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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Global results from RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3 suggest that overall Navy personnel want to participate and work in a positive cultural environment. Furthermore the results suggest that Navy's culture is a positive culture with positive intent. Collective results from RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3 have identified there is a clear dividing line emerging within Navy that demonstrates those groups / individuals who are willing to positively engage in the demonstration of the Signature Behaviours and those that are not. These results will enable Navy to focus their resources and attention on those groups reticent to engage in, and demonstrate positively, the Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours.

Any acts of misconduct that occur are more likely to come from minority groups within the groups identified as pockets of concern, or those groups refusing to respond and participate in cultural engagement activities. Any acts of misconduct that do occur within Navy is NOT a reflection of the Navy’s culture, and not an outcome of the Navy’s contemporary culture, but is instead, a reflection of some smaller subgroups of individuals who are more resistant to change and have become positioned in maintaining an interest in activities of self interest rather than protecting and role modeling a positive Navy culture. In large organisation's, such as Navy, it is not uncommon to find minority pockets of individuals who on occasion act inappropriately. Inappropriate behaviour from these minority groups is not a reflection of the overall culture of an organisation, but instead, is a consequence of the diversity and size of organisations.

The priority recommendation for Navy as an outcome of the RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3 results, would be to simplify and steadfastly focus on communicating one consistent message across Navy in order to continue to imbed and influence the positive engagement and demonstration of the Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours. This message would be “Just Demonstrate the Signature Behaviours”. Training at all levels of the Navy should focus on “how to live the Signature Behaviours”. This one simple, consistent message advocates across Navy, accountability, transparency and truth in reporting.

1.1 Findings

Out of a sample size of [participants], a [response rate] was achieved by the RANavyPulse 3 (as opposed to a [response rate] for RANavyPulse 1 and a [response rate] for RANavyPulse 2). Of the [response rate] there was a [positive engagement take-up rate], calculate this with the [no response rate] results in a [engagement take up rate] of Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours. This means that currently [of the Royal Australian Navy]
Navy (RAN) population is positively engaging in the 10 Signature Behaviours (as opposed to positive engagement for RANavyPulse1 and RANavyPulse 2). These results also indicate that the RAN population positively perceives their colleagues and peers to be actively demonstrating the 10 Signature Behaviours in a positive light. Furthermore, consistent with RANavyPulse 2, results suggest that there are particular pockets that have been highlighted across the organisation that are less likely to be positively involved, or actively, becoming engaged in the take up and demonstration of Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours. (These pockets were identified as a result of non participation rates and scoring averages).

A pattern of three consistent attitudes continue to emerge within these pockets of negative engagement:

1. **Cynical Attitudes.** Navy people with cynical attitudes do not believe that any real positive change will occur. They tend to believe that implementation of programs have been occurring for years with no significant outcomes or change “just another program or training I have to attend”. Navy people, across a number of different categories, who demonstrate cynical attitudes have a tendency to believe there are tribal laws within Navy which means nothing will ever change. The rule and are better than all the rest. Those that hold cynical attitudes are more likely to engage in behaviours that are considered unacceptable as a way of giving rise to their frustration and sense of powerlessness. RANavyPulse 3 results did however, demonstrate a decline in those Navy people evidencing cynical attitudes and have begun to register a more positive and active involvement in the demonstration of the Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours.

2. There are also individuals whose values simply may not be aligned to the Navy’s Signature Behaviours and are more likely to act in a self interested manner and also engage in unacceptable behaviours.

3. **Apathy.** In addition, some Navy people (groups) demonstrate a more apathetic attitude. Apathetic individuals are more likely to be easily influenced negatively by their peers (particularly peers who hold cynical attitudes), and may find themselves engaging in unacceptable behaviours or attitudes that they would not normally choose to engage in. Results of RANavyPulse 3 have indicated that these particular groups of individuals particular in and continue to be apathetic with apathetic scores increasing.

4. Smaller still minority groups were found to be disillusioned in attitude. This individuals / groups are more likely to go about doing their “own thing” with a negative or indifferent attitude.

The increase in the Signature Behaviour engagement rate is due to those participants who did participate, scoring their peers higher in overall positive ratings. It is expected that with focused intervention and training across
those groups identified as negatively, or simply not engaging in the demonstration of the Signature Behaviours, will result in an increase in the Signature Behaviour positive engagement rate across Navy.

Participation rates between RANavyPulse 2 and 3 were fairly consistent with a slight reduction for RANavyPulse 3 relative to RANavyPulse 2 and RANavyPulse 3. Participation rates for RANavyPulse are still considerably higher that response rates across Navy for all other voluntary surveys (average of across Navy for all other voluntary surveys (average of). The slight decrease in response rate for RANavyPulse 3 could be due to the timing of the pulse being implemented too close to the Christmas leave period.

The levels of engagement for the 10 Signature Behaviours, as determined by the overall average score, continue for all three pulses, to score similarly with “Makes Navy Proud and Makes Australia Proud by Demonstrating Navy’s Values” continuing to score the highest across RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3. This particular Signature Behaviour (Make Navy Proud, Make Australia Proud), is based more upon the perception that Navy people hold of themselves and others, in their aspirations to serve Navy and their country. This Signature Behaviour relates to a state of “Being” it is a feeling that Navy people want to hold about themselves and others in the Navy. It is this Signature Behaviour that ALL Navy people would benefit from understanding how to live the value rather than aspire to the value.

Below are the three top Signature Behaviours listed which Navy people consider to be the three most important Signature Behaviours. These Signature Behaviours relate to “Doing” behaviours. It is what Navy people understand to be the most important behaviours to demonstrate. Below list the three top behaviours from the combined results of RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3:

1. Q9 Always strives to dig deep and be the best I / they can be for all the right reasons

2. Q5 Demonstrates cost conscious behaviours and attitudes by effective use of resources and eliminating wasteful practices where possible

3. Q8 Goes out of their way to improve relationships across and beyond Navy

Results of the RANavyPulse 2 found all 10 Signature Behaviours to remain highly correlated and consistent across all three pulse results. This continues to reinforce that the Navy has identified and selected a cohesive set of Signature Behaviours which are positively correlated with one another. The ongoing focus should be to continue to work towards increasing the current engagement levels of the 10 Signature Behaviours through RANavyPulse and
the identification of those groups which have the greatest influence (both positive or negative) in terms of influencing
the wider RAN organisation to engage in, and demonstrate, the 10 Signature Behaviours.

It should also be noted that just because the top three behaviours have been identified as the most important, it
does not yet mean that all Navy people are positively demonstrating these behaviours.

The two Signature Behaviours that score the lowest as a combination of the combined three pulse results were;

1. Encourages participation in and allows decisions to be made at the right level including downward decision
   making

2. Can be seen to appropriately challenge existing practices with innovative ideas and contributions

Whilst "Making Navy Proud, Make Australia Proud continues to score the highest, it was found that improving
relationships, being more cost conscious and striving to be ones best for all the right reasons were considered to be
the most important. More work around decision making at the right levels and appropriately challenging practices
requires additional thought and consideration.

Comparisons were conducted across the following groupings

(i) Ship / Shore;
(ii) Locations;
(iii) Ranks;
(iv) Gender; and
(v) Female Junior Sailor and Female Officers
(vi) Male Junior Sailor and Male Officers

Comparisons have been calculated based on participation rates and scoring responses. Below are the findings for
each of the comparisons conducted.

i. No significant differences were found between the Ship and Shore comparisons across Navy Pulse 1, 2 and
   3. This suggests that from a cultural perspective the same behaviours occur whether on shore or at sea.
   (see Appendix C.).

ii. Comparisons between the Locations of ACT, NSW, NT, QLD, VIC and WA across RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3
demonstrated some consistent patterns. Overall continued to show the biggest improvements whilst
continued to worsen over the 3 pulses. There were very little differences found between
(see Appendix D).

iii. Across all three RANavyPulse’s results, in most cases, all ranks improved. The continued to improve in an upward trend for all three Pulses, experienced a decrease in Pulse 2 but then bounced back to improve in Pulse 3 remained steady and at times showed slight improvements and decreases across the overall three Pulses. The first data cut for the showed similar results to that of the The improved between Pulse 1 and 2 although have experienced a significant decrease for Pulse 3. If it remains plausible that and are considered to be the primary “gateways” when influencing the Navy culture, then RANavyPulse 3 would support this hypothesis. The continued to improve the perception of their positive demonstration and engagement of the Signature Behaviour’s and although experienced a decrease in Pulse 2 they have come back with increased scores of engagement in Pulse 3. are perceived to have a greater impact on the than any other rank. Similarly the did not demonstrate continuous improvements and the decreased in Pulse 3. Results indicate that the are having a more positive impact on their lower ranks than are the on the or More targeted work is required with the to encourage and influence the positive demonstration of the Signature Behaviours which will then also have a positive flow on effect to the

iv. Across the first two RANavyPulse’s no differences were found between and however, Pulse three results indicate that the have continued to improve whilst the have decreased slightly. After three Pulses the are seen to be more positively engaging in the Signature behaviours than are the (see Appendix F)

v. Substantial differences continue to be found between and Across every Signature Behaviour, were found to score considerably lower than (see Appendix G). In Pulse 1 and 2, means were found to be lower than all the other comparisons conducted, however Pulse 3 results have demonstrated an increase in scores for suggesting they were more actively engaging in the positive demonstration of the Signature Behaviours.

vi. Substantial differences continue to be found between and Across every Signature Behaviour, were found to score considerably lower than (see
Appendix H). It should also be noted that even though there are significant differences between \( \text{and} \) improvements continue across all three Pulses.

vii. The gap between \( \text{and} \) is closing with little difference showing for Pulse 3. When looking at gender comparisons and differences between \( \text{and} \) and \( \text{the} \) score the highest, meaning they are perceived to be more actively and positively demonstrating the Navy’s Signature Behaviours than any other group.

Pockets of concern where Navy personnel are less engaged and less positive about the engagement and demonstration of the Navy's 10 Signature Behaviours is now becoming very clear (calculations include participation and non-participation rates and scoring responses). There were some groups which improved significantly for RANavyPulse 3, as an example, the majority of \( \text{groups} \) demonstrated quite a sharp curve of improvement. For the first time across the RANavyPulse’s, the \( \text{groups} \) are mostly featuring in the positively engaged groups. Out of the \( \text{groups} \), there are only \( \text{groups} \) that sit within the medium range (amber band), \( \text{groups} \) in the positively engaged range (green band) and \( \text{groups} \) in the negatively engaged band (red band). See the table below for groupings of positive, medium and negatively engaged groups across Navy.

1.2 Summary of Group Engagement
Interesting for Navy to note is that the groups listed below were in the top ten negatively engaged groups for RANavyPulse 2. For RANavyPulse 3 only three of these groups now feature in the negatively engaged group (those highlighted in red) the rest now predominately feature in the positively engaged category.

and with a combined groups between the two remain an area of concern and feature within the more apathetic attitude styles. This particular attitude style is easily influenced so would benefit from some positive training around how to best demonstrate the Signature Behaviours and “Live the Experience”.

Below are the pockets of excellence where Navy personnel were identified as most positively engaged in the 10 Signature Behaviours for RANavyPulse 3, these groups, except one (which is now listed in the medium band) continue to be included in the groups of excellence (results include participation and non participation rates and scoring responses). Additional groups to the list below, although not limited to, include these groups were previously listed in the negatively engaged groups.
1.3 Implications of Findings

As a consequence of the combined results of RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3, Navy might want to consider the following points and then decide upon appropriate courses of action if required;

(i) Results of the three RANavyPulse's suggest that the Navy's culture cannot be blamed for individual acts of misconduct. Overall Navy people demonstrate positive intent to engage in a positive culture.

(ii) More targeted discreet pieces of cultural reform initiatives can be applied across those groups listed as negatively engaged in the demonstration of Navy's Signature Behaviours. The message across Navy should be consistent and simplified to encourage and influence the positive demonstration and engagement of the Signature Behaviours. This message should be simply and consistently "Just Demonstrate the Signature Behaviours" or "Just Live the Signature Behaviours" Navy would benefit from having their training consultants develop programs that can be delivered across the organisation which focuses on how Navy people can demonstrate the Signature Behaviours across all levels and geographic's of the organisation and "live the experience". "Just demonstrating the Signature Behaviours" will result in a more accountable, transparent and vibrant Navy organisation focused on truth in reporting.

(iii) The differences found between male and junior female sailors and male and female officers require further verification and consideration. In order to better understand these differences and before assumptions are drawn from the findings, Navy would be encouraged to investigate the following comparisons to ratify and explain this particular finding:

- Comparisons between junior males and females
- Comparisons between officer males and females
- Age comparisons between males and females
- Time in service between males and females
- Department and / or divisional and / or locations verses junior and officer males and females
- Ranks verses junior and officer males and females
- Divisional comparisons
RANavyPulse 3 has evidenced the Departments showing a significant improvement in the positive engagement and demonstration of the Signature Behaviours. This result needs to be closely monitored over the next 12 months for two reasons:

i. To validate that the change is consistent, sustainable and continuing to improve

ii. To continue to positively influence the engagement and demonstration of the Signature Behaviours.

It may also prove beneficial to work with a group subset of tribes to understand better the underlying culture that exists between these tribes and how to improve and respect the roles and working relationships that have been used as an example and although they have demonstrated in RANavyPulse 1 and 2 a stronger leaning towards the demonstration of cynical attitudes towards this attitude was also found in other categories).

Simplify training and development programs with one consistent message tied into all programs. ‘Just Demonstrate (or live) the Signature Behaviours’. Include in the training and development modules examples of how to demonstrate the Signature Behaviours across all ranks and geographies of the Navy organisation.

It is highly recommended that Navy consider implementing only those programs which have a high level of transparency attached. The whole of Navy will benefit from the understanding that every action taken, and every behaviour engaged in, will be made transparent. It then comes down to accountability and choice. Good behaviours, good decisions – good outcomes. Bad behaviours, bad decisions – bad outcomes. As long as those individuals who are more likely to engage in unacceptable behaviours think they can “get away with it”, it becomes more probable they will, and continue to, engage in less than desirable behaviours.

Given the RANavyPulse is demonstrating higher response rates than any other voluntary survey within Navy and increases in levels of Signature Behaviour engagement are being evidenced then it would be considered reasonable to continue with RANavyPulse 4, 5 and 6 in 2012. This will provide consistent and ongoing monitoring of Navy’s cultural engagement levels and continue the encouragement and engagement of Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours.

Results from RANavyPulse 3 have evidenced a shift from the greatest pocket of concern being the Departments to 13 combined groups within These groups represent
apathetic attitudes and can be easily influenced. Navy may want to focus some attention and resources to this particular area of Navy.

(ix) Introduce and implement an RANavyPulse dashboard to monitor live the shifting, shaping and engagement of the Navy’s 10 Signature Behaviours

(x) Send a message to ALL Navy personnel – We are all accountable and responsible for demonstrating and role modelling our Signature Behaviours – NO Exceptions.

2 Introduction

PulsePrograms developed a very unique methodology designed to provide organisations with very specific measurable information regarding outcomes of any initiatives that have been implemented and demonstrate the degree to which these initiatives have been successfully engaged. In addition the Pulse Programs methodology simultaneously shapes and influences behaviours resulting in higher levels of engagement and uptake of cultural behaviours and values.

PulsePrograms is known to be a sophisticated corporate governance methodology formulated on continuous learning principles and continuous reinforcement methods which influences behaviour through cognitive dissonance motivation and in conjunction with regularity of feedback. It has been determined that in order to create a predisposition or motivation to change, it is necessary to provide regular messages or feedback. PulsePrograms research determined that regular feedback included a consistent message being provided to participants at least three times per year. This is known to PulsePrograms clients as being “Pulsed” three times a year.

PulsePrograms has been commissioned by the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) to conduct three (3) RANavyPulses across 2011 in order to provide the RAN with the following

- Govern, measure, encourage, and enable the ten (10) RAN core Signature Behaviours
- Monitor and influence the take-up of the 10 Signature Behaviours
- Monitor the progress and engagement levels of the 10 Signature Behaviours
- Encourage and influence Navy personnel to live Signature Behaviours and lead by example
• Monitor cultural trends as they are forming, predict future trends and recommend resource allocation best suited to influence and shape behaviours
• Identify areas of performance and behaviour that are of potential concern
• Provide predictive measures of future behaviour and performance
• Provide a 95% level of confidence that over the period of 2011 the RAN will evidence an increase in the engagement levels of the 10 Signature Behaviours
• Develop an ongoing set of performance and behavioural trends

It was agreed that PulsePrograms would provide a progress report at the conclusion of each of the three RANavyPulses and within two – four weeks after each survey activity. Reports and briefings will be provided directly and in consultation with the Chief of Navy, Deputy Chief of Navy and the Program Director NGN and any other parties requested to be present by the Chief of Navy. This is the third and final report following the implementation of the RANavyPulse 1, 2 and 3.

In December 2011, RANavyPulse 3 survey of Australian Royal Navy (RAN) personnel was conducted measuring the engagement levels of the RAN ten (10) Signature Behaviours. Analysis was conducted to rank the 10 Signature Behaviours in order to determine which of the behaviours have the greatest impact, the least impact, and if any interact positively or negatively with one another and to compare against the results of RANavyPulse 1 and 2. In addition a number of other comparisons were performed including;

• Ranks
• Locations;
• Ship vs. Shore;
• Gender; and
• Junior Female Sailors and Female Officers

Additional comparative analysis can be performed such as comparing specific groups, ranks, category’s and location’s however any further analysis would be additional to the current commissioned scope of work. Analysis was conducted by PulsePrograms and Data Analysis Australia

This final report will make recommendations regarding the overall engagement levels of the 10 Signature Behaviours and as a consequence to these findings, where resources should be allocated to support and influence the ongoing take-up of embedding the Signature Behaviours throughout the Royal Australian Navy.
3 Methodology

Navy Personnel were placed in groups (ranging from 4 to 12 people per group) and asked to rank themselves and their peers on a 9-point Likert scale (1=never and 9=always) in relation to each of the following RAN 10 Signature Behaviours:

1. Demonstrates respect for the contributions made by Navy people regardless of rank or division.
2. Promotes, encourages and supports the wellbeing and development of all Navy people.
3. Communicates genuinely, clearly, appropriately and in a timely manner.
4. Can be seen to appropriately challenge existing practices with innovative ideas and contributions.
5. Demonstrates cost conscious behaviours and attitudes by effective use of resources and eliminating wasteful practices where possible.
6. Can find solutions to problems, take action to fix problems and implement successfully if required.
7. Encourages participation in and allows decisions to be made at the right level including downward decision-making.
8. Goes out of their way to improve relationships across and beyond Navy.
9. Always strives to dig deep and be the best they can be for all the right reasons.
10. Makes Navy proud and makes Australia proud by demonstrating Navy’s values.

The group sample was drawn randomly and ratified by the RAN New Generation Navy (NGN) division and provided to PulsePrograms. This sample is considered to be a representative sample of the RAN and of which, can demonstrate a set of trends evidencing current engagement levels for the 10 Signature Behaviours.

When assessing the engagement levels of each the 10 Signature Behaviours and the interaction of each of the Signature Behaviours, an individual’s overall score for each of the behaviour’s was taken as the average of the scores given by their group members, including their own self-assessment score. Principal Component Analysis...
(explained in appendix A) was performed on these scores to investigate the relationship between behaviours. Overall average scores for each behaviour were calculated to determine the behaviours with the least and greatest levels of engagement.

Other assessment including comparing specific groups (as mentioned previously) according to means and the variances between upper and lower limits, were performed.

4 Demographics

4.1 Survey Responses

Overall email queries and responses from RANavyPulse survey's sent out were received by PulsePrograms and NGN. These enquiries included

- persons emailed wanting to be a part when found out they were not selected.
- queries were received due to a security certificate issue that came up for some participants. In most cases respondents were assisted and they went on to complete the survey
- respondents reported technical issues
- respondent declined to participate
- respondents had been listed in two groups so only completed one of the surveys.

4.1 Summary of Responses from the RANavyPulse 3 Groups

- of the groups had only 10% response rate
- of the groups had only 20% response rate
- of the groups had only 30% response rate
- of the groups had only 40% response rate
- of the groups had only 50% response rate
of the groups had 60% response rate

• of the groups had 70% response rate

• of the groups had 80% response rate

• of the groups had 90% response rate

• of the groups had 100% response rate

RANavyPulse 3 had a total of of the groups achieving a 60% response rate and over compared to for RANavyPulse 2

4.2 Summary of Comments

There were fewer comments received from the groups in RANavyPulse 3 than there were in RANavyPulse 1 and 2, below is a sample of comments.

Table 2: Summary of comments includes:
Table 4. Correlation Matrix of Behaviours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations above 0.8 are considered to be highly positive correlations and correlations over 0.7 are considered positive.

Principal Components Analysis was used to analyse the relationship between the behaviours. It was found that the first principal component explained over 80% of the total variation observed in the data. This indicates that there is a high level of correlation between the behaviours and the response from a single behaviour gives you the expected score for all the other behaviours. At group level we may find that there is a reduction in the correlation and that all questions are pertinent to the analysis of the responses form a group.
Glossary

**Trends** - The term "trend" refers to the concept of collecting information and attempting to spot a pattern in the information.

**Patterns** – Consistent and reoccurring characteristic or trait that helps in the identification of a phenomenon or problem, and serves as an indicator for predicting future behaviour.

**Significant Difference** - In statistics, a result is called statistically significant if it is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

**Level of Confidence** - The confidence level tells you how sure you can be. It is expressed as a percentage and represents how often the true percentage of the population who would pick an answer within the parameters hypothesized.

**Cynical** - Cynical behaviour at its worse can be summed up as people being motivated by self-interest or demonstrate an attitude of scornful or jaded negativity, especially a general distrust of the integrity or professed motives of others. Or it may be defined simply as people feeling doubtful as to whether something will happen or is considered to be worthwhile.

**Apathetic** - Feeling or showing a lack of interest, concern, indifference, unresponsive or showing little emotion.

**Disillusioned** - having lost one's ideals, illusions, or false ideas about someone or something or feeling disenchanted.
Appendix A

Principal Component Analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) is a multivariate technique that reduces the dimensions of a dataset while still retaining the most important information. This makes it easier to explore the relationships between variables, in particular understanding how particular survey questions are related.

Technically speaking, PCA linearly transforms the data to a new coordinate system such that the greatest variance by any projection of the data comes to lie on the first coordinate axis (called the first principal component), the second greatest variance on the second coordinate axis (called the second principal component) which is orthogonal to the first principal component and therefore uncorrelated, and so on. For any dataset the number of principal components that can be extracted is equal to the number of variables in the dataset. However, the technique is designed so that the first few principal components explain most of the variation and therefore later components can generally be ignored without losing significant information.

In interpreting results of a principal components analysis, the first principal component (PC1) provides information on which variables are most important in terms of the overall variation. The important variables will have a high correlation (closer to 1 or −1) with PC1. A positive correlation with PC1 means that increasing values of the variable will correspond to increasing values on PC1. Conversely, a negative correlation means that increasing values of the variable will correspond to decreasing values on PC1. A set of variables that all have high correlations with PC1 will also be highly correlated with each another.