5.2 *Coded questionnaire results using Morphological Analysis*

The text as presented in Table 5.0 was analyzed using a combination of morphological analysis and some aspects of grounded theory. Neither of these techniques was used in its original sense. For instance in using grounded theory, we focused only on two key aspects, the *seed categories* and their *properties,* which corresponds in morphological analysis to *leading variables or dimensions* and *discreet conditions.* In simple terms, these are the column headings and the various descriptions identified as falling under each heading. Although a tedious process if performed manually as we did, the technique is straightforward. For each question and from each respondent, we identified the leading variables and their discreet conditions as described in the text presented in Table 5.0. Following this process, a consolidated series of morphological fields was created. The leading variables are reflected in the first column of Table 5.1, followed by a list of the discreet conditions in the second column. The third column shows a total count of the "discreet conditions" for each leading variable. The leading variables were then ranked in accordance with the total number of identified discreet conditions. The complete results from this process are shown in Table 5.1 below. It is important for us to indicate that the *discreet conditions* terminology as used here simply refer to variable properties which are not necessarily mutually exclusive as in the strict sense of morphological analysis.

We paid no particular attention to the distinguishing features between morphological analysis and grounded theory as pointed out in chapter 3. This was because we did not find this necessary since our interest was in using them as analysis techniques and data organizing approaches rather than as vehicles for theory building. Our theory building process is based on the use of the framework we have constructed in interpreting the text as presented in both Tables 5.0 and 5.1.

Table 5.1: Consolidated Morphological Fields

Question 1: *Are there occasions in your organisation/department when you have to justify (explain in some detail) your organisation's/department's decisions to other people, whether within or outside the organisation/department?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Stakeholders	Constituency, civil society, senior government officials, networks, requirements from other departments, branch offices, donors, international secretariat, staff, labour unions, forums, clients, ourselves.	13	1
Legislature	Transparency, professionalism, equity, participation, fairness, parliament, policy, accountable, value choices, common good.	10	2
Budget committee	Financial control, salary increases, infrastructure upgrades, budget limitations.	4	3
The Public	Policy changes, presentations, if related to our work, reasons for impossibilities	4	3
The Board	Research outcomes, beneficiaries, relevance and utility, meetings	4	3
Always	resources held in trust, every decision	2	4
The press	interview with media	1	5

Table 5.1: **Consolidated Morphological Fields**

Question 2: *If such occasions do arise, do you find them compelling due to reasonable and satisfactory grounds; or do you find them deserving no response in some instances?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Vital to respond	Always compelling as they have profound impact on other stakeholders, in most cases compelling, need to explain why justify, share information, to contain perceptions, to satisfy customers, allocated funds, need to be reflective, even those that do not deserve it, it is courteous to respond, deserving, if addressed to office, for good communication, it is part of our jobs, in my organisation's own interest, little or no co-operation if failing to justify, always necessary even if stating the obvious, it is reasonable to expect it, when required.	18	1
Absolutely unnecessary in some instances	Very few instances, due to ignorance, very weak cases	3	2

Question 3: *Why, in your opinion do you think it is necessary for your organisation/ department to justify some decisions?*

Could see the basis of decisions	Communicate rationale for strategic decisions, it establishes a logical and rational need for the decision made,		

Table 5.1: Consolidated Morphological Fields

Question 3 cont.: *Why, in your opinion do you think it is necessary for your organisation/ department to justify some decisions?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Could see the basis of decisions	People respond positively to issues when they are explained or justified, consistency of application of decisions must be seen, to justify reason given for action, decisions have impact on society and economy.	6	1
Avoid misunderstanding	Understand management's line of thinking, understand policy and its changes, organisational mission, technical understanding, ill-informed clients, give clarity in case of rumours.	6	1
Our way of doing things	Responsibility, evaluate impact, build good image, transparency, fairness, accountability.	6	1
Minimise unresolved issues	Respond to criticism, clarification of role and mandate, when people enquire, good communication, to keep focused.	5	2
Stay within budget limits and intentions	Demonstrate how resources have been used, use public funds	2	3
Enshrined in constitution	Are public institutions whose decisions may affect the functioning of the country's economy.	1	4
Customer first	Meet client's expectation.	1	4

Table 5.1: Consolidated Morphological Fields

Question 4.: *How does your organisation/department normally go about in responding to such a need for decision justification when it arises?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
No rigidity unless by policy or legislation	Call meetings to formulate a response report, planning frameworks, forward response to those asking for it, discuss issues openly, telephone and letters, press releases, list servers, detailed verbal explanations, use e-mails	9	1
Use of organisational artifacts	Newsletters, written response, memos & minutes, other communication channels, visual presentations, workshops, report formats, computer information, reports	9	1
Depends on query nature	Get facts and relevant info, personal contacts, revisit the basis of the decision, address by top management, rules and process clearly defined, interviews, patience, evaluation after response.	8	2
Research is done	An inquiry, data-look back, proactive response, policy maintained	4	3

Table 5.1: **Consolidated Morphological Fields**

Question 5.: *Are you generally satisfied with the way your organisation/department go about responding to such a need for decision justification, or is there perhaps a particular way which you think should be followed?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Yes	But could go a little further, more consultation could be helpful, has skill and positive, generally satisfied, once fully explained, rules and processes can always be amplified to obviate future justification, but there is always room for improvement, are satisfied, sometimes less time for making decisions.	9	1
No	Could be done speedier, more bureaucratic, proactiveness is key, proper co-ordination in choosing respondents needed, accuracy and completeness of data needed, be based on proper information and facts.	6	2

Question 6.: *List some of the tools, procedures and frameworks commonly used in your organisation in supporting decisions*

Resources	Funds, assets, MIS/EIS, CBS, budget templates, project management procedures, business intelligence software, master system plan framework, appraisal formats, mathematical models	10	1
Research	Facts, figures, reports, databases, reliable data, documented conceptual architecture, market needs.	7	2

Table 5.1: **Consolidated Morphological Fields**

Question 6 cont.: *List some of the tools, procedures and frameworks commonly used in your organisation in supporting decisions*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Organogram	Mission, PR department, central IT committee, department IT committee, context of larger organisation, objectives of organisation gives framework on decision-making.	6	3
Workshops	Management, board, advisors, stakeholders, strategic planning committee.	5	4
Meetings	Minutes, discussions, fora, informal discussions.	4	5
Policy	Consultation, democratic, transparent, documented IT policy and strategy.	4	5
Records	Precedent, filing systems, computer printouts	3	6
Constitutional	Legal, legislation, mandated positions of constituencies	3	6

Table 5.1: Consolidated Morphological Fields

Question 7.: *In your view, are these tools, procedures and frameworks commonly used in your organisation in supporting decisions well understood by those who need to use them when such a need arise?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading Variable rank
Yes	By definition of a decision maker, in most instances, I believe they are, we are at implementation level, well understood but perhaps not used effectively, provided communicated in language well understood, understanding ranges from fair to sound, generally yes.	8	1
No	Not necessarily, not always appreciated, odd occasions of ignorance, not often.	4	2

Question 8.: *Do you find that people readily accept these explanations given within the available procedures and frameworks, or you are sometimes compelled to revisit such procedures and frameworks?*

Do revisit	Operating environments dynamic, sometimes compelled, procedures must always be open for changes, periodic reviews useful, resource restrictions, continually revisit frameworks in an effort to improve policy processes, if necessary, they form a useful archive, revisit through consultation, often asked to, when enough research is done, people mostly accept them, top management accept them readily	13	1

Table 5.1: **Consolidated Morphological Fields**

Question 8 cont.: *Do you find that people readily accept these explanations given within the available procedures and frameworks, or you are sometimes compelled to revisit such procedures and frameworks?*

Leading Variable or Dimension	List of discreet conditions	Number of discreet conditions	Leading variable rank
Not readily	Individual expectations not always met, people not always satisfied, people often differ, true to life - people do contest vigorously sometimes, satisfied with procedure-not necessarily agree with content, our policy making procedures lack feedback loop, unions often question our decisions, they form a useful archive, sometimes need to explain in greater detail-especially if party is not fully informed about procedure.	8	2
Both	Total decision picture needed, reminders constantly, context changes.	3	3

5.4 *Setting the scene for the use of the analysis framework*

In using the analysis framework, the series of morphological fields (Table 5.1) is used as starting points. From these starting points, we work backwards to the original text in Table 5.0. In this way, and through the various lenses of the framework, responses to our research questions are systematically sought through an interpretive-hermeneutic process. For a quick overview of the morphological tables, we created eight morphological graphs corresponding to each question, showing the *leading variables* and the number *of discreet conditions*. The morphological tables are used to interpret the data in Part III of this chapter. The leading variables and the number of discreet conditions serve as organizing frames for our interpretation using the analysis framework. A similar analysis approach in the information systems field was used by Sawyer (2001). Our table of morphological fields corresponds to Sawyer's *explanatory matrices*. Sawyer uses explanatory matrices to draw themes from different data sets. The themes are then used to help frame a return to field notes and organize data to support or refute their value.

5.5 *Conclusions on Part I*

Part I contains the empirical data which has been obtained through the use of an open-ended questionnaire constructed in accordance with the process-based framework. The resulting text was organised and categorised using a combination of grounded theory and morphological analysis. It is this categorised text which will be analysed and interpreted using the analysis framework in order to gain a deeper understanding of the group decision justification process - at least from the point of view of those that responded on behalf of their groups. This part mainly addresses the first leg of our research purpose. Next we discuss how the text from the GSS use session was generated and categorized.

Part II: Generating the text through GSS use case studies

5.6 Thick description of the first case study on GSS use

The notion of a *thick description* being used here is borrowed from Geertz's (1973) ethnographic studies. We use it here to refer to the entire context in which the case studies were conducted. It includes the background as well as the intention of GSS use. We heed Walsham's (1995) remark that in order to establish some credibility to the reader, researchers reporting on interpretive case studies should describe in some detail how they have arrived at their 'results'. In this case the 'results' is the text from GSS use by the group. The context of the case study is part of a learning programme of a module on systems and decision-making for masters students in the Department of Informatics at the University of Pretoria in South Africa. For this first case study, the module was presented during the period July-October, 2000 and embodied a framework to prepare groups for group decisions where justification of the decisions made is called for. The last meeting of the learning programme included a GSS software use. In order to enable the reader to make sense of the GSS transcripts which we later present, it is necessary to describe the learning programme of the group in detail.

The learning programme of the group

The group consisted of five students in a Master of Commerce in Information Systems programme. The module took four sessions of three hours each. A complete work programme was given to the students at the beginning of the module. They had to read a selected set of articles for each theme. Each theme was completed during one session. The sessions were facilitated by the author and they included discussions of the prescribed literature, assignments, presentations by the students and scheduling for each subsequent session/theme. The students completed a ten page assignment for each session/theme. The facilitator was able to assess the learning progress of the students

through their written assignments, presentations during sessions and the degree to which they were able to appropriately critique the literature. Central to the students' programme was the use of Toulmin *et al.'s* schema of reasoning, applied within a

Systems Thinking paradigm. Each student used the Unified Systems Hypothesis (USH) proposed by Hitchins and Shrivenham (in Jackson *et al.* (1991)) to construct their own conceptual 'systems view' on the Mozambique flood disaster situation. The assignment was based on a flood disaster which befell Mozambique, a poorly resourced African country sharing a border with South Africa. In February 2000, the devastating floods destroyed almost the entire infrastructure in Mozambique and many lives were lost. South Africa, together with many other countries of the world, provided support, first on rescue operations and later with some resettlement and relief support. The students had to conceptualize all this using the USH and then make a claim about their conceptualization. Their claim was to be supported using Toulmin *et al.* schema of reasoning. Our aim was partly to explore whether the schema of reasoning (Toulmin *et al.* (1979)) used in combination with systems thinking concepts could serve as a good organizing framework to prepare groups for a decision justification process which could suitably be supported by any GSS software. We next describe the sessions of the learning programme in the order in which they were conducted.

Session one:an overview of systems concepts

In order to remove the notion of a classroom lecture situation, a module handout was given to the students emphasizing that the sessions will be conducted in a meeting format. The lecturer is the learning process facilitator and does not necessarily know '*how to make good decisions*'. The complete agenda was given. Additional reading on the work of Ackoff (in Emery (1969)) and Toulmin *et al.* (1979) was given and also briefly discussed during the meeting. Each student was given an opportunity to lead a discussion based on one article. The facilitator made a presentation on various models of decision-making, including those of Simon in Harrison (1981) and the strategic choice approach

developed by Friend and Hickling (1997). There was a discussion on how an understanding of systems could assist in the complex task of decision-making. At the end, the students were required to hand in a ten page assignment a week before the next meeting on the Mozambique flood disaster situation as described earlier. Having understood the logic encapsulated in systems concepts and Toulmin *et al.'s* schema of reasoning, and having

demonstrated their understanding through conceptualizing a real life problem situation, the students were ready to engage in a broader systems thinking mode.

Session two: systems thinking, problem structuring methods and ethics in decision-making

The procedure remained the same as in the first meeting. Once again the students took turns in leading the discussions on one of the prescribed articles. The facilitator then summed up the session discussions on the board. The students were ready to do their second assignment. They were to identify a "messy" problem from their work environment and use their knowledge of problem structuring to resolve it.

Session three: critical systems thinking (CST)

The facilitator made a presentation on critical systems thinking based on the work of Jackson *et al.* (1991) and Midgley (*op. cit.*). The five 'commitments' of critical systems thinking as presented by Jackson were analyzed and discussed. The article by Midgley on what it means to be critical about systems was also discussed. After the presentation by the facilitator, each student was given 30 minutes to make a presentation on his or her work on the 'messy problem' (the second assignment). The students were given an opportunity to grade each other based on the presentations and how well they thought their colleagues succeeded in answering questions. Feedback from the students after this session indicated a great level of understanding and satisfaction. There was no discussion

about Information Systems and the students were given an additional reading on the work of Klein and Hirschheim (1994). Their third assignment required them to argue the merits or otherwise of designing an information system using critical systems thinking.

Session four: the use of GSS and Toulmin et al.'s schema of reasoning

This was the last session. Here the students brought together all their knowledge about systems, systems thinking, critical systems thinking, problem structuring methods, decision making and ethics as well as information systems design ideals. They were to use all their knowledge and

reflect on their individual claims about the Mozambique flood disaster situation. The requirement was that they submit their cherished individual claims to the rest of the group for an argument in accordance with Toulmin *et al.'s* schema of reasoning and then come up with a 'consensus claim' of the group. They did this through an electronic meeting in a Group Decision Room (GDR) facility at the CSIR. The software used in the GDR was GroupSystems, a well-known GSS (although not yet well explored in South Africa) which was originally developed at the University of Arizona in the USA. Standard preparations (see Nunamaker *et al.* (1991), De Vreede *et al.* (2000)) in conducting this kind of electronic meeting were followed, except that we were not interested in measuring any aspect of the group's behaviour. Our interest was rather on the justification process followed by the group, based on their broad understanding explained in the sessions above. In other words, our interest was more on the "thinking" and the "sense-making" of the group *prior* to the use of the GSS. We wanted to make some observations as to *whether* and *how* the group engages in a critical reflection based on this "thinking" as they use the GSS software to support them in the justification process. The results of this session constitutes the data for the first case study from GSS use which we present in the next section.

5.7 Data from the first case study - text from GSS use

The technical setup of the Group Decision Room together with the functioning of the GroupSystems software were briefly explained to the group. The agenda of the meeting had been distributed beforehand and was displayed just to refresh the participants' minds. The group used their individual claims from the first assignment, typed them into the categorizer facility of GroupSystems following Toulmin *et al.'s* schema of reasoning. Each participant entered the

entire argument; namely, the claim, grounds, warrant, backing, modal qualifiers and possible rebuttals before submitting to the rest of the group. The submissions were such that the participants identified themselves. The text presented in section 5.12 is a complete un-edited transcript of the GSS session. The facilitator mainly served as a time keeper and observed the intensity of their arguments as they converged towards a consensus claim. Each student was asked to give a written assessment of the learning experience and the GSS software at the end of the session. The assessment statements are interpreted separately and do not form part of the 'strips' discussed below.

Like Trauth and Jessup (2000), we borrow from Agar's (1986) language on the concept of a *strip*. We present the transcripts of the GSS discussions as strips. A strip is a meaningful unit of discourse. It can either be a single statement or several people's comments about a single idea. It can also be an observable act, an interview, an experiment, a document, a comment, or any other bounded phenomenon against which the researcher tests his or her understanding (Trauth and Jessup, 2000). For this case study, the strips are categorized according to the *participants' lines of argument* in accordance with Toulmin *et al.'s* schema of reasoning. For example strip1-1 contains mostly the first participant's line of argument in support of his or her claim. On the basis of the first participant's lines of argument, other participants, also based on their own understanding, engage in a dialogue with the first participant and the group as a whole. The strips were only categorized but not edited, except for reasons of anonymity. This is

to allow the reader to have a feel of the original text (authenticity). The strips are presented next.

Strip 1-1

Claim: Mozambique's dependent and unsophisticated socio-economic infrastructure contributed to the fact that they would not have been able to deal with the flood situation without international help. {#14}

Ground: Mozambique is officially labeled one of the poorest countries in the world, and the country most dependent on foreign loans. {#17}

Warrant: Very few countries have the resources to face a disaster without some degree of international assistance {#19}

Backing: Based on the way that national disasters are dealt with in other countries {#20}

Modal qualifier: So, possibly {#21}

Rebuttal: Unless they could have coped themselves and their pleas for help were just in order to settle the situation more speedily {#22}

They could have handled the disaster, but the consequences would just have been more severe {#16}

Good claim - I agree. Do you think other countries were to blame for not responding fast enough? {#25}

I think we could join this claim and XX's claim to read something like "they could not help themselves without international help, but international help was slow" {#47}

Yes it sort of makes sense to join them but it is two separate claims that are linked. Are we allowed to have a sort of double barreled claim like this? {#57}

I think we can. It is still will claim.... with two sections.... {#62}

The war contributed to the socio-econ situation but did not disable the country to respond themselves. Instead I think it brought some of their factions closer together. {#68}

No they are both to blame. Comms/logistics and locality is more of an issue. SA could have reacted immediately and much more effective should funding be quicker. The other countries more got involved with the effects of the disaster than the actual disaster support situation. {#44}

Was it a plea for help or was it a humanity response from other countries? {#26}

Strip 1-2

Claim: The systems found in the Mozambique situation fits the USH systems theory.

Grounds: The Mozambique situation as deduced from the INGC Situation report and other reports on the floods, is typical of a Containing system as explained in USH.

Warrant: {#15}

What about the moment and time of total disintegration during the flood situation - It was about survival and no other system were thought about or even considered - e.g. education, medical, etc. {#48}

for a period in time the system were non-existing e.g. chaos. Only after chaos the system revert back to its normal state of equilibrium - it may be a total other system that resulted from that. Thus I do not perceive it as an example of USH {#31}

I do not agree with this. According to them, they were in equilibrium. Everything were working fine for them. From our view points it might not look like that, but we are not in the system... {#40}

I think it is a good case study for USH (you can define any situation as a system, and USH is supposed to be universal), but so are many other systems. So the claim is a bit like stating the obvious? {#39}

According to other reports on the Web, other systems went on. The floods were only in some provinces. {#50}

This is too vague to form part of the claim, lets cut it out. {#60}

Strip 1-3

Claim: Previous wars contributed negatively to the overall influence of the flood disaster in Mozambique.

Grounds: The flood water dislodged land mines used for military purposes from marked areas and moved them to unmarked areas. This caused medical problems when people move across these unmarked areas, which in turn had a negative influence on the medical situation of Mozambique, which in turn had a negative influence on the monetary funds.

Warrants: The flood disaster caused huge expenses. This was due to money spend on saving flood survivors, provide food and housing to homeless, etc. The extra burden of medical expenses to be paid for land mine victims increased these expenses.

Backing: The web sites visited states all of the above information and is provided by high sought organizations.

Modal Qualifier:

Rebuttal: {#18}

No, what would have been the excuse if the same happened in the Netherlands where there was no war? {#51}

No , it is two separate claims and the first claim indicated that the people themselves was not and are not able to handle the situation themselves without outside interference which I disagree totally. {#35}

I agree with the claim - had the civil war not occurred Mozambique would have
been more economically stable and thus able to react faster to the situation and help itself. {#30}

Can we not group together my claim (TTT's) with this one? It is because of the wars etc. that their infrastructure was bad and that they were to poor to cope by themselves. {#32}

Why do you disagree that they can't help themselves without outside interference.....? {#37}

Even before the wars they would not have been able to help themselves {#38}

That is true. The wars just incremented to overall influence of the floods (land mines moving.....) {#42}

37, I agree that they would have recovered by themselves, but they were actually in a really dependent situation. Much bigger parts of their population would have been wiped out if not for intervention (and a person can't recover from dying,) Maybe I must revise my claim to say that they were very dependent on international aid (TTT).{#46}

I have a new claim combination...

"Mozambique needed international intervention because of their underdeveloped socio-economic structure. The best country to support need was SA but this can only be done with the channelling of international funds through SA to help with the relief....." {#58}

let's refine it then... {#69}

I like what 58 is saying. {#61}

I think 58 needs some minor refinement and then it is a good suggestion for a joint claim. {#66}

This is an excellent combination of the claims, lets find common grounds for it. {#67}

Could work... {#70}

Strip 1-4

South Africa does have the best ability to support disasters in the SADAC region with its locality and infrastructure ability and capability to mobilize relief. {#11}

52 - do not agree with all their money and planes they could only respond seven days later to handle the after-effects of the disaster. {#54}

SA would not be able to support SADAC disasters without international funding, specially on the MZ level. However as the leading country in the region and its position and infrastructure it still stays the best to establish such a structure in SA with international funding. (or should US/EU establish such a facility in Zim?) {#41}

I totally agree... Read what I (ZZZ) had to say in the last part of my claim... {#63}

so presumably SA is in the best position to support Mozambique during the flood disaster {#12}

unless SA does not have the financial backing if international funding {#13}

Don't you think that the claim is then not valid that SA is the best to support disasters in SADAC region if we do not have the money. Would'nt it be more feasible to say that countries such as the USA are the best for this job, having the infrastructure and the money... SA normally uses all it's funds to help other but with negative influences on our infrastructure (like the grounding of our ORYX helicopters because no money for fuel or servicing). {#29}

SA was the most willing to help and proximity enabled us to respond faster. But I agree with 29, we did more in Mozambique than we were actually able to afford. If we were to be a channel for international aid, that would have been different. {#36}

I totally agree with 36... If SA would have got funding to help Mozambique, we could have done much more much faster without cutting our own throats.. {#49}

Sure, proximity counts slightly in South Africa's favour, but US and UK have vast funds. With air travel (one example is US sending a fleet of C-17's with millions of $ worth of supplies) it is also quite possible for countries far away to provide assistance. SA could however have done more to help with rescue operations though. {#52}

Strip 1-5

Claim: Although assistance was sluggish in coming through, this was not because of bad intentions on the part of other countries, but rather a result of bad communication. The attitude of those assisting was right, but the inherent logistics were lacking.

Grounds: Countries were willing to offer assistance. At a conference in Rome, countries pledged more than 452 million dollars in assistance to Mozambique.
Warrant: If a country wishes to be perceived as benevolent and willing to help it must offer generous assistance to another country in need.
Backing: Countries should try and be benevolent to other countries in need
Modality: It appears that....

Rebuttal: Unless the countries were deliberately slow in trying to help Mozambique and used the issue of poor communication and logistics as a smoke screen {#23}

I is very funny that EU/US do a lot of talking and promises but is fairly slow in their delivery. {#55}

That's true {#65}

Why do you say that the communication was bad? {#24}

Response time was slow - it was claimed that enough was known about the magnitude and location of the disaster for assistance to be fast {#27}
I agree with the rebuttal more than with the claim. If we in SA knew about the situation (we are part of an international news network), and official pleas were made internationally for help, why did the countries not respond faster? {#28}

Why do you think were the response time so slow? why would other countries be sluggish in to help if they did have the money? Could it be they thought Mozambique could try to help themselves first...! {#33}

No - {#34}
No -they just took time to wake up to the fact that something was going wrong. Standard mechanisms (i.e. logistics support) were not in place to facilitate the process of lending assistance. Other countries were willing to help, they just weren't sure how to go about it. {#43}

Other countries may not have realised help was required. No country assisted Europe with their mud slides and towns being devastated. Outside assistance was not expected. {#45}

But Europe does have enough money... {#53}

I do not buy the argument that a country like America is not able to respond faster. They have some of the best logistics support systems in the world! {#56}

It's not funny that US/EU do a lot of talking - its tragic.... {#59}

Are you saying US wanted people to die? They did not help because they were not fully aware of it.... {#64}

I don't think they want people to die, they are just very self-centred. They will do things for their own interest first, and what is their interest in Mozambique? {#71}

Strip 1-6: whole group

Consensus Claim through system

I have a new claim combination...
"Mozambique needed international intervention because of their underdeveloped socio-economic structure. The best country to support need was SA but this can only be done with the channelling of international funds through SA to help with the relief....." {#73}

Backing: We are all humans and the total world screams in support of their social ethical responsibility towards disadvantages and suffering people {#97}

Backing: People tend to support other people thus {#99}

Mozambique's dependent and unsophisticated socio-economic infrastructure contributed to the fact that they would not have been able to deal with the flood situation without international help. This international help can be supplied by SA's infrastructure but international relief funds should be channelled through SA to help. {#74}

Grounds:?????? {#75}

Warrants:?????? {#76}

Beautiful claim - I go with it. Anyone disagree? {#77}

Backing:?????? {#78}

Modal Qualifier:??????? {#79}

Rebuttal:?????? {#80}

Warrant: For a country to help itself in times of disaster it must have a developed infrastructure. Countries with developed infrastructure and sufficient funds can help countries in need. {#81}

Backing: Based on the statistics/history from previous national disasters {#100}

Warrant: If they gave the infrastructure, but not the funds, and they are the best to do the job, funds should be provided by those who have the funds but is not the best provide the help. {#83}

Put 81 and 83 together... {#88}

Grounds: Because of war, Mozambique was poorly developed. South Africa had the means to help but needed funds to further assist Mozambique. {#82}

Grounds: The rains and storms, hurricanes over Mozambique caused floods resulting in problems for the country. {#84}

Grounds (1st part of claim) : Mozambique is one of the poorest countries in the world and officially the one most dependent on foreign aid. {#93}

Modal: Which leads us to think.. {#85}

Rebuttal: Couldn't a country with the funds and the infrastructure that is far away perform the same role? {#86}

Warrant: I vote for 81 {#87}

Rebuttal: Mozambique might have been able to help itself if they tried hard enough. Other countries did not really have enough resources to help Mozambique. {#89}

I like 81 - hey its mine. {#90}

Rebuttal: Why should funds be channelled through South Africa? Why not straight to Mozambique? {#91}

They do not have the infrastructure to supply the needs... {#92}

rebuttal: Why should other countries have to help, surely they need not if they don't want to? {#94}

That is very true..... {#95}

We are lacking Backing//// {#96}

Backing: Countries will try to help other countries in need? {#98}
Backing: Countries will at some point in time be subjected to natural disasters? {#101}

Strip 1-7: whole group

Consensus through verbal interaction

Claim: Mozambique's dependent and unsophisticated socio-economic infrastructure contributed to the fact that they would not have been able to deal with the flood situation effectively without international help. This international help can be supplied by SA's infrastructure but international relief funds should be channelled through SA to help. {#103}

Warrant: For a country to help itself in times of disaster it must have a developed infrastructure. Countries with developed infrastructure and sufficient funds can help countries in need, and if they gave the infrastructure, but not the funds, and they are the best to do the job, funds should be provided by those who have the funds but is not the best provide the help. {#104}

Backing: Based on the statistics/history from previous national disasters {#105}

Grounds: Mozambique is poorly developed: they are one of the poorest countries in the world and officially the one most dependent on foreign aid. South Africa is one of the most feasible countries to assist them and to channel relief funds. {#108}

Modal qualification: Which leads us to think.. {#109}

Possible Rebuttal: Mozambique might have been able to help itself if they tried hard enough. Other countries might not really have enough resources to help Mozambique and why should they have to help if they don't want to? {#110}