

Raw H-diagrams and action plans from the PATH conference

“How well are different values represented in participatory processes?”

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory GROUP processes?	Positive reasons Code R1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People often consider it difficult to talk about values - It is difficult to include all relevant actors - Values often get underestimated compared to “facts”. - Hidden value prefers of organises of a pp do not get addressed - Someone or group usually dominates framing proceeds - Participants are sometimes not clear over their own value base - Takes a long time and influence from facilitator to bring them to the fore: undue influence? - Policy makers prefer “facts” rather than values - Do you serve values when including many different actors? 	Scores: 4 → 4 5 → 5 5 → 5 6 → 6 7 → 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participative methods designed to take into account value pluralism. Essential part of the process: to bring to the fore hidden values - Involving many stakeholders / actors includes different values - Heterogeneous group composition encourages articulation of different viewpoints and values - Many methods available to elicit value judgements in participatory processes - Many methods worry on power. The resulting methods should enable to have values represented - Choice of participants intended to give a broad range of value and interests - Facilitation as a means to express values and to encourage people to do so - Usually managed so different values are articulated to some degree - Increasing sensitivity to sampling biases 	
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:		
	Accept that values don’t always have to be expressed		
	Make more/ better use of methods that help to articulate values		2
	Increase the salience of value questions		4
	There should be more clearly defined (during the process) when facts or values are addressed		
	Making more explicit the link between facts and values		1
	Making more explicit how facts and values are gonna count in decision making		1
	Minimise values of the organiser in the process		7

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Value elicitation requires active facilitation -> not always acknowledged- “Values” are something that is supposed to be avoided in participatory process- Things may be presented as “facts” but reflect a certain value- Values are outcomes as much as inputs therefore subject to the participatory process- Stop talking about “values”; rather talk about framing of issues		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Sometimes there are some sort of values represented but not very clearly
--	--	--

Comment Card:

None

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory processes?	Positive reasons	Code R2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future generations are badly represented, if at all.... - The selection of participants may represent only key - dominant discourses - No representation as diversity of beliefs and values - No tools for selecting participants / stakeholders on the basis of values - Representatives are not trained for that kind of representation - Values are not made explicit (so included ≠ articulated) - It is given more importance to “stakeholders” than to citizenship representation - The academia hasn’t found the solution to representation problems yet - Formal and informal representation are not complementary - Economic interests prevail - Environmental concerns are not prioritised or addressed - There is persistent poverty and inequality 	<p>Scores: 2 → 3 3 → 3 3 → 3 3 → 3 4 → 4 4 → 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy makers begin to be conscious that representation is an issue - Techniques to choose people are explored - Techniques are there / available - Participatory techniques (games and exercises) can be very useful - Most concerned people are beginning to be involved - Policies change over time to reflect new circumstances - Identify conflicting point and close positions - Policies recognise difference between different sectors of population - Different stakeholder groups are recognised in striving for (demographic) representativeness. You can hope different values are included - <u>Diversity</u> is required - The organisers of the processes usually struggle to involve as many views as possible - Public participation processes tend to focus on values (values as being input of citizens) - There is <u>some</u> diversity in the policies of different political parties 		
	<p>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</p>			
	<p>Should make more clear the difference between involving/ representing different “stakeholders” and different <u>values</u></p>			4
	<p>Create methods and tools to distinguish among diversity of values and to integrate them into decision making participatory process</p>			2
	<p>More research needed on how to integrate quantitative representation (representative democracy) and qualitative differences in values (participation/ deliberative democracy)</p>			1
	<p>Publish “Calls for Values” when launching Participatory Processes</p>			7
	<p>Opposed values – how to incorporate and bring together....</p>			
	<p>Develop (better) tools to articulate values in order to recognise and expose opposed values</p>			4

<p>within society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loudest voices cause change - “usual suspects” scenario evident - it is not usually achieved a quantitative and qualitative representation - minorities without power might not be considered (representativeness of opinions) - Lack of open, inclusive process 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broad values representation helps in problem’s framing - Conversations between experts and lay public do happen
--	--	--

Comment Card:

There is a difference in the assumptions of group member re what constitutes “participation process” i.e. one member is including usual democratic representation process – voting.

Different stakeholders does not mean necessarily different values – is it values or representation of groups we are seeking?

We are having some problems with the words that have been used in the question – each has several interpretations - as does the sentence itself. Many subtleties of this are lost in translation.

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory processes?		Positive reasons Code R3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heterogeneity may even be avoided to minimise conflict and keep the process easy to manage - Voting (or similar) may cut certain values/ voices - Many different values can't be encompassed if the participatory process seeks consensus - By its nature, representation often means values being generalised or grouped together, but this may change the "meaning" of the value - Depends also on the recruitment of participants in the process - "values" and "scientific knowledge/ values" often split in PP but should both be debated together – thought about by all - The practitioners might influence the process and outcomes because of their subjective point of view 	Scores: 3 → 3 4/5 → 4/5 4 → 4 4 → 4 5 → 5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - various PP cover range beyond "demographic representation" - if a process seeks multiple outcomes or "open thinking" then there is room for different views - being truly deliberative the process must involve all values represented amongst the participants - there is a clearer move towards institutional support for wider participation - multi stakeholder processes are increasingly common and advocated - some form of "stakeholder" analysis is increasingly considered in preliminary stages - many participatory processes derive the participants from a wide social spectrum - "opening up" strategy becoming more accepted by some decision-makers
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:		
	Stakeholder analysis should become a routine step in process design	3	
	Methods must be developed that ensure that all important values among the participants are expressed and taken into account	2	
	Framing done with public so that range of issues/ values citizens feel strong about are considered (but depends on when/ level of process is held)	4	
	There need to be different processes, working simultaneously, then different values will have a chance to be represented somewhere	3	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representation of different values is rarely addressed systematically during process design - There is an issue of “silence” of why some people actively choose not to participate - Pre-framing often done far too narrow and without public -> this affects what values/ issues get raised and represented and what experts chosen, etc. - “Roles” of participants rarely/ not always made explicit or only one of several brought out e.g. citizen/ self; citizen/ professional; citizen/ national; citizen/ stakeholder and interests - representation is not always considered important in qualitative research with small sample sizes - often neglected that informal processes may bring out “real/ strong” values. Especially stakeholders may seem represented but limited perspective only 		
--	--	--

Comment Card:

Representation the diagram

Process and/ or outcome

Negative reasons	How well are different values (INTERESTS?) represented in participatory processes?	Positive reasons	Code R4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Group – think” can homogenize the values represented - some values are less socially acceptable in the current climate - PPs often aim for consensus - PPs are often framed (directly or indirectly) in terms of particular values - There are many different kinds of values (ethical, political, epistemic, technical) - a situation that often yields confusion - Powerful groups have own supporting circles - Some values are over-represented because of the asymmetrical distribution of power among the actors - Some groups very organised at playing the participatory game, and may manipulate 	Scores: 3 → 4 4 → 4 4 → 4 5 → 5 5 → 5 6 → 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selection of participant groups - PPs bring representatives of different groups together - Increased awareness of importance of representing a range of values - Individuals with different values can be accessed through representative groups - Most participatory processes <u>aim</u> to represent different groups/ interests/ values - Participatory processes often seek participants via contact with special interest groups therefore they are likely to be invited to attend - Those with specific values are able to do so in a listening, open, accepting environment - Participatory processes deliberately seek to be inclusive of all view points - Upper limit to elite groups 		
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:			
	Effective planning and chairing of participatory meeting/ process			2
	Participants should be involved in framing the process			5
	Elicit the variety of values involved in a participatory process, especially the assumptions behind technical values			2
	Provide education and logistical and financial subsidies to allow ordinarily disenfranchised parties/ individuals to participate			6
	Provide equality of opportunity to all potential participants			3

<p>processes to the detriment of others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elites have more knowledge beforehand - Logistical (\$, timing, location) and psychological/ cultural factors limit participation - Dominant personalities can squelch expression by less bold participants - Fear, feeling marginal, shyness, quietness, nervousness, persecution uncertainty are all characteristics which can result in under representation - Participants are subject to influence from more vocal/ powerful participants - Lack of representative bodies for marginalised groups - Some value groups lack political and economic power to ensure representation - Particular groups not “in the loop” in the debate may not be invited to attend – system relies on convenor to identify groups and ensure invited - Economic interests are dominant 	<p>Empower the powerless</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In modern societies there is a plurality of stand points that somehow are reflected on the participatory process - There is some variety of values structures among participants - Participants have different priorities among multiple goals - Even one person encompasses a suite of values - PPs often give rise to surprise results - Independent moderator - Experts have technical values but also “common sense” values. Both kinds of values circulate between experts and non-experts
--	------------------------------	---

Comment Card:

None

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory processes?		Positive reasons	Code R5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is little work about how to identify different legitimate values, which lead to important/ biases in PP - there are legitimacy problems with ≠ value positioning - scientific knowledge is many times (always?) value biased - because there are values that can not be vocalised in the current institutional / social framework - socially not accepted values will be under represented - frequently normative opinions are being “covered” by rational arguments 	Scores: 2 → 4 4 → 3 4 → 3 3 → 3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Because participatory processes give space to values that otherwise would not be vocalised - Because there are spaces and avenues where values can be put across - Civil society is bringing their own voice to policy avenues - In decision- making different stakeholders are being consulted - Better understanding than in the past of what value differences exist - In participatory processes different values can be discussed - Only by allowing participation we already open the possibility of considering ≠ values 	
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:			
	Pay more attention when preparing a participatory process to the range of values	2		
	Focus discussion on values and make them explicit	4		
	Encourage people to think about their values and not stick to initial positions	3		
	Don't allow any stakeholder to define whether a value is “good” or “bad”	3		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - because there is always a degree of determinism on the representation of values that excludes other values/ definition of values itself is a problem – variability - confusion about what “values” are: - can they be negotiated, or are they fixed? - In a top down organised participatory process decision maker do not have a complete view on all different values - Too much emphasis on starting positions, fear of changing views - “Participation” has its own values: it therefore closes out certain others automatically - values are not static, they always change even individually 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Because at least one value is always represented - Some “values” have organised groups to represent them - There are people making research on participatory process dynamics which is essential for better agency of participants - Individuals with different values can submit viewpoints to decision makers - Participation is a good way to discuss and think about one’s own values
---	--	---

Comment Card:

None

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory processes?	Positive reasons	Code R6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussions usually do not reach the discussion of values (or even clarification) - discussion is often about “facts” on the surface/ not underlying values - there are little participatory processes taking place that actually allow <u>any</u> stakeholder groups to make their values relevant to decision making - designers of participatory processes are not aiming at this (method question) - often certain stakeholder groups are left out – by purpose or (more often) just forgotten → Lack of stakeholder analysis - sometimes one group of actors lead the rest (in focus groups) - time constraints and budget constraints to cover all actors - unclear question formulation - discussion is often about individual needs/ 	Scores: 2 → 2 2 → 2 2 → 2 5 → 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it’s better than non-participatory approaches - participation is open for everyone (in principle) - because there is space for “difference” however constrained - bringing in a diversity of perspectives leads to multiple values present - if there are participatory processes, different stakeholder groups with that views and values are per definition involved somehow, can state that opinions - participatory processes often about difficult issues with different perspectives on the issue - often participation is done in terms of a public meeting. <u>All</u> values can be represented there. - There is some awareness of stakeholders/ different social actors - Long processes tend to bring different sensitivities - Sometimes consensus is reached among a wide base of actors 	
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:		
	Improve methodology of stakeholder analysis and “value groups” (simple and clear)		3
	Treat citizens as what they are (citizens) not as 1-dimensional labels (e.g. select on mentality instead of demographics)		2
	Involve citizens in the development of their own methods of “self-representation”		3
	Extend the time frame of the processes and wide use of “snowball” method to find the stakeholders		3
	Develop (or be explicit about) methodologies which challenge participants to express their ideas and discuss it on the level of values		4

<p>not broader (moral) concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - because “demographics” fragments people into pre-constituted groups - participants are often not selected on their values - because processes set-up often to legitimise pre-existing values - representatives of values are often not elected by the stakeholder group they represent - because values always changing and procedures try to fix and stabilise - strategic use and involvement obstructs representation of different values 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Antagonism creates political change - These processes can work to politicise people (through their exclusion)
---	--	--

Comment Card:

None

Negative reasons	How well are different values represented in participatory processes?	Positive reasons Code R7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - excluded, powerless, marginalised “groups” are often under represented - Participatory processes tend towards “simplified” responses which may not capture people’s range of values – e.g. grey areas/ context dependency, etc. - Depending on process some people may not be heard - Framing of a process can exclude certain values i.e. technocratic vs political/ spiritual - Some “interested” publics may not represent some values - Some kinds of PP can “reduce” representativeness rather than elicit different values - How do you get average Joe/ Jill’s voice in the process? - Ideological difference not reconcilable? - Which values should prevail? - Tendency to decontextualise “values” - Environmental values are very difficult to represent e.g. non-humans - Typically, values are expressed but only those that do not challenge dominant interests and strategies are “heard” 	<p>Scores: 1 → 1 6 → 4 5 → 4 8 → 8 7 → 7 4 → 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing acknowledgement that values important to opinions/ understanding - Broad values often well represented - Participants came from fairly varied “constituencies” - Major stakeholders are usually identified and invited to participate - Those who have a vested interest usually are the first to volunteer for their participation - Diversity of representation balances views - Many participatory exercises are designed to elicit the expression of values - It is possible to find participatory exercises in which values are well expressed - Depends on type of process – good workshops can elicit different values/ perspectives - Certain methods are good at reflecting different values - Attempts have been made to be representative 	
	<p>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</p>		
	<p>Processes need to be longer – not short term - with more resources. More bottom up process – active inclusion of minority groups etc.</p>		5
	<p>Improve representativeness by linking outcomes of processes to policy decisions – knowing what comes out of process will make a difference</p>		6
	<p>Clarify values already embedded in science and technology - rather than leave them implicit and not defended</p>		1
	<p>Representation – improve demographic analysis / issues analysis and incentives to participate. Values - include ways to allow people to state own values and get them to think about values that inform their opinions</p>		3
	<p>Have a process that covers the broad spectrum of issues – not just demographics</p>		2

Comment Card:

Concern that public participation focused too much on public as source of values and too little on public as source of relevant knowledge; this also obscures the values already embedded in science, technology and policy. In other words, public ≠ values

A question (the values one) that elicited the complexity in (what at first seems like a not-so-hard) question.

<p>Negative reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they are so broad, not clear where to use which one - the question is more how to take into account scales other than that at which the process is being held... - ... and that is very often not clear at all - scale issue not only dependent on methods but more on facilities, knowledge, experiences - be aware “the public” is differently engaged at different scales i.e. locally and in early stakeholder - different methods require different data, problem setting, etc. not always possible to get this data on all scales - expenses at EU scale! - We still need to test CIT pan-global scale :o) - Lack of capacity to deliver - Whilst they can be used in this way few examples exist - It requires skills and large resources to design large multiple scale processes neither of which are very available - Pan European trans national approach 	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p> <p>Scores: 2 → 4 2 → 2 5 → 5 3 → 8 1 → 4 4 → 4</p> <p>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100px;"> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </table>													<p>Positive reasons Code S1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - methods can be adapted to scale - the toolbox is quite big and diverse - to ascertain about any method can be adopted to any scale - the problem is not method but lack of initiatives at i.e. trans national scale - many of the methods are flexible in adapting to different scales (e.g. TICE, focus groups,...) - you can design your own methods to be appropriate for your scale or methods - good practice is tailored to the situation so it is possible to design a process that works and includes multiple scales - IT/ the Net make multiple scale dialogue more possible

Comment Card:

Action Planning

“How well are different values represented in participatory processes?”

Suggested actions were taken from the H-diagrams and participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Why is it important?
- Who should be responsible for what to make it happen?
- How can they encourage it to happen?
- When should it be done?
- How will we know when it is done?

Action	Provide equality of opportunity to all participants, including disenfranchised/marginalised groups. (Requires education, logistical and financial support)
Why ?	Because it is democratic (right to be heard, justice, fairness)[accountability of policy work], instrumental (clear basis of conflict) substantive (improve decision quality and implementation)
How?	To provide (objective!) information – accepted wisdom, results of research etc. Provide logistical and financial support
Comments	Need to recognise issues of: gender; values and concerns; social types; knowledge – access to it and dominant forms disclose assumptions behind (scientific) knowledge – the public themselves; financial and logistical support; regard participation (power relations) process.
Action	Minimise values of the organiser/facilitator in the process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attempt to neutralise the process via employment of professional facilitator, thus providing balance OR - Make the values as explicit as possible and then pluralise and equalise all values OR act as a value leader or champion - Reach a dissensus
Why ?	Organisers have a tremendous influence on the process in general. Otherwise decisions get made on the basis of implicit value, which may or may not be representative of public opinion
Who? and How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EU guidelines on minimum standards for participation requiring value statements (similar to ethics statements) - Researchers to promote transparency within their research design. - National agencies with global networks to promote ‘explicitisation’.
When?	NOW!
Done?	Decisions will be justified/made on the basis of value explicit PPP exercise.

Action	Method development for values expression (making them explicit). When the right people are there, do the right thing. Develop methodologies that challenge participants to express/ discuss their ideas on the level of values.
Why ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of useful methods - Better combination of methods - Values are the basic/normative underlying assumptions which determine actions - Representation of values is useless when they are not visible in the process
Who?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STS researchers - Added contributions for participants in participatory activities (process view) - It is context dependant though
How?	More attention in the STS community for analysis tools Underlying theories to build methods on
When?	Ongoing activity: all the time
Done?	When actors express they gained insights in values of themselves and other when methods are being applied A plea for evaluation with participants
Action	Ensure broad participation early in the process in order to define values and interests using many perspectives. Frame topic/issue with the public so that a range of issues and values can be considered as perceived by citizens (limited by regulatory and political stage issue – but within those limits give the citizens as much range as possible.
Why ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - makes values explicit - increases legitimacy - reveals gaps in disclosure Narrowing of remit/ marginalisation of certain interest groups is a common problem – try to avoid cutting out certain values from the beginning
Who?	We should all do this in our projects Funders should ensure that we do Increased support from funders to do scoping studies so stakeholders can get involved on research proposals
How?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematically gather input - Choose the most appropriate methods of participation given input - Evaluate the process
When?	Early and all the way through

Done?	When we have an evaluation based on input from all participants	
Action	Recognise the “PUB” in public and hold events where people are comfortable	
Action	Focus discussion on values and make them explicit. It helps to understand your own and other positions and to shift positions	
Action	Improve representation if we link the outputs of the process to policy decisions	
Why ?	Knowing what comes out of the process	
Action	Getting the right people there. Choosing the right criteria for selecting participants	
Why ?	To avoid bias and block invisible values	
Action	Publish a “call for values” when funding participatory processes to develop better tools to articulate values in order to recognise and expose opposed views/ positions leading to better and more effective participatory processes	
Why ?	Need to make a distinction between different stakeholders and different values within society	
Action	Initialising networks of excellence for participation	-
How?	Distribution of mailing list to all participants	-
Done?	It has been done!!!	