome of the process to ensure the developer is accountable for	31	4	3
49	The developer 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 period	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	The developer's shared planning and decision making response with the developer	50	-2	-4
42	Citizens were delegated decision making power above developer likelihood	42	-2	-5
41	Negotiations and tradeoffs were not possible or all stakeholders	41	0	2
3	The discussion format allowed for inclusive participation	3	2	-1
43	Citizens made decisions with more influence than the developer	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 assurance	39	1	4
37	The process served to manipulate the public in accepting a project that	37	-2	0
14	Time was allowed to revisit issues and decisions, even if	14	1	-2
12	There was inadequate administrative support	12	-2	1
29	The broader public was informed about what decisions are being made	29	3	0
21	Financial resources were provided to enable people to participate effectively	21	0	-3
5	People's values and opinions were discussed	5	3	-1
47	Participants are manipulated into thinking that their opinions	47	-2	2
40	Although all had the chance to discuss and argue their point	40	0	4
46	The process 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	The process served to bully the public into accepting a project already	36	-3	1
19	Uncertainties were acknowledged 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.

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1		Factor 2	
		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

No. Statement	No.	Factor 1		Factor 2	
		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		
7. <u>Core Belief:</u>		
a. Inclusive participation [31] is considered as valid [16] with general representation [32]		
8. <u>Secondary Belief:</u>		
a. 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. <u>Core Belief:</u>		
a. Knowledge can be manipulated [26] and used to control discussions and/or the process [15]		
2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u>		
a. 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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Consistently high participant turn out [13]</p> <p>b. Participants trust the technical teams decisions and solutions [14]</p>		

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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Strong faith that knowledge is not being manipulated [26].</p> <p>b. Social concerns are foregrounded [27] by participants.</p> <p>c. Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [35].</p>		

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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Participation characterised by irregular attendance [13] coupled with a lack of constructive collaboration [2].</p> <p>b. Public participation does not provide a platform for the freedom of environmental decision making [35].</p>		

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:
 - a. 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:
 - a. Transparency, trust [5] and ideal role taking [4] did not occur.
 - b. Democratic decision making is not always appropriate [25].
 - c. 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:
 - a. 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:
 - a. 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:
 - a. 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:
 - a. Lack of power neutrality [11; 4; 3; 28] hindered the understanding others beliefs and values [22]
 - b. 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:
 - a. The sustainability of democratic control of the environment [34] is restricted by
 - i. The difficulty in building trust amongst participants [5]
 - ii. Educated participants' manipulation of knowledge [26]
 - iii. 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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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.</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Participants are not good ideal role takers [10]</p> <p>b. Generality and autonomy in deliberations compromised for those less able to articulate their opinion [31].</p>		

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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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].]</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. The social, economic and environmental needs of present and future generations are not considered by all the participants [30].</p>		

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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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.</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Expert knowledge is valued more than stakeholder's knowledge [24].</p> <p>b. Understanding of democratic rights is essential to EIA public participation [36].</p>		

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.	<u>Core Belief:</u>	
a.	Mainly the social needs are fore fronted [27] but economic and environmental needs are also considered [30].	
2.	<u>Secondary Belief:</u>	
a.	Discussions were not controlled by those who understood the procedure and process best [15].	
b.	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.	<u>Core Belief:</u>	
a.	Generality [23], Power Neutrality [6] and Autonomy [3] in deliberation occurred without instances of manipulation [37] nor placation [48] of the participants.	
2.	<u>Secondary Belief:</u>	
a.	The best available science [18] was used.	
b.	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.	<u>Core Belief:</u>	
a.	Time extensions [14] allowed for citizen acceptance of developer solutions [49].	
2.	<u>Secondary Belief:</u>	
a.	Process challenged on grounds of elements of manipulation [37], exclusion [20] and inequality of power to participate [21] for participants.	
b.	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:
 - a. 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:
 - a. 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:
 - b. 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:
 - a. 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	+4

	promises	
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:
 - a. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] aided the quality of analysis [27; 5] and the substance of deliberation [31].
2. Secondary Belief:
 - a. 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:
 - a. Unbiased and independent facilitation [8] is imperative to providing the ideal atmosphere [1] and enabled superficial generality [6 qualified by 21] in deliberation.
2. Secondary Belief:
 - b. 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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. 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].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>b. Citizen power is restricted but not considered to be manipulative [47].</p>		

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. <u>Core Belief:</u>
a. Citizen power considered as Consultation and Placation [40; 44; 50; 24].
2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u>
b. 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. <u>Core Belief:</u>
a. Developer accountability is of paramount importance [32; 31]
2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u>
b. Evidence for decisions questioned [27].
c. Citizen power is limited in generality [22] and no significant participation occurred [46; 38].
d. 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
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [1].</p> <p>b. 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].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Generality must not be limited [22] but the topics of discussion must be limited [7].</p> <p>b. Citizen power in decision making is considered above non-participation [48] and manipulation [36] but below delegated power [51]</p>		

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 shared planning 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		
<p>1. <u>Core Belief:</u></p> <p>a. The process requires unbiased and independent facilitation [8] and participants should feel comfortable and safe at the meetings [1].</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary Belief:</u></p> <p>a. Citizen power in decision making above informing [39] and consultation [4] but below partnership [50] and delegated power [51].</p> <p>b. The process taps the knowledge and experiences of local people [11].</p> <p>c. Costs, remedies and benefits of the development are not distributed equitably [32].</p>		