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Summary of Thesis

Sustainable development is one of the most important international policy agendas of the 21st Century and involves the development of policies that integrate environmental and development issues with those that are central to poverty and social inequalities. While it is imperative that the policymaking process begins at the local level, there is uncertainty surrounding its implementation. 'Going for Green' was the UK Government's approach to achieving sustainable development at the local level. This thesis has developed a model research process to evaluate how the initiative's Pilot Sustainable Communities Project was implemented within two comparative project areas in Merthyr Tydfil (South Wales).

The case study was selected as a research framework, combining quantitative and qualitative research methods. To assist in the collection of empirical data and respond to changes during the initiative's implementation, the research process was divided into three interrelated phases (exploratory, process monitoring and explanatory). An analysis was made of the scope, stage, significance and level of participation, and also how the 'local' community was defined. Empirical data was organised using a case study database and analysed at three different levels: initial preparatory work, a general analytic strategy and the use of analytic techniques.

Research findings have indicated that there is a need for sustainability to be locally defined, and reflect how the environment is perceived and understood. Encouraging participation amongst a broad range of community stakeholders requires the development of different approaches based on local identities. Understanding recent social and cultural changes that have occurred within a particular locality can assist in their identification.

The thesis concludes that community studies are important in developing and evaluating initiatives that promote sustainable development at the local level. As a research approach they provide an understanding of how communities operate and identify ways of involving them more effectively.
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8.1 Role choices adopted by the researcher in conducting the model research process.
1.1 Introduction

Sustainable development\(^1\) has become one of the most important international policy agendas of the 21\(^{st}\) Century. Although the origins of the concept extended from concern for the environment in the 1960s and 1970s, sustainable development approaches environmental concerns from a broader perspective. The concept provides a guiding principle for the development of policies that integrate environmental and development issues with those that are central to poverty and social inequality. To ensure that resulting national policies meet a range of needs, it is imperative that the policymaking process begin at the local level (Baker \textit{et al}, 1997; Warburton, 1998).

This introductory chapter will discuss the significance of the concept of sustainable development and key issues relating to how it should be achieved. The chapter is organised into two parts. The first (Section 1.2) begins by outlining the origins of sustainable development, and discusses what it means as a policy issue. This section will also consider analytical models that have been developed to understand and evaluate different policy approaches used to achieve sustainable development. The second part of this chapter (Section 1.3) will focus on how the principles of sustainable development are to be achieved through increased public participation in policy decision processes. Due to the lack of clarity surrounding how this process needs to be promoted, this chapter will indicate the need for further research towards developing an increased understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to the

\(^1\)In this thesis, the concepts of sustainable development and sustainability are used interchangeably, and no distinction is made between them.
achievement of sustainable development. This thesis will argue that there is a need to use community studies to develop and evaluate initiatives that promote sustainable development at the local level. The thesis also develops a model research process to evaluate the implementation of the UK Going for Green Pilot Sustainable Communities Project within two comparative pilot project areas. The chapter will conclude with the aims and objectives of this thesis and how they relate to the overall structure and those issues that are considered within each chapter.

1.2 Sustainable Development and its origins

The emergence of 'environmentalism' in the industrialised world during the 1960s and 1970s was significant in terms of the recognition that the environment had a role to play in development. An inextricable part of such environmentalism was its concern for global environmental issues and the concept of sustainable development, which provided the focus for the 1972 United Nations (UN) Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm. Through the Stockholm Conference, the 'global crisis' became a key theme to a new kind of environmentalism (Adams, 1990). The increase in concern for global environmental issues not only provided a framework for the development of ideas on sustainable development in the World Conservation Strategy (IUCN, 1980), but also lay the foundation to the report 'Our Common Future' (commonly referred to as the Brundtland Report), which was published by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987). Although both of these documents underpinned the most contemporary environmentalist thinking on sustainable development (Adams, 1990), the Brundtland Report was different in many respects. Firstly, it was global in its scope and internationalist in its formulation. Secondly, it was a more effective document as it
provided a more practical and applied approach to development (Adams, 1990; Selman, 2000), as opposed to being a theoretical perspective. Thirdly, it approached environmental problems from a broader perspective (Baker et al, 1997), by encompassing those factors that were central to poverty and social inequality (WCED, 1987). Fourthly, it reflected a conscious transformation of environmental rhetoric, as it was people focused and involved the integration of environmental and developmental issues within a more sustainable policy framework. This integration enabled environmental protection and economic development to be viewed as compatible, as opposed to conflicting objectives (Baker et al, 1997).

1.2.1 Understanding the concept of sustainable development

Although the concept of sustainable development originated during 1960s, it achieved a 'new status' (Reid, 1995), and gained 'political orthodoxy' at an international level (Kirkby et al, 1995) following the publication of the Brundtland Report and the Rio de Janeiro 'Earth Conference' of 1992. Sustainable development has become one of the most important policy agendas of the 21st Century, not only internationally, but also nationally and locally (WCED, 1987; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Basiago, 1995; Rowe & Robbins, 1999). In its Report, the Brundtland Commission concluded that present patterns of economic and social development would destroy the Earth's ecosystem within a matter of decades, and the solution to the crises was the global adoption of the principle of sustainable development. Although the concept of sustainable development provides little basis for theory (Adams, 1990), its ambiguity and flexibility has been viewed as adding to its attractiveness, and many definitions have been assigned to it (Lele, 1989; Peezey, 1989; Pearce et al, 1989; Rees, 1989; Estes, 1993; Harcourt, 1994; O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998),
the most common being that which was given in the Brundtland Report;

"development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (WCED, 1987, p.43)

This definition of sustainable development is based on two main precepts. Firstly, in meeting the basic needs of all, the primacy of development action should be for the poor, and these needs were to be socially and culturally determined (Baker et al, 1997). Secondly, the idea of developmental limitations should be viewed not only from an environmental perspective, but also in terms of technological and social organisation. Understanding the concept of sustainable development from this perspective represented an important transformation from a previous narrow ecological agenda, towards a wider quality of life discourse, that included the socio-economic context of development (Adams, 1990; Selman, 2000). Sustainable development in the Brundtland Report was therefore not defined by the condition of the environment, but instead by a holistic process of achieving social, economic and environmental objectives (Littlewood & While, 1997). Recognition was made by the Brundtland Report, that failure to address both resource depletion and increasing poverty would result in accelerated global deterioration (WCED, 1987).

1.2.2 Sustainable development and its policy significance

The publication of the Brundtland Report in 1987 was important in terms of raising political awareness of the need for sustainable development. However, despite broadening the concept, and the growing acceptance and value of the need for sustainability, it eludes a common definition (O'Riordan, 2001). The concept's flexibility and ambiguity has meant that it is theoretically problematic. As a result, there has been a lack of agreement as to
what it means (IUCN, 1991; Mitlin, 1992; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Basiago, 1995, Baker et al, 1997; O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998). This has included, what constitutes 'development' (Adams, 1990; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Reid, 1995), and what is being 'sustained' (Adams, 1990; Jacobs, 1991; Jacobs & Stott, 1992; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Franks, 1996). Consequently, sustainability has become a much contested concept, and is perceived by some as attempting to reconcile two contradictory processes (Holmberg & Sandbrook, 1992; Baker et al, 1997; Munton, 1997; Barton, 1999; O'Riordan 2001). In terms of achieving sustainability, O'Riordan (2001) has argued that the transition from a less to a more sustainable society should not be standardised, as it will be unique to a particular locality, and continuously redefined over time (Milton, 1996). Rather than being a goal in itself, sustainable development should be viewed as the beginning of a process of political and social change (Adams, 1990; Basiago, 1995; Baker et al, 1997), that is both evolutionary and exploratory in nature (O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998).

Despite its criticisms, sustainable development is still viewed as a significant integrating policy objective (Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Jacobs, 1997), bringing together diverse interests, and viewing environmental, social, and economic development as a single issue (Murdoch, 1993; Baker et al, 1997; Macnaghten et al, 1997; Myers & Macnaghten, 1998; Selman, 2000). The concept has also been viewed as providing an organising focus and guiding principle for decision-making and policymaking processes (Sterling, 1992; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Christie, 1994; Agyeman & Evans, 1995; Basiago, 1995; O'Riordan & Church, 2001). The outcomes should be the development of policies that are not only economically viable and resource conserving, but also socially inclusive, which provide an improved quality of life that can be enjoyed by all sectors of society (Selman, 2000). Although as a global objective, the policy implications for sustainable development
within each country will vary, Baker et al (1997) have highlighted that this has left policy makers with the task of translating 'generalised, declaratory political statements' into practical action. The extent to which new policy development may be informed by sustainable development thinking is an important point. As Murdoch (1993) has remarked, the concept of sustainability can act as a convenient 'cover', and allow traditional practices to continue. A key challenge therefore is to examine the extent to which policy is becoming more sustainable.

1.2.3 Analytical models for sustainable development

To understand different policy approaches used to promote sustainable development and their associated implications, a number of analytical models have been developed, including those by Turner (1993), Baker et al (1997), Jordan & O'Riordan (1997), and O'Riordan & Voisey (1998). Each model contains different positions on sustainability, with the move from weak to strong sustainability involving a more serious commitment to sustainable development, and a greater degree of integration of environmental and economic issues. Baker et al's (1997) 'Ladder of Sustainable Development' which relates to advanced industrialised societies, identifies the range of policy options that are associated with different sustainability approaches. Although this ladder contains four main approaches to sustainable development; treadmill, weak, strong, and an 'ideal' model they are not entirely distinct, and can overlap. As the concept's flexibility has aided in its acceptance as a policy goal, Baker et al (1997) have argued that this has enabled governments to hold different views and interpretations of sustainable development, thereby adopting a range of positions on the ladder. However, to achieve an authentic and democratic transfer to sustainability, O'Riordan & Voisey (1998) have argued that all
dimensions of the sustainability discourse (social, economic and environmental) need to be accommodated in policy decisions. The validity of a weak position on sustainability has been queried by Gouldson & Murphy (1996), who have argued that such approaches merely involve the adjustment of existing structures and policies as opposed to the necessary institutional and policy changes that are required to achieve sustainable development. Munton (1997) referring to Eden (1994), has highlighted that for some governments, the response to achieving sustainable development has been to redefine and subvert the original intentions behind the Brundtland Report, where environmental limits were found to have impinged on their economic goals.

Baker et al (1997) have divided their Ladder of Sustainable Development into two main approaches: anthropocentric and ecocentric. The anthropocentric approach, also referred to by Barry (1999) as 'environmental' or 'light green', regards humans as being situated above nature, and considers nature as capital as opposed to income (Schumacher, 1974). This perspective is the most dominant position used within the industrialised world, and tends to be associated with a 'weak' approach to sustainable development as it is based on materialisation, wealth and economic growth (Richardson, 1997; Selman, 2000). The ecocentric approach, also referred to by Barry (1999) as 'ecological' or 'dark green', regards humans as being part of nature, and considers domination over nature as threatening its own existence and sustainability (Baker et al, 1997). This perspective tends to be associated with a 'strong' approach to sustainability, and is based on direct intervention, and greater social and institutional change (O'Riordan & Jordan, 1995; Selman, 2000). Both of these perspectives will have implications in terms of how policies aimed at promoting sustainability are developed and implemented. Whereas ecocentric approaches are closely related to community empowerment and the development of local initiatives to
improve environmental quality, the anthropocentric approach plays down those elements associated with an ecocentric approach, and instead focuses on managing and controlling human processes and activities (Baker et al, 1997). The Brundtland definition of sustainable development has been viewed by Richardson (1997) and Selman (2000) as lacking authentic ecocentrism, and they have argued that this is why the Brundtland principles have been readily endorsed by most national governments. Although ecocentric and anthropocentric perspectives have simplified Baker et al's (1997) Ladder of Sustainable Development into two main approaches, and identified the various positions that can be adopted in achieving sustainable development, they are a useful method from which to evaluate the degree of commitment to achieving sustainability (Gibbs et al, 1996). This thesis will return to consider both of these perspectives in Chapter 6 when evaluating the UK Government's approach to achieving sustainable development. The second part of this chapter (Section 1.3) will now focus on how the principles of sustainable development were to be achieved in practice, and concludes that there is a need to develop an intuitive research methodology from which to monitor and evaluate those processes that are being used to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development.

1.3 Achieving Sustainable Development

Perhaps the most significant outcome from the Rio Conference 1992 was Agenda 21 (A21), as it provided a framework through which sustainability could be implemented (Wilks & Hall, 1995; Freeman et al, 1996; Tuxworth, 1996; Wild & Marshall, 1999). Through new forms of involvement and co-operation, A21 suggested that major stakeholders would resolve potential conflict on environmental and developmental issues
Agyeman & Evans (1994) have argued that A21 is "profoundly democratic and egalitarian in outlook" (1994, p.14) as it not only emphasised the use of policies and strategies that meet the needs of disadvantaged groups, but also the importance of encouraging such groups to participate in decision-making and policy implementation. Although ambitious in its attempt to co-ordinate an international response to sustainable development, A21 has also been viewed as representing a challenge to traditional forms of policymaking (Wilks & Hall, 1995; Lafferty & Eckerberg, 1998) as it would involve a significant shift from the development of strategies that are generated through top-down bureaucratic approaches towards those that are generated through bottom-up involvement. However, securing bottom-up involvement is an extremely difficult political process (Macnaghten et al, 1995; Young, 1996) due to inherent tensions between requirements for top-down input by government and the role of community stakeholders in determining sustainable development policies at the local level. As Baker et al (1997) have highlighted, resulting policies may represent a compromise between competing interest, as perceptions of sustainable development may differ between local stakeholders and central policy makers.

1.3.1 Role of local government in achieving sustainable development

A21 recommended that the process of achieving sustainable development begins at the local level (Baker et al, 1997; Warburton, 1998), and local participation would be a determining factor of its success as a practical programme for action (Munton, 1997). In fulfilling the objectives of A21, local authorities were identified as critical players in the move towards more sustainable communities (Roseland, 2000), as they were central to local governance structures (Whittaker, 1995; Freeman et al, 1996);
"Because so many of the problems and solutions being addressed by Agenda 21 have their roots in local activities, the participation and co-operation of local authorities will be a determining factor in fulfilling its objectives ... As the level of governance closest to the people, they play a vital role in educating, mobilising and responding to the public to promote sustainable development." (UNCED, 1993: Agenda 21, Section 28.1)

Within a British context, it has been estimated that almost two-thirds of A21 will require local authorities participation and co-operation (LGMB, 1992; UNCED, 1992; Wilks & Hall, 1995). A21 not only provided a framework for achieving sustainability, but also set out two fundamental principles of the process involved. Firstly, sustainability was to be locally defined and accepted (Voisey et al, 1996). Local authorities were required to develop partnerships, and produce through consultation and consensus, a 'local' A21 that would resonate with local people and reflect local conditions and circumstances (Young, 1996; Lafferty & Eckerberg, 1998). Secondly, sustainability needed to be linked with empowerment and effective democracy at the local level to ensure that a broad range of stakeholders participated in that process (Voisey et al, 1996; Young, 1996; O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998; Roseland, 2000). Increased democracy and an ability to influence both the development and implementation of policy decisions were therefore identified as being central to achieving sustainability (Eden, 1996; Roseland, 2000). Local Agenda 21s (LA21s) were an important outcome from Rio and being promoted as an integral part, and a principal method of implementing A21 and achieving sustainable development at the local level (Selman & Parker, 1999). The key challenge was to identify the range of local interests, and develop mechanisms to secure their inclusion. From this, the development of LA21s provided local authorities with a central role in delivering and implementing an international policy on sustainable development at the local level. This thesis will return to discuss LA21 in greater detail in Chapter 2, focusing on its development within the UK,
and how local authorities were supported in implementing that process (Section 2.4.2). The following section (Section 1.3.2) will now focus on the importance of public participation in relation to achieving sustainable development, and what A21 envisaged that process would involve.

1.3.2 Public participation and 'local' sustainability: a developing research agenda

Although public participation has been an aspect of other policy areas, the participatory process envisaged by A21 is both quantitatively and qualitatively different from that which has previously existed (Agyeman and Evans, 1995; Young, 1996; Roseland, 2000) for two main reasons. Firstly, it is important that the process of participation is inclusive and extends beyond involving just the more articulate and self-representing groups. As the central theme of the sustainable development philosophy rests with the participation of all stakeholders (Littlewood & While, 1997; Alabaster & Hawthorne, 1999), LA21 must be built on a consensus basis. By placing an important link with equity issues and meeting the needs of all, the preparation of LA21 has the potential to provide an arena for empowering the socially excluded and involving them in decision-making and subsequent implementation of policies (Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Young, 1996; Wild & Marshall, 1999). Secondly, Chapter 28 of A21 specifically indicates that, as part of the process there is also a need to retain a diversity of interests, and formally include those of minority groups. As the community can be a political resource, in that certain groups may dominate and exclude other less powerful groups (Agyeman & Evans, 1995), this raises questions in relation to the validity of a participatory process that does not recognise the complexity of those social divisions that exist within many neighbourhoods,
"... unless there are specific attempts to reach out to those who are traditionally reluctant to 'participate'... then any hope of securing the level of democratisation of decision-making implicit in Agenda 21 must be slim" (Agyeman & Evans, 1995, p.38)

Rio gave participation a new status (Young, 1996), as it was an integral part of achieving sustainability, and would involve promoting a new approach to decision-making through increased democratisation and local participation (Patterson & Theobald, 1995). In comparison to public participation in other policy areas, Essex (1995) has viewed the participatory process required by A21 as being controversial as it challenges the traditional structures of representative democracy. Public participation is central to achieving A21 and an integral part of the policymaking process for a number of reasons. Firstly, unsustainable development in the past has been attributable to unequal power relations. Secondly, as sustainability will involve making difficult choices, it needs to be built on a broad consensus. Thirdly, sustainable development requires broad participation and support in achieving 'sustainable communities' (Selman, 2000). Although the significance of local participation is recognised in A21, there is little clarity as to how this process is to be achieved (Rydin, 1997; Lafferty & Eckerberg, 1998).

Much of the work on sustainable development has been quite abstract, and analysis has related to policy level (see Baker et al, 1997; Munton, 1997; Voisey & O'Riordan; 1997, 1998; Roseland, 2000). Relatively little critical evaluation has been made of participatory processes and what is actually happening in communities. Where evaluations have been made, particularly in relation to LA21, they have been unable to provide a detailed insight into the experiences of those involved at the local level (see Freeman et al, 1996; Selman, 1998; Selman & Parker, 1999; Wild & Marshall, 1999). This thesis will fill an appreciable
research gap by developing a rigorous methodological framework from which to evaluate how participatory processes are being implemented through the UK Going for Green Pilot Sustainable Communities Project (GFG PSCP). Focusing on this key community initiative is of particular significance for two main reasons. It ran alongside LA21, the primary framework for achieving sustainable development. The GFG model represented a partial strategy to achieving sustainable development as it focused on encouraging individuals to adopt sustainable lifestyle changes. This thesis will not only focus on processes involved and the experiences of a range of community stakeholders but also provide explanations as to why the objectives of sustainable development were not being met through this initiative.

During the PSCP a number of Universities were involved with commissioned research, each focusing on different pilot project areas. All associated Universities have undertaken baseline and end of study surveys to measure changes in environmental awareness and behaviours. In addition, research has also focused on particular aspects of the PSCP. For example, focus groups and interviews have been used to examine the experiences and perceptions of project participants in Lancashire and the London Borough of Merton (see CSEC, 1996; Percy et al, 1999). In Huntingdonshire, an analysis has been made of the project process (see Davies 1999a). Commissioned research in Merthyr Tydfil focused on barriers and opportunities for change (see Collins et al, 1999).

However, O'Riordan (2001) has argued that an abstract and detached approach to research will not provide the necessary depth of insight to those transition processes that are occurring. To gain an increased understanding of those processes that are occurring and evaluating their effectiveness in relation to promoting the participatory aspect of achieving
sustainable development, there is a need to develop an intuitive and creative research approach that can utilise multiple research methods to examine local community initiatives, and evaluate their effectiveness. This will enable the researcher to be responsive and sensitive to a particular setting that is under study and allow both theoretical and methodological discovery (O'Riordan, 2001). The value of developing such a research approach for this thesis will enable the researcher to be responsive to those processes that were occurring at the local level, and utilise opportunities to explore in greater depth particular experiences, and make a significant contribution to the growing debate on how to promote increased public participation in achieving sustainable development.

1.3.3 Research Aims and Objectives

This thesis has two primary aims: first, to identify the role of community studies in evaluating initiatives developed to promote sustainable development at the local level; and second, to develop a model research process from which to undertake a community study. These aims will be achieved through the following research objectives:

1. Develop a thematic framework for those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development.
2. Examine the role of a key community initiative developed for the UK Government's Sustainable Development Strategy.
3. Evaluate the link between commissioned research and the need for rigorous research methods in conducting community studies.
4. Develop appropriate research methods for undertaking community studies.
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of the model research process and make recommendations
for the future development of research methods relating to community studies.

To gain an increased understanding of how to promote increased public participation in achieving sustainable development, the focus of this thesis is to develop a model research process and evaluate the UK GFG PSCP in two pilot project areas (PPAs). Those issues that need to be considered have been incorporated into the thesis in the following way.

**Chapter 2: Thematic Framework for Participatory Processes**

Building on a review of literature relating to sustainable development and how its principles were to be achieved (Chapter 1), Chapter 2 will discuss how the concepts of participation and community need to be understood in terms of achieving sustainable development. Those key issues that need to be considered in developing a thematic framework for participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development are then summarised. An overview of the development of LA21 in the UK will also be provided, including a discussion of those factors that have been found to influence progress made by local authorities.

**Chapter 3: Going for Green - the citizens' environmental initiative**

Chapter 3 will begin by briefly examining how environmental policy has developed within the UK since the late 1960's, and how this has influenced and impacted upon the UK Government's approach to achieving sustainable development through GFG. This will be followed with an outline of how the initiative was developed. Focusing on the PSCP in Merthyr Tydfil (South Wales), this chapter will also discuss its initial set up, and the University research that was commissioned to monitor and evaluate those outcomes that
resulted from its implementation. This chapter will conclude by identifying those research questions that provided a focus for the model research process, and assisted in understanding and evaluating how the PSCP was implemented and those outcomes that were achieved.

Chapter 4: Research Strategy and Design

Considering the limitations of the University commissioned research in increasing our understanding of how to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development and the previous research questions, this chapter will select an appropriate research strategy to provide a framework on which to base the model research process. This chapter will also consider those initial design stages of the model research process, and how research data will be analysed.

Chapter 5: Model Research Process

Following on from the design stages of the research process, Chapter 5 will discuss those initial considerations that were made in relation to the data collection process. This chapter will also describe in detail those research methods that were built into the model research process to provide answers to the research questions and investigate those issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes.

Chapter 6: Implementing the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project

Chapters 6 and 7 will present and discuss those research findings that were obtained from monitoring and evaluating how the PSCP was implemented within both PPAs. Chapter 6 will focus specifically on those methods and processes that were used to encourage
participation in the PSCP, and evaluate their overall outcomes and impacts. Factors found to influence the participatory processes will also be identified.

Chapter 7: Project Outcomes and Factors Influencing Progress

Chapter 7 will focus on the experiences of local action groups in both PPAs. This chapter will also analyse those specific outcomes that were achieved by each group, and those impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP. The chapter concludes by identifying those wider factors that influenced what progress was made within each PPA.

Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter will begin by outlining what this thesis has found from using the model research process. The conclusions from this thesis will be discussed in terms of their policy implications relating to the promotion of sustainable development at the local level and what the UK Government had aimed to achieve from GFG. The model research process will be evaluated in relation to its effectiveness in monitoring and evaluating how local sustainable development initiatives are being implemented. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for future research and practice, and how this thesis can be extended through specific research questions.

1.4 Summary

This chapter has highlighted two key issues in relation to achieving sustainable development. Firstly, sustainable development is a significant policy issue and needs to involve an integration of social, economic and environmental issues in policymaking
processes. How sustainable development is achieved will be unique to a particular locality and should not be standardised. Secondly, the role of public participation in relation to achieving sustainable development has also been discussed. However, the stage at which that participatory process occurs is important and opportunities to influence the development of participatory processes as well as their implementation need to exist. Both of these issues will be returned to in Chapter 2, when developing a thematic framework to evaluate participatory processes. Due to the lack of clarity surrounding how this process needs to be promoted, and the inability of detached research methods to understand those processes in detail, this chapter has identified the need to develop an intuitive research approach that is responsive to processes, and can provide explanations to resulting outcomes. Before developing the model research process, Chapter 2 will build upon those issues that have been considered in this chapter and develop a thematic framework against which to assess those participatory processes that are being used to achieve sustainable development at the local level.
Chapter 2: Thematic Framework for Participatory Processes

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (Chapter 1) has considered the importance of sustainable development as an integrative policy issue and the value of those analytical models that have been developed to evaluate the strength of different policy approaches used to promote sustainable development. How the principles of sustainable development were to be achieved through the framework of A21 has also been discussed, and the importance of encouraging a broad range of community stakeholders to participate in both decision-making and policy implementation. This has resulted in a number of fundamental questions including, 'How do you encourage the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders', 'How do you identify the diversity of local interests? and, 'How should the process of community participation be implemented?' In relation to developing the thematic framework for participatory processes, the previous chapter (Chapter 1) has highlighted two key issues that need to be considered: first, sustainable development requires an integration of environmental, economic and social issues in policymaking processes; and second, the stage at which participation occurs. The participatory process should involve not only implementing policy decisions, but also their development.

This chapter will develop a thematic framework for those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development, and provide an initial insight to how this process was being supported by the UK Government through the LA21 process. This chapter is organised into two parts. The first part (Section 2.2) will discuss how the concepts of participation and community need be understood in terms of promoting the participatory
aspect of achieving sustainable development. This section concludes with a summary of those key issues that need to be considered when assessing processes being used to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development. Before turning to examine the UK Government's approach to promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development (Chapter 3), the second part of this chapter (Section 2.3) will provide a detailed overview of the development of LA21 in the UK between 1992 and 1997. Understanding how local authorities were being supported in implementing the LA21 process will provide us with an initial insight to the extent to which the UK Government was promoting the increased role of the public in influencing national policies relating to sustainable development.

2.2 Participation and Community

A number of debates have started to focus on the most effective methods through which to implement the objectives and participatory aspect of achieving sustainable lifestyle changes (Eden, 1993; 1996; Harrison et al, 1996; Selman & Parker, 1997; Burgess et al, 1998; Myers & Macnaghten, 1998; Alabaster & Hawthorne, 1999; Blake, 1999). Before discussing the concepts of participation and community, Section 2.2.1 will begin by considering those claims made for and against public participation in policymaking processes, and discusses those concerns that have emerged from experience in other policy areas within the UK, including housing, health and planning.
2.2.1 Policy and Public Participation: experiences within the UK

The role of public participation in policy is not new (Richardson, 1983; Midgley, 1986) and has been an aspect of other policy areas in the UK since the late 1960s including Social Services, Education, Housing, Social Benefits and Planning (Richardson, 1983; Midgley, 1986; Thomas, 1996; Freeman et al, 1996; Cooper & Hawtin, 1997). Although interest in participation diminished after its initial implementation in the British Planning system in 1970s (Boaden et al, 1982), participation and community involvement were still used within a variety of contexts (Young, 1996), including, regeneration programmes such as City Challenge and Single Regeneration Budgets (SRBs) (Young, 1996; Warburton, 1998).

There are various and often-conflicting claims made for and against participation in the policymaking processes. Most claims made for participation focus on the process of participation and its subsequent consequences. Direct effects include developmental effects on participants, an increase in their capacity and self-efficacy, and strengthening community development. Indirect effects include increased social integration, and increased public acceptability of decisions (Richardson, 1983; Essex, 1995; DETR, 1998). Participation is also supported by its potential to alter both the nature and direction of decisions between participants and service providers (Richardson, 1983; TPAS/CIH, 1989). It is also commonly advocated that by encouraging public involvement, the decision-making process will benefit from wider input and knowledge, resulting in improved policies and services that meet local needs and aspirations (Richardson, 1983; Hallet, 1987; TPAS/CIH, 1989; Essex, 1995; DETR, 1998). Counter arguments have also been made in relation to the effect that participation has on management efficiency.
Experience of encouraging public participation in policy areas such as housing, health and planning has resulted in a number of emerging issues. A main concern relates to who participates, and whether participants are truly representative (Arnstein, 1969; Richardson, 1983; Atkinson & Cope, 1997). Where there have been opportunities for public participation, it is argued that this has often reinforced inequalities and existing power relations, as those processes have tended to attract and favour the more articulate and representative groups (Bracht & Tsouros, 1990; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Murdoch & Marsden, 1994; Croft & Beresford, 1996; Thomas, 1996; Cooper & Hawtin, 1997; Selman & Parker, 1997). A further concern relates to participatory processes involving consultation as opposed to involvement in decision-making (Boaden et al, 1982). In addition to this, participation has also been viewed as being manipulative, tokenistic, and often superficial, in that it enables decision makers to legitimise their own decisions with a stamp of public approval, without reducing their overall power (Sanders, 1980; Richardson, 1983; Cooper & Hawtin, 1997). An important focus of agreement amongst many critics, has been the difference between authentic participation and the co-opted form of participation, which Asthana (1989) argues often happens in practice. Richardson (1983) has argued that co-option of participants in decision-making, such as through tenant involvement in housing management may act as a form of ‘social control’, and reduces the influence and enthusiasm of participants, diverting them from their true concerns. A counter argument is that co-option enhances participants’ persistence to address and resolve their concerns. As partnership approaches used in other policy areas have found that the most powerful partner will shape the agenda upon which decisions are to be made,
Cooper & Hawtin (1997) argue that consideration also needs to be made of those 'political convictions' that have developed participatory strategies.

Given the various views held on public participation in policymaking processes, and the potential range of outcomes, the following section (Section 2.3.2) will discuss how the concept of participation needs to be understood with respect to promoting the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development.

2.3.2 The concept of participation

The concept of participation is ambiguous and flexible, and there is little consensus as to what it means, or what it seeks to achieve (Arnstein, 1969; Richardson, 1983; Hallet, 1987; Asthana, 1989; Thomas, 1996). White (1996) has stipulated that, "its transparency has enabled it to take multiple forms and serve a variety of interests" (1996, p.7). Participation has been referred to as 'taking part' in the formulation or the implementation of decisions (Richardson, 1983; Gyford, 1991; Hill, 1994). However, questions arise as to what 'taking part' involves. Does it refer to taking part in decision-making? or, does it refer to taking part in the process in which decisions are made? Various analyses have been used to explain what the concept of participation means (Wilcox, 1994; Wilks & Hall, 1995; Young, 1996; Davies & Gathorne Hardy, 1997). The most frequently cited model, although not without criticism, is Arnstein's (1969) Ladder of Participation (see Table 2.1).

Arnstein (1969) has defined participation as an opportunity and a deliberate attempt to redistribute citizen power, and include those previously excluded from political and social processes. The overall aim is that everyone can share and enjoy the benefits. Arnstein
views participation as a progressive concept, and her ladder of participation is based upon a vertical description of the objectives and implications of various forms of participation. These run from manipulation and therapy at the bottom rungs, through to delegated power and citizen control, which represent the top rungs of the ladder. The type or degree of participation reflects the extent to which citizens' power determines the final outcome.

Table 2.1: Arnstein's Ladder of Participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Citizen control</th>
<th>Delegated power</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Informing</th>
<th>Education/Therapy</th>
<th>Non-participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citizen control</td>
<td>Full delegation of all decision-making and action.</td>
<td>Some power is delegated.</td>
<td>People can begin to negotiate with traditional power holders, including agreeing roles, responsibilities and levels of control.</td>
<td>People's views have some influence, but traditional power holders still make the decisions.</td>
<td>People are given a voice, but no power to ensure their views are heeded.</td>
<td>People are told what is going to happen, is happening or has happened.</td>
<td>Levels 1 &amp; 2 people are educated to participate, through the provision of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delegated power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education/Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Arnstein, 1969)

Although, Arnstein’s model is useful in its assertion that there are significant gradations of participation, and that the concept of power is central to understanding what participation actually is, it has a number of limitations, some of which Arnstein has acknowledged. Firstly, its misinterpretation of participation at the different levels (Cooper & Hawtin, 1997). For example, those who wish to participate may adopt lower levels on the ladder, or a partnership approach may be designed to manipulate difficult communities as opposed to
decision-making. Thirdly, it is a highly generalised measure of participation (Burns et al, 1994), as different degrees of power will occur in different spheres of influence and different areas of decision-making. Fourthly, it represents a simplification of reality in terms of the dynamics and complexities involved in the 'struggle for power' (Richardson, 1983; Burns et al, 1994). Fifthly, the ladder perceives power as a 'zero-sum' transaction, where empowering one group will equal the loss of power in another group. Wild & Marshall (1999) found that community empowerment did not lead to a direct reduction in local authority power, but instead created a new form of community power that was of limited scope. Despite its criticisms, Arnstein's ladder is still widely referred to, and viewed as being a useful tool from which to research participatory processes and categorise approaches used to encourage community involvement (Wild & Marshall, 1999; Watt et al, 2000). This thesis will return to consider Arnstein's ladder when developing research methods from which to monitor and understand those processes involved in implementing the GFG PSCP (Chapter 5), and when evaluating those outcomes and impacts that resulted from using such an approach (Chapter 7).

Richardson (1983) in her conceptualisation of participation makes an important distinction between direct action, being engaged in determining policies and implementing policy decisions, and indirect action or political representation. Richardson (1983) has suggested that participation is not synonymous with the power of decision-making, but about being involved in the process in which decisions are made. However, others have argued that participation is the active involvement in the decision-making process as opposed to consultation, and have viewed the concept of power as being crucial in any analysis, and critical to understanding what participation actually is (Arnstein, 1969; Thomas, 1996; White, 1996; Young, 1996; O'Riordan & Voisey, 2001). Nevertheless, Wild & Marshall
have argued that the level of participation is not the only issue that needs to be considered when evaluating community participation. Other issues previously discussed in Chapter 1 have included the *significance* of the issue, and the *stage* at which the participatory process occurs (Wilcox, 1994; Young, 1996; Wild & Marshall, 1999). As sustainable development involves implementing policy decisions at the local level, the *scope* of that participation is also an issue that needs to be considered (Wild & Marshall, 1999). In the context of achieving sustainable development, the following section (Section 2.3.3) will now focus on what the scope of that participatory process should involve by considering the role of the citizen.

### 2.3.3 Citizenship

Recent debates surrounding environmental citizenship have focused on the role of citizens as *consumers* or *communities* (Carley & Christie, 2000; Selman, 1996a, 2000; Selman & Parker, 1997, 1999; Barry 1999; Smith *et al*, 1999, 2000). The role of the citizen as a consumer is viewed as being a *passive* form of citizenship (Selman, 1996a, 2000). This neo-liberal perspective places emphasis on individual freedom and choice, and the role of the market in achieving economic goals and material well-being (Cooper & Hawtin, 1997; Carley & Christie, 2000) and does not require a change in the balance of power relations. Participation is based on individual consumption as opposed to collective action. In comparison, the community perspective is viewed as being a more *active* form of citizenship (Selman, 1996a, 2000), and is based on a social democratic perspective (Cooper & Hawtin, 1997). Participation is based on consensus, shared views and values, and increasing social equity through collective action (Carley & Christie, 2000). Although both of these perspectives on citizenship are pertinent to the debate on how to achieve local
sustainability (Selman & Parker, 1997), there are inherent problems as traditional policy approaches to achieving economic growth in western societies, including the UK, have involved competitiveness, exploitation of resources, and collective consumption based on individual preferences, as opposed to achieving the environmental and social aspect of sustainable development which is based on collective community needs (Rowe & Robbins, 1999).

Although changes in individual attitudes and behaviours are important contributions to the process of sustainability (Roseland, 2000; Selman, 2000), in terms of managing the use and consumption of local resources, individual action alone cannot form the basis of collective action (Barry, 1999; Carley & Christie, 2000). As individual preferences and consumption patterns are not fixed, but unstable and malleable (Barry, 1999), a broader perspective of citizenship is pivotal to the success of sustainability for three primary reasons. Firstly, a political approach is needed to generate the necessary active involvement in the development and implementation of policy decisions that are based on consensus (Selman, 1996a; Barry, 1999; Selman, 2000). Secondly, to address the imbalance of power and social inequalities, common goals cannot be based on individual preferences (Selman, 1996a; Carley & Christie, 2000). Thirdly, to achieve collective agreement and encourage sustained voluntary action, increased democracy is fundamental to achieving sustainability (Jacobs, 1991). Active citizenship will enable society to redefine a common purpose and decide how local needs can be sustained, an issue which Carley & Christie (2000) argue is denied by an individualistic approach. As it is the 'civicness' within a community that provides the basis upon which collective action for sustainability is to be based (Selman & Parker, 1997), the following section (Section 2.3.4) will now discuss how the concept community needs to be understood with respects to promoting the participatory aspect of
achieving sustainable development.

2.3.4 The concept of community

Although the notion of community is inextricably linked to achieving sustainability at the local level (Myers & Jacobs, 1997; Gilchrist, 1999), it has only been recently that debates have developed between the concepts of 'sustainability' and 'community'. The very idea of communities participating in policymaking processes is perceived as being as ambitious as the concept of sustainable development (Warburton, 1998), and questions arise in relation to what constitutes a 'local' community. There are a number of advantages associated with being a community member including; physical and mental well being, access to resources, support, providing a 'sense of belonging' and promoting social solidarity (Gilchrist, 1999).

Although the 'community' is often viewed as a 'good thing' (Bianchini & Torigiani, 1995; Cohen, 1995; Warburton, 1998) and a valuable aspect in relation to quality of life (Gilchrist, 1999), the concept has also been subject to criticism. As well as being inclusive, communities can also be exclusive (Atkinson & Cope, 1997), and impose a traditional social order (Phillips, 1995), with hierarchical implications which may reinforce inequalities (Gilchrist, 1999).

The concept of 'community' is ambiguous and subjective, and has been assigned various meanings (Lee & Newby, 1983; Lyon, 1987; Mullins, 1987; Bracht, 1990; Crow & Allan, 1994; Freeman et al, 1996; Jewkes & Murcott, 1996; Atkinson & Cope, 1997; Chaskin, 1997; Dalby & Mackenzie, 1997; Gilchrist, 1999; Truett Anderson, 1999) such as in terms of geography, relationships, mutuality, shared culture, interest and experience, political and social organisation. People can belong to multiple communities, each having different
degrees of attachment, which will be redefined over time (Atkinson & Cope, 1997; Truett Anderson, 1999). Within a particular locality, various types of communities may exist at the same time, with some being more dominant that others (Warburton, 1998). Tönnies (1957), a leading theorist developed a classical sociological concept theory of community. This theory was based upon a 'Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft continuum', which is commonly translated as ‘Community and Society'. The Gemeinschaft or community, was viewed to hold the following community-like characteristics; intimate and enduring relationships, relatively immobile and homogeneous culture, strong moral custodials, close and enduring loyalties to both place and people. Although both ends of Tönnies continuum were found to co-exist in a number of areas (Young & Willmott, 1957; Gans, 1976), it is still viewed as being a continuing source of ideas on the concept of community (Bell & Newby, 1971; Jewkes & Murcott, 1996).

Despite the multitude of definitions that have been put forward, sociologists have found difficulty in achieving a common definition of community (Day & Murdoch, 1993). Some sociologists have argued that despite increasing attempts to define it, the term has begun to lose its meaning (Stacey, 1969; Bell & Newby, 1971), and has resulted in even more confusion. The major problem in achieving an agreeable definition has been that various value judgements, referred to as its ‘normative prescription’ (i.e. what sociologists feel it should be), have been influential on its ‘empirical description’ (i.e. what it actually is) (Bell & Newby, 1971). Consequently, the concept of community is often portrayed by a multiple of contradicting normative prescriptions (Lee & Newby, 1983). To overcome problems of definition, Stacey (1969) has argued that instead, sociologists should concentrate on understanding 'local social systems', those inter-relationships that exist within a geographically defined locality.
2.3.5 The changing nature of 'community'

In pre-industrialised societies, communities were tied to a particular locality for economic and occupational dependence (Lee & Newby, 1983; Gilchrist, 1999). Consequently, the concept of community has often been used to refer to a specific geographical location within which certain relationships transpire (Evans, 1994). As a result of urbanisation and industrialisation in the early 1960s, this has resulted in a number of social and economic changes, including; increased mobility, separation of place of employment from place of residence, changes in the social composition of populations, and physical developments (Lee & Newby, 1983). Consequently, those characteristics commonly associated with the 'traditional' community have changed or dissolved, and they have increasingly become 'open systems' (Truett Anderson, 1999), with the local place of residence and its associated mutual support provided by local neighbours being less significant for most people (Gilchrist, 1999). This has resulted in a loss of 'community-like structures', such as cohesiveness and solidarity (Mullins, 1987), and is referred to by sociologists as the perceived 'loss of' or reduced 'sense of community'. In addition, there has also been a decline in the importance of locally based social relationships, which previously formed the basis of modern social organisation (Lee & Newby, 1983; Cohen, 1985). Resulting from this, it has been argued that 'local' communities no longer exist in contemporary modern society (Mullins, 1987; Evans, 1994; Agyeman & Evans, 1995; Hall, 1995). The effect of losing such community-like structures formed the basis of Mullins (1987) case study of an anti-freeway movement in an inner urban area. Following an analysis of social networks from which to understand community social structure and mobilisation, Mullins found that the fragmented character of a neighbourhood's social base had contributed to the
loss of community, and hence the reason for low levels of mobilisation in response to an anti-freeeway movement. Although the decline in the 'local' community and the perceived loss of community are viewed as having reduced the relevance of locally based social relationships (Lee & Newby, 1983; Cohen, 1985), attachment to the local area, and involvement in community activities are still viewed as being important to many people (Gosschalk & Hatter, 1996; Gilchrist, 1999).

2.3.6 Community and 'local' sustainability

Within the discourse of sustainability, Agyeman & Evans (1995) have argued that A21 has used the concept of community in an unproblematic manner, ignoring the complexities of modern social life. The community is regarded as a coherent unit, and places an assumption that its members will work together and develop a consensus approach for local sustainability without any conflict or contradiction. Unless those fundamental changes associated with the 'community' are recognised, Truett Anderson (1999) argues that this will impact upon our understanding of both present and future social changes, and therefore the ability to plan and organise action for achieving local sustainability. For the purpose of promoting those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainability, the 'local' community should not be regarded as a population in situ (Dalby & Mackenzie, 1997), as it contains a range of different characteristics that will shape a range of local identities. As highlighted by Rowe & Robbins (1999), those LA21 programmes designed to engage geographical communities and develop consensus on achieving local sustainability have only been able to engage with certain interest groups, as opposed to the broad range of interests as specified by A21. As it is participation at the local level which is an important aspect of achieving sustainability, there is a need to understand how change
is understood and expressed at that level (Baines, 1995; Myers & Macnaghten, 1998), and rediscover the local 'place' within the context of globalisation (O'Riordan, 2001).

If the process of participation is to be promoted in the spirit envisaged by A21, it has been argued that the concept of community should be understood in terms of local social interests or identity (Willmott, 1987; Evans, 1994; Agyeman & Evans, 1995; Dalby & Mackenzie, 1997; Warburton, 1998; Gilchrist, 1999; Rowe & Robbins, 1999; Voisey & O'Riordan, 2001). Referring to Belay (1996), Cherni (2001) has identified six possible categories of cultural identity: sociological, occupational, geo-basic, national, co-cultural and ethnic. As individuals and social networks will perceive sustainability differently, within the context of their history, needs and aspirations for the future, the transition from a less to a more sustainable society cannot be standardised. To plan and organise a strong approach from which to achieve sustainable development, it has been argued that there needs to be an appreciation of those local interests and cultures that exist, as they are a vital component of promoting active citizenship and sustainability, and will enable an understanding to be developed with respects to existing networks and solidarity, relationships with place, and those factors that may influence change (Gilchrist, 1999; O'Riordan & Church, 2001).

2.3.7 The role for community development

The necessary infrastructure for achieving the participatory process envisaged by A21 is dependent on an existing dense network of social activity (Putnam et al, 1993). The opportunity for social cohesion and interaction is dependent on both the diversity and intensity of local connections. A coherent and well-connected community is viewed as
having a greater capacity, as it is more able to respond and make use of a wider range of ideas and resolve local problems due to their collective resources and skills, otherwise known as *social capital* (Gilchrist, 1999). This has significance for achieving participation in local democratic and decision-making processes, such as those required to produce LA21s. The most effective form of organisation involves the use of flexible networks, as they are more able to adapt to change (Hastings, 1993). The connection of social ties and flexible interconnections will act as an important resource in terms of empowerment and promoting active citizenship due to the opportunity that it presents in terms of sharing knowledge, skills and experience (Etzioni, 1995).

Previous studies have demonstrated that those communities which are successful in achieving goals and can adapt to changing circumstances have a long tradition of collective organising and strong local networks (Taylor, 1995). For this reason it is argued that empowerment and community development should also be viewed synonymously with sustainable development (Bracht and Tsouros, 1990; Cooper and Hawtin, 1997), as this will provide an opportunity for those community stakeholders that participate, to develop power, skills, knowledge and experience, and take action in relation to local problems and the democratic process (Harris, 1994). The role of community development is particularly relevant in locations were resident's experience what has been termed as ‘network poverty’ (Perri 6, 1997), in that they are socially excluded and unable to adapt to changes and address local needs. As community development is concerned with supporting and developing opportunities for networking, it will enable the creation and maintenance of collective organisations that can subsequently define and determine local solutions to global problems. To empower and encourage the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, there is
also a need for community resources to be extended and utilised by those other than core activists (Steward et al., 1995; Hastings et al., 1996). The following section (Section 2.3.8) will now summarise those issues to be included in a thematic framework against which to assess those participatory processes being used to achieve sustainable development.

**2.3.8 Thematic framework for local participatory processes**

The first issue to be included in the thematic framework relates to the *significance* of the issue in which participation is being encouraged (Section 1.2.2). The process of participation needs to be based on meeting a broad range of needs, including those of minority groups. As the transition to sustainable development requires the inclusion of a diversity of interests, an anthropocentric approach would represent a weak response, as it would not include those issues that are central to achieving social equality. A strong approach to achieving sustainable development needs to be based on an integration of social, economic and environmental issues in the policymaking process. The second issue to be included relates to the *stage* at which the process of participation is being initiated. As previously indicated in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3.1), local government was identified by LA21 as playing a central role in achieving sustainable development through the development of partnerships with local stakeholders. Strengthening the relationship between local government and their communities is an important aspect of achieving local sustainability, due to the need for strategies to be developed through bottom-up involvement. To secure the necessary support and commitment to achieving sustainable development, an effective participatory process needs to be established at the policymaking stage as opposed to merely implementing pre-determined policy decisions. This will require organisational changes by local government in the way that decisions are made,
and the development of effective structures and dialogue with a broad range of community stakeholders. Following on from that, the stage at which the participatory process occurs will also have an impact on the *scope* of that participation (Section 2.3.3). Although the role of the citizen as a consumer is an important aspect of achieving local sustainability, as it is insufficient on its own, as it omits the need to achieve social equality. The role of the citizen needs to be extended to encourage the active involvement of a broad range of community stakeholders in developing a consensus approach for local sustainability, and generating the necessary voluntary and sustained collective responsibilities for implementing policy decisions.

The fourth issue to be included in the thematic framework relates to the concept of *power* (Section 2.3.1). The participatory process involved in achieving sustainable development requires active involvement in the decision-making process, as opposed to being involved in the process in which decision are being made. This will require power being devolved to the local level so as to provide opportunities to influence policymaking decisions. Finally, as previously discussed in Section 2.3.5, due to the loss of cohesiveness and solidarity associated with the traditional community, the concept of *community* should not be regarded as a population *in situ*. To ensure that a broad range of community stakeholders are encouraged to participate and influence policy decisions relating to sustainable development, there is a need to identify the range of local social identities that exist within a locality, and consider their different needs and perceptions of change in promoting active citizenship and sustainability.

So far this chapter has discussed the various views held on public participation in policymaking processes and the potential range of resulting outcomes. Drawing from a
review of literature on sustainable development and how its principles were to be achieved (Chapter 1), and developing an increased understanding of how the concepts participation and community need to be interpreted, in relation to achieving sustainable development this chapter has developed a thematic framework against which to assess processes that are being used to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development. Before briefly examining the development of environmental policy within the UK since the late 1960s, and how this influenced and impacted upon the UK Government's approach to achieving sustainable development (Chapter 3), the final part of this chapter (Section 2.4) will now focus on the development of LA21 within the UK. As previously mentioned in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3.1), LA21 was the principal method from which to implement A21 and promote sustainable development. As local authorities had a central role in instigating local participation in that process, understanding how they were supported in implementing LA21 will provide us with an initial insight to the extent to which the UK Government was promoting the increased role of the public in influencing national policy relating to the achievement of sustainable development.

2.4 Implementing Agenda 21 in the UK

In this section, reference to progress made by UK local authorities in implementing the LA21 process will only relate from when A21 was initially agreed at the Rio Earth Conference 1992, through to May 1997, which marked the end of twenty-two years of central government administration by the UK Conservative Party (1979-1997). Understanding how local authorities were supported in implementing LA21 during this period is particularly important in terms of the political position of the Government during that period as it influenced its commitment and approach to achieving sustainable
development within the UK. Although LA21 has already been discussed in Chapter 1 (Section 1.3.1), it may be worthwhile briefly restating its overall aims and the process involved in its implementation.

2.4.1 The challenge of Local Agenda 21 for Local Government

The aim of LA21 was to ensure that the objectives of A21 were transformed from rhetoric to a process of reality, through the development and promotion of local policies and programmes for sustainable development (Tuxworth, 1996). These would focus on addressing a wide range of quality of life issues as opposed to the previous narrowly defined environmental agenda of the 1980s (Selman, 1998, 2000). As specified by A21, the process of developing LA21s required local authorities to take a leading role in involving and supporting a range of community stakeholders in deciding through consensus, how best to achieve sustainability within their locality. These decisions would subsequently be used to assess and modify existing local authority programmes and policies in relation to achieving A21. LA21 has therefore provided local authorities with an opportunity to consider existing participatory structures, and develop new and innovative methods of working with and for their local communities (Freeman et al, 1996).

2.4.2 National response to Local Agenda 21

In response to A21, the UK Government produced its own Sustainable Development Strategy (DoE, 1994). Although the UK Government's response to achieving sustainable development will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3, at this stage of the thesis it is sufficient to mention that the strategy viewed LA21 as a primary vehicle through which to
secure commitment and convert public environmental concern into individual behaviour (Munton, 1997). Due to their extensive experience of dealing with environmental protection issues, central government placed LA21 within the remit of local authorities. Although the process of implementing LA21 would involve local government developing local sustainability action plans with their local communities, and using that information to inform the development of national strategies in addressing social, economic and environmental issues in a integrated way (ICLEI, 1997; Lafferty & Eckerberg, 1998), these additional responsibilities were not matched with increased resources, support or direct guidance from central government (Patton & Worthington, 1996). Instead, the then Department of the Environment (DoE) concentrated on encouraging local authorities to make more efficient use of existing resources within their traditional environmental service areas, which Voisey (1998) refers to as the 'technical exercises of LA21'. These included the provision of eco-auditing, environmental management systems, sustainable development indicators and sustainability reporting. In addition, the UK Sustainable Development Strategy also specified that a LA21 Initiative would be developed to assist local authorities. However, instead of central government playing a significant role in the development of this initiative, the Local Government Management Board (LGMB)\(^2\) became responsible for its co-ordination, through the provision of information, guidance and training (Voisey et al, 1996; Voisey, 1998). It should also be noted that LA21 was not made a statutory duty for local authorities, and therefore they were not legally bound to develop and implement local sustainability strategies (Wilks & Hall, 1995; Munton, 1997; Church & Young, 2000). Although the UK Government's response to the 1992 Rio Conference will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, Voisey et al (1996) have argued that the type of support provided to local authorities by the UK Government in

---

\(^2\) The LGMB, now renamed the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) is composed of four UK local authority organisations (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).
implementing the LA21 process was attributable to a lack of political leadership and support for sustainable development, and concerns relating to the need for policy integration. To avoid making difficult policy decisions, Richardson (1997) has argued that central government resorted to encouraging an anthropocentric view of the environment (Section 1.2.4) as opposed to adopting the wider objectives of A21.

As the UK Government had not developed a clear strategy as to how LA21 was to be achieved, this resulted in local authorities using a range of different methods and processes from which to implement the LA21 process. Church & Young (2000) have argued this to be attributable to ambiguities surrounding the concepts of sustainable development and community participation. This lack of central government support has raised concerns relating to the ability and extent to which local authorities are able to meet the challenge of LA21 (Freeman et al, 1996), as local government autonomy and status had been reduced by changes introduced by the Conservative Party whilst in central government control since 1970. These changes included; increased funding restrictions, reduced and fragmented powers by allocating traditional functions to quangos and other non-elected local agencies, and an increased role of the private market in service provision through Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) (Christie, 1994; Tuxworth, 1996; Voisey, 1998). Referring to Cairns (1996), Littlewood & While (1997) have argued that the UK Government's approach to decision-making and the new forms of local governance that had been created since 1979, had resulted in a loss of faith in local government as a democratic institution. Although the aim of local government re-organisation in 1996 was to create a more effective form of government, by replacing a two-tier government with unitary authorities, Voisey (1998) has indicated that experience amongst unitary authorities has been characterised as having a lack of strategic planning, fragmented service provision,
has been characterised as having a lack of strategic planning, fragmented service provision, reduced local accountability, and a reduced ability by local communities to influence decision-making. Consequently, this has led to a further weakening of the relationship between local authorities and their communities. As the LA21 process requires increased community participation in decision-making processes, this emphasises the importance of local democratic principles and the fundamental role of local government in facilitating that process. By not providing adequate direction and power to enable local authorities to implement the LA21 process, Church & Young (2000) have argued that this has acted as a barrier to the wider promotion of sustainable development within the UK. As discussed further in Chapter 3, the level and type of support given to local authorities in implementing the LA21 process also reflected the UK Government's approach to promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development through its citizens' environmental initiative, GFG.

2.4.3 Uptake of Local Agenda 21 by local government

Despite the lack of central government support to implement LA21, the opportunity to re-establish a leading role in policy development resulted in a number of local authorities being actively engaged in developing LA21s. This uptake of LA21 is viewed as being attributable to a number of reasons. Firstly, it reflected an increasing concern for global environmental issues (Christie, 1994; Voisey & O'Riordan, 1997). Secondly, LA21 was perceived as an attractive policy area, as A21 had made explicit the importance of local authorities in delivering it (Tuxworth, 1996). Thirdly, following the success of Green Parties in Europe, the environment had become an increasingly political issue and was the focus of much campaigning (Voisey & O'Riordan, 1997). Fourthly, LA21 was perceived as
redefine their traditional role in service delivery (Ward, 1993; Voisey & O'Riordan, 1997; Selman, 2000), and legitimise their enabling role through the participatory aspect of LA21 (Voisey et al, 1996). Finally, the quality and extent of guidance provided by the former LGMB through the LA21 Initiative (Wilks & Hall, 1995; Young, 1998; Selman, 2000).

The former LGMB have produced a number of general guidance documents relating to sustainable development, including 'an explicit non-descriptive framework' for future action on LA21, which outlines important aspects of the policymaking process (LGMB, 1993). This framework document promotes the role of local authorities in achieving sustainability on the basis of the principle of 'subsidiarity', decentralising decision-making to the most appropriate level in implementing A21, claiming that;

"As the level of government nearest the people, they are best equipped to understand the needs of the people and the environment in their areas. They are democratically accountable and have developed high standards of open government, consultation and partnership. Through their many involvements in managing and protecting the local environment they are ideally placed to promote sustainability at the local level." (LGMB, 1993, p.iii)

In comparison to local authorities in other leading European Countries such as Sweden, Norway and Netherlands, which have demonstrated the greatest commitment to LA21, particularly in the environmental arena, the same guidance has not been found to exist in those countries (Voisey et al, 1996). Consequently, progress made on LA21 within the UK has attracted considerable interest from other countries, including those with the greatest commitment to LA21 (Tuxworth, 1996). Although comparisons between national responses is comparatively problematic due to differences in local government structure, Selman (2000) has argued that the UK response for LA21 falls behind other countries’ best practice in terms of its quality and commitment for LA21. The extent to which progress
has been made by UK local authorities on LA21, and those factors that have been found to influence that process will now be outlined in Section 2.4.4.

2.4.4 Progress made by local authorities within the UK

Surveys commissioned by the former LGMB (Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995; Thomas & Tuxworth, 1996) have been undertaken to analyse the development of the LA21 process within local authorities. These focused on three main areas of local authority activity; (1) action within the authority, (2) action in the wider community, and, (3) measuring and monitoring progress made on sustainability (Levett, 1994). Results found that between 1994 and 1995, 71.5% of local authorities indicated that they were committed to LA21 (although 50% were only identified as offering 'tentative support'), and 42% agreed to developing an action plan (Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995). A repeat survey in 1996 found that the level of commitment to participating in the LA21 process had increased to 91%, and 40% of local authorities were committed to producing a LA21 strategy by the end of 1996 (Thomas & Tuxworth 1996). As a number of local authorities were committed to environmental programmes prior to 1992 (Tuxworth, 1996), one of the main features on progress made by local authorities on LA21 has been the development of internal environmental management programmes (LGMB, 1997; Selman, 2000). Although these research findings at first glance present a positive image of LA21, Voisey (1998) has questioned their validity, as no information was available in relation to the activities of 44% local authorities that did not respond to the survey. Furthermore, following an examination of the quality of survey responses, a number of problems have been identified with responding authorities. LA21 responsibilities had been added to the workload of existing staff, and was not found to be discussed in local authority committees, and
relatively few effective partnerships had been established with other stakeholders (Voisey, 1998). Furthermore, few local authorities had progressed beyond producing state of environment reports, and the role of the local community in the LA21 process was found to be relatively limited (Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995).

Although some local authorities have been enthusiastic in taking the lead on LA21 and developing links between environmental, social and economic issues, the majority have continued to perform their traditional environmental protection role (Church, 1995; Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995; Wilks & Hall, 1995; Thomas & Tuxworth, 1996; Church et al, 1998; Voisey, 1998; Selman, 2000) with LA21 often been the responsibility of an environment based officer (Tuxworth, 1996). As highlighted by Voisey et al (1996) and O'Riordan & Voisey (1998), a similar response to A21 has also resulted from a number of countries across Europe, with most LA21 activities being related to water and energy use, limiting pollution, bio-diversity and transport (Tuxworth & Thomas, 1996; Morris & Hams, 1997; O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998; IDeA, 1999). From this, Selman (2000) has argued that progress made on LA21 within the UK has merely involved 'rebadging traditional green policies' as opposed to addressing 'hard' sustainable development issues (Tuxworth, 1996). In relation to promoting those participatory processes involved in developing LA21s, Thomas & Tuxworth (1996) found that two-thirds of local authorities were using one or more existing participation structures, and almost three-quarters of local authorities had developed at least one new structure for encouraging participation. These new structures have been both wide ranging and innovative, and included, 'Planning for Real' exercises, community visioning, community profiling, community auditing, focus group discussions, LA21 and environmental forums, round tables, citizen juries and parish maps (Bishop, 1994; Church, 1995; Thomas & Tuxworth, 1996; Tuxworth, 1996; Young,
Although the development of new participatory techniques indicates the beginning of progress being made on LA21, both Patton & Worthington (1996) and Selman (1998) have argued that there still remains a need to create a more effective approach for increased local democracy.

As quantitative surveys have been unable to provide the necessary depth of insight from which to examine and evaluate those participatory processes that were being used to implement LA21, to address this limitation, a number of case studies (Freeman et al, 1996; Patton & Worthington, 1996; Selman, 1998; Wild & Marshall, 1999) and analytical models (Ward, 1993; Wilks & Hall, 1995; Voisey et al, 1996; Voisey, 1998) have been used and developed. Despite the commitment and use of a wide range of methods from which to encourage participation, difficulties have been encountered in securing the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders, especially those of disadvantaged groups that have previously been excluded from decision-making processes (Selman, 1998; Wild & Marshall, 1999). Those community stakeholders that have participated in the LA21 process have either been existing community activists, or those who already have an understanding of environmental issues (Selman, 1998; Voisey et al, 2001). Where regular participants were involved with a range of other groups, this was found to pose a threat to the sustainability of the LA21 process (Selman, 1998). Although the development of new participatory techniques has indicated the beginning of progress being made on combining top-down and bottom-up processes, Voisey et al (1996) and Wild & Marshall (1999) have argued that local authorities will require further resources if they are to undertake their role in the LA21 process effectively, and secure the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders.
Although LA21 has provided a framework for achieving sustainable development, O’Riordan & Church (2001) have argued that it is not proving to be an organising focus for change (O’Riordan & Church, 2001). Voisey (1998) has indicated that national constraints and institutional barriers still prevent policy integration, which is an integral part of making the transition to sustainability. A primary factor that has determined the evolution of LA21 in the UK has been the nature of local-central government relations (Voisey, 1998), and the gap between national rhetoric and local responses being attributable to the lack of local authority powers that were being made available. Drawing upon those experiences and constraints faced by local government in implementing LA21 between 1992 and 1997, this chapter has provided a useful insight into the UK Government's commitment to encouraging increased public involvement in influencing national policies aimed at achieving sustainable development. The following chapter (Chapter 3) will continue with this discussion, highlighting that this lack of commitment to supporting the LA21 process had larger ramifications on those specific initiatives that were developed by the UK Government to promote sustainable development, as they avoided the need to make the necessary institutional changes.

Before an evaluation can be made of GFG, Chapter 3 will briefly examine how environmental policy has developed within the UK since the late 1960s, and the influence this had on the scope of the participatory process being promoted by the UK Government through GFG. The following chapter will also consider how progress was being monitored and evaluated through commissioned research.
Chapter 3: Going for Green – the citizens’ environmental initiative

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (Chapter 2) has developed a thematic framework against which to assess those processes being used to implement the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development. Providing a detailed overview of how LA21 has developed within the UK, Chapter 2 has also given an initial insight as to how the UK Government aimed to support that process by identifying what progress had been made by local authorities in encouraging public participation in that process and those constraints that were encountered.

This chapter will examine how the UK Government aimed to promote increased public involvement in policy decisions relating to sustainable development through its citizens' environmental initiative, GFG. Those research questions that provided a focus for the model research process will also be identified. This chapter is organised into four parts. To understand the UK Government's interpretation as to what policy changes were required to achieve sustainable development, the first part (Section 3.2) will begin by examining how environmental policy has developed within the UK since the late 1960s, and provide an insight to the context within which its citizens' environmental initiative developed. The second part of this chapter (Sections 3.3 & 3.4) will then examine how the UK Government aimed to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development through its citizens' environmental initiative, GFG. Following on from that, the third part (Sections 3.5 & 3.6) will describe how GFG would be implemented within one of the UK Pilot Sustainable Communities Projects (PSCP), and
the University research that was commissioned to monitor and evaluate those outcomes and impacts that resulted from its implementation. Finally, considering the thematic framework for participatory processes (Chapter 2) and how the UK Government aimed to promote public participation in relation to achieving sustainable development through GFG, the final part of this chapter (Section 3.7) will conclude by identifying those research questions that provided a focus for the model research process that was developed for this thesis.

3.2 Environmental policy within the UK

The inclusion of the ‘environment’ as a policy issue within the UK did not emerge until the 1970s, when a number of influences contributed to the rise of environmentalism, namely, environmental pressure groups and its membership with the European Community (EC) (Lowe & Flynn, 1989; Robinson, 1992; Christie, 1994; Gray, 1995; Voisey & O’Riordan, 1997) as opposed to the inherent interest on the part of the UK Government (Agyeman & Evans, 1994). Membership with the EC in 1973 introduced a new influence on the UK’s national environmental policy through EC Directives and a number of environmental policies that were centred on ‘action programmes’. In the case of EC legislation, this was often met with tensions emerging between EC environmental policy and UK national policy (Robinson, 1992) as it challenged the UK Government’s fragmented and ad hoc approach to environmental regulation and management. Despite the EC influencing the need to centralise policymaking, and for central governments to have an increasingly active role in setting policy objectives and developing a more strategic approach to environmental policymaking, within the UK the majority of environmental regulation still remained decentralised.
Although Selman (1996b) has argued that without pressure from the EC and the environmental movement, environmental policies would not exist within the UK, during the 1970s and early 1980s, the UK Government introduced two important pieces of environmental legislation; the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) (1974) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). However, as McCormick (1991) has pointed out, these legislative measures were debated and developed with the UK Government adopting a traditional style of consultation between regulators and those who were being regulated. Furthermore, the ability of the environmental movement to influence the debate was also restricted. Although these environmental legislative measures represented ‘a different genre of legislation’ (Robinson, 1992, p.19), the method through which they were debated depicted a government with minimal understanding of environmental policy (McCormick, 1991). In retrospect, this may explain why the UK Government did not pursue a more planned and strategic approach in relation to dealing with environmental issues as they competed with other more influential interests such as agriculture, businesses, transport and the national economy.

3.2.1 The role of the environmental movement

Despite having extensive support and organisation (McCormick, 1991), the style of participation that was being offered to the environmental movement within the UK enabled the Government to not only politically marginalise the movement’s influence and power in the environmental policymaking process, but also restrict and focus its efforts on practical and local conservational type activities, and inform the public through education as opposed to propaganda (Lowe & Flynn, 1989). In an attempt to further conserve and restrict the objectives of environmental interest groups, the Government actively sought to
promote such practical environmental activities. Consequently, as Lowe & Flynn (1989) point out, environmental groups were obliged to seek funds that the Government would be inclined to support. This not only enabled the Government to be portrayed as supporting direct action on environmental issues, but also reinforced the Conservative Government’s philosophy of reducing dependence on the state (Lowe & Flynn, 1989). As discussed further in the second part of this chapter (Section 3.3), this support and approach in relation to addressing environmental issues was also pursued by the UK Government through its citizens’ environmental initiative, GFG.

3.2.2 Institutional structures and mechanisms

Although the UK Government had a number of existing institutional structures in relation to dealing with environmental problems in the late 1960s and 1970s, they did not enable the ‘environment’ to be considered comprehensively or allow it to have its own political identity. To allow for a comprehensive approach, the Department of Environment (DoE) was established in 1970, bringing together and integrating policy areas of Housing, Local Government, Public Building and Works, and Transport. Although the establishment of the DoE was symbolic of the recognition of the interconnectability of such issues, Robinson (1992) points out that the DoE was merely an ‘institutional panacea for environmental problems’ (1992, p.10) as it represented a reorganisation of existing government ministries as opposed to generating a new structure with new powers (McCormick, 1991). Although the setting up of the DoE aimed to integrate policy areas, it still remained in competition with other government departments as they had different objectives, and there still existed a lack of departmental co-operation and co-ordination between them. Furthermore, there was the potential for tension between the DoE’s dual responsibility for environmental
protection and environmental development. As the formation of the DoE had left many key environmental concerns with other ministries, this enabled the Government to marginalise it from central policymaking, with environmental policies and legislation being the result of incremental response tactics (Lowe & Flynn, 1989), which represented a reactive approach by the Government in relation to solving environmental issues. This misunderstanding of environmental issues and their complexity is reflected in the UK Government’s approach to environmental management, and has been described by McCormick (1991) as being ‘ad hoc, improvisational and piecemeal’ (1991, p.10), an approach that has been viewed as characterising the UK policymaking process generally (Richardson & Watts, 1985; McCormick, 1991).

In addition to the DoE, a number of other major institutional bodies were established between 1970 and 1982 in an attempt to centralise environmental policymaking. These included the Standing Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (1970), the Health and Safety Commission (1974), and a Select Committee on Environment (1979). Although the latter aimed to create opportunities to introduce environmental concerns directly to the House of Commons and inform the role of the DoE, the Committee was composed of individuals with minimal understanding of environmental issues, who were either members of an opposing political party or defending the DoE (Robinson, 1992). The composition of such institutional bodies highlights the UK Government’s limited understanding of environmental issues and its lack of authentic political support in addressing environmental concerns by limiting any opposition to its approach, and hence marginalising any influence in the overall policymaking process.
3.2.3 Widening the environmental perspective

As previously mentioned in Chapter 1 (Section 1.2), the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972) and its subsequent international action plan marked a significant shift in terms of what the environment meant as a policy issue. In doing so, the environment issue changed emphasis from a parochial form to have a wider perspective and focus on environmental protection and the new human environment (McCormick, 1989), thereby reinforcing the interrelationship between many policy areas. This change in emphasis gained increased political recognition at an international level and led the environment to become more central to policy issues and international in perspective (McCormick, 1989; Robinson, 1992; Burke, 1995). Despite the change in direction and emphasis by the UN, the complexity of environmental issues and the importance of the human dimension raised issues in relation to the effectiveness of the UK Government’s existing policies in resolving environmental issues. The environment had now become a risky and politically sensitive issue for the UK Government, as it had the potential to call for structural administrative changes and a re-evaluation of current policies. As indicated by Robinson (1992), the UK Government in their response document to the Stockholm Conference, although accepting the need for international co-operation and collaboration, they were unwilling to implement and adopt a global approach. Instead, emphasis was placed on the need to approach environmental issues at the national level which would enable them to take into account of ‘their historic, geographic and economic circumstances’ (DoE, 1972). Although the political response to environmental concern within the UK increased rapidly in the early 1970s, enforcement procedures tended to follow a similar approach as they had previously, in that environmental regulation still supported the short term economic interest of the UK Government of that time as they
were voluntary, discretionary and sensitive to the economic practical constraints of businesses (Lowe & Flynn, 1989; McCormick, 1991).

3.2.4 The ‘greening’ of British Party Politics

During the 1980s, with adverse economic conditions and the political resurgence of business interests, the UK Government’s approach to environmental policy placed emphasis on the superiority of the market over state intervention (Lowe & Flynn, 1989). Subsequently, the Government marginalised environmental policy by reducing pollution control burdens on businesses, and pursuing deregulation as a political priority. However, an exception to this was additional protection measures being given to areas of high environmental value such as Sites of Special and Scientific Interest, National Parks, and Areas of Outstanding and Natural Beauty. This was an area of environmental concern that matched the paternalistic ideas of the UK Government at that time (Lowe & Flynn, 1989), and which McCormick (1991) argues, reflected their narrow understanding of environmental issues.

From 1982, there was an increase in pressure from a number of political influences within the UK in relation to addressing more complex environmental issues. One such example included a request made by the Department of Health (DoH) and Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution in 1983, relating to the removal of lead from petrol supplies (Robinson, 1992). The UK Government reacted with a delayed response, which was gained only through improvisation due to an increasing rise in adverse publicity. This further emphasised its lack of responsiveness to environmental concerns as opposed to adopting a voluntary and planned approach. Similarly, despite having both external and
internal political pressures, the environment did not feature highly in the General Election of 1983 (Robinson, 1982). Despite the growth in concern for environmental issues and sustainable development, the UK Government was labelled the 'Dirty Man of Europe' (Rose, 1990; Young, 1998) as its environmental conditions were behind most other European Countries. Having generated adverse publicity in relation to a number of environmental issues including acid rain and nuclear waste, together with the potential for increasing competition by 'green' parties, between 1983 and 1987 there was a political shift or 'transformation' in relation to environmental policy formulation and its political interpretation within the UK (Robinson, 1992). This was marked by an increased rhetoric being placed on the environment and the production of an unprecedented number of environmental policy documents and statements from all political parties (Owens, 1986). The environmental rhetoric had shifted from an area of policy at the margins to one that was central to the Government's thinking. This occurred through a number of ways: the environment was considered with emphasis on integrating it with other policies as opposed to being an 'add on' policy; the incorporation of the environment into party policies; and, the adoption of a more proactive approach towards the environment by focusing on environmental protection measures. Robinson (1992) has described this period of transformation in environmental policy within the UK as the 'greening' of British party politics.

Although environmental policy has benefited from having a high public profile and playing a less central part in the UK Government's political programme (Lowe & Flynn, 1989), at the outset, this mainstreaming of environmental policy may be viewed as the Government having made significant progress towards addressing the complexity of environmental issues. However, in reality it represented a retrogressive step, as the Government had not
introduced any novel or progressive approaches in relation to dealing with environmental issues. As the environment is difficult to compartmentalise due to its complexity as a policy issue, utilising the existing form and remit of administrative arrangements within the UK Government enabled the reinforcement of policy development trends in the 1960s, by centralising environmental decision-making and fitting in with the ‘traditional sectoral pattern of the political agenda’ (Robinson, 1992, p.19). Due to its sensitivity and associated political implications, centralising environmental policy enabled the UK Government to conceal it and justify decisions made on conflicting areas of policy. Evidence of such concealment, and limited ambition to address environmental issues continued throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s, and was subsequently a strong characteristic of the UK Government’s response to the 1992 Rio Earth Summit in achieving sustainable development. Although between 1988 and 1994, the development of environmental policy included the emergence of significant documents, initiatives and statutes, including the publication of a White Paper entitled ‘This Common Inheritance’ (DoE, 1990), the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990, and a UK Strategy for Sustainable Development (DoE, 1994) (UKSDS), these were not matched with any significant change in direction for UK environmental policymaking. The form and remit of administrative arrangements reinforced its previous approach to policy development and in achieving the UK Government’s political priorities, with short term economic concerns taking priority over long term environmental protection (McCormick, 1991). Despite having an image of ‘conviction politics and resolute action’ (Lowe and Flynn, 1989, p.273), Gray (1995) has argued that the UK Government retained a purely rhetorical concern for the environment, with the majority of its initiatives simply promoting an image of environmental concern, and having no significant commitments or action.
3.2.5 Emergence of sustainable development in environmental policy

In response to the Brundtland Report (UNCED, 1987), the UK Government reacted by producing its own document entitled ‘Sustaining Our Common Future’ (DoE, 1989). Although the Government supported the principle of sustainable development as an integral part of its policies (Voisey & O’Riordan, 1997), its significance in terms of influencing policymaking was played down, compared with the promotion of economic and developmental principles. This emphasis on economic growth and development was continued in its subsequent White Paper ‘This Common Inheritance’ in 1990. Although this White Paper made reference to environmental issues extending beyond the role of the DoE and towards wider sustainable development principles, it indicated that the Government had preference for market measures rather than regulation (Patterson & Theobald, 1995). Furthermore, it also emphasised that environmental considerations must not inhibit wealth creation or the international competitiveness of the UK economy (Robinson, 1992). Thus, the UK Government’s overall environmental commitment and responsibilities to address environmental issues were marginalised in two main ways. Its responsibilities were viewed strictly in terms of its international environmental obligations as opposed to having any effect on its national policies. Specific emphasis was placed on the role of the individual citizen. This chapter will return to consider this key issue further in Section 3.2.9, were placing emphasis on the role of the ‘individual’ was supported and developed further by the UK Government in its National Sustainable Development Strategy (DoE, 1994a). As Eden (1996) has highlighted, the role of the public was limited to participation in policy implementation as opposed to policy development.

Although the 1990 White Paper represented the UK Government’s first coherent policy
strategy on the environment, Voisey and O’Riordan (1997) have argued that its response represented a weak definition of sustainable development for two main reasons. Firstly, it enabled a reinstatement of existing policies, evading any attempt to integrate environmental, social or economic policies. Secondly, there was no attempt to develop a strategic approach towards attaining long-term environmental protection. Overall, the UK Government’s approach was viewed as being short term, with few targets; few commitments or new initiatives. Although four mechanisms were introduced as a result of the 1990 White Paper: Ministerial Committees, Green Ministers, Annual Departmental Reporting and Guidance Documents, these were not matched with political commitment and leadership in order to secure progress and implementation. In addition, although the Government made reference for the need to consult and communicate with the public, Munton (1997) points out that there was no reference to the concept of local empowerment, an issue which is imperative to securing sustainable participation at the local level. As discussed further in Section 3.3, this omission of reference to empowerment and increased local democracy became a common thread to the UK Government’s approach and response in adopting and achieving the principles of sustainability.

3.2.6 Political support for sustainable development in the UK

The UNCED Conference (1972) reinforced the need for national governments to adopt the principles of sustainability with respect to resolving global environmental issues (Section 1.2). Agreeing and signing up to these international agreements, the UK Government subsequently had to produce a comprehensive policy for achieving sustainable development. Although the production of such a policy had the potential to legitimise the environment as an area of government policymaking, and enhance the power and status of
the DoE by increasing its ability to influence policies of other government departments, in reality it had limited effect on, or commitment from, other departments (Voisey & O’Riordan, 1997). Consequently, in terms of delivering the UKSDS, the DoE was politically restricted in terms of its commitment, resources, and those outcomes it could seek to achieve. O’Riordan & Voisey (1998) have argued that the lack of encouragement from central government, together with the unwillingness of main economic departments to address sustainable development, and relative political weakness of environmental ministries was the ultimate barrier to sustainability. In relation to implementing the LA21 process, Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.4) has previously indicated that the approach and level of direct support given by the UK Government limited progress being made by local authorities. The following section (Section 3.2.7) will continue with this line of argument, indicating that the UK Government’s approach to LA21 also influenced and impacted upon how GFG, its citizens’ environmental initiative was developed and implemented.

3.2.7 Responding to the Rio agreements

As previously mentioned in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4.2) in response to signing up to A21, the international agreement to achieving sustainability, the UK Government launched its National Strategy, 'Sustainable Development – the UK Strategy' which contained four separate documents: Sustainable Development: the UK Strategy; Climate Change: the UK Programme; Biodiversity: the UK Action Plan; Sustainable Forestry: the UK Programme (DoE, 1994 a-d). Despite the Government’s enthusiasm and relatively quick response, this Strategy received a mixed reception (Selman, 1996b), with the publication of four separate documents being viewed as an incoherent approach with no interdepartmental support (Christie, 1994; Munton, 1997). ‘Sustainable Development: the UK Strategy’ (DoE,
1994a) was the main publication in relation to the Government’s Strategy, setting out the principles of sustainable development. However, although this Strategy document referred to the need for a wide range of initiatives, only three new initiatives were proposed, each having a different role in relation to achieving sustainable development. These new initiatives were:

1. A *Round Table on Sustainable Development* that provided a forum in which different sectors could discuss major issues relating to sustainable development and develop a consensus approach to addressing such issues.

2. A *Government Panel on Sustainable Development* that acted as independent advisors to the government on strategic sustainable development issues.

3. A *Citizens’ Environmental Initiative* responsible for disseminating the message of sustainable development to the general public.

Although these distinct institutional mechanisms were something new to have emerged from the UKSDS, similar to the 1990 White Paper, they were not matched with the necessary political commitment or leadership from which to secure progress towards achieving sustainable development within the UK (see Section 3.2.6). Consequently, as these initiatives were directed to different government departments, there has been relatively little development of a relationship between them (Voisey & O’Riordan, 1997).

### 3.2.8 Significance of sustainable development on UK policy

The significance of sustainable development as a policy objective was that it was non-specific, and non-transitional, and had the potential to set ‘a robust and theoretically
vigorous set of principles to guide and inform action’ (Agyeman & Evans, 1994, p.2). Sachs (1993) has argued that definitions can influence perceptions of problems, subsequent solutions and the inclusion of those who should be involved in the process. Although the UKSDS provided reference to the Brundtland definition of sustainable development (see Section 1.2.1), it denied any discussion surrounding the concept. Due to the concept’s lack of a theoretical core, Adams (1990) has argued that for this reason sustainable development was acceptable, as the UK Government did not perceive that it required major policy changes. Consequently, the UKSDS did not indicate what political adjustments were required, or what targets needed to be met as a result of adopting the sustainable development principles. This made it intrinsically difficult to assess the Government’s or others’ performance in terms of response and progress.

The UK Government’s interpretation of sustainable development endorsed a ‘business-as-usual scenario’ (Munton, 1997), as its Strategy clung to market-based and development principles and priorities, allowing for economic growth within a context of conserving resources,

“[t]he challenge of sustainable development is to find ways of enhancing total wealth while using common natural resources prudently, so that renewable resources can be conserved, and non-renewables used at a rate which considers the needs of future generations.” (DoE, 1994a, p.33)

The context within which sustainable development is set in the UKSDS is future oriented, steering away from problems generated by previous government policies. Within the Government’s interpretation, there was an omission of the need to fulfil and meet the current needs of all. Furthermore, as highlighted by Voisey & O’Riordan (1997), the social perspective of development was not embraced. Consequently, Agyeman & Evans (1994)
have viewed the UK Government’s overall response as lacking commitment as it failed to explore its potential implications for existing policies or administrative structures. As a result there was limited political commitment or leadership, minimal policy alignment or new administrative structures, and no defined role for the Treasury (Voisey & O’Riordan, 1997). As previously highlighted in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4.2), the UK Government superficially addressed the challenge of sustainable development as it had also failed to adequately support the role of local government with respects to implementing the LA21 process.

How sustainable development is defined and implemented will reflect the integration of environmental, social and economic policies. The strength of this integration will determine whether the approach adopted towards achieving sustainability is anthropocentric or ecocentric (see Section 1.2.4). Although within Europe, the UK is the most advanced in terms of its documentation and policy rhetoric for A21, O’Riordan & Voisey (1998) argue there is much ambivalence over the relationship between environmental policy and sustainable development as a more comprehensive policy framework. Gibbs et al (1996) have also indicated that there is relatively little empirical evidence to indicate that this has been complemented with specific targets, integrative activity, cultural change, or the introduction of strong sustainability initiatives.

### 3.2.9 The role of central government

Within the context of the UKSDS, the Government’s responsibilities were limited as it emphasised the significant role for collaborative partnerships as the primary mechanism for instigating participation. Although the Government set up a Panel and a Round Table
on Sustainable Development, the perception was that through its citizens’ environmental initiative, public participation in individual lifestyle changes was central to achieving sustainable development. This line of argument and placing emphasis on the role of the individual citizen in the 1990 White Paper (Section 3.2.5) was one that was further supported and developed in implementing the UKSDS.

So far, this chapter has highlighted that since the late 1960s, despite having a rhetorical concern for environmental issues, environmental policy within the UK has contained a number of paradoxes. Due to the successive UK Government’s minimal understanding of environmental policy and the need to reverse a declining national economy, the environment has been conceived as being a political problem as opposed to being an integral part of their overall political programme. Consequently, support for environmental issues have been hesitant, tentative and cautious (McCormick, 1991), with measures and approaches rarely resulting with effective action to strengthen its commitment (Redclift, 1995). Indeed, this lack of coherence and political action has led Lowe & Flynn (1989) to argue that, at the end of the 1980s there had been ‘no overall environmental policy’ within the UK, other than a number of individual incremental responses (1989, p.254). In relation to achieving sustainability through public participation in individual lifestyle changes, the second part of this chapter (Sections 3.3 & 3.4) will now examine the development of the UK Government's citizens' environmental initiative and how the role of the public was being promoted.
3.3 Going for Green – the citizens’ environmental initiative

The third element of the UK Government’s approach to achieving sustainability was its citizens’ environmental initiative. With the remit and responsibility being given to the DoE, it was renamed and publicly launched as 'Going for Green' (GFG) in 1995. At its official public launch, the speech transcripts (GFG, 1995) have highlighted a number of issues in relation to how the Government at that time interpreted sustainable development, namely sustained economic growth within a context of conserving resources. This was reinforced and emphasised in an address made by John Gummer (Secretary of State for the Environment), at the Campaigns launch,

“... thinking green ... is precisely what we have to do if we are going to make the difference that matters ... sustainable development is about growth without cheating on our children ... it is ... about facing the real cost of growth.” (GFG, 1995)

Central to the UK Government’s approach in achieving sustainable development was the need to ensure that individuals were aware of the role that they could play by ‘doing their bit’ towards helping to improve the environment (GFG, 1998a). In addition to raising awareness, GFG was “set up to secure the participation of individuals” (GFG, 1998c, p.1).

Professor G Ashworth3, Chairperson of the GFG National Committee advocated at the initiatives’ launch that an environmental awareness campaign was the best method in which to achieve the significant participation of the individual citizen,

---

3 In 1994, Professor Graham Ashworth (Chief Executive of the Tidy Britain Group) was invited to be Chairman of the GFG Advisory Committee, due to the experience of the Tidy Britain Group with environmental type campaigns and awareness raising events. With effect from April 1996, GFG became a registered Company Limited by Guarantee. This enabled it to secure funding for its continuation. Professor Ashworth then became Chairman of GFG Ltd. ENCAMS (Environmental Campaigns) was created in January 1998 to establish a "parent" organisation that encompassed those activities that were undertaken by both corporate companies of TBG and GFG. The purpose was to look for economies by pooling and sharing resources, which might otherwise be duplicated, with the aim of keeping administration costs for both the DoE and the new organisation to a minimum. The DoE pays one grant to Encams covering the work of all three bodies.
"Going for Green is a public campaign to identify and explain what sustainable development is and what we can do about it... an easy to follow Green Code... shows what simple steps we can all take to achieve sustainable lifestyles in the UK... [We] are developing a national publicity campaign through the usual media channels... [and] a series of service providers... to provide reliable information about green issues and objectives... Going for Green will in the broadest sense be engaged in environmental education and training to encourage people to either do or not to do certain things." (GFG, 1995, pp.3 & 5)

As sustainable development requires changes to lifestyles and behaviours, this has the potential for conflict of interest and major institutional tensions (Gibbs et al, 1996). Sustainability has even been considered as being 'potentially an inherent undemocratic principle' (Agyeman & Evans, 1994, p.19). Considering the potential implications on UK Government policy which had market-oriented and developmental priorities, it may not be surprising that its approach to increasing participation was made within an inherently weak sustainable development agenda, focusing on public awareness and education.

3.3.1 Going for Green and its independence from Central Government

An important aspect of GFG was that it should be seen to be independent from Central Government in order to gain the much needed trust and support for those messages that it wanted to get across to the general public. Initially, this led GFG to form as an Advisory Committee, reporting to the Secretary of State for the Environment for a period of two years, with the following as terms of reference;

“To advise the Government, following consultation with voluntary bodies, local authorities, the churches and others, how best to increase people’s awareness of the part their personal choices can play in delivering sustainable development, and to enlist people’s support and commitment in the coming years by organising and raising sponsorship for national promotional events and projects for local action.” (GFG, 1997, p.3)
Due to the period of time taken by the DoE to set up GFG and second appropriate staff, in 1995 the GFG Advisory Committee ‘encouraged’ the Secretary of State for the Environment to extend the Campaign beyond its initial two year duration (1994-1996), as relatively little progress had been made. This resulted with the GFG Advisory Committee reconstituting itself as a registered Limited Company by guarantee, enabling it to continue for a further three years (1996-1999). Although GFG was still partly funded by the Government through the then DoE, it was also responsible for raising its own finance from the private sector. Examples of sponsors included Biffa, Tesco, The Post Office, McDonalds, Hoover, Kellogg’s, Co-operative, BP, Coca Cola, Blue Circle Industries Plc, National Lottery (renamed Community Fund), Dwr Cymru Welsh Water and Powergen. In 1996, the campaign had been financed by the DoE with almost £1½ million, and a further £7 million for advertising purposes (including television, newspaper and supporting literature). Many of the sponsorship deals with private companies had resulted in additional publicity, including GFGs logo on consumable products such as sugar packets and cereal boxes. Although GFG claimed that it was ‘the biggest environmental campaign ever’ (GFG, 1996), an assessment of the promotion of sustainable development in the UK has suggested that the budget provided for GFG through the DoE had been relatively small, and this was a major restriction in relation to what it aimed to achieve (Hill, 1995).
3.3.2 Developing the Going for Green Campaign

During the initial stages of its development, GFG was an organisation that was shrouded in some secrecy. With the Chief Executive of the Tidy Britain Group (TBG) as its Chairperson (Professor G. Ashworth), GFG initially started out as a very autocratic organisation with the Chairperson’s vision directing its development in line with that of the TBG.

3.3.3 National Going for Green commissioned research

In 1995, the Harris Research Centre was commissioned by GFG to undertake national research in relation to environmental behaviours, attitudes and knowledge, and the conversion of environmental concern into action. The findings from this research were intended to provide the framework from which GFG would target its information and publicity. However, the research was briefed to focus on findings that would support an existing vision held by some personnel on the GFG Advisory Committee, as to GFG and its future development, as opposed to utilising it as an opportunity from which to learn and develop a greater understanding in relation to implementing and approaching the new challenges being introduced by sustainable development.

---

4 Within GFG Ltd, there is relatively little archival data in relation to the setting up of GFG and the development of its related activities (including PSCP). Information relating to its development has also been obtained through personal conversation with staff at GFG and TBG, or as a result of direct involvement with the PSCP associated Universities research.

5 The Tidy Britain Group (TBG) is an independent voluntary organisation, registered as a charity and a company limited by guarantee. It is recognised as the national agency for litter abatement and its activities are primarily aimed at changing attitudes and behaviours towards litter. It seeks to achieve this through campaigning, education, competitions and awards. It also seeks to develop better methods of litter prevention and control, and the widespread use of systematic approach to cleanliness by the private and public sectors.
The National GFG commissioned research consisted of three phases:

1. A review of published research based literature to provide an overview of existing public environmental knowledge, beliefs, attitudes and (claimed) behaviour.

2. A face-to-face survey of individuals in relation to behaviours and attitudes and barriers to adopting sustainable lifestyle changes.

3. An in-depth study involving focus groups from which to obtain qualitative data with the aim of ‘help[ing] Going for Green identify the types of environmental activity and the types of audience to whom its efforts would be most effectively directed” (Harris Research Centre, 1995a, p.1).

Although the National GFG commissioned research identified that 80% of the sample population were either very or quite concerned about the environment (Figure 3.1), over half of the sample population indicated that they were not interested in receiving advice in relation to doing more to help the environment (Figure 3.2). The interpretation of the latter finding was that, ‘Nearly half of the respondents in the quantitative survey expressed an interest in getting advice on how to help the environment” (Harris Research Centre, 1995b, p.9).
Figure 3.1: Level of concern for the environment.

(Source: Harris Research Centre, 1995b)

Figure 3.2: Level of interest for receiving advice on helping the environment.

(Source: Harris Research Centre, 1995b)
3.3.4 Going for Green related activities

Through its national publicity campaign, GFG had five specific areas of activity that provided a focus through which to promote individual lifestyle changes:

1. The *Green Code*, a five point code of pro-environmental behaviour to encourage individuals to take small steps which together would help improve the environment. This was promoted through a national publicity campaign. Each point within the GC also received its own dedicated Theme Month through which a different aspect of the GC would be promoted to ‘stimulate action’ (GFG, 1998). Where possible, these were linked with existing environmental campaigning activities. One example includes the month of June being used by GFG to promote its ‘Travel sensibly’ message in conjunction with the Don’t Choke Britain Campaign events, such as National Bike Week and Car Free Day.

2. *Education for Schools*, in particular ‘Eco-Schools’ which is a Europe-wide programme for schools aiming to raise children’s awareness of the impact of their actions on the environment. A Green Code Programme was also developed for schools. This was based on an ICT-based package related to the national curriculum for children of all school ages.

3. *Environment Club 21*, an opportunity for leading British companies to contribute to, and become part of, the awareness-raising role of GFG.

4. *Research and Development*, through which to provide a framework and enable the public to adopt different lifestyle changes. In particular, ‘Eco-Cal’, a computer based programme was developed to enable households to measure how ‘green’ they are, and to find tips and advice on being more environmentally friendly. There was also a pilot
educational project called ‘Slim your Bin’ which was aimed at educating households in how to cut down on waste. Specific groups of individuals were also targeted including church members through a programme of awareness called ‘Eco-Congregation’.

5. Pilot Sustainable Communities Project (PSCP), a pilot project working within geographically located communities to encourage households to care for their environment.

3.3.5 The Green Code

The national GFG publicity campaign aimed to promote sustainable lifestyle changes amongst the general public by encouraging them to take small individual actions to improve the environment. The awareness raising and promotion undertaken by the GFG focused on two methods from which to encourage the public to ‘do their bit’ for the environment. Firstly, through the provision of information, and secondly, encouraging an individual approach in the participatory process, thereby avoiding the need to identify action on a consensus basis, and minimising the potential to scrutinise and oppose the UK Government’s approach to achieving sustainable development. From the direction and influence of the Chief Executive of the TBG, the provision of information and education in relation to an environmental agenda was subsequently packaged into an easily understood, prescribed code of pro-environmental behaviour called the Green Code (GC) (see Appendix 1). Initially, the GC consisted of a fourteen point code, but this was reduced to five, thereby making it more readily accessible to the general public and assisting in marketing the Campaigns sustainable development message (Bagnal, 2000). The five objectives of the GC were to, ‘cut down on waste’; save energy and natural resources; ‘travel sensibly’; ‘prevent pollution’ and ‘look after the local environment’. The overall
aim was that if everyone adopted those actions within their local environment, they could make a larger difference to the wider global environment.

The GC provided the cornerstone to the GFG Campaign in delivering its sustainable development message and in encouraging individual lifestyle changes. However, it had a number of inherent problems that directly impacted upon other GFG activities, including the PSCP. Although GFG represented a top-down approach to achieving sustainability, it attempted to encourage a commitment to bottom-up processes of implementing the GC through locally defined action. However, as Eden (1996) highlights, this approach to encouraging increased public participation contradicted what A21 requested. Similar to the slogan 'think globally, act locally' which has been used to communicate the sustainable development message (Rowe & Robbins, 1999), GFG adopted a similar line of thinking with their marketing slogan 'Making a World of Difference – together'. As previously mentioned in Section 3.3.4, GFG had a number of specific activities that provided a focus for promoting individual lifestyle changes. The following section (Section 3.4) will now focus on how the PSCP was developed to enable GFG to demonstrate how its GC could be interpreted into practical action at the local level.

### 3.4 Pilot Sustainable Communities Project

Running in parallel with its mass media campaign, GFG had a number of PSCPs with an overall objective of testing the relevance and effectiveness of the GC in initiating community action, and 'examine those factors which encourage or prevent people from adopting environmentally responsible behaviour' (GFG, 1996, p.2). These PSCPs were set up for a period of three years (April 1996 - April 1999) with the DoE allocating an initial
annual budget of £300,000 for six PSCPs, each receiving an annual budget of £50,000. Although the budget would be managed through GFG Ltd, it was to be used to assist with the establishment and development of the PSCP in each participating local authority, and to act as a catalyst for various GC related projects. In addition to funding provided by the DoE, each PSCP had to actively seek additional funding either in cash or in kind from their own members or third parties.

Those local authorities that were involved with the PSCP were: Huntingdonshire District Council, Sedgefield Borough Council, Lancashire County Council, London Borough of Merton and Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council. In Scotland, the PSCP was initiated under the auspices of Forward Scotland\(^6\). Each participating local authority also had an associated university, which would monitor and evaluate, and in some cases act within an advisory capacity (Smith et al, 1999). The above-mentioned local authorities were linked to the following universities: Cambridge University (Committee for Interdisciplinary Environmental Studies), Sunderland University (Centre for Sustainable Development, School of the Environment), Lancaster University (Centre for the Study of Environmental Change), South Bank University (School of Urban Development and Policy), University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (Faculty of Community Health Sciences, School of Environmental Sciences) and Edinburgh University (Alcohol and Health Research Group). The setting up of these partnerships have led the PSCPs to be viewed as,

"represent[ing] the first closely researched evidence of processes and projects aimed at delivering progress towards sustainable communities in the UK." (Smith et al, 1999, p.197)

\(^6\) Forward Scotland is an independent Company with charitable status, and is the primary delivery agent for sustainability issues throughout Scotland. It is governed by a Board of Directors and funded by the Scottish Office (now Scottish Parliament).
3.4.1 Selecting local authorities

The selection of local authorities was not an ‘open’ process, whereby all interested local authorities would be invited to submit a bid to GFG for consideration. Instead, the selection had been partly predetermined by the GFG Advisory Committee, with some local authorities actively being encouraged to submit a bid to GFG, primarily those with a major political constituency in their boundaries, for example, Conservative Party support within Huntingdonshire and, Labour Party support within Sedgefield. In addition to this, there was also a perception as to what other local authorities GFG needed to get on board to enable it to retain a high profile throughout the Country, namely a London Borough, and also representation from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Those local authorities that were chosen represented a mixture of county, borough and district authorities (see Figure 3.3). They also reflected an array of different environmental and demographic features throughout the UK. Huntingdonshire and Sedgefield were selected on the basis of their high political profile (Bagnall, 2000), as they were the constituencies of the then Prime Minister, John Major, and Leader of the Labour Party, Tony Blair. Having invited the political constituencies of two major political parties, Yeovil, the political constituency of the Liberal Democrats was also approached. However, they indicated a lack of willingness to be involved with the GFG Campaign. Lancashire County Council was selected on the basis of its perceived progress and advanced thinking with regards to environmental sustainability issues. Merton was selected as the London Borough representative, as at the time of selection it was amongst one of the first London Authorities to have published its LA21 Strategy, and was viewed as having a ‘strong background to LA21’ (Smith et al, 1999, p.201). In Scotland, the PSCP was initiated
through the auspices of Forward Scotland. Although there were intentions to have a representative from Northern Ireland, political difficulties and circumstances at the time of selection meant that it was not possible. In Wales, there was considerable debate amongst representatives from a range of environmental organisations and agencies (including the Environment Agency and Keep Wales Tidy Campaign\(^7\)) concerning the selection of a local authority. It was decided, following what was described by one participant in the discussions as a ‘smoky room deal’ in the Welsh Office (now National Assembly for Wales), that Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council would be encouraged and helped to submit a bid to GFG on the basis of two main reasons. Firstly, following Local Government Reorganisation in Wales (1996), it was the local authority with the smallest population. Secondly, at the time of selection, it did not have a LA21 Strategy, and its involvement in the PSCP would hopefully assist in the development of that Strategy. To further facilitate the high level of profile and publicity surrounding the PSCPs, each participating local authority had its own individual official public launch, involving key political leaders and public figures, including the Prime Minister, John Major, Leader of the Labour Party, Tony Blair, Neil Kinnock (European Commissioner for Transport) and Glynis Kinnock (MEP, South East Wales).

3.4.2 Selecting Pilot Project Areas

In their submission bid to GFG, local authorities had to select two or more geographically located communities as Pilot Project Areas (PPAs) with identifiable boundaries, each having a population of between 3,500 to 5,000. These PPAs also had to reflect the range of

---

\(^7\)Keep Wales Tidy Campaign is the Welsh subsidiary to the Tidy Britain Group.
Figure 3.3: Structure of Going for Green and the PSCP.
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physical, socio-economic and cultural characteristics within their particular locality. This identification procedure highlights that in selecting PPAs there were tensions between identifying social groups that would be more receptive to those issues included within the GC, such as the middle class, against those that were representative of the socio-economic characteristics of a particular locality. GFG aimed to utilise the experiences within the PSCPs to demonstrate and encourage environmental citizenship, through locally defined action by,

“enabl[ing] residents to adopt Going for Green’s Green Code in ways in which reflect people’s concerns. Projects . . . [would] be managed by groups of local residents . . . to ensure the participation of all members of the community in the initiatives they develop.” (GFG, 1998a, p.2)

3.4.3 Additional issues surrounding the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project

Despite the potential for the PSCP to inform future GFG activities and indeed the wider sustainability debate, the commissioned research undertaken by the Harris Research Centre (1995) on behalf of GFG (see Section 3.3.3) did not seek to inform the framework of GFG in developing an increased understanding of how the concept of community should be interpreted in terms of achieving sustainability, or how communities operate, by identifying factors that would inhibit participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. From this it can be seen that GFG was an initiative of its time as it represented an approach to addressing environmental issues that still enabled the UK Government to pursue its political priority of economic development. Rather than adopting the wider rhetoric of community participation, which is included and widely referred to in a range of academic literature and documentation relating to sustainability, GFG insisted on pursuing an approach to participation that focused on individual action, and in doing so
adopted a simplistic view of what constituted a local community: ‘a population *in situ*’ (Dalby & MacKenzie, 1997). From this it could be argued that the PSCPs merely represented a number of opportunities to feed GFGs marketing campaign, by producing case studies and positive images of individuals having adopted simple lifestyle changes. However, as indicated by the then National GFG Co-ordinator, encouraging individuals to participate in isolation, as opposed to considering the context within which they live their everyday lives, was found to have hindered GFGs success, as the public resisted and ignored its attempts to communicate its sustainable development message,

“We started off with a very straightforward ambition . . . but we got tangled up in reality . . . social processes wasn’t our remit . . . nobody adopted our simple lifestyle changes.” (Bagnal, 2000)

However, in hindsight, GFGs publicity and marketing approach was also an innovative attempt to overcome what Agyeman & Evans (1994) refer to as the ‘free-rider’ problem which has been found to be a major barrier to encouraging participation in any initiative that illustrates the aggregate benefits from individual action. Although positive images were being used, this was not always an appropriate interpretation of what actually happened on the ground within a range of PPAs (GFG, 1998c), and GFG was persistently reluctant to learn and alter the overall approach and direction of the campaign (Smith et al, 1999).

### 3.4.4 Developing links with other initiatives

As it was advocated that GFG would seek to develop and support many existing environmental initiatives, including those initiated by local government, the PSCP was initially viewed as having potential significance for LA21 (Voisey et al, 1996), and as
providing a rudimentary learning base through which to fulfil the objectives of sustainable development (Smith et al, 1999). However, within most of the selected local authorities, the GFG campaign developed and acted in isolation to many existing initiatives including LA21. In addition, GFG did not aim to attempt to fill the knowledge gap concerning methods through which to develop effective collaborative partnerships to achieve the necessary integration of sustainability issues at the local level. Having ignored and missed an opportunity from which to connect and add-value to existing initiatives, Smith et al (2000) have indicated that this raises questions about the relevance of the campaign, particularly in relation to LA21.

So far this chapter has highlighted that, despite pressure from a number of influences including the EC, the environmental movement, and also at an international level, environmental policy with the UK consisted of a number of contradictions. Although the UK Government produced a number of publications and strategies, and established a range of institutional mechanisms in relation to addressing environmental issues, the UK Government still failed to develop a strategic approach in relation to developing environmental policy, as developments were fragmented and existed in isolation from each other. Furthermore, although advocating a central role in relation to achieving the wider principles of sustainable development, these were not matched with any structural administration changes or the necessary political commitment or leadership to ensure that progress was being made. This lack of authentic support and commitment in addressing environmental and sustainability issues was continued by the UK Government in terms of how it developed GFG. Not only did this initiative exist in isolation of the other proposed sustainable development initiatives, its remit was restricted to simply repackaging existing environmental messages into a GC. In addition to this, it was not supported by the
necessary financial or political commitment. Consequently, despite attempts to encourage individuals to ‘do their bit’ by raising their awareness of environmental issues and practical actions that they could taken in the GC, GFGs approach was ignored by many PPAs due to its lack of local relevancy. The third part of this chapter (Sections 3.5 & 3.6) will now focus on how the PSCP was to be implemented by MTCBC, one of the selected local authorities, and the University research commissioned by the local authority to monitor and evaluate what progress was being made within its PPAs.

3.5 Merthyr Tydfil: Pilot Sustainable Communities Project

As previously discussed in Section 3.4.1, MTCBC was selected as one of six PSCPs within the UK, and the only one in Wales. The primary reason behind its selection was on the basis that at the time of selection it did not have a LA21 Strategy, and that its involvement in the PSCP would hopefully assist the authority in its development. Secondly, following Local Government reorganisation in Wales in 1996\(^8\), the local authority became a new Unitary Authority under the Local Government Reorganisation in Wales Act 1996. Of the twenty-two new Unitary Authorities in Wales, Merthyr Tydfil has the smallest population of almost 60,000. The County Borough covers an area of approximately 43 square miles (112 square kilometres) which runs from the Brecon Beacons National Park to the centre of the former coal mining region in the south (see Figure 3.4).

Within the authority’s boundary there are two river valleys; the Taff, and the smaller Taff Bargoed. Almost one fifth of the County Borough is within the National Park Boundary.

---

\(^8\) Merthyr Tydfil is one of 22 unitary local authorities created in 1996 following Local Government reorganisation in Wales. Unitary Authorities provide all the main local government services for those who live within their boundaries. The unitary authorities replaces the two-tier local government system, which had been in place since 1974, under which eight counties and thirty-seven district authorities shared responsibility for delivering Welsh local government services.
The town of Merthyr Tydfil is situated at the top of the Taff Valley and is strategically located at the intersection of the A470 and A645 (Heads of the Valleys Road). The A470 links Merthyr Tydfil with the M4 motorway and Cardiff, which is twenty-five miles south. The A465 also gives easy access to the M5, Birmingham and the Midlands and the North of England. Almost two-thirds of the population living in the County Borough (42,000) reside within the main conurbation of Merthyr Tydfil town itself. The remaining 18,000 are located in a number of small villages to the north and south of the town.

Figure 3.4: Location of Merthyr Tydfil County Borough.

(Source: Data Wales Index Search 2001)
3.5.1 Merthyr Tydfil and its historical development

Merthyr Tydfil is an area that has an extensive historical background, particularly in relation to its pivotal role in the Industrial Revolution. In 1803, Merthyr Tydfil had a population of approximately 10,000 (three times the size of Cardiff), and was one of the largest and fastest growing towns in Wales. People were attracted to, and moved to the area due to the potential of earning highly paid wages during the time of its industrial growth. Initially, populations moved to the area from elsewhere in Wales, but immigrants also came from countries as far as Ireland, Spain and Italy. In the late nineteenth century, when Merthyr Tydfil was at the height of its industrial development it became known as the Iron Capital of the world as it had four of the largest iron works in the world. The Dowlais Ironworks was renowned as the largest iron producer in the world. These sources of iron were exported to countries throughout the world, subsequently this led to an expansion of nearby docks in Newport and Cardiff. A combination of diminished local raw materials, increased extraction costs, greater competition and world-wide recessions in the 1930s subsequently led to a decline in, and the eventual closure, of both iron and steel works. This was followed with the closure of nearby coal mines. Statistics indicate that the level of male unemployment in the area in 1935 had reached 60%. Over the following years, the coal mines continued to close with the last remaining site closing in 1993. In more recent years, many of the coal tip areas have been reclaimed and landscaped. Due to the location and road infrastructure of Merthyr Tydfil, there is both quick and easy access to other areas of the country, including a number of major UK cities. Subsequently, the area has begun to attract light manufacturing industries. Small factory estates have been developed within the area, making it a regional commercial centre.
3.5.2 Implementing the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project in Merthyr Tydfil

Although the PSCP officially began in April 1996, it was not initiated in Merthyr Tydfil until August 1996. For the purpose of managing and co-ordinating the PSCP within MTCBC, a GFG Project Manager and GFG Project Co-ordinator (GFGO) were appointed. The GFG Project Manager had three primary roles. Firstly, to manage the project and ensure compliance with the GFG PSCP contract of conditions and specifications. Secondly, to act as a facilitator for the GFGO with other local authority officers in relation to various projects that would be undertaken, including those involved with the People and Places Programme\(^9\), the authorities ‘Clean and Green Team’\(^10\) and a range of local authority officers who had an environmentally related work remit\(^11\). Thirdly, the GFG Project Manager also acted as chairperson of a GFG Steering Committee, which was to be established for the duration of the PSCP. This thesis will return to discuss the function and composition of the GFG Steering Committee in greater detail in Chapter 6 (Section 6.2.4).

The GFGO was appointed in August 1996, after having worked as a recycling education officer in a neighbouring authority. The primary role of the GFGO was to set up GFG action groups (LAGs) within each PPA, and co-ordinate various projects that were undertaken in relation to the GC. Both the GFG Project Manager and GFGO were based within the local authority’s Environmental Health Department. This was primarily for two primary reasons. The department had a responsibility for waste management and other related environmental protection issues. At the time of the PSCP, the Environmental

\(^9\) People and Places is a Programme of the Tidy Britain Group. Participating local authorities are given independent advice on how to deal with litter and waste issues, and offer solutions to problems relating to the local environment including graffiti and dog fouling.

\(^10\) The ‘Clean and Green’ Team were part of the authorities Clean and Green Programme. Its primary role was education and promoting awareness of environmental issues amongst school children. The Team’s responsibility also involved preparing displays and exhibitions and publishing a periodical magazine in-house, which is circulated free of charge to all schools throughout the Borough.
Health Department had sole responsibility for sustainable development within the local authority.

3.5.3 Selecting geographical ‘communities’ as Pilot Project Areas

In the County Borough of Merthyr Tydfil, the local authority selected two geographical ‘communities’ for the purpose of piloting the PSCP. These were Pantyscallog and the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (see Figure 3.5). The latter includes the villages of Bedlinog and Trelewis. Although MTCBC indicated in its submission bid to GFG that it had selected its PPAs on the basis that they had ‘different socio-economic profiles and differing community characteristics’ to each other (MTCBC, 1999, p.3), their selection was also influenced by the following issues. Firstly, the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog was identified as it not only had a population of 3,177, which was within the size range specified by GFG, but also on the basis that for a number of years those residents that lived in the area felt alienated from the authority and its services due to its geographical location within the County Borough. Secondly, in relation to this, there was also an increasing perception that the authority was spending most of its financial budget on improving services within Merthyr Tydfil town and the immediate surrounding area, ignoring villages such as Bedlinog and Trelewis that were at the edge of its boundaries. By including the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the local authority would be able to use the PSCP as an opportunity in which to overcome these perceptions, and hopefully lead its residents to feel that the authority was doing something for them.
Thirdly, as the area had a wide range of community groups and organisations, some of which had an specific environmental interests, the local authority perceived that these groups would help to support the PSCP in that they could be involved in establishing a GFG action group specifically for the PSCP. Fourthly, although not an issue that influenced the overall decision to include the area, the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog had a relatively homogenous socio-economic profile, within the lower socio-economic groupings. So, from the outset, the inclusion of the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog in the PSCP was beneficial for the local authority for two main reasons. It would provide an opportunity from which to adopt a 'public relations' exercise in relation to issues that
would not pose a political threat to the authority, or be controversial and lead to adverse publicity. As there were already a number of community-based groups and organisations within the area that had a particular interest in the environment, the local authority perceived that these would facilitate the success of the project.

Pantyscallog, the second geographical community to be selected as a PPA, was identified on the basis of having four characteristics that were comparable with the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog. It had a relatively few community based groups and organisations, none of which had a specific environmental interest. Although within the Electoral Ward of Dowlais, an urbanised area, it was regarded as a ‘community’ in its own right as it had its own easily identifiable boundary. The area was of similar population size and was also regarded as a suitable comparison as its socio-economic profile was perceived by the local authority as being less homogenous than the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, as it had a mixture of both lower and upper socio-economic groupings. Table 3.1 lists those Electoral Wards within the County Borough of Merthyr Tydfil and their Index of Deprivation, which is based upon the Welsh Office Index of Socio-Economic Conditions. In relation to the Index of Deprivation in Merthyr Tydfil, the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog is at the lower end of the scale with a Deprivation Index of 7.26 (i.e. it has low socio-economic conditions), whereas Pantyscallog is at the opposite end of the scale with an estimated Deprivation Index of 4.30. Due to its comparative characteristics with the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, Pantyscallog was perceived by the local authority to be an opportunity from which to ‘test out’ how the lack of existing community groups and organisations would affect Pantyscallog in terms of participating in the PSCP. Its selection

---

12 Figures obtained from 1991 Census relate to Ward level, therefore specific figures are not available for Pantyscallog. Figures used by the local authority to compare Pantyscallog with the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog are therefore based upon an estimate only.
was also viewed as an opportunity from which to assist in identifying and developing alternative methods through which households in communities similar to Pantyscallog could be encouraged to participate in a sustainable communities project (MTCBC, 1995).

**Table 3.1: Index of Deprivation for Electoral Wards in Merthyr Tydfil.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral Ward</th>
<th>Index of Deprivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedlinog</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyfarthfa</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowlais</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pantyscallog (estimate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4.13)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurnos</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Vale</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penydarren</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treharris</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaynor</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Welsh Office Index of Socio-Economic Conditions)

**3.5.4 Background to both Pilot Project Areas**

This section will provide baseline information relating to both PPAs for two main reasons. It sets the context within which the UniCR was conducted. As discussed in greater detail in Chapters 6 and 7, the various characteristics of each PPA impacted on how the PSCP was implemented, and those outcomes and impacts that resulted from its implementation.

**3.5.4.1 Electoral Ward of Bedlinog**

The Electoral Ward of Bedlinog lies within the Taff Bargoed Valley and consists of two villages; Bedlinog and Trelewis (Figure 3.6). Although both villages are within the same Electoral Ward, a distance of three miles separates them. Bedlinog is at the upper end of the valley and is built on the hillside, whereas Trelewis is at the lower end of the valley and
Figure 3.6: Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (PPA).

(Source: Ordnance Survey, 2001)
is built around a main road which runs from the bottom of the valley to the top, were Bedlinog is located. Although each village has its own distinct location within the valley, they both have a common identity which extends from when men that lived in both villages worked in the mines together. Another distinguishing feature about the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog is that it is the only Electoral Ward within the County Borough to have retained its Community Council.

**Bedlinog**

The village of Bedlinog developed and grew from a small number of small hill farms. However, before the First World War, the village grew rapidly following the sinking of the Bedlinog Colliery coal pit in the 1870’s by the Dowlais Iron, Steel and Coal Company, due to the demand for ‘sale coal’. This was followed with a further two collieries being opened in the village; Nantwen and Colly. Between the three collieries, 8,000 tons of coal were being produced on a weekly basis. At the time of the First World War, the village had a population of almost 5,000. Bedlinog was a single-class community with the vast majority of the population being colliery workers who lived in common conditions. Like many other pre-war Welsh communities, Bedlinog was a place where religion had a major influence on people’s lives. In 1924, the Bedlinog Collieries closed, and many of the miners sought work in the neighbouring Taff Merthyr Colliery, which was located in the village of Trelewis. Coal continued to be extracted until the Taff Merthyr pit finally closed in 1993. Its closure had a devastating impact on the village as a whole, as the high level of unemployment led to the closure of shops and the outward migration of the younger generation in search for employment opportunities outside the area. Despite the closure of the pits, the way of life has continued for many of its residents, and the villages is still
viewed as being a close knit community which is proud of its coal-mining and working class heritage (MTCBC, 1999).

A large proportion of the housing stock in Bedlinog is of owner-occupied terraced type properties. In comparison, there is a small proportion of local authority housing and private detached housing on the edge of the village. There are three schools within the village, one infant’s school and two junior schools. Those children that attend secondary school travel to school outside the area. The village has a Post Office, one newsagent, a small grocer and small butchers. There is also a doctor’s surgery and a health clinic, both of which are located in terraced type properties. There are two public houses, two places of worship and an extensive network of locally based groups and organisations serving a variety of interests such as the allotment society, rugby, cricket, bowls, choirs, OAP/Pensioners group, Farmers Union, Girl Guides and religious groups. The village also has a St. John’s Ambulance Hall, a Community Hall, a Rugby Football/Cricket Club and a Conservative Club. Although the village has a relatively stable population, with third and fourth generations of some families currently living in the village, the population is gradually declining as younger families are migrating elsewhere in search of employment opportunities. Subsequently, there is a growing concern amongst community leaders that the village may eventually primarily consist of retired and elderly residents.

**Trelewis**

The village of Trelewis developed from a small hamlet, which was originally known as Bontnewydd (meaning Newbridge). However, it was not until the nineteenth century that

---

13 Following the official end of the PSCP, all three schools had amalgamated into one.
the village of Trelewis developed as a small community of mining families. Collieries that served the villages included Trelewis Drift, the Deep Navigation which was in the neighbouring village of Treharris, and the Taff Merthyr, which lay to the north of the village. The village continued to grow with many families migrating to that area for employment opportunities. Most of these families were Scots. Following the closure of the mines, some of those families have continued live in Trelewis. This increase in population was followed with the construction of additional housing to the north and south of the village (Stormtown and Shingrig). During the 1980s, the Taff Merthyr colliery employed 680 men, and produced on average, 440,000 tons of coal annually. The closure of this pit in 1993 had a devastating impact on the village as a whole, with high levels of unemployment, the closure of shops and the outward migration of younger generation in search for employment opportunities.

The village has a mixture of housing types. There are two residential areas of local authority type housing; Stormtown and the Shingrig Estate. However, the majority of properties in the Stormtown area are mostly privately owned. The central part of the village contains mostly terraced type properties. In recent years, a private housing estate has also been developed on the fringe of the village, with the majority of residents commuting to work outside the area, due to easy access to the A470 and Cardiff. The village has a Post Office, two public houses, a small grocery/newsagent, confectioners, two fish and chip shops and one electrical goods shop. There is one primary school, and those children that attend secondary school travel outside the area. The village has an OAP Hall, a Community Centre and a Boxing Club, although the latter is in a state of disrepair and is currently vacant. As there is no doctors’ surgery or medical clinic within the village, the OAP Hall is used as a clinic/surgery at specific times during the week. The village has two
places of worship. Although there are a number of locally based groups and organisations within the village, such as religious groups, skittles group, a children’s play group and an entertainment/theatrical group, it is not to the same extent as Bedlinog. As indicated in Figure 3.7, almost 80% of households within the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog are owner-occupied. Over 50% of properties are terraced-typed properties and almost one-third are semi-detached (see Figure 3.8).

**Figure 3.7: Household tenure in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog.**
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(Source: MTCBC, 1997)
Following the closure of the pits within the area, both villages have suffered from high levels of unemployment. Both villages, along with the neighbouring village of Treharris were successful in receiving funding allocated by the Welsh Office as part of a Community Revival Strategy Programme. This funding has been used to acquire the site of the previous Trelewis Drift from the Coal Board, and from which to develop the ‘Taff Bargoed Development Trust’, which has responsibility to regenerate the villages in the area through promoting its largest asset, the surrounding countryside.

**3.5.4.2 Pantyscallog**

The village of Pantyscallog is situated north east of Merthyr Tydfil town (see Figure 3.9). Although it is a suburb, it is also within close proximity of the Brecon Beacon National Park boundary. While it is within the Electoral Ward of Dowlais, it is viewed as being separate to other residential areas within the Ward as it has its own distinct identity and
location. Pantyscallog (or Pant, as it is known locally) originated as a farming community that developed when it became part of a drover’s route. This resulted in a number of inns being established along the way. Two of these inns now house local public houses. However, it was not until the Dowlais Iron and Steel Works opened in the neighbouring area of Dowlais in the 1750s that the village’s population increased as a result of the overspill of families that had migrated to Dowlais. However, as the village was perceived to be quite a prestigious area to live in, the majority of residents were primarily managers and professional type workers, with those families that were employed at the Iron and Steel Works only contributing to a small proportion of the total number of residents. The village expanded after the First World War, with two local authority estates being added on to the edge of the village. These developments occurred at two different stages, the first in 1921 (the Rhodfa’r), and then the second in 1938/9 (Heol y Bonymaen). Prior to the Second World War, ICI, an ammonia company, opened a plant in the adjoining area offering a new type of employment for those that lived there. However, this only remained open until the 1960s. Despite the absence of industry in the immediate area, the village has continued to grow steadily.

Pantyscallog currently has a mixture of housing types; almost two-thirds are owner-occupied and one third rented from the local authority (see Figure 3.10). Similar to the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the third largest proportion of housing consists of terraced type properties (see Figure 3.8). The main road that runs through the village divides it into two, separating local authority housing and terraced type properties. A private housing development was built on the edge of the village in the 1980s. This has been followed with a further development of large detached executive type properties on the edge of the village, and in close proximity to the Brecon Beacon National Park boundary. The village
Figure 3.9: Pantyscallog (PPA).
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(Source: Ordnance Survey, 2001)
has three public houses, a Post Office, a confectionery/newsagents and a small franchised grocery store. There are also two places of worship and a cemetery within the village. There is one primary school, and children of secondary school age travel outside the area. There are a small number and range of locally based groups and organisations such as Brownies, Scouts, OAP group and religious organisations. The village has a Scout Hall and a small OAP ‘meeting’ place (Heddwich Close) which is located in a vacant local authority housing property. Although there is a Social Club within the village, it is in a state of disrepair, and is only used occasionally by those who live in the village. On the edge of the village there is a private golf club. There is also a small industrial estate on the edge of the village, next to the adjoining residential area of Dowlais.

Figure 3.10: Household tenure in Pantyscallog.
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Having discussed how the PSCP was to be implemented by MTCBC and considered the background to those geographical communities that had been selected as PPAs, the following section (Section 3.6) will now provide an outline of the University research that
was commissioned to monitor and evaluate what progress was being made. This section will conclude that the University commissioned research (UniCR) research required expansion to fill the research 'gap' with respect to what research issues were being monitored and evaluated. It should however be acknowledged that in the initial stages of implementing the PSCP, this research gap was unforeseen, and the funding allocated by the local authority for the UniCR did not allow for an adjustment. However, the opportunity of being directly involved with the UniCR enabled the researcher to build upon and extend the original research strategy, with the financial support of the University to undertake the research for this thesis. In doing so, this enabled the researcher to make a significant contribution to the growing debate on how to implement those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development.

3.6 University Commissioned Research

To fulfil the contract and specifications of GFG and the PSCP, MTCBC was required to form a partnership with an associated university for the purpose of conducting a programme of research during the course of its PSCP. The University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (UWIC) (Faculty of Community Health Sciences, School of Environmental Sciences) (now School of Applied Sciences) were invited by the local authority to conduct this research as it had, ‘a team of research professionals with several years experience of designing surveys and managing data analysis in both environmental and health fields’ (MTCBC, 1995). As previously mentioned in Section 3.4, each local authority that had been selected for the PSCP was allocated with a budget of £50,000 per annum. Although the PSCP would operate over a three-year period (April 1996 - April 1999), MTCBC allocated a total of £10,000 per annum, for a period of two years, from which to fund its
UniCR\textsuperscript{14}. It should be highlighted that other Universities associated with the PSCP elsewhere within the UK were allocated a larger research budget from their relevant local authority, often with the local authority supplementing the PSCP from its own financial budget. Although this was not the case with MTCBC, it should be acknowledged that the local authority did contribute towards the PSCP ‘in kind’, through the provision of office space, associated facilities, secretarial support and officer assistance. These financial limitations need to be highlighted at this stage as they placed a number of restrictions on both the research and implementation of the PSCP within both PPAs.

3.6.1 University Commissioned Research Design

The UniCR was based upon the overall objectives of the PSCP. In its paper ‘Guidelines for submitting proposals’, GFG specified that proposals submitted by local authorities should aim to;

“... develop a methodology and action plan to achieve a measurable impact from the implementation of the ‘green code’ ... [and] identify barriers or mechanisms preventing the implementation of these actions by the community.” (GFG, 1995, p.5)

In response, MTCBC’s submission bid to GFG stated that,

“... initial environmental ... data ... [would] be obtained to provide a baseline against which future trends and improvements may be measured, compared and assessed.” (MTCBC, 1995, p.9)

The above extracts indicate that both the GFG proposed guidelines and the local authorities submission bid were geared towards measuring GFG’s own aims and

\textsuperscript{14} Additional funding of approximately £1,500 was allocated for the purpose of providing additional assistance for the transcription of focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews.
objectives; raising awareness of GFG and GC issues, and encouraging the participation of individuals and households in adopting sustainable lifestyle changes. The emphasis was on measurable and quantifiable outputs relating to the goals of GFG, as opposed to those actual participatory processes that were occurring within each PPA. Those limitations associated with the UniCR will be considered in greater detail in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.1) before selecting an appropriate research strategy on which to base the model research process being developed for this thesis.

The research strategy used for the UniCR combined both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Figure 3.11 illustrates the time scales of the PSCP in relation to both the UniCR and PhD research. The UniCR was conducted at three distinct stages during the course of the PSCP, and involved two main components. The first component was based upon a longitudinal questionnaire survey of household behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues. The first phase of this longitudinal postal questionnaire survey was undertaken between October 1996 and December 1996, and was used as baseline data from which the local authority could plan, develop and encourage participation within both PPAs. The second phase of the longitudinal survey was undertaken between February 1998 and April 1998, sixteen months after the first phase, and used to identify changes in household attitudes, and the adoption of GC sustainable lifestyle changes. The second component of the UniCR was undertaken between June 1997 and February 1998, and involved conducting a series of semi-structured interviews in both PPAs with the aim of identifying perceived barriers and opportunities for sustainable lifestyle changes15. The findings from the UniCR were included within a number of Progress Reports which were produced for the local

15 Although the overall aims of the local authority commissioned research were retained, alterations were made with respects to the methodology for the researchers PhD (see Chapters 4 & 5).
Figure 3.11: Gantt Chart illustrating the timescales of the pilot Sustainable Communities Project, University Commissioned Research (UniCR) & PhD research.

- **1996**
  - PSCP implemented (April 1996 – April 1999)
  - GFGO appointed (August 1996 to mid March 1999)
  - Longitudinal Study (Phase 1) (October 1996 to December 1996) (UniCR & PhD Research)
  - Collection of observational data and documentary evidence (August 1996 – August 1999) (PhD Research)
  - PSCP introduced to both PPAs. (November 1996 to April 1999)

- **1997**
  - August 1996 Start of UniCR
  - Focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews (June 1997 to February 1998) (UniCR & PhD Research)

- **1998**
  - Longitudinal Study (Phase 2) (February 1998 – April 1998) (UniCR PhD research)

- **1999**
  - August 1998 End of UniCR
  - Focused interview and focused group interviews (September 1999 to November 1999) (UniCR & PhD Research)

* UniCR (University Commissioned Research)
authority over the two year contract period (see Collins et al, 1997a; 1997b; 1997c; 1998a; 1999; Belcher et al, 1999). As discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, the research presented in this thesis was undertaken in conjunction with the UniCR.

3.6.2 Tensions and opportunities

Due to an increasing lack of trust towards local authorities by the general public as 'agents of change' (Macnaghten et al, 1995), it was important from the outset, that the UniCR was seen to be undertaken independently from the local authority. Although the local authority and the University research management team (URMT)\(^{16}\) considered in the early stages, that the PSCP would be a relatively straightforward project and research protocol, as the PSCP progressed, both the PSCP and its associated research findings became very sensitive and political issues. This subsequently led to a number of concerns and reactions by the local authority and those involved with the research. Firstly, there were issues relating to the appropriate interpretation and use of the UniCR. Secondly, although the researcher and GFGO had established a good working relationship during the course of the PSCP, the URMT were kept at a distance by the local authority due to the political implications of the PSCP. In some instances the URMT also distanced themselves from the PSCP in terms of advising the local authority with respect to its implementation, due to sensitivity surrounding the PSCP and its associated research findings in terms of challenging existing power relations. Thirdly, as a large component of the UniCR focused on quantitative outcomes and changes towards GC issues, the research findings from the longitudinal study suggested

\(^{16}\) Within the Faculty of Community Health Sciences (School of Environmental Sciences), a University research management team was established for the purpose of managing the commissioned research that was undertaken during the course of the PSCP.
that the PSCP had been relatively ineffective in relation to changing attitudes and behaviours towards the GC. The local authority argued that those research findings were not representative of the efforts made by the GFGO in relation to implementing the PSCP. Following on from this, there was a gradual breakdown in the contractual relationship between the local authority and the URMT. Finally, due to the sensitivity of the UniCR findings, the researcher was in some instances persuaded by the URMT to present the research findings within a positive context.

It is not the intention to apportion blame in relation to how the UniCR was agreed upon or managed. It is however important to raise awareness of the sensitivity and political issues surrounding the conduct of such UniCR because it has wider ramifications for current trends in the research process. For example, researchers are encouraged to engage with, and secure funding from user groups, but such protocols for undertaking research and strategies for dissemination may need further refinement. Both the original aims and objectives of GFG and the UniCR, within a relatively short period of time became increasingly less appropriate methods through which to monitor the participatory process that was actually occurring within both PPAs. However, due to a number of issues including the requirements of the GFG PSCP contract, the limited budget allocated to the local authority by GFG, and the restrictive research budget allocated by the local authority to the University, the initial UniCR proposal could not be altered significantly. However, the research presented in this thesis extends from that UniCR and aims to widening our understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. Before selecting an appropriate research strategy on which to base the on model research process (Chapter 4), the final part of this chapter (Section 3.7) will identify those research
questions that were developed to provide a focus for the model research process being developed for this thesis.

3.7 Research Questions

Having developed a thematic framework for those participatory process involved in achieving sustainable development and examined the UK Government's approach to promoting increased public participation through GFG, the following research questions were identified as providing a focus for the model research process in this thesis and from which to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the PSCP within both PPAs. A more detailed outline of how those research questions were developed will be provided in Chapter 4 (Section 4.5).

1. Identify those models(s) and strategy(ies) that were used to promote community participation in the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

2. Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

3. Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

4. Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

5. Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

6. Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.
Using the above research questions to monitor and evaluate how the GFG PSCP was implemented will enable the researcher to draw upon those lessons learnt and develop successful strategies used to promote public involvement in influencing community focused policies relating to sustainable development elsewhere. This will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 8. Considering the above research questions, Chapter 4 will now focus on selecting an appropriate research strategy to provide a framework on which to base the model research process being developed for this thesis.
Chapter 4: Research Strategy and Design

4.1 Introduction

Examining how environmental policy has developed within the UK, Chapter 3 has gained an increased understanding of the UK Government's response to A21 and its approach to increasing public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. In addition, Chapter 3 has also provided a detailed outline as to how GFG aimed to test the relevance and effectiveness of its approach in achieving sustainable lifestyle changes through a number of PSCPs, and how this Project would be implemented by MTCBC within two comparative PPAs. Providing background information relating to both PPAs, Chapter 3 has not only provided an initial insight into recent social and cultural changes, but also set the context within which the research for this thesis was conducted. As this thesis will argue in Chapter 8, there is a need to understand recent cultural and social changes that have occurred within a particular locality as they are central to generating the necessary commitment and action for achieving sustainability at the local level. To provide a focus for the model research process being developed for this thesis, Chapter 3 has concluded with those research questions that provided a focus for the research.

In relation to developing the model research process for this thesis, this chapter consists of four parts. The first part (Section 4.2) will focus on the UniCR, highlighting its limitations with respect understanding how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. The second part (Sections 4.3 & 4.4) will provide a detailed account of the research strategy that was selected by the researcher to overcome those limitations associated with the UniCR and provided a framework for the
model research processes. The third part (Sections 4.5, 4.6 & 4.7) will focus on the initial stages of the revised research strategy. Finally, Section 4.8 outlines those steps that were taken to ensure that an in-depth and comprehensive analysis would be undertaken of those processes involved in implementing the PSCP in both PPAs, and to evaluate resulting outcomes and impacts.

4.2 Commissioned programme of research

The UniCR was undertaken by UWIC (Faculty of Community Health Sciences, School of Environmental Sciences) between August 1996 and August 1999 (see Figure 3.11). As it is not within the scope of this chapter to provide a comprehensive account of the UniCR, a brief outline can be found in Appendix 2. Information relating to the methodology and research findings is contained within a number of PSCP progress reports (see Collins et al, 1997a, b, c; 1998, 1999; Belcher et al, 1999). A number of limitations associated with the UniCR were identified by the researcher, not only in relation to monitoring and evaluating those participatory processes that occurred within both PPAs, but also in terms of what GFG had hoped to learn from the experiences of the PSCP. Before discussing those limitations and restrictions associated with the UniCR in greater detail, there is a need to understand the boundaries within which the research was conducted.

4.2.1 University Commissioned Research: Limitations and Restrictions

The overall objective of the PSCP was to test the relevancy and effectiveness of the GC in initiating community action, and its practicability in promoting sustainable lifestyles by changing attitudes and behaviours towards the environment (Section 3.4). The UniCR
design involved two research methods. The first was a longitudinal postal questionnaire survey, which aimed to measure changes in household behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues, and awareness of GFG and the GC. The second involved conducting interviews with community leaders, community group leaders and community group members\(^\text{17}\) in both PPAs, and aimed to identify perceived barriers and opportunities in relation to achieving sustainable lifestyle changes, and perceived roles and responsibilities in improving the environment. Those research methods were regarded as separate components, and were not formally combined within the overall research design. As previously indicated in Chapter 3, the UniCR had a number of restrictions placed on it, not only in terms of financial and time constraints, but also having to conduct the research within those time scales of the PSCP (Section 3.6.1).

With respect to widening our knowledge and understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, the UniCR had a number of limitations. For the purpose of developing the model research process, it is important to highlight those limitations as they placed a number of restrictions in terms of providing the depth of information and insight required to monitor and evaluate those participatory processes that actually occurred within each PPA.

1. The UniCR primarily focused on GFG's objectives; testing the relevance and effectiveness of the GC in initiating community action, and its practicability in promoting sustainable lifestyles by changing attitudes and behaviours towards the environment. The UniCR did not include in its design, an analysis of those actual

\(^{17}\) This refers to a geographically defined community (i.e. PPA).
participatory processes that occurred within each PPA, or identify those wider outcomes and impacts relating to that process.

2. Those research participants that were identified by the UniCR were restricted to householders, community leaders, community group leaders and community group members. By not including non community group-members, the UniCR was unable to confirm that responses obtained represented the views of a broad range of community stakeholders, and not just the more articulate and representative groups.

3. Although the PSCP would be implemented over a period of three years (April 1996-April 1999), the UniCR was only conducted during the first two years of the project’s implementation18 (see Figure 3.11). Consequently, this meant that the final eight months of the PSCPs implementation within both PPAs would not be accounted for within the UniCR design. Furthermore, the UniCR did not continue beyond the official end of the PSCP, a period of study that was important in terms of measuring the sustainability of any changes or outcomes that had occurred as a result of implementing the PSCP.

4. There was relatively little flexibility not only with the overall research design, but also with the content of those different research methods that were to be used for the UniCR. Following a relatively short period of time, both the focus of the UniCR and the aims and objectives of GFG became increasingly less appropriate methods from

---

18 The UniCR was conducted between August 1996 and August 1998.
which to monitor those participatory processes that were actually occurring within both PPAs. Consequently, those research findings that were obtained from the UniCR did not depict a complete overview of those processes and dynamics that were involved in implementing the PSCP within both PPAs. A more flexible research design would have enabled the researcher to make adjustments to data collection instruments used, and probe emergent themes and special opportunities present in a given situation. This would have enabled the UniCR to identify additional and unforeseen outcomes that resulted from implementing the PSCP.

5. Those projects that were undertaken within each PPA were to be led and managed by groups of local residents (Section 3.4.2). However, the UniCR omitted the need to identify whether the process of implementing the PSCP encouraged participation by a broad range of community stakeholders, thereby including those residents that had previously been excluded from decision-making and participatory processes.

6. In selecting PPAs, the ‘local’ community was interpreted by GFG and MTCBC as being ‘a population in situ’. This interpretation subsequently influenced the nature of the UniCR in terms of those potential research participants that were included in the research process. The selection of PPAs and the UniCR design prevented the development of a greater understanding of the concept of ‘community’ with respect to promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development.

7. Although the UniCR included the need to identify perceived barriers and opportunities in achieving sustainable lifestyle changes, this did not include the identification of
factors inhibiting or facilitating participation beyond those existing power holders within both PPAs, an issue included in the thematic framework for participatory processes.

8. In relation to the longitudinal questionnaire survey, there were issues surrounding the low level of response, and the representativeness of those research findings that were obtained from both PPAs. Used on its own, this raises concerns in relation to the validity of the UniCR and any conclusions that were drawn from such data.

9. Although the UniCR design involved collecting empirical data using two data collection methods; postal questionnaire survey and interviews, they were regarded as separate components as opposed to being combined more formally into the overall research design. The separation of these two research components did not allow for triangulation of research findings, an element of research design that is important with respects to enhancing the validity of any research findings (Patton, 1990).

In addition to the UniCR, the local authority had to monitor and provide feedback to GFG on progress being made through six monthly progress reports and a final report (see MTCBC, 1997a, b; 1998a, b; 1999). However, this monitoring process also had limitations as it only related to those outcomes that resulted from implementing the GC as opposed to wider issues relating to the process of participation. Those limitations and restrictions associated with both methods of monitoring and reporting raise questions in relation to what GFG wanted to learn from the PSCP.
As the UniCR had placed a number of limitations and restrictions on the research design, the model research process needed to be extended and widened in focus in order to monitor and evaluate those actual participatory processes that occurred, and evaluate those outcomes and impacts that had resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs. Selecting the *case study* as the research strategy from which to base the model research process, the second part of this chapter (Sections 4.3 & 4.4) will identify those opportunities and challenges that existed in using that strategy and overcoming those limitations associated with the UniCR, and from which to gain the depth of insight that is required in relation to increasing our understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development.

### 4.3 Research Strategy

One of the most important steps that needs to be undertaken in any research study is to identify those research questions or issues that are to be investigated. Although a number of research questions were developed for this thesis (Section 3.7), prior to undertaking the data collection process, only several had been decided upon. It was not until the actual process of implementing the PSCP had begun, that the complete list of research questions were agreed upon and finalised. Figure 4.1 lists those research questions that provided a focus for the model research process, and their relationship with project processes and outcomes. Those research questions that were used needed to be not only precise, but also inclusive, so as to minimise any unforeseen activities and outcomes that may have arose as
Figure 4.1: Research questions and their relationship with project processes and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Process and Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify those model(s) and strategy(ies) that were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>1. Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>1. Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>2. Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PSCP (Pilot Sustainable Communities Project)
a result of implementing the PSCP. As discussed in the third part of this chapter (Section 4.6.1), this model research process involved a continuous process of data collection, data analysis and refining the line of inquiry. This subsequently informed not only the next set of issues requiring investigation, but also those methodologies that were used and those sources from which to obtain the necessary empirical evidence.

4.3.1 Selecting an appropriate research strategy

When considering the most appropriate research strategy for those research questions that were under investigation, Yin (1984) has indicated that the following three conditions need to be considered;

1. The type of research question.
2. The amount of control an investigator has over those events that are being investigated.
3. Whether the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon as opposed to a historical phenomenon.

Yin (1984) has argued that the case study is the most appropriate research strategy when the following three criteria can be met. Firstly, there is a need to answer 'how' and 'why' questions. Secondly, the researcher has no control over those events that are being investigated. Thirdly, the focus of the research is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real life context. Figure 4.2 provides a flow chart of those decisions involved in selecting the most appropriate research strategy that will provide a framework on which to base for the model research process. As the research being undertaken fulfilled all three criteria presented by Yin (1984), the case study presented itself as being the most appropriate
research strategy for the following reasons. Firstly, those research questions and issues involved investigating ‘how’ the PSCP was being promoted within both PPAs, and identifying ‘why’ some methods were more effective than others. Secondly, the researcher had no control over how the PSCP would be implemented within both PPAs. Thirdly, the research would involve investigating how the PSCP was being implemented within two selected PPAs over a period of three years.

Figure 4.2: Decisions involved in selecting the most appropriate research strategy.

1. Is there a need to answer ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions?  
   - YES
   - NO

2. Does the researcher have control over those events that are under investigation?  
   - YES
   - NO

Consider alternative strategies:
   - Experiment
   - Survey
   - Archival analysis
   - History

3. Is the focus of the research on a contemporary phenomenon within a real life context?  
   - YES
   - NO

Adopt the Case Study Strategy

(Source: Adapted from Yin, 1984, p.17)
To understand the design and process involved in conducting a case study, there is a need to firstly define what is meant by a *case*, and secondly, explain what a *case study* actually involves (Bassey, 1999). A case is a phenomenon that occurs within a bounded context (Punch, 1998; Stake 1995) and can be either an individual, an organisation, a business, a policy, actions, behaviours, settings, incidents or events, a social situation, a process or even a community (Yin, 1993; Stake, 1995; Punch, 1998; Bassey, 1999). The case study is not a methodological choice (Stake 1994; 1998), but a specific research approach (Hamel, 1993) or strategy (Yin, 1984; Punch, 1998; Eisenhardt, 1999). The case study is a multifaceted and distinctive form of empirical inquiry whose unique characteristics enable us to distinguish it from other research strategies, and understand the process that is involved in conducting the case study (Yin, 1984; 1998). The aim of the case study is to deepen our understanding of the case. It does this in three main ways: firstly, its ability to provide a holistic overview of each case; secondly, its ability to use various data collection methods and organise multiple sources of research data; thirdly, its capacity to retain the case as a specific unit under study (Punch, 1998). This research approach provides the researcher with an opportunity to analyse intensively, specific details that are often overlooked by other research methods (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969) in understanding not only the complexity of those cases that are under consideration (Hamel, 1993; Simons, 1996; Eisenhardt, 1999), but also the product that results from that learning (Stake, 1994; 1998).

The case study is a common research strategy and has been used within a variety of disciplines and contexts including psychology, sociology, management and organisational
studies, individuals, communities and neighbourhoods, planning, political science, business and social work (Yin, 1984; Robson, 1993). As the research process involved in conducting a case study is both active and interventive, it consists of both the imagination of the case and the invention of the study (Kemmis, 1980). Consequently, the various research methods that were used during the model research process were not defined from the outset, but selected according to the appropriateness of the case under study and those issues that were under investigation.

Those research questions identified in Chapter 3 (Section 3.7) were considered to be too complex for single research methods to explore and analyse. Therefore, the case study provided a comprehensive research strategy for understanding and exploring (Punch, 1998), both the phenomenon and how the PSCP was being implemented within both PPAs. Due to the complexity of those issues that were under investigation and the depth of analysis required, the case study would strengthen the research process due to its capacity to understand such complexities by using a wide and varying range of sources of evidence (Yin, 1984). Furthermore, as the case study would enable the researcher to retain a holistic view of those processes that were involved in a real life situation (Yin, 1993), it presented itself as being the most effective research strategy, as the research process could evolve and develop during the course of the study.

4.3.3 Variations in case studies

Case studies have been categorised by Yin (1984) into four basic designs: single or multiple case design, and within each of those, the units of analysis can be either single or multiple. In addition to those variations, Yin (1993) has also suggested that case studies
can be of different types, and based upon a 2 x 3 matrix (see Table 4.1). This matrix indicates there can potentially be six design categories; single or multiple case design, and within each of those, three variations in the type of study; exploratory\textsuperscript{19}, explanatory\textsuperscript{20} and descriptive\textsuperscript{21}. Similar to Yin (1993), Stake (1994) has also distinguished between three main types of case study, which are based upon the purpose of the investigation: (1) intrinsic and (2) instrumental, both of which involve single cases, and (3) collective or comparative case study, which involves multiple cases.

Table 4.1: Types of case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study design</th>
<th>Case study type</th>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single case study</td>
<td>Single case study (exploratory)</td>
<td>Single case study (explanatory)</td>
<td>Single case study (descriptive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple case study (exploratory)</td>
<td>Multiple case study (explanatory)</td>
<td>Multiple case study (descriptive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Yin, 1993)

When deciding upon the type of case study strategy to be adopted, there is a need to consider not only whether the study will be of single or multiple case design, but also identify and define those reasons as to why a particular case is being studied. For the purpose of this thesis, Yin’s (1993) multiple case study design was used, as the ability to include embedded units of analysis would provide the researcher with flexibility to focus and investigate in depth what was important to each PPA. Furthermore, including both exploratory and explanatory case study variations would also provide the researcher with

\textsuperscript{19} Exploratory case study: where fieldwork and data collection is undertaken prior to defining the research question and hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{20} Explanatory case study: where research data provides an explanation as to what caused or produced which effects.

\textsuperscript{21} Descriptive case study: where a complete description of a phenomenon within its context is presented.
an opportunity to develop a greater understanding of those participatory processes that occurred within both PPAs, by exploring the context within which the PSCP was being implemented and providing explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts.

4.3.4 Advantages of using the case study in this research

As this thesis involved investigating how the PSCP was being implemented within two comparative PPAs, the case study provided the researcher with an ability to conduct research considering its appropriateness and opportunity from which to understand the complexity of particular contexts (Simmons, 1996). In addition to this, the case study has also been identified as being beneficial due to its distinctive role in evaluation research (Yin, 1993). Firstly, the case study is a particular type of research that is not only used to monitor and assess both the intervention and implementation process, but also to provide an explanation with respects to those results that are obtained from specific interventions in real life settings. Secondly, the case study can test hypotheses and develop theoretical propositions, which is the main technique from which generalisations can be developed from case study findings. From the various types of case studies presented in Table 4.1, Yin (1993) has suggested that explanatory case studies are the most effective methods from which to undertake an evaluation. However, this model research process combined both explanatory and exploratory case design to gain the depth of insight that was necessary to understand and explore methods and processes used to implement the PSCP, and identify those outcomes and impacts that resulted from its implementation within each PPA.
4.3.5 General criticisms associated with the case study as a research strategy

Although the case study as a research strategy is advantageous in many respects, it has also been the focus of much criticism. Firstly, on academic grounds the case study is often opposed on the basis that as a research technique it is ambiguous (Reinharz, 1992) and lacks rigour (Yin, 1984) in the collection, construction, and analysis of its empirical material. This lack of rigour means that findings and conclusions are open to the influence of biases, by both the researcher and research participants (Hamel, 1993; Yin, 1984). However, as Yin (1984) argues, biases can also be a criticism of other research strategies.

A second criticism of the case study as a research strategy is their duration, resource implications, and the requirement to have large amounts of data. Although the model research process developed for this thesis was undertaken over a period of three years, the research data that was collected related to specific phases of the research process and was focused in terms of its aims and objectives. A third criticism of the case study relates to an unknowing shift in the nature of the study, where the original research design becomes inappropriate for those research questions that need to be answered (Yin, 1984). Finally, the greatest criticism of the case study has been its lack of ability to provide a generalisation of a particular phenomenon (Yin, 1984; Punch, 1998). However, a number of arguments have been developed in relation to this criticism. Firstly, Punch (1998) questions whether there is a need to generalise from a particular case study, especially where the intention of the study is not to generalise, but to provide a greater understanding of a particular case because of its uniqueness. Punch (1998) has also argued that the need to generalise from a case study is also irrelevant where the study relates to a ‘negative case’, and the purpose of the study is instrumental and seeks to provide a greater insight into a particular issue or refine a theory. Both Yin (1984; 1998) and Stake (1994; 1995)
have also argued that the case study does not aim to produce a generalisation of a
population from a particular case study, such as statistical generalisation that is used in
experiments. The real essence of the case study is to generalise in relation to theoretical
propositions, which in turn provides an analytical generalisation. In undertaking this model
research process, the researcher adopted a number of approaches within the overall
research design and process in an attempt to overcome those traditional criticisms of the
case study. These design considerations will be discussed in further detail at those stages at
which they were considered during the research process.

Despite its criticism as a research strategy, the case study has continued to be used
extensively within a range of social science research areas including both traditional
disciplines and practice-oriented fields (Yin, 1984). Furthermore, the case study is often
used for both thesis and dissertation research in all disciplines and fields, and also in
evaluation research. In particular, where our knowledge with respect to a particular
phenomenon is either incomplete or non-existent, Punch (1998) has indicated that properly
constructed case studies can make a valuable contribution in three main ways. Firstly, by
developing an in-depth understanding of a particular case. Secondly, new or persistent
problems in a particular research area can be better understood through an in-depth study
of a case, thereby achieving a fuller understanding and conceptualisation of important
issues. Thirdly, in combination with other research approaches, the case study can also
make an important contribution by investigating deeper into a particular situation or issue
which is important in developing a fuller understanding, and which is not possible through
other research approaches.
4.3.6 Redefining the focus of the research

Evaluations are concerned with assessing outcomes and making causal inferences to explain those outcomes (Yin, 1993). Comparable with case studies, evaluations differ significantly from experimental research projects where there is tight control over those experimental conditions under which a project takes place. In comparison, evaluations occur within a real life setting, therefore the research has to deal with uncertainties and changes that result from the intervention (Rossi & Freeman, 1993). The in-built flexibility of the case study in conducting research within a real life context makes it a valuable evaluative tool, as this will enable an evaluation to overcome such issues. However, as Yin (1993) highlights, evaluations may encounter a number of conditions, which the researcher needs to be aware of in order to overcome them;

1. Changes in the intervention, which require the need for alternative measures of process and outcome, or even, develop a new evaluation design.

2. Changes in participation within specific sites, which will distort the initial research design.

3. Poor retention and high attrition rates which would jeopardise statistical analyses and evaluation results generally.

4. Strained relationships between the evaluator and the project demonstrator.

During the initial stages of the UniCR, the researcher encountered all four conditions. However, these presented the researcher with an opportunity from which to re-define the focus of the research being undertaken for two main reasons. Firstly, within a relatively short period of time, those measurements that were being used in relation to those
processes and outcomes that resulted from implementing the PSCP became increasingly less appropriate and required modification. The identification of the need for alternative measures and a refocusing of the research were recognised relatively quickly by the researcher due to the intensity of study that had been carried out during the initial stages of implementing the PSCP. This in-depth investigative role that had been undertaken by the researcher was crucial to identifying and overcoming a common criticism of the case study, an unknowing shift in the nature of the study (see Section 4.3.5), where the original research design becomes inappropriate for those research questions that need to be answered (Yin, 1984). Secondly, the process of encouraging participation in the PSCP not only differed between PPAs, but also altered within each PPA throughout the lifetime of the project. Therefore, those units of analysis that were identified for the UniCR (i.e. households) did not reflect the actual participatory process that was occurring, and therefore required alterations to be made to the overall research design. Figure 4.3 illustrates how the focus of the research was redefined, those changes that were involved in the overall research design, those issues that were to be investigated, and the various roles that the researcher would undertake. These changes would re-define the focus of the research and enable the researcher to use those opportunities presented by the case study as a research strategy to develop an increased understanding as to how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. Furthermore, they enabled the researcher to gain the necessary depth of insight into those cases that were included in the study, and observe and understand those dynamics and processes that were involved. Redefining the focus of the research also enabled the researcher to develop an increased insight and understanding as to how each PPA operated on a daily basis, and identify the range of local identities that existed, an issue that is central to understanding the concept of community. Those steps and procedures that were involved in developing
Figure 4.3: Illustration of how the focus of the research was re-defined.

**Original Research Design**

Research issues:
- Behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues.
- Awareness of the GFG Project and GC.
- Barriers and opportunities in achieving sustainable lifestyle changes.
- Perceived roles and responsibilities in improving the environment.

Units of Analysis:
- Households.
- Community leaders, community group leaders, community group members.

Role of researcher:
- Monitor & Interviewer.

**Evolved Research Design**

Research issues:
- Models and strategies used to encourage community participation.
- Effectiveness of the GC as an agenda for encouraging community participation.
- Methods and processes used to encourage community participation.
- Effectiveness of those methods and processes used in encouraging community participation.
- Outcomes that resulted from implementing community participation.
- Impact of those methods and processes used to encourage community participation.
- Factors inhibiting and facilitating community participation.

Units of analysis:
- Households.
- Community leaders, community group leaders, community group members, non community group members, community based workers.
- Local Action Group Participants.
- Non-LAG Participants.
- Pant Residents Association.
- GFGO.
- Agencies and Organisation (Steering Committee members).

Role of researcher:
the overall model research process will now be outlined in the third part of this chapter (Sections 4.4, 4.5 & 4.6).

4.4 Research Design

The research design is an 'action plan' (Yin, 1984; 1998) that links the empirical data that is to be collected with the initial research questions, and also those conclusions that are to be drawn from it. It represents a tool that will guide the researcher through the process of collecting, analysing and interpreting empirical data in relation to the specific case that is under study. As highlighted by Yin (1984; 1998), the research design is much more than a work plan, as it needs to guide both data collection and analysis, thereby ensuring that empirical results meet two necessary criteria. Firstly, that results are interpreted with minimum ambiguity, and secondly, that the interpretation will bear directly on the causal hypothesis of the study in question (Yin, 1993). The research design is the most difficult and critical part of undertaking a case study. However, as Yin (1984) points out, unlike other research strategies, the case study has no catalogue or commonly used model of design from which the researcher can draw upon. The case study is different in its approach to research, as it requires development and modification to its design according to those specific issues that are under investigation. To ensure that the research design remained appropriate for those research questions and issues that were under investigation, and were effective in obtaining an increased understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, the model research process was divided into three distinct but interrelated phases. The exploratory phase, which related to those stages of the model research process from which the researcher aimed to gain an increased understanding of the research phenomenon and those
selected cases. The process-monitoring phase which related to the period during which the PSCP was being implemented within both PPAs. The explanatory phase, which related to the period after which the PSCP had officially finished being implemented within both PPAs. Adopting this design from which to undertake the model research process enabled the researcher to organise and undertake the data collection effectively, and ensure that the model research process was able to deal with and respond to any uncertainties and changes that may have occurred during the implementation process.

4.4.1 Additional components of the research design

In addition to the three research phases, following a review of literature relating to case studies and evaluations, the following stages were identified as incorporating those components that are necessary in developing an effective case study design, particularly in relation to its role in evaluation (Yin, 1984; 1993; Bassey, 1999) (see Table 4.2).

| Stage 1 | Collating evidence relating to the goals and design of the programme |
| Stage 2 | Literature review |
| Stage 3 | Identifying research questions |
| Stage 4 | Defining the purpose of the inquiry |
| Stage 5 | Identifying unit(s) of analysis, including embedded units of analysis |
| Stage 6 | Collection of empirical data |
| Stage 7 | Data analysis |

By including these additional components in the research design process, Yin (1993) argues that this will enable a case study evaluation to approach and deal with three important issues that tend to be ignored by other research methods. Firstly, by defining the case, the researcher will have undertaken and considered the actual definition of the
programme and the intervention that is to be evaluated. Secondly, the case study evaluation will enable theories to be developed about the context that is under investigation. Thirdly, resulting from the development of theories, there will be the development of what Yin (1993) refers to as ‘program logic models’, which aim to explain how a programme can operate successfully through the development of programme theories.

Those stages that were involved in developing the model research process will now be discussed in turn so as to guide the reader through the line of inquiry that was undertaken by the researcher to ensure that an effective case study design had been constructed. As Stages 1 and 2 have already been dealt with in Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis, the following sections of this chapter (Sections 4.5, 4.6 & 4.7) will focus on Stages 3, 4 and 5. Due to the complexity of the model research process, and understanding how the three research phases aimed to address those criticisms associated with the case study, Stage 6 (Collection of empirical data) will be discussed in the following chapter (Chapter 5). As the design of a case study is inextricably linked to the analysis of its empirical data, Stage 7 (Data Analysis) will be discussed in the final part of this chapter (Section 4.8), as it is necessary as this stage to understand how data would be analysed at different phases of the model research process, and how research findings refined the focus of the inquiry and informed subsequent phases.

4.5 Developing research questions

Stage 3

Section 4.3 has indicated that one of the most important steps to be undertaken in any research study is to identify those research questions or issues that are to be investigated.
Identifying research questions will enable the researcher to specify units of analysis and the type and depth of data that is necessary in order to answer those research questions. Those key issues that have been included in the thematic framework for participatory processes (Section 2.3.8) provided the springboard for those research questions that needed to be answered in this thesis. This was important for two main reasons. Firstly, it would enable theory to be built from this case study (Eisenhardt, 1999), as it has the same rationale as hypothesis testing. Secondly, without such focus, the researcher may have become overwhelmed by the amount of empirical data that can be generated from a case study. Although the most common conceptual organisation for an evaluation is around programme goals (Stake, 1995), both the PSCP and the UniCR had a number of limitations with respect to what knowledge was to be gained from the experiences of implementing the PSCP within both PPAs. Following the development of the thematic framework for participatory process in Chapter 2, those research issues that were under investigation were extended beyond the goals of GFG and the UniCR through a number of broad research questions (Section 3.7). In doing so, the focus of the research was not to test a hypothesis, but exploratory and explanatory in relation to those specific participatory processes occurring within both PPAs and the overall research issues that were under investigation.

The research question is the vehicle from which to take forward the enquiry by identifying those actions of investigation that the researcher needs to undertake, and when. It does this by establishing what Bassey (1999) refers to as ‘the research agenda’, which includes what data is to be collected, what data analysis needs to be undertaken, and also the boundaries of the inquiry. A well stated research question will give a clear indication as to not only the direction and design of the case study, but also what data is necessary in order to answer those research questions (Punch, 1998; Yin, 1998). Good research questions are clear,
specific, answerable, interconnected and substantively relevant (Punch, 1998). The best research questions evolve during a study, as they not only guide the researcher in data gathering and reporting, but also sharpen the focus of inquiry and illuminate the differential utility of perspective findings. Stake (1995) has also highlighted that good research questions are important, as the case and context are infinitely complex, and the phenomenon is fluid and elusive. Those research questions that were developed for this thesis were inclusive, so as not to avoid any unforeseen activities and outcomes that may have arisen as a result of implementing the PSCP. Research questions were also flexible, and progressively redefined those issues that were under investigation, seizing opportunities from which the researcher could learn more. Alterations to the research focus and data collection methods has been viewed by Eisenhardt (1999) as being a feasible method from which to develop theory from the research, as it is important for the researcher to understand each case in-depth as opposed to producing statistics from which to summarise any observations made. However, as Eisenhardt (1999) has pointed out, such flexibility in design does not infer that a researcher can be unsystematic, but presents an opportunity from which to take advantage of the uniqueness of a specific case and the emergence of new themes to improve ‘resultant theory’ (1999, p.145). An illustration of those research questions developed for this thesis and how they were interconnected in relation to providing greater insight to those processes involved in implementing the PSCP is provided in Figure 4.4.

Prior to undertaking the data collection process only several research questions had been decided upon (Section 4.3), with the entire list of research questions not being agreed upon and finalised until the actual process of implementing the PSCP had commenced. The development of questions underwent a process referred to by Punch (1998) as ‘reciprocal
Figure 4.4: Research questions and how they were interconnected in terms of investigating the participatory process within each PPA.
interaction’ (1998, p.47). This involved an interaction between those research questions and data that were being collected, thereby unfolding and refining the line of inquiry, which subsequently influenced the way questions were identified, and developed, and where relevant empirical evidence could be found. Figure 4.5 provides an illustration of the various stages of interaction that occurred between research questions, data collection and analysis, and the overall line of inquiry that was involved in conducting the model research process in this thesis.

4.6 Defining the purpose of the inquiry

Stage 4

The role of theory is pivotal to designing, conducting and analysing a case study’s empirical evidence (Yin, 1993; 1998). Theory will direct and focus the research design according to its relationship with relevant literature and policy issues, and direct the researchers’ attention to those particulars that need to be examined, and where to look for relevant evidence. Punch (1998) has highlighted that research questions and the conceptual framework often develop in a reciprocal way and usually involves an iterative process. Developing a conceptual framework will provide the researcher with a number of benefits (Punch, 1998). Firstly, it identifies those cases that are to be studied, and the appropriate case design that is needed. Secondly, in the case of exploratory case studies, the theory will assist in focusing and specifying what is to be explored or investigated (Yin, 1993), thereby enabling the researcher to organise research questions more clearly (Punch, 1998). Thirdly, in the case of descriptive case studies, the theory will define what needs to be described. In addition to design issues, theory also aids in the analysis of a case study’s empirical evidence, as theory can be used to generalise research findings to other cases.
Figure 4.5: Illustration of the interaction involved between research questions, data collection and analysis, and the overall line of inquiry.
It makes explicit what is already known about those research issues (Punch, 1998), and theory can be used as a ‘template’ from which to compare empirical results of the case study (Yin, 1994, p.31).

4.6.1 Issue Questions

Issue questions are those outside issues that are brought into the study by the researcher, and enable the researcher to organise the study with respect to what could be learnt from a particular case (Stake, 1994). A number of issue questions were also used to force the researchers’ attention and direct the line of inquiry. Table 4.3 lists those issue questions that were developed by the researcher, and which drew specific attention to problems and concerns surrounding the implementation of the PSCP in both PPAs. A similar approach was used by Stake (1995) in previous evaluative research, which involved observing how problems were dealt with in order to develop an understanding of issues. This was based upon ‘a belief that the nature of people and systems becomes more transparent during their struggles’ (Stake, 1995, p.16). As issues are intricately connected to wider political and social issues, they are important in studying cases as they not only provide a ‘powerful conceptual structure’ from which to organise a case study, but also increase our understanding of the complexities of each case and reasoning behind particular problems and actions (Stake, 1995).

As the model research process in this thesis was an evolving one, and involved a process of progressive focusing, some issue questions evolved to those that were faced by participants within each PPA, thereby encouraging greater understanding of the case and processes by the researcher. Table 4.4 lists those evolved research questions that were developed for this
Table 4.3: Issue questions developed for the model research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary research questions</th>
<th>Issue questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify those model(s) and strategy(ies) that were used to implement community participation.</td>
<td>How would the process of community participation be implemented? Would it involve a bottom-up or top-down process? What was used to encourage participation? What was the agenda?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether the GC was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation.</td>
<td>Were residents concerned about their local environment? What were residents’ main environmental concerns? What were their main issues of concern? Did the GC relate to concerns that residents had about their local environment? Did the GC correspond to what residents perceived to be local environmental issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation.</td>
<td>What methods and processes were used to encourage community participation? Was use made of existing community groups and organisations, or was a specific group established for the purpose of the project? How was the project group established? Who was invited to join and how? Who joined the project group? Was it the more articulate residents? Was it primarily those with an environmental interest? What projects were undertaken? What issues did they relate to? Who was involved in decision-making processes? Was there a struggle for power? What influence did project group participants have in relation to project generation and implementation? How successful or otherwise were these projects in encouraging wider community participation? Why did, or didn’t people participate? Where specific project groups an effective structure for encouraging participation in the project? Where there any other issues that should have been considered? Did the project group relate to how each pilot project area operated on a day to day basis? Did it relate to how residents perceived their local community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation.</td>
<td>Where those methods and processes used successful in encouraging community participation? Did those projects that were undertaken result in sustained participation? Where those projects that linked to GC issues effective in encouraging participation? What types of projects were more successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP. | What impact did the project group and the project make within each pilot project area?  
Who did it make the most impact on? |
|---|---|
| Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP. | What factors (internal and external) inhibited the participatory process?  
What factors (internal and external) facilitated the participatory process? |

in encouraging wider community participation? What factors made them more successful?  
Did both project groups result in sustained participation? Where there any supporting factors?  
How were decisions made in relation to those projects that group project participants wanted to undertake?  
How influential were group participants in relation to local authority decision making?  
What type of participation did the project offer project group participants? What level of participation did they achieve?
Table 4.4: Research questions and evolved issues developed for the model research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Evolved research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What model(s) and strategies were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>Was the GC an effective agenda for encouraging community participation? Who was involved in implementing the community participation process? What was their role? How was community participation implemented within both PPAs? Where any partnerships established with other organisations or authorities? How was the project managed? Who was involved? What were their roles and responsibilities? What type of management structure was used? How was it formed? How was the project initially introduced to both PPAs? What type of publicity was used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>How many households were concerned about the local environment? What did the term environment mean to residents? What was the PSCP perceived to be about? What environmental issues were of most concern to residents? What general issues were of most concern to residents? Was the PSCP and the GC perceived to be of relevance Which aspect(s) of the GC (if any) were perceived to be of most relevance? Who was the project perceived to be most relevant for? How many residents participated in GFG related projects? Who participated in GFG related projects? How did those residents that participated differ to those that didn’t participate in any GFG related projects? Why was the PSCP not perceived to be of relevance to residents? Why did residents not participate in GFG related projects? Which aspect(s) of the GC (if any) were perceived to be of most relevance? And, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td><strong>Local School Involvement</strong> Why were projects initiated through the schools? How were schools involved in the PSCP? How were projects initiated? How many projects were initiated through schools? What types of projects were initiated?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What projects were implemented?
What methods were used to encourage community participation?
Which aspects of the GC were these projects linked to?
Which projects were most successful in encouraging wider community participation?

**LAGs**
Why were LAGs established for the purpose of implementing community participation in the SCP?
How were LAGs established in both PPAs? What processes were involved?
What issues were encountered when encouraging community participation within the LAGs?
Who participated in the LAGs? (number, gender, age, number of years participants had lived in their respective PPAs, duration, involvement with other community groups and organisations)
Who didn't participate in the LAGs? and why?
How effective was the LAG as a structure for residents to participate in the PSCP?
What advantages and disadvantages were there in establishing LAG?

**Community Focused Projects**
What projects were implemented? How many were implemented? How did they relate to the GC?
Who was involved in generating project ideas?
Who was involved in implementing project ideas?
What methods were used to encourage wider community participation in the various projects? How effective or ineffective were these methods? And why?
Who participated in the various projects, and why? Was their participation sustained?
Who didn't participate in the various projects, and why?
Was there a relationship between the type of projects undertaken and the level of wider community participation? What factors were found to be influential?
| Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the PSCP. | **Local School Involvement**  
What impact did those projects that were initiated through local schools make on the wider community?  
How many residents had heard about the PSCP through local schools?  
Which residents had heard about the PSCP through the local schools?  
Did those projects that were initiated through the local schools result in sustained participation?  
How many residents participated in those projects that were initiated through local schools?  
Which residents participated in those projects that were initiated through local schools?  

**LAGs**  
Who participated in the LAGs? (number, sex, age, number of years participants had lived in their respective SCP area, duration, involvement with other community groups and organisations)  
Who didn’t participate in the LAGs, and why?  
How effective was the LAG as a structure for residents to participate in the PSCP?  
What advantages and disadvantages were there in establishing the LAG?  

**Community Focused Projects**  
How many residents participate in community focused projects?  
How many residents participated in those projects that were related to GC issues?  
Which projects were found to be more effective in terms of encouraging community participation? Were those projects related to the GC?  
How many community focused projects encouraged sustained participation? What issues did these project focus on?  
Was participation sustained?  
Which projects were residents most aware of?  
Did the involvement of lag participants encourage participation in projects?  
Did the involvement of lag participants raise awareness of those projects that were being undertaken?  

| Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs. | **LAGs**  
Did project generation and implementation differ between both PPAs?  
Did the level and number of existing skills and experience of group management by LAG participants influence what LAGs achieved?  
What level of participation did LAG participants achieve?  
What skills did LAG participant’s gain as a result of participating in the PSCP?  
Was there a change in relation to how decisions were made?  
Did those existing skills and experience held by participants influence what each LAG achieved?  
Did the involvement of the GFGO influence what each LAG was able to achieve?  
What did LAG participants achieve as a result of participating in the project?  
What impact did each LAG make in each PPA? |  
| Non LAG participants | Were LAG participants perceived as being able to influence local authority decision-making?  
How many residents were aware of the LAG in their PPA?  
How many residents were aware of what the LAG did?  
How many residents perceived that the LAG had made an impact in their PPA?  
What impact did residents perceive that the LAG had made? |  
| **Other residents** | How many residents perceived that the LAG had made an impact in their PPA?  
What impact did residents perceive that the LAG had made? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Other organisations and authorities**
What impact did the PSCP have on those other groups and organisations that were involved with the Project and the LAG, in relation to how they would implement community participation in future projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implementing the project and community participation process (external issues)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interest in GC issues and the local environment.
Awareness of various projects and other related project activities (who was aware and who wasn’t)?
Participation in various projects (who and why)?
Awareness of LAG and its related activities?
Did the GFGO facilitate the level of participation achieved by LAG participants?
Were there differences between PPAs, what factors facilitated or inhibited it?
Did the implementation of the PSCP through the Local Authority prevent community participation in the LAG and the various project and related activities (if so, why)?
What level of support did the Local Authority have towards the PSCP?
Was each PPA perceived as being a ‘local community’ (if not, did they define their local community)?
Did the commissioned research (in particular, the household survey) create an interest in the PSCP, if so why?
To what extent was the commissioned research used to implement the community participation process?
Could the commissioned research have been used more effectively?
Was the commissioned research an appropriate method through which to monitor the participatory process?
Was the commissioned research conducted at the correct stages of the PSCP duration?
Was the commissioned research used by LAG participants (if so, how)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participatory process (internal issues)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Was there a ‘sense of community’ within each PPA as a whole?
Was there a relationship between the ‘sense of community’ within each PPA as a whole and the level of awareness and participation in...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What factors were perceived as contribute to creating a sense of community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors were perceived to be contributing to a decline in the 'sense of community'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the number and range of community groups and organisations in each PPA have an impact on the 'sense of community'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the 'sense of community' within each PPA have an impact on awareness of the LAG, various projects, and their perceived impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participated in the LAGs? (age, gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors facilitated or inhibited their level of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was participation sustained? If not, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any individual participant who had a particular influence on the LAG, did this encourage or discourage participation by the wider community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was it established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who were members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was participation by original participants sustained, if not, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits had participants gained from being involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did it inhibit or facilitate participatory process within both PPAs, and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What input did they have on LAG?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
model research process. However, Stake (1995) has highlighted that research issues can become increasingly more complex, requiring more and more attention and therefore making more demands upon available resources, with tensions rising between the need to study a particular issue or the original case. This increased demand placed on resources was cited in Section 4.3.5 as being one of the main criticisms of the case study as a research strategy. To ensure that an in-depth understanding of research issues was developed, the researcher returned to the wider case, thereby placing issues within a wider context and achieving a more holistic understanding of each case.

4.7 Identifying unit(s) of analysis, including embedded units of analysis

Stage 5

Although the case study is a valuable social research tool, its value will depend on how well it is focused (Hamkin, 1988). How the case under investigation is defined, is critical to understanding the phenomenon that is under investigation (Patton, 1990; Yin, 1993) and in defining the boundaries of the study (Yin, 1998). It is a case’s boundedness and how it operates as a system which are key factors to understanding a case (Stake, 1998). Those PPAs that were selected for the PSCP were identified by the researcher as being suitable comparable cases for a number of reasons. Firstly, the interpretation of a ‘local’ community as being ‘a population in situ’ was a significant research issue in its own right, especially within the context of understanding how residents within both PPAs defined their local community. Secondly, the inclusion of two cases in the research design was not for sampling purposes, but to replicate and implement the PSCP within two comparable PPAs, and investigate how their different characteristics would impact upon the participatory process. As Yin (1998) has indicated, the use of multiple cases will not only
strengthen but also broaden analytic generalisations,

"The replication approach to case studies combines the theory development stage with case selection. Within each individual case study, the data should converge on why a particular theoretical proposition is supported or disconfirmed...across cases. [It] will indicate the extent of the replication logic, and why certain cases were predicted to have certain results, whereas other (deliberately contrary) cases were predicted to have contrasting results." (Yin, 1998, p.240)

Comparisons between both PPAs were identified as aiding towards the development of a rich theoretical framework in relation to those issues that were being investigated by the researcher. Although comparisons are a 'powerful conceptual mechanism' (Stake, 1994, p.242), Stake (1994) has argued that they can also compete with learning about and from a particular case. As the model research process in this thesis required intensive investigations into both PPAs throughout the research study period, comparisons were made at defined stages of analysis (see Figure 4.5). Comparisons made between PPAs did not relate to general variables, but to those issues that were important with respects to learning more about each case. Furthermore, to make comparisons there was a need for the researcher to learn about each case in depth before hand. Undertaking comparisons at defined stages of the model research process enabled the researcher to advance learning and understanding about each case, and also gain from comparisons made through intrinsic interests. Finally, undertaking the UniCR in both PPAs facilitated the PhD research process for the researcher in a number of ways, including: gaining access to each case; identifying potential research participants; and collecting information relating to the PSCPs implementation and resulting outcomes and impacts. These associated benefits enabled the researcher to make efficient use of available time and resources, thereby overcoming one of the criticisms associated with the case study as a research strategy, that being, the increased demand that it can place upon resources (see Section 4.3.5).
As discussed in further detail in Section 4.7.2, the identification of appropriate cases, the level of analysis and the selection of further embedded units of analysis were crucial to undertaking this model research process, and making a significant contribution to what is already known in relation to promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. Those key issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development (Section 2.3.8) provided a focus for those issues that required investigation, what empirical evidence needed to be collected, and also those methodological issues that needed to be considered. The case study design that was used to provide a framework for this model research process enabled the focus of the research and the subsequent analysis of those processes to occur not only within each PPA, but also across both PPAs. This was decided upon, not only for theoretical replication and the production of corroboratory evidence from the two cases (Yin, 1993), but also on the basis that it would strengthen and broaden the learning experience for the researcher. The decision for selecting embedded units of analysis was not only decided upon in order to reflect theoretical priorities, but also in relation to issues including practicability, feasibility, and availability of resources.

Although those local authorities selected for the PSCP had identified a number of different PPAs, this case study focused on those PPAs within the County Borough of Merthyr Tydfil. The inclusion of two PPAs may have been perceived as being a constraint of this study, however, in retrospect it enabled the researcher to develop an increased understanding of the research phenomenon by conducting a more intensive study within a smaller number of cases, as opposed to conducting a less intensive study within a larger number of cases. This opportunity to learn from a smaller number of cases has been viewed by Stake (1994) as a much superior criterion to that of representativeness. As the
true essence of conducting a case study lies with its particularisation as opposed to its
generalisation (Stake, 1995), the first and most important emphasis is understanding the
case itself. This intensity of understanding that was developed in relation to both PPAs not
only enabled the researcher to collect an extensive amount of data, but also enabled
opportunities to be gained from being involved in intensive periods of observing and
monitoring the participatory process, which was necessary in collecting detailed empirical
data and understanding the research phenomenon. This intensive research process was
required not only to investigate those dynamics that resulted from implementing the PSCP,
but also provide the researcher with primary empirical evidence as opposed to placing a
reliance on documentary evidence and retrospective data. Furthermore, as the research
design was ‘progressively focused’ (Stake, 1995), this enabled the research framework to
be adaptive and flexible to those situations and opportunities that arose during the course
of implementing the PSCP, an aspect which is fundamental to case study design and
process analysis.

4.7.1 Embedded units of analysis

Within both PPAs, embedded units of analysis were also identified, thereby allowing for
significant opportunities for extensive analysis and enhancing insights into the
participatory process. Table 4.5 lists those embedded units of analysis that were identified
for this study and the level at which analysis occurred with respect to answering those
research questions and investigating those issues included in the thematic framework for
participatory processes. These embedded units of analysis were identified at those different
phases that had been built into the research design and were based on an ‘opportunity to
learn’ (Stake, 1994). Where possible, the same embedded units of analysis were identified
Table 4.5: Embedded units of analysis used within each Pilot Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units of analysis</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>Pilot Project Areas</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non community -Group members</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group members</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantyscallog Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non LAG participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies &amp; Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within both cases for comparative purposes. However, as both PPAs had different characteristics, each having a different impact on the participatory process, embedded units of analysis were also identified specifically in relation to each PPAs: individual circumstances.

The embedded design of this model research process was an important tool for focusing the research inquiry and enabling the researcher to identify and consider multiple perspectives that were crucial to understanding those participatory processes, resulting outcomes and impacts, and also in conducting the overall evaluation. At each level of analysis, different research collection techniques were used according to the type of empirical data required. However, it should be highlighted that the embedded case study design is not without its problems, the most significant issue being that having focused on sub-units for analysis, the researcher may fail to return to the case, the primary unit of analysis. To overcome this criticism, the researcher analysed and evaluated the adequacy of data collected at each stage of the model research process in relation to the overall case, before proceeding onto the next stage of the research (see Figure 4.5). How that empirical data was analysed, provides the focus for the final part of this chapter.

---

22 For example, it was only in Pantyscallog that a Tenant & Resident Association participated in the PSCP.
4.8 Data analysis

Stage 7

Analysis of case study data involves two main components; linking data to theoretical propositions and selecting criteria from which to interpret research findings (Yin, 1984). Although data analysis is central to building theory from case studies, this aspect of the research design is particularly difficult and is the least developed stage of the case study (Yin, 1984, 1998; Eisenhardt, 1999). As opposed to the range of statistical tests that can be used in survey analysis, with the case study, there are no formulae that the researcher can use. There are however several key features that are required in conducting such analysis (Eisenhardt, 1999), which are dependent upon the researcher’s own rigorous thinking, sufficient presentation of evidence, and the consideration of alternative interpretations (Yin, 1984, 1998).

It is important that the analysis of empirical data is considered during the initial stages of the case study research design, as it can set out the analytical framework from which to conduct the analysis. In addition to analysing data at the end of each phase of the model research process, there was a continuous overlap between data collection and analysis during the entire research process. This enabled the research process to be flexible and responsive to those events and processes that occurred within both PPAs. The overlapping of data collection and analysis not only reduced the amount of time it took to complete the final analysis, but also enabled the researcher to take advantage of flexible data collection (Eisenhardt, 1999) and in identifying the need to redefine the focus of the inquiry (see Section 4.5.2). In an attempt to overcome any limitations and biases that may have resulted from adopting single analytic techniques, data generated from this model research process
were analysed at three different levels: (Level 1) *Initial preparatory work*, (Level 2) *General analytic strategy*, and (Level 3) *Analytic techniques*. Each level of analysis will now be discussed in turn with reference to how it was undertaken during the model research process.

### 4.8.1 Initial preparatory work

**Level 1**

Initial preparatory work was undertaken following the completion of individual research methods. This involved the researcher using a range of methods and techniques from which to organise and provide an initial structure to data that had been collected. Those methods and techniques that were used to undertake an initial analysis of research data are outlined in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: Methods and techniques used to undertake an initial analysis of research data.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>Developing categories</em> using primary research questions. Relevant research data was placed into corresponding categories. Further sub-categories can also be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>Creating data displays</em> to examine data. For example, creating flow diagrams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><em>Tabulation of variables.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><em>Coding transcripts</em> from interviews using research questions, concepts and issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.2 General analytic strategy

Level 2
In addition to the initial preparatory work, a general analytic strategy was also developed to assist the researcher in selecting different techniques and complete the analytic phase of the research. This second level of analysis was conducted at the end of each research phase and was important with respect to overcoming those difficulties associated with the analysis of case study data, and involved categorising, summarising, condensing and recombining data (Yin, 1998). Yin (1984) has identified two main types of analytic strategies; firstly, relying on theoretical propositions, and secondly, developing a case description. The use of theoretical propositions has been viewed by Yin (1984) as being the most preferred strategy as the design, objectives and data collection involved in conducting this model research process were based upon those key issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes developed in Chapter 2. Theoretical propositions guide the case study analysis by causing the researcher to focus on and organise what evidence is required and also defining those alternative explanations that are to be examined. Combining existing literature within emerging theory enhances not only internal validity, but also generalisability and the theoretical level of theory building from the case study research (Eisenhardt, 1999). The later strategy, developing a case description involves developing a descriptive framework for the purpose of organising the case study and allowing each case to be studied and analysed comprehensively (Yin, 1998).

Although the purpose of this model research process was not descriptive, the researcher combined the use of theoretical propositions and developing a case study description, as
the complete description of the phenomenon under study would also reflect those key issues that were under study. A descriptive framework was developed at two distinct stages during the research process: first, following the exploratory phase (see Table 4.7), where it set the scene and background to each PPA, and second, following the process-monitoring phase (see Table 4.8), where it outlined the process by which the PSCP was being implemented within both PPAs. This was subsequently used to structure and present those findings in this thesis (see Chapters 6 & 7). Utilising this approach from which to analyse case study data is viewed as being useful in terms of identifying those causal links that need to be analysed (Yin, 1984, Eisenhardt, 1999). Furthermore, developing a description is central to generating an insight into each PPA and would enable the researcher to become ‘intimately familiar’ with each case (Eisenhardt, 1999, p.145), and allow for patterns to emerge, which the researcher could use to generalise patterns across PPAs. Developing a descriptive insight to the participatory process at the end of the process-monitoring phase also enabled the researcher to quantify certain aspects of how the PSCP was being implemented. This was subsequently used to explain those outcomes and impacts that had resulted from implementing the PSCP within both PPAs. Those key issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes were used by the researcher at all levels of analysis including the provision of explanations in relation to those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs (see Table 4.8).
Table 4.7: Analysis of data (exploratory phase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Level 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Level 2 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the Green Code as an agenda for encouraging community participation.</td>
<td>Likes &amp; Dislikes</td>
<td>Theoretical propositions and data generated from the exploratory phase were used to develop a descriptive framework of each PPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors inhibiting or facilitating community participation.</td>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub-categories)</td>
<td>Part of the same community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main issues of concern</td>
<td>How PSCP area differs to other areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main local environmental issues of concern</td>
<td>Is the community capable of coming together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the local environment</td>
<td>Descriptions of PPAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of GFG</td>
<td>How PPAs will differ in 10/15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and range of community groups and organisations</td>
<td>What PSCP will be like in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tabulation of variables)</td>
<td>Main issues of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues</td>
<td>Concern for the local environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population characteristics</td>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and range of community groups and organisations</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire response rates</td>
<td>What the term environment meant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the local environment</td>
<td>Awareness of GFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues of concern</td>
<td>What GFG was perceived to be about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main issues of concern</td>
<td>Was GC perceived to be relevant to PSCP (why &amp; why not)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of GFG Project and the GC</td>
<td>GFG action perceived to be sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of LAG and their aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8: Analysis of data (process-monitoring phase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Level 2 Analysis</th>
<th>Level 3 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tabulation of variables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Using data generated from the process-monitoring phase and theoretical propositions provide a descriptive framework for those processes and that were involved in implementing the PSCP in both PPAs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model(s) and strategy(ies) used to implement community participation.</td>
<td>Changes in household behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues.</td>
<td>Pattern-matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Green Code as an agenda for encouraging community participation.</td>
<td>Population characteristics</td>
<td>Compare theoretical propositions with those processes and activities that occurred from implementing the PSCP (firstly within cases and then across cases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method(s) and process(es) used to encourage community participation.</td>
<td>Number and range of community groups and organisations</td>
<td>Compare similarities and differences of those processes and activities that occurred within both PPAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of those method(s) and process(es) in encouraging community participation.</td>
<td>Questionnaire response rates</td>
<td>Time-series analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing community participation.</td>
<td>Concern for the local environment</td>
<td>Use observations and documentary evidence to provide an initial explanation in relation to the effectiveness of those processes and methods that used to implement the PSCP in both PPAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors inhibited or facilitated community participation.</td>
<td>Environmental issues of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data displays</strong></td>
<td>Main issues of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes involved in the initial stages of implementing PSCP</td>
<td>Awareness of GFG Project and the GC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and processes used to encourage community participation within each PPA and their outcomes.</td>
<td>Perceptions as to what GFG was perceived to be about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long each LAG existed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of attendees at LAG meetings and related activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of participation by attendees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of attendees at steering committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.3 Analytic techniques

Level 3

In relation to data analysis, there are two design tests that need to be considered with respect to analysing case study data; internal validity and external validity. To address these issues, Yin (1984, 1998) has suggested the following analytic techniques; pattern matching, explanation building and time series analysis. Both pattern-matching and explanation building relate to cross-case tactics which aim to ensure that the researcher analyses beyond any initial impressions, thereby improving accuracy and reliability of any theory that is generated. Furthermore, cross-case tactics can also enhance the ability of the researcher to capture novel findings in the research data (Eisenhardt, 1999).

4.8.3.1 Pattern matching

Pattern matching is regarded by Yin (1984, 1998) as being the most preferred analytic method and involves comparing an empirical based pattern with a predicted pattern. Cross-case searching for patterns can enable the researcher to avoid reaching premature and false conclusions based upon what Eisenhardt (1999) terms as 'information-processing biases', such as forming conclusions that are either based upon limited data, vividness, or more 'elite' responses (1999, p.146). With the explanatory case study, patterns can relate to dependent and independent variables, in other words, those outcomes that resulted from the study. Where predicted patterns are confirmed, or alternative patterns from rival predictions are not confirmed, the results from the case study are said to have strengthened its internal validity (Yin, 1984, p.103) and subsequently strong inferences can be made. In analysing data generated from this model research process, comparisons were made
between predicted and actual patterns both within and across cases following the process monitoring phase and explanatory phase (see Tables 4.7 & 4.8). Although these patterns were quantified, no statistical criteria were used, as Yin (1984) has pointed out that “statistical techniques are likely to be irrelevant because none of the variables in the pattern will have a ‘variance’”, as each variable represents a ‘single data point’ (Yin, 1984, p.107). However, this lack of precision associated with such comparisons can allow the researcher to introduce their own interpretation, and hence, Yin (1984, 1998) indicates that the researcher needs to act with caution when deciding as to whether a pattern has been matched. As this model research process was both explanatory and exploratory, the researcher adopted a two-staged approach when deciding as to whether any patterns had been matched. Firstly, theoretical propositions were used to identify patterns matches within cases. Secondly, pattern matching was also undertaken between cases, with patterns relating to those variables that had been identified from the exploratory phase of the case study (see Level 1 Analysis, Table 4.7). Within the process-monitoring and explanatory phases of the model research process, a pattern was said to have occurred when a significant match had been identified. A further tactic suggested by Eisenhardt (1999) in cross-case patterns involves listing both similarities and differences between pairs of cases, thereby forcing the researcher to identify any subtle similarities and differences. As Eisenhardt (1999) has pointed out, looking for differences in apparently similar cases will enable the researcher to break simplistic patterns. Furthermore, searching for similarity within two different cases can lead the researcher to have a more sophisticated understanding of the phenomenon under investigation, which Eisenhardt (1999) highlights can result in previously unanticipated categories and concepts.
4.8.3.2 Explanation building

Explanation building was the second analytical method that was used to analyse data from this case study, and aimed to build an explanation about those cases that were under study and their outcomes (see Table 4.9). Analysis does not only occur within each case, but also across cases. As these explanations may be both complex and difficult for the researcher to measure, the majority of explanation building that has occurred in case studies to date have been in narrative form (Yin, 1984). Due to its lack of preciseness and a danger that the explanation may begin to drift from the original topic of interest, Yin (1984) has suggested that to ensure good analysis, the researcher should use theoretical propositions for the purpose of developing explanations. In addition, to focus and develop explanations from research data the researcher also used those research questions that were developed during the initial stages of the research design. Other approaches were also built into the model research process to assist in ensuring that an effective analysis had been conducted: the development of a research design (Section 4.4); triangulation of research findings (see Section 5.2.4); following a chain of evidence (see Section 5.2.5); and the construction of a case study database (see Section 5.2.6).

4.8.3.3 Time-series analysis

Time-series analysis was the third analytic strategy that was used and is similar to that which is used to analyse experiments (Yin, 1984, 1998). This involved examining not only observations, but also answering both ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions about the relationship of events over time. In this model research process, time-series analysis was used in two ways. Firstly, in following those processes that had been involved in initiating participation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Analysis</th>
<th>Level 2 Analysis</th>
<th>Level 3 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coding of transcripts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tabulations (cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pattern matching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model(s) and strategy(ies) used to implement community participation.</td>
<td><strong>(Non-Participants)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Compare theoretical propositions with those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP (within each case and then across cases).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of GC as an agenda for encouraging community participation.</td>
<td><strong>Awareness of the GFG Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation building</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method(s) and process(es) used to encourage community participation.</td>
<td><strong>Perceptions as to what GFG is about</strong></td>
<td>Use theoretical propositions and primary research questions to provide explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts (within each case and then across cases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of method(s) and process(es) in encouraging community participation.</td>
<td><strong>Range &amp; number of residents that were involved with GFG related project and activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Time series analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing community participation.</td>
<td><strong>Number that attended LAG meetings</strong></td>
<td>Use observational and documentary evidence to provide explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation.</td>
<td><strong>Methods through which they had heard about GFG</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the concepts community and participation</td>
<td><strong>Number &amp; range of residents that perceived GFG had made an impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Local schools)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perceived impact made by GFG.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of GFG and what it is about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of community focused projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tabulations (embedded units of analysis)</strong></td>
<td>Number &amp; types of schools involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Participants)</strong></td>
<td>Number of projects undertaken through schools ( &amp; number linked with LAG activities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Number of community members that participated in school related projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of participation at different levels</td>
<td>Types of project undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and gender of participants</td>
<td>Number of projects that involved other partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of community group &amp; organisations</td>
<td>Number of projects that resulted in sustained participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that participants were involved with</td>
<td>Publicity generated from projects undertaken through schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years participants had lived in their PPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities held by participants in other community groups and organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of activities that participants were involved with in other community groups and organisations</td>
<td>(Community focused projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; type of skills that participants had acquired from their involvement with other groups and organisations</td>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation indicator assessment: issues generation, project leadership, project organisation, resource mobilisation &amp; project management</td>
<td>Types of residents that participated in projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of projects that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) related to local issues of concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) resulted in sustained participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) used publicity to encourage participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) were generated through bottom-up &amp; top-down processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the PSCP (see Table 4.8). Secondly, in tracing those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP within both PPAs (see Table 4.9).

4.9 Summary

This chapter has discussed those limitations and restrictions associated with the UniCR and the local authority’s monitoring process with respects to increasing our understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. To overcome and address those issues, the case study was selected as the most appropriate strategy to provide a framework on which to base the model research process, and from which to widen the focus of the research and investigate in greater depth, those processes and activities that actually occurred within each PPA. This research approach also enabled the researcher to consider and make effective use of available of time and resources, and utilise opportunities provided by the UniCR to collect relevant empirical data. As the model research process was flexible, this enabled both research questions and those key issues to evolve in line with those participatory processes that were occurring in both PPAs. The opportunity to identify embedded units of analysis within each PPA, and combine both exploratory and explanatory variations in the research design allowed the researcher to alter the focus of the inquiry and investigate in depth, what was important to each case. Furthermore, this dual case design also assisted the researcher in gaining a deeper understand of the context within which the PSCP was being implemented, and providing explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts.

As the model research process involved monitoring those processes that were occurring within two comparative PPAs, it was important that the focus of the research remained
appropriate throughout the PSCPs implementation, and was able to include and account for any uncertainties and changes that resulted from its implementation. To achieve this, the model research process was divided into three distinct but interrelated phases, and incorporated a number of design stages. To ensure that data analysis was undertaken effectively and would inform the researcher’s understanding of the research phenomenon, a comprehensive analytic framework involving three specific levels of analysis was incorporating into the data analysis process. By investigating how the PSCP was being implemented in two comparative PPAs, this thesis was able to make a significant contribution to what was already known on promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, as the data analysis process would not only involve analysing within cases, but also compare across cases. Having selected the case study as the research strategy on which to base the model research process, and considered the initial design stages and how data would be analysed, Chapter 5 will now provide a detailed discussion of those initial considerations made in conducting this research, and how the model research process was undertaken and those specific research methods that were developed to collect relevant data and provide answers to the research questions.
Chapter 5: Model Research Process

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 has highlighted those limitations and restrictions associated with the UniCR in relation to increasing our understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. Considering those limitations and the research questions developed in Chapter 3, the previous chapter has selected the case study as a framework on which to base the model research process being developed for this thesis. As those measurements being used for the UniCR had become an inappropriate method from which to assess those processes that were occurring in each PPA, the focus of research has also been re-defined. In addition, Chapter 4 has also provided a detailed discussion of the initial stages involved in designing the model research process including the development of research questions, defining the purpose of the inquiry, identifying units of analysis, and how data would be analysed.

As the research issues under investigation were inherently complex, this chapter will provide a detailed discussion of those processes that were involved in collecting empirical data, including reference to those specific mechanisms that were built into the research design to address those traditional criticisms associated with the case study (see Section 4.3.5). To describe how research data was collected for the model research process, this chapter is organised into four parts. The first part (Section 5.2) will discuss those initial considerations that were made in relation to the data collection process. The remaining part of this chapter (Sections 5.3, 5.4 & 5.5) will provide a detailed account of how the data collection process was undertaken within each phase of the model research process. As
both the research questions and those issues included in the thematic framework provided direction and focus to the model research process, Table 5.1 provides an illustration of the relationship that existed between them.

5.2 Collection of empirical data

Stage 6

The collection of empirical data relates to Stage 6 of the research design (see Table 4.2). This stage of the model research process was divided into three distinct, but interrelated phases; exploratory, process-monitoring and explanatory (see Section 4.4). Organising and conducting the data collection process in this way enabled the researcher to continually reflect and interact between those key issues that were being investigated, and both data collection and analysis.

5.2.1 Sources of evidence

Multiple sources of evidence were utilised by the researcher in order to obtain the required empirical data, as no one single source of information could provide the necessary comprehensive perspective of the participatory process that was occurring within both PPAs. This approach to data collection would not only provide an insight into the complexity of those processes and dynamics that occurred within both PPAs, but would also address the research questions from different perspectives. Table 5.2 outlines those sources of evidence that were used within each phase of this model research process. These will be discussed in more detail at relevant sections within this chapter.
Table 5.1: Illustration of the relationship that existed between the thematic framework for participatory processes and research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic framework for participatory processes</th>
<th>Identify those model(s) and strategy (ies) that were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</th>
<th>Determine whether the GC was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</th>
<th>Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</th>
<th>Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in implementing the PSCP.</th>
<th>Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP.</th>
<th>Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sustainable development needs to be based on an integration of social, economic and environmental issues in policymaking processes.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The participatory process needs to involve participation in policy development and implementation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In addition to their role as consumers, citizens need to play an active role in the process active by developing a consensus approach and generating collective responsibilities in implementing policy decisions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Power needs to be devolved to the local level to provide opportunities to influence policymaking decisions.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The concept of community should not be regarded as a population in situ, but based on the range of local social identities that exist within a locality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Sources of evidence used in each phase of the model research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Phase</th>
<th>Details of sources of evidence</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploratory Phase</strong></td>
<td>Commissioned research&lt;br&gt;University Progress Reports (Collins et al, 1997a, b, c; 1999)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal household survey&lt;br&gt;Phase 1</td>
<td>October 1996-December 1996</td>
<td>October 1996-December 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews &amp; focus groups&lt;br&gt;Intervews&lt;br&gt;Community Leaders</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Group Leaders</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Group Members</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-community Group Members</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community based Professionals</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;Community Group Members</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAG Projects and associated activities</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td>n = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public meetings&lt;br&gt;yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFG Anniversary meeting&lt;br&gt;yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Senior Police Officer</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductory meeting of PSCP to Residents Association&lt;br&gt;Planning for Real Exercise&lt;br&gt;Steering Committee Meetings</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diary of events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFGO Researcher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commissioned Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Progress Reports (Collins et al, 1998; Belcher et al, 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAGs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG Projects and associated activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTCBC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCP Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles &amp; publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focused interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFGO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of interviewees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non LAG Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of interviewees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of interviewees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent families (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies &amp; Organisations</td>
<td>Teenagers (3)</td>
<td>Caeracca (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors (3)</td>
<td>Brecon Rise (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionals (3)</td>
<td>The Hawthorns (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed (3)</td>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young families (3)</td>
<td>Rhodfa'r &amp; Heol y Bryneau (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of interviewees:**

**Range of interviewees:**

- November 1999
  - n = 5
  - Princes Trust (1)
  - Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil (1)
  - Ground Work Trust (1)
  - Keep Wales Tidy Campaign (1)
  - Elected Member (1)

  - November 1999
  - n = 5
  - Road Safety Officer (MTCBC) (1)
  - Dog Warden (MTCBC) (1)
  - Dowlais Police (1)
  - Keep Wales Tidy Campaign (1)
  - MTCBC Leader/Elected Member (1)
5.2.2 Use of qualitative and quantitative data

The type of data that is used in any kind of research is determined by a number of factors, but ultimately those substantive issues, in other words, what we want to find out, often dictates methodological issues (Punch, 1998). The appropriate selection of research data was important with respect to understanding the research phenomenon and understanding those issues that were under investigation. To gain an in-depth insight and understanding of those participatory processes that were involved in implementing the PSCP, the researcher placed greater emphasis on qualitative data collection techniques, due to its ability to view events, perceptions and values from the perspective of those that were involved in the PSCP. Quantitative data collection methods were used in relation to identifying those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP, as there was a need to use similar terms, concepts and variables not only for the purpose of standardisation and analysis of data, but also to allow for comparison of research findings within and between both PPAs.

Combining qualitative and quantitative data is advantageous for a number of reasons. Firstly, triangulation of research data and methodologies will enable a broader range of issues to be addressed (Denzin, 1978; Philip, 1998), and secondly, allow confirmation and corroboration of theories. Thirdly, it enables elaboration and development during analysis, thereby giving much richer and in-depth detail. Fourthly, combining data of both the general and particular will provide greater insight to issues under investigation, and also the larger context that they are embedded in (McLafferty, 1995). Fifthly, it can initiate new thoughts and fresh insights for further ideas of investigation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Finally, the use of single methods tends to be subject to methodological errors, whereas the
use of multiple methods will enable the researcher to address problems related to construct validity by using a range of data collection techniques to compensate each others weaknesses (Burgess, 1984; 1988; Yin, 1984; Patton, 1990; Punch, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). During this model research process empirical data was collected using a mixed-method design. This involved combining quantitative and qualitative research data throughout the entire research process for the purpose of linking data required to key research issues. The contribution and significance of each type of data collected varied according to; the issue under investigation, those research participants that are involved, the depth of knowledge required, those data collection techniques that were being used, and the stage at which the PSCP was being implemented.

5.2.3 Triangulating research findings

As no single research method can ever adequately reflect reality (Patton, 1990), this model research process used multiple sources of data to enable the researcher to triangulate the ‘facts’ of the case. Triangulation is a basic component of case study research, and involves combining evidence from three or more different sources. Although there are four main types of triangulation; methodological\textsuperscript{23}, data source\textsuperscript{24}, investigator\textsuperscript{25} and theory triangulation\textsuperscript{26} (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1990; Yin, 1994), methodological and data source triangulation were used by the researcher in understanding those complex processes and

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Methodological triangulation} is the most commonly recognised form of triangulation. As it uses a number of research methods to research the same issue, this increases confidence in the overall interpretation of research findings.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Data source triangulation} is used where the focus is to identify as to whether the research phenomenon or case remains the same at other times. This type of triangulation seeks to determine as to whether what is being observed carries the same meaning under a different set of circumstances (Stake, 1995).
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Investigator triangulation} is used where other researchers’ are involved in investigating the same research phenomenon. The aim is not only to support or reject the original researchers’ interpretation, but also an opportunity from which to collate additional data for the case study.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Theory triangulation} is used where co-observers or investigators from alternative theoretical viewpoints compare their research data.
\end{footnotesize}
dynamics that were involved in implementing the PSCP, and the number of variables that needed to be considered in relation to the overall evaluation. Table 5.3 illustrates how methodological triangulation was used to answer those research questions that were developed for this thesis. When using case study data, Yin (1993) indicates that the researcher should seek to use methodological and data triangulation, as converging evidence will not only result in confidence of findings, but also substantiate and clarify different meanings by identifying different ways the phenomenon is being seen (Flick, 1992). Utilising quantitative and qualitative data was important not only in terms of combining data types, but also as part of the repertoire of collecting necessary data from research participants in order to understand each case fully. By using this type of orientation for data collection, in conjunction with the initial research design, Yin (1993) indicates that this will enable the researcher to evaluate a project’s process and outcomes. Following on from this, Yin (1993) further argues that the evaluation of the process should not be an end in itself, but should be linked to a full range of outcomes that are related to the process. In this model research process, methodological and data source triangulation was used not only to provide a more robust methodology, but also to confirm research findings and search for alternative explanations in relation to particular issues. This search for alternative explanations has become a common use of triangulation amongst many qualitative researchers (Stake, 1995). During the model research process, opportunities were actively sought by the researcher to triangulate empirical data in order to examine the same issues or for further clarification on a particular issue. As triangulation places an increased demand on resources, it was important that only relevant data was triangulated. This included those issues that would be used by the researcher to either bring understanding about each PPA, help clarify the story, or differentiate between conflicting meanings (Stake, 1995).
Table 5.3: Illustration of the relationship between the range of research methods and research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary research questions</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify those model(s) and strategy(ies) that were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews &amp; Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>Longitudinal Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To avoid those traditional criticisms associated with the case study as a research strategy (Section 4.3.5), the researcher needed to ensure that research findings and conclusions were both valid and reliable. Validity relates to the extent that a research finding is what it is claimed to be (Bassey, 1999), in that ‘it empirically represents the concept it purports to measure’ (Punch, 1998, p.100), whereas reliability relates to the extent to which a research finding can be repeated (Bassey, 1999). Four design tests are commonly used to establish the quality of social research; construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability. As Yin (1984, 1998) has pointed out, the ‘design work’ of these tests need to be undertaken throughout the duration of the case study to ensure a quality research design.

In relation to the above design tests, Yin (1984) has identified a number of tactics that the researcher can adopt at different stages of the case study in relation to ensuring validity and reliability of case study research. To ensure that the model research process produced valid and reliable research findings and conclusions, and meet the needs of all four design tests, Table 5.4 provides an outline of how those tactics were built into the overall research design of the model research process.

---

27 Construct validity is concerned with ensuring that the correct operational measures are used for those concepts that are being studied (Yin, 1984). This is particularly problematic in case study research as failure to develop a sufficient operational set of measures could mean that data collection processes would be based upon subjective assessment.

28 Internal validity is an issue for explanatory or causal case studies. It involves establishing a causal relationship, or cause-effect relationship, as opposed to spurious relationships.

29 External validity relates to whether case findings are generalisable beyond the immediate case. This is a major criticism of the case study as single cases are often a poor basis for generalising. However, as Yin (1984) and others have highlighted, the case study does not produce generalisations in relation to a population, such as statistical generalisations provided by a survey. Case studies generalise in relation to theoretical propositions and provide analytical generalisations.

30 Reliability is a central concept to measurement, and refers to consistency (Punch, 1998) which can be of two types; (1) consistency over time, whereby the measuring instrument needs to be reliable, and (2) internal consistency, the extent to which research methods are consistent with each other (Punch, 1998).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design tests</th>
<th>Stage at which design test occurs</th>
<th>Tactic(s) to be used</th>
<th>How tactic(s) were built into the research design and process</th>
<th>Section references (where relevant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Construct validity | Data collection | Use multiple sources of data | a) Different sources of evidence were used. 

b) Research findings were triangulated to broaden the range of issues being investigated. 

c) Multiple sources of evidence were used to provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon. 

d) Multiple types of data collection methods were used. 

e) A formal case study data base was created to organise and document data collected for this case study. This also increased the reliability of the case study as a whole. 

The research process involved a procedure of primary research questions → evidence → conclusions by: 

a) Making reference to sources used within the case study database. 

b) Ensuring that the database contained evidence and circumstances under which the data was collected (e.g. time, place, participant). 

c) Ensuring that a & b were consistent with procedures and research questions (i.e. they followed a line of inquiry). 

d) Establishing a chain of evidence (move from primary research questions to research methods and research findings). | 5.2.1  
5.2.4  
5.2.1  
5.2.4  
5.2.6 |
<p>| Composing the case study report | Data collection | Establish a chain of evidence | | |
| Internal validity | Data analysis | Pattern matching | Compare empirical data with predicted outcomes (i.e those developed from theory). If results coincide, they can strengthen the case studies internal validity. | 4.8.3.1 |
| Data analysis | Pattern matching | Explanation-building | Analyse case study data by building an explanation of the case, and where possible develop ideas for further study. | 4.8.3.2 |
| Data analysis | Time series analysis | | Match a trend of data points with a theoretical trend. | 4.8.3.3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Embedded unit(s) of analysis</th>
<th>Follow procedure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ensure that embedded units of analysis are not the main focus of the inquiry and relates to the larger case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Results are interpreted at that the sub-level and then used as pattern-matching and/or explanation building at the single case level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Analysis to be conducted and interpreted at the single case level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Pattern-matching and explanation building is conducted across cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External validity</th>
<th>Research design</th>
<th>Use replication logic (multiple cases studies)</th>
<th>Research strategy included two comparative cases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Use case study protocol</th>
<th>Use research design and primary research questions to direct research process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Develop case study database</td>
<td>Construct a formal case study database (see Table 5.5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.5 Creating a case study database

An important principle to be considered in relation to data collection is concerned with how a case study’s data is organised and documented. As Yin (1984; 1998) points out, this is an area of case study research that has not received much attention but is important with respect to overcoming a traditional criticism of the case study as a research strategy; that evidence is presented selectively due to the inevitable confusion between data and interpretation of data (Yin, 1998). To address this criticism, Yin (1984; 1998) has suggested that the researcher should aim to develop a ‘formal retrievable database’ (Yin, 1984). The case study database is much more than a collection of field notes and data, as it relates to how various sources of data answer the overall research questions and those research issues that are under investigation. This approach to answering research questions is viewed by Yin (1998) as providing an excellent agenda from which to organise the case study database, and is beneficial in three respects. Firstly, it will enable the case study report to be completed more easily. Secondly, making thorough use of evidence in relation to various issues increases efficient use of resources as less time is spent referring to original sources of evidence. Thirdly, creating the case study database is an important prelude to further case study analysis.

The process of constructing the database for this model research process involved the researcher using the research questions as topics from which to organise data. This involved focusing on, and considering every data source for evidence in relation to answering those questions. The fact that the researcher had already initiated data analysis at various stages throughout the case study also aided this process. Although the process involved in constructing this case study database involved considerable time and effort, it
provided the researcher with the opportunity from which to relive some aspects of the PSCPs implementation and become more selective in identifying relevant data. In some instances, opportunities arose from which to find important insights to data that had previously gone unnoticed during the data collection process. Table 5.5 provides an illustration of the case study database that was developed for this thesis, those sources that provided evidence for each primary research question, and whether that data was quantitative or qualitative. The following sections of this chapter (Sections 5.3, 5.4 & 5.5) will outline those research methods that were used to collect empirical data at each phase of this case study. Section 5.3 will begin by discussing those methods that were used in the exploratory phase.

5.3 Exploratory Phase

The exploratory phase was used to develop an increased understanding of the research phenomenon and both PPAs before finalising those research questions that needed to be answered. The exploratory phase would also assist in the subsequent analysis of those processes, outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP, due to developing an increased understanding of each PPA and the context within which the PSCP was being implemented. Morgan (1997) has referred this to as the ‘exploratory’ aspects of analysis. Before describing the exploratory phase in detail, the following section (Section 5.3.1) will discuss the importance of interviewing in the design and focus of the overall research process.
Table 5.5: Case study database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interviews &amp; Focus Group Discussions</th>
<th>Longitudinal Survey</th>
<th>Observational Data</th>
<th>Documentary Evidence</th>
<th>Focused Group Interviews (LAG’s)</th>
<th>Focused Interview (Non-LAG’s)</th>
<th>Focused Interview (GFGO)</th>
<th>Focused Interviews (Agencies &amp; Organisations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What model(s) and strategy(ies) were used to implement community participation within both SCP areas?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Green Code an effective agenda for encouraging community participation?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What method(s) and process(es) were used to encourage community participation?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective were those method(s) and process(es) in encouraging community participation?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What outcomes resulted from implementing community participation?</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impact did those method(s) and process(es) have with respect to encouraging community participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors inhibited or facilitated community participation?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1 Interviewing

Interviews are one of the most common and powerful means through which to access and understand people’s experiences, perceptions and definitions that they hold in relation to a range of situations (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Punch, 1998). The interview is also a useful method for initiating and studying interaction. In evaluation type studies, such as this thesis, interviews are also a valuable method through which to investigate processes and outcomes. As the interview can take a variety of forms, fulfil a number of objectives and employ different questioning formats (Fontana & Frey, 1994), various typologies have been designed in an attempt to distinguish between the different forms of interviews (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1990; Fontana & Frey, 1994; Punch, 1998). When deciding as to what type of interviewing methods are to be used in any research, there is a need to consider, not only the overall research strategy, but also the purpose of the research, those research questions that need to be answered (Fontana & Frey, 1994), and the context within which the research will take place (Punch, 1998). The flexibility associated with the case study as a research strategy enabled the researcher to develop a range of interviewing methods in relation to not only those issues that required investigation, but also the range of potential research participants and the stage at which the interviewing took place in relation to the overall research process. In the exploratory phase of this model research process, a combination of focus groups and semi-structured interviews was used to obtain a historical account of previous experiences of community action and participation within both PPAs, and identify those factors that may inhibit or facilitate attempts to encourage participation in the PSCP (see Table 5.6). Each interviewing method will now be discussed in turn with reference to; how they contributed to the exploratory phase, those research participants that were included, and how results informed the development of the
Table 5.6: Interviewing methods used during the exploratory phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewing method</th>
<th>Range of Research Participants</th>
<th>Research issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>• Community group members</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of changes within their community (past, present &amp; future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Background to experiences of community action and participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors perceived to inhibit or facilitate community action and participation in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities with respects to addressing local issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors perceived to inhibit or facilitate local issues being resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>• Community leaders</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>• Community group leaders</td>
<td>Perceptions of their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community group members</td>
<td>Concern for their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community based professionals</td>
<td>Perceived changes in their local environment (past, present &amp; future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities with respects to improving their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Going for Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of the GFG Project and the GC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived relevance to their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions as to whether the PSCP will result in sustained community action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subsequent *process-monitoring phase*.

### 5.3.2 Focus groups

The focus group is a common research method that is used not only by social scientists, but also marketers, policy analysts and political consultants (Punch, 1998; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1998). As they provide opportunities for exploring the wider social framework in which particular issues are discussed (Macnaghten *et al*, 1995, p.19) their use in academic studies and policy-related studies has increased (Greenbaum, 1998). Consequently, they have been used within a variety of disciplines including geography, planning, environmental, sociology and health studies (see Burgess *et al*, 1988; Kitzinger 1994, 1995; Krueger, 1994; Agar & Macdonald, 1995; Macnaghten *et al*, 1995; Darier *et al*, 1999; Davies, 1999c; Bloor *et al*, 2001). In addition, there has been an increased use of focus groups through LA21 projects and associated strategies in an attempt to increase public involvement in policy (LGMB, 1994) as they are a method through which to empower the public and involve them in policymaking processes (Barton, 1999; Bishop 1994; Church, 1995; Davies & Gathorne-Hardy, 1997; DoE, 1994; LGMB, 1999; Tuxworth, 1996; Wilcox, 1994; Young 1998). Focus groups have also been viewed by Bloor *et al* (2001) as an attractive medium for encouraging public participation in the research process for three main reasons. Firstly, they are sociable events, secondly, they are time-limited, and thirdly, they do not place demands on research participants for technical skills (2001, p.13). This latter point was particularly important for this model research process in terms of overcoming those concerns relating to previous attempts to encourage public participation in other policy areas, and in securing the participation of a wide range of research participants, including residents that have previously been excluded.
reluctant to participate in decision-making processes.

The primary benefit of using the focus group as an interviewing technique is that they are a powerful method through which to gain access to rich qualitative data (Morgan, 1988; Punch, 1998), and provide a ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1983) of events and experiences which would not be obtainable without the interaction involved in group discussions (Burgess et al., 1988; Morgan, 1988; Morgan, 1997). Facilitating group interaction can assist in bringing to the surface, aspects of a situation that may not otherwise have been exposed through other research methods. Focus group participants are often selected on the basis that they share certain pre-defined characteristics that are of relevance to the research phenomenon (Robson, 1993; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Furthermore, focus groups can also provide insight to those ‘normative understandings’ that a group draws upon in arriving upon their collective judgements (Bloor et al., 2001, p.4). Gaining access to group conversations and participants terms and categories, referred to by Holstein & Gubrium (1995) as a group’s ‘indigenous coding systems’, were also invaluable to the researcher in terms of understanding the research issue and in undertaking subsequent analysis.

Focus groups can be used at any stage of the research process, but are most commonly used to explore in-depth, where relatively little is known about the phenomenon of interest. They are used not only to ascertain participants’ views and perceptions of particular issues, but also in identifying suitable hypothesis about the issue of interest (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1998). As the researcher can include a large number of participants in the data collection process, focus groups not only make efficient use of resources, but also have an ability to obtain as much rich data (Punch, 1998) as that which would result from extensive ethnographic work (Bloor et al., 2001). Considering the limited time and resources from
within which to conduct the exploratory phase of this case study, this was an important consideration. Therefore, combining focus groups with semi-structured interviews provided the researcher with interviewing methods in which to address such issues, yet still being able to collect quality research data through participants own words and context (Punch, 1998; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1998).

5.3.3 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were also used in the exploratory phase to investigate the same research issues, although the range of research participants differed (see Table 5.6). As highlighted by Morgan (1997), less structured approaches to interviewing are particularly useful when the nature and purpose of the research is primarily exploratory. In addition to being a more flexible and adaptive empirical research method, the interview enables the researcher to alter the line of inquiry so that it meets the goals of the study, and follow-up on interesting responses and investigate motives which self-administered questionnaires could not (Robson, 1993; Sarantakos, 1998). Similar to focus groups, the interview can provide rich and highly illuminating research material (Robson, 1993). In this model research process, the strength of the semi-structured approach to interviewing was particularly important with respect to research participants pursuing those issues that they perceived to be of most interest to them. Similar to focus groups, they provided the researcher with an opportunity to learn more about each PPA.

5.3.4 Benefits of combining focus groups and semi-structured interviews.

As the development of meanings behind opinions and views cannot be reflected adequately
in surveys (Bloor et al, 2001), the use of focus groups and semi-structured interviews aided the research process by providing the researcher with contextual data of previous experiences of community action and perceptions using everyday terms, expressions and categories. The primary goal of using both focus groups and semi-structured interviews was that resulting data would contribute to the researcher’s understanding of the research phenomenon, as the boundaries between the context and the research phenomenon could not be separated. This was particularly important, as each PPA would have its own specific previous experiences in relation to community action and participation, and within each PPA there would be a range of different factors that would impact upon the participatory process in different ways.

Although focus groups can be used as a self-contained research method, they are most commonly used as an adjunct to other methods (Bloor et al, 2001), either as a supplementary source or in multi-method designs (Morgan, 1997). This ancillary role of the focus group was used in this model research process to provide a contextual basis for observing, understanding and comparing those processes and outcomes that resulted from implementing community participation within both PPAs. Gaining access to such information was important as it enabled the researcher to deepen the line of inquiry due to the initial assessment of each PPA. However, less structured approaches to interviewing such as focus groups and semi-structured interviews have a major disadvantage in that their responses are more difficult to compare (Morgan, 1997). To address this concern, the researcher developed an interview guide (see Appendix 3) which was used whilst conducting semi-structured interviews and focus groups, thereby ensuring that group interactions and discussions were focused yet still allowing for individual perspectives and experiences to emerge (Patton, 1990, p.283).
5.3.5 Interview guide

The interview guide enabled the researcher to interview a range of community stakeholders within both PPAs, yet still allowed the interviewing process to be adapted to particular needs and circumstances. The interview guide consisted of six main topics which focused on issues related to community action and participation in the PSCP, and within each of those, specific issues that were to be covered in discussions and interviews. However, how those issues were introduced to focus groups and semi-structured interviews varied.

The interview guide acts as a framework from within which the researcher can develop questions based upon defined issues, the sequence of those questions, and deciding whether to follow certain issues in more depth. For the purpose of the exploratory phase, the interview guide enabled the researcher to develop a conversational style of interviewing. This was important with respect to; pitching the interview at the appropriate level of understanding for the range of research participants, developing trust, and gaining access to the required depth of insight needed for this research, yet still enabling the researcher to focus on predetermined issues. This approach to interviewing enabled the researcher to make efficient use of available time (Patton, 1990), which was an important consideration at this phase of the case study. Although the interview guide can provide the researcher with flexibility in exploring, probing and questioning research participants on particular research issues, this can result in “substantially different responses from different perspectives’ and reduce the comparability of responses” (Patton, 1990, p.289). In an attempt to address this concern, where possible, the researcher referred consistently to the interview guide throughout the interviewing process so as to ensure systematic collection of data from each research participant, thereby increasing the comprehensiveness of data.
collected (Patton, 1990).

5.3.6 Selection of research participants

By extending the range of research participants that had been identified by the UniCR, this model research process aimed to reflect the participatory process envisaged by A21. Those research participants that were involved in the exploratory phase of this model research process included community leaders\(^{31}\), community-group leaders\(^{32}\), community-group members\(^{33}\), non community-group members\(^{34}\) and community based professionals\(^{35}\). From this, the model research process aimed to be instrumental to understanding and providing explanations in relation to those factors inhibiting or restricting participation by a broad range of community stakeholders.

The selection of research participants for the exploratory phase was not to provide a representative sample of each PPA's population, but instead aimed to reflect those theoretical issues that were being investigated. This approach to sampling has been termed purposive or 'theoretical sampling' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Patton, 1990; Morgan, 1997). The number of focus groups and semi-structured interviews that were conducted was not determined from the outset, but depended on whether the range of perspectives had been

\(^{31}\) Community leader refers to those primary opinion leaders and decision-makers within each PPA. For example, Elected Members and Community Councillors.

\(^{32}\) Community group leader refers to leaders of groups and organisations within their respective PPA. For example, Club Secretary or leader of a religious organisation.

\(^{33}\) Community group member refers to those residents that were members of groups and organisations within their respective PPA, for example, local sports club, religious group, Parents Teachers Association or Residents Association.

\(^{34}\) Non community-group member refers to those residents that were not members of groups or organisations within their respective PPA.

\(^{35}\) Community based professional refers to those professionals that worked within each PPA, and had regular contact with residents in that PPA, for example, police officers, nurses, doctors and teachers.
included and had reached a level of 'saturation' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). That is, the point at which additional data will not further the researcher's understanding of those issues that are being investigated. As this model research process involved conducting research in a real life situation, both the range and number of research participants was influenced by the individual characteristics of each PPA. For the purpose of recruitment, the researcher aimed to work within those existing networks and structures of each PPA, by including pre-existing groups and organisations, and those individuals that held leadership positions. This enabled the research to build upon the way that each PPA was organised and functioned on a daily basis.

The need to include multiple perspectives on those research issues included within the interview guide was crucial to enhancing the researcher's insight into understanding those processes and outcomes that resulted from implementing the PSCP in each PPA. Those perspectives that were included aimed to reflect the range of interests within each PPA. To encourage a high level of participation in the exploratory phase, the researcher initially contacted potential interviewees and focus group participants either by telephone or through face-to-face contact. Those that agreed to take part in the research were given a letter of invite that explained the purpose of the research, and appointment forms (see Appendix 4).

5.3.7 Focus group participants

As it is the interaction and social dynamics that occur between research participants which makes the focus group a distinctive research tool, it is vital that there is careful consideration to the composition of a focus group (Bloor et al, 2001). The decision as to
whether focus groups should use pre-existing groups or a group of individuals that are brought together specifically for the research has received much debate (Bloor et al, 2001). The advantages of using pre-existing groups for focus groups is becoming increasingly recognised both for practical recruitment (Morgan, 1997) and reduced attrition rates (Bloor et al, 2001). As highlighted by Kitzinger (1994), utilising pre-existing groups can provide the researcher with an opportunity to gain access to those interactions which approximates to ‘naturally occurring’ data, as they ‘provide one of the social contexts within which ideas are formed and decisions are made, and also from which future action could be initiated’ (Kitzinger, 1994, p.105).

Using pre-existing groups within both PPAs from which to conduct focus groups provided a ‘feel safe factor’, particularly with respect to including those who may have been reluctant to get involved on a one-to-one basis (Bloor et al, 2001), or who may feel that they have nothing to say (Kitzinger, 1995). Both group interaction and positive dynamics are developed as participants have an element of ‘common ground’ (Hedges, 1994). Recruiting focus group participants in this way enabled the researcher to overcome one of the limitations associated with focus groups, that the results may be biased as they tend to attract only those who are keen to participate. Furthermore, this approach also enabled the researcher to address a previous concern relating to attempts to encourage public participation in other policy areas, in that those opportunities for participation tended to attract the more articulate, thereby reinforcing inequalities and existing power relations (Bracht & Tsouros, 1990; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Murdoch & Marsden, 1994; Croft & Beresford, 1996; Thomas, 1996; Cooper & Hawtin, 1997; Selman & Parker, 1997).

Although the use of pre-existing interest groups can prevent the researcher from
identifying and understanding those existing ‘taken for granted’ assumptions (Agar & MacDonald, 1995), for this model research process it was necessary to use pre-existing groups so as to capture group dynamics when exploring and understanding those factors that may inhibit or facilitate community participation in the PSCP. Furthermore, this approach to data collection and analysis would also support subsequent observational data collected during the process-monitoring phase, in terms of being able to provide explanations in relation to resulting outcomes. Recruiting research participants from pre-existing interest groups would also enhance the quality of debate and depth of data collected due to participants’ ability to draw upon shared experiences and events in discussions, something which would not occur if groups consisted of strangers. This was of particular significance with respect to exploring and understanding previous experiences of community action and participation within each PPA. As research participants were drawn from pre-existing groups, they were self-supporting prior to, during and after the discussion. Therefore, the researcher did not have to spend time at the beginning of discussions, developing a group dynamic.

As suggested by Kitzinger (1994), as a general strategy for focus group composition, where there are a number of issues under investigation, the researcher should use ‘homogenous interest groups’, in other words, groups with a similar interest, and within that aim to capture a range of distinct perspectives. As indicated in Table 5.7, homogeneous interest groups were used for focus group discussions within both PPAs. Within those groups, the researcher aimed to include a range of perspectives based upon age, gender,
Table 5.7: Focus Group composition in the exploratory phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(1) (OAP Group)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1) (Youth Group)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants: 10</td>
<td>No. of participants: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60+</td>
<td>Age: 15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: retired</td>
<td>Perspective: school/ college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: medium to long</td>
<td>Residency: short to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2) (Youth Group)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2) (Youth Group)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants: 4</td>
<td>No. of participants: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 16 – 21</td>
<td>Age: 15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: school &amp; college</td>
<td>Perspective: school &amp; college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: short to medium</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(3) (Religious Group)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3) (Entertainment Group)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants: 8</td>
<td>No. of participants: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Female (5) Male (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 55+</td>
<td>Age: 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed &amp; retired</td>
<td>Perspective: employed &amp; unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: short to long</td>
<td>Residency: medium to long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(4) (Slimming Club)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4) (Religious Group)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants: 4</td>
<td>No. of participants: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45 – 60</td>
<td>Age: 28 &amp; 55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed &amp; retired</td>
<td>Perspective: employed &amp; long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: short to long</td>
<td>Residency: short to long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(5) (Youth Group)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5) (Sports Club)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>August 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants: 3</td>
<td>No. of participants: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 19 – 24</td>
<td>Age: 21 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: school &amp; employed</td>
<td>Perspective: university &amp; to long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residency
Short term (0-3 years)
Medium term (4-10 years)
Long term (11+ years)
employment status and duration of residency. Group names have not been identified for reasons of confidentiality. Conducting focus groups using several groups can help the researcher to identify trends in perceptions in subsequent analysis (Krueger, 1988). Although literature relating to focus groups has advised having between six and ten participants (Morgan, 1997; Bloor et al 2001), it can involve as low as three or four (Morgan, 1997; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Due to the individual character of pre-existing interest groups in both PPAs, this has meant that the number of participants in focus groups ranged between three and ten.

5.3.8 Semi-structured interviews

Although focus group discussions can be relatively inexpensive, data-rich and flexible methods for collecting qualitative data (Punch, 1998), the process of conducting a focus group raises important issues in relation to power relations within groups (Davies, 1999c). As the usefulness and validity of focus group data is affected by the extent to which participants can discuss their ideas freely without being inhibited, there can also be problems associated with a group's culture and dynamics, in achieving balance in group interaction (Fontana & Frey, 1994). Due to the potential for conflict within groups, and the potential for results from discussions to be biased by dominant or opinionated participants (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1998; Davies, 1999c), semi-structured interviews were conducted with community leaders, community group leaders, those community group members with strong personalities, and non-community group members. With the exception of Community Nurses in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, semi-structured interviews were
conducted on a one-to-one basis. Table 5.8 provides a comprehensive outline of those research participants involved in semi-structured interviews. Participants’ names have not been identified by name for reasons of confidentiality.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the above individuals for different reasons. Firstly, due to their position of authority, semi-structured interviews were conducted with community leaders, community group leaders and community-based professionals. This approach to interviewing not only enabled these individuals to have a meaningful discussion with the researcher, but also enabled the researcher to pitch the interview at a more appropriate level, which may not have been possible through focus groups. Furthermore, the individual interview enabled the researcher to have closer communication with these interviewees (Morgan, 1997). As the individual interview can place an increased burden on interviewees in relation to explaining themselves (Agar & MacDonald, 1995), this enabled research participants to explain themselves with relatively little need for the researcher to use prompts. This degree of interviewee ‘control’ in providing explanations in relation to the research phenomenon was particularly important to the researcher with respects to investigating those research issues included within the interview guide. Although community-based professionals were not residents within either of the PPAs, they were included in semi-structured interviews as they provided the researcher with an external perspective of each PPA, due to having regular contact with residents and an insight into community action and processes of change.

Semi-structured interviews were also used to interview non community-group members, although the reason for adopting this interviewing method differed to that used for community leaders, community group leaders and community based professionals.
Table 5.8: Semi-structured interviews conducted in the exploratory phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Leaders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Leaders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) (Community Council)</td>
<td>(1) (Local Business Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Age: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 35</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Age: 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) (Community Council)</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>January 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 54</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Community Council</td>
<td>(3) (Church leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 48</td>
<td>Age: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed (professional)</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) (Farming group)</td>
<td>(4) (Youth group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45</td>
<td>Age: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed (professional)</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>(5) (PTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) (PTA)</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Age: 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 46</td>
<td>Perspective: unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group members</td>
<td>Community group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) (Sports Club)</td>
<td>(6) (Sports Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 52</td>
<td>Age: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) (Religious Group)</td>
<td>(7) (Male Voice Choir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 75</td>
<td>Age: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: retired</td>
<td>Perspective: Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group members</td>
<td>Community group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) (Male Voice Choir)</td>
<td>(6) (Sports Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 70</td>
<td>Age: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: retired</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) (Sports Club)</td>
<td>(7) (Male Voice Choir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 58</td>
<td>Age: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: retired</td>
<td>Perspective: Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) (PTA)</td>
<td>(6) (Sports Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 55</td>
<td>Age: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
<td>Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: long</td>
<td>Residency: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) (PTA)</td>
<td>(7) (Male Voice Choir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45</td>
<td>Age: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective: unemployed</td>
<td>Perspective: Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency: short</td>
<td>Residency: long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Community Group Members</td>
<td>Community Based Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Non-Group Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>Age: 42 Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 1997 Residency: short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Non-Group Member</td>
<td>Age: 34 Perspective: employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td>(community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 1997 Residency: short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) (Police)</td>
<td>Age: 47 Perspective: professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>November 1997 Residency: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) (Headteacher)</td>
<td>Age: 47 Perspective: community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td>October 1997 Residency: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) (Community)</td>
<td>Age: 32 &amp; 37 Perspective: professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nurses)</td>
<td>1997 Residency: NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewing non-community group members may not have achieved the depth of insight required had a focus group been used, due to the possibility of their being a lack of commonality between participants, which may have inhibited discussion. To ensure non-community-group members were encouraged to explore their individual opinions, experiences and perspectives to the same extent as other research participants, the researcher adopted a conversational style of interview. Interviewing non-community-group members on a one-to-one basis also facilitated the interviewing process, as the researcher was able to pitch the conversation at an appropriate level for each interviewee, thereby enhancing communication between the researcher and interviewees. In addition, those community group members that had particularly dominant personalities were also interviewed on an individual basis, due to the potential for them to dominate focus group discussions and bias results generated from focus group discussions. The researcher identified these during the initial stages of implementing the PSCP in each PPA.

5.3.9 Collecting comparable data from focus groups and semi-structured interviews

By combining focus group and semi-structured interviews, the researcher aimed to strengthen the exploratory phase of this model research process. However, as Morgan (1997) points out, there has been concern as to whether both research methods produce similar data for subsequent comparisons and validity checks. In an attempt to address this issue and ensure that comparable data was generated, a two staged approach to interviewing was adopted. Firstly, where possible, focus groups were conducted prior to semi-structured interviews. This enabled the researcher to adopt a more structured approach to the semi-structured interviews, and focus on obtaining more depth and detail on those topics that were only discussed in broad terms during focus groups (Morgan,
Using semi-structured interviews as a follow-up to focus groups was also useful with respect to identifying individuals whose perspectives may have been underrepresented in focus groups (Morgan, 1997). This was particularly important in terms of recruiting non-community group members. Conducting semi-structured interviews in this way also proved to be more practical in terms of the researcher finding those potential interviewees who had certain needed characteristics as opposed to arranging a focus group.

Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were recorded on audio-tape following consent from research participants. Participants were assured anonymity in any reports that would result from the research. Following the transcription of recordings, all tapes were kept in a locked cupboard, and were only accessible by the researcher. Empirical data generated from focus groups and semi-structured interviews was analysed using QSR NUD-IST (v4), a Qualitative Social Research computer application that is used to analyse Non-numerical Unstructured Data by Indexing, Searching and Theorising. Although NUD-IST is regarded as being one of the most prominent qualitative data analysis packages (Punch, 1998), it also presented itself as having a number of advantages in relation to analysing data from the model research process. Firstly, it provided the researcher with an easy to use interface for handing case study data, and secondly, it was compatible with the approach that was to be used to analyse data and develop theory from this research. The process involved transcribing semi-structured interview and focus group audio-tape recordings, and entering qualitative data into the application as a text only file. From this, the data was coded using what are referred to as nodes, which were based on the researcher’s interpretation of the data. This is equivalent to this case study's Level 1 analysis (Section 4.8.1). As a relationship develops between codes during this initial analytical stage, a hierarchy of codes can be generated. This takes the form of a ‘tree
structure', from which the researcher can begin to develop theory and test hypothesis.

5.3.10 Developing links with process-monitoring

The use of focus groups and semi-structured interviews in the exploratory phase of the model research process was also beneficial to the researcher in gaining an initial exposure to each PPAs previous experiences and perspectives of community action and participation. Comparisons between PPAs provided the researcher with insight as to how the participatory process involved in implementing the PSCP might progress, and what to observe and explore in greater depth during the process-monitoring phase. The third part of this chapter (Section 5.5) will provide a detailed outline of the process-monitoring phase and those research methods that were used to collect empirical data.

5.4 Process-Monitoring Phase

To enhance the researcher's understanding of those processes and methods that were involved in implementing the PSCP and their effectiveness in encouraging community participation, the process-monitoring phase involved collecting empirical data by; undertaking observations, conducting a longitudinal postal questionnaire survey and collecting documentary evidence. Each of these research methods will be discussed in turn with reference to their overall contribution to this model research process.

5.4.1 Process Observation

Observation is an ethnographical approach from which to study people (Punch, 1998), and
can occur within a variety of settings where people are involved in activities, such as, communities, home, businesses, programmes and schools (Patton, 1990). As a research method, observation does not only involve the researcher collecting visual data, but also directly observing the phenomenon that is under investigation (Alder & Alder, 1994). Unlike the range of interviewing methods used in the exploratory and explanatory phases of this model research process, whilst conducting observations, the researcher needs to ensure that the research setting and action is not influenced by the researcher’s presence (Spindler & Spindler, 1992; Punch, 1998). To understand any group, event or process, it is important that the studying of behaviour occurs within its natural setting (Fielding, 1996). During this model research process, observations were used to gain access to those specific settings within each PPA, and from which the researcher could observe those methods and processes that were involved in implementing the PSCP. This was particularly important in terms of being able to inform and provide interpretations and explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts.

5.4.2 Advantages of using observational methods

A key advantage of using observation as a research method is the ease at which the researcher can gain access to a particular setting (Alder & Alder, 1994). As it does not require direct interaction with research participants or place demands on them, it can be conducted inconspicuously (Webb et al, 1966). A further advantage associated with observation as a research method extends from it ability to be creative and responsive to what needs to be observed more closely (Alder & Alder, 1994). Considering those limitations and restrictions associated with the UniCR, observations provided the researcher with an opportunity from which to examine and understand in detail those
participatory and social processes that were occurring within each PPA. This was important in terms of increasing the researcher's understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, as observations would highlight those limitations and restrictions that were encountered by GFG and MTCBC in defining a 'local' community as a population in situ, and their understanding of how to increase public participation.

5.4.3 Conducting observations

To ensure that observations remained appropriate throughout the duration of the PSCP, there was continual interaction and reflection between research questions and the data that was being collected. As this model research process was being conducted within a real life context, observations were not determined from the outset, but altered both in range and focus during the entire period of observation. This ability to shift the focus of what was being observed was facilitated by the case study's flexibility as a research strategy. As it was not possible to observe everything, the researcher had to be selective. The decision as to what was observed reflected the research questions and those key issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes. To assist the researcher in deciding what to observe, a two staged process was developed. Firstly, observations were based upon what Patton (1990) refers to as 'sensitising concepts', those issues that were fundamental to the overall research. This enabled the researcher to break down the complexity of the participatory process and the context within which they were occurring, into distinguishable and manageable parts. Figure 5.1 provides an illustration of what was observed at the different stages of the research process. Due to the nature of the PSCP and those research issues that were to be investigated, it was not necessary for the researcher to
Figure 5.1: Illustration of observations made during the implementation of the PSCP.
become immersed for prolonged periods within each PPA. It was important that observations related to those activities and behaviours that were occurring within each PPA. Consideration was made of sites both within and external to each PPA. Figure 5.2 illustrates those units of analysis and settings that were used for conducting observations, and within that, those processes and activities that were observed closely, and the number of times observations were made within each setting. As the researcher had been involved in undertaking the UniCR, this facilitated access to those particular case settings and units of analysis that needed to be observed more closely. Although the majority of observations were qualitative, where appropriate, quantitative observations were also made, for example, gender, approximate age, and number of participants attending meetings, related activities and events.

5.4.3.1 Focusing Observations

Observations made during the initial phases of implementing the PSCP in each PPA were primarily descriptive in nature, whereas, in the later stages observations were focused on specific units of analysis and settings. Sharpening the research focus in ethnography has been described as 'funneling', where the focus and structure of the field work emerges during the research process (Spradley, 1980; Silverman, 1993). Focusing of observations during the process-monitoring phase was facilitated in three main ways. Firstly, the researcher became more familiar with those research settings within which to conduct observations due to previous involvement with the UniCR. Secondly, ensuring that there was a continuous interaction between data collection and analysis during the project’s implementation. Thirdly, gaining access to participant’s previous experiences and perceptions of community action and participation during the exploratory phase provided
Figure 5.2: Settings used for conducting observations during the process-monitoring phase.
the researcher with an insight as to how the participatory process might progress within each PPA. As the duration of observations depend on the purpose of the study and the research questions (Patton, 1990), the researcher had to ensure that the key stages of the participatory process had been observed. In the process-monitoring phase, observations were made over a two and a half-year period (September 1996 to February 1999). This was when research data had reached what Glaser & Strauss (1967) refer to as 'theoretical saturation', that is when the generic features of research findings consistently replicate previous ones. This period from within which to conduct observations not only provided the researcher with data relating to the initial stages of introducing the PSCP to each PPA, but also establishing LAGs, developing and implementing community focused projects, and identifying those resulting outcomes and impacts, including results from the longitudinal questionnaire survey.

5.4.3.2 Defining the role of the researcher during observation

Several typologies have been developed to explain the various roles that the observer can take when collecting research data (Gold, 1958; Alder & Alder, 1987). Alder & Alder (1987) have identified three 'membership roles'; the complete-member-researcher, the active-member-researcher, and the peripheral-member-researcher. Punch (1998) has highlighted that each role will have different consequences of the extent to which the researcher intrudes into the situation during data collection and hence the level of reactivity in the data that is collected. As the extent to which a researcher participates during observation depends on the nature of the programme and those research issues that are to be investigated (Patton, 1990), an 'inside' perspective of the PSCP was pivotal to achieving the depth of insight to those actual processes, activities and behaviours that were
occurring within each PPA. To achieve this, the researcher adopted Alder & Alder's (1994) 'complete-membership role' as it would enable the researcher to become immersed in those settings within which the research phenomenon could be observed. However, to avoid problems relating to researcher influence, it was also important that the researcher's participation was restricted to observation.

5.4.3.3 Issues relating to observational data

The main criticism associated with observational research relates to the validity of the data that it generates (Patton, 1990; Alder & Alder, 1994). As qualitative approaches to observation are unstructured, and do not use predetermined categories, researchers have to rely on their own perceptions of a given situation in relation to the research phenomenon. Therefore, resulting data may be biased by the researcher's subjective view (Denzin, 1989; Alder & Alder, 1994). In an attempt to address this issue, the researcher's observational notes contained not only specific reference to participants interactions, settings, descriptions, interpretations, but also, were possible, these were supported by subjects' quotes, so as to enable the researcher to enrich and confirm analysis and interpretation of particular situations (Alder & Alder, 1994). As this model research process also used other research methods in relation to investigating the same research phenomenon, the validity of observational data was enhanced due to the ability to triangulate research findings (Denzin, 1989; Alder & Alder, 1994). A second criticism of qualitative observational research relates to its lack of reliability, as it does not allow for the statistical analysis of research data (Alder & Alder, 1994). As data from observations related to specific units of analysis as opposed to the wider population within each PPA, to enhance the generalisability of research findings, the researcher conducted similar observations in a
number of different situations and settings.

5.4.4 Longitudinal Questionnaire Survey

For the purpose of monitoring and evaluating those outcomes that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs, GFG and MTCBC focused on the need for measurable and quantifiable outputs relating to the goals of GFG; raising awareness of GFG and GC issues, and encouraging the participation of individuals and households in adopting sustainable lifestyle changes, as opposed to those actual participatory processes that occurred within each PPA. The UniCR involved two main components, one of, which was a longitudinal postal questionnaire survey, which aimed to identify changes in household behaviours and attitudes towards GC issues as a result of implementing the PSCP within each PPA. The baseline survey (Phase One) was undertaken at the outset of the PSCP (October 1996 - December 1996) (see Figure 3.2). This was used not only to provide MTCBC with a ‘snap shot’ of households’ current attitudes and behaviours towards GC issues, but also to provide baseline data from which the local authority could plan, develop and encourage participation in each PPA (Collins et al, 1997a; 1997b; Belcher et al, 1999). The follow-up survey (Phase Two) was undertaken eighteen months later (February 1998 to April 1998) (see Figure 3.11), and aimed to identify changes in household attitudes and behaviours in relation to GC issues (Collins et al, 1998; Belcher et al, 1999).

A number of limitations were identified by the researcher in relation to the UniCR, not only in relation to understanding and analysing those actual participatory processes that occurred within both PPAs, but also in terms of what GFG had hoped to learn from the
experiences of the PSCP. Results obtained from the UniCR did not depict a complete overview of those processes and dynamics that were involved in implementing the PSCP within each PPA (see Collins et al, 1997a; 1997b; 1997c; 1998; 1999; Belcher et al, 1999). In addition, there were a number of ‘gaps’ in the operationalisation of those issues that were under investigation, in terms of both survey design and those research instruments that were used. However, it should be acknowledged that GFG and MTCBC restricted the UniCR in a number of ways. This included not only financial and time constraints in relation to research contract, but also having to conduct research at times that would fit in with the time scales of the PSCP. In hindsight, had there been greater resources and flexibility in the design of the UniCR, the researcher would have been able to produce a more robust methodology, and drawn firmer conclusions in relation those results that were obtained. Despite such restrictions, the longitudinal questionnaire survey was retained by the researcher for inclusion in this case study design for three main reasons. Firstly, as Phase One would be conducted during the initial stages of implementing the PSCP, it would provide the researcher with an initial insight to those issues that were of concern to households within each PPA. This was potentially beneficial to the researcher in that it was relatively low in cost and would produce results within a relatively short period of time (Robson, 1993). Secondly, as the model research process would utilise a range of research methods, those results that were obtained from the longitudinal questionnaire survey could be used to triangulate research findings from other data sources. This was important in terms of enhancing the validity of any final conclusions that were drawn from the research data. Thirdly, as the UniCR became increasing less relevant as the participatory process progressed within both PPAs, this enabled the researcher to identify how the research needed to be refocused, and within that, those issues that needed to be investigated. Before providing an outline of the procedure that was followed in relation to conducting the
longitudinal questionnaire survey, the following section (Section 5.4.4.1) will outline those methodological concerns associated with this aspect of the UniCR, so as to highlight the equivocal nature of those results that were obtained from using a single research method.

5.4.4.1 Methodological concerns relating to the longitudinal survey

Although longitudinal surveys can be an effective research method through which to demonstrate change in attitudes and behaviours over time, they are not without their problems. Firstly, as this model research process was conducted within a real life situation, activities and publicity relating to GFG nationally at that time may have also influenced those variables that were being assessed in both PPAs. Therefore, those results obtained from the longitudinal survey could not confirm that any changes in household behaviour and attitudes in relation to GC issues were solely as a result of those processes and activities that occurred within both PPAs. Furthermore, households may have given ‘socially desirable’ responses (Fowler, 1998), as they may have wanted to appear to be environmentally concerned because the PSCP was operating within their respective PPA. Secondly, the response rate obtained from both PPAs in Phase One and Two of the longitudinal questionnaire survey was poor, and hence this questions the validity of those results that were obtained. Thirdly, the design and content of those questionnaires used for the longitudinal survey was such that it could be argued that it did not assist in the maximisation of the response rate. Fourthly, as those data collection methods included in the UniCR design were regarded as separate components, this did not allow for triangulation of research findings, an important element of research design with respects to enhancing the validity of any research findings (Patton, 1990). Fifthly, in relation to postal surveys there are a number of problems that the researcher may have been faced with,
including; low response, incorrect completion of questionnaire and misinterpreting questions (Robson, 1993). In this longitudinal questionnaire survey, the lack of direct personal contact with householders meant that the researcher was not certain as to how each questionnaire was completed, who had completed it, and whether their views were representative of those that lived within each household. Finally, the accuracy of results obtained and their validity is questionable, as no validity checks had been built into the questionnaire design. To enhance the quality of data collected for this model research process and enable the researcher to triangulate research findings, a number of modifications were made to the content of those questionnaires. Table 5.9 provides a detailed outline of those overall changes that were made to the questionnaires content and aims. Those questionnaires that were used for Phase One are contained within Appendix 5.

Table 5.9: Detailed outline of alterations made to questionnaires used in the longitudinal questionnaire survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims (University Commissioned Research)</th>
<th>Additional aims &amp; issues (PhD Research)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One</td>
<td>Phase One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Household attitudes and behaviours towards GC issues.</td>
<td>- Household concern for the local environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Household awareness of GFG and the GC.</td>
<td>- Household local environmental issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two</td>
<td>Phase Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Household attitudes and behaviours towards GC issues.</td>
<td>- Household main issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Household awareness of GFG and the GC.</td>
<td>- Household membership with community groups and organisations within their respective pilot project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changes in households attitudes and behaviours towards GC issues.</td>
<td>- How households had heard about the GFG Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.4.2 Research Procedure

Prior to the administration of questionnaires within each PPA, they were initially piloted with fifty households in a different residential area in Merthyr Tydfil County Borough. The reason for this was to assess the content, structure and layout of the questionnaire (Oppenheim, 1992). Although results obtained from the pilot study in Phase One highlighted two main concerns in relation to the questionnaire content; firstly, that the questionnaire was too long, and secondly, in relation to this, those questionnaires that had been returned had only been partly completed, MTCBC still maintained that all questions were to be included. In an attempt to minimise its effect on the overall response rate, the initial questionnaire was divided into three separate questionnaires, each relating to different aspects of the GC. Table 5.10 provides an outline of the content of those questionnaires that were used in Phase One of the Longitudinal Household Survey. In comparison, Phase Two involved the administration of a single questionnaire (Appendix 6). Although this questionnaire retained a similar format and design as those used in Phase One, alterations were made to the number of questions that were included. Table 5.11 provides an outline of the questionnaire content used in Phase Two.
Table 5.10: Questionnaire Content (Longitudinal Survey Phase One).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire A</th>
<th>Questionnaire B</th>
<th>Questionnaire C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Saving Energy and Natural Resources. *</td>
<td>2. Concern for the environment.*</td>
<td>2. Looking after the Local Environment.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concern for the environment.</td>
<td>3. Membership with local groups &amp; organisations.</td>
<td>3. Concern for the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Membership with local groups &amp; organisations.</td>
<td>4. Environmental and local issues of concern.</td>
<td>4. Membership with local groups &amp; organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Environmental and local issues of concern.</td>
<td>5. General Household Information.</td>
<td>5. Environmental and local issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Additional comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Additional comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Green Code issue.
Table 5.11: Questionnaire Content (Longitudinal Survey Phase Two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Concern for the local environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Main environmental issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cutting Down on Waste.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Saving Energy and Natural Resources.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travelling Sensibly.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preventing Pollution.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Looking after the Local Environment.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Awareness of GFG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. General household information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Green Code issue.

5.4.4.3 Sampling Procedure

Within each PPA, every household listed in the Electoral Register was administered a self-completion questionnaire. However, for Phase One each of the three different questionnaires were assigned to households using a sampling technique referred to as ‘systematic sampling’, where the selection of sample units [i.e. households] is dependent on the selection of the previous one. By working systematically through the Electoral Register for each PPA, questionnaires were assigned to households as outlined in Table 5.12. The primary reason for adopting this sampling method was that within each PPA, every street or road would receive an equal number of each questionnaire type. This approach to sampling would not only increase the reliability of results, but also the representativeness and generalisability of resulted obtained (Sarantakos, 1998). In addition, there was also an intuitive appeal in using systematic sampling in that it would obtain household data from both PPAs in a way that would lead to more ‘representative’ results compared to those that would be obtained from either random sampling or quota sampling.
techniques. Table 5.13 outlines the total number of questionnaires that were administered within each PPA for both Phases of the longitudinal survey.

Table 5.12: Questionnaires assigned for Phase One of the Longitudinal Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household (as listed in the Electoral Register)</th>
<th>Household (allocated number)</th>
<th>Questionnaire assigned through systematic sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Station Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Station Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Station Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Station Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Station Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: Number of questionnaires administered within each PPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.4.4 Distributing questionnaires

As MTCBC had responsibility for distributing and collecting household questionnaires, a private mail distribution company was used for two main reasons. Firstly, it was more economical in comparison to purchasing postage stamps, or having questionnaires delivered by local authority staff. Secondly, as questionnaires would be delivered separately to regular mail, MTCBC anticipated that this might facilitate an increase in the response rate as questionnaires may not be regarded as ‘junk mail’. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a covering letter, which informed households that UWIC were undertaking the research on behalf of MTCBC (Appendix 7). The reason for adopting this
approach extended from research that had previously been conducted by Macnaghten et al (1995), which revealed widespread public distrust towards both local and central government, and scepticism towards government as agents of change and their attempts to promote sustainability. The covering letter did not refer to GFG as this may have influenced household responses and introduced bias to those results obtained. Households were given three weeks within which to complete their questionnaires and return them. For Phase One of the longitudinal questionnaire survey, households were asked to return questionnaires to their local post office. For Phase Two, the number of return points was extended by MTCBC to include local public houses and primary schools. The reason for adopting this method of return was twofold. Firstly, households would not incur any cost. Secondly, MTCBC hoped that the increase in local collection points for Phase Two would increase the return rate of questionnaires within each PPA (Collins et al, 1998a). In an attempt to further enhance the level of response, using the covering, posters were produced and placed at each return point, and adverts were placed in the local newspaper.

5.4.4.5 Follow-up studies

Although household responses would remain anonymous, each questionnaire was assigned a code for the purpose of identifying the street or road from which the questionnaire had been returned. Following the return of questionnaires from Phases One and Two, those areas within both PPAs that had a low level of response were included in a follow-up study of non-responding households. This involved selecting a random sample of households from those areas in which there had been a low level of response, conducting door-to-door visits, and establishing why households had not returned their questionnaires.
5.4.4.6 Analysing results from the longitudinal questionnaire survey

Questionnaires from both Phases of the longitudinal questionnaire survey were analysed using SPSS (version 9) (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), a computer software package used by social scientists and related professionals for statistical analysis (Coates & Steed, 1999). Data was firstly analysed using descriptive statistics. This served two main purposes. Firstly, to initially explore the empirical data that had been collected, and secondly, to summarise data in relation to those variables that were under investigation. In addition to conducting a descriptive analysis, following the completion of Phase Two, a chi-squared test (a test of statistical significance) was also conducted for each variable comparable in Phases One and Two. This statistical test was used to indicate whether, within each PPA there had been any statistical difference (i.e. change) between those attitudes and behaviours reported in Phase One and those reported in Phase Two of the survey at 5% level of significance\(^{37}\). Due to the large number of individual variables that were under investigation, and relying on statistical evidence obtained from conducting a separate statistical test for each variable, there is an increased likelihood of obtaining significant results by fluke. One method to overcome this problem is to apply an adjustment to the probability level that is used to signify a significant statistic. A commonly used method is known as the ‘Bonferonni adjustment’. This is an adjustment that is used to ensure the validity of multiple comparisons, and involves dividing the traditional probability level by the number of dependent variables\(^{38}\).

\(^{37}\) If the p-value is found to be significant (i.e. less than 0.05) then the variable (i.e. the reported behaviour or attitude) within each PPA differs significantly, and therefore change is said to have occurred.

\(^{38}\) In this case, there were a total of 50 variables. For a variable to be statistically significant in this longitudinal survey, the p-value must be less than or equal to (0.0012).
5.4.5 Documentary evidence

In addition to conducting the longitudinal questionnaire survey and observing processes and activities that occurred in relation to implementing the PSCP in each PPA, this case study also collected a wide range of documentary evidence between September 1999 and August 1999. Table 5.14 provides an outline of the type and sources of documentary evidence that were collected during the process-monitoring phase. Although documentary evidence can provide a rich source of social research data, if studied in isolation from the social context that it relates to, the researcher can be deprived if its true meaning (Punch, 1998). To ensure that the researchers' interpretation of documentary evidence resulted in valid conclusions being made, it was important that the researcher understood the context from which each document originated. Although documentary evidence was also being collected by MTCBC for the purpose of the local authority progress reports and the UniCR, they did not depict a complete overview of those methods and processes that were actually occurring within both PPAs. To address this issue, the researcher widened the scope of what documentary evidence was being collected and considered in relation to each PPA. This was facilitated by the researcher having had access to specific settings whilst conducting the UniCR, and also through conducting process observations. It was also an important consideration that when analysing documentary evidence the researcher triangulated it with other sources of empirical data (McDonald & Tipton, 1996) (see Table 5.3).
Table 5.14: Documentary evidence collected during the process-monitoring phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diary of events</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diary of events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFGO</td>
<td>GFGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Progress Reports (Collins et al, 1997a,b,c; 1998, 1999)</td>
<td>University Progress Reports (Collins et al, 1997a,b,c; 1998, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG Mid Term Review (1998d)</td>
<td>GFG Mid Term Review (1998d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newspaper articles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Newspaper articles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCP launch</td>
<td>PSCP launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community focused projects and related activities</td>
<td>Community focused projects and related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minutes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG Meetings</td>
<td>LAG Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG Steering Committee</td>
<td>GFG Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photographs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Photographs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG Launch</td>
<td>GFG Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community focused projects</td>
<td>Community focused projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG meetings</td>
<td>LAG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letters</strong></td>
<td><strong>Letters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicising community meetings</td>
<td>Publicising community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posters</strong> (to advertise)</td>
<td><strong>Posters</strong> (to advertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community focused projects</td>
<td>Community focused projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG meetings and related activities</td>
<td>LAG meetings and related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity materials</strong></td>
<td><strong>Publicity materials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community focused projects (e.g. hippo bags)</td>
<td>Community focused projects (e.g. poop scoops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG mugs &amp; T-shirts</td>
<td>GFG mugs &amp; T-shirts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG village signs</td>
<td>GFG village signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local GFG newsletter</td>
<td>Local GFG newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National GFG newsletter</td>
<td>National GFG newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitution</strong></td>
<td><strong>Constitution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG Constitution</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To enable the researcher address one of the criticisms associated with the case study, in that it can result in large amounts of data being collected, the researcher only collected documentary evidence that related to and supported those methods and processes that were involved in implementing the PSCP. Focusing the collection of documentary evidence in this way not only enabled the researcher to obtain a range of perspectives of the PSCP, but also compare those interpretations against those actual outcomes and impacts that were identified by the researcher in the explanatory phase. The fourth part of this chapter
(Section 5.5) will provide a detailed outline of the explanatory phase and those research methods that were used to collect data in relation to those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs.

5.5 Explanatory Phase

The explanatory phase of the model research process was important for three main reasons. Firstly, in identifying the complete range of outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP, including any additional and unforeseen outcomes relating to the wider participatory process. Secondly, answering those research questions that had been developed (Section 3.7), and assessing the PSCP against the thematic framework on participatory processes. Thirdly, identifying barriers and opportunities in achieving participation beyond those existing community stakeholders, an issue that was identified in Chapter 2 as being pivotal in achieving the participatory process envisaged by A21.

For the purpose of the explanatory phase, the researcher used a combination of focused interviews and focused ‘group’ interviews. Similar to those interviewing methods that were used in the exploratory phase, focused interviews and focused group interviews enabled research participants to express perceptions and experiences using their own terms, expressions and categories. The primary aim of using these interviewing methods within both PPAs was that resulting data would enable the researcher to evaluate the effectiveness of the PSCP as an approach from which to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to the achievement of sustainable development. As discussed in further detail in Chapters 6 and 7, the individual characteristics of each PPA, and their previous experiences of community action and participation impacted upon and influenced the
participatory process in a variety of ways.

5.5.1 Selection of research participants

Those research participants that were involved in the explanatory phase were not determined from the outset of this model research process as participation in the PSCP evolved during the lifetime of the project, and at times changed in unanticipated directions. Due to the case study’s flexibility as a research strategy, the researcher was able to select a range of suitable research participants having considered those processes that had occurred as a result of implementing the PSCP within each PPA. To capture the complete range of perspectives and experiences relating to those actual participatory processes that occurred within each PPA, those research participants that were involved in the explanatory phase included; the GFGO, LAG participants, Non-LAG participants\(^{39}\), and those Agencies and Organisations that had been involved with the GFG Steering Committee and the implementation of community focused projects. Table 5.15 provides an outline of the range of focused interviewing methods that were developed for the explanatory phase, and those research participants that were involved.

5.5.2 Issues surrounding the explanatory phase

As previously indicated in Chapter 3, this model research process was influenced by the implementation of the PSCP and its related time-scales. With the exception of those focused interviews that were conducted with the GFGO, all other focused interviews and focused ‘group’ interviews that formed part of the exploratory phase were conducted

\(^{39}\) Non-LAG participants refers to those residents that lived within each PPA, but did not actively participate in their respective LAG.
Table 5.15: Range of Focused interviewing methods used (explanatory phase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Research Questions</th>
<th>Focused Interview (FSGO)</th>
<th>Focused ‘group’ Interview (LAG participants)</th>
<th>Focused Interviews (Non-LAG Participants)</th>
<th>Focused ‘telephone’ Interviews (Agencies &amp; Organisations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify those model(s) and strategy(ies) that were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between September 1999 and November 1999 (see Figure 3.11). Reasons for conducting the explanatory phase of the model research process six months after the official end of the PSCP extends from those previously mentioned tensions and sensitivities surrounding the UniCR (Section 3.6.3) and other circumstances beyond the control of the researcher.

5.5.3 Focused Interviews

As the primary focus of the explanatory phase was to identify those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP, there was a need for the researcher to adopt a more structured approach to data collection in comparison to that used in the exploratory phase, so as to facilitate the comparison of results within and between both PPAs. As market research undertaken to date has tended to rely on qualitative methods, such as the focus group, Merton et al (1990) have argued that there has been a failure to translate those resulting social facts into policy recommendations. The focused interview as a research method can aid in addressing this concern, as it combines the detailed knowledge and insight provided by the interview in relation to a particular situation, together with the methodological rigor of a survey (Merton et al, 1990).

As an interviewing method, the focused interview differs from other interviewing techniques in a number of ways (Merton & Kendal, 1946; Merton et al, 1990; Cohen & Manion, 1994). Firstly, research participants have been involved in "a particular situation". Secondly, the situation in which participants were previously involved has been analysed by the researcher, and has resulted in hypotheses that relate to the meaning and outcome of the situation. Thirdly, the analysis is used as the basis of an interview guide, which outlines the main areas of inquiry and those hypothesis that are to be tested. Fourthly, the interview
process focuses on the subjective experiences of research participants to the previously exposed situation. It is these research participant’s responses that enable the researcher to test the validity of hypotheses, and ascertain unanticipated responses.

5.5.3.1 Advantages of the focused interview

As a research method, the focused interview has the dual advantage of being economical and able to produce precise results in relation to those specific issues that are being investigated. Due to the distinctive feature of the focused interview in having undertaken prior analysis of the situation that participants have been involved (Merton & Kendall, 1946; Cohen & Manion, 1994), the researcher was able to play a more dominant role in the interviewing process, thereby ensuring more control over the direction of the interview and restricting the discussion to participant’s specific experience (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Furthermore, having undertaken prior analysis, the researcher is familiar with the situation to which participants have been involved and is able to identify selective responses, thereby enhancing the researcher’s ability to explore and understand those responses further (Merton et al, 1990). By having a more directive and active role in the interviewing process, this enabled the researcher to fulfil four main criteria of the focused interview as an interviewing technique; range, specificity, depth and personal context (Merton et al, 1990; Kahn, 1991), something that could not be achieved had a focus group discussion or structured interview been used. Using the same interviewing process with a range of research participants facilitated the comparison of experiences within and between both PPAs. This comparability of research data was important in terms of assessing the effectiveness of the PSCP as an approach through which to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development in two comparative PPAs.
5.5.3.2 Interview guides

As the researcher's judgement and social skills are essential to the success of focused interviews (Merton et al, 1990), it was important that sufficient time was allocated to enable the researcher to carry out a full and proper prior analysis of those methods and processes that were involved in developing interview guides. In this model research process, as there was a continuous process of data collection, data analysis and refining the line of inquiry, this supported the prior analysis of the participatory process that research participants had been involved with as a result of implementing the PSCP within their respective PPAs.

The development of interview guides following prior analysis of the situation enabled the researcher to focus on the experiences of those research participants, and in doing so, this facilitated access to the necessary depth of responses in two main ways. Firstly, as the focused interview requires the researcher to continually assess those responses received during the interview process (Merton et al, 1990), the researcher was able to explore those specific experiences of participants immediately, and also follow-up on any unanticipated responses. Secondly, having conducted an initial analysis of the situation, the researcher was able to make reference to various aspects of the actual participatory process that occurred, so as to enable research participants to recall their experiences more vividly. Due to the range of research participants that were involved in the explanatory phase, a range of different interview guides were developed to enable the researcher to reflect upon those different experiences, but still focus on identifying those outcomes and impacts that resulted from the participatory process. This approach to interviewing not only enabled the
researcher to make efficient use of available time and resources, but also enabled the interview to be tailored to the various research participants and their different levels of involvement in the PSCP. Those focused interview guides that were developed included a combination of open and closed-ended questions. Closed questions were used to obtain specific answers in relation to certain research issues, whereas open questions were used to account for individual differences and experiences, and also provide the researcher with greater flexibility to explore some issues further, including any unanticipated outcomes.

As the recall of experiences from a particular situation may be distorted and lack the necessary depth of detail required, reinstating those events and processes that occurred aimed to address and assist in the recall of necessary detail (Merton et al, 1990). These detailed responses can be achieved from research participants through retrospection; the recall of the situation to which a participant was exposed to, and their reactions to that previously exposed situation. To enable research participants to draw from and reflect upon the previous situation for answers (Merton et al, 1990), the researcher also made use of focusing exercises and prompts. With the exception of those focused ‘telephone’ interviews that were conducted with Agencies and Organisations, all other focused interviews and focused group interviews were recorded using an audio-tape recorder. Recording data from interviews in this way was important with respects to enabling the researcher to play a more active role during the interviewing process, assess responses and identify specific outcomes and impacts. Similar to empirical data generated in the exploratory phase, data from focused interview and focused ‘group’ interviews were analysed using QSR NUD·IST (v4) (Section 5.3.9). Each focused interviewing method will now be discussed in turn, with reference to how they aimed to identify outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP, and evaluating its effectiveness as an
approach from which to promote the participatory process aspect of achieving sustainable development.

5.5.4 Focused interview with Going for Green Co-ordinator

The primary reason for interviewing the GFGO was to increase the researcher's understanding as to why particular methods and processes had been used to implement the PSCP within each PPA. To gain an understanding of those experiences and perspectives held by the GFGO in relation to those methods and processes, the focused interview was not only identified as being the most appropriate method through which to obtain the necessary depth of insight, but was also important for ensuring 'continuity and completeness' of description and sequence of those methods and processes that were involved (Morgan, 1997). As illustrated in Figure 5.3, focused interviews with the GFGO were conducted at two separate stages prior to the official end of the PSCP. This was important for two main reasons. Firstly, due to the depth of insight required during the interview process. Secondly, as the PSCP would officially end in April 1999, the GFGO may not have been accessible for interviewing purposes after that date. The interview guide developed for interviewing the GFGO can be found in Appendix 8. Although the interview guide contained some specific research questions, due to tensions surrounding the PSCP and the UniCR (Section 3.6.2), the researcher adopted a conversational style of interviewing so as to reduce any apprehensions. In addition to the interview guide, the researcher also utilised the GFGOs diary of events to facilitate the re-call of previous experiences.
Figure 5.3: Illustration of Explanatory Phase.
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5.5.5 Focused 'group' interviews with Local Action Group Participants

As the PSCP was to be led and managed by groups of local residents, a LAG was established within each PPA. By conducting focused group interviews with LAG participants, the researcher aimed to evaluate whether this was an effective method through which to encourage participation by a range of community stakeholders within both PPAs. The criteria upon which this evaluation would be based aimed to reflect those issues included in the thematic framework for those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development. Those issues included; who participated, what issues did they participate, what power was made available to participate in that process, what was the scope of their participation, and at what stage in the process did they participate. As community development and capacity building also need to be viewed synonymously with sustainable development (Bracht & Tsouros, 1990; Cooper and Hawtin, 1997), the extent to which community development had occurred as a result of implementing the PSCP was also included as a criteria for evaluation. These interrelated criteria were investigated by the researcher through an interview guide (see Appendix 9) and a number of focusing exercises. Figure 5.4 provides an illustration of the process that was involved in conducting focused group interviews with LAG participants.

5.5.5.1 Conducting focused 'group' interviews

Although in the exploratory phase of this model research process, those community group members with dominant characteristics were interviewed on an individual basis, for the purpose of the explanatory phase, the researcher did not conduct separate interviews with those LAG participants that had dominant personalities for two main reasons. Firstly, using
Figure 5.4: Flow chart of focused group interview with LAG participants.
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1. **LAG Interview Discussion** (Interview Guide see Appendix 9)
   - Perceptions of PSCP
   - Community Participation
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   - GFGO
   - Outcomes
   - Future of the LAG

2. **Community Participation Assessment (Part 1)** (Appendix 11)

3. **Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation** (see Table 2.2)

4. **Community Participation Assessment (Part 2)** (Appendix 11)

5. **Identifying 'communities of interest' in PPA** (see Table 5.16)
A group interview has advantages in terms of capturing the perspectives of a larger number of participants in relation to the same situation (Merton et al, 1990). Furthermore, the group situation also facilitates individual participants’ recall of their experiences due to the reporting of other experiences, which may not have been achieved through an individual interview. Secondly, as LAGs were the primary structure for encouraging community participation in the PSCP, it was important that the researcher retained those particular characteristics associated with each LAG, as this was a significant outcome of the participatory process, and would indicate who was encouraged to participate in the LAG, and hence its effectiveness as a structure for encouraging participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. Furthermore, it would also enable the researcher to observe group dynamics in relation to each LAG, and identify any internal power hierarchies and conflict. As the participatory process that occurred within each PPA differed significantly, it was necessary to conduct a separate focused group interview with each LAG in order to take account of those differences. Although Merton et al (1990) have suggested that to secure the participation of all research participants and ensure that the depth and range of insight extends beyond that of an individual interview, the group interview should involve between ten and twelve, during this model research process the researcher aimed to include the existing number of participants within each LAG. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, there were a total of ten LAG participants. However, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, due to the collapse of the LAG in Pantyscallog and the subsequent withdrawal of support by the GFGO in June 1998, the researcher encountered difficulties in recruiting participants, and was only able to encourage four LAG participants to participate in the focused ‘group’ interviews.

As group dynamics can also be dysfunctional to a group’s interview process and purpose,
to facilitate and encourage participation by all research participants, and address what Merton et al (1990) refers to as the ‘leader effect’, in other words, were the more articulate participants adopt a leader role during the interviewing process, the researcher initiated both group interviews by asking each participant the same question. This rotation of questioning in the initial stages of the group interview was used to encourage all participants to participate throughout the remainder of the interview process. In addition, the researcher also encouraged from the outset of focused group interviews, self-exploratory reports of individual participant’s experiences, by indicating that there were no correct or incorrect answers, and that the purpose of the group interview was to explore a range of perspectives. In comparison to those focus groups conducted in the exploratory phase, the researcher played a more active role and therefore had more control as to the direction of the interview process and those issues that were discussed.

5.5.5.2 Focusing exercises

To ensure that research participants remained focused during the interview process, the researcher included what Bloor et al (2001) refers to as ‘focusing exercises’, those exercises that are used by the researcher to concentrate the group’s attention on a particular topic by requiring the group to undertake a task which requires participant’s interaction in relation to a specific issue. Three focusing exercises were used during focused group interviews with LAG participants to enable comparison of data relating to the participatory process and those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP (see Figure 5.4). The first exercise involved a participant profile questionnaire, which was introduced by the researcher prior to conducting the actual group interview. This questionnaire aimed to focus participants' attention on themselves as individuals and those
activities that they were involved within their respective PPAs. The second exercise was a community participation assessment, which had two primary aims. To force participants to reflect upon the initial stages of their involvement with the PSCP and their LAG. Those criteria that were included in the assessment were subsequently used to facilitate and enhance the group’s discussion in relation to those changes that had resulted from their participation in the LAG. The third exercise involved using Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of participation (Table 2.1) to develop an increased understanding of how they participated in their LAG. Due to the period of time between the official end of the PSCP and undertaking the explanatory phase of this model research process, these focusing exercises also acted as useful icebreakers, and from which the researcher could rebuild trust with research participants. This was of particular importance in the case of Pantyscallog, as the LAG had ceased to exist for almost fifteen months and participants were not well known to each other.

The significant contribution made by this thesis relates to developing a model research process and from which to evaluate how the PSCP was implemented within two comparative PPAs with respects to increasing our understanding of how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development. To evaluate the effectiveness of the PSCP in achieving the objectives and participatory element of A21, this thesis has already developed a thematic framework for those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development. For the purpose of evaluating the effective of the PSCP as an approach from which to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development, the researcher used those previous mentioned focusing exercises. These exercises collected a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Table 5.16 illustrates how each of those focusing
Table 5.16: Focusing exercises used to evaluate those participatory processes involved in implementing the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focusing Exercises</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who was participating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. LAG Participant Profile</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arnstein's Ladder of Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Focused 'group' interview guide</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exercises enabled the researcher to evaluate those participatory processes that occurred within each LAG during the lifetime of the PSCP. These focusing exercises will be discussed in turn with reference to how they contributed to the overall evaluation.

### 5.5.5.3 Participant Profile Questionnaire

The first focusing exercise introduced to focused group interviews was a participant profile questionnaire (see Appendix 10). The primary aim of the questionnaire was to identify those community stakeholders that had participated in each LAG, and whether the PSCP had been effective in encourage participation beyond existing community stakeholders, to include those previously excluded from participatory processes.

### 5.5.5.4 Community Participation Indicator Assessment

The second focusing exercise introduced to focused group interviews was a community participation indicator assessment. As the effectiveness of an approach from which to encourage community participation cannot simply be reduced to the numbers that participate (Bracht & Tsouros, 1990), a community participation assessment model developed by Rifkin et al (1988) to evaluate a community health related project was adopted and modified by the researcher in relation to identifying and understanding those changes that had occurred as a result of encouraging participation in each LAG. This model is based on five criteria of community participation which had been identified following an analysis of over 100 case studies (Rifkin et al, 1988). Those five indicators were; (1) needs assessment, (2) project leadership, (3) organisation, (4) resource mobilisation, and (5) management. For each of these criteria, Rifkin et al, (1988) had
developed a continuum. However, to ensure that LAG participants would understand the continuum and relate it to their own experiences in the PSCP, the researcher developed a question for each indicator and created a scenario for each point on the continuum (see Appendix 11). This focusing exercise was completed at two stages during the group interviewing process (see Figure 5.4). LAG participants were asked to allocate a score between 1 and 3 for each indicator, firstly, in relation to what they perceived the situation to be during the initial stages of participating in the LAG, and secondly, at the official end of the PSCP. This ranking exercise instrumentally served two main purposes. Firstly, to force participants to think back to the initial stages of their involvement, and secondly, to set the background to their perceptions on changes and impacts that resulted from their involvement.

Although the community participation assessment model can be used at different stages of a project’s implementation, in this model research process it was used after the official end of the PSCP. For the purpose of conducting focused group interviews with LAG participants, it was important that they could recall and reflect upon their experiences in order to inform the group interview process. Although Rifkin et al.’s (1988) indicator model is a useful tool from which to measure and assess the extent to which change has occurred, and those strengths and weaknesses surrounding a particular project’s approach (Bajárás et al., 1991), these indicators only relate to the breadth of the participatory process, and do not indicate whether the PSCP had achieved the necessary social changes. As the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders is central to achieving sustainability at the local level, there was a need to identify who participated, and what that participatory process involved.
Although levels, structures and techniques used to promote the process of public participation can act as a guide when evaluating the effectiveness of the PSCP, they do not identify those who have been devolved power in decision-making (Wild & Marshall, 1999), and whether those traditionally excluded from decision-making processes were also encouraged to participate. As the community can be a political resource, in that certain groups may dominate and exclude other less powerful groups (Agyeman & Evans, 1995), when evaluating the effectiveness of the PSCP as an approach, there was a need to recognise the complexity of social divisions that may have existed, and whether the range of community stakeholders within each PPA had participated. The range of stakeholders that participated in the PSCP was identified in two ways. Firstly, those who participated in the LAGs were asked to complete a participant profile questionnaire. Secondly, through a number of focused interviews with non-LAG participants, the researcher was able to identify those community stakeholders that had participated in community-focused projects and related activities, and what their actual participation involved.

5.5.5.5 Ladder of Participation

The third focusing exercise that was introduced through focused group interviews with LAG participants was Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of participation (see Table 2.1). This was introduced to research participants using a visual display of the ladder on a flip chart, and giving a brief description of the ladder and the levels of participation that were represented by each rung on the ladder. Despite those limitations previously mentioned in relation to Arnstein’s ladder, namely; its failure to incorporate wider dimensions of the participatory process, including the identification of those community stakeholders that have power to influence decision-making, and the scope of the participation (Section 2.3.2), the
researcher used the ladder during focused group interviews as it represented a simple categorisation of various levels of participation, and was easily understood by all LAG participants. This was important in terms of facilitating discussion and encouraging debate about their experiences of participating in the LAG.

5.5.6 Focused interviews with non-LAG participants

At the conclusion of focused group interviews, LAG participants were asked to identify and categorise the range of community stakeholders that lived within their respective PPAs. Identifying and selecting non LAG participants in this way, the researcher aimed to draw upon LAG participants' knowledge and understanding of those local social identities that existed within each PPA, a factor that is pivotal to understanding how the 'local' community should be understood in terms of promoting public participation aimed at achieving sustainable development (Section 2.3.8). Table 5.17 lists those community stakeholders that were identified by LAG participants within both PPAs. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog LAG participants identified community stakeholders in terms of age, employment status and family characteristics. In Pantyscallog, LAG participant's identified community stakeholders on the basis of residential areas (see Figure 3.9). From these categories, non-LAG participants were selected for subsequent focused interviews. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, non-LAG participants that were interviewed were randomly selected from a list of potential participants identified by LAG participants in relation to each community stakeholder sub-group. To ensure that research participants identified by LAG participants did not bias results, LAG participants were asked not to identify potential interviewees that were related to them in anyway, or who they socialised with on a regular basis. In the Pantyscallog, LAG participants were asked to comment on
their categories and compare them with those identified by LAG participants in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog. Three similarities were identified; (1) children that attended school, (2) families with children and (3) families with no children or whose children had left school, and residents that were retired/OAP. To enable the researcher to make some broad comparisons between focused interviews with non LAG participants in both PPAs, when randomly selecting three interviewees within each residential area in Pantyscallog, efforts were made to ensure that they represented each comparative criteria. To avoid results from focused interviews being biased, interviews were conducted at different times of the day and different days of the week.

Table 5.17: Range of community stakeholders identified within each Pilot Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Total number of interviewees (n = 24)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>Total number of interviewees (n = 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfar &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced ‘type’ properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Young Families</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the range of community stakeholders within both PPAs, there is a potential that the experiences of some may be meaningless to others, or some individual’s experiences may be greatly different to others, this may result in participant withdrawal and interest from a group interview (Merton et al, 1990). To ensure that productive responses were obtained from research participants (Merton et al 1990), the researcher conducted individual focused interviews with non-LAG participants. An interview guide was developed to assist
the researcher in conducting these focused interviews to ensure that the interview remained focused on identifying specific outcomes and impacts. The interview guide that was developed by the researcher for non-LAG participants took the form of a semi-structured questionnaire developed specifically for each PPA (see Appendix 12). As the primary focus of these focused interviews was to identify the range of community stakeholder involvement in the PSCP, adopting this structured approach from which to conduct interviews was necessary for the comparison of results within and between PPAs. Due to the range of community stakeholders within each PPA, to facilitate the interviewing process and ensure that each focused interview was pitched at an appropriate level of understanding, the researcher adopted a conversational style of interviewing while completing the semi-structured questionnaire. To address problems relating to the selective recall of experiences, the interviewer also used a series of prompts to activate individuals memory in the same way as those focusing exercises used during the focused group interviews with LAG participants. Appendix 13 provides a detailed outline of those prompts that were used by the researcher in each PPA.

5.5.7 Focused ‘telephone’ interviews with Agencies and Organisations

Focused ‘telephone’ interviews conducted with Agencies and Organisations aimed to identify how participants had been involved with the PSCP, and from their experience of how the PSCP as an approach for encouraging community participation, would influence how their organisation would encourage communities to participate in projects in the future. Due to the range of Agencies and Organisations that were involved, the researcher aimed to include a representative, and within that, the different types of involvement. Table 5.18 provides details of those Agencies and Organisations that were involved in the
focused ‘telephone’ interviews. As each Agency and Organisation had various degrees of involvement during the implementation of the PSCP, the researcher identified that there was a need to interview individuals on a one-to-one basis, so as to gain the necessary depth of insight into their different experiences which may not have been achieved had a focused group interview been arranged. Furthermore, by conducting individual interviews this enabled the researcher to pitch the interview at an appropriate level and follow-up on any unanticipated outcomes and impacts.

Table 5.18: Agencies and Organisations involved in focused ‘telephone’ interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Organisation</th>
<th>Research Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep Wales Tidy Campaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Groundwork Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Project Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</strong></td>
<td>Pantyscallog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Princes Trust Bro</td>
<td>1. Dowlais Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>2. Road Safety Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td>Elected Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. GFG Project Manager (GFG Steering Committee)</td>
<td>1. Local Elected Member (Pantyscallog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(also Leader of MTCBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dog Warden (Pantyscallog)</td>
<td>2. Local Elected Member (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leisure Department (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering that those Agencies and Organisations work place was widely geographically dispersed, this meant that the researcher would incur difficulties in terms of arranging and conducting focused interviews. To secure a high response rate, telephone interviews were used to conduct focused interviews. Furthermore, considering those limited resources from within which to conduct this final stage of the case study, conducting interviews by telephone was also perceived by the researcher to be a more cost effective and efficient method through which to collect research data from these research participants (Lavrakas, 1998). Similar to face-to-face interviews, the telephone interview has a number of
advantages that were an important consideration for the researcher, including securing a high response rate, being able to correct any misunderstandings during the interview process and also being able to make use of prompts (Robson, 1993). Although a major disadvantage of the telephone interview relates to those limitations that it places on the complexity of the interview (Lavrakas, 1998), the nature of the focused interview with Agencies and Organisations did not require an extensive in-sight into their experiences, but simply to identify what they had learnt from their involvement with the PSCP. To ensure that research participants remained focused during the interview process, the interview guide developed for interviewing Agencies and Organisations took the form of a structured questionnaire containing open type questions (see Appendix 14).

5.6 Summary

This chapter has provided a detailed discussion of the model research process that was used to collect empirical data for this thesis. Conducting and organising the data collection process into three distinct phases enabled the researcher to continually reflect and interact between those key issues that were being investigated, and both data collection and analysis. This approach not only provided direction and focus to the model research process as a whole, but also aided in overcoming one of the largest criticisms of the case study as a research strategy: that of an unknowing shift in the nature of the study, where the original design becomes inappropriate for those research questions that need to be answered (Yin, 1993). It also enabled the researcher to take advantage of unexpected and exciting opportunities that presented themselves during the course of the PSCP. To strengthen the collection and analysis of empirical data, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data was collected to provide a comprehensive perspective of those
participatory processes that were occurring within both PPAs. The use of methodological and data triangulation enabled the researcher to strengthen confidence in research findings and understanding the complexity of those processes that were involved in implementing the PSCP. To address those traditional criticisms associated with the case study as a research strategy, four design tests were built into the research design to ensure that the research findings and conclusions were valid and reliable. In addition, to ensure that evidence generated from the model research process was not subject to selective interpretation, a formal case study database was also created.

Interviewing played a pivotal part in this model research process, not only in relation to understanding previous experiences of community action and participation within both PPAs, but also in terms of investigating processes and outcomes. The flexibility associated with selecting the case study as a framework for the model research process enabled the researcher to develop a range of interviewing methods in relation to those issues requiring investigation, the range of research participants that were included, and the stage at which interviewing took place in relation to the overall research process. Furthermore the range of approaches that were adopted for interviewing also enabled the researcher to make efficient use of resources. For the exploratory phase a combination of focus groups and semi-structured interviews were used. Both interviewing methods were invaluable in relation to identifying those variables that were important and specific to each PPA in terms of encouraging participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. Understanding each PPA was invaluable in terms of understanding the context within which the PSCP was being implemented, and in evaluating it as an approach through which to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development.
Both of these interviewing methods were developed to encourage a range of community perspectives and overcome concerns and barriers that related to community participation in other policy areas. To increase the depth of inquiry and level of understanding, the researcher sought to enhance co-operation and participation in the research process by using positive aspects of each interviewing method, namely; using pre-existing groups to facilitate focus group discussions and generate a sense of empowerment and support due to the presence of those similar to themselves, and creating a conversational style of interviewing whilst conducting semi-structured interviews. This was particularly important in relation to interviewing non-community group members so as to develop trust, and gaining the necessary depth of insight.

Those PPAs that were selected for the PSCP were based upon geographically defined communities. This interpretation as to what constituted a 'local community' subsequently influenced the nature of the UniCR, with the range of research participants being restricted to householders, community leaders, community group leaders and community group members, but excluded members of the wider community, including less powerful groups and those less likely to participate in decision-making processes. Furthermore, no consideration was made in relation to those power relations that existed within each PPA, an issue that was identified in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.2) as being crucial to analysing and understanding any approach to participation. As this model research process sought to reflect the participatory process envisaged by A21, the range of research participants was widened to include non-community group members.

In relation to understanding those methods and processes that were involved in
implementing the PSCP and evaluating their effectiveness in encouraging community participation, the process-monitoring phase involved a combination of Process Observation, a Longitudinal Questionnaire Survey and Documentary Evidence. Both Process Observation and Documentary evidence were creative and responsive to those processes and activities that were actually occurring within both PPAs, and were important in terms of proving explanations in relation to resulting outcomes and impacts, and identify limitations and restrictions encountered by using GFGs definition of a 'local' community. Although the researcher conducted observations in each PPA, it was important that the researcher's presence did not influence or impact upon the implementation of the PSCP. To ensure what was being observed was relevant to those processes that were occurring in both PPAs, there was a continual interaction and reflection between research questions and data collected.

The explanatory phase of this model research process involved a combination of focused interviews and focused group interviews. Similar to the approach that was adopted for interviewing in the exploratory phase, these interviewing methods aimed to support and include a range of research participants, although a more structured approach was adopted to enable comparison of results within and between PPAs. To enable the researcher to include a range of experiences but still focus on identifying outcomes and impacts, the development of different interview guides enabled the researcher to include different levels of involvement. To facilitate the recall of experiences, use was made of focusing exercises, prompts, and the GFGO's diary of events. Research participants were selected ensuring that a complete range of perspectives and experiences were included.

Having undertaken a prior analysis of those methods and processes that were involved in
implementing the PSCP, the researcher was able to play a more active role in the interviewing process. The researcher’s social and interpersonal skills were also crucial to engaging and gaining the necessary depth of responses from participants. Although in the initial stages of conducting this model research process, it was intended that the explanatory phase would involve identifying perceptions of change, the researcher wanted those comments to be fresh in research participants’ minds and inform discussions. Whilst it would have been useful to have asked LAG participants to complete a community participation assessment in the earlier stages of their involvement with the PSCP and LAG, it was their perception of change that the researcher wanted to include in discussion. Furthermore, had the assessment been given to LAG participants to complete at an earlier stage, they may have not fully understood its purpose. Involving LAG participants in identifying the range of community stakeholders within their respective PPA, the recruitment of non-LAG participants would enable the researcher to develop an increased understanding of how the ‘local’ community should be defined, and whether the PSCP was an effective approach from which to encourage the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders.

Having provided a detailed outline of those research methods involved in collecting empirical data, using those issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes, Chapters 6 & 7 will discuss of the PSCP was implemented within both PPAs, and methods that were used to encourage participation and evaluate their effectiveness using the thematic framework for participatory processes. Both chapters will also draw our attention to those factors that were found to inhibit or influence community participation in the PSCP.
Chapter 6: Implementing the Pilot Sustainable Communities Project

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (Chapter 5) has discussed in detail those research methods that were included in the model research process to evaluate those methods and processes that were used to implement the PSCP in both PPAs, and identified the need to build specific tactics into the case study design to ensure that research findings and conclusions are both valid and reliable. Chapter 5 has also identified the need to use multiple sources of evidence and triangulate research findings in order to provide methodological rigour and gain a comprehensive perspective of those participatory processes that were occurring in both PPAs, and provide answers to the research questions and gain an insight from different perspectives. In addition, the previous chapter has discussed how a case study database was used to organise and ensure that all sources of empirical data were considered before drawing any conclusions.

Chapters 6 & 7 will focus on answer those research questions that were developed for this thesis using empirical data generated from the model research process (see Table 6.1). Due to the complexity of the research process and the interconnectedness of the research questions these chapters will be structured in the following way. Chapter 6 will begin by considering the overall strategy that was used to promote community participation in the PSCP. It will also consider those methods and approaches that were used to encourage participation, and evaluate their overall outcomes and impacts. Chapter 7 will then focus specifically on the experience of LAG participants, those impacts that the PSCP made within each PPA, and what Organisations and Agencies had learnt from being involved in
supporting MTCBC in implementing the PSCP. Chapter 7 will conclude by identifying those wider factors that were found to influence community participation in the PSCP.

Table 6.1: Research questions developed for the model research process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Identify those model(s) and strategy(ies) were used to promote community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Determine whether the Green Code was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Identify those method(s) and process(es) that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Determine how effective those method(s) and process(es) were in encouraging community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Analyse those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Determine those factors that inhibited or facilitated community participation in the PSCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of presented and discussing empirical findings relating to how the PSCP was implemented within both PPAs, this chapter is organised into four parts. The first (Section 6.2) provides a detailed outline of those models and strategies that were used to promote community participation in both PPAs. The second (Section 6.3) will determine whether the GC was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP. The third part (Sections 6.4, 6.5 & 6.6) will describe in detail those methods and processes that were used to implement the PSCP, and present evidence from this model research process as to their effectiveness in encouraging community participation. Finally, Section 6.7 will consider the research findings presented in this chapter, and discuss their implications in relation to promote the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development.
6.1.1 Presenting empirical data

When presenting results in this chapter and Chapter 7, reference will be made to the range of relevant empirical data that has been used to assist the researcher in providing answers to the research questions. The term 'source' will refer to where research data was obtained, or the research methodology that was used. Where extracts have been taken from interview transcripts or observational notes, 'R' refers to the researcher, and GFGO refers to Going for Green Co-ordinator. 'M' and 'F' denote male and female research participants respectively. Where more than one person is involved in an exchange, numbers are also allocated to research participants. As direct comparisons will be made between both PPAs, LAGp and LAGb will used to refer to LAGs in Pantyscallog and Electoral Ward of Bedlinog respectively.

6.2 Model(s) and Strategy(ies) used to promote community participation

The strategy used to implement the PSCP in each PPAs incorporated a number of components: the Green Code; project co-ordination by a GFGO; information and publicity; establishing a GFG Steering Committee; and, developing Project Partnerships with other local Agencies, Organisations and businesses. Each of these components will be discussed in turn with reference to how they support the local authority in promoting community participation in the PSCP.

6.2.1 The Green Code

The GC was a five point code of pro-environmental behaviour, developed and used by
GFG to deliver its sustainable development message (Section 3.3.5). It was GFG's intention that the GC would provide the core strategy from which local projects would develop within each PPA.

6.2.2 Appointment of a Going for Green Officer

In August 1996, MTCBC appointed a GFGO within its Consumer and Environmental Protection Department. This was due to the department's related work activities with environmental issues and the GC. The role of the GFGO was to encourage community participation in the PSCP by promoting the GC and co-ordinating community action. However, as the following extract indicates, there was no formal written documentation relating to how the local authority would implement the PSCP. Consequently, there was a lack of clarity and direction in relation to the overall approach that was being developed and used within both PPAs.

R: When you first started with GFG did you set out a strategy as to how you would approach the project?
GFGO: What, write one down? . . . I formulated one in my head.
R: What was the overall strategy?
GFGO: To meet people. Well this is it, it is to make community contacts not just . . . That's what I did, set up a Steering Committee . . . I recognised the partnerships. I then went out into the community. Met people to see whether they would want to get involved in whatever way.

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)

6.2.3 Information and Publicity

The strategy used to implement the PSCP also involved a continuous publicity drive throughout the duration of the PSCP, at both a national and local level. With an annual spending budget of almost £1 million per year (GFG, 1998a), between 1996 and 1999,
GFG developed and used a range of publicity to increase the profile of the Campaign and those local activities that were taking place during the PSCP\(^{40}\). These included: a national GFG newsletter which was published on a regular basis (although there were several changes to the format, design and name); supporting printed materials including a series of posters and leaflets to explain each point of the GC, and reports relating to activities and progress being made within PPAs; a GFG website (http://www.gfg.iclnet.co.uk); and a number of associated publicity materials including badges, papers, sugar packets, pens, and key-fobs. Although the national GFG newsletter and supporting printed material aimed to demonstrate how the GC was being converted into practical ‘local’ action, the professional ‘glossy’ format of these publications presented a mixed message as to what the GFG Campaign was actually about, and whether it was promoting rather than supporting action during the PSCP. Furthermore, these national GFG publications contained a selective presentation of activities within PPAs, and findings from the UniCR (see GFG, 1998a,c,d).

The GFGO also utilised local publicity opportunities to promote and encourage participation in the PSCP. These included: articles in the local newspaper; the publication of a ‘local’ GFG newsletter for households, which included articles relating to community focused projects and practical suggestions for taking action on GC issues; associated publicity materials, including a GFG village sign in each PPA, and a range of publicity items, including t-shirts, stickers, pens, pencils and reusable shopping bags, most of which were made from ‘eco-friendly’ materials and recycled products, and used the GFG ‘logo’. In addition, the PSCP was officially launched in MTCBC's Civic Centre in November

---

\(^{40}\) Publicity developed and used by GFG differed throughout the UK. For example, a pilot TV advertising campaign was developed with Yorkshire and Tyne Tees regions of North East England (which covered the Sedgefield PSCP), whereas in Wales, there was a launch of the GC in the Welsh language.
1996 by Neil Kinnock (European Commissioner for Transport), Glynis Kinnock (MEP, South East Wales) and Chief Executive (TBG), Professor G Ashworth.

Invitations were only extended to local agencies, organisations and businesses whose work activities related to aspects of the GC, Elected Members, Community Councillors (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog), and Headteachers from schools within both PPAs. Although the public launch of the PSCP generated a wide range of publicity at a national and local level, it represented the first time that residents within both PPAs had been informed that they had been selected to be part of a UK pilot citizen's environmental initiative. As the following extract indicates, the focus of the launch was not directed at residents that lived in each PPA.

"The launch was a publicity vehicle . . . people were there to see big names backing GFG you know that's what pulled them in . . . you look at the agenda for that day it was very high profile. It was a thing to draw people in and it made whoever were to be involved in GFG to be part of a bigger thing . . . it wasn't aimed at the communities."

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)

6.2.4 Going for Green Steering Committee

As previously mentioned in Chapter 3 (Section 3.5.2) a GFG Steering Committee was established for the duration of the PSCP. This Steering Committee was composed of representatives from local voluntary organisations, agencies and businesses that attended the public launch of the PSCP, and whose work remit related to those issues included within the GC (see Appendix 15). The Steering Committee was a predetermined management structure, and was formed in February 1997 without prior consultation with residents from either of the PPAs. The Steering Committees role in relation to implementing the PSCP in both PPAs was to;
1) Encourage the establishment and future management of LAGs.
2) Guide and advise LAGs.
3) Encourage the development of skills to enable community ownership of projects.

(Source: Steering Committee Minutes, February 1997)

At the inaugural meeting of the GFG Steering Committee, members discussed how LAGs could be established within each PPA. Although one Steering Committee member suggested the use of existing community structures, such as Community Councils as the basis through which to form LAGs, the GFGO disputed such an approach, on the basis that using groups ‘connected’ to the local authority may have adverse implications when encouraging participation in the PSCP, as results from the UniCR (Longitudinal Survey, Phase One) had indicated that there was a lack of trust towards the local authority as agents of change.

Despite both PPAs being selected on the basis of their comparative characteristics (see Section 3.5.5), the GFGO used a similar approach to encourage participation in both PPAs. In an explanation relating to how PPAs would be encouraged to participate in the PSCP, the following extracts indicate that although the GFGO perceived the PSCP as supporting a bottom-up approach to encouraging community participation, in a later explanation it became apparent that the PSCP was a top-down approach, as residents would be encouraged to take part in action that had already been defined by GFG.

“One of the fundamental factors of this project is that the communities decide which issues are of most importance to them and for them to act upon them. It is not for me to say this is what I think should be done, neither should it be Member led. It is important that the community owns this project and so it is from grass root level.”

(Source: GFGO, Observational notes, Steering Committee Meeting, February 1997)
"... the setting up of community groups will initially be attempted through getting the community to come forward to participate in the campaign. Should this prove to be impossible then I intend to take the campaign to the community and try to encourage the community through different methods."

(Source: GFGO, Observational notes, Steering Committee Meeting, February 1997)

6.2.5 Developing Project Partnerships

Prior to implementing the PSCP in both PPAs, between September 1996 and February 1997, the GFGO contacted those organisations and agencies that had previously been involved in undertaking projects relating to GC issues within each PPA. The GFGO adopted this approach for two main reasons; to avoid duplicating similar types of projects, and to identify potential project partnerships in relation to undertaking further community focused projects in each PPA. As indicated in Table 6.2, despite making contact with a wide range of agencies and organisations, only three project partnerships were developed further during the course of the PSCP. Having provided an outline of the various components that would be used to support the local authority in promoting community participation in the PSCP, the second part of this chapter (Section 6.3) will now determine whether the GC was an effective agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP.
Table 6.2: Project Partnerships developed during the PSCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency or Organisation</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact made</td>
<td>Project partnership developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taff Bargoed Development Trust</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitulars (Landlord Association)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Wales Tidy Campaign</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork Trust</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the River Taff Co-ordinator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro Taf Health Authority</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowlais Police</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Wales (CSV)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Company</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Effectiveness of the GC as an agenda for encouraging community participation

Before an evaluation can be made of the GC and its effectiveness as an agenda for encouraging community participation, the following issues need to be considered;

1) Concern for the local environment.
2) How the term ‘environment’ was perceived.
3) What the PSCP was perceived to be about.
4) Environmental issues and main issues of concern.
5) Perceived relevance of the PSCP and GC.
6) Which aspect(s) of the GC were most relevant?

6.3.1 Concern for the local environment

The response rates from Phases One and Two of the Longitudinal Survey was poor in both
PPAs. As indicated in Table 6.3, the total response rate for Phase One was 16.6%, and 9.8% for Phase Two, an overall decrease of 6.8% in the response rates between Phases One and Two. However, within most surveys, a response rate of 75% or above from the total population under study is considered to be good (Bowling, 1997). In view of this, the responses received from the Longitudinal Survey may be deceptive, and so conclusions drawn may be tentative. In other words, it could be argued that for Phase Two of the survey, the views and opinions of almost 90% of households in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog that did not respond may have been opposite to those households that did respond. Consideration of such non-response is important, as it affects the quality of the data collected by reducing the effective sample size. Despite having a relatively low response rate, the sample of responding householders may still be representative of the study population in particular elements, which is the key issue of any survey focused research (Crombie & Davies, 1996). In terms of examining the response rates, the key issue is not necessarily the number of responses, but whether the sample of respondents were representative of the study population (Fife-Shaw, 1995). As the information collected in relation to demographics was limited in the Longitudinal Survey, it was difficult to compare survey responses with Census data relating to both PPAs. However, Table 6.4 indicates a larger proportion of householders within both PPAs that had returned their survey forms for both Phases were of retirement age. This figure almost represents twice that expected from Census population characteristics. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the responses received from the Longitudinal Survey were representative of both PPAs following the comparison of such simplistic demographic details.
Table 6.3: Response rates for the Longitudinal Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
<th>Difference in response rates (Phase One – Phase Two)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=1366)</td>
<td>246 (18.0%)</td>
<td>158 (11.6%)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantyscallog (n=1107)</td>
<td>176 (15.9%)</td>
<td>84 (7.6%)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422 (16.6%)</td>
<td>242 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)

These poor response rates raise a number of concerns, not only in relation to the survey design and research instrument that was used, but also the equivocal nature of results obtained from this single research method, and the interpretation and conclusions that were drawn from this component of the UniCR. When presenting findings from this model research process, the researcher will consider these methodological concerns and indicate whether results from the Longitudinal Survey were supported or contradicted by data collected from those other research methods that were used. In doing so, this will enable the researcher to demonstrate the methodological rigour associated with using the case study as a framework for the model research process and from which to explore those research issues that were under investigation.

In relation to concern for the environment, Table 6.5 indicates that from Phases One and Two of the Longitudinal Survey, 90% or more of responding households in both PPAs reported that they were either very or quite concerned about the condition of their local environment. Results from the Longitudinal Survey have also indicated that between Phases One and Two, there had been an increase in the level of household concern for the local environment within both PPAs, in particular, as highlighted in Table 6.5, the proportion of households in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog that were very concerned about the environment.
Table 6.4: Comparison of responding householders with population characteristics in both PPAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Population characteristics</th>
<th>Longitudinal Survey (response rate)</th>
<th>Population characteristics</th>
<th>Longitudinal Survey (response rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Part A</td>
<td>Part B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 17 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years – retirement</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data based on 1991 Census.
† The percentage response rate for responding householders is based on those who indicated on their survey form that they attended college/university, and probably represents an over-estimation of those within this age band.

(Source: Upton, 1999)

Table 6.5: Household concern for the local environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of concern</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase One (n=176)</td>
<td>Phase Two (n=84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite concerned</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very concerned</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not concerned</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)

However, further evidence from the model research process found contradictory evidence in relation to high levels of concern for the environment within both PPAs. Firstly, in the follow-up study to Phases One and Two of the Longitudinal Survey, reasons given by households in both PPAs for non-response indicated that there was a lack of interest by households in relation to concern for the environment. Secondly, additional comments given by responding households on Longitudinal Survey forms, and data from Semi-
Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions also indicated that there was a lack of concern for the environment, as other issues were perceived to have a higher priority.

“This sort of questionnaire might seem relevant to residents of leafy towns and villages in South East England, but a little inappropriate for this area. The first steps to improving the lives of people here involve concrete economics, a strange pun, involving employment opportunity. While dog fouling or litter may annoy everyone, the struggle against poverty and the deprivation trap is far more important to deal with.”

(Source: Longitudinal Survey, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

“What we need to do is reduce crime so that other good works like what you’re trying to achieve can then come into their own... As soon as it goes dark love, they’ll go. In our house if we go upstairs, lock both doors and we’re only going up stairs. Now in dark nights, people would like to do these things, but their home is very important to them.”

(Source: Focus Group Discussion, Pantyscallog)

“People aren’t interested unless it affects them directly. People don’t care”

(Source: Longitudinal Study (Follow-up study), Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

“Um, but as for the um, environment generally, no I don’t think they’re interested... only things that’s close to them. You know, if they see them when they are travelling to work, or walking to the shop, or doing something else, then they notice it. Other than that they don’t really look into it... Um, I think a lot... what have you got to offer, really? is the question we’re asking ourselves What are you offering the people of Pant?

(Source: Focus Group Discussion, Pantyscallog)

Although data from Semi-Structured Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and Focused Group Interviews with LAG Participants has indicated that there was a consensus of opinion that the majority of residents that lived in both PPAs had a lack of interest in the environment, it was perceived that there were a minority of residents that were concerned. This included; children and their parents, residents that had time and money, and older residents, who were perceived to be most concerned about the environment.
6.3.2 How the term 'environment' was perceived

To evaluate the effectiveness of the GC as an agenda for encouraging community participation, there is a need to develop an increased understanding as to what the term 'environment' meant to residents that lived within both PPAs. How the term environment is perceived is important in terms of how relevant the GC was perceived to residents in both PPAs, and hence its effectiveness as an agenda for encouraging community participation. Drawing upon data generated from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions, there was a consensus of opinion that the majority of residents in both PPAs perceived the term environment from two main stances. Firstly, in terms of the immediate area or locality within which they lived, and secondly, in terms of 'green issues' such as litter, recycling, air quality, trees and nature. There were certain community members that were identified as having a wider global perspective of the term environment. Firstly, residents between the age of 15 and 24 years, and those non-community group members that had only lived in their respective PPA for a relatively short period of time (and had professional jobs outside the area)\(^41\). Secondly, community leaders and those non-community group members that had only lived in their respective PPA for a relatively short period of time (and had professional jobs outside the area) also considered health, social and economic issues as being part of the environment.

---

\(^{41}\) Although this was not a variable that was initially considered for investigation, following analysis of data from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions, it was identified as a research outcome that warranted comment.
6.3.3 Perceptions of the PSCP

Although results from Phases One and Two of the Longitudinal Survey (see Table 6.6) and Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants (see Table 6.7) indicate that there was a relatively high level of awareness of the PSCP within both PPAs, this model research process also found that there was a low level of understanding as to what the GC and the PSCP were perceived to be about. Evidence to support this finding has been drawn from, not only the Longitudinal Survey and its subsequent follow-up studies, but also Semi-Structured Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, Focused Group Interviews with LAG Participants, and Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants. Furthermore, this lack of understanding was continuously documented throughout the entire duration of the PSCP.

“...people have asked me what Going for Green is about and some have commented by saying 'is it about climbing trees and digging holes?'”

(Source: LAG Participant, Observational Notes, LAG meeting, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Table 6.6: Households that had heard about the PSCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=176)</td>
<td>(n=246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantyscallog</td>
<td>77 (44%)</td>
<td>201 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Ward of</td>
<td>(n=84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedlinog</td>
<td>42 (50%)</td>
<td>115 (73%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)

Responses received from the Longitudinal Survey have indicated that the majority of households in both PPAs perceived the PSCP to be about the cleanliness and tidiness of the ‘local environment’ in which they lived, or in terms of ‘green’ environmental issues such as recycling, saving energy and pollution (see Table 6.8).
Table 6.7: Awareness of the PSCP by Non-LAG Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog (n = 24)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n = 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfar &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced ‘type’ properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participants)

Table 6.8: Household perceptions of the PSCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Pantyscallog (n=84)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=158)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The local environment</td>
<td>33 (39%)</td>
<td>55 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green environmental issues (including recycling, saving energy and pollution)</td>
<td>28 (33%)</td>
<td>62 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental awareness/education</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community initiative</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and personal safety</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of local facilities</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An active group of local people</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having regard to future generations</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey Phase Two)

Similar findings were also identified from Semi-Structured Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants (see Tables 6.9 & 6.10).

"Cleaning the environment, tidying the place up, keeping it clean and environmentally friendly. That was my initial impact of it all."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)
"I thought it was about improvements generally to black spots in the village and hopefully improving the environment aesthetically and making it generally more attractive."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Table 6.9: Perceptions of PSCP (Non-LAG Participants, Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-LAG Participants (n=24)</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfa &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced ‘type’ properties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Perceptions held by the majority of Non-LAG Participants.

(Source: Focused Interviews, Non-LAG Participants, Pantyscallog)
Table 6.10: Perceptions of PSCP (Non-LAG Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-LAG Participants (n=24)</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local environment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Families</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Perceptions held by the majority of Non-LAG Participants.

(Source: Focused Interviews, Non-LAG Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

6.3.4 Environmental and general issues of concern

Responses received from the Longitudinal Survey identified that those environmental issues that were of most concern to households in Pantyscallog were; crime and vandalism, dog fouling and litter, whereas in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, those environmental issues that were of most concern to households were; litter, dog-fouling, dumping of rubbish and flytipping, and the reclamation of former colliery sites (see Table 6.11). These results are important in terms of encouraging community participation in the PSCP as they have highlighted a number of issues. Firstly, households environmental concerns included issues that extended beyond the remit of the GC. Secondly, the range of environmental issues that were of most concern to households in each PPA differed in terms of their relative importance. Thirdly, it was only those issues that related to Point 5 of the GC that received concern by households in both PPAs. These included; dog fouling, litter, dumping of rubbish/flytipping. Data from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions,
Observational Data and Documentary Evidence relating to both PPAs have also been found to support this finding.

Table 6.11: Household environmental issues of concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental issues of concern</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal Survey Phase One (n=176)</td>
<td>Longitudinal Survey Phase Two (n=84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/vandalism*</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling †††</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter †††</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of rubbish/flytipping †††</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise nuisance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation of former colliery sites †††</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General appearance of village (incl. condition of roads &amp; footpaths) ††</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Issues that related to Point 5 of the Green Code.
* Environmental issues of most concern to responding households in Pantyscallog
+ Environmental issues of most concern to responding households in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog.

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)

“Basically there are certain parts of Pant were um youth were gathering there causing damage, causing annoyance to them really and, there is a fear, up there of the um shear number of them gathering, they were afraid to go out at night, so old people area afraid to go out.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Pantyscallog)

“Dog mess is my main concern. People open their front doors and leave their dog mess wherever they want. Many a time I’ve had to disinfect my front pavement. It’s been carried in my house on people’s shoes, in the night time when we can’t see so good. I’ve been sick cleaning it up! But then its always back! My husband and I witnessed a dog fouling, leaving a mess on the grass and the dog owner wiping its bottom with toilet paper and throwing that on the grass as well. I think we laughed with shock. I have to be on guard most of the time for the sake of my five year old son.”

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Pantyscallog)

“Uhm... if they put a bit of money in here and had a look at it and sort of tidied up the odd corners... the little corners about the place, yeah well, I think it needs someone with a little bit of vision to come along and sort of say, right, I mean that road needs, you know... I just think that they could do that...
little bit more in improving the infrastructure in tidying up the environment, you know, making nice areas here and there, you know, if there was some nice benches throughout the village, I mean I know they’ve done one or two up round George Street there, by the Complex because that is you know an elderly complex, but I think they could do some nicer areas, or turn what I think are pretty poor areas now into more attractive areas.”

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"Well, we don’t want them (Hippo Bags), take them to Merthyr first."

(Source: Observational Data, LAG Meeting, May 1998, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

A second issue that needs to be considered relates to those general issues that were of most concern to residents in both PPAs. Table 6.12 indicates that similar to those responses received for household’s environmental issues of concern, those general issues that were of most concern to households and their relative importance differed between each PPA. In Pantyscallog, the general issues of concern were; crime and vandalism, dog fouling, children’s education, litter and health, whereas in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the main issues of concern were; crime/vandalism, employment, dog fouling, children’s education, health, litter and dumping of rubbish. Data from Semi-Structured Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants, and a range of Observational and Documentary evidence relating to both PPAs has also been found to support this finding.

42 This project focused on reducing household water usage.
Table 6.12: Household general issues of concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main issues of concern</th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study Phase One (n=176)</td>
<td>Study Phase Two (n=84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/vandalism *</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog fouling ††</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's education *</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health *</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping of rubbish/flytipping † †</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise nuisance*</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter †</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding motor vehicles*</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion † †</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeeping of pathways and cycleways</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment *</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Issues that were related to Point 5 of the Green Code.
† † Issues that could be related to other aspects of the Green Code.
* Main issues of most concern to responding households.

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)

"Going for Green, a paper exercise? A joke to the village? An idea dreamt up by some department, unknown and not really interested. Will this like many other good ideas die a death? An ounce of action is worth a ton of thought!"

(Source: Longitudinal Survey, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"Money. When you've been brought up through a social structure where the main income of support is heavy industry, that has an adverse effect on the environment. The buzz word was green side to the environment. It is a damaging wasteful industry. Concerns for other issues, such as rivers, trout, goods, fields come very much secondary to putting money in your pocket and feeding your family. Because its all fair and well sitting back and saying you've got to protect the planet and heritage for our future it is very easy saying that to, if you've got food on your table and money in your bank account. It's very hard, and very difficult to swallow. And unfortunately, the majority of people who stand there and explain these rules, haven't anything to worry about. Those that take the moral high ground can afford to do, just that. Unfortunately, people round here can't. It's all very well, having a nice green field, but if there's a number of thousand tons of coal that can come out from that, and for the next foreseeable 20, 15, 25 years of their life, and the start of their families life it's going to take priority. I'm afraid the green field's gone."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"To be honest I haven't had no interest in it . . . to think so much is going on its surprising. The thing is people are afraid to leave their houses and park their cars down the bottom, you know school disco at four o'clock and people were getting their cars pinched, or Christmas concerts and people were having their cars taken."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG, Participant, Pantyscallog)
Similar to data relating to households' environmental issues of concern, these general issues of concern also highlight a number of concerns in relation to the effectiveness of the GC as an agenda from which to encourage community participation in the PSCP. Firstly, those issues of most concern to residents extended beyond the remit of the GC. Secondly, issues that were of most concern to households in each PPA differed in terms of their relative importance. Thirdly, it was primarily Point 5 of the GC that was found to be of most concern to residents in both PPAs.

6.3.5 Perceived relevance of the PSCP and GC

Our attention now needs to be drawn to identifying those residents that perceived the PSCP and the GC to be relevant to them and their respective PPA. Evidence from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions has indicated that there was mixed opinion as to whether the PSCP and the GC were relevant to those residents that lived within both PPAs. In relation to those residents that did perceive the PSCP and GC to be relevant, data from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions has indicated that there were differences between PPAs in terms of who it was perceived to be most relevant for. In Pantyscallog, the PSCP was perceived to be of most relevance to the younger generation, whereas in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the PSCP was perceived to be mostly relevant to those residents that were concerned about their PPA as a whole. Indeed, LAGb Participants indicated during a Focused Group Interview that they perceived the PSCP as a catalyst and opportunity through which to bring those residents together that had similar concerns about their PPA.
"... I think it's, it's been a catalyst for, then again most people are aware of the environment and each has their concerns about it, it was, it is a Project that brought people out to actually, people of like-minded, be in the same mood to discuss these things, um it isn't that it wasn't there before 'Going for Green' there just wasn't something to bind it and it is the catalyst I think, and I think, yeah, it is a good starting point, but I think it needs, I think it also needs guidance, you know, from someone."

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_b Participants)

The GC and the PSCP were not perceived to encourage participation amongst the majority of residents that lived in both PPAs. Table 6.13 indicates that in Pantyscallog, only one Non-LAG Participant reported having been involved with at least one community focused project, whereas in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, nine Non-LAG Participants reported having been involved with at least one community focused project. These Non-LAG participants were; unemployed, retired/OAPs, juniors and teenagers. Both Documentary evidence and data from Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants have also indicated that within both PPAs, interest and participation in the PSCP did not extend significantly further than LAG participants, and those children that had been involved with projects that had been introduced by the GFGO through local schools. As indicated in Table 6.14, those residents that were involved in LAGs were primarily older residents that lived within both PPAs. Furthermore, the majority of LAG_b participants where also involved with a number of other community groups and organisations in their PPA (see Table 6.15).
Table 6.13: Participation by Non-LAG Participants in community focused projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Juniors*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfar &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Teenagers*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced 'type' properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unemployed †</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young Families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These Non-LAG Participants had participated in community focused projects that had been introduced through local schools by the GFGO.
† These Non-LAG participants were also involved with LAG participants in other community groups and organisations.

(Source: Focused Interviews, Non-LAG Participants)

Table 6.14: Age of LAG Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>LAG_P (n=4)</th>
<th>LAG_B (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59 yrs</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 + yrs</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: LAG Participant Profile Questionnaire, Focused Group Interviews)

Table 6.15: LAG Participant involvement with other community groups and organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community groups &amp; organisations</th>
<th>Pantyscallog (n=4)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age concern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School governor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Navigation Liaison Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Legion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Residents Association (PRA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number involved with other community groups &amp; organisations</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: LAG Participant Profile Questionnaire, Focused Group Interviews)
The Longitudinal Survey, Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions identified a number of reasons as to why the PSCP was not perceived to be relevant to residents that lived within both PPAs. Reasons included a lack of interest in the environment and GC issues, and that the PSCP was not perceived to resonate with residents immediate concerns and interests.

"Once your concept of ‘Green Projects’ includes political economy or liberated ecologies, then it may be accepted as relevant to local people. The Green/Environmental/Sustainable Development lobby has been in fashion for ten years. It must now give way to progressive political, economic and social action."

(Source: Longitudinal Survey, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"I think that the Project is about um, a government initiative that says let’s do something about the environment and this is how you do it."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

M What a load of bollocks, um it’s a very cheap way of appearing to be environmentally concerned, um
R You said the word ‘appearing’
M Yes
R You don’t think it will change the community’s attitudes or behaviours?
M Not a chance . . . Hanging baskets comes up all the time, it’s a metaphor, because when people talk about improving the valley they tend to often focus on the physical, you know let’s have hanging baskets they look nice, yoopee doo is my response . . . it’s the councils thing it’s physical, that’s visible. Look at all the hanging baskets, in the area, it doesn’t actually change the quality of peoples lives at all one iota, um and it’s not their priority . . . It’s a bit like counselling you know . . . we can’t think of a better offer but we’ll teach you to feel good about being poor, and it’s bollocks, at the end of the day if you’re poor you have a right to rant and rave and say this is unjust, I’m not poor because of who I am, I am poor because of a system who has made me poor, I am poor because of political decisions that were made, that ain’t good enough.

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Within the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the PSCP was perceived as being an ideological and middleclass answer to solving environmental problems. In terms of encouraging community participation, the PSCP was perceived as being unsuitable for local implementation for two main reasons. Firstly, GC issues were not perceived to resonate
with residents’ main priorities. Secondly, it was perceived that the PSCP would not change resident’s behaviours and attitudes as it focused on the physical aspects of the environment. Imposing projects such as the PSCP, which had a predetermined environmental agenda was not perceived to be relevant to those residents’ that lived within both PPAs as it did not include those issues that were having an adverse effect on residents quality of life. The perceived ineffectiveness of using a predetermined agenda such as the GC to encourage community participation was summed up by the local authority GFG Project Manager following the official end of the PSCP,

“Don’t preach from the soap box of sustainable development, listen to what they have to say, their needs . . . listen and facilitate their ideas and concept of what is wrong and hopefully develop to the Green Code . . . When GFG started I thought that we would go in with the Green Code and say now in order to do this you need to do this. But in communities like Pant that wouldn’t happen as people’s priorities were crime and dog fouling. You need to let the community have their say.”

(Source: Focused telephone Interview, GFG Project Manager)

Within both PPAs, Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions indicated that the PSCP would have been perceived to be more relevant to residents if it had a wider remit, and was of direct benefit to them and made a link between the local environment and resident’s current social and economic circumstances. This finding was further supported by data from a Focused Group Interview with LAGp Participants, who perceived themselves as being ‘guinea pigs’, with the researcher benefiting more from the PSCP than they had. LAG Participants from both PPAs also indicated they perceived that other residents didn’t participate in the LAG or community focused projects as they were not interested in the wider environment, and would only get involved if the PSCP was relevant to them personally, as opposed to their respective PPA as a whole.

M Um, I think a lot . . . ‘what have you got to offer really’ is the question we’re asking ourselves? What are you offering the people of Pant? Personally it does to me, but not generally, I don’t think so.
This lack of interest and perceived irrelevance of the GC to residents in Pantyscallog was identified by the researcher throughout the duration of the PSCP. Although a LAG was established in Pantyscallog, during the PSCP it was continually observed and documented that LAGp Participants found it difficult to generate ideas for community focused projects, as their main issues of concern were not included within the remit of the GC. Similarly, the GFGO was continually faced with the problem of trying to make the GC relevant to LAGp Participants. Consequently, the LAGp had a limited lifespan of 11 months, and the majority of community focused projects undertaken were primarily generated and implemented using a top-down approach, with minimal participation by LAG Participants or the wider community (see Table 6.16). Similarly, in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, during LAGb...
Table 6.16: Effectiveness of community focused projects in encouraging community participation (Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Project link with GC</th>
<th>Project generation</th>
<th>Project implementation</th>
<th>Methods used to encourage community participation.</th>
<th>Did the Project encourage community participation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dog fouling*         | Point 5: Looking After the Local Environment. | Top - down & Bottom – up | Primarily top - down. However LAG participants identified possible locations for bins. | a) This project linked with a local issue of concern.  
 b) Dog bins were erected along Pant Road.  
 c) Anti dog-fouling signs placed above bins.  
 d) Poop scoop bags given to LAG participants to distribute to dog owners.  
 e) Poop scoop bags located in Pant Primary School and local Spar Shop.  
 f) Information leaflet produced relating to a recent prosecution relating to dog fouling. This leaflet was delivered to every street in the PPA.  
 g) A newspaper article relating to the project which included a dog owner and local school children.  
 h) Education talk in relation to dog ownership delivered to local school children by RSPCA. | Focused interviews with Non-LAG participants indicated that the project had not resulted in sustained improvements. |
| Dog Warden*          | Point 5 (Looking After the Local Environment). | Top - down          | Top - down              | a) Dog warden surgery set up to report straying and fouling dogs.  
 b) This project linked with a local issue of concern.  
 c) Residents were informed by word of mouth by LAG participants.  
 d) Posters were displayed in local shop windows advertising the surgery. | The surgery was not used and subsequently withdrawn. |
| Energy Conservation  | Point 2 (Saving Energy and Natural Resources). | Top - down          | Top - down              | a) Home Energy Efficiency Survey (HEES) Grant Application forms left in Post Office.  
 b) SWALEC talk on energy saving and an information Energy Action Trailer was placed on the Green next to Pant Road. | 1 resident returned a HEES Grant Application form. |

* Project relates to a local issue of concern.
LAG (Local Action Group)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organic Gardening          | Point 5 (Looking After the Local Environment)  
Point 2 (Saving Energy and Natural Resources)  
Point 4 (Preventing Pollution) | Top - down  
Top - down  
Top - down | This event was advertised in the local newspaper and included a photo of two LAG Participants.  
Event was also advertised in the ‘local’ GFG newsletter.  
Project advertised through ‘local’ GFG newsletter.  
Free and subsidised garden equipment was advertised in ‘local’ GFG newsletter.  
Publicity in local newspaper. | 14 residents visited the Energy Action Trailer.  
1 resident attended the SWALEC talk. |
| GFG village signs          | None, but was important in terms of creating a community identity and awareness raising about the PSCP. | Top-down and bottom – up  
(LAG Participants identified location for signs) | None. | None |
| 'local' GFG Newsletter     | All points of the Green Code | Top - down  
Top - down  
Top - down | The GFG Newsletter was used to advertise community focused projects and information relating to GC issues. | None |
| Anti-motorbike landscaping*| Point 5 (Looking After the Local Environment)  
Point 4 (Preventing Pollution) | Top - down & bottom – up  
Top - down  
Top - down | This project linked the GC with a local issue of concern (speeding motor - bikes over open areas of land next to Rhydd y Bedd) with Point 5 of Green Code – Looking After the Local Environment).  
A link was developed with the Local Authority’s Leisure Department & PRA.  
This project was advertised in the ‘local’ GFG Newsletter. | 1 resident was involved in identifying were the landscaping was required.  
A ‘Walk to School Day’ resulted with 32 from a total of |

* denotes events that were successful and are planned to continue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>c) Links were developed with the Local Authority’s Road Safety Officer (RSO).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) School children were involved in producing a Walk to School Guide book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Educational talks were given to schoolchildren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Publicity was generated in the local newspaper including a photograph of RSO and school children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) A walk to school day was organised to coincide with National campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192 children walking to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 parents got involved in identifying ‘Safe Routes to Schools’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meetings and other related activities including community consultation exercises, it was consistently observed and documented that residents concerns extended beyond the remit of the GC, and related to their ‘local’ environment and the locality in which they lived. To instigate interest and participation in the PSCP, LAG_B participants consistently indicated throughout the duration of the PSCP that the GC needed to relate to local issues of concern, and there was a need for residents to see change within a relatively short period of time.

6.3.6 Which aspect(s) of the GC were of most relevance?

Data obtained from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions has indicated that Point 5 of the GC, ‘Looking After the Local Environment’, was perceived to be most relevant to residents in both PPAs. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, this was in terms of landscaping, improving areas of land, and dealing with issues such as litter and dog fouling, whereas in Pantyscallog, this was in terms of vandalism and fear of crime, reducing litter and dog fouling, and making residents feel better about the area in which they lived. Similarly, LAG Participants in both PPAs also reiterated the relevance of Point 5 of the GC in terms of improving their respective PPA. Documentary evidence also found that throughout the duration of the PSCP, LAG_B Participants consistently indicated that Point 5 of the GC was the most important in relation to their PPA, and there was a need to take action on this issue before considering the other aspects of the GC, which related to the wider environment. Due to the relevance of Point 5 of the GC and the ability of LAG_B Participants to link it with some of their main issues of concern, the majority of community focused projects were generated and implemented using a bottom-up approach (see Table 6.17). Despite this, LAG_B participants still perceived that the GC was of limited relevance
to their PPA, as their main issues of concern lay at the fringe of what GFG was concerned with.

"Point five, the last point there in the green code, it's more important than the others, it should be top of the list I'd argue, for the village. If we'd worked that way and come down to the others instead of coming down from the other things and finding that at the bottom."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Having determined how effective the GC was as an agenda for encouraging community participation in the PSCP, the third part of this chapter (Sections 6.3, 6.4 & 6.5) will now describe in detail those methods and processes that were used in both PPA, and determine their effectiveness in encouraging community participation in the PSCP.

6.4 Local School Involvement

During the initial stages of the PSCP, the GFGO identified headteachers of local schools as a primary point of contact within each PPA. Consequently, they were invited to the public launch of the PSCP in November 1996. The reason for initiating the PSCP through local schools was explained by the GFGO during a Focused Interview,

"I knew that the school would play an important part so I introduced myself to them . . . Cause they're a very good link basically I knew that I would be carrying out educational work it's one of the fundamental ones that you can access a large amount of the community through schools . . . In my mind schools are relied upon too much whether it be road safety or food safety or whatever through to environmental issues. Everybody says just put it through the schools put it through the schools. And this is were GFG differs from most campaigns in the sense that they take it beyond the schools to encourage other aspects of the community to get involved. And what I wanted to get across to them was that I recognise that the schools were an important and fundamental part but it wasn't the only thing for GFG, it was one aspect . . . it has to be tackled from both sides. For years people have been going into schools talking about litter and all the rest of it but as soon as that child leaves the school, if the parent is standing there dropping litter . . . You've got to be dealing with the parent as well as the school child . . ."

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)
Table 6.17: Effectiveness of community focused projects in encouraging community participation (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Project link with GC</th>
<th>Project generation</th>
<th>Project implementation</th>
<th>Methods used to encourage community participation.</th>
<th>Did the Project encourage community participation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bedlinog Terrace*       | Point 5 (Looking After the Local Environment). | Bottom-up          | Top - down & bottom-up  | a) This project linked with a local issue of concern (improving areas of derelict land).  
b) Links were developed with local primary and infant schools through practical projects such as bulb planting.  
c) Some LAG Participants were actively involved.  
d) Links were developed with Celtic Energy with regards to landscaping.                                                                 | Participation was limited to local school children and some LAG Participants. |
| Job Finder Bus Service* | Point 3 (Travelling Sensibly). | Top-down           | Top-down               | a) This project linked with a local issue of concern (unemployment and an inadequate bus service).  
b) Unemployed were given a questionnaire relating to public transport  
c) Posters relating to the day event were placed in bus shelters and local Post Offices  
d) Links were developed with Job Centre, local Bus Company and local businesses  
e) Publicity was generated in local and national Radio and newspapers  
f) LAG Participants were involved in the publicity day and in organising the revised timetable.  
g) A limited number of free bus tickets were made available  
h) A four month pilot bus service was set up  
i) The bus service and free tickets were advertised using an advertising trailer in several locations within the PPA.  | 6 residents attended the publicity day event. All 6 lived in the village of Bedlinog.  
Although 2 teenagers used the bus service, one later passed his driving test and gave the other teenager a lift to work.  
Due to limited use of the bus on a regular basis, the service was withdrawn |
| Energy Conservation     | Point 2 (Saving Energy and) | Top - down         | Top - down             | a) A SWALEC talk on energy saving and an information Energy Action Trailer was made available for one day in  | 4 residents attended the SWALEC talk and 2 |

* Project relates to a local issue of concern.  
LAG (Local Action Group)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>Water Conservation (Hippo Bag Scheme – Bedlinog)</th>
<th>Parc Hen Project and Consultation*</th>
<th>Colly Row*</th>
<th>Play area (Bedlinog)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top - down</td>
<td>Bottom - up</td>
<td>Bottom - up</td>
<td>Bottom - up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top - down</td>
<td>Top - down &amp; bottom - up</td>
<td>Bottom - up</td>
<td>Top - down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three locations.</td>
<td>a) Publicity was generated in local newspapers</td>
<td>a) Links were developed with Princes Trust Bro, Groundwork Trust and the Local Authority’s Leisure Department</td>
<td>This project was undertaken and organised by LAG Participants.</td>
<td>a) This project linked with a local issue of concern (a lack of play areas for young children).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This event was</td>
<td>b) A link was developed with Dwr Cymru Welsh Water</td>
<td>b) LAG Participants were involved in organising display panels for the consultation event, writing letter to residents and consulting local school children</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) A link was developed with the Local Authority’s Leisure Department to provide an old bench and materials to improve the play area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included a</td>
<td>c) Hippo Bags were installed by a Dwr Cymru Welsh Water Engineer on request</td>
<td>c) The consultation event was held in the Community Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) This event was advertised in the local newspaper and included a photograph of two LAG Participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>photograph of</td>
<td>d) A Dwr Cymru Welsh Water trailer distributed Hippo Bags at three different locations in Bedlinog.</td>
<td>d) Leaflets were delivered by LAG Participants advertising the event.</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) A Dwr Cymru Welsh Water trailer distributed Hippo Bags at three different locations in Bedlinog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two LAG Participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td>e) LAG Participants were also involved in encouraging nearby residents to participate by knocking on doors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>e) LAG Participants were also involved in encouraging nearby residents to participate by knocking on doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The event was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children that were involved in the clean up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also advertised in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the ‘local’ GFG newsletter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residents visited</td>
<td>141 (24% of households in Bedlinog were given a Hippo Bag).</td>
<td>Although water usage dropped, there were also leaks in the water supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Energy Action Trailer. These residents were from the village of Bedlinog.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The event was attended by 8 residents, most of whom were under 14 years of age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 adults attended the event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 resident joined the LAG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of those residents that lived nearby also got involved. This involved planting flowers and maintaining a wall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recycling Bins | Point 1 (Cutting Down on Waste) | Top - down & bottom up | Top - down | a) The provision of recycling bins was advertised in the ‘local’ GFG Newsletter.  
b) An educational talk was delivered to local primary and infant schools | Data was not collected with respects to its usage |
| Organic Gardening | Point 5 (Looking After the Local Environment).  
Point 2 (Saving Energy and Natural Resources).  
Point 4 (Preventing Pollution). | Top down | Top down | a) Advertised through GFG newsletter.  
b) Free and subsidised garden equipment was advertised in the ‘local’ GFG newsletter.  
c) Publicity in local newspaper. | 8 residents indicated an interest. |
| ‘local’ GFG Newsletter | This related to all aspects of the Green Code | Top-down | Top - down, but over time LAG Participants and other residents made small contributions. | The ‘local’ GFG Newsletter was used to advertise community focused projects and provide information relating to GC issues. | Primarily LAG participants, with occasional contribution from other residents |
| GFG village signs | None, but was important in terms of creating a community identity and an initial awareness raising about the PSCP. | Top-down and bottom - up (LAG Participants identified location for signs) | Top - down | None. | None |
Within both PPAs, the GFGO involved local Secondary, Primary and Infant schools in a range of projects related to the GC (see Tables 6.18 & 6.19). As Secondary Schools were outside each PPA, the GFGO involved them in fewer projects compared to Primary and Infant schools. The primary method through which local schools were involved in the PSCP, was through education and awareness raising of GC issues. This was delivered mostly through a series of educational talks targeting specific age groups, or in some instances the entire school. With the exception of a requested talk on ‘litter’ and providing support in developing an ‘Organic School Garden’ in Pantyscallog (Table 6.18), and taking part in an ‘Environmental Awareness Course’ in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (Table 6.19), all other projects were initiated by the GFGO. Tables 6.18 and 6.19 also indicate that twice as many projects were undertaken with local schools in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog compared to Pantyscallog. In comparison to Pantyscallog, in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog twice as many projects undertaken by local schools developed a link with the LAG_B. This may have been attributable to a number of LAG_B Participants having involvement with local schools, either as School Governors or members of the PTA (see Table 6.15). Consequently, this may have influenced the GFGO and the direction of the PSCP in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog.

Tables 6.18 & 6.19 indicate that projects involving practical activities with children outside the school area were successful in generating publicity in the local newspaper. However, in terms of encouraging further participation amongst residents in both PPAs, data from Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants has indicated that the overall impact of involving local schools was perceived to be limited primarily in terms of raising awareness of certain issues. Instigating projects through local schools was found to be more effective in raising awareness of the PSCP in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, as 29% of Non-LAG
Table 6.18: School involvement with the PSCP (Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Project/Issue</th>
<th>Project type</th>
<th>Initiated by GFGO</th>
<th>Link developed with LAG</th>
<th>Link developed with rest of PPA</th>
<th>Resulted in sustained participation</th>
<th>Link developed with other project partners</th>
<th>Publicity generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Eco - Schools Programme</td>
<td>Information educational &amp; yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Dog fouling</td>
<td>Educational &amp; yes involved with publicity,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Talk delivered by RSPCA on dog ownership.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Organic school garden</td>
<td>Educational &amp; practical inside school &amp; no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) GFG Calendar Competition</td>
<td>Educational &amp; awareness raising &amp; yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Litter</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ring - leader</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Walk to school Project</td>
<td>Educational &amp; practical &amp; yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Road Safety Officer was involved in road safety issues.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projects that did not result in sustained participation.*
Table 6.19: School involvement with the PSCP (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Project/Issue</th>
<th>Project type</th>
<th>Initiated by GFGO</th>
<th>Link developed with LAG</th>
<th>Link developed with rest of PPA</th>
<th>Resulted in sustained participation</th>
<th>Link developed with other project partners</th>
<th>Publicity generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Eco - Schools Programme</td>
<td>Information &amp; Educational</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Local Business Enterprise, MTCBC &amp; Keep Wales Tidy Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Environmental Awareness Course</td>
<td>Educational &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Parc Hen Project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Parc Hen Project *</td>
<td>Practical Consultation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 additional LAG participant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Princes Trust Bro, Groundwork Trust &amp; MTCBC.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants (Welsh medium)</td>
<td>4) GFG and GC</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants (Bedlinog)</td>
<td>5) Dog fouling</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ring leader</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Bulb planting</td>
<td>Educational &amp; Practical</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (Bedlinog Terrace)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Celtic Energy &amp; MTCBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (Bedlinog)</td>
<td>8) GFG Calendar Competition</td>
<td>Educational &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) Environmental issues</td>
<td>Educational &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) Abbey National Helping Hands Project (litter)</td>
<td>Educational &amp; Practical</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infants (Graig)</td>
<td>11) Bulb planting</td>
<td>Educational &amp; practical</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (Bedlinog Terrace)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Celtic Energy &amp; MTCBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Trelewis)</td>
<td>12) GFG Calendar Competition</td>
<td>Educational &amp; awareness raising</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Parc Hen Project *</td>
<td>Practical Consultation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 additional LAG Participant</td>
<td>Princes Trust Bro, Groundwork Trust &amp; MTCBC.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants reported that they had heard about the PSCP through this method (see Table 6.20), whereas in Pantyscallog, only 16% of Non-LAG Participants had heard about the PSCP through local schools (see Table 6.21). Within the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, raising awareness of the PSCP through local schools was identified as being more effective in raising awareness of the PSCP amongst residents that had regular contact with local schools. This included; juniors, teenagers, one-parent families and young families.

Although some school projects had been arranged around organised events in their respective PPA, such as the ‘Walk to School Project’ and the Planning for Real® Exercise in Pantyscallog, and the ‘Parc Hen Project’ in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, these were found not to encourage sustained participation (see Table 6.18 & 6.19). For example, the ‘Walk to School’ event in Pantyscallog did not result in sustained behavioural change as parents continued to take their children to school by car. The ineffectiveness of undertaking projects through local schools to encourage participation amongst other residents in both PPAs is further supported by data from Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants. As previously indicated in Table 6.13, only one Non-LAG Participant in Pantyscallog reported that they had participated in a community focused project. This project had not been developed with local schools. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, although nine Non-LAG Participants reported that they had participated in at least one community focused project, the largest proportion of residents that were retired/OAP and unemployed, who indicated during Focused Interviews that they did not have regular contact with local schools.
Table 6.21: Range of methods through which Non-LAG Participants had heard about the PSCP (Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-LAG Participants (n=24)</th>
<th>Local newspaper</th>
<th>Local GFG newsletter</th>
<th>Local schools</th>
<th>Through a local project</th>
<th>From researcher</th>
<th>GFG village signs</th>
<th>By word of mouth</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Total that had heard of the PSCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local authority built properties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfwr &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terraced 'type' properties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caercaca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private housing developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Households that had children which attended local schools.
6.5 Local Action Groups

Within each PPA, the LAG was the primary method used to encourage community participation in the PSCP. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of each LAG in encouraging community participation, the following issues need to be considered:

1) *Methods and processes* involved in establishing LAGs.
2) *Issues* encountered when encouraging community participation in LAGs.
3) *Who* participated in LAGs?
4) Why other residents *didn’t* participate in their respective LAG?
5) *Effectiveness* of each LAG in encouraging participation in the PSCP.

6.5.1 *Methods and processes involved in establishing LAGs*

As previously indicated in Chapter 3 (Section 3.4.3), local projects were to be managed by groups of local residents. On the basis of there being a different number of community groups and organisations in each PPA, the GFGO used different methods to encourage an initial interest in the PSCP and form a LAG.

**Pantyscallog**

As only a few community groups and organisations existed in Pantyscallog, a Planning for Real®

---

43 Planning for Real® is a technique that uses a 3D-scale model to enable residents to highlight issues and put forward their suggestions in order to achieve an improvement in their neighbourhood or community.
approach was decided upon by the GFGO prior to consultation with local residents. The reason for adopting this approach was indicated by the GFGO in a Focused Interview,

R: Why did you decide to carry out a Planning for Real exercise in Pant?
GFGO: Because it’s something that would bring the village together. Pant doesn’t have a lot of community groups but it might draw people together with similar interest and persuasions.

(Source: Focused interview with GFGO)

To attract residents to the consultation exercise, the local primary school developed a 3D model of their PPA. The Planning for Real® exercise involved a one-day event at the local primary school (March, 1997), and residents were given an opportunity to indicate what concerns they had about their PPA. The event was advertised by delivering leaflets to every household, and placing posters in shop windows and at the local Post Office (Appendix 16). Letters were also given to schoolchildren inviting their parents to take part in the event. In total, sixty-one residents participated in the exercise, with almost half being schoolchildren. Of those adults that attended, almost half indicated that they would be willing to participate in a LAG.

Following the Planning for Real® exercise, letters were sent to those residents that had expressed an interest in participating in a LAG, inviting them to attend the first LAGp meeting (May, 1997). No additional methods were used to advertise this meeting to other residents within the PPA. This first LAGp meeting attracted three residents who were aged fifty-five and over. These initial participants suggested that to increase participation in the LAGp, there was a need for the PSCP to firstly address local issues of concern, and secondly, develop a link with an existing community group such as the Pant Residents Association (PRA). This group was run and organised by residents that lived in the Local
Authority Housing Area, and met on a regular basis with local Elected Members and the Police Authority to discuss how they could tackle local issues of concern. In addition, participants also indicated that LAGp meetings and the PSCP needed to be advertised more effectively, and suggested using the local newspaper rather than placing posters in windows of local shops.

To increase participation in the LAGp, the GFGO attempted to encourage residents involved in the Pant Residents Association to participate in the PSCP by attending several of their meetings. However, as the following extract indicates, there was limited interest in the LAGp and the PSCP.

"...not many people stayed to listen about Going for Green. It was a bit like the novelty item at the end of the news...there was a bit of interest but not much."

(Source: GFGO, Observational Notes, LAG Meeting, Pantyscallog)

In addition to encouraging those residents that were involved with the PRA, a letter was also delivered to every street in the PPA inviting residents to attend the following LAG meeting (Appendix 17). The reasons for adopting this approach was that within each street, it was intended that the letter would be passed from household to household, and hopefully initiate conversation between neighbouring residents and encourage increased attendance at future LAGp meetings. Although this approach initially encouraged a further eight residents, they were primarily elderly residents and their attendance was only of limited duration, as the LAGp did not provide them with an opportunity from which to discuss their concerns with local Elected Members.

44 In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, this approach was found to be an effective method of generating interest and increasing attendance at LAG meetings.
Electoral Ward of Bedlinog

In comparison to Pantyscallog, the process involved in establishing a LAG in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog was initiated by the GFGO organising a public meeting (April, 1997). This initial meeting was decided upon without prior consultation with local residents. Posters were placed in bus shelters, local Post Offices, public houses, and a local newspaper, inviting those residents that were concerned about their local environment and PPA, to attend a public meeting (Appendix 18). The reason for using this approach from which to encourage an interest in establishing a LAG was indicated by the GFGO in a Focused Interview;

R Why did you use the approach of a public meeting?
GFGO Because from my information Trelewis and Bedlinog were motivated communities through the number of groups set up so I thought that they might feel that they would want to come to a public meeting that would inspire them to do something about their local environment

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)

The first public meeting was attended by five male residents, one of which was a Community Councillor. From this meeting the GFGO indicated that it was intended that those residents would form the LAGB.

“As far as I am concerned, this is the community group.”

(Source: GFGO, Observational Notes, First Public Meeting, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Residents that attended the first public meeting indicated those methods that had been used by the GFGO to advertise the meeting had been ineffective in terms of encouraging participation, and suggested that advertising by ‘word of mouth’, or making contact with existing community groups and organisations would have been more effective. In an
attempt to increase further interest amongst local residents in forming a LAGb, attendees suggested that a second public meeting needed to be arranged. This meeting was advertised by means of a letter, which was written by a resident that had attended the first public meeting and delivered to each street in the PPA indicating why he thought local residents should get involved with the PSCP (Appendix 19).

"Yes I remember that letter basically kicking people up the ass and telling them to get their acts together.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

This approach resulted in forty residents attending the second LAGb meeting. During that meeting, representatives from a number of community groups and organisations nominated themselves to form a LAGb, as they perceived that forming a group made up of representatives from existing community groups and organisations would be an effective method through which to take the PSCP forward. Although during the initial stages of the PSCP, eighteen representatives from a range of community groups and organisations participated in the LAGb, this reduced to seven within a period of four months (May 1997-September 1997) and the GC and PSCP did not reflect the interests of their particular group or organisation.

6.5.2 Issues encountered when encouraging community participation in LAGs.

Pantyscallog

Although the number of LAGp participants increased from three to eleven, evidence from this model research process found that their participation was only of short duration. Those residents that participated in the LAGp indicated throughout the PSCP that there was a lack of awareness amongst the majority of residents that lived in the PPA as to what the PSCP
was about, and the overall aim of the LAGP. Participants indicated that to increase participation, the PSCP needed to be of relevance and interest to local residents. As the GFGO and LAGP participants found it difficult to develop a link between local issues of concern and those included in the GC, five months after the PSCP had been introduced, the number of LAGP participants decreased to five (April 1997-August 1997), with those remaining participants being primarily elderly residents. These participants perceived that the LAGP was not effective in isolation, and that there was a need to develop ‘partnerships’ with other Agencies and Organisations that worked within their PPA, including the Police Authority, whose work remit related to residents’ local immediate needs and concerns. As LAGP Participants were unable to take action in relation to addressing residents immediate concerns, within eleven months of establishing the LAGP (March 1997-February, 1998), the number of participants reduced to one. At this stage the LAGP was considered to be an ineffective approach from which to encourage participation in the PSCP, and the GFGO altered the approach taken by attempting to generate interest and implement the GC through the Pant Residents Association.

Despite being in existence for twelve months and regularly attended by fourteen residents, the Pant Residents Association was unable to make progress on local issues of concern through their involvement with the PSCP. Consequently, as the following extract indicates, attendees became increasingly apathetic in relation to the lack of progress that had been made.

“It’s like peeing into the wind and putting your head against a brick wall.”

(Source: Chairman PRA, Observational notes, PRA Meeting, March, 1998)
Although the GFGO made several attempts to develop project ideas by linking local issues of concern with the GC, evidence from the model research process has indicated that this approach did not encourage participation in community focused projects.

R Do you think that the PRA was an ideal way through which to introduce and encourage participation in the PSCP?
GFGO It can, it's just a case of linking in with the community group that is already meeting and they've started to show an interest within their area.
R How much support do you think GFG is getting through these PRA meetings? How much community support?
GFGO I do think it is beyond their actual concern, their immediate concern at the moment, but having said that they don't really know how to deal with their initial concern anyway which is crime ... There is a noticeable difference of people who for the first time ever are belonging to a group compared to Bedlinog. You've got well practised people in the way of having meetings and getting stuff done. Even still they are on a learning curve, but there's a big difference anyway.

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)

Electoral Ward of Bedlinog

During the initial stages of the PSCP, LAGB Participants highlighted a number of issues in relation to encouraging community participation. Firstly, different methods would be required to encourage participation in the villages of Bedlinog and Trelewis, as they were perceived as being separate communities with their own individual identity. Secondly, the majority of residents were reluctant to participate in the PSCP as they were sceptical as to how much influence the LAGB would have in terms of influencing local authority decision-making.

"... in the last ten years in Bedlinog they have asked and asked and asked and they won't answer anymore because nothing has ever become of it."

(Source: LAG Participants, Observational Notes, LAG Meeting, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

LAGB Participants also indicated throughout the duration of the PSCP that to generate
interest and encourage further participation, small projects needed to be completed relatively quickly to overcome apathy, and demonstrate the effectiveness of the LAG_B in bringing about change.

"Perhaps once local can see something's happening, then more people will become interested in what we are doing."

(Source: Observational Data, LAG_B Meeting, July 1997)

Furthermore, community focused projects needed to be relevant to residents and relate to their 'local' environment as opposed to those wider environmental issues included in the GC. As the following extract indicates, even the name GFG was found to discourage people from participating in the PSCP,

"The very name of 'Going for Green' has put a lot of people off because they think it's concerned with the ozone layer and stuff like that."

(Source: LAG_B Participant, Observational Notes LAG Meeting, July 1997)

6.5.3 Who participated in LAGs?

Table 6.22 indicates that the LAG_B was found to be more effective in encouraging participation as it had ten consistent participants, whereas the LAG_P had only four consistent participants. This finding is also supported by further evidence from this model research process, as during the initial stages of establishing both LAGs, both Observational Data and Documentary Evidence found that there had been a greater level of interest in the LAG_B as more residents attended LAG_B meetings. As illustrated in Table 6.22, the number of Non-LAG_B Participants that reported having attended a LAG_B meeting was also almost twice as many compared to Pantyscallog. Furthermore, following the official end of the PSCP and the withdrawal of support from the GFGO in April 1999, the LAG_B was still in
existence at the time that Focused Group Interviews were conducted with LAG Participants (October, 1999), whereas the LAG₁ had a limited existence of eleven months (see Table 6.22).

**Table 6.22: Effectiveness of LAGs in encouraging community participation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of consistent LAG Participants*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-LAG Participants that had attended a LAG meeting**</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LAG Participants that had heard about the PSCP**</td>
<td>(n=24) 12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>(n=24) 21 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LAG Participants that had heard about the PSCP via LAG participants**</td>
<td>(n=4) 0 (0%)</td>
<td>(n=10) 9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of LAG†</td>
<td>11 months (March 1997 – February 1998)</td>
<td>30 months (April 1997 – October 1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Source: Focused group interview with LAG Participants)
** (Source: Focused interviews with Non-LAG Participants)
† Refers to the time that Focused Group Interviews were conducted with LAG Participants.

The profile of those residents that participated in LAGs in both PPAs also differed. Table 6.23 indicates that in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog there were more than twice as many female participants as there were male participants, whereas in Pantyscallog, there were an equal number of male and female participants. Although there were a greater number of LAG participants over sixty years of age in both PPAs (see Table 6.14), within the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the age range of LAG₂ participants was greater, with six participants between forty and fifty-nine years of age.

**Table 6.23: Number and Gender of consistent LAG Participants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pantyscallog (n=4)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of consistent participants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: LAG Participants Profile Questionnaire, Focused Group Interview)
Table 6.24 indicates that a greater proportion of LAG Participants in both PPAs were over sixty years of age, and none were below the age of forty. Although the number of LAG\textsubscript{P} participants involved in a Focused Group Interview was relatively small, the proportion of LAG\textsubscript{P} participants within each age category was between two and three times greater than that expected from Census population characteristics.

Table 6.24: Comparison of LAG Profile with population characteristics of both PPAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Pantyscallog Population Characteristics* (male &amp; female)</th>
<th>LAG Profile† (male &amp; female)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog Population Characteristics* (male &amp; female)</th>
<th>LAG Profile† (male &amp; female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40 yrs</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 yrs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 yrs+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data based on 1991 Census.
† Data based on responses received from LAG Participant Profile Questionnaire.

In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the number of years that LAG\textsubscript{B} participants had lived in their PPA ranged from three participants having lived there for 0-10 years, through to two participants having lived there for 61 years or more (see Table 6.25). In comparison, the number of years that LAG\textsubscript{P} participants had lived in their respective PPA was less wide ranging, with participants having lived there between 21 and 60 years.

Table 6.25: Number of years LAG Participants had lived in their PPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Pantyscallog (n=4)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (30%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 yrs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 yrs</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 yrs</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 yrs</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60 yrs</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 + yrs</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These LAG participants were also involved in other community groups and organisations in their PPA.
As previously indicated in Table 6.15, compared to LAGp, more than four times as many LAGB Participants were involved with other community groups and organisations in their PPA. These LAGB participants also had a wider range of experience in relation to their responsibilities and those activities they had undertaken as a result of being involved with such groups (see Tables 6.26 & 6.27). Although the following extract indicates that LAGB participants perceived themselves as being ‘very ordinary people’, and not the most articulate of residents that lived in their respective PPA, data from Semi-Structured Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and Focused Group Interviews with LAGB participants has indicated that it was perceived that the same residents participated in the majority of the ‘local committees’.

Table 6.26: Responsibilities held by LAG Participants in other community groups and organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>LAGp (n=4)</th>
<th>LAGb (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing letters and reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting assessments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number that held</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: LAG Participants Profile Questionnaire)
Table 6.27: LAG Participants involvement with other community groups and organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of activities</th>
<th>LAG F (n=4)</th>
<th>LAG B (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose planning applications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number that were involved with other activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 (50%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 (90%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: LAG Participants Profile Questionnaire)

R  Who is actually involved in the Going for Green group?
M1  The crème de la crème of Bedlinog.
All  Laugh.
F1  And Trelewis.
R  Who is involved, what sort of people?
M1  Very ordinary people.
F1  With a lot of enthusiasm.
M  Enthusiasm, vision, hopes, dreams.
R  Would you say you are the most articulate?
All  No.
F1  No, I wouldn't say that.
M1  No more than the next person.
F1  The average man, or woman . . .
R  So what sort of people are you?
M1  Very ordinary.
F1  Just ordinary.
M1  Ordinary individuals.
M2  Dedicated.
F2  People who worry about . . . who want their children and grand children to grow up in a better place . . .
Data obtained from Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions have also indicated that a broad range of research participants were sceptical as to whether the PSCP would be able to encourage participation by residents other than the ‘converted’.

"It’s the same people that are on most of the committees in the village.”

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

“... most of these are of other organisations like Diane and Yvonne, they are members of the PTA. We’ve got a strong PTA in Bedlinog the same as everything else ... I think if you are interested in something you belong to it. Different organisations in Bedlinog whether it's darts or it's always a small core of workers, they may not join anything else and you'll never get everybody to join everything.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

“... this is my view. 'Going for Green with the best will in the world was actually parachuted in and ... certain members of the community latched onto it, great, but I certainly don’t get the feeling that local people are saying ‘this is ours’.”

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

### 6.5.4 Why other residents didn't participate in their respective LAG

To evaluate whether the LAG was an effective method through which to encourage community participation in both PPAs, there is also a need to identify why other residents didn’t participate in their respective LAG. Data from Focused Group Interviews with LAG Participants from both PPAs has indicated there were three main reasons why the majority
of residents living in both PPAs didn't participate in their respective LAG. Firstly, the local authority was perceived to hold the main responsibility for improving and cleaning up their environment. Secondly, the remit of the PSCP and the LAG was not perceived to be of interest to the majority of residents that lived in both PPAs, as it did not relate to them on a personal basis. Thirdly, particularly in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, both Observational data and Focused Interviews with LAG_B participants indicated that the majority of residents did not perceive that participating in the LAG_B would result in any significant change within their PPA as there was a lack of uncertainty as to whether they would be able to influence the local authorities decision-making processes.

F1 They all want it.
F2 But they don't want to do the work.
F3 They don't want to get involved.
F2 They leave it to somebody else to do it.
F3 You look at the compost bins and the water butts.
F1 I think it's because all the years we say the same thing, talk to any councillor, member of the public all the money goes up there. Nothing is spent down here. We all say the same and that's how we got into a rut really. People think oh god what's the point they're not going to have nothing.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_B Participants)

"Going for Green is seen as part of the Council. They have no faith in them up there . . . They agree with it, but they'll believe it when they see it."

(Source: Observational Data: LAG_B Meeting, May 1998, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"What is it about? That's a good question, because I've asked myself that a couple of times, what is it about especially after hearing what's going on, because you know, uh 'Going for Green' is fair enough, we are doing our best to improve the environment, but I'm afraid that we've got to have a better remit than we've got. An organisation has got to be something more than a talking shop; it's got to have teeth, now I don't see any teeth. I have spoken to the Chairman privately right and I would like to see, I would, to put a scheme forward which would show us how much a real interest and how much a real backing the local authority will give us. It's got to be more than a talking shop."

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"...what angers me more than anything else...is I feel that people in the community will say there's a certain comfort in dicing, you know, and um that makes them cynical because that's their defence mechanism. ...And the last thing you want to hear you know, is someone saying well there's a way of doing this, you've got to get of your arse and fight for it. And they don't want to hear that. Because then it means then that there's a hidden agenda then, that means that I've got to do something and the
last time that I did I got a lamping, you know so I’m better off doing nothing. So leave it to somebody else, you know, the council, the, whoever, then, you know, really the em. This is a very depressed area by anybody’s reckoning, you know. It gets to that stage in the end that you become completely incapacitated as a community or class or whatever you want to say, or group of people you know, they become incapacitated themselves, and you know, it’s not a nice thing to look at, you know. But its not that I dislike, what I dislike is the system that has done that and rendered them into that condition you know . . . people will say ‘they’re all apathetic, they don’t want to do anything’. But I think the basis of all apathy is two things. One is fear, because last time they had a go they got hammered . . . And then secondly, ‘cause is it bloody worth it really’, they can make that analysis . . . That’s why you have people saying ‘I don’t want to work on a scheme’. It’s not because they’re lazy or anything, it’s because it’s not worth it. It doesn’t do anything for me. You know, it’s not worth anything for me. Middle class attitude would be ‘well, it’s good for you. You should have it, you should want it’, ‘cause it’s good for you’ . . . And they say ‘bugger it, I don’t care’ (laughs) you have it. Who are you to say what’s good for me?’ . . . You know what I mean? You know. And it’s the same with anything like this, that’s conceived of outside the objective demands.”

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

### 6.5.5 Effectiveness of LAG in encouraging community participation

**Pantyscallog**

In Pantyscallog, LAGp meetings were initially perceived by participants as being a ‘one stop shop’ through which residents could express their concerns to Local Authority Officers and local Elected Members. Similar to the experience of those residents that were involved with the PRA, despite having a number of project ideas, participants did not have the necessary skills or capacity to take those ideas forward. Consequently, they required continuous support and guidance from various Agencies and Organisations when deciding how to address their local concerns. When reflecting upon their experience of participating in the PSCP, LAGp participants indicated during a Focused Group Interview that forming a LAG from only those residents who came forward to participate did not generate the most effective group from which to take project ideas forward with their PPA. Instead, it was perceived that a better alternative would have been to recruit representatives from those community groups and organisations that existed within the PPA, so as to reflect the diversity of interest groups within the PPA. In addition, LAGp participants also indicated that it was necessary to involve those residents that had ‘the gift of the gob’, due to their
ability to get things done.

**Electoral Ward of Bedlinog**

In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, data from this model research process has also indicated that LAG$_B$ Participants and Non-LAG$_B$ Participants perceived that establishing a LAG composed of representatives from a number of different community groups and organisations was an effective method through which to develop a consensus as to what action needed to be taken in their PPA. LAG$_B$ participants also perceived the LAG was an effective method through which to access and influence local authority decision-making processes. Participating as a group as opposed to individuals, LAG$_B$ participants perceived themselves as having a ‘louder voice’ and ‘more power’.

“... a carrot and stick, a vehicle for locals to be heard and listened to, something that would shake the Council up and ensure that action would be taken.”

(Source: LAG$_B$ Participant, Observational Notes, LAG Meeting, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

In terms of encouraging participation in the LAG$_B$, the GFGO was perceived by LAG$_B$ participants as a useful source of information, and a point of contact for the local authority. Although the LAG$_B$ was a new community structure from which to encourage participation, it was perceived by LAG$_B$ Participants as providing an opportunity for those residents who were concerned about their local environment to come together and decide what action needed to be taken. Due to the existing skills and capacity of LAG$_B$ participants, this enabled them to utilise and build upon those skills and experiences they had gained from their previous involvement with other community groups and organisations. Evidence from this model research process has also identified that in comparison to LAG$_P$, the LAG$_B$ was more effective in raising awareness of the PSCP. As
indicated in Table 6.22, almost twice as many Non-LAG\textsubscript{B} Participants reported during Focused Interviews that they had heard about the PSCP through LAG\textsubscript{B} Participants.

"...they're always putting notices up about GFG and its in the paper and if you don’t go to the meetings you do know what's going on there."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG\textsubscript{B} Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

6.6 Community Focused Projects

In addition to establishing LAGs, a number of community focused projects were also undertaken within each PPA. To evaluate their effectiveness in encouraging community participation, the following issues need to be considered;

1) Who was involved in generating and implementing project ideas?
2) What methods were used to encourage participation in the community focused projects?
3) Who participated in community focused projects?
4) Was there a relationship between the types of projects undertaken and the number and range of participants?

Despite a number of project ideas being suggested by LAG Participants in both PPAs, it was only those projects listed in Tables 6.16 and 6.17 that were undertaken. Research findings from this model research process have raised a number of issues in relation to those community focused projects in terms of encouraging community participation in the PSCP. Firstly, more than twice as many projects were undertaken in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog compared to Pantyscallog. Secondly, those projects that did not relate to local issues of concern were generally found to be least effective in terms of encouraging community participation. Thirdly, although those projects that related to local issues of
concern were found to be more effective in terms of encouraging community participation, they did not result in sustained participation. It could be argued that these projects only encouraged community participation as they focused on special organised one-off events. Indeed, data collected from the Longitudinal Survey, Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group Discussions also indicated that despite undertaking a community focused project in Pantyscallog which aimed to tackle dog fouling, the problem was still perceived to exist.

"Not a lot of thought went into putting dog foul boxes throughout the village. Do they really think that people with dogs are going to use them. People need educating and not many have common sense to do anything about it."

(Source: Longitudinal Study Phase Two, Pantyscallog)

The ineffectiveness of community focused projects in encouraging sustained participation is also supported by data collected from the Longitudinal Survey (Table 6.28). In terms of attitude and behavioural change, only three issues were found to have resulted in a positive change since the first baseline survey had been conducted. Those issues were; walking short distances (Pantyscallog only), and, having heard about the PSCP (both PPAs). Although there had been a positive change, this was mostly in terms of increasing awareness raising of the PSCP, and not sustained behavioural or attitude change towards GC issues.

Table 6.28: Positive household changes towards GC issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>p &lt; 0.05</th>
<th>Bonferonni adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantyscallog</td>
<td>Walking short distances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heard of the PSCP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Ward of</td>
<td>Walking short distances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedlinog</td>
<td>Heard of the PSCP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey)
Fourthly, although publicity in a local newspaper and the ‘local’ GFG newsletter was used to raise awareness of the PSCP and encourage participation in community focused projects within both PPAs, data from this model research process has indicated that the ‘local’ GFG newsletter was least effective in terms of raising awareness of the PSCP. As indicated in Table 6.29, 14% and 9% of responding households from Pantyscallog and the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog respectively reported that they had heard about the PSCP through the ‘local’ GFG newsletter. Similarly, Tables 6.20 and 6.21 also indicate that only three Non-LAG Participants in both PPAs had heard of the PSCP through the 'local' GFG newsletter. Furthermore, Non-LAG Participants in Pantyscallog indicated that one of the reasons why they did not participate in the PSCP extended from not being aware that projects were being undertaken.

"To be honest I haven't had any interest in it . . . to think so much going on is surprising. I haven't heard much about it through the Merthyr Express really. I was talking to a man and he didn't know there was a community centre around here, not a community centre as such, but that place in Heddwch Close. He didn't know it was there and he's live in Pant longer than us. The thing is people are afraid to leave their houses and park their cars down the bottom, you know school disco at four o'clock and people are getting their cars pinched, or Christmas concerts and people are having their cars taken."

(Source: Focused interview, Non-LAGp Participant, Pantyscallog)

". . . we knew about the dog fouling project because we commented on the bins as they appeared. We didn't know what they were at first until we had a look."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAGp Participant, Pantyscallog)
Table 6.29: Range of methods through which households had heard about the PSCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of methods</th>
<th>Pantyscallog (n=84)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog (n=158)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td>28 (33%)</td>
<td>37 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Press</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘local’ GFG Newsletter</td>
<td>12 (14%)</td>
<td>14 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFG village signs</td>
<td>15 (18%)</td>
<td>15 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local schools</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG Participants</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>13 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Residents Association</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours/word of mouth</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>16 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of work</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Wales Tidy Campaign</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTCBC</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Longitudinal Survey, Phase Two)

Fifthly, where LAG Participants had been involved in project implementation, this method was found to be more effective in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog than in Pantyscallog, in terms of raising awareness of the PSCP and encouraging community participation (Tables 6.16 & 6.17). Sixthly, in comparison to LAGp, LAGB participants played a more active role during the PSCP and had greater influence in both project generation and implementation (Tables 6.16 & 6.17). Although LAGB participants’ involvement in initial community focused projects was limited, Observational and Documentary evidence from this model research process have indicted that having had previous committee and group skills, within a relatively short period of time LAGB participants had more influence in relation to what projects were undertaken, and organised a number of community focused projects with little or no support from the GFGO. Examples include; the Parc Hen Consultation Exercise and Colly Row Project. In the case of the Parc Hen Project, this resulted in one additional resident becoming involved with the LAGB. In the case of the Colly Row Project, those residents that lived within the immediate vicinity were also encouraged and got involved. However, Non-LAGB Participants reported during Focused
Interviews that they were sceptical as to whether this would have a knock on effect throughout the entire PPA and encourage increased participation in the PSCP.

“I would say that most people in the village know about GFG . . . its had a big impact it’s certainly made the place look a lot tidier and I think the view of most of the people is that it should have been done along time ago like. Cause everything has been left to run down and run down and it’s marvellous to see it I know the people at Colly Row appreciate it very much and the people at Bedlinog Terrace they see it day in day out and people living in the area. I know they appreciate it but on the other hand they don’t want to get involved in doing something else see you know what I mean they say oh that’s a good idea I could give a few hours or something like that, but they don’t because it’s the same gang and most of them are elderly women, you know GFG, and its nice to see them getting involved it a pity other people don’t get involved as well.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

“It’s hard to gather enthusiasm round here unless it touches their house.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

“Colly Row oh that was brilliant . . . they bought plants and put them out. I though it looked great really nice . . . Half of the people in this village are too lazy to get up and scratch their ass and that’s the truth. Especially the ones that leave school until about twenty-six they can just about go and get their dole that’s how I feel about all of them youngsters.”

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

To identify those residents that were most likely to participate in community focused projects, no formal evaluation was conducted at the time projects were undertaken. However, results obtained from Focused Interviews with Non-LAG Participants have raised a number of issues relating to their effectiveness in encouraging participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. In Pantyscallog, Table 6.13 indicates that only one Non-LAGp Participant reported having participated in at least one community focused project, the ‘Organic Gardening Project’. This Non-LAGp Participant indicated at the time of the Focused Interview that he already had an interest in the topic, and was attracted by the prospect of being able to purchase subsidised gardening equipment. In comparison, in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, nine Non-LAGB Participants reported that they had participated in at least one community focused project (see Table 6.13). With the exception
of those juniors and teenagers that were involved in community focused projects introduced through local schools by the GFGO, those that participated were mainly retired/OAPs and unemployed residents. This finding suggests that it was primarily those residents that had time to spare, who reported they had participated in community focused projects. Data from Focused Interviews with Non-LAG_B Participants has also been found to support this finding, as having a ‘lack of time’ was reported to be one of the primary main reasons as to why Non-LAG_B Participants did not get involved in the PSCP.

“... what I tend to get involved in are things that I can actually help with like if there is something going on like this school amalgamation, not necessarily something legal but if they need someone to make a representation then I’ll do that... I just think that what individuals can do will vary from individual to individual. I’m happy for people to make use of my skills as much as they are, but it would be more difficult for me to devote a day digging a trench.”

(Source: Focused Interview with Non-LAG_B Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

7.3.3 GFG Steering Committee

Chapter 6 (Section 6.2.4) has previously indicated that the GFG Steering Committee was a predefined management structure, composed of representatives from local Voluntary Organisations, Agencies and Businesses, whose work remit related to those issues included in the GC (see Appendix 15). Both Documentary Evidence and Observational Data from found that this Steering Committee did not facilitate increased community participation in the PSCP as the majority of its membership interests related to GC issues (an exception was Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil). Due to the lack of interest in the GC within both PPAs (see Table 6.11 & 6.12), the only way some of the GC Projects were implemented was by some Steering Committee members getting involvement in one-off type projects, which were implemented using a top-down approach. For example, the Hippo Bag Project (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog), and the Energy Conservation Project (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog & Pantyscallog) (see Tables 6.15 & 6.16). As LAGs from both PPAs were not
actively involved in the GFG Steering Committee, no effective relationship was established between PPAs and Steering Committee members. As a result, this model research process found that by not being able to develop effective partnerships with MTCBC and other Steering Committee members, this inhibited LAGg participant's ability to sustain their level of participation as they encountered difficulties in completing community focused projects once the PSCP had officially ended.

So far this chapter has outlined those components that were used to support the local authority in promoting community participation in the PSCP, and considered the effectiveness of the GC and those methods and processes used to implementing the PSCP in both PPAs. Section 6.7 will now discuss those research findings in relation to the thematic framework for participatory processes and evaluate the effectiveness of those methods and processes used to encourage community participation in the PSCP.

6.7 Discussion

Although the PSCP has been viewed as having potential significance for LA21 (Voisey et al, 1996) and providing a rudimentary learning base through which to fulfil the objectives of sustainable development (Christie, 1994; Smith et al, 1999), these results have raised a number of issues relating to the PSCP as a model from which to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to the achievement of sustainable development.

6.7.1 Going for Green's Strategy

The strategy adopted by GFG to promote community participation in the PSCP was found
to be similar to those 'top-down' strategies used by local authorities within the context of implementing the LA21 process (Young, 1996a). Those components that were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP had been predetermined by GFG. To support GFGs strategy, the role of the GFGO was to promote the GC and co-ordinate community action within both PPAs. The GFG Steering Committee also supported GFGs approach to encouraging participation as it had an educational and advisory role to both PPAs on GC issues.

GFG was not found to promote the need for a strategic and long-term approach to achieving sustainable development within both PPAs as the PSCP was the responsibility of an environmental officer. Similar to the experiences of local authorities involved in implementing the LA21 process, the PSCP was found to promote a continuation of the local authorities’ environmental protection role as opposed to encouraging the development of a more integrated approach to decision-making (Church, 1995; Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995; Wilks & Hall, 1995; Thomas & Tuxworth, 1996; Church et al, 1998; Voisey, 1998; Selman, 2000).

To encourage sustainable lifestyle changes within both PPAs, a range of methods were used to promote the GC and explain how it could be converted into practical action. This approach was based on an assumption that the primary barrier to translating environmental concern into action was a lack of information (Eden, 1996; Myers & Macnaghten, 1998; Blake, 1999) and individuals would respond to messages in a similar way. However, from an early stage of implementing the PSCP, the findings obtained from this research and other PSCP associated University found that the process of encouraging community action was much complex (Blake, 1999; Smith et al, 2000). Although those methods that were
used to raise awareness of the PSCP in both PPAs had been effective, there was a low level of understanding as to what the GC and PSCP aimed to achieve. Furthermore, only a minority of residents within both PPAs had taken part in community focused projects. GFGs ineffectiveness in encouraging participation was also found in other PSCP areas (Blake & Carter, 1997; Percy et al, 1999; Smith et al, 2000). For example, in Huntingdonshire, whilst 75% respondents had heard of GFG at the end of the PSCP, only 4% had taken part.

6.7.2 Promoting the Green Code

GFG's interpretation and approach to delivering its sustainable development message was encompassed within its GC. As opposed to making advances on those 'soft' sustainability issues which had been addressed by local authorities through the LA21 process (Church, 1995; Tuxworth & Carpenter, 1995; Wilks & Hall, 1995; Thomas & Tuxworth, 1996; Church et al, 1998; Voisey, 1998; Selman, 2000) GFG focused on repackaging and promoting traditional environmental issues which related to environmental protection (Voicey & O'Riordan, 1997; Church et al, 1998; Selman, 2000). Through the PSCP, GFG was found to be promoting an anthropocentric or 'light green' approach to achieving sustainable development as the GC did not include issues relating to social equality and meeting the needs of a broad range of community stakeholders. However, within both PPAs those environmental and general issues of concern were found to extend beyond the remit of the GC and differ in terms of their relative significance, a finding that has also been echoed from the experiences of other PSCPs (Smith et al, 1999). Subsequently, the PSCP was perceived to be irrelevant by the majority of residents in both PPAs as it related to the wider global environment as opposed to their immediate locality. It should be
highlighted that although GFG's own commissioned research found that over half of research participants (51%) indicated that they were not interested in receiving advice in relation to doing more to help the environment (see Figure 3.2) GFG still continued to develop an approach that focused on encouraging individuals to take action on environmental issues.

Promoting a single model from which to achieve sustainable development within both PPAs, the depth of insight provided by this research process found that the GC restricted influenced participation in the PSCP in a number of different ways. In Pantyscallog, the number of LAG participants was relatively small, and participation was not sustained. It was found that only those residents that had an existing concern for environmental issues participated in community focused projects. The ineffectiveness of using a predetermined agenda from which to encourage has also been reiterated by other Universities involved with the PSCP (Smith et al, 2000). To increase the number of participants in LAGs and community focused projects, the GFGO made attempts to link the GC with local issues of concern, such as the 'Job Finder Bus Service' (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog) and the Safe Routes to School' (Pantyscallog). However, the results from this thesis have indicated that the design of the PSCP was unable to provide an effective framework within which to develop strategic 'partnerships' with other agencies and organisations from which to achieve sustained improvements within both PPAs as projects were arranged around one-off type projects and did not result in sustained participation. Research findings from the experiences of LA21 have also demonstrated that local authorities encountered difficulties in encouraging participation beyond those with an environmental interest (Bond et al, 1998; Selman, 1998; Voisey et al; 2001).
6.7.3 Role of the individual

GFGs approach to encouraging participation placed emphasis on the role of the individual by developing an awareness of the relationship between individual human activity and environmental destruction. This approach represented an anthropocentric approach to achieving sustainable development as individuals were viewed as consumers of the environment as opposed to citizens that interact with it and within it. In relation to taking action on GC issues, no specific targets had been set by GFG. Although individual attitudes and behaviour changes are an important aspect of sustainability (Roseland, 2000; Selman, 2000), results from this study and other PSCP areas have found that encouraging participation on a voluntary basis was ineffective in securing sustained participation (Smith et al, 2000).

6.7.4 Methods and Processes

To encourage participation in the PSCP, three target groups were used to encourage community participation in the PSCP; local schools, the wider community through community focused projects, and a LAG from which to manage and co-ordinate those projects.

Education and information sharing through schools are often used by various public institutions to convey their message to the wider public. For example, road safety, and litter reduction campaigns. However, this thesis found that the impact of using this approach was restricted to awareness raising as opposed to encouraging participation in the PSCP. Although some projects developed a direct link between local schools with the
wider community, these were also found to be ineffective in encouraging participation.

Within both PPAs, the GFGO adopted different methods to encourage an initial interest in the PSCP and from which to establish a LAG. These methods offered different types of involvement and their selection was based on a consideration of the number of community groups and organisations that existed within each PPA. The results from this thesis have found that both methods were not effective in encouraging participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. An important issue in analysing and understanding any approach to participation is who participates and their representativeness (Arnstein, 1969; Richardson, 1983; Atkinson & Cope, 1987). However, the focus of the UniCR was to measure households' lifestyle changes as opposed to evaluating whether the PSCP had been effective in encouraged participation by a broad range of community stakeholders in both PPAs. Combining research findings from the exploratory phase and the explanatory phase, this study found that the LAG restricted participation to those community stakeholders that held an existing interest in environmental issues and were committee members of a number of community groups and organisations. Using LAG participants' categorisation of those community stakeholders within their respective PPA, this thesis also found that by not considering the range of identities that existed within each PPA, the use of single methods from which to encourage participation in community focused projects had been relatively ineffective. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, project participants were found to be of a similar identity to LAG participants. Those community stakeholders that did not participate in community focused projects did not perceive them to be of direct benefit. As different people will respond to environment information and persuasion in different ways (Myers & Macnaghten, 1998) this finding indicates that GFG's interpretation of a community as a population in situ was inappropriate as it did not
account for the range of different identities or interests that existed within each PPA. Similarly, results from the PSCP in Huntingdonshire has also found that within each PPA a range of barriers existed and GFGs 'blueprint' approach was viewed as being inappropriate (Blake, 1999).

6.8 Conclusion

The results presented in this chapter have so far indicated that GFG's strategy was an ineffective approach from which to encourage participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. As the GC did not relate to immediate priorities within both PPAs this inhibited participation in community focused projects. Furthermore, the GC was also found to restrict the scope of participation as it involved implementing pre-determined decisions as opposed to being involved in the process in which decisions were being made. By not identifying the range of identities that existed within each PPA, GFGs model restricted the range of community stakeholders that were encouraged to participate in community focused projects and both LAG.

This chapter has evaluated how the PSCP was promoted and the appropriateness of those specific methods and approaches used to encourage participation within both PPAs. It has also identified outcomes and some initial factors that were found to influence the participatory process. Chapter 7 will now focus on the experiences of LAG participants, as they were involved in deciding how the GC would be implemented within each PPA.
Chapter 7: Project Outcomes and Factors Influencing Participation.

7.1 Introduction

The previous chapter (Chapter 6) has looked at the overall strategy that was used to promote community participation in the PSCP. It has also discussed those specific methods and approaches that were used to encourage community participation including the GC, community focused projects, involving local schools and setting up a LAG. These have been evaluated by identifying their outcomes and effectiveness in encouraging community participation. This chapter will now focus on the experiences of those residents that participated in each LAG, and evaluate those outcomes and impacts that were achieved. The chapter will also discuss wider factors that were found to influence community participation in the PSCP.

For the purpose of presenting and discussing the research findings, this chapter is organised into four parts. The first (Section 7.2) will identify and evaluate those outcomes achieved by each LAG. The second (Section 7.3) will identify and analyse those impacts made by the PSCP within each PPA and on the future work of those Agencies and Organisations that were involved in terms of the GFG Steering Committee or undertaking community focused projects. Within Section 7.2 & 7.3 specific reference will be made to data previously presented in Chapter 6. Although Chapter 6 and the previous sections of this chapter will have identified some initial factors that influenced community participation in both PPAs, Section 7.4 will discuss those additional factors that have not been covered elsewhere. Finally, Section 7.5 will consider the research findings presented in this chapter and discuss their implications in relation to the effectiveness of the PSCP as
an approach from which to implement the participatory aspect of achieving sustainable development.

7.2 Local Action Groups

Within each PPA, project generation and implementation differed quite significantly. As previously indicated in Chapter 6, the majority of community focused projects undertaken in Pantyscallog were generated and implemented using a top-down approach, with LAG\textsubscript{P} Participants contributing to just two projects; the 'Dog Fouling' and the 'Anti-motorbike Landscaping' Project (see Table 6.16 column 3). In comparison, LAG\textsubscript{B} participants were involved with project generation and implementation from an early stage of their involvement with the PSCP. As indicated in Table 6.17 (columns 3 & 4) LAG\textsubscript{B} participants contributed to a total of nine community focused projects within their PPA. Although six community focused projects related to Point 5 of the GC, 'Looking After the Local Environment' (see column 2), LAG\textsubscript{B} participants indicated throughout the duration of the PSCP, and during a Focused Group Interview, that not all aspects of the GC had provided a focus for those projects that had been undertaken, as their main issues of concern lay at the fringe of what GFG was attempting to promote through its GC.

R At the beginning Going for Green came into the village, and they had a Green Code. . . . what Going for Green wanted to achieve and what you wanted to achieve, were they the same? Did they overlap?

M No, totally different . . . you've got the five points and I would argue that if you reversed them and put the 'local environment' first not last we'd be in agreement with the, but I've argued and we've all argued that it's no good looking to recycle material if we are throwing that material on the road. And we'd argued always as a group, the local environment first and the we'd talk about recycling. It is the reverse of what Going for Green want to achieve. In principle we agree with it all. 'Sensible travelling' in principle we agree with it all but sensible travel got to be under our guidance not how Prescott sees it, deputy prime minister. It's alright talking about taking cars off the road but you've got to have something in it's place. You've got to look at where we're living before you decide to take cars of the road. We agree it needs it, there is no question about it.

F1 The local environment first . . . the dream of this group has been, let's get the environment cleaned up and then we'll go onto the other things.
All (Agreed)
F2 To give us something to be proud of. To walk down the street and say isn’t this lovely.
M And to say you will not drop your litter, and you will not be allowed to park your car.
F2 That everything is in its place.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_b Participants)

"The Green Code should be linked with issues closer to home. Litter, informing people that if they drop litter they could cost a lot of jobs. A link needs to be made between the environmental effects of litter and the effects on the local economy of the Valley."

(Source: LAG_b Meeting, Observational Notes, April, 1997)

"The Green Code should be reversed, point five should have been top of their list."

(Source: LAG_b Meeting, Observational Notes, August, 1997)

"Once the village is tidy and clean then you can get people to do other things."

(Source: LAG_b Meeting, Observational Notes, January, 1998)

"Point five it’s more important than the other, it should be top of the list I’d argue, for the village. If we’d worked that way and come down to the others instead of coming down from the other things and finding that at the bottom . . . its like a hierarchy."

(Source: LAG_b Meeting, Observational Notes, September, 1999)

This model research process has also found that both the level and range of existing skills, and previous experience of group management amongst LAG_b participants, was influential in terms of those outcomes that resulted from implementing the PSCP in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog. As previously indicated in Chapter 6, LAG_p participants had relatively few existing skills and experience of group management prior to their involvement with the PSCP (see Table 6.26, column 2 & 6.27, column 2). Consequently, both Documentary Evidence and Observational Data have identified that LAG_p participants placed a continuous dependence on professionals for guidance and direction in relation to generating and implementing project ideas.
Despite its associated limitations, Arnstein's Ladder of Participation (1969) was used to develop an increased understanding of the *level* of participation that occurred within each LAG (see Section 5.5.5.6). Figure 7.1 illustrates that LAGp participants perceived their level of participation in the PSCP did not increase beyond Rung 5. This level of participation is referred to by Arnstein (1969) as 'Involvement', and is interpreted as being where, although participants can advise, decision-making is still retained by traditional powerholders (see Table 2.1). In the case of implementing the PSCP, decision-making powers were retained by the GFGO. As previously mentioned in Chapter 6, during the later stages of the PSCPs implementation, the GFGO developed links with the PRA (see Section 6.5.2). However, those PRA members that participated in the LAGp indicated during a Focused Group Interview that they perceived their level of participation remained at Rung 5 for only a relatively short period of time, due to a lack of interest in the PSCP. Consequently, between June 1998 and August 1999, the level of participation remained at zero, as the LAG had dissolved, and the GFGO withdrew from implementing the PSCP in the PPA (see Figure 7.1).
Figure 7.1: Perception of changing levels of participation (LAGp)

* The 'turning point' refers to when the level of participation in the LAG began to increase as a result of some project or activity that occurred in relation to the PSCP.

(Source: Ladder of Participation, Focused Group Interview, LAGp)

R At the very beginning of the project where would you position yourselves?
M1 Number 3, Informing. We were informing the GFGO of our complaints.
F1 Yes, cause we went down, this model was there and we had to put things on it didn't we, to say what we wanted to have done.
R Before the former Going for Green Group disappeared, where was the group when you left?
M1 I suppose I was hopeful, at number 6. When we were trying to get together in a partnership and do something about it . . .
R So did it actually reach number 6?
M1 Yeah, I suppose we never really got as far as partnership really.
F1 5 then.
M2 It was taken on board, but I think it was number 5 as it wasn't actually acted upon, a lot of things wasn't acted upon.
M1 Yeah, it was number 5.
F2 Yeah.
R What about when Going for Green was taken down to the residents association?
F1 It more or less stayed, it phased out really.
R Did it drop?
F1 No I wouldn't say it dropped, it ceased.
M2 It depleted out sort of thing.
F1 It did, didn't it.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGp Participants)

During a Focused Group Interview, LAGp participants indicated that they were unable to increase their level of participation in the PSCP, due to their lack of ability to contribute to decisions that were being made in relation to those projects that were being undertaken.

M1 At first I thought we were going to get involved in a practical way ... in the beginning my role was just informing, you know. I don't like this, that's untidy, so and so. That street is untidy, this thing and that thing . . .
M2 Like a watch dog.
M1 Yeah, we were just complaining about things.
F1 Yeah, and suggest things . . .
M1 I thought that (GFGO) was going to be going to the officials as our group were unhappy about this particular thing, 'Can you sort it out?' We couldn't enforce it, we couldn't enforce anything that we wanted to do. We didn't feel as a group that we had influence.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGp Participants)

F1 When the dog fouling bins went up you thought, 'Oh, perhaps something is going to happen'.
M1 Yes, yes.
M2 Yes.
F2 Yes.
F1 But it didn't get very far mind . . .
M1 There was nothing else discussed.
R Did you think there was a shift in power, in how decisions were being made?
F1 No.
M1 No.
M2 I didn't see any power at all to be honest with you.
R Why do you think that was?
M1 We got told by (GFGO) you've got money there if you think of projects, that's as far as it got.
F1 Yeah, it didn't go any further did it, like. You can use this for this project or that project . . .
F2 Yeah.
M1 It couldn't be used for anything other than general environmental projects could it?
F1 I think the group needed help because although there was money, no one ever had project ideas
to put the money into.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGp Participants)

Consequently, LAGp Participants considered that the PSCP had not made impact in their
PPA, and perceived that the PSCP had been a public relations exercise as they had been
unable to influence the direction of the PSCP.

"I don't think (GFGO) had any power to be honest with you. I mean, OK, it sort of a public relations
exercise as I could see it . . . we had no power we had no teeth and that's why it started breaking up, it
appeared to be a complete waste of time basically."

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGp Participants, Pantyscallog)

Those research findings obtained from the LAG Community Participation Indicator
Assessment (see Section 5.6.5.5 & Appendix 11) were also found to support this
perception of change as it was only the 'organisation' indicator that had resulted in a
positive change, with an increase of 1.0 in LAGp participants mean score (see Figure 7.2).
All other assessment indicators were found to have remained unchanged. Table 7.1
provides a description of the change that occurred within the LAGp.
Figure 7.2: Community Participation Assessment (LAG Pantyscallog).

* A total of 4 LAGp Participants completed this focused exercise.

(Source: Community Participation Indicator Assessment, Focused Group Interview, LAGp)

Table 7.1: Description of change (LAG Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Initial stages of involvement (Before)</th>
<th>Official end of PSCP (After)</th>
<th>Change within LAG (After-Before)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 1.0 &quot;The goals of the project had already been defined. How we would achieve the project's goals had also been decided. There were only a few local groups involved. The project was mainly being run by professionals.&quot;</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.0 &quot;The goals of the project had already been defined. Although it had been decided how the project's goals were to be achieved, there was flexibility in how it was done. Although the project was mainly being run by professionals, there were also a number of non-professionals involved&quot;</td>
<td>2.0 - 1.0 = 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Community Participation Indicator Assessment, Focused Group Interview, LAGp)

**Electoral Ward of Bedlinog**

In comparison to LAGp Participants, the majority of LAGb participants had a range of skills and experience of group management prior to their involvement with the LAGb (see
Data obtained from Documentary Evidence, Observational Data, and Focused Group Interviews with LAG$_B$ Participants, the GFGO and Non-LAG$_B$ Participants have indicated that these existing skills and experience enhanced and facilitated LAG$_B$ Participants' level of participation in the LAG$_B$, and impacted on what they had achieved.

"In Pant . . . there is a noticeable difference of people who for the first time ever are belonging to a group compared to Bedlinog you've got well practised people in the way of having meetings and getting stuff done. Even still they are on a learning curve, but there's a big difference anyway."

(Source: Focused Interview, GFGO)

R | So how did you participate in the project?
---|---
F1 | We just had shovels, helmets.
F2 | And just got stuck in.
R | If we go right back to when the project first came to the village how did you take part?
M | Join the committee.
F3 | Held meetings and talked about what's needed.
F2 | We just had meetings really to discuss what was happening really.
F1 | And discussed how to go about them . .
F3 | That's the most important thing of all.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG$_B$ Participants)

R | Do you think that setting up a group like this is a good example of how to encourage the community to get involved?
M1 | There is no other way, you can't do it as an individual, you've got to do it as a group . . .
R | So do you have hope for your group in the future?
M1 | Personally, yes
All | Yes, yes.
M1 | Yes.
F1 | Yes.
F2 | Oh yes.
M1 | Absolutely.
M2 So long as the committee stays strong.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGb Participants)

"They done the Colly Row, they got the bins for the dogs waste haven't they. Well they had money didn't they, they had so much money to do it, and they did it, didn't they and they've raised more money doing different things."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non LAGb Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"They're the 'Mafia' aren't they? Always going up to meetings at Merthyr Council."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non LAGb Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"Most of them are of other organisations like . . . the PTA. We've got a strong PTA in Bedlinog . . . they've [LAGb] made a big impact."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAGb Participant, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

During the initial stages of introducing the PSCP and establishing the LAGb, Observational data, Documentary Evidence and Focused Group Interviews have indicated that LAGb participants influenced and guided the direction of the PSCP, thereby ensuring that it was of benefit to those that lived within their PPA.

"We talked and discussed and argued, irrespective of (GFGO) cause I'm not trying to degrade. . . It was what we were arguing about, where we wanted to go, what we wanted to achieve, and then we said to (GFGO) well how do we do this, there's a difference."

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGb Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Figure 7.3 indicates that LAGb participants perceived that their level of participation during the initial stages of the PSCP was at Rung 3. This level of participation is referred to by Arnstein (1969) as 'Informing', and is interpreted as being were, participants are told what is happening, but lack the power to ensure that their views are heeded by powerholders (see Table 2.1).
Figure 7.3: Perception of changing levels of participation (LAG Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

*The 'turning point' refers to when the level of participation in the LAG began to increase as a result of some project or activity within the PPA.

(Source: Ladder of Participation, Focused Group Interview, LAG_B)

Within two months of establishing the LAG_B (June, 1997), LAG_B participants perceived that their level of participation had increased to Rung 6, as they were working in 'partnership' with the GFGO in both project generation and implementation. Rung 6 is referred to by Arnstein (1969) as 'Partnership', and is interpreted as being when participants can begin to negotiate with traditional power holders, including agreeing roles, responsibilities and levels of control (see Table 2.1).

R  At the very beginning of the project, where would you place your level of participation?
F1  Number 3.
F2  Number 1.
Ml  4.
M2  Number 3.
All (Everyone agreed)
F1  That's where it stopped for most people.
M2  Started.
F2  Stopped.
M2  No, you can't say that, cause from that meeting then we got the group formed.
F3  For most people.
F4  For most people. There were a lot of people in that meeting and we haven't seen them since.
M2  What I'm trying to argue is once the group was formed.
F3  Not for most people.
F4  Not for most people.
R  The group formed, so what was the position on the ladder?
M1  6.
M2  6.
F3  6, partnership.
R  Right at the very beginning?
M2  Yes.
F4  Cause we had (GFGO).
F2  Yes.
F3  If we hadn't of got (GFGO) we would have been down at the bottom again.
M2  The situation was never (GFGO) saying right we're going to do this.
All  No, no, no.
M2  No.
F4  Although we needed (GFGO).
F2  We really needed (GFGO).
M2  Cause (GFGO) led us into avenues of course. We'd discuss something, we'd agree to it. We'd make a decision and from there on were we would go . . . Up until that point the group, number 6.
M1  Partnership.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGb Participants)
During that time, both Documentary Evidence and Observational Data also found that LAG_B participants were collecting background information and developing a number of contacts in relation to various community focused projects that they were undertaking (see Table 6.17, column 5).

Within nine months of establishing the LAG_B (December 1997), LAG_B participants perceived that their level of participation had continued to increase, as they began to guide and direct the PSCP. LAG_B participants indicated during a Focused Group Interview that they adopted this approach as they wanted to ensure that the LAG_B would continue following the official end of the PSCP and the withdrawal of support from the GFGO.

"... everything I feel that has been done so far has been done by word of mouth via (GFGO) and I feel that we need to do more."

(Source: LAG_B participant, Observational Notes, LAG meeting, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

LAG_B participants also began to develop their existing skills, and increase their responsibilities by opening a bank account, writing a constitution, book keeping, minute taking, completing grant applications and preparing leaflets to explain what the LAG_B was about. After being established for one year (April, 1998), LAG_B participants indicated during a Focused Group Interview that as a group they had gained more confidence and skills through their involvement with the LAG_B, and their perceived level of participation had increased to Rung 8 (see Figure 7.3). This level of participation is referred to by Arnstein (1969) as 'Citizen Control', and is interpreted as being where participants have obtained full delegation of all decision-making powers and action (see Table 2.1).
Earlier you said (GFGO) sort of led you for the first twelve months. After the anniversary celebration that you had, did it change? Did you move up? Did it stay the same? Move down? Has it ever been at the top?

Yes, if you are referring to the group as citizens. . . . we took control.

Yeah, I think we are in control now.

So do you think you reached number 8?

Yeah, oh yes.

At any time did you move back down the ladder?

No.

We were knocked back a couple of times.

Only in that we were not achieving quick enough, we were all unhappy.

Although we were knocked back.

We didn't actually go back down the ladder.

Yes.

We were on a level plateau that was extended a bit longer than we'd like it to be.

The morale of the group would drop if we didn't win a grant, and if we felt that things weren't moving quick enough.

We were knocked back a bit with the buses weren't we.

But we didn't go back down the ladder.

It was our morale really.

What has the group gained from being involved?

Apart from headaches.

Confidence.

Enthusiasm, participation.

Satisfaction.

Sense of achievement.

The legal side of things.

Sense of frustration.

Yeah, I like that.

Meeting people, having courage to go and talk to the council, saying look we want this.

Courage of your convictions, more do you want more?

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGb Participants)
M2 Stand up to trouble.
F1 Sense of achievement.
F2 Oh, that goes without saying.
F3 The sense of achievement is whenever Trevor come and say that we've won a grant.
M1 Like today, I handed Marion a cheque for £500 odd pounds.
F2 It's just a matter of knowing the right jargon.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGb Participants, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Data obtained from the Community Participation Indicator Assessment (see Section 5.6.5.5 & Appendix 11) has also been found to support this perception of change, as all five assessment criteria had resulted in a positive change. Table 7.2 provides a description of those changes that occurred within the LAGb. Both 'organisation' and 'resource mobilisation' were found to have resulted in the greatest changes, with an increase in 0.8 and 0.9 respectively in LAGb participants mean score (see Figure 7.4).

**Figure 7.4: Community Participation Indicator Assessment (LAG Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).**

![Figure 7.4](image)

*A total of 12 LAG Participants completed this exercise.

(Source: Community Participation Indicator Assessment, Focused Group Interview, LAGb)
Table 7.2: Description of changes (LAG Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Initial stages of involvement (Before)</th>
<th>Official end of PSCP (After)</th>
<th>Change that occurred (After-Before)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilisation</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 1.8 &quot;Only through official funding.&quot; (top down funding)</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.7 &quot;Although we were using official funding, we were also searching for external funds. We were also making use of non-financial resources.&quot;</td>
<td>2.7 - 1.8 = 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.2 &quot;The goals of the project had already been defined. Although it had been decided how the project's goals were to be achieved, there was flexibility in how it was done. Although the project was mainly being run by professionals, there were also a number of non-professionals involved.&quot;</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 3.0 &quot;Although the project had specific goals, there was flexibility in how we met them. The project was mainly being run by a number of non-professionals.&quot;</td>
<td>3.0 - 2.2 = 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.4 &quot;Decisions were being made jointly by professionals and the community.&quot;</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.8 &quot;Decisions were being made jointly by professionals and the community.&quot;</td>
<td>2.8 - 2.4 = 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.1 &quot;The professionals and community defined the issues together.&quot;</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.4 &quot;The professionals and community defined the issues together.&quot;</td>
<td>2.4 - 2.1 = 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 1.9 &quot;It represents a small group of people.&quot;</td>
<td>LAG mean score = 2.2 &quot;It represents a small group of people.&quot;</td>
<td>2.2 - 1.9 = 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Community Participation Indicator Assessment, Focused Group Interview, LAGs)

Although LAGB participants perceived that they had the ability to influence the direction of the PSCP, they did not perceive that there had been a ‘true’ shift in power, as following the official end of the PSCP they still depended upon the local authority for support and advice in order to complete projects. The following extract illustrates how LAGB participants had to rebuild themselves as a group and develop new project contacts.
following the official end of the PSCP and the withdrawal of support by the GFGO.

M  Right from the start, there was no shift right from the start we depended on help from the government, local government.
F1  Mind you I think when (GFGO) finished it went down into a slump then didn’t it.
M  We lost contact didn’t we.
F1  Yes, we had to build ourselves back up no one took notice of us.
M  We had to look for new contacts then.
F2  And then we started inviting people to our meetings.
F3  I think we lost confidence then.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_{B} Participants)

The increase in LAG_{B} participants perceived level of participation and their ability to influence the PSCP has been supported by further data obtained from Focused Group Interviews with both LAGs. Although LAG participants in both PPAs perceived the PSCP in the initial stages as being a top-down approach to encouraging community participation, it was only LAG_{B} participants that were able to reverse GFG’s approach and develop a number of projects using a bottom-up approach (see Table 6.17, columns 3 & 4). However, LAG_{B} participants acknowledged that their success had also been facilitated by the GFGO.

R  Did you think it was a top-down project or bottom up?
F1  Top down.
F2  Bottom up I thought it was.
F1  Yeah, I think perhaps later top down I thought it was in the beginning.
M  Top down to start, but we changed it and turned it around . . . We turned it around.
R  Why do you think you that?
M  Because we made demands of them.
F3  I think if (GFGO) hadn’t been here mind they wouldn’t have taken no notice of us at all. If she hadn’t of been here.

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_{B} Participants)
Although as the following extract indicates, LAG_B participants perceived that they had been 'empowered' through their involvement with the LAG_B, the following extract indicates that their influence was limited to environmental issues, and with lower ranking Officers in the Local Authority.

R  Do you think the committee has had an impact on how the local authority makes its decisions?
M  Oh yes.
F  Yeah.
All (All agreed)
R  In what sort of way?
F3  We tell 'em what we want doing now, we don't just wait for them to do something . . . when you say Going for Green I think they do listen a bit more rather than just saying Mrs Wood from Bedlinog."

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_B Participants)

In comparison to LAG_B, LAG_P participants did not perceive that they had the capacity to influence the direction of the PSCP, and ensure that it was of benefit to those that lived within their PPA. Subsequently, LAG_P participants still retained the view that the PSCP was a top-down project, and they had not gained anything from their involvement.

"We didn't get that far really did we or participate in any of the schemes like . . . the project really didn't have any teeth or backing from official organisations . . . the only thing that really happened was the doggy bags and the bins."

(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAG_P Participants)

R  What impacts do you think the project had?
M  Very little.
F1  None.
M2  None at all.
M1  I think that's why it all depleted out.
F2  Yeah.
Fl  Nothing getting done.
M1  It was a complete waste of time to be honest with you.
(Source: Focused Group Interview, LAGP Participants, Pantyscallog)

7.2.1 Impact made by LAGs

In terms of the impact made by each LAG, only 4% of Non-LAGP Participants perceived that their respective LAGP had made a positive impact within their PPA (see Table 7.3). As indicated in Table 7.4, this was primarily in terms of addressing the problem of dog fouling through the provision of dog bins. In comparison, 79% of Non-LAGB Participants perceived that their respective LAGB had made a positive impact in their PPA (see Table 7.3), this was primarily in terms of local aesthetic improvements such as the 'Colly Row Project' and the 'Bedlinog Terrace Project'. Table 7.5 indicates that 21% of Non-LAGB participants perceived that their respective LAGB had increased the 'sense of community' within their PPA. Although the school litter-related project, 'Abbey National Helping Hands' (see Table 6.19, column 2) was perceived to have led to a reduction in the amount of rubbish that was being dropped by school children, the following extract indicates, there was concern as to whether this behavioural change would be sustained.

"Its increased the children's awareness. When they were involved with projects at school level they are hyped up but then of course when they come out of school everything they learn about litter just goes out the window."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAGB Participant)
Table 7.3: Number of Non-LAG participants that perceived their LAG had made an impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
<th>(n = 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfar &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced ‘type’ properties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young Families</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19 (79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4: Impact made by LAG (Pantyscallog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-LAG Participants (n=24)</th>
<th>Perceived Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority built properties</td>
<td>Tackling dog fouling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodfar &amp; Heol y Bryneau</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhydd y Bedd</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced ‘type’ properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King &amp; Queen Street</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeracca</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant Road</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private housing developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Rise</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hawthorns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.5: Impact made by LAG (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-LAG Participants</th>
<th>Reduction in litter dropped by school children (n=24)</th>
<th>Perceived Impact</th>
<th>Increased sense of community (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Improvements* (n=24)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired &amp; OAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>14 (58%)</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to Colly Row and Bedlinog Terrace Projects.

"Yes I think it's had a big impact it's certainly made the place look a lot tidier and I think the view of most of the people is that it should have been done a long time ago like. Cause everything has been left to run down and run down and its marvellous to see it I know the people at Colly Row appreciate it very much and the people at Bedlinog Terrace they see it day in and day out and people living in the area. I know they appreciate it but on the other hand they don't want to get involved in doing something else see you know what I mean they say oh that's a good idea I could give a few hours or something like that, but they don't because it's the same gang and most of them are elderly women, you know GFG it's nice to see them getting involved it's a pity other people don't get involved as well."

(Source: Focused Interview, Non-LAG Participant)

7.2.2 Agencies and Organisations

From those Agencies and Organisations that were involved in Focused 'telephone’ Interviews (see Table 5.17), with the exception of one who worked for MTCBC, all other research participants indicated that they perceived that the PSCP made relatively little impact or influence in relation to how they would encourage community participation in similar projects in the future.
"Not sure if I have learnt anything. Capacity building was what the project was in the end. Existing actors to latch onto. It was easier in Bedlinog that in Pant. In Bedlinog there had previously been an element of capacity building and community development. A tradition of a bit of self-help. Pant didn’t have a group, and so it was more difficult to access community activists. There is a stage before development that is often missed out, this is often a very labour intensive task. Not sure if I have learnt anything."

(Source: Focused 'telephone' Interview, Agencies and Organisations)

Those Agencies and Organisations that had relatively little previous experience of working with communities, both Observational Data and Focused 'telephone' Interviews have indicated that their involvement with the PSCP had made them increasingly aware of difficulties relating to processes involved in encouraging community participation, particularly in terms of promoting the concept of sustainable development. However, as the following extract indicates, one interviewee still remained unaware of problems associated with 'traditional' methods, such as public meetings, in securing participation by a broad range of community stakeholders.

"We had public meetings in the early stages but they didn’t go very well, which I can’t really understand."

(Source: Focused Telephone Interview, Agencies and Organisations)

So far this chapter has examined the experience of those that participated in each LAG and identified those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs. Section 7.3 will now discuss those wider factors that were found to inhibit and facilitate participation in the PSCP.

7.3 Factors inhibiting and facilitating community participation

Although factors influencing participation in the PSCP have been identified in the previous chapter and in the first part of this chapter, two additional factors were found to have
influenced progress in both PPAs: the local authority, and recent social and cultural changes that had taken place within each PPA.

7.3.1 Local Authority

A wide range of empirical evidence generated from the model research process including Semi-structured Interview and Focus Group Discussions, Observation Data and Documentary Evidence, identified that there was widespread lack of trust towards the local authority as an agent of change. Data obtained from Semi-structured Interview and Focus Groups, and Observational Data has indicated that this lack of trust was perceived to be attributable to the local authorities lack of interest and response in addressing local issues of concern within both PPAs. In the case of the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, this was a particular concern. Consequently, this perception of the local authority was found to inhibit participation in the PSCP and LAGs, as residents in both PPAs were unsure about its commitment and support for improvements needed within their respective PPA.

"Well, I just feel that em, being under Merthyr Borough Council I feel they're not doing anything to improve our village. We try and improve our village, but em they just don't seem to bother."
(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"They've never had anything in the past, and the certainly haven't got any faith in Merthyr Council."
(Source: Observational Data, LAG9 Meeting, May, 1998)

M It's the lack of interest generally, with the councils and with people generally.
R Why do you think councils have a lack of Interest?
M Lack of money obviously and mis-spent money or whatever... they could do a lot more.
R Do they know what local people want?
M They know, yeah.
R They do, yeah?

M 'Cause of the Bedlinog plan and all the work that the community councils have done and the councillors in the past, we've all tried and made the effort. No response. Always got the excuse that we'll look into it but it gets boring in the end, you get, you ask the question and then you know the answer that's going to come out it is. Makes you angry, makes me angry.

R What do local people think about that?

M They just accept it as the norm then, that you know and this is one of the problems, we find with this, getting interest in this [PSCP]. But they, the minute you start talking about this, they say 'yeah, but it's the same old story', 'you've had that haven't you, you've seen it, it's the same and it's true, it's what people believe. Question is, how do you alter it?

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"The Council haven't got a clue . . . they don't want to listen. If they said 'Alright we'' starting shaking Pant up', you know what they'd do, they'd put some flowers and plant some trees."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Pantyscallog)

R Does the local authority respond to local needs and concerns?

M No, not as well as it could.

R Why's that?

M They haven't got the funding . . . I know because I work for them. I know that's the reason for it. If I didn't work for the local authority, I'd just think they didn't give a toss about us. But that's not it. It's simply that the funds have got to come from somewhere.

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Pantyscallog)

As previously mentioned in Chapter 6, to generate and encourage further interest and participation in the PSCP, the GFGO developed community focused projects that linked the GC with local issues of concern. However, the PSCP encountered delays in gaining support from different departments within MTCBC. For example, in relation to the 'Job Finder Bus Service' (Electoral Ward of Bedlinog), several attempts had to be made to encourage the Transport Department to attend LAGB meetings and discuss public transport problems. Documentary Evidence and Observational Data have also indicated that the way in which some local authority services were being delivered either contradicted what GFG was aiming to achieve, or did not provide the necessary mechanisms to support what each
LAG was attempting to achieve. For example, the local authority's Street Cleansing Contract only included the collection of litter from footpaths and roads, but not on adjacent grass verges, were the majority of litter was found to be accumulating.

"There's no more public skips. They used to rotate around the borough on that sort of basis, and every 3 months you'd have a skip, for a week. Every day for a week. Since they got rid of that, I noticed carpets and mattresses and stuff like that being dumped around the place."

(Source: Semi-structured Interviews, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Both Observational Data and Documentary Evidence relating to LAG_B meetings have identified this led LAG_B participants to become disillusioned with the PSCP and MTCBC's commitment to what they were aiming to achieve.

"They say they don't have enough in their budget... yet the have £4,000 to put a stained glass window in the Civic Centre."

(Source: Observational data, LAG_B Meeting, January 1998)

Finally, as the local authority was not seen to be providing additional financial assistance to support its involvement with the PSCP was perceived as being a 'tokenistic' gesture.

"... down to resources, which is a method 'Going for Green' shines away from recognising and I can understand issue like thing locally and acting globally to put the environment right in this valley it's going to cost millions and I don't believe that 'Going for Green' is anymore effective than anything else, ... I don't actually believe that anybody is ever going to spend thousands and thousands of pounds planting a big forest on the top of the mountains to stop the litter... because that's what it would take... Merthyr is not actually saying we want to push Agenda 21, it's easier to put say 10 grand aside for a year and that'll be enough, cause we'll get volunteers and stuff, it's a lie, it's a con, if they want to do it properly, do it properly, don't exploit the people who live here, their own agendas, and I know, I accept that Merthyr have got no money, that isn't necessary the issue, they can choose to spend more money very differently, if they are so concerned about Agenda 21 as an example, why have they spent a fortune on A470 Bypass which is spending millions of pounds it cost, other than on the people in this valley, get people in this valley temporarily employed. Several thousand of them said right boys you are now the environmental task force, there's 15 grand a year each, or 20 grand a year each, or whatever their salaries are, um go and clean up the valley and they would be quite happy to, but why should they do it for nothing and have an officer from the council, sitting there being an officer."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)
7.3.2 Recent social and cultural changes

Within Pantyscallog a 'sense of community' was not perceived to exist within the PPA as a whole, but confined to small areas and groups of individuals.

M  Round by here, I mean we all look out for each other because we know each other quite well . . . But it's very isolated areas, I mean a lot of people would tell you that they don't know nothing about the next door neighbours at all, a lot of people don't even know who their next door neighbour is because of work and so forth, they come back and they're missing each other, all this kind of stuff, um but small little areas have got a sense of community, but that's it

R  Not the village as a whole?

M  No, not the village as a whole . . . . I don't know, perhaps nobody trusts anybody anymore. Different times, you know we actually will trust a whole area as such, I mean Hafod . . . it's not as bad, you know it's not too bad an estate, but you go somewhere else and it's a totally different area . . . I know a lot of people around here, and if I seen anything being damaged of theirs I would do something, but that's about it, I mean there is no sense of all right I've got to watch out for my neighbour over there and stuff like this with old people.

(Source: Semi-Structured Interviews, Pantyscallog)

"There are a lot of individuals living here . . . not a friendly bunch. They look after themselves. I supposes it's how you survive especially when you haven't got time or money"

(Source: Observational Data, Planning for Real® exercise, Pantyscallog)

R  Is there a community in Pant?

M1  There's definitely a community in Pant (laughs)

M2  Oh yeah, aye.

M1  Well community is a group of people that 'em live adjacent to each other in a particular place.

R  Why did you laugh when you said there was a community

M1  Well, it's a community which I find they don't participate in a lot of things. Even though it's a community, they're not a close community.

F1  No they're not

R  Why is that?

M1  That the $64 question.

F1  Go back years ago we'd be combined all together. If there was something going you'd all join in, but now you suggest something, and they say 'oh, yeah, yeah', but when you go and knock their door, you get 'oh, no', they just don't want to know.

M1  Well, different people have got different groups. There's the school, they do their own thing, the church, they do they're own thing, the social club, they do their own thing. But none of them sort
of come together do they?

The following extract indicates how these communities of 'interest' with Pantyscallog were perceived to have developed.

"I think we've always tended to have our own district identification, north of the railway lines that used to be run down by . . . the village boundary as it was then, in the 50's. Since then of course, we had all green fields - it was a green field area, but that's been built upon now with the Rhyd-y-Bydd estate, the Hafod estate etc., even this one Brecon Rise. There are probably plans in the pipeline to extend."

(Source, Semi-structured Interview, Pantyscallog)

This lack of 'sense of community' within Pantyscallog as a whole was perceived by those research participants involved in Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups to be attributable to a number of changes that had occurred within the past ten years, including, a more transient population, and an increased diversity in the socio-economic population profile of the PPA. These changes were perceived to have resulted in fewer residents knowing and socialising with each other.

"Pant used to be a lovely village, everyone would know everyone you know we didn’t know where they lived we’d sort of know up this hill somewhere but now we don’t know who’s living in the streets."

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Pantyscallog)

In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, the majority of research participants involved in Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups in the exploratory phase of the model research process did not perceive that a sense of community existed within the PPA as a whole. The villages of Trelewis and Bedlinog were perceived as being separate communities even though they were within the same Electoral Ward. As the following extract indicates, further divisions within the village of Trelewis were perceived to exist.
R  Do Bedlinog and Trelewis feel part of the same community?

M  I don't know whether they do, that seems a bit bizarre, because I would have thought that we're much closure to Treharris and should be linked with Treharris, and Bedlinog really is two miles away, um and it's pretty much a self-contained unit in itself. It's got a fairly good community spirit up there and they are much more close knit, maybe more of what the valleys communities were like twenty/thirty years ago um I don't think Trelewis has got any particular connection with uh, we're just on the same river but uh community wise I wouldn't have thought so,

M  Well again, I reckon as I said before um Bedlinog is quite a centralised community um whereas Trelewis has got two larger . . . there's Stormtown and Shinrig which seems to me to be more like community orientated which is a shame really which I hope will be another, and the rest of it just rather ribbon like and um you don't um, there's no sort of focus in Trelewis, there's no shopping centre,

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

R  If you were to define your community would it be your street or Bedlinog?

F  Oh, Bedlinog as a whole.

R  Well, what about the Electoral Ward Bedlinog or Merthyr Tydfil?

F  No, Bedlinog, . . . Well, you can see the difference, you were saying about Pant, you see, now there's no way we can associate with Pant, because its part of the Merthyr, well I know we're part of Merthyr, but that's perceived to be Merthyr borough O.K, and we've got the same problem as Trelewis. That 2.5 miles of the road between us, makes that huge difference. Trelewis is unique, on its own. Treharris is unique on its own. And we as Bedlinog we could on our own. So, I always look at it, I'm afraid as Bedlinog, not the ward of Bedlinog and Trelewis, always Bedlinog.

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

The sense of community that existed in Bedlinog was perceived to be attributable to the majority of residents having a shared sense of identity which had developed from the majority of families being employed in nearby coal pits and living within the same locality.

M  . . . people generally in the village will look after each other, fend for each other and help each other . . . I think Trelewis is as far apart as anything from Bedlinog, Bedlinog is it's own community, and I think Trelewis, Treharris, Derry over the other way or whatever, they're little villages outside, but they're definitely separate to Bedlinog. Bedlinog is without a doubt it's own community, . . . . Bedlinog is this little village on a hill where everyone is sort of on top of each other as you go up, and Trelewis seems to be built around a main road, uh so I think it is a little different . . . .

R  So what do you think has caused this sense of community?

M  Oh it's definitely work I think more than anything. If you go back twenty, twenty five years ago, I would imagine everybody in the village that lived here all worked in the mines. It was a very very small minority that worked elsewhere, but I would say 80% of the menfolk worked in the
mines here, and everybody knew each other and everybody worked with each other, and pulled for each other and that’s what built up the spirit and even since the mines have closed and everybody thought it was going to break up the spirit in the community, you know people have stuck together, they still meet together in their local pubs and clubs and in their local teams and whatever, and it hasn’t been as bad as everyone thought it was going to be, but I definitely think the thing about them, got the community, definitely the workplace, everybody worked there

R  Would you include Trelewis as part of that
M  No, I don’t think so, I think Bedlinog itself, we are very very lucky, like I said, we’ve got this community spirit, it is a pretty little village.

(Source: Semi-Structured Interviews, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

This perceived sense of community was perceived as one of the primary reasons why the majority of residents enjoyed living in the PPA it brought with it a number of benefits including; a wide range of community groups and organisations, and a large percentage of residents knowing one another.

R  Would you say that Bedlinog had a strong community spirit?
M  Oh yeah, tremendous really.
R  Does that help the village?
M  Yeah. I’ve found them marvellous with charity work and things like that you know they, people go round the doors knocking for different things and they do, and as you know they do, the groups or charities or whatever. Rugby club do a lot for charity, yeah this is good. And the away team. And we’ve got the, it’s either cystic fibrosis he’s got, and they did a tremendous amount for that, sent them to Disney Land, bought the wife, his mother a van, her parents a van you know, you’ve seen that haven’t you, yeah, bought them the wheelchair you, put a lot of work into that. Anything, and then going back a couple of years there was somebody up the top, a young girl, you know they really did a lot for her, concerts kind of things, and do functions for the hospitals. So, there’s always that kind of charity work, it’s been very good.

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

In relation to previous experiences of community action, the 'sense of community' that existed within the village of Bedlinog was perceived to facilitate their response to, and support for others in addressing issues of concern.

R  Is it a community?
All  Oh yeah, yeah, definitely
F  One, one wonderful story if you want to hear a story that sums it all up is when a gentleman
living in Woodland Place suffered a heart attack and unfortunately before the whole village was packed in snow, you couldn’t get in, you couldn’t get out an Ambulance came to the gentleman, at least not an Ambulance, it was one of these land rover ambulance’s came for the gentleman, they couldn’t get him down to the ambulance to get him to the hospital and people came out, mind going cold now, people came out with their brushes and their shovels and they cleared that hill between the community to get that man into that ambulance, that’s the community that Bedlinog is

(Source, Focus Group Discussion, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

R   Is there anything you particularly like about the area, or dislike about the area?
M   Um, I mean basically it’s got a good community spirit and it’s a bit unusual in this day and age. People do, um, tend to know each other. And there’s some people where everybody knows your business, on the other hand a lot of people are very kind and will help people out. So, you know, I think that’s an advantage. It’s actually quite a pleasant area as well and it’s very scenic really um, you know um and it’s actually very pleasant in that there’s very little traffic, relatively compared to most places. So, you know it’s quite nice.

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

Consequently, the model research process found that in comparison to Pantyscallog, the strength of social networks, and those skilled that had been developed from previous experiences of community action facilitation participation in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog in four ways: the level of participation achieved by LAG Participants (see Figure 7.3); the mean scores of all five community participation assessment indicators (see Figure 7.4 & Table 7.2); the number of community focused projects that LAGB participants had contributed to (see Table 6.17); and, the duration of the LAG (see Table 6.22). However, the exploratory phase found indications that the density of social networks associated with the 'traditional' mining community were perceived to be gradually declining. This was perceived to be attributable to the closure of the coal mines and changes in the lifestyle of those that lived in the village.

"Unfortunately, a lot of public houses have had to close you know, which tends then to take the people out of the village, elsewhere."

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)
"... what I found most difficult when I moved down here was there was nowhere to meet your friends like we used to go up to town, go to the café you know for a coffee I mean there is nothing in Bedlinog like that you’d have to go to Ponty or Merthyr, or Nelson is the nearest café, When I first moved down here everybody was in each others house, the door was open and people would walk in, that’s what I found difficult, people would just walk in whereas we would always knock ... Before we walked in, or waited for somebody to answer the door there, here you just walk in, you know, but there’s a lot of people coming into the village that’s made it slightly different now."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"... usually the village rallies round and does something about it, but I think that there’s quite a lot of new people coming into the village which haven’t got the heritage of the village, knowledge of the heritage of the village, or how the village was formed, and they think it’s a different world."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"My view is that when we talk about communities we are not really, really talking about community, we are talking about different classes. OK. But I mean we call them communities, but that’s a term. But there’s a central point, the central basis of existence of communities like ours that are economic, there’s only one reason why all these people happen to be here, you know, otherwise it would be a rural area. They are communities as well, it’s a different nature this one. So therefore, take away the economic liaison and we start to destroy what some people call community, what I would say the formalised class or whatever, you know, the group of people become more desperate and more polarised but then all the other things come into play then. And also, it’s exasperated by the fact that the um, the capacity to do something about it has also been taken away by that. ... So things like what some people call community spirit, depending on what community you are in, what I would call solidarity and class consciousness, right, are deleted obviously, you know. Because the central objective point has gone. If you replace that, then you replace the other."

(Source: Semi-Structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

"I suppose the um, the fact that um, there is a lot of unemployment and that impinges on my work. It means that a lot of people obviously leave the village and move elsewhere. Whereas perhaps they wouldn’t otherwise and it does then leave a vacuum so you’ve got quite a lot of empty houses which are being done up by the housing association and I mean when you say you’ve got a resistance to change um, I know a lot of the locals don’t really well like people from outside the housing association. Obviously similar families come in, our potentially problem families and um, you know that’s gonna be to the detriment of the village potentially."

(Source: Semi-structured Interview, Electoral Ward of Bedlinog)

As the focus for community activities was perceived to be gradually shifting from the locality towards interests and identities, the following extract highlights that LAG Participants recognised from their involvement with the PSCP that there was a need to develop new and alternative methods for encouraging increased participation that were
based on local interest.

R  How would you go about trying to get more people involved?

F1  We have tried.

M  I have approached all the groups I can think in the area, there's the clubs and pubs, all those people... but I think because they've got their own little group, 'I go here tonight, and I go here every week, I don't really want to go to your meeting, but you can tell me what happens'... Let's put it this way you speak to someone who's very keen on rugby about Going for Green, and you get nothing from them. Change the conversation to rugby, and he won't stop talking for two hours.

F2  It's whatever you are interested in.

M1  Everyone is articulate in their own interest or sphere. If you can translate that in rugby into Going for Green, they would be just as articulate

(Source: Focused Interview, LAG Participants)

So far this chapter has analysed those outcomes and impacts that resulted from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs, and identified those factors that were found to influence that process. Section 7.4 will now discuss those research findings in relation to issues included the thematic framework for participatory process.

7.4 Discussion

From the experiences of those who participated in the LAG in each PPA, the results from this thesis have found that restricting the scope of participation to developing projects based on those issues included in the GC marginalised what progress was made in a number of different ways. In Pantyscallog, the majority of community focused projects were generated and implemented by the GFGO, and LAG participants withdrew from their involvement with the PSCP within a relatively short period of time. In the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, although LAG participants perceived that they had been empowered to influence the direction of the PSCP, this was limited to small landscaping improvements.
Using a similar thematic framework as this thesis, Wild & Marshall (1999) also found from assessments made on LA21 processes that empowerment at the local level did not lead to a direct loss of local authority power. Instead, it resulted in power that was of limited scope through the 'rediscovery of environmental responsibilities'. This lack of authentic power to influence decisions was particularly evident following the withdrawal of the GFGO at the official end of the PSCP as LAG participants in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog had to rebuild themselves as a group and re-establish relationships with the local authority, and other agencies and organisations.

Although empirical data from the focused 'group' interview with LAG participants in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog suggested that they had been empowered through their involvement, the PSCP did not consider the significance of those issues being addressed, the stage at which participants were be involved in the decision-making process or the scope of their participation. These omissions from the participatory process meant that the PSCP was 'tokenistic' in its approach, thereby reducing their level of participation to the lower rungs of Arnstein's ladder (see Table 2.1). As the design of the PSCP did not provide opportunities to increase residents’ capacity to influence decision-making processes, the PSCP was not found to have made any advances on previous experiences of public involvement in other policy areas, including LA21 (Selman & Parker, 1997; Thomas, 1996; Agyeman & Evans, 1994; Selman, 1998; Wild & Marshall, 1999). Of particular significance, in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog, LAG participants were found to be articulate, and held positions of power within a number of local groups and organisations.

Within the context of LA21, both local government structure and institutional culture were found to have provided difficulties and give rise to the ad-hoc and inconsistent progress
that was made (Voisey, 1998; Church & Young, 2000). Although during the PSCP decisions were being made as to how the GC could be implemented within each PPA, some areas of local authority policy and service delivery were found to be acting contradictory to what GFG was promoting through its GC. Evidence from the experience of other PSCP research teams has also found that the GC was often acting against current market forces and other areas of national government policy, for example, transport (Smith et al, 1999). This thesis has also found that delays were encountered in gaining support and commitment from other local authority departments to address project ideas that would integrate the GC with wider sustainability issues. Although the PSCP was promoting the need to build sustainable development at the local level, this research has found that there were no appropriate mechanisms to support local decisions other than the GFGO.

A significant issue that was investigated in this research, but one that has not been directly addressed by the UniCR or other PSCP research teams involved the investigation of past and present experiences of community action, and developing an understanding of how residents in both PPAs identified with their 'community'. Although the UniCR design included the need to identify perceived barriers and opportunities for change (see Collins et al, 1999), analysis was restricted to community leaders, group leaders and group members. To enhance the validity of empirical data, this thesis extended the range of research participants to include non community-group members. Obtaining a retrospective account of community activities in the past and present, this research found that recent social and cultural changes within each PPA had resulted in community activity shifting from the locality as a whole towards a range of different identities. This finding indicates that GFG's view of a community as being a population in situ was inappropriate as individuals are not homogenous and would not respond to similar messages in the same way. As previously
discussed in Chapter 6, by not considering the range of identities that existed within each PPA, the use of a single model was not found to be effective in encouraging the participation of a broad range of community stakeholders.

7.5 Conclusion

The results presented in this chapter have found that a number of parallels existed between those outcomes that were achieved from implementing the PSCP and progress made by a number of local authorities in implementing LA21 process. The range of projects were restricted to small environmental projects/improvements, participants were existing community activists, local authority support was restricted to environmental protection issues, and there still existed a need to change the ways in which decisions were made by the local authorities in order to support local action. In relation to the concept of community, GFGs interpretation did not consider the range of identities that existed within each PPA. This thesis has found that understanding recent social and cultural changes within each PPA enabled the researcher to identify a range of specific identities. This chapter has also demonstrated that having had detailed insight into those processes involved in implementing the PSCP and problems that were encountered, focused ‘group’ interviews and the use of focused exercises in the model research process enabled the researcher to gain access to 'true' meanings behind the experiences of LAG participants.

The following chapter (Chapter 8) will now bring together those conclusions that have been drawn from the research findings in Chapters 6 and 7, and discuss their policy implications in relation to promoting sustainable development at the local level and what the UK Government had aimed to achieve from the GFG PSCP.
Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Introduction

This thesis has identified the importance of community studies in evaluating initiatives that promote sustainable development at the local level. The model research process has demonstrated that the PSCP was an incomplete approach to achieving sustainable development at the local level. A number of parallels have been found to exist between those outcomes achieved from implementing the PSCP in both PPAs and the progress that had been made by a number of local authorities in implementing LA21 between 1992-1997 (Section 2.4.4). These findings are broadly in line with other evaluations of the PSCP elsewhere in the UK. Using a predetermined agenda that viewed environmental issues in isolation was found to restrict participation to those community stakeholders that had an existing interest in environmental issues. Omitting the need to develop an understanding of what constitutes the 'local' community, this thesis found that the use of a single approach from which to achieve sustainable development was ineffective in encouraging participation by a broad range of community stakeholders. The model research process has also demonstrated that community studies can be used to understand how communities are structured and operate, and assist in identifying the range of identities that are central to generating the necessary commitment and support for achieving sustainable development.

The first part of this chapter (Section 8.2) will begin by drawing together those conclusions made in Chapter 6 and 7, and discuss their policy implications in relation to promoting sustainable development at the local level and what the UK Government had aimed to achieve from the PSCP. The second part (Section 8.3) will evaluate the effectiveness of the
model research process in monitoring and analysing how local sustainable development initiatives are being implemented. Finally, Section 8.4 will make recommendations for future research and practice. This chapter will then conclude by summarising the contribution that this thesis has made to the debate surrounding how to promote increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development.

8.2 Policy implications

GFGs interpretation of changes required to achieve sustainable development was encapsulated within its GC. However, the lack of theoretical core and ambiguity surrounding what constitutes sustainable development (Adams, 1990; O'Riordan, 2001) allowed GFG to pursue an approach that viewed the environmental in isolation as opposed to being integrated with social and economic issues. By not considering the different concerns within each PPA, this reduced the significance of the PSCP, as action had been restricted to those issues included in the GC. Subsequently, the majority of stakeholders in both PPAs perceived the PSCP and GC as being irrelevant. This finding supports the view that sustainable development should not be standardised (O'Riordan & Voisey, 1998). As issues of concern in both PPAs related to the local environment as opposed to wider global environmental issues included in the GC, to ensure that the process involved in is relevant to a broad range of interests, future initiatives need to consider two issues. There is a need to identify how the concept of sustainable development is interpreted at the local level. Consideration also needs to be placed on an understanding of how the environment is perceived and those different meanings that are attached to it. Similar issues have also been raised in a recent study supported by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. From their findings, Burningham and Thrush (2001) concluded that environmental policy is more likely to be
of interest to local people and encourage action when it focuses on the locality in comparison to the wider global environment.

The major task of any participation initiative is generating 'local responsiveness' (Munton, 1997). However, in designing the PSCP, GFG did not develop an understanding of what constituted the 'local' community. Subsequently, GFG's single model for encouraging participation was not found to be an effective approach in encouraging participation amongst a broad range of community stakeholders. As communities can differ in terms of their composition and stage of development, and community stakeholders may not want to be involved at the same level or in the same way. Therefore, when implementing future initiatives, there is a recognised need to develop a range of different opportunities for participation. This is also supported by the findings of Blake (1999). As suggested by Selman (1998) and O'Riordan (2001) these need to be based on identities. These theses found that by developing an understanding of how communities are structured and operate, will identify the range of local identities that exist within a particular locality. Understanding those recent social and cultural changes that had occurred within each PPA was found to assist with this process. Recent research has show to encourage involvement amongst disadvantaged groups there are advantages in understanding their history in addition to focusing on those problems that they face (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1999)

In terms of implementing the PSCP, the process of participation was interpreted by GFG as a means of educating individuals to adopt sustainable lifestyle changes based on the GC. This was found to have impacted approach impacted on the stage and level of participation that was available through the PSCP. Promoting a top-down approach from which to achieve sustainable development was found to undermine the participatory process set out
by A2l, the stage at which was participation was being encouraged involved implementing pre-determined decisions as opposed to being involved in the process in which decisions were being made. An effective participatory process needs to be established at the policy making stage as the encouragement to build sustainable development at the local level was found to be unsuccessful in bring about sustained improvements. Unless organisational changes are made in the way that decisions are made by local authorities and effective structures and dialogue with a broad range of community stakeholders are developed, initiatives similar to GFG will remain marginal to the priorities of policymakers. Selman (1996b) has also argued that there is a need to consider the wider framework of sustainable development when designing and implementing local initiatives.

Placing emphasis on the role of individuals to 'do their bit' for the environment, GFG marginalised opportunities for increased local democracy within both PPAs. This thesis found that reducing the scope of individuals participation to a consumer of the environment did not secure sustained behavioural changes or encourage participation in community focused projects. Whilst the role of the consumer is important aspect of achieving sustainable development, findings from this thesis supports the argument that it cannot exist in isolation (Selman, 1996a; Barry, 1999). To make successful progress towards achieving sustainable development, the scope of participation needs to be extended to actively involve individuals in developing an approach they will have ownership of. This will not only also secure the necessary commitment and support required in achieving sustainable development, but also ensure that a range of needs are being met. O' Riordan & Voisey (1998) have argued that in developing GFG, the UK Government has been able to cover-up an inherently weak approach to achieving sustainable development and avoid the need for the necessary institutional and policy
changes required in achieving a more authentic and democratic transfer to sustainability.

Although GFG promoted an image of environmental concern, this thesis has concluded that represented a partial sustainable development strategy, as its approach to promoting increased public participation in policy decisions relating to sustainable development was both fragmented and ad-hoc. The weakness that runs through the experiences of the PSCP is attributable to the lack of theoretical underpinning for those participatory processes involved in achieving sustainable development. If the necessary support and commitment for achieving sustainable development is to be achieved, this thesis has demonstrated that more emphasis needs to be placed on thinking about the concepts of 'community' and 'participation', and how they relate to the outcomes of sustainable development. These findings also have implications for other policy areas including urban regeneration, social inclusion, Community Planning and the 'Modernising of local government agenda'. Having discussed the policy implications of this thesis, the following section (Section 8.3) will evaluate the effectiveness of the model research process in monitoring and analysing how local sustainable development initiatives are being implemented.

8.3 Evaluating the Model Research Process

This thesis used the case study as a framework on which to base the model research process as it provided a comprehensive strategy from which to understand and explore how the PSCP was being implemented within each PPA. In terms of evaluating the PSCP, the case study was found to valuable in understanding how each PPA was structured and operated, understand how the process of participation needs to implemented, investigate particular issues or situations in depth, and identify outcomes that resulted from its
implementation. To enable the researcher to continually reflect and interact between those research questions, and data collection and analysis, the model research process was divided into three distinct but interrelated phases (exploratory, process-monitoring and explanatory). As the model research process involved evaluating a real life situation, managing the research process in this way enabled the researcher to respond to uncertainties and changes in the way the PSCP was being implemented. This continual interaction and reflection was important in ensuring that the evaluation remained appropriate and reflected those issues that needed to be investigated.

The exploratory phase of the model research process enabled the researcher to develop an understanding of how each PPA was structured and how it operated. This aspect of evaluation also provided valuable examples of community activity in the past and present, and the range of barriers that existed with respects to encouraging participation in future initiatives. This information was found to assist the researcher in understanding those recent cultural and social changes that had occurred within each PPA and how they had shaped the development of those identities that existed. In hindsight, this baseline information would have been of value in designing the PSCP and ensuring that it was meaningful to both PPAs.

As a research strategy, the case study provided the researcher with an opportunity to draw upon a range of qualitative and quantitative research methods. This aspect of model research process enabled the researcher adopt different roles (see Table 8.1), and investigate those issues included in the thematic framework for participatory processes using different research methods and from different perspectives. The researcher was also able to alter what research methods were needed to reflect changes in how the PSCP was
Table 8.1: Role choices adopted by the researcher in conducting the model research process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of study</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Listener</th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>Interpreter</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
<th>Participant observer</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee meetings</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews &amp; focus group discussions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused Interview (GFGO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community focused projects and LAG activities</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused 'group' Interview (LAG Participants)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused Interviews (Non-LAG Participants)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused 'telephone' Interviews (Agencies &amp; Organisations)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
being implemented between and within both PPAs throughout the lifetime of the project. O'Riordan (2001) has also argued the need for active and creative research to provide insight to those processes that detached research is unable to access. The case study's flexibility was also found to enable the researcher to take advantage of unexpected and exciting opportunities that presented themselves during the course of the PSCP which could not have been captured by those research methods used to conduct the UniCR.

8.4 Recommendations for future work: research and practice

The research in this thesis has highlighted the importance of the case study in assisting in the development of sustainable development initiatives. There are some fundamental research and practical issues that need to be addressed. At the research level, there is a need to the need for greater emphasis to be placed on understanding how the 'local' community should be defined. Community studies that incorporate multiple research methods can be used to understand how communities are structured and operate. Identifying the range of identities that exist within a particular locality can also assist in the designing the initiative and developing a range of methods to encourage participation. At a practical level there are two main issues that need to be addressed. The first relates to the need to monitor and evaluate how the participatory process is being implemented. There is a need for evaluate frameworks to be built into the design of the initiative to provide base line information about the locality within which the initiative is to implemented and also from which explanations can be made in relation to resulting outcomes. The second issue relates to the need for sustainable development to be defined at the local level. This will also involve developing a greater understanding of how the environment is perceived and understood by a range of community stakeholders.
8.4.1 Future research questions

With respect to extending the research in this thesis, three specific research questions have been identified. Firstly, to examine how recent changes have impacted upon different localities within the UK, and identify the range of local identities that exist elsewhere. Secondly, as there can be no one model to encourage participation, there is a need to identify approaches that are successful in encouraging participation with various types of local identities. Thirdly, at a more strategic level, to examine how local sustainable development action plans are being developed and can best be used to influence local authority policymaking processes.

There is a recognised need to develop methodological approaches in the social sciences, and the ESRC have launched a new £4 million 'Research Methods Programme' to support research that raises interesting and novel ways to understand and analyse problems (ESRC, 2001). This thesis has developed and evaluated a model research process and extended our knowledge of the role of community studies in understanding how communities are structured and operate and how they can be involved more effectively. It has also identified the need to develop a rigorous methodological framework when evaluating initiatives that promote sustainable development at the local level due to the complexity of issues that require investigation. Finally, this thesis has demonstrated how qualitative and quantitative research methods can be effectively combined to examine the experiences of a wide range of community stakeholders and analyse problems that are encountered.
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People who are... Going for Green.

Follow the Green Code by

1. **CUTTING DOWN WASTE** by
   - Reducing the amounts of packaging we buy and use
   - Re-using carrier bags, bottles and containers
   - Recycling paper, cans, bottles, plastics and rags
   - Repairing things instead of throwing them away

2. **SAVING ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES** by
   - Turning off electricity and gas when not needed
   - Using water wisely
   - Insulating the home

3. **TRAVELLING SENSIBLY** by
   - Making fewer car journeys and sharing cars
   - Walking and cycling more
   - Using public transport more
   - Keeping cars properly tuned and maintained

4. **PREVENTING POLLUTION** by
   - Careful disposal of chemicals and oil
   - Not dumping waste
   - Not burning waste which gives off fumes and gases – especially plastics

5. **LOOKING AFTER THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT** by
   - Clearing up litter
   - Helping to keep and create special areas for wildlife
   - Composting and using organic gardening methods
   - Asking local authority environment officers and voluntary groups in the area about projects which need help

...GET INVOLVED AND MAKE A COMMITMENT.
**Outline of University Commissioned Research**

For the purpose of participating in the pilot SCP, Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council had to form a partnership with an associated university for the purpose of conducting a programme of research during the course of its pilot SCP. In April 1999, the University of Wales, Institute, Cardiff (Faculty of Community Health Sciences, School of Environmental Sciences) was invited by the Local Authority to undertake this research.

**Conducting the research**

The local authority defined the overall objectives required from the commissioned research. These corresponded with GFG aims and overall objectives; raising awareness of GFG and GC issues, and encouraging the participation of individuals and households in adopting sustainable lifestyle changes. The method of study from which the above aims and objectives would be monitored and evaluated was proposed by the University Project Management Team (UPMT) (staff at the School of Environmental Sciences). A research student was appointed to undertake the research and ensure liaison between the local authority and the UPMT. Furthermore, the research student would work under the supervision of an internal Research Steering Group, which was made up of the UMPT and two representatives from the local authority, namely the GFG Project Manager and the Going for Green Officer (GFGO).

**Timescale**

The commissioned research was conducted between August 1996 and August 1998.
Financial Resources

Of the £50,000 annual budget received from GFG, MTCBC allocated a total of £10,000 per annum for the purpose of funding the commissioned research.

Commissioned research design

As indicated in Table 1, the original research proposal contained two research data collection methods, each with its own specific aims, timetable, sampling methods and data sources. However, there was relatively little flexibility in terms of altering the overall research design within the terms of the commissioned research contract. Where appropriate, these data collection methods were utilised by the researcher for the purpose of collecting empirical evidence for the PhD research, with minor alterations being made to those issues that were being investigated, research data collection techniques that were being used, and the range of research participants.

Where the PhD research had been conducted simultaneously with the commissioned research, and those research findings added further value to the commissioned research, these were incorporated with the local authority progress reports. It should however be highlighted that recognition of the PhD research was not always indicated in those reports as it was often difficult to separate and differentiate between commissioned research and PhD research, especially in relation to identifying perceived barriers and opportunities for change.
Table 1: Outline of the University Commissioned Research proposal and how it was extended for the PhD research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Duration of research</th>
<th>Sources of research data (including research participants)</th>
<th>Additional aims and/or issues</th>
<th>Alterations made to research techniques, research participants and sampling techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal postal questionnaire survey</td>
<td>1. Measure changes in household attitudes and behaviours towards GC issues as a result of implementing the project in both SCP areas. 2. Awareness of GFG and the GC</td>
<td>The research would be conducted at two separate phases of the two-year commissioned research period. <em>Phase 1</em>: October 1996 to December 1996 <em>Phase 2</em>: February 1998 to April 1998</td>
<td>Householders in both SCP area, using random sampling technique.</td>
<td>Identify:  <em>Household local environmental issues of concern.</em>  <em>Household main issues of concern.</em>  <em>Household concern for the local environment.</em>  <em>Local community groups.</em></td>
<td>Random sampling was replaced with systemic sampling of households in both pilot project areas (PPAs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (One to one)</td>
<td>Identify: 1. Perceived barriers and opportunities in achieving sustainable lifestyle changes. 2. Perceived roles and responsibilities in improving the environment.</td>
<td>Conducted within the two year commissioned research period. <em>(June 1997 – February 1998)</em></td>
<td>Community leaders, community group members, community group leaders. No sampling method was specified.</td>
<td>The breadth of issues was widened to include;  <em>Community focused issues.</em>  <em>Broader quality of life issues.</em>  <em>Perceptions of the environment.</em>  <em>Community action.</em>  <em>Local Action Groups (LAGs).</em></td>
<td>1. The range of community stakeholders was increased to include a wider range of community members including non-community group members and community based professionals. 2. In addition to one to one interviews, interviews were also extended to include two interviewees. 3. Focus group discussions were also undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Interview Guide (Exploratory Phase)

Interview Guide (Exploratory Phase)
Semi-Structured Interviews & Focus Groups

**Introduction**
- Introduction to purpose of research and the researcher.
- Consent to record focus group/interview on audio-tape.
- Indicate that when the tape recording is transcribed, the name of participant(s) will remain anonymous for purposes of confidentiality.
- Tape recordings will kept in a locked cupboard.
- Participant(s) reminded that they can ask at anytime to pause or stop the interview process if they feel uncomfortable or need to rest.

**Individual**
Brief introduction about the participant(s), including (where applicable):
- Area of residence
- Age
- Community group membership
- Position within the ‘community’
- Network of friends and family members in the community
- Length of residence
- Length of time worked in area

**Community**
- Description or definition of their ‘local’ community, i.e. street, neighbourhood, pilot project area or wider.
- What participant(s) liked or disliked about their ‘local’ community.
- Has their community changed over the past 10,15,20 years. If so, how and why?
- What they perceive their community to be like in the future.
- Is there a ‘sense if community’ within the area as a whole, or is it restricted to certain areas. What benefits does a ‘sense of community’ give local residents?
- Examples of community action in relation to tackling local issues of concern.
- Who got involved, and why?

---

1 For the purpose of the topic/interview guide, ‘community’ refers to the pilot project area.
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- Was community action successful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Issues of concern
- Main local issue(s) of concern to participant(s) and the wider community.
- How have those issues impacted upon participant(s) quality of life?
- What is perceived to prevent local issue(s) of concern from being resolved?
- Who is responsible for resolving local issue(s) of concern?

Community action & participation
- Examples of community action in relation to tackling local issues of concern.
- Who got involved, and why?
- Was community action successful? If so, why? If not, why not?
- Barriers and opportunities in securing community action and participation in local decision-making processes.

Environment
- What the term ‘environment’ meant to participant(s)? Is this perception the same as other residents?
- How has their ‘local’ environment changed over recent years.
- What do they perceive their ‘local’ environment to be like in the future?
- Concern for the ‘local’ environment held by participants and the wider community.
- Roles and responsibilities for improving the local environment, including, individuals, the community, Community Council (in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog), Local Authority, local businesses and the Voluntary sector e.g. Keep Wales Tidy Campaign or Groundwork Trust.
- Barriers and opportunities in improving the local environment.

Going for Green
- Heard of Going for Green.
- What the pilot SCP is perceived to be about? Individual or community action?
- Awareness of the Green Code, and its perceived relevancy to local people? If yes, why? If not, why not?
- Is such action perceived to be worthwhile?
- Barriers and opportunities in securing participation in the pilot SCP.
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- Barriers and opportunities in securing sustained participation in the pilot SCP.

Close of interview/focus group

- Any additional perceived barriers or opportunities with respect to achieving community action and/or participation in local decision-making processes?
- Brief overview of Going for Green (if participants were unaware as to what the project was about).
- Brief overview of the research and its purpose.
- Offer participant(s) opportunity to ask any further question(s) relating to the Going for Green Project or the research.
- Identification of potential participants for future interviews/focus groups, including a point of contact.
Dear,

I am a research student at the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff and currently involved with the Going for Green Project in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog.

As you may remember, questionnaires were sent to local residents in November 1996, from which we received a tremendous response, with very interesting issues being raised about the village.

Since then various efforts have been taken to set up a 'Going for Green' Community Action Group in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog. This group is made up of local residents and aims to tackle those issues that were raised as a result of the questionnaire.

Having attended several Going for Green Community Action Group meetings it has come to my attention that local people like to give their opinions and views on certain aspects of their local community. I would be grateful if you could provide me with the opportunity to sit down with you and share your thoughts, views and experiences.

I aim to contact approximately 15-20 local residents in your village for the same purpose. Each appointment will take 30 minutes, or as long as we want to talk! You are assured that anything that is said will be treated with the strictest confidence. Our meeting will help guide the Going for Green project both locally and nationally.

I will aim to be as flexible as I can in order to arrange a date and time with you. For reasons of convenience, it would be preferred if we could arrange to meet at your home, or if you prefer somewhere in your village were we will not be disturbed.

I have enclosed two appointment forms, one of which you can keep to remind yourself of our appointment. It would be greatly appreciated if you could complete the enclosed appointment forms and send one to me at your earliest convenience in the enclosed S.A.E. or alternatively you can contact me on (01222) 506896.

I shall contact you two days before our appointment, so as to ensure that it is still convenient. If you wish to change your appointment at any time please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Andrea Collins
(Research Student)
Appointment Form - Going for Green

Name:

Address:

Telephone number:

Date and time: (please indicate what date and time is most convenient to you)

I shall contact you two days before our appointment, so as to ensure that it is still convenient. If you wish to change your appointment at any time please do not hesitate to contact me on (01222) 506896.
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Phase 1 (Questionnaire A)  
Reference number: - ..........................

SECTION 1  
This section of the questionnaire is concerned with waste produced by your household.

QUESTION 1  
Do members of your household refuse extra packaging when purchasing goods? (for example, plastic carrier bags).

 always  □
sometimes  □
rarely  □
ever  □

QUESTION 2  
Do members of your household re-use packaging / containers wherever possible?

 always  □
sometimes  □
rarely  □
ever  □

QUESTION 3  
Are there any recycling facilities within your local community?

 yes  □ please go to question 4
no  □ please go to question 8

QUESTION 4  
Are the members of your household satisfied with such recycling facilities?

 yes  □
no  □
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**QUESTION 5**

Please give reasons for your answer in QUESTION 4?


**QUESTION 6**

Does your household use these recycling facilities?

- always  □  please go to question 7
- sometimes □  please go to question 7
- rarely  □  please go to question 7
- never  □  please go to question 8

**QUESTION 7**

What does your household recycle?

- paper  □
- cans  □
- glass  □
- clothing  □
- car oil □
- car batteries  □
- other (please specify): ...........................................

**QUESTION 8**

Do you think the members of your household could recycle more?

- yes  □
- no  □
- don't know  □
SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with your household's use of energy and natural resources, (this includes gas, electric and water).

QUESTION 1

Does your household do any of the following?

- Turn down heating when not required
- Turn off lights/television when not in a room
- Heat only one room
- Use energy efficient appliances e.g. fridges/freezer
- Have loft insulation
- Have walls insulated
- Have double glazing installed
- Use low energy lighting
- Heating control on radiators
- Draught Proofing
- None of the above
- Other (please specify): .................................................................

QUESTION 2

Is your household concerned about the amount of domestic fuel they use?

- yes □ please go to question 3
- no □ please go to question 4

QUESTION 3

Why is your household concerned?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
**QUESTION 4**

Does your accommodation have a water meter?

- yes
- no

**QUESTION 5**

Does your household do any of the following?

- Take showers rather than baths
- Put full loads in washing machine
- Use a low-flush toilet
- Taps not left running when washing dishes etc.
- Use a rain water butt or watering can when watering the garden rather than a hose or sprinkler
- Wash a motor vehicle using a bucket, rather than a hose or going to a garage
- Use water efficient appliances e.g. washing machines/dishwasher
- Ensure water taps don't drip
- None of the above

Other (please specify):---------------------

**QUESTION 6**

Is your household concerned about the amount of water that they use?

- yes
- no

please go to question 7

please go to the next section

**QUESTION 7**

Why is your household concerned about the amount of water they use?

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................
SECTION 3

This section of the questionnaire is concerned about local issues.

QUESTION 1

Is your household concerned about the condition of their local environment?

- very concerned
- quite concerned
- not very concerned
- not concerned

QUESTION 2

What does your household consider to be the main environmental issues in their local community?

Please list them below in order of importance, were 1 = most important.

1) .......................................................... 
2) .......................................................... 
3) .......................................................... 
4) ..........................................................
5) ..........................................................
6) ..........................................................

QUESTION 3

Are any members of your household involved with any local groups?
(for example, Girl Guides, Women’s Group, Angling Club, Rugby Club, Church Group).

- yes □ please go to question 4
- no □ please go to question 5
**QUESTION 4**

Please state the name of the group(s)?

........................................................................................................................................................................

**QUESTION 5**

Please indicate in order of importance which of the following 5 issues are of concern to members of your household.
(1 = most important issue and 5 = least important issue).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noise nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog fouling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local wildlife and nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upkeeping of pathways and cycle ways</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubbish produced</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of recycling facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumping of rubbish</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children's education</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speeding motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify): ............................

**QUESTION 6**

Has your household ever heard of the “GOING FOR GREEN” PROJECT?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with general information about your household.

QUESTION 1

How long has your household lived in your village?

...............years

QUESTION 2

When was your accommodation built?

- Pre-1919  [ ]
- 1919-1944  [ ]
- 1945-1964  [ ]
- 1965-1980  [ ]
- 1980 onwards  [ ]

QUESTION 3

What type of accommodation does your household live in?

- Detached  [ ]
- Semi detached  [ ]
- Mid or End Terraced  [ ]
- Flat  [ ]
- Other (please specify): ..........................

QUESTION 4

Which one of the following applies to your household's accommodation?

- Owner occupied  [ ]
- Local Authority rented  [ ]
- Housing Association rented  [ ]
- Private rented  [ ]
- Other (please specify): ..........................
QUESTION 5
How many people live in your household?

........................................... people

QUESTION 6
Which one of the following categories applies to YOU?

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Retired □
Housewife □

Other:-..................................

QUESTION 7
Which of the following categories applies to the rest of your HOUSEHOLD? (please tick more than one box were appropriate).

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Pre-school age □
Housewife □
Retired □

Other:-..................................
If there are any further comments that you would like to express about your local environment which have not been previously mentioned, please mention them below.

...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation in completing this questionnaire.
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Phase 1 (Questionnaire B)

Reference number:..............................

SECTION 1

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with the way in which your household travels from place to place.

QUESTION 1

Does your household have access to any type of private motor vehicle? (For example a car, van or motorcycle).

- yes □ please go to question 2
- no □ please go to question 6

QUESTION 2

How many private motor vehicles does your household have access to?

- 1 □
- 2 □
- 3 or more □

QUESTION 3

Are these vehicle(s) regularly serviced?

- yes □
- no □

QUESTION 4

Does your household ever share journeys with others? (for example when travelling to and from work or when shopping).

- yes □
- no □
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QUESTION 5

Does your household combine journeys when travelling by private motor vehicle? (for example, going shopping on the way home from work).

- yes ☐
- no ☐

QUESTION 6

When travelling short distances (less than 2 miles), which methods of the following methods of getting about does your household use?

- private motor vehicle ☐
- public transport ☐
- walk ☐
- cycle ☐
- taxi ☐
- other (please specify): ............................................

QUESTION 7

When travelling longer distances (2 miles or more) which of the following methods of getting about does your household use?

- private motor vehicle ☐
- public transport ☐
- walk ☐
- cycle ☐
- taxi ☐
- other (please specify): ............................................
SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire is concerned about local issues.

QUESTION 1

Is your household concerned about the condition of their local environment?

very concerned □
quite concerned □
not very concerned □
not concerned □

QUESTION 2

What does your household consider to be the MAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES in their local community?

Please list them below in order of importance, where 1 = most important.

1) .................................................................
2) .................................................................
3) .................................................................
4) .................................................................
5) .................................................................
6) .................................................................

QUESTION 3

Are any members of your household involved with any local groups? (for example, Girl Guides, Women's Group, Angling Club, Rugby Club, Church Group).

yes □ please go to question 4
no □ please go to question 5
QUESTION 4

Please state the name of the group(s)?

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

QUESTION 5

Please indicate in order of importance which of the following 5 issues are of concern to members of your household.
(1 = most important issue and 5 = least important issue).

- noise nuisance
- air pollution
- dog fouling
- open space
- local wildlife and nature
- upkeeping of pathways and cycle ways
- litter
- traffic congestion
- water pollution
- rubbish produced
- water usage
- energy consumption
- lack of recycling facilities
- dumping of rubbish
- children's education
- crime
- employment
- speeding motor vehicles
- housing
- their health
- other (please specify): ........................................

QUESTION 6

Has your household ever heard of the “GOING FOR GREEN” PROJECT?

  yes  □

  no  □
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QUESTION 5
How many people live in your household?

.............................................people

QUESTION 6
Which one of the following categories applies to YOU?

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Retired □
Housewife □

Other (please specify):-....................................

QUESTION 7
Which of the following categories applies to the rest of your HOUSEHOLD?
(please tick more than one box were appropriate).

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Pre-school age □
Housewife □
Retired □

Other (please specify):-....................................
If there are any further comments that you would like to express about your local environment which have not been previously mentioned, please mention them below.


Thank you very much for your time and co-operation in completing this questionnaire.
Section 1

This section of the questionnaire is concerned about pollution in your local environment.

Question 1

Does your household know how to dispose of chemicals / oils properly?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Question 2

How does / would your household dispose of them?

Question 3

How does your household dispose of bulky waste items? (for example, beds, chairs etc.)

Question 4

Are there any areas within your local community which are frequently used for fly tipping / dumping of waste?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
QUESTION 5

Please state where?


QUESTION 6

Does your household ever use bonfires to burn rubbish (other than garden refuse)?

   yes  □
   no   □
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SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire is concerned about your local environment.

QUESTION 1

Does your household consider that your local community is kept free from litter?

- yes □
- no □

QUESTION 2

Does any member of your household ever pick up other people's litter?

- yes □
- no □

QUESTION 3

Does your household have any of the following?

- a garden □ please go to question 4
- a greenhouse □ please go to question 4
- an allotment □ please go to question 4
- none of the above □ please go to the next section

QUESTION 4

Does your household use artificial fertilisers and/or other garden chemicals?

- yes □
- no □
QUESTION 5

Does your household use ‘peat based’ compost?

yes [ ]

no [ ]

QUESTION 6

Does your household have compost facilities?

yes [ ] please go to question 7

no [ ] please go to the next section

QUESTION 7

What does your household compost?

kitchen waste [ ]

garden waste [ ]
SECTION 3

This section of the questionnaire is about local issues.

QUESTION 1

Is your household concerned about the condition of their local environment?

- very concerned [ ]
- quite concerned [ ]
- not very concerned [ ]
- not concerned [ ]

QUESTION 2

What does your household consider to be the MAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES in their local community? (for example, pollution, litter, dog fouling).

Please list them below in order of importance, were 1 = most important.

1) ................................................
2) ................................................
3) ................................................
4) ................................................
5) ................................................
6) ................................................

QUESTION 3

Are any members of your household involved with any local groups? (for example, Girl Guides, Women’s Group, Angling Club, Rugby Club, Religious Group).

- yes [ ] please go to question 4
- no [ ] please go to question 5
QUESTION 4

Please state the name of the group(s)?

QUESTION 5

Please indicate in order of importance which of the following 5 issues are of concern to members of your household.
(1 = most important issue and 5 = least important issue).

- noise nuisance
- air pollution
- dog fouling
- open space
- local wildlife and nature
- upkeeping of pathways and cycle ways
- litter
- traffic congestion
- water pollution
- rubbish produced
- water usage
- energy consumption
- lack of recycling facilities
- dumping of rubbish
- children's education
- crime
- employment
- speeding motor vehicles
- housing
- their health

other (please specify): .................................................................
QUESTION 6

Has your household ever heard of the “GOING FOR GREEN” PROJECT?

   yes □
   no □
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SECTION 4

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with general information about your household.

**QUESTION 1**

How long has your household lived in your village?

.................... years

**QUESTION 2**

When was your accommodation built?

- Pre-1919
- 1919-1944
- 1945-1964
- 1965-1980
- 1980 onwards

**QUESTION 3**

What type of accommodation does your household live in?

- Detached
- Semi detached
- Mid or End Terraced
- Flat
- Other (please specify): ..................................................

**QUESTION 4**

Which one of the following applies to your households accommodation?

- Owner occupied
- Local Authority rented
- Housing Association rented
- Private rented
- Other (please specify): ..................................................
QUESTION 5
How many people live in your household?

..............................................people

QUESTION 6
Which one of the following categories applies to YOU?

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Retired □
Housewife □

Other (please specify):..............................................

QUESTION 7
Which of the following categories applies to the rest of your HOUSEHOLD?
(please tick more than one box were appropriate).

Employed □
Unemployed □
Attending school □
Attending college/university □
Pre-school age □
Housewife □
Retired □

Other (please specify):..............................................
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If there are any further comments that you would like to express about your local environment which have not been previously mentioned, please mention them below.

....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation in completing this questionnaire.
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Reference number: ..........................................

SECTION 1

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with waste produced by your household.

QUESTION 1

Do members of your household refuse extra packaging when purchasing goods? (for example, plastic carrier bags).

always ☐
sometimes ☐
rarely ☐
never ☐

QUESTION 2

Do members of your household re-use packaging / containers wherever possible?

always ☐
sometimes ☐
rarely ☐
never ☐

QUESTION 3

What does your household recycle?

paper ☐
cans ☐
glass ☐
clothing ☐
car oil ☐
car batteries ☐
one of the above ☐
other (please specify): ....................................

QUESTION 4

Do you think the members of your household could recycle more?

yes ☐
no ☐
don't know ☐
SECTION 2

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with your household’s use of energy and natural resources, (this includes gas, electric and water).

QUESTION 1

Does your household do any of the following?

- Turn down heating when not required
- Turn off lights / television when not in a room
- Heat only one room
- Use energy efficient appliances e.g. fridge freezer
- Have loft insulation
- Have walls insulated
- Have double-glazing installed
- Use low energy lighting
- Heating control on radiators
- Have draught proofing
- None of the above
- Other (please specify): .................................................................

QUESTION 2

Has your household made attempts to gain more information on energy conservation within the home?

- yes ☐
- no ☐

QUESTION 3

Is your household concerned about the amount of domestic fuel they use?

- yes ☐ please go to question 4
- no ☐ please go to question 5
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QUESTION 4
Why is your household concerned?

QUESTION 5
Does your household do any of the following?

- Take showers rather than baths
- Put full loads in washing machine
- Use a low-flush toilet
- Taps not left running when washing dishes etc.
- Use a rain water butt or watering can when watering the garden rather than a hose or sprinkler
- Wash a motor vehicle using a bucket, rather than a hose or going to a garage
- Use water efficient appliances e.g. washing machines/dishwasher
- Ensure water taps don't drip
- Have a ‘Hippo’ bag installed in a toilet
- None of the above

Other (please specify):

QUESTION 6
Is your household concerned about the amount of water that they use?

- yes  □  please go to question 7
- no  □  please go to the next section (Section 3)

QUESTION 7
Why is your household concerned about the amount of water they use?

..................................................................................................................................................................................
SECTION 3

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with the way in which your household travels from place to place.

QUESTION 1

When travelling short distances (less than 2 miles), which of the following methods of getting about does your household use?

- private motor vehicle  
- public transport  
- walk  
- cycle  
- taxi  
- other (please specify): .......................................................... 

QUESTION 2

Please give reasons for your answer?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

QUESTION 3

When travelling longer distances (2 miles or more) which of the following methods of getting about does your household use?

- private motor vehicle  
- public transport  
- walk  
- cycle  
- taxi  
- other (please specify): .......................................................... 

QUESTION 4

Please give reasons for your answer?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
SECTION 4

This section of the questionnaire is concerned about pollution and your local environment.

QUESTION 1

How does your household dispose of bulky waste items? (for example, beds, chairs etc).

QUESTION 2

Does your household ever use bonfires to burn rubbish?

yes □
no □

QUESTION 3

Does any member of your household ever pick up other people's litter?

yes □
no □

QUESTION 4

Does your household use artificial fertilisers and / or other garden chemicals?

yes □
no □

QUESTION 5

Does your household have compost facilities?

yes □ please go to question 6
no □ please go to the next section (Section 5)

QUESTION 6

What does your household compost?

kitchen waste □
garden waste □
SECTION 3

This section of the questionnaire is about local issues.

QUESTION 1

Is your household concerned about the condition of their local environment?

very concerned □
quite concerned □
not very concerned □
not concerned □

QUESTION 2

What does your household consider to be the MAIN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES in their local community?

Please list them below in order of importance, where 1 = most important.

1) ........................................................................
2) ........................................................................
3) ........................................................................
4) ........................................................................
5) ........................................................................
6) ........................................................................

QUESTION 3

Has your household ever heard of the “GOING FOR GREEN” PROJECT?

yes □
no □

QUESTION 4

If yes, where have you heard about it?

...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
SECTION 6

This section of the questionnaire is concerned with general information about your household.

**QUESTION 1**

How long has your household lived in your village? ...............years

**QUESTION 2**

How many people live in your household? ...............people

**QUESTION 3**

Which one of the following categories applies to YOU?

- Employed
- Unemployed
- Attending school
- Attending college/university
- Retired
- Housewife
- Other (please specify):-...............................

**QUESTION 4**

Which of the following categories applies to the rest of your HOUSEHOLD? (please indicate as to how many persons in your household are within each category).

- Employed
- Unemployed
- Attending school
- Attending college/university
- Pre-school age
- Housewife
- Retired
- Other (please specify):-...............................
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If there are any further comments that you would like to express about your local environment which have not been previously mentioned, please mention them below.
Dear Householder,

Your local community is important and valuable, and therefore every opportunity should be taken to continually improve it, such an opportunity has arisen.

To be successful, the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (U.W.I.C.) will be working together with Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council and you, the local citizen.

To enable U.W.I.C. and Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council to get an accurate picture of your local community and the views of its citizens, it would be greatly appreciated if you, the householder would complete this short and simple questionnaire.

Any answers given in this questionnaire will remain confidential, and your household will not be disclosed under any circumstances.

We would like to thank you for completing this questionnaire, as such information will provide an opportunity for improvements to be made in your local community.

Questionnaires are to be returned to your local Post Office before 25th November, 1996.

Your local Post Office is: - Trelewis Post Office, 22-23 High Street, Trelewis

If your household would prefer this questionnaire in Welsh, please do not hesitate to contact either Ms. S. Richards on (01685) 725402 or Ms. A. Collins on (01222) 506852.

Dear Trelewis Resident,

Last year Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council asked the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (U.W.I.C.) to administer a questionnaire within Trelewis, in order to get an accurate picture of the community and the views of the local people. The results obtained from the questionnaire were very interesting, and have proven to be a valuable source of information for the local authority.

It has been over one year since the first questionnaire was administered to households, and there is a need to administer a second questionnaire in order to find out if there have been any changes in householders views.

Any answers given in this questionnaire will remain confidential, and we would like to thank you in advance for taking time to complete this questionnaire.

Questionnaires are to be returned to any of the following locations before 22nd March, 1998, where there will be a collection box on display:

- The Bontnewydd Hotel
- Trelewis Post Office

The questionnaire may also be handed in at the local school by your child.
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Interview Guide
Going for Green Officer

Model(s) and strategy(ies)
- Was a formal strategy developed for implementing the PSCP?
- If yes, what did that strategy involve?
- Why was the PSCP based in the environmental health department?
- Why was there an official GFG Launch in Merthyr Tydfil?
- Who was involved and why?
- Where both PPAs involved? (why not)

Effectiveness of the Green Code in encouraging community participation
- What was the PSCP perceived to be about? GFGO/ Local Authority/Elected representatives

Methods and Process(es)
- What was community participation perceived to be about? What did this mean in terms of implementing the PSCP?
- How were the community encourage to participate?
- Where those method(s) and process(es) used to implement the PSCP based upon examples from other projects?
- Why (and how) were local schools involved?
- Why were local community organisation and groups contacted?
- Why were supporting publicity materials developed and used?

Steering Committee
- Why was it established?
- Who was involved and why?
- Where residents from both pilot project areas involved? If not, why?

Pantyscallog
- Why was a Planning for Real® Exercise used to encourage community participation?
- Was the Pant Residents Association an effective method through which to reintroduce the PSCP to residents? If yes, why? If not, why?
Appendix 8: Focused Interview Guide (Going for Green Officer)

Electoral Ward of Bedlinog

- Why was a public meeting used to encourage community participation?

Effectiveness of method(s) and process(es)

- Who did and didn’t attend the Planning for Real® Exercise in Pantyscallog?
- Who did and didn’t attend the public meeting in the Electoral Ward of Bedlinog?
- How much support is the PSCP getting from the Pant Residents Association?

Outcomes and impacts

- What did the GFGO aim to achieve during the course of the PSCP?
- Where specific aims developed for each local project that was developed?
- What was used to measure the success of these projects?
Focused Group Interview: LAG Participants

GFG Project
• What was the GFG Project initially perceived to be about?
• What was it perceived to involve?

Participation
• What does the term participation mean to you?
• What does it involve?
• Factors perceived to facilitate or inhibit participation in the LAG?
• Who participated in the LAG?
• Who didn’t participate, and why?
• Factors perceived to facilitate or inhibit participation by the wider community in GFG related Projects (including examples)
• Perceived benefits of participating in the LAG and its related activities.
• What was involved by participating in the LAG? (including examples)
• Perceived benefits and gains from participating in the LAG (individually and as a group)

Community Participation
• What was the term community participation perceived to mean?
• What did the concept of community mean (including the identification of any divisions)
• Is the LAG a good example of community participation?
• Is the LAG an effective method through which to encourage community participation? (If yes, how and why?) (If no, why)
• Is the LAG representative of the wider community?
• How has the LAG attempted to encourage community participation in its related projects?
• Where these methods effective, and why?
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**Participation (refer to Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation)**

- What was the level of participation in the initial stages of the project? Who participated at this stage?
- What was the level of participation after the LAG had formed? Who participated at this stage?
- What was the highest level of participation achieved by the LAG? When did this happen? Why?
- Was this level of participation retained by the LAG? Why?
- What factors were perceived to influenced the level of participation achieved by the LAG?
- What was the most significant point for LAG participants through being involved with the project? Why?
- At what stage did LAG participants feel that they were having an influence over decisions made in relation to the Project?
- Was there a shift in power over time?
- Was this level of power retained by the LAG? Why?
- What was perceived to be the most significant point for the wider community? Why?

**Impact made by LAG**

- Was the LAG able to influence Local Authority decision-making? Why and how?
- What impact did the LAG have on the wider community?
- Did the LAG have an impact on only certain particular ‘groups’ within their Pilot Project area? Who and why?

**GFGO**

- What role did the GFGO play in relation to LAG activities?
- Did the GFGO influence what LAG participants achieved as a resulted of participating in the Project? Why and how?
- Were those efforts undertaken by the GFGO in relation to implementing projects perceived to be effective? Did they make an impact? How and why?
Future of the LAG

- Was the LAG perceived to be an effective method through which to encourage participation by the wider community in the future?
- What did the LAG achieve?
- In hindsight, how could the LAG have increased any impact that it made?
- How could the activities of the LAG be enhanced in the future? Could it develop links with other local groups and organisations?
- Was the LAG perceived to have any limitations in terms of what it could hope to achieve in the future?
- What did participants perceived to have gained as a result of participating in the LAG?
- What had not been gained and why?
- What the Green Code relevant to the LAG in terms of what they wanted to achieve? How and why?
- Can the efforts of the LAG be sustained?
- Factors perceived to facilitate and inhibit the sustainability of the LAG.

- What is perceived to have been the overall impact of the LAG and its related activities on the wider community?
- Identify ‘communities of interest’
LAG Participant Profile Questionnaire

For the purpose of this research please complete the following questions. To ensure confidentiality of information your name is not required.

1. Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Age: _______ years

3. Which village do you live in?
   - Bedlinog [ ]
   - Trelewis [ ]
   - Pantyscallog [ ]

4. How many years have you lived in this village? _______ years

5. Which one of the following categories applies to you?
   - employed (professional) [ ]
   - employed (non-professional) [ ]
   - unemployed [ ]
   - retired [ ]
   - housewife [ ]

6. What other groups or organisations are you currently involved with?

7. What responsibilities or position do you hold within such groups or organisations?

8. Within such groups and/or organisations, what type of activities do you get involved with?
### Community Participation Assessment (LAG Participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question asked</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2-2.9</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who was involved in deciding what issues needed to be tackled?</td>
<td>&quot;It was the professionals that decided&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The professionals and the community defined the issues together&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It was the community that decided that they needed the GFG Project&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were local groups and organisations involved in leading the GFG project?</td>
<td>&quot;It represents a small group of people&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It involves a combination of some groups' interest&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It represents many groups' interests&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the GFG Project organised?</td>
<td>&quot;The goals of the project had already been defined. How we would achieve the project's goals had also been decided. There were only a few local groups involved. The project was mainly being run by professionals.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The goals of the project had already been defined. Although it had been decided how the project's goals were to be achieved, there was flexibility in how it was done. Although the project was mainly being run by professionals, there were also a number of non-professionals involved.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Although the project had specific goals, there was flexibility in how we met them. The project was mainly being run by a number of non-professionals&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were the aims of the project being met?</td>
<td>&quot;Only through official funding&quot; (top-down funding)</td>
<td>&quot;Although we were using official funding, we were also searching for external funds. We were also making use of non-financial resources.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We have secured external funds and are also making use of our own non-financial resources.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who was involved in managing the project?</td>
<td>&quot;It was mainly 'external' professionals that were making all the key decisions&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Decisions were being made joint by professionals and the community&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;It was mainly the Community that were making the decisions. We were also using professionals as resources.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 (based on the extent to which community learning and capacity building occurred)
Community Interviews
Pantyscallog

1a. Have you heard of the Going for Green Project?
☐ yes
☐ no

1b. If yes, where did you hear about it?

2. What do you think the Going for Green Project is about?

3. Have you heard of any of the following projects etc? What do you know about them?
☐ Village signs
☐ Newsletter
☐ Planning for real exercise
☐ Going for Green Group
☐ Energy Month (Valley Energy Action trailer and SWALEC talk)
☐ School Organic Garden
☐ Energy Conservation (HEES forms)
☐ Travelling safely and sensibly
  (walk to school Project and walk to school Guide book)
☐ Anti-motorbike landscaping
☐ Dog fouling project
☐ Dog warden
☐ Going for Green Programme of talks and Calendar Competition

4a. Have you been involved with any of the projects etc?
☐ yes
☐ no

4b. If yes how? If not, why?
5. What do you understand by the term community participation?

6. Were you aware that there was a Going for Green group set up in your village?
   - yes
   - no

7a. Do you know what that group of people did?
   - yes
   - no

7b. If yes, what?

8. How has the Going for Green Project had an impact on those that live in the community? (What, who and how?)
Community Interviews
Electoral Ward of Bedlinog

1a. Have you heard of the Going for Green Project?
☐ yes
☐ no

1b. If yes, where did you heard about it?

2. What do you think the Going for Green Project is about?

3. Have you heard of any of the following projects etc? What do you know about them?
☐ Newsletter
☐ Village signs
☐ Public meeting
☐ Going for Green Group
☐ Play area – Shinrig Estate (Trelewis)
☐ Playground area (Bedlinog)
☐ Colly Row (Bedlinog)
☐ Going for Green Programme of talks and Calendar Competition
☐ Abbey National Helping Hand Community partnership Programme (Bedlinog Juniors)
☐ Job Finder Service
☐ Bedlinog Square (Bedlinog)
☐ Bedlinog Terrace (Bedlinog)
☐ Parc Hen Trelewis (Trelewis)
☐ Recycling Banks (Trelewis)
☐ How does your garden grow (Composting)
☐ Energy Month (Vallies Energy Action Trailer and SWALEC talks)
☐ Water conservation (HIPPOS bags – Bedlinog and info leaflets – Trelewis)

4a. Have you been involved with any of the projects etc?
☐ yes
☐ no
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4b. If yes how? If not, why?

5. What do you understand by the term community participation?

6. Were you aware that there was a Going for Green group set up in your village?
   □ yes
   □ no

7a. Do you know what that group of people did?
   □ yes
   □ no

7b. If yes, what?

8. How has the Going for Green Project had an impact on those that live in the community? (What, who and how?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantyscallog</th>
<th>Electoral Ward of Bedlinog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Village signs</td>
<td>1. Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photographs of GFG signs</td>
<td>• Copies of Issues 1, 2 &amp; 3 of the GFG Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Newsletter</td>
<td>2. Village signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Copies of Issues 1, 2 &amp; 3 of the GFG</td>
<td>• Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planning for Real exercise</td>
<td>3. Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newspaper article:</td>
<td>• Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Model pupils’ green dream takes shape</td>
<td>• Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photographs</td>
<td>• Copy of household letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Going for Green Group</td>
<td>4. GFG group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of LAG and where they meet</td>
<td>• Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Energy Month</td>
<td>5. Play area (Trelewis – Shingrig Estate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newspaper article:</td>
<td>• Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Green scheme aims to cut power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bills’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poster used to advertise Trailer event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photographs</td>
<td>• Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newspaper articles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pupils keep going green’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pupils go for green to brighten up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Referred to HEES forms (Home Energy</td>
<td>• Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Service forms) which had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been left at local post office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travelling safely and sensibly</td>
<td>8. GFG Programme of Talks and Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk to school guide book</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photographs</td>
<td>‘The Green Scene – call for more buses and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newspaper article:</td>
<td>less mess please!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Children face hazards on way to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description</td>
<td>partnership Programme (Bedlinog Juniors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dog fouling project</td>
<td>• Newspaper article:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Referred to ‘red’ dog fouling bins</td>
<td>‘Bedlinog school children give Green Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newspaper article:</td>
<td>a helping hand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Poop scooping top of green agenda’</td>
<td>‘We need jobs now’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11  | Dog warden | • Description  
• Poster used to advertise Dog Warden Service |
| 12  | Going for Green Programme of talks and Calendar Competition | • Calendar  
• Photos  
• Article in MTCBC Newsletter: 'The Green Scene - call for more buses and less mess please!' |
| 11  | Bedlinog Square | • Description  
• Photos |
| 12  | Bedlinog Terrace | • Photos  
• Newspaper articles: 'Time to remember'  
'Children turn land into nature reserve'  
'Going back to nature' |
| 13  | Parc Hen | • Description  
• Photographs  
• Newspaper articles: 'People power plans new look for new environmental project'  
'Sporting plan for village wasteland'  
'First Phase finished by November'  
'Pupils planning to give Valley a greener future'  
'Volunteers go greener . . . .' |
| 14  | Recycling Banks | • Photos |
| 15  | How does your garden grow (Composting) | • Description  
• Refer to article in Newsletter |
| 16  | Energy Month | • Description  
• Copy of Poster used to advertise event |
| 17  | Water Conservation | • 'Blue' HIPPO Bags  
• Information leaflet  
• Photographs |
Focused Interview (Explanatory Phase)

Agencies & Organisations

Name:

Telephone number:

Organisation/Authority:

1. How were you involved with the pilot Sustainable Communities Project in Merthyr Tydfil?

2. Through being involved in the Project, has that experience had any influence in terms of how your agency/organisation will implement community participation in its future projects? If so how? If not why not?
## Appendix 15: Going for Green Steering Committee Membership

### GFG Steering Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedlinog &amp; Trelewis, Going for Green Group</td>
<td>Trevor Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Telecom</td>
<td>Peter Curtis, Programme Manager for Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales</td>
<td>Morgan Chambers, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic Energy</td>
<td>Phil Jenkins, Production Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Manufacture</td>
<td>Phil Corke, Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwr Cymru Welsh Water</td>
<td>Tom Bourne, Environment Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Wendy Merret, Area Catchment Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going for Green</td>
<td>Jo Sutton, National Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork Trust</td>
<td>Sue Price, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork Trust</td>
<td>Margaret Hannigan-Popp, Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion Unit</td>
<td>Ella Jones, Health Promotion Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion Unit</td>
<td>Malcolm Ward, Health Promotion Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Plc</td>
<td>Tim Morgan, Design Engineering Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Wales Tidy Campaign</td>
<td>Bob Gilchrist, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council</td>
<td>Sally Richards Going for Green Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council</td>
<td>Mike Thomas, Principle Environmental Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council</td>
<td>Councillor Helen Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council</td>
<td>Councillor John Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagecoach</td>
<td>Peter Tinsley, Western Area Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWALEC</td>
<td>Dafydd Ricard, Environmental Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taff Bargoed Development Trust</td>
<td>Howard Jackson, Environment Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Flexible</td>
<td>Richard Robbins, Senior Buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wales Institute Cardiff</td>
<td>Andrea Collins, GFG Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Can Company</td>
<td>Alan Rawlinson, Director of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Energy Action</td>
<td>Michael Dicks, Energy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Action Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>Ian Davy, Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR CHANCE TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN PANTYSCALLOG

SO COME ALONG AND MAKE YOUR OPINION KNOWN AT:
PANTYSCALLOG PRIMARY SCHOOL
ON THURSDAY, 27TH MARCH 1997
2.30 p.m. - 7.30 p.m.

For Further Details Contact the Going for Green Officer on 01685 725123

MODEL OF VILLAGE BY PANTYSCALLOG PRIMARY SCHOOL COORDINATED BY DAVID LEWIS JONES

REFRESHMENTS AVAILABLE
Dear Pant Resident,

I would like to invite you to a Going for Green meeting on Thursday 19 June 1997 at Pant Social Club beginning at 7.00pm. Some of you may or may not be familiar with Going for Green. For those of you who are not, Going for Green is a national campaign designed to look into the concerns of communities and then to try and act upon these to enable improvement. There is a Green Code which asks people to adopt the changes in lifestyle which will benefit the local and wider environment.

Merthyr Tydfil Council is the only Welsh authority chosen to take part in this campaign and have chosen to work in the villages of Pant, Bedlinog and Trelewis. So get involved - you are not just representatives of your village and Merthyr but also of Wales.

It was decided after a couple of meetings, backed up by research that one of the first concerns that could be tackled would be dog fouling. The idea being to develop a scheme which can tackle the problem and promote good dog ownership. I realise that this letter will be reaching dog owners who are already responsible, your input will be valuable in designing such a scheme.

The idea of tackling dog fouling is just one of the possible projects that could be set up with Going for Green if you have any further suggestions then please come along to the meeting and put you ideas forward also.

This copy of the letter is intended for your Street only. Other Streets will have their own copies. You may of course disagree with the contents but all I ask is that you ensure that the letter is passed onto your Neighbour. There are some 26 Streets and about 1100 houses in Pant. It is difficult to reach everyone. So even, if you are not interested PLEASE pass this onto your neighbour after your family has read it. That way no-one can say 'didn't know there was a meeting'.

SIGNED: SALLY RICHARDS
01685 725 123

Give me a call if you can't make it but are interested for the future.
WANTED

We need people who care about their village, the environment and their children's future. We need people who want to make a difference.

If you fit this description then report to:
TRELEWIS COMMUNITY CENTRE
on the Thursday, 3rd April 1997 at 7.00 p.m.

The aim of this Public Meeting is to form the Going for Green Local Action Group SO COME ALONG - THE MORE THE MERRIER

CONTACT SALLY RICHARDS ON (01685) 725123 IF YOU NEED MORE DETAILS
Dear Bedlinog Resident,

A Meeting for 'Going for Green' was arranged at Trelewis Leisure Centre on Thursday 3rd April.

The response from Bedlinog was abysmal to say the least. Why abysmal? - because I was the only one from Bedlinog there. There was one other person from Bedlinog but he was part of the representation of the Taf Bargoed Organization.

There was also an abysmally poor turnout from Trelewis.

You are reminded that Merthyr Council accepted the challenging concept of 'Going for Green' and chose the Wards of Pant and Bedlinog (which includes Trelewis) to pilot the scheme.

Bedlinog Ward, with Pant is one of only FIVE such schemes now going on in the whole of Great Britain. It is the only one in Wales.

If the Ward of Bedlinog is not interested in it, not interested in what it entails, what prospects there are in taking part in such a scheme, what it could do for the Village and surrounding area - fine! No problem! I'm sure the Council will ask another Ward in the Borough, Aberfan or Troedyrhiw for example, to take over. The resulting publicity will, I fear, make the people of Bedlinog look like idiots, and deservedly so. There is always a lot of talk about what is wrong in Bedlinog so I am offering you a chance to redeem yourself.

A Public Meeting will take place in the Bedlinog Community Centre on MONDAY 14TH APRIL, 7PM PROMPT. If no-one is there 5 minutes after 7pm I will feel that at least I tried and call it a day and wish which ever Ward will take up the challenge the best of luck.

I make no apologies for the tone of this open letter. I have strong feelings about the issues raised by 'Going for Green' - why else would I turn up for a Meeting. 18% of Bedlinog filled in the 'Going for Green' forms last November which highlighted 120 local issues of concern. Some or all of these issues can, among other things, be discussed at this Public Meeting.

P.T.O.
One final point I would like to make. The Register of Electors for the forthcoming General Election in May shows over 100 new registrations in Bedlinog. Youngsters who have reached the age of 18 etc. What is their future in Bedlinog? What heritage do we bequeath them? Here is a chance for you and the new generation to make yourselves heard.

It is up to you - do nothing and have nothing done.

This copy of the letter is intended for your Street only. Other Streets will have their own copies. You may of course disagree with the contents and sentiments but may I just ask that you ensure the letter is passed on to your Neighbour. There are some 27 Streets and more than 500 houses etc in Bedlinog. It is difficult to reach everyone. So even, and particularly, if you are not interested PLEASE pass this on to your Neighbour after your Family has read it. That way no-one can say 'didn't know there was a meeting'.

SIGNED: TREVOR MORGAN
20 COLLY ROW
tel 710534

Give me a call and cheer me up!