## ABSTRACT

# A BASIS FOR INTERPRETING AND WEIGHING PUBLIC INPUT IN FOREST SERVICE DECISIONMAKING

By

Don Thomas Nebeker

During the 1960's the American public began a movement to obtain more input into decisions being made by administrative branches of government. This public pressure developed as a result of increasing activity by administrative agencies, such as the Forest Service, coupled with the public's sense of inadequacy in influencing decisions. Indeed, Congress joined in sparking public pressure by passing several measures implying the public's right to participate in administrative decisionmaking. Unfortunately, the statutes and administrative orders were not accompanied by comparable guidelines on how the statutes and orders were to be carried out.

The author sets out to provide a method of weighing public input so that there will be some degree of certainty that public expression will be given proper consideration. The basis to understanding public expression, the author postulates, lies in the behavioral sciences. While admitting that the behavioral sciences are in no way yet comparable to the exactness of the hard (physical) sciences, he points out that certain theories have emerged which administrators

can use to help determine what the public is saying, and also to gauge how large and influential public support is for a particular spokesman's position.

The author begins with an analysis of the image that each of us has of the world and how we use it to filter incoming data. Since many people have similar, although not identical, viewpoints we tend to aggregate in groups and exert pressure to obtain those things we deem important. Theories of participation, membership, and group operations are outlined to show how each group disciplines itself. The effectiveness of such discipline then determines, to a great extent, what a spokesman for a group means when he speaks out on an issue, and how much of the public that spokesman represents. The author points out how individuals and groups reconcile differences between their images and the perceived facts, and if convinced by the facts, how they move toward a form of attitude consistency so that the contradictions between facts and beliefs do not create uncomfortable mental strains. Certain other phenomena are discussed, such as signal reactions and labeling, which enable an individual or group to react to material without the necessity of coming to terms with the differences that exist between the image and the facts.

While most activities which lead to the commitment of groups or individuals occur internally, the author points out that certain external clues indicate the internal process.

Such things as the salience of reference groups, the need to belong to certain groups, the need to dress in the uniform and speak in the jargon of one group or another, the content and punctuation of language, the amount of defensiveness, the extent of participation in the taking of a stand by a group and the continuity of a position all assist the manager to determine the depth of intensity of a commitment, if the factors are weighed properly. To judge the intensity and to assist in proper weighing of the individual factors involved in a commitment, the author uses a five-point scale where the numbers from one to five indicate an increasing commitment.

However, the author points out that intensity of commitment by itself is not enough to determine public interest. Other variables must be taken into consideration when weighing public input into a decision, most notably the numbers and political influence of each person speaking on an issue and the need that person will have to wield the power available. The author points out that knowing total numbers is not enough. The decisionmaker must also know the effective numbers that a spokesman can bring to bear, involving such factors as the commitment of the membership to the position taken, the strength the group has shown in the past, and the group's proved ability to persuade noncommitted members of the public to its view. He also produces a method to measure the power of a group and its need to use power based on the effective distance between

(1) the objectives of the proposal under consideration versus the goals of the speaker and (2) the rational impact of the proposal compared to that impact which the speaker asserts will be the outcome.

Each of the factors is weighed to arrive at a method of measuring the intensity and duration of a group or individual commitment, the power which a group can develop to support its position, and the need it will have to react if the proposal becomes policy. Each factor is measured on a five-point scale, and examples are developed in a hypothetical case and in an actual situation the U.S. Forest Service faced several years ago. The illustrations are designed to show the manager how the system can be used to measure public input.

The author summarizes by developing forms which individual managers may use to assist them in implementing the system to measure public input on issues. The author does not claim the method will prove infallible. Rather, the method he develops is an attempt to come to grips with public input and an attempt to begin providing a systematic framework by which decisionmakers of public agencies can begin to assess the public input and give it proper weight in the process of evaluating the decisions that must be made by public bodies.

# A BASIS FOR INTERPRETING AND WEIGHING PUBLIC INPUT IN FOREST SERVICE DECISIONMAKING

By

Don Thomas Nebeker

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Forestry

1976

# PREFACE

Who shall speak for the people?
Who has the answer?
Where is the interpreter?
Who knows what to say?
THE PEOPLE, YES.

Sandberg

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| An Overview of Objectives | 2 |
| Chapter | |
| I. THE PROBLEM | 4 |
| The Rising Publics | 4 |
| Public Interest | 6 |
| The Variables of Communication | 8 |
| Graphing the Input | 10 |
| The Matrix | 11 |
| II. LAWS THAT BIND THE FOREST SERVICE | 14 |
| The Legal Background | 14 |
| The Laws Behind Decisionmaking | 15 |
| Public Participation | 17 |
| Procedures for Public Involvement | 23 |
| III. OUR VIEW OF THE WORLD | 29 |
| The Image | 29 |
| The Effects of the Image | 32 |
| The Image and the Organization | 34 |
| The Image of the Forest Service | 42 |

Chapter Page

IV. THE OPERATIONS OF GROUPS . . . . . 53

Forming Groups . . . . . 53

Pressure Groups . . . . . 55

Group Prominence . . . . . 57

Defensive Reactions . . . . . 59

Participation . . . . . 64

V. THE PROCESS OF TAKING A STAND . . . . . 69

The Limits of the Science . . . . . 69

Commitment . . . . . 70

Forms of Commitment . . . . . 74

The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance . . . 75

Attitude Consistency . . . . . 80

VI. CLUES TO COMMITMENT . . . . . 83

Commitment . . . . . 84

Reference Groups . . . . . 86

Defensiveness . . . . . 89

Language . . . . . 90

Participation . . . . . 95

Continuity . . . . . 96

Weighing Commitment . . . . . 99

VII. THE USE OF POWER . . . . . 103

Numbers . . . . . 106

Political Influence . . . . . 110

Needs Versus Objectives . . . . . 112

Impact . . . . . 115

Chapter Page

VIII. MEASURING THE PUBLIC INTEREST . . . . . 120

Method of Measurement . . . . . 123

Reliability of Data . . . . . 131

IX. TESTING COMMITMENT . . . . . 134

Reference Groups . . . . . 137

Defensiveness . . . . . 140

Language . . . . . 141

Participation . . . . . 145

Continuity . . . . . 149

Summary of Commitment . . . . . 151

X. THE IMPORTANCE FACTOR . . . . . 157

Numbers . . . . . 159

Political Clout . . . . . 162

Needs Versus Objectives . . . . . 166

Impact . . . . . 168

Importance . . . . . 170

XI. A CASE HISTORY . . . . . 175

The Background . . . . . 175

Measuring the Conflict . . . . . 182

The Measurement . . . . . 194

Conclusion . . . . . 200

XII. SUMMARY . . . . . 203

Measurement . . . . . 206

Form 1--Measuring Public Input . . . . 208

Intensity of Commitment . . . . . 208

Chapter Page

VIII. (Continued)

Duration of Commitment . . . . . 213

The Power Factors . . . . . 215

Need to Use Power . . . . . 219

Form 2--Ranking Public Inputs . . . . 222

Weaknesses . . . . . 222

Conclusion . . . . . 224

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 234

## LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Form 1--Measuring Public Input . . . . . | 226 |
| 2. | Form 2--Ranking Public Input . . . . . | 233 |

# INTRODUCTION

Within the last two decades hitherto silent masses of the American people have shown surprising ability to make their desires heard by their government. Decision-makers at all levels have been confounded when seemingly innocuous decisions have resulted in storms of protest. Major issues have been inundated by floodwaters of public comment. Decisions have been overturned. Public careers have been left in wreckage as previously silent publics proved their ability to be heard and to change decisions. Too often, the decisionmakers could have been forewarned had they listened to the public before the decision was made. Failure to hear what the public was saying was not often deliberate, but rather because the decisionmaker did not have the tools to filter the significance of what he was hearing from the many public sources. It is my intention to begin forging some of those tools.

In these pages, I intend to develop a weighted, graphic method decisionmakers may use to evaluate the willingness and ability of an individual or group to use the power available to it to sway public decisions. Social scientists have provided a number of different factors which can be introduced to assist the decision-making

process. These factors are important to understanding the meaning of messages and can be related to each other, I believe, to signal the type of reaction which may be expected to a decision.

An Overview of Objectives

From the Washington Monument to the Golden Gate, from the Gulf of Mississippi to the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana, the public is knocking on the doors of government, demanding that the bureaucracy heed its pleas. From the monument to the bridge, from the bay to the forest, the decisionmakers are trying, or being forced, to listen. The public voices are strident, they are soft, they are demanding, they are suggesting. With so many different ideas in so many voices even a decisionmaker fully committed to listening cannot sort out what exactly it is that the public wants. The decisionmaker often lacks the tools to evaluate what he hears.

The lack of tools does not mean that no knowledge exists as to how the public voices may be evaluated. Social scientists, although limited by a shortage of research funds, have evolved a number of theories which could help the manager. Unfortunately, many of these theories are difficult to empirically confirm. The theories are often overlooked by managers. Many of the theories, however, offer clues to those who would sort out public input to attain some definition of the public interest in a given situation. Again, unfortunately, the

social scientist and the decisionmaker speak different languages so that what the social scientist theorizes about public behavior based on the evidence seldom is transmitted to the person who needs it in a usable form. These pages are an effort to bridge that gap.

The following pages will provide the manager-decisionmaker with a basis to transmute some of the beliefs and theories of the researchers into usable practices. In any determination of public input into government decisionmaking, two factors appear to be of primary importance. They are the willingness of the persons making an assertion to use power to support the statement, and the extent of that power. If more than one opinion is involved, the decisionmaker must have a way to balance the differing opinions into a reasonably accurate view of what may occur when a given decision is made. Some decisionmakers do a reasonably accurate job in many cases by the "seat of their pants" as it were. In these pages I will attempt to provide a more structured method by which all decisionmakers may be able to increase their percentage of accuracy.

# CHAPTER I

# THE PROBLEM

## The Rising Publics

That public participation in governmental decision-making would come of age in the 1970's was inevitable. In the strife of the 1960's, disenfranchised citizens made their point. The racial struggles that began in Watts in 1965 were the start of a movement which might be matched only by great revolution. On the heels of Watts came an awakening of the Chicanos, Indians, intellectuals, students, straights, and numerous other coalitions. It was an awakening fueled by the assassination of President Kennedy, stimulated to action by the war in Vietnam with its attendant bloodletting and by galloping inflation which seemed to make the rich richer and the poor worse off.

Public involvement and public rule have always been basic beliefs in our system of government. When the Constitution was framed, two-year terms were set for members of the House of Representatives so that the public could periodically have its say about how the government was doing and what it should be doing. Now that system

seemed to be breaking down. With the mantle of world power and world leadership descending to the United States, the Congress seemed unable to take the initiative. The power of the presidency and the associated executive branches had grown until, in most cases, laws were initiated in the executive branch and only approved or disapproved by the Congress. The individual who tried to deal with the executive agencies frequently found himself smothered under the overwhelming inertia of the bureaucracy. A new method of public participation in government had to be developed.

Poor people squeezed by inflation angrily began to awaken the consciousness of the American people to the need. Then came the environmentalists. They let it be known that they wanted their say. Officialdom slowly began to listen. Laws were passed to assure--at least in principle--public participation in some of the more vital public decisions of the executive branch (see Chapter III). The term public involvement, almost never heard of a few years previously, became a cliche among bureaucrats and "rebel" leaders alike. Today documents praising the value of participation can be found in most agency files, and academicians refer to it in books often in the most knowing ways, and as somewhat of a "cure-all." Public participation and involvement are good, per se, but few documents describe how they can be effected, <u>much</u>

less interpreted. Government agencies are deluged with public input from all sides, all quarters, and in all forms: some voices are loud, some are soft, some passive, some insistent.

During some seventeen years of experience administering public programs, the author has not observed a practice sought more vigorously than the so-called "public involvement" policy. Virtually all agencies, aided and abetted by some political scientists, have rallied to this cause without knowing how to involve the public, nor stopping to define the purpose, except for a so-called public interest.[1]

Public Interest

"Public interest" is an extremely abstract thing. Although the government is established to carry out this evasive abstraction, "public interest" has not been defined in any precise way--no criteria have been developed for determining the "public interest." Scholars from a wide range of fields have not satisfactorily been able to come to grips with the problem of precise definition. Schubert puts it this way:

> Most of the literature characteristically tends to define the public interest as universal, in terms so broad that it encompasses almost any type of specific decision.

---

[1]For example, David K. Hart, University of Washington, talks about "participatory democracy," but offers no method or discussion of one. (See "Theories of Governemtn Related to Decentralization and Citizen Participation," Public Administration Review, XXXII, October 1972.)

> If I have succeeded in correctly specifying the label of many voices which characterize the meanings attributed to the public interest by both the practitioners of government and the professional students of their behavior how can one hope to bring cosmos out of such chaos.[2]

It should not be implied, however, that the concept of "public interest" is not worthwhile--however abstract. Governmental administration is established to serve the public's best interest. The "public" includes an incomprehensive milieu of individuals, small groups, large groups, organizations, institutions, and societies. Any individual citizen may be a part of any or all levels--as well as just himself. He is often a member of different organizations competing for different things. He may not know himself exactly what he wants. His wants may vary from time to time. Stating it another way, Schubert again expresses the point:

> In a democracy, it generally is accepted that the ultimate sources, at least, of political authority is the people. The people, yes, but which people: If we think of popular political action in terms of voting, almost half are legally disenfranchised by age, residence, and other requirements; furthermore, many of the electorate fail to exercise their franchise. The maximum level of voting participation, which occurs in presidential elections, includes little more than half of the American people who are legally qualified to vote. Active participation in the work of political parties is extremely low. Affiliation with interest groups and vicarious political participation, through group activity,

---

[2]Glendon Schubert, The Public Interest (Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960). pp. 11-15.

> represents a third alternative. Interest groups are dominated by their professional bureaucracies and the supporting fractions of activists, which means that the voice of the interest group is neither Vox Populi nor Vox Dei; it is the voice of the Organization Man.[3]

It is the author's thesis that the public interest will be served well if at any one point the "public" can express to its servants what it wants in such a way that some thread of weight can be attached to the inescapable milieu of expression which will inevitably come to an administrator. Herein lies the problem: Any public service agent is continually bombarded with expressions of public desires, wishes, whims, wants, and needs. No method exists by which he can systematically--or otherwise--put together an understandable framework of assessing what is being said. Authors very glibly speak of the value--in fact the necessity--of public involvement in governmental decision-making. Not one, in the numerous works reviewed by the author, has stopped to suggest how a public agent can best take what he hears into account, or to suggest just how he is to decide what it is he hears.

The Variables of Communication

For one human being to understand another, a number of dependent and independent variables relating to human communications must be understood--taken into account. Such variables can be found in disciplines dealing with

---

[3]Ibid., p. 19.

the behavioral sciences. Bringing together some of the more relevant factors which will help an administrator pull together with reasonable fidelity what he hears from the "public" so that he can make a reasonable assessment of what "they" want (irrespective of what they might need) is the purpose of this study.

Only certain bits of incoming data are needed to make management decisions. For the most part the important information relates to public objectives, efficiency, acceptability, and placing values upon products and services (or equitability). At the same time it is essential for an administrator to know what an individual wants: How strong his felt needs are and how important those needs are in terms of his own and organizational goals. It is also important to know how an individual operates in groups and how those groups function.

An administrator must know how a person looks at the world if he is to know what the person wants. Each person has an "image" or "filter" through which he views the world. Each person's image is different, but the formation of all images seems to follow certain patterns. The individual's image joins with others in groups to set the image of each group of which the individual is a member. To have some idea of the image sets the basis for interpretation of communication between the agency and individuals and groups.

An administrator must also know the legal requirements for public involvement. In this context, those statutory, administrative and policy statements which bind the Forest Service, as a representative agency, will be discussed in future pages.

Graphing the Input

Since the goal is to provide a tool for administrators we will conceptualize the variables of the problem and graphically display them so they can be understood on a matrix whereby an area of acceptability between images of the organization and its clientele can be defined.

One component of the vertical axis of the matrix will deal with behavior factors indicating the degree of commitment of the source to what he (they) is saying. We will call this the "Commitment" factor. The vertical axis will also reflect the relative importance of expressed need. This component will be termed "Importance" factor. This axis will determine the willingness of groups or individuals to use power available to them.

Such things to be considered as behavioral indicators of commitment are as follows: commitment phenomena per se, reference groups, defensiveness, language, participation, and continuity of behavior. Commitment will be charted under two factors: the degree of commitment and its duration. In considering expressed need, factors which relate directly to the importance of any particular public input problem will be taken into account. Such things as numbers

represented, political clout, relationship to public objectives, and impact upon clientele will be used as indicators. Determinations will be made on the basis of citizen support and political support.

The matrix will be used to classify responses and determine their consistency from a particular source or among different sources. It will provide an index as to whether information is sufficient or whether more is needed and its kind and character.

All of the various factors specifically dealing with both components of the vertical axis will be developed and described in detail, based upon available literature. A description of how they can be applied will coincide with each factor.

On the horizontal axis, each matrix component will be given a classification ranking, based upon an original scale from one to five. The values which can be assigned will be derived from a specifically defined set of criteria for each matrix component and factor.

## The Matrix

As an example, consider the following profile for a small mining industry in a rural state--the only industry other than farming located in the county.

Matrix Profile

| | Value Indicator | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment | Reference Group | | | | X | |
| | Defensiveness | | | | | X |
| | Language | | | | X | |
| | Participation | | | X | | |
| | Continuity | | | | X | |
| Importance | Numbers | X | | | | |
| | Political Power | | | | | X |
| | Salience of Objectives | | X | | | |
| | Impact Upon Client | | | | | X |

In this oversimplified case there is an obviously high degree of commitment from the group being rated. Such a rating is based on strong ties (salience) with a reference group (the logging association). There is a very defensive emotional value expression and a dogmatic approach. Participation among local citizens in formulating an industry position has been substantial. And, there is continuity between what is said and done. On the importance scale there are few numbers. What is communicated does not correlate well with the objectives defined for the particular action (possible substantial reduction in the annual output due to increased state environmental standards). This particular local group has strong political clout,

and a decision adverse to them would have substantial monetary impact. The agency's decision alternatives are whether or not to react favorably to this expressed desire, change the objective, compromise, or make a decision adverse to the clientele. The "commitment" scale suggests that the group is likely to react. The "importance" scale suggests the action is likely to be negative and with political influence.

To be meaningful such a profile would have to be made for each relevant group (or individual) participating in the total public involvement process, then a weighted summary made for opposing factions.

The importance of any summary depends upon the input. An administrator must be constantly evaluating his sources. He must also work within certain boundaries set for him by statute and policy. Since the legal boundaries determine what an administrator is able to do to encourage public participation, let us turn first to a discussion of those rules faced by one agency, the U. S. Forest Service.

# CHAPTER II

# LAWS THAT BIND THE FOREST SERVICE

## The Legal Background

An agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government is first given statutory powers-of-action to carry out its function by the Congress of the United States. Such statutes are often called enabling acts. Enabling acts tend to be broadly worded, conferring relatively wide ranges of authority. Other statutes, orders, regulations, and policies evolve to define more precisely the activities intended and necessary to the function of the agency. Such defining rules usually narrow and restrict discretionary power. Particularly in recent times, the role of public agencies has tended to be more narrowly spelled out, perhaps justifiably so, given the increasing powers of public agencies over persons and resources. While such power has increased demands for public participation in agency operations, surprisingly little "solid" legal direction has been given to public involvement in the decision-making processes of public land management agencies, such as the Forest Service.

Legal requirements are expressed by statute, executive orders, administrative regulations, and agency policies. There has been little uniformity in procedures to involve the public. Public participation may involve consultation with advisory committees or boards representing interested parties that have been established by statute, by regulation, or merely by policy. Consultation may achieve agreement between the agency and the parties but the value of the agreement may be limited by the methods of choosing the board. Some public involvement provides for written submissions or oral presentations by representatives of interested parties. There may be a speech-making hearing at which any interested party may present views for the record. There may be a trial-type hearing. This is usually an adversary proceeding for the purpose of resolving disputed facts. The Forest Service may use one or a combination of these processes depending upon the legal format required. Some of the methods are legally required.

The Laws Behind Decisionmaking

The Constitution of the United States provides in Article IV, Section 3, that, "The Congress shall have the Power to dispose and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." In exercising that constitutional power, the Congress provided by the 1821 Creative Act[1] and 1897

---

[1]16 U.S.C. 471

Organic Act[2] for the reservation of public domain lands as national forests. The 1897 act conferred authority to protect and administer these forests. In early litigation, such as United States v. Grimand,[3] the Secretary's authority to regulate the forests was held to be broad and discretionary; and, the regulations held to have the force and effect of law. The courts soon well settled that the early statutes relating to the establishment and administration of the national forests clearly intended that the everyday, on-the-ground management of the forests was to be left to the professional service, with virtually no meaningful public involvement.

The prevailing attitude in what was then a predominantly agricultural society can be described as follows: The Congress, made up of the elected representatives of the people, managed the public property through executive departments it created. The Congress supervised the activities of these departments. The people could best make known their wishes through their elected representatives. That being the attitude of the times, it is understandable that the acts which constitute the foundation of the Forest Service did not provide for the public to participate in decisionmaking.

---

[2]16 U.S.C. 475

[3]220 U.S. 506 (1911)

Less readily understood, however, may be the reasons why, in an increasingly complex, industrialized economy dependent on natural resources, virtually all the acts of Congress relating to the national forests from the turn of the century to the present have been equally as silent with respect to public involvement.

Public Participation

Those statutes which do require involvement by the public in decisions related to the national forests have called for establishment of advisory boards or for using public hearing and notice techniques.

The first such act was the Granger-Thye Act of 1950,[4] which provided for local advisory boards through which national forest grazing permittees could express their views concerning management of national forest range lands.

In the 1960's the Wilderness Act[5] required public involvement, through hearings of the speech-making type and through submission of written views, as to the suitability of making certain areas of the national forests into permanent wilderness. Such involvement does not extend to the everyday decisionmaking process concerned with the wide range of management alternatives for national forest wilderness areas.

---

[4]16 U.S.C. 580

[5]16 U.S.C. 1131

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966,[6] makes mandatory notice and advice of an advisory council.

> The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking . . . take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site . . . The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under Title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.

The Department of Transportation Act of 1966,[7] specifies:

> Special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of the lands traversed.

While the act involves the Forest Service and more importantly the States, it includes no provision for direct public participation.

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, added in 1970,[8] gives the public an additional right to information on the environmental aspects of Federal action. It requires the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

---

[6] 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.

[7] 49 U.S.C. 1653

[8] 42 U.S.C. 1857a

to comment on any proposed legislation, regulation, or agency action affecting air or water quality, pesticides, solid waste disposal, radiation, or noise control. These comments must be publicly available in writing at the end of EPA's review, and presumably gives the public a chance to respond.

Since the establishment of the national forests, the act which most generally affects the management of the forests is the Multiple Use--Sustained Yield Act of 1960.[9] It might be assumed that if any act relating to the Forest Service was to touch on the subject of public involvement after more than 60 years of the Forest Service's existence, it would be this one. But that Act makes no provision for public involvement. To the contrary, it is primarily a management directive to the professional service and it might be argued that the Act, by specifically authorizing the Secretary merely to cooperate with interested state and local governmental agencies and others in the development and management of the national forests,[10] implies no other participation by the public.

While the Congress provides but few situations requiring public involvement, the need to know how any proposed action will affect the public, especially the commodity users, cannot be ignored by the Forest Service.

---

[9]16 U.S.C. 528 et seq.

[10]16 U.S.C. 530

In most instances, that part of the public which will be affected, or which demonstrates continued interest, in proposed management decisions is identifiable. This being so, the Forest Service has traditionally and voluntarily advised affected or interested parties of proposed agency actions. It appears truthful to say that up until the last few years this voluntary involvement of affected or interested parties has worked satisfactorily. Perhaps this explains the lack of need for more laws specifically addressed to requiring public involvement. However, the public now seeks an expanded role in the decision-making processes. What is happening is a recognized fact. It can be assumed that this demand will increase for some time and will eventually be reflected by additional legal requirements establishing processes for public involvement.

Naturally, meaningful participation by interested parties depends in large measure on the availability to them of government records. The Administrative Procedure Act,[11] as revised by the 1967 Freedom of Information Act,[12] respecting the publicity of information, is applicable to the activities of the Forest Service. The Freedom of Information Act predates the upwelling of citizen environmental action. The Act laid down a general rule that all

---

[11] 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq.

[12] 5 U.S.C. 701 et seq.

agency data must be available to the public, with certain exceptions, and is basic, therefore, to public availability of environmental data. Some provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act have been considered inapplicable to the activities of the Forest Service. It has been the position of the Department of Agriculture that the provisions of the Act regarding public participation in rule making do not apply to the Forest Service as the Act specifically exempts matters relating to public property. However, the Forest Service has voluntarily established formal procedures provided under the Administrative Procedure Act. The following statement in regard to public participation in rule making was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture on July 20, 1971:

> Notice is hereby given of the policy of the Department of Agriculture to give notice of proposed rule making and to invite the public to participate in rule making where not required by law.
>
> 5 U.S.C. 553 provides generally that before rules are issued by Government agencies, notice of proposed rule making must be published in the Federal Register, and interested persons must be given an opportunity to participate in the rule making through submission of data, views, or arguments.
>
> The law exempts from this requirement rules relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts.
>
> The Administrative Conference of the United States has recommended that Government agencies provide for public participation when formulating rules relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits or contracts as a matter of policy.

> The advantages of implementing the Conference's recommendation that the public be afforded an opportunity for greater participation in the formulation of rules relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts will outweigh any disadvantages such as increased costs or delays.
>
> The public participation requirements prescribed by 5 U.S.C. 553 (b) and (c) will be followed by all agencies of the Department in rule making relating to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts. The exemptions permitted from such requirements where an agency finds for good cause that compliance would be impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest will be used sparingly, that is, only when there is substantial basis therefor. Where such a finding is made, the finding and a statement of the reasons therefor will be published with the rule.[13]

The pertinent parts of 5 U.S.C. 553 referred to in the foregoing notice from the Secretary are as follows:

> (b) General notice of proposed rule making shall be published in the Federal Register, unless persons subject thereto are named and either personally served or otherwise have actual notice thereof in accordance with law. The notice shall include--
>
> (1) a statement of the time, place and nature of a public rule making proceedings;
>
> (2) reference to the legal authority under which the rule is proposed; and
>
> (3) either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subjects and issues involved.

Except when notice or hearing is required by statute, this subsection does not apply--

> (a) to interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice; or

---

[13] 36 F.R. 13806, July 24, 1971.

> (b) when the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.

More often the Forest Service reaches decisions by informal consultations or conferences between Forest Officers, at one or several levels of authority, and representatives of interested or affected parties. Not all decisions, and in all probability this includes the vast majority of day-to-day, on-the-ground decisions, are "rules" as that word is defined by the Administrative Procedure Act.

The suggestion that rule making in the management of the national forests be subjected to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act is often met with the criticism that these Governmental operations are of such tremendous scope and of such an expert nature that it is essential they not be burdened by mandatory procedural requirements. But public involvement has not proved so burdensome for activities which have been subjected to this requirement.

Procedures for Public Involvement

In addition to the Administrative Procedure Act, there are other circumstances which have resulted in establishing procedures for expanded public involvement in decisions which affect the use of our land and resources.

The purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969[14] are very broad indeed. They include

---

[14] 42 U.S.C.A. 4321

declaring a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment, promoting efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man, encouraging man's understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the nation.

NEPA recognizes the importance of public access as a force for corrective action. It does so by requiring public availability of environmental impact statements and of agency comments, regardless of whether they contain advice on matters of policy. The Council guidelines generally require that draft and final environmental impact statements be available to the public for minimum periods of 90 to 30 days, respectively, before the agency acts. The guidelines also require that draft statements be made public at least 15 days before hearings. It states that:

> It is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with state and local governments, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.
>
> In order to carry out the policy set forth in the Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy,

> to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may . . . enhance the quality of renewable resources.

The Act does not, however, establish a formal requirement for direct public involvement except in responding to environmental statements prepared by the agency under the provisions of Section 102 of the Act. In the Act it is recognized that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and it is implied that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

In the same philosophy is Title II of the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970,[15] in which Congress finds that man has caused changes in the environment and that many of these changes may affect the relationship between man and his environment. If one equates man, as so often mentioned in these Acts, with the people, can it any longer be said that management of the Nation's natural resources does not have a major impact on the people and will it not require involvement of the public in decisionmaking?

Some conservation groups have sought to gain an expanded role in affecting management decisions by enlisting the assistance of the Federal courts. This has generated

---

[15] 42 U.S.C.A. 4371

a good deal of publicity, and, in a peripheral way bears upon the public's role of involvement. After a thorough search of the records, the author has been unable to find a single case brought to the courts expressly directed to failure to involve the public or an interest group. Rather, the numerous recent cases have been directed to overcoming a specific decision pertaining to vested interest.

From a strict legal point of view, there is no statutory requirement for public involvement except in connection with the establishment of wilderness areas, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Granger-Thye Act, the Department of Transportation Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Clean Air Act, and of course, the public information aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act.

The most direct requirement for general public participation appears in the President's Executive Order 11514, for the "Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality." The order further defines the responsibilities of Federal agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act. Among the President's requirements is one to develop procedures to ensure the <u>fullest practicable provision of timely public information and understanding</u> of Federal plans and programs with environmental impact <u>in order to obtain the views of interested parties</u> (emphasis added). These procedures shall include, whenever appropriate, provision

for public hearings, and shall provide the public with relevant information, including information on alternative courses of action. Hence, Federal agencies with responsibilities in the field of environmental quality are directed by the President to develop procedures to obtain the views of interested parties and encouraged, when appropriate, to resort to public hearings for that purpose. Such procedures would be available not only for the purpose of giving timely information to the public of Federal plans and programs but also of receiving the views of the public to assist in reaching decisions to implement plans and programs with environmental impact. Administrative regulations have been found to have the force and effect of law.[16] Presumably executive orders would also fall in the same general category. Thus, it would appear that action could be taken against a government agency under administrative appeal procedures or under the Mandamus Doctrine for failure to abide by the provisions of Executive Order 11514.

No record yet shows that the court has held that Forest Service administrative action under review has been arbitrary and capricious. Assuming that each decision is reached after consideration of all available information, under the applicable statutory guidelines, a Forest Officer

---

[16]See United States v. Grimand, 220 U.S. 56 (1911) and 16 U.S.C. 551.

should be able to reach decisions with the confidence that, if that decision is challenged judicially, it will be sustained. In other words, a reasonable decision, when reached with public involvement as specified in Executive Order 11514, should under the prevailing rules of law be upheld.

The question depends for its answer, of course, on whether the officer has considered properly all the input he has received from the public. To do so requires that he know the sources of that input.

# CHAPTER III

# OUR VIEW OF THE WORLD

## The Image

Anyone who has worn sunglasses until late afternoon when the sun is setting, or who has worn them on a cloudy day, knows how looking at the world through tinted lenses changes the view of the day. If a person does not take sunglasses off at dusk when the need for them is gone with the descending sun, that person may think it is later than it is. On a cloudy day sunglasses can distort the impact of the day upon the sensibilities of the observer. A cloudy but bright and pleasant day can become gloomy behind sunglasses. The filtering effect of sunglasses seems to be more intense, or at least it makes us unaware so that we do not compensate for it. We may be surprised at how bright and pleasant the day really is when we remove the sunglasses. Our impression depends upon the filter through which we view the day.

An old bit of wisdom claims that a pessimist is a person who looks at a bottle and says it is half empty while an optimist is a person who looks at the same bottle and says it is half full. The person's reaction depends

upon the general outlook he or she has toward the bottles in his life. A gloomy reaction to any event can be expected from a person with a generally gloomy outlook on life--a happy reaction from a person with a happy outlook. The reaction depends upon the overall image the person has on life. If the person believes that everything that can go wrong will, then that belief acts as the filter, the sunglasses as it were, with which he views the world. A person who believes most things will go right will see a different picture when he looks through his sunglasses.

If a third person begins to question these persons as to why they feel the way they do, each will be able to cite a raft of specific supporting instances in which the world has gone bad or has been good. Each "fact" helps build the frame and lenses of the sunglasses with which each person views the world.

If every person wore his "sunglasses" on the outside we would be able to tell at a glance how he viewed the world. Unfortunately, we internalize our filter. Boulding[1] calls this internalization "The Image," and defines it as all those facts which an individual believes to be the truth and against which he tests all incoming messages. One will accept or reject an incoming message

---

[1]Kenneth E. Boulding, The Image, Knowledge in Life and Society, (Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1969), p. 6.

on the basis of how much it collides with his image of what is happening. A message may be rejected because it is too trivial to become aware of and take into the image; it may change the image by simply adding additional facts which one can accept as facts and fit into his present image; or it may collide with a keystone of his image and convert his entire picture into something new, much as a child's kaleidoscope changes each image radically as we turn it.

Boulding says:

> The sudden and dramatic nature of these reorganizations is perhaps a result of the fact that our image is in itself resistant to change. When it receives messages which conflict with it, its first impulse is to reject them as in some sense untrue. Suppose, for instance, that somebody tells us something which is inconsistent with our picture of a certain person. Our first impulse is to reject the proffered information as false. As we continue to receive messages which contradict our image, however, we begin to have doubts, and then one day we receive a message which overthrows our previous image and we revise it completely. The person, for instance, whom we saw as a trusted friend is now seen to be a hypocrite and a deceiver.[2]

Boulding also believes that the image can be modified in another way--clarity.

> The image has a certain dimension, or quality, of certainty or uncertainty, probability or improbability, clarity or vagueness. Our image of the world is not uniformly certain, uniformly probable or uniformly clear.[3]

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

Various messages we receive may make the image we have clearer or less clear.

> The impact of messages on the certainty of the image is of great importance in the interpretation of human behavior. Images of the future must be held with a degree of uncertainty, and as time passes and as the images become closer to the present, the messages that we receive inevitably modify them, both as to content and certainty.[4]

The Effects of the Image

Our view of the world determines how we act or react in specific situations. The pessimist, for instance, who believes everything will inevitably turn out badly, is less likely to make a determined effort to change things. The optimist, however, may react strongly in a situation in which most outside observers would call his chances poor. What we see as possible because of our image of the world will determine how we act in that world.

Another aspect of the image contributes heavily to the behavior pattern. We will rate an image as to value. In other words, we believe that some of the things we "know" about the world are "good" and some of the things we "know" about the world are "bad."[5] We are more likely to take action to change the things we believe are bad.

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[5] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

The valuation ratings of the image play an important role in how well we accept the messages we receive. If the messages fit into the image, even though they may modify it slightly, we can accept them easily. If they oppose our image, or support things we believe are bad then we will resist those messages. Generally, an unfavorable message may be ignored or resisted with varying degrees of strength. The strength of the resistance determines how many times a message must be repeated before there is any possibility of changing the image.[6]

Strength of the resistance depends upon the internal cohesiveness and unity, the stability, of our image of the world. Boulding says, "There seems to be some kind of principle of minimization of internal strain at work which makes some images stable and others unstable for purely internal reasons."[7] Boulding says the stability of the internal structure does not necessarily depend upon logic but rather upon the needs of the person or the way in which the structure fits into a whole.

> The structure may, for instance, have certain aesthetic relationships among the parts. It may represent or justify a way of life or have certain consequences which are highly regarded in the value system, and so on.[8]

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[7] Ibid., p. 13.

[8] Ibid., p. 13.

Boulding claims even so-called messages of fact are filtered through this image system.

> We do not perceive our sense data raw; they are mediated through a highly learned process of interpretation and acceptance. When an object apparently increases in size on the retina of the eye, we interpret this not as an increase in size but as movement. Indeed, we only get along in the world because we consistently and persistently disbelieve the plain evidence of our senses. The stick in water is not bent; the movie is not a succession of still pictures; and so on.
>
> What this means is that for any individual organism or organization, there are no such things as "facts." There are only messages filtered through a changeable value system.[9]

What Boulding is saying, in effect, is that the world we see is not the real world but rather the world that we have created. Each of us creates our own world and reacts to it in the real world. An understanding of the perception that someone has of the world becomes a prerequisite for understanding how that person will react under varying conditions. The public service officer, such as those in the Forest Service, must understand the concept of the image before he can understand and react properly to many of the forces encircling organizations in today's changing world.

The Image and the Organization

Boulding says part of the image of most persons is a belief that other people share our image of the world.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 13.

"If a group of people are in a room together, their behavior clearly shows that they all think they are in the same room. It is this shared image which is 'public' knowledge . . ."[10] When people converse they further share their images. And people tend to associate most with those who share their images, or at least those who will not transmit messages that will create resistance within the image they hold.

In an organization this works to bring about a generally common image of the world. A person who shares this image joins; one who does not share the image does not join, or if he does, his image may be changed in the direction of the image held by most members, depending to a great extent upon the importance the joiner places upon membership in the organization or upon the efforts he had to make to become a member.[11]

Boulding writes:

> The basic bond of any society, culture, subculture, or organization is a 'public image,' that is, an image the essential characteristics of which are shared by the individuals participating in the group.[12]

More important is that this public image is passed down from generation to generation by one means or another. The important aspect to be transmitted, for the society or subculture, is the value system. The group wishes to

---

[10]Ibid., p. 14.

[11]See below, p. 77.

[12]Boulding, op. cit., p. 64.

preserve, first and foremost, those values which make it acceptable and worthwhile in its own eyes. "Education in most societies is a matter of harnessing the biological drives in the interest of establishing the value system of a society," Boulding claims.[13] In other words, what is sometimes called socialization of the individual is a method of indoctrinating him or her into the value system of the society of which the person is a member. This can be done through formal education in which authority and a superior/inferior relationship impose strict sanctions for deviations. More important for our consideration are less formal strictures which occur in face-to-face relationships. "The sanctions of the peer group, however, are usually much more effective on the individual than the sanctions of superiors."[14] Some religious groups who make it a habit to remain by themselves in communal groups have both formal and informal strictures. A member who leaves the group will also be dropped by other members of the organization. A person will much more readily leave the formal group if in the process he will still be accepted within the homes of those members important to him. When he becomes an outcast through the informal agreement of his former friends and family with formal sanctions, he becomes much less likely to leave.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 73.

[14] Ibid., p. 73.

In the organization of a governmental bureaucracy, informal sanctions enforce official sanctions. The maverick within the group must maintain his or her emotional balance in spite of an image of the world that creates friction with superiors and with peers because it is at odds with their own. An example is the military service. Each service has stern rules and regulations governing how members may act toward superiors, toward each other and toward outsiders; how members must dress; and how they must follow formal channels to accomplish their goals. In addition to the formal strictures, informal images tell each member of the military group how to act. A member of a military organization may take actions disapproved by the majority of his fellows and yet be following the letter of the formal regulations. Such a person may be ignored or publicly despised by other members of the group. If he is to accomplish the goals which set him off in the first place, he must have a powerful image of the world he wants, and in general must find allies outside the group who support his image of the world and can help him circumvent the group. An example is Admiral Hyman Rickover of the U.S. Navy. Admiral Rickover's image of a powerful atomic fleet has been strong enough to keep him going and give him influence in the Navy despite both official and unofficial efforts to make him surrender his beliefs, his image. Powerful members

of Congress who have shared the Admiral's image have supported him to the extent that he has climbed the Navy ranks despite various sanctions. For a person whose image was less strong, or who had weaker allies, the pressures applied to Rickover could have proved too much and the image he held might have been changed radically. Generally, in a bureaucracy, such pressures work to imprint the overall image the organization has of itself upon even very new members.

Thus, an organization has two ways to preserve its self image. The first is by careful selection of new members to insure that they hold the proper image. The second is by imposing various sanctions to insure that all members share similar goals and ideas.

Once the members of an organization have subconsciously defined an image of the group, they may become extremely hostile to change. The image its members have of themselves and their group will resist efforts to change that image. In a bureaucratic situation, particularly in the situation that has existed in recent years, many messages aimed at changing a group have been delivered from outside the group. Because of the shared image, the group tends to draw closer to itself and to resist the messages it receives. Thus, the public and private behavior of the organization depends upon the image it has of itself.

This is not to say that an organization's image is a monolith. Each organization deals with at least two overall images of itself: (1) the image it has for its existence, that is, the job it is supposed to do; and (2) the image it has of how successful it is in fulfilling that job. Any grouping which has been raised to the level of a formal organization will deal with these images. A social club, for example, will contain an image of helping its members enjoy themselves. A church has an image of itself as helping its members closer to God. In the public sphere, each government agency is formally charged with doing something for the public good, ranging from the beneficial development of atomic energy, to the protection of various zoological species. The agency will have an image of itself as manager, or developer, or protector. The social club will also have an image of how well it is accomplishing its goal, whether its members are enjoying themselves or whether they are not. The church will have an image of how well it is accomplishing its goal of bringing its members closer to God. The government agency will have an image of how well it is doing its job. While each member of the group has his own image of what is happening, his image will join with those of others in the group to reinforce the organization image.

Several general propositions can be made about the two images. Although the organization has an overall image,

it will permit differing images by its members to a greater or lesser extent as long as those members support the overall image in public debate. Internal controversy is fine, but the members must maintain loyalty. Taking complaints outside the group is considered disloyal and will be punished by the impositions of sanctions, up to and including expulsion. Promulgating complaints internally beyond a point at which the complaint has been officially proclaimed "not policy" may generate similar sanctions. The organization uses these sanctions to maintain its internal integrity. Change may occur only when a sufficient number of the membership is convinced, and that change must be made in such a way that it is consistent with the overall image the group has of itself. A second general proposition is that members of a group may be permitted to hold differing images on how well that group is performing its function as long as, again, the criticism is maintained with the organization. A group will have an overall image of itself as performing its function at least "as well as can be expected under the circumstances." Failure to accomplish certain goals may be blamed upon external forces such as other sources of entertainment, the Devil, or interference by political hacks. With this in mind, it is consistent that the group will resist outside efforts to make it change. It has been given a mission and it is accomplishing that mission as well as it can be presently done. Therefore, a third general statement about organizational images:

Unless there is dramatic evidence of a need for change, any changes which occur will be over a period of time and may be stopped at almost any time up to the final implementation. Some organizations have been so resistant to change for various reasons that in the end, the image of the membership brought on the group's destruction. The nobility of Europe fell victim to this process during the age of revolution.

There is a third image important to an organization. This third image is that which outsiders hold to the group. In some cases, this may be more important in the long run than the internal images. If outsiders hold an image of a country club that makes them wish to join it, the club will have a waiting list of new members that will keep it healthy and strong. If, for some reason, the image of the outsiders changes so that it is no longer desirable to belong to the club, if a fancier club is formed, for example, then the first club may be forced to bring in members of lesser status than before and the status of membership may decline. If a government agency fails to perform properly, if a congressional probe turns up a scandal, the image of the agency held by the public might change so that a formerly autonomous and respected agency becomes a center of suspicion and distrust. In less than 50 years, for example, the image of the Federal Bureau of Investigation held by the public has changed from one of contempt for its weaknesses to one of respect for its accomplishments to what appears to be one of suspicion.

In each case, the attitude of the public has resulted in changes in funding and in powers, and has forced internal change by virtual fiat. A general statement, then, is that it is to the advantage of most organizations to maintain an internal image that will bring them the most rewarding external image. The more public the organization, the greater the need for this third image to be maintained so that the organization will not be changed or superseded from without.

The Image of the Forest Service

The Forest Service operates within the series of internal images. From its beginnings shortly before the turn of the century, the Forest Service had an image, both internal and external, as a custodian of the national forests. "For forty years, from 1900 until 1940, the administration of the national forests in the west was pretty much a job of custodianship," Behan asserts.[15] Then World War II and its aftermath created demands for the resources of the national forests, particularly timber, to supply a rapidly increasing need for housing. Gradually, in a way congruent with its image, the Forest Service shifted from guarding the national forests toward an image of managing them for the most beneficial uses. "The

---

[15]R. W. Behan, The Lincoln Back Country Controversy, A Case Study in Natural Resource Policy and Administration. Unpublished study, University of Montana, 1963, p. 5.

transition from custodianship to active management, though, was not a frantic progression nor a crash program. It had taken, by and large, about 20 years--from 1940 to 1960."[16] The image of the Forest Service that developed over the years, Behan says, was that of a:

> . . . vigorous and growing agency with a heritage of crusading hard work and the administrative toughness to resist local controversies. The agency that had cut its teeth in the face of local antagonism, that had gone on to earn the respect and support of its former antagonists, now had shifted its role from preserving the forests to managing them; it had realized its professional potential; it had, with greatly increased appropriations, what amounted to a new legislative mandate, and it had a long and successful history of accomplishing what it set out to do--in spite of difficulties.[17]

A similar viewpoint, differing only in tone and values, appears in a paper from the University of Montana written a few years later:

> The heavy timber orientation is built in by legislative action and control, by executive direction and by budgetary restriction. It is further reinforced by the agency's own hiring and promotion policies and is rationalized in the doctrines of its professional expertise.[18]

This paragraph recognized the developmental image of the Forest Service mentioned in Behan's paper quoted above along with an implicit recognition of how the Forest

---

[16] Ibid., p. 6.

[17] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[18] Select Committee of the University of Montana, A University View of the Forest Service, S. Doc. No. 115, 91st Cong., 2d. Sess. (1970), pp. 2-3.

Service's own image of its role acts to reinforce that image. Discounting the outsider's image that the University of Montana report contains toward the Forest Service, the paragraph is an excellent recognition of the internal factors that go into molding and maintaining the image.

The fact that an organization fosters and maintains an image of itself in relation to what its job is, and an image of itself in relation to how well it is doing that job, is not only understandable but necessary if the job is to get done at all. Only when conditions of rapid change clash with the image does the agency find itself under heavy attack from outside. Both papers cited above deal with controversies in which the Forest Service image of itself clashed with an outside image of what it should be. Behan's report dealt with a controversy over development of an area of the Helena National Forest called the Lincoln Back Country. The University of Montana Select Committee report discussed aspects of a controversy in the Bitterroot National Forest concerning management practices for timber. In both cases, the Forest Service's image of its job clashed with what many persons outside felt it should be. Performance in both cases was not mentioned to any great extent, the battle centering over what the agency's duties were and how it was to determine those duties.

Bolle of the University of Montana School of Forestry lays out the conflicts in a paper published in 1971:

> There appears to be a breakdown in the normal democratic process through which the public need is translated into law by the legislature and, in turn, carried out by administrative agencies. Dissatisfaction is expressed in confrontation, conflict and lawsuits as means of defending and developing environmental values.
>
> . . . The awareness of value changes can emerge primarily through involvement of the public in agency programs at the field level. Citizen involvement in government should be welcomed by the natural resource administrators as evidence of the growing importance of these programs to the American public. Unfortunately the reaction of administrators far too often is resentment. The many and growing instances of conflict between natural resource agencies and their publics are basically breakdowns in relationships because of administrators' lack of genuine understanding of the participation process.[19]

What Bolle said is that society is changing in that its members wish more participation in decisions of certain organizations. This comes into conflict with the image the organization has of itself, particularly when the organization is staffed by highly-trained professional people. Bolle speaks to this point concerning the Bitterroot controversy:

> . . . It was the attitude of some of the professionals that if the public relations people had been doing their job correctly, adequately, and professionally, the public would have raised no objection. . .
>
> An attitude expressed at upper levels of the agency was somewhat similar--that the public was unappreciative of the programs of the Service, was irresponsible because it did not accept the

---

[19]Arnold W. Bolle, "Public Participation and Environmental Quality," Natural Resources Journal, July 1971, pp. 497-498.

> country's great need for wood, and seemed totally unwilling to learn. In other words, first the agency was right, second the people were wrong, and third how could the agency get these people to recognize it? The agency had determined the public interest in terms of its own professionalism. This approach provides an almost impossible basis for the public participation. . .
>
> The professional forester apparently accepts certain assumptions which would give him certain fundamental truths believed by him to be beyond the comprehension of the ordinary mortal. These truths are good for people in spite of what they as people might think or feel.[20]

Again discounting the tone of the article as expressed in these paragraphs, Bolle is speaking to the clash caused by differing images of what an agency's job is. Bolle obviously believes that the professional members of the Forest Service have an image of themselves that needs to be changed. He spells that belief out even more strongly in another paragraph. Speaking of the reaction of professional foresters to public participation in the decision-making process, he writes:

> . . . "We would be abrogating our professional responsibility if we didn't work out the problem and present the public with our best solution," they say. What arrogant and irrelevant nonsense! To do so they would have to first identify the problem, which involves setting the goals! Foresters are no more competent to set goals for society than any other group of citizenry or citizen.[21]

While Bolle is speaking with arrogance himself, as well as with some anger, he illustrates an outsider's image of an agency.

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 499-500.

[21] Ibid., p. 501.

To some extent each of the claims Bolle has made appears either implicitly or explicitly in Behan's discussion of the Lincoln Back Country dispute. Briefly, Behan believes the Back Country controversy developed because the Forest Service was attempting to move from the custodial era mentioned above into the developmental era without taking into consideration the evolving demand for public participation in the decisions which involved the type of development. First of all, Behan says the Forest Service was moving into a development of the forests that had been generated by the need for timber and by the increasing need for outdoor recreation, as legislated into policy by the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act of 1960. The Forest Service began to develop recreation areas and to sell more and more timber out of the Helena Natioanl Forest.

> By the summer of 1962, the new Supervisor and the new (district) Ranger, aided by the appropriations and the mandate of the Multiple Use Act, had their planning well underway for the development and future use of the Back Country. The planning, at least ostensibly, was a result of the new supervisor's initiative. It was presented to the Helena National Forest Advisory Council in August.[22]

The plan as it was initiated and approved by the Advisory Council called for development of the Lincoln Back Country with roads and camping areas. It envisaged

---

[22]Behan, op. cit., p. 11.

opening up the Back Country previously accessible only on foot or horseback to a wide range of motorized vacationers and campers. It was a plan initiated at the top and passed down.

As Behan outlines the controversy, the plan ran head-on into the community of Lincoln, a small town which had obtained its first paved access to the outside in 1957 and which earned its living from pack trips into the Lincoln Back Country and from the exploitation of the timber. A very small group of men had in 1960 formed the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association which had almost died by 1962.[23] But the various activities associated with initiating the development plan spurred a revival of the group which initiated state-wide support in opposition to wide-scale development. The opposition to the plan requested a public hearing which was eventually held. The Forest Service presented its plan and those in favor and those against had time to speak. Perhaps because of the structure of the meeting, those in favor and those against seemed about evenly split. One result was to crystallize the opposition. Within a short time a large majority of the sportsmen and conservation groups within the State of Montana were in opposition to the development of the Lincoln Back Country. At first, opposition ranged from absolutely no development, to limited development, to asking for delayed development.

---

[23]Behan, op. cit. p. 12.

On May 17, 1963, the president of the Western Montana Fish and Game Association suggested in a letter to the Supervisor of the Helena National Forest that the Lincoln Back Country not be developed for at least ten years.[24] Within a month other sportsmen's groups and Montana's junior U.S. Senator had joined in asking for a delayed development. Behan identifies a consensus of public opinion:

> Senator Metcalf's letter . . . represented a clearly apparent consensus that opposed the immediate development of the Back Country, and opposed the execution of the Long Range Plan. Beyond the opposition, the will of the public diffused somewhat, ranging from tangible proposals for a 10-year moratorium to indefinite suggestions . . . that the area "could be retained in its natural state." Specifying the consensus position is difficult, but it probably stood for (1) no immediate development, (2) an implication of some form of future development, should the need arise, and (3) a recognition that the Back Country should not be classified, either as a formal Wild or Wilderness Area.
>
> But the existence of a consensus was beyond question. The office of the Regional Forester was flooded with letters and telegrams opposing the Long Range Plan. For more than two months following the April 19 meeting . . . there was not one single written expression received in support of it.[25]

Even the groups which normally supported development--the timber, mining and livestock interests--were silent, Behan says. The opposition was the only group commenting on the plan and it had seemed to reach a consensus that it did

---

[24]Behan, op. cit., p. 20.

[25]Ibid., p. 21.

not want to stop development, but to delay that development for as much as ten years.

The Forest Service apparently had an image of itself and the opposition that continued to lead it into direct confrontation rather than into conciliatory positions. Behan himself says that the Forest Service had shown from its beginnings, "the administrative toughness to resist local controversies. . ."[26] The great traditions of the foresters who had preserved the national forests in the face of assaults by those who would merely exploit the forests and leave them in waste undoubtedly played a strong part in the Forest Service stance. Those traditions are an integral part of the image the Service has of itself. Unfortunately, the tradition has such strength that the Service may have failed to recognize that it had no supporters in its stance, or very few, and those few only half-heartedly committed, rather than the very strong allies it had during the local controversies a half-century or more earlier. From statements attributed to Forest Service representatives by Behan, it would seem that at least some administrators failed to recognize that what they were facing was a change rather than a simple rerun of battles fought long before.

The image of itself developed years earlier undoubtedly played some role in the failure of Forest

---

[26]Ibid., p. 8.

Service leaders to recognize the changes in the position of the public which had for so long supported the Forest Service stand against the exploiters. Dean Bolle asserted that what the public wanted was no less than public participation in the decision-making process at all levels.[27] Foresters at all levels of the Service seemed to miss this point. In a memorandum following the meeting at which the plan was first publicly outlined, the Forest Supervisor seemed unaware of what was taking place. A few days later, in a memorandum to Washington, the Supervisor's superior, the Regional Forester, indicated that he felt opposition would continue throughout developmental work.[28] But in no case did either man indicate that he believed the opposition was more or less than the usual type which the Forest Service had always encountered. A few months later, the Service modified the plan without taking into consideration anything that had been heard from the public up to that time. Forest Service personnel appeared to be holding an image of this public as worthy of being ignored as they had previously ignored the voices of the exploiters, sure in the purpose the public had laid out years before.

In October of 1963, the Regional Forester failed to recognize that the general consensus of the opposition

---

[27]Bolle, op. cit., p. 497.

[28]Behan, op. cit., p. 15.

to the plan had crystallized behind a delay. A statement indicated that he believed that the opposition wanted to lock the Lincoln Back Country up as a roadless or wild area. In these and in certain other actions given in Behan's account of the controversy, the foresters failed to recognize what was occurring among the opposition. The explanation may be that in viewing the world through the filter which the traditions of the agency had built up, they simply misinterpreted the opposition; their image of the opposition blinded them as to what was happening. The opposition in both the Lincoln controversy, and the Bitterroot logging controversy on which Bolle wrote, viewed the Service through its own filter so that neither side was seeing what was happening. In retrospect, it seems that if either had been able to see beyond the image it had of the other, or to take the time to add more information to its image, the escalation of the controversies might have been avoided.

It is the ability to see beyond the image into the facts that the author hopes to put into the hands of public officials and others who must deal with the myriad voices of the public. First, however, it is important to understand more clearly why people need to form groups and how groups act upon members as they reinforce the image of each.

# CHAPTER IV

# THE OPERATIONS OF GROUPS

## Forming Groups

Group theory rests on the premise that man is a social animal. Each man has a particular profile of values, judgments, opinions, likes, dislikes, and emotions, that precisely coincides with no other man's. Each man has his own "filter," his own image of the world as discussed in the last chapter. In his interactions with other men, he seeks agreement or mental support of at least some of his views, and in doing so creates the nucleus of what can develop into a group.

Most interaction between public agency officials and their clientele is carried out within small groups of about two to eight persons; the factors examined in this chapter will, for the most part, be in this context.

A group is based upon a set of common beliefs, value judgments or shared attitudes. It thereby exerts a demand on its members to share its foundation tenets. Groups are defined in a variety of ways. One useful approach defines a group in terms of "proximics" or shared space. Proximics suggests a process of metamorphosis.

An assemblage of persons might at first become a coalition by virtue of some sharing of values, objectives, or other reasons to bring people together and then become a group. The group exists when there is shared a proximity of (1) physical closeness, (2) sociological closeness (common objective), and (3) psychological closeness. Conformity to the set of proximities shared by the group is necessary for affiliation with the group.[1] A reciprocity is evident: The group owes its existence to the commonality and demands acceptance of it as the price of admission. Thus there exists a kind of dynamic balance or what Homans describes as "practical equilibrium."[2]

Other useful process criteria for defining a group are: that the membership can be identified, that members think of themselves as a part, that there exists a sense of shared purpose, that there exists a greater ease of communication, that there is a feeling of obligation to respond to the behavior of others, that members have standards and expectations of behavior, that leadership functions and policies exist, and that there develops a status system for the group.[3]

---

[1]Class notes, Management 806, Dr. E. E. Jennings, November 1972, Michigan State University.

[2]George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961), pp. 112-114.

[3]Class notes, Small Group Interaction, Sociology 448, Dr. Duane Gibson, January 11, 1973, Michigan State University.

An important distinction is implied here. Group theory does not state that man exerts his values only through groups. It merely holds that he usually does. It is not just a voluntary process, but almost inescapable if we hold valid the assumption of innate social tendencies. And, therein lies a basic problem: how does the individual break through the predominate curtain to be heard.

Pressure Groups

Schubert attempts to answer by quoting John Dewey, "(The public) arrives at decisions, makes terms, and executes resolves only through the medium of individuals. They are officers; they represent a Public, but the Public acts only through them."[4]

David B. Truman in writing The Governmental Process,[5] captures much of the essence of group theory and verbalizes some of its built-in dilemmas. Truman speaks of the effectiveness of a group as being in its degree of formal organization. From this it would seem that formal organization is some kind of guarantee to pressure groups, or in other words groups which can bring greater pressure to bear would be most likely to further their own goals. Therein lies a devastating problem, the phenomenon called

---

[4]Glendon Schubert, The Public Interest (Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960), p. 9.

[5]David B. Truman, The Governmental Process (New York: Knopf, Alfred A., 1959).

multiple membership and its inherent property of overlapping loyalties. This notion is deceptively simple in theory and profound in its effects. Overlapping loyalty appears to be the great leavener in pressure group politics. It is a safety valve providing checks and balances that no governmental action could very well supply alone. Political scientists have long noted that each pressure group, almost invariably, confronts an antipathy--a group with diametrically opposing norms. The people are free to join, and frequently do, one or the other, or both. Multiple memberships must be taken into account in assessing "public interest." Speaking from the context of political parties, Cotter states the problem this way:

> The disciplined political power necessary to integrate public policy on a party basis has been lacking. This is caused by the "heterogeneous membership and . . . amorphous character" of the parties.[6]

What is a "pressure group"? Blaisdell defines it as a group which is "any aggregate, organized or unorganized, which applies pressure tactics,"[7] and Cotter, citing Edmund Burke's definition, defines it as "a body of men united for

---

[6]Cornelius P. Cotter, ed., Practical Politics in the United States (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969), p. 8.

[7]Donald C. Blaisdell, American Democracy Under Pressure (New York: The Ronald Press, 1957), p. 61.

promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle on which they are all agreed."[8]

What is important here is that the existence of pressure groups which are applying pressure tactics promoting some particular principle, each supporting an alternate decision, means that the decisionmaker has a difficult problem to sort out where the preponderance of public opinion lies. In weighting public opinion, the administrator comes face-to-face with the problems of multiple membership with its resultant puzzle of determining which of many memberships any one person is representing when he or she speaks on an issue. The person himself may not know for certain which of his memberships he is truly representing.

Group Prominence

According to Ruddock,[9] "role conflict" is a major source of stress for the individual in modern societies. By keeping roles separate, however, many people seem to be able to contain bewildering contradictions in their lives.

Vohs supports the point by suggesting that, "Involvement is manifested in an individual's commitment.

---

[8]Cotter, op. cit., p. 13.

[9]Ralph Ruddock, Roles and Relationships (New York: Humanities Press, 1969), pp. 8-9.

to . . . reference groups . . . which are a component of his social identity."[10]

Kelley states that, "The degree to which, in any given situation, a specific group is present and prominent in a person's awareness is termed salience of the group."[11]

Anyone attempting to interpret what a person or group means by what is said must recognize the role of relationships that a communicator experiences and that they are often conflicting.

For whom is "he" speaking? Such a question may be difficult to answer but there are some clues:

Strong Membership Need: Persons who are strongly motivated to achieve or maintain membership in a given group are likely to relate questions of conflict to its norms, whether or not the group or its symbols are immediately present.

Salience Clues: Kelley supports the notion of salience as being a prime motivational factor in the manner in which persons will tend to attach themselves to any particular group and its norms. He put it this way:

---

[10]John L. Vohs and Roger L. Garrett, "Resistance to Persuasion: An Integrative Framework," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 32, 1968, p. 449.

[11]Harold H. Kelley, "Salience of Membership and Resistance to Change of Group Anchored Attitudes," cited in Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research, eds., Herbert H. and Eleanor Singer (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 298.

> The degree to which, in a given situation, a specific group is present and prominent in a person's awareness is termed the salience of that group. In some instances high salience corresponds to presence in the center of the person's attention, but it is not the intention here to restrict the notion to instances where there is a fully conscious or reportable awareness of the group. Possible differences in the salience of the various aspects of the group or its norms will be disregarded and reference will be made only to general salience of the group, on the tentative assumption the salience of any aspect of the group heightens the tendency to conform to its norms at the particular time.[12]

Such things as proximity of other group members and clothes are a major means of signaling the type of role a person will tend to play. Recency of interaction will affect saliency. The perceived role of the audience and the degree of social influences will tend to "check and balance" the manner in which a person will communicate and believe in a position.

An insight into the particular groups to which a person belongs and the degree of salience of one or more of the various groups affecting him at the time of communication could well add the vital key to determine what he is saying and to what degree he means it.

Defensive Reactions

Of the many causes of conflict which exist in small group interaction, defensiveness appears in the forefront. Expression of some form of defensiveness is present whenever

---

[12] Ibid., p. 298.

there is a real or imagined threat. In discussing the process, Chodorkoff and Chodorkoff[13] state that whenever threat appears, an automatic reaction occurs to defend one's self. It is one of the most basic of survival techniques along with the need for food and reproduction. In addition to threat against physical injury, Sappenfield[14] indicates that defensive activities are often carried out to defend the ego.[15] "Ego defense" is the most significant form of defense to administration. McGregor[16] points this out in defining the need for providing opportunities for fulfilling social (ego) desires. He emphasizes the complexities of social aspirations and sources of threat to egotistic needs. He suggests that the inevitable scalar organization of groups almost inherently causes threats tothe needs a person has to feel: a sense of belonging, acceptance by his fellow workers, giving and receiving friendship and, not to be overlooked, the need for achievement and recognition. This occurs in the group when there is "arbitrary . . . behavior which arouses uncertainty

---

[13]Bernard Chodorkoff and Joan Chodorkoff, Perceptual Defense: An Integration with Other Research Findings," The Journal of General Psychology, LVIII (1958), pp. 75-80.

[14]Bert R. Sappenfield, Personality Dynamics (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 73.

[15]In this context, personal feelings related to prestige.

[16]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 35-43.

. . . or which reflects favoritism or discrimination."[17] Preventing defensiveness is an area of constant challenge.

Virtually every textbook dealing with human-relations problems implies the author's approach to the problem. Commonly suggested methods of overcoming the effects of defensiveness are presented here.

Maier suggests that in defining problems of management one can either focus upon the inadequacies of behavior which produce the problem or refer to the deficiencies of the situations themselves.

> When a supervisor states a problem to a group in behavioral terms, it means that he is not satisfied with the performance of his employees; it represents disapproval not only of their behavior but of them. Thus, with a single stroke he sets himself apart from the group, so that mutual goals are no longer in effect. This action tends to cause the subordinates to band together so the differences among them, which might have led to improvements, now are set aside to defend themselves against their common opponent--the supervisor.[18]

In describing a problem in which there has been group abuse of the phone privileges, Maier suggests an example of a behavioral statement might be: "How can we best deal with the matter of unnecessary use of the company telephone for personal purposes?" The use of the word "unnecessary" indicates someone's unfavorable value judgment and is likely to trigger some form of defense.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 37.

[18] Norman R. R. Maier, Problem-solving Discussions and Conferences: Leadership Methods and Skills (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963), pp. 77-78.

In contrast he suggests the statement: "What would be a fair goal to set for personal calls?" The word "abuses" does not appear in either statement, indicating the approach which is likely to give the best results can be used. In the "situational" statement, "setting the goal" establishes a target to work toward and presents the problem in positive terms.[19]

This suggests the practice of carefully wording statements and questions to avoid putting people in defensive positions. To differentiate between "behavioral" and "situational" connotations, statements which make references to behavior and thus involve ego may take the form of the attempt to shift responsibility, or an argumentative attitude, or silent withdrawal.[20] In contrast, statements referring to situations are impersonal. Problems stated in situational terms involve no threat and hence tend to stimulate thought and arouse interest. The situational approach orients the group toward an objective (setting a goal) instead of focusing on personal, defensive mechanisms.

---

[19]Ibid., pp. 77-80.

[20]Silence may be one of the most difficult defensive acts to deal with. Literature suggests it may also be one of the most common defense mechanisms.

In diagnosing the problems of the centralized organization, Argyris[21] points to what he calls "descriptive nonevaluative" feedback[22] as a method of minimizing defensiveness. He simply means that feedback in interpersonal relations should be characterized by describing without evaluating. To demonstrate, he uses the examples: "You shouldn't behave in x manner," and "I experience the following feelings when you behave in x manner."[23] Thus in the latter approach emphasis is placed on description rather than on evaluation! It should be pointed out that nonevaluative feedback could also create defensive positions unless the proper atmosphere is established. Argyris points out that this technique is not easily learned, and that it is a matter of developing a basic philosophy and a set of values for individual growth rather than learning techniques simply by practice.

In summary, there are undoubtedly cases where the tendency for defensiveness can be used as an effective activating force by the administrator. However, when the objective is to reduce defensiveness, it can often be effectively overcome if the administrator can avoid

---

[21]Chris Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness (Homewood, Ill.: Irwin and Dorsey, 1962), pp. 15-19.

[22]Feedback simply means the response resulting from a stimulus which may be observed and interpreted by the source of the stimulus.

[23]Argyris, op. cit., p. 16.

implying disapproval, or, in effect, threatening people's sense of well-being, and by making clear exactly what is meant. Further, on assessment of a person, "ego involvement" or degree of defensive behavior can serve well as a key as to what he means by what he says.

By forcing persons into defensive positions we give them a shovel by which to entrench themselves even farther. In the Lincoln Back Country dispute discussed in Chapter III, it is possible that defensiveness involving individual egos played some role in the intransigence of both sides. While a great deal of the research involving defensiveness has been done in industrial situations, it seems a fair conclusion that the principles hold true for other groups. Nonevaluative feedback, as developed by industry, seems to open the doors to a more positive possibility. Preventing defensiveness is essentially a negative nonproductive tactic. But if we can encourage the members of a group to help us reach a solution we have moved in a positive direction.

Participation

It is a rather basic law of human nature that people will come to defend their right to determine their own destiny, and oppose oppression. Marx said it and, indeed, that is what is happening in contemporary movements. Civil rights and environmental activists want to be heard in contemporary American public decisionmaking. Such a tendency lays the foundation for the age-old class struggle

and, indeed, is the reason for the American Revolution. The right of the individual to choose and exercise a voice in government--the consent of the governed--is the foundation upon which our country is built.

Approached from a more technical and less dramatic context, participation has been the subject of well-known experiments conducted in the fields of group dynamics and of social psychology since the late 1930's. One such study summarizes the general theme: Persons will tend to support a decision almost in direct relation to the degree in which they participate in its development. Coch and French in studying the changing of group production norms, found that:

> The rate of recovery (to original work production) is directly proportional to the amount of participation, and that the rates of turnover and aggression are inversely proportional to the amount of participation.[24]

Contemporary writers in management and human relations are proponents of member involvement in decisionmaking. Simon states that:

> Significant changes in human behavior can be brought about rapidly only if the persons who are expected to change participate in deciding what change shall be made and how it shall be made.[25]

---

[24]Lester Coch, and J. R. French, "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, eds., Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (2nd ed.; New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960), p. 332.

[25]Herbert Simon, "Recent Advances in Organization Theory," Research Frontiers in Politics and Government (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1955), pp. 28-29.

One of the more important contexts of participation is its application with everyday, on-the-job decision situations. In pointing out participation results through group discussion in this context, Likert states that:

> For both blue-collar employees, those with favorable job-related attitudes were much more likely to feel that group discussions did some good, that their supervisor liked to get their ideas and tried to do something about them.[26]

Similar support is evidenced by other recent students of behavioral science. It is not surprising that a hypothesis which suggests that there will be conflict in the absence of democracy is widely accepted in America. It is surprising, however, that participation is not more widely practiced. It is not uncommon in the author's experience for management to issue policy, instigate changes and, in general, operate under a completely authoritarian approach. Perhaps this is less often the case since the emergence of organized labor, but the process is still very evident in basic philosophy.

What are the reasons for this apparent paradox between the recognition of the values of participative management and the general failure to achieve it? Chris Argyris[27] writes in vivid and persuasive terms about what

---

[26]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961) pp. 26-27.

[27]Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957).

he regards as a built-in dilemma of formal organizations--the conflict between the system and the individual. Argyris suggests that the formal organization, because of its superior/subordinate relationships, causes dependency and lack of communication, and consequently, limits participation throughout the organization regardless of good intentions. Because of this frustration of the "self-actualizing" impulses, employees adopt ingenious sets of defense by creating more controls and pressures, which only serve to further limit achievement of needs and frustrate the problem more.

This same general theme is expounded by Douglas McGregor[28] in his postulation of management theory "X." Here he describes the value system typically inherent in a scalar organization. He holds that such an organization serves to create conflict and even self-perpetuates conflict by contributing to the very thing that causes it in the first place. Harold Stieglitz[29] alludes to this same inherent problem in discussing "Barriers to Communication."

---

[28]Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

[29]Harold Stieglitz, "Barriers to Communication," Business and Industrial Communication: A Source Book, eds. W. Charles Redding and George A. Sanborn (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), pp. 150-159.

However, the process of participation when it is present seems to open the way to some commonality of communication. A person is much more likely to support a decision if he has had a hand in making that decision. Thus, if a group sits down to determine a policy on private use of company telephones mentioned as a potential problem above, the members of that group appear much more likely to abide by the decision reached if they have had a chance to talk it out with their supervisor in such a way that there seems to be a majority consensus on the decision. Such participation seems to make each member of the group more committed to the decision and much less likely to be forced into a defensive position. In the process of probing through the antics of group dynamics, the decisionmaker is in reality attempting to determine just how committed each group or individual is to the stand asserted. Some of the elements of commitment are discussed in the last few pages. It seems to be time, now, to take a longer look at the factors which lay at the roots of an individual's commitment to a position on an issue.

# CHAPTER V

# THE PROCESS OF TAKING A STAND

## The Limits of the Science

When a decisionmaker seeks to determine the opinions and attitudes of the public, he must determine the intensity of feeling behind the positions that have been taken. Some cues concerning intensity of feeling or commitment are to be found in the social sciences dealing with human behavior. Unfortunately, there is a great deal science does not know concerning behavior and it is probable that it will be a long time before enough research and experience in application will be available to define a person's commitment with a high degree of accuracy. However, we can see trends, patterns, and threads of direction.

Bridging the gap between theory and practice is not always easy. Research data concerning behavioral science trickles out in the form of controlled experiments concerning basic theory or specific applied research. At best, social science data can only suggest the most logical approach to those who are familiar with the application, the subtleties and shortcomings of the science.

Failure to respect and understand the difference between the practical and theoretical may be a severe handicap, and it could lead to misguided "cookbook" attempts to translate indicative findings into quick solutions. For this reason, it must be borne in mind that the data referred to here is not the final word. It has not been possible to review all related areas of inquiry. Indeed it is not the intention to do so. My purpose is to review and introduce what I believe are the more salient ideas, theories, principles and hypotheses relating to commitment.

Commitment

The effects of commitment are some of the more interesting facets of human behavior. Commitment is demonstrated by rigid, unbending behavior after a person has committed himself to a position. It may be manifest in relative degrees under varied and often difficult to understand circumstances. It is closely related to intensity of feeling.

Studies suggest that commitment is closely connected with social pressure. In many cases, social pressures have made changing one's mind an unrewarding experience. The principles of commitment are generally classified in two categories: (1) internal, which refers to personal commitment made either privately or publicly,[1] and (2) external, which refers to commitment attributed to one by someone else.

---

[1]Sometimes called self-committal or self-commitment.

Rosenbaum and Franc[2] investigated some of the conditions under which external commitment affects the response to an attempt to change opinion.

Attributed opinion which is incongruent (inconsistent with the subject's response tendency) caused the subject to change his opinion in the direction of the attributed position. The latter (incongruent position) case was found to be more significant than an earlier study by Rosenbaum and Zimmerman,[3] which indicated a lesser degree of opinion change with an incongruent position. This earlier study dealt with more emotionally-oriented positions concerning segregation and desegregation at a southern university. This led to the hypothesis by Rosenbaum and Franc[4] that the failure to demonstrate this effect of opinion change was due to the deep-seated emotional character of the original response tendency. It might be suggested also that the emotional ties to the source of the external commitment strongly affect how much change occurs.

---

[2]Milton F. Rosenbaum and Douglas E. Franc, "Opinion Change as a Function of External Commitment and Amount of Discrepancy from the Opinion of Another," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXI (1960), pp. 15-20.

[3]Milton E. Rosenbaum and Isabel M. Zimmerman, "The Effect of External Commitment on Response to an Attempt to Change Opinions," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXIII (1959), pp. 247-254.

[4]Rosenbaum and Franc, op. cit., p. 15.

In studying the effects of internal commitment (self-commitment), Fisher, Rubenstein and Freeman[5] found that within a continuous small-group interaction situation, subjects who commit themselves immediately prior to an attempt to change their opinion show more resistance to change initially; however, they tend to become somewhat more susceptible to change as interaction and persuasion attempts continue. This occurred both when the subject's opinion and the control opinion were relatively close and relatively divergent. The change appeared to occur as a result of subsequent commitments in response to persuasion attempts rather than a change in the initial commitment response.

The importance of the relationship between social pressures and the effect of commitment is indicated by Lewin,[6] who found the most significant change in attitude (toward different foods) was among housewives who had expressed public commitment in small discussion groups.

---

[5]Seymour Fisher, Irvin Rubenstein and Robert W. Freeman, "Effects of Immediate Self-Committal in a Continuous Social Influence Situation," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), pp. 200-207.

[6]Kurt Lewin, "Group Decision and Social Change," Readings in Social Psychology, eds. Eleanor E. Maccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley (3d ed; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958), pp. 197-211.

The general effect of commitment is pointed out by Hobart and Hovland[7] in finding that subjects who were required to commit themselves on a social issue prior to an attempt at influence were more resistant to change by persuasion attempts than a control group in which commitment was lacking.

Schachter and Hall[8] reported an interesting context of the commitment principle in groups of students volunteering for an experiment. They found that volunteers from a group in which high restraints to volunteering were present were more reliable as subjects than those from groups in which relatively less restraint was present. Subjects from the high restraint groups demonstrated a higher degree of commitment and subsequent follow-through after they had broken the restraint barrier.

In general, research suggests that resistance to attitude change when different degrees of commitment exist is greater as an individual is ego-involved, when social pressures are strong, and as stimuli are ambiguous.[9]

---

[7]E. M. Hobart and C. I. Hovland, "The Effect of 'Commitment' on Opinion Change Following Communication," American Psychologist, IX (1954), p. 394.

[8]Stanley Schachter and Robert Hall, "Group Derived Restraints and Audience Persuasion," Human Relations, V (1952), pp. 397-406.

[9]Fisher, et al., op. cit., p. 200.

Forms of Commitment

Different forms of the principle of commitment are encountered frequently in any human interaction.

Barnlund and Haiman point out that, "As we become identified with a position, we begin to interpret criticism as not only an attack on our side, but as an attack on ourselves personally."[10] When this becomes a possibility, it would be well to clarify that disagreement is only with the idea and not with the person or his right to hold the view. Otherwise the defensive reaction mentioned in the preceding chapter may come into play.

Along with encouraging an atmosphere of free exchange, it would appear appropriate to be quick to provide a "line of retreat." This suggests a way to "save face" as well as to prevent further decisive commitment.

The results of external commitment upon groups and individuals suggest a method of gaining rapport and cooperation when used in the congruent case. For instance, a speaker might emphasize the strong features of the group and the individuals who compose the group. He might point out the intelligence of the group and the fact that they are people who can listen and are responsive to what is said. In this way he would be gaining the advantages of external congruent commitment from the group.

---

[10]Dean C. Barnlund and Franklyn S. Haiman, The Dynamics of Discussion (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960), p. 264.

The Theory of Cognitive Dissonance

Supporting and, in fact, tending to form a foundation for the above is the theory of cognitive dissonance. It has implications which tend to show aspects of commitment effect as it applies to opinion and attitude.

When an inconsistency exists between what one does and what he believes, there is said to be cognitive dissonance. This is the case whenever there is psychological inconsistency among the things a person accepts as true. Festinger explains the theory as follows:

> This theory centers around the idea that if a person knows various things that are not psychologically consistent with one another, he will, in a variety of ways, try to make them more consistent. Two items of information that psychologically do not fit together are said to be in a dissonant relation to each other. The items of information may be about behavior, feelings, opinions, things in the environment and so on. The word "cognitive" simply emphasizes that the theory deals with relations among items of information.[11]

When a person feels dissonance, he will, in a variety of ways, try to reduce it, and in his mind make things seem more consistent.

> Cognitive dissonance is a motivating state of affairs. Just as hunger impels a person to eat, so does dissonance impel a person to change his opinion or his behavior.[12]

---

[11]Leon Festinger, "Cognitive Dissonance," Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology, ed. Edward E. Sampson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 10.

[12]Ibid.

One implication of the theory is in the reactions resulting from a person making a statement which he does not necessarily believe. This obviously would create dissonance to a greater or lesser degree depending on the deviance between the statement and one's true feeling. Studies designed to demonstrate the implications and effects of this have been conducted at Stanford University by Carlsmith and Festinger. They found that:

> After having made an irrevocable public statement at variance with his private belief, a person will tend to change his private belief to bring it into line with his public statement. Futhermore, the degree to which he changes his private belief will depend on the amount of justification or the amount of pressure for making the public statement initially. The less the original justification or pressure, the greater the dissonance and the more the person's private belief can be expected to change.[13]

They found that people who are highly rewarded for doing something inconsistent with their beliefs tend to change their opinion less toward the direction of believing what they said than those receiving little reward. Perhaps the reason is that with little reward there is not as much "justifiable" reason for being inconsistent. Another experiment by Cohen showed that:

> It is clear that the smaller the original justification, for engaging in the dissonance-producing action, the greater the subsequent change in private opinion to bring it into line with the action.[14]

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[14] Ibid., p. 13.

Another interesting application of the dissonance theory is the consequences associated with temptation. People tend to persuade themselves that something they want and cannot have is not worth having. This happens when there is dissonance created (an absence of justification for resisting temptation). When there is temptation and at the same time much prohibition, there exists relatively less dissonance since there is a high degree of justification for not giving in to temptation. Thus, it would appear that one who refrains from temptation where there is not great justification for doing so will tend to persuade himself that the object of temptation is not worth having. However, when significant prohibitions (justification for resisting temptation) exist, he will tend to continue his initial opinion with the same intensity because dissonance will not tend to occur.

We frequently observe that when we go through much pain and trouble to attain something, we tend to value it more highly and with more intensity than when something is easy to get. The theory of cognitive dissonance strongly implies this relationship. Although a person may go through much effort to attain an end, such as to become a member of a group, there will always be things about the group that he does not like. This knowledge will be dissonant with his making the effort to gain membership. He may reduce his dissonance by convincing himself that the effort or initiation to gain membership was not really significant,

or he can exaggerate the advantages of membership and minimize the disadvantages. With increasing effort to gain membership it becomes more and more difficult to believe the effort was not really significant. Thus, a person will tend to reduce his dissonance by exaggerating the attractiveness of the group. In studying the effects of initiation to groups among female college students, Aronson and Mills found that:

> The subjects who underwent a severe initiation perceived the group as being significantly more attractive than did those who underwent a mild initiation or no initiation. There was no appreciable difference between ratings by subjects who underwent a mild initiation and those who underwent no initiation.[15]

There exists an almost infinite variety of ways and situations in which dissonance is experienced. The conditions under which people will tend to reduce this dissonance as well as the ways they will go about doing it are as yet only generally defined. Studies seem to indicate that dissonance reduction is closely related to the severity or degree of dissonance. In other words, the more dissonance, it follows that the greater will be the effort to reduce it. The problem lies in predicting the amount of dissonance experienced. We have observed that

---

[15]Elliot Aronson and Judson Mills, "The Effect of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, eds. Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (2d ed.; New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960), pp. 102-103.

inconsistencies are justified if reward for inconsistency is enough. Obviously rewards will be considered differently by different people. Studies concerning attitude change by Rosenbaum and Zimmerman[16] suggest that the dissonance experienced may be related to the degree of emotion involved where incongruent commitment[17] is used. Similar results were indicated by Kolz, et al., in classifying the degree of ego defense.[18] This seems to add confirmation to the hypothesis that dissonance will not occur when there is enough justification for inconsistency, whether it is emotional or material reward. The fact that what people will consider incongruent and what they will consider justification for incongruence is apparently still not predictable.

The theory of cognitive dissonance has been operationally demonstrated in a variety of ways. In this context it has been possible to describe only a few. Based upon these particular experiments, possible applications of the ideas represented have been postulated. It

---

[16]Milton E. Rosenbaum and Isabel M. Zimmerman, "The Effect of External Commitment on Response to an Attempt to Change Opinions," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIII (1959), pp. 247-254.

[17]As used here, commitment dissonance with the subject's belief.

[18]Daniel Kolz, Charles McClintock and Irving Sarnoff, "The Measurement of Ego Defense as Related to Attitude Change," Journal of Personnel, XXV (1957), pp. 465-474.

should be recognized that there is no way that behavior can be definitely predicted based on the assumptions made; however, possible reactions are suggested. Perhaps this is more reliable than not using an empirical, systematically defined approach at all. It does provide at least a way to try to answer some questions, and has been relatively predictable in the context of the experiments. It is well to keep in mind that there is undoubtedly an infinite variety of other applications of the theory resulting from the many ways in which dissonance expresses itself. Festinger summarizes by stating:

> The theory of cognitive dissonance obviously has many implications for everyday life. In addition to throwing light on one's own behavior, it would seem to carry useful lessons for everyone concerned with understanding human behavior in a world where everything is not black and white.[19]

Attitude Consistency

Correspondence between expressed belief and feelings and actual behavior can be viewed as a potent index to commitment to a position. It is often assumed that overt behavior will be consistent with a person's attitude. But there is little evidence that attitude and overt behavior are always consistent, and we know of many cases in which attitudes and actions are quite disparate.

---

[19]Festinger, op. cit., p. 15.

An illustration is provided by a classic social psychological study by LaPiere.[20] A number of U. S. hotel owners and managers were asked if they were willing to house Chinese guests. Most said no. LaPiere and a well-dressed Chinese couple appeared in person at the hotels and requested lodging. Almost all the hotels provided rooms to the guests. These results are cited as evidence that verbally expressed attitudes are not always entirely consistent with actions.

There are numerous possible shortcomings of this study, such as the fact that the experimenter accompanied the Chinese couple, that they were well-dressed, and that hotel clerks' actions on one hand are contrasted with the attitudes of hotel owners and managers on the other.

Rokeach[21] provides some generally confirmatory support for this position. He argues that reasons for attitude-behavior dissonance lie in the personality structure of the individual and the attitudes toward both the object and the situation in which it is found.

Recent field investigations conducted under more closely controlled conditions also provide definitive

---

[20]Richard T. LaPiere, "Attitudes vs. Actions," in Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement, Martin Fishbein, ed. (New York: Wiley & Co., 1967), pp. 26-31.

[21]Milton Rokeach, "Attitude Change and Behavior Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX (1966), pp. 529-550.

evidence of the distinction between attitudes and actions. For instance, Festinger[22] summarizes the results of three field experiments in which a change in attitude toward an innovation occurred for many respondents, but this attitude change did not result in behavioral change.

To a decisionmaker, the aspects of commitment outlined in this and preceding chapters have several important relevancies. Within the discussion of each aspect to commitment are various clues that can tell him where a person stands on a given issue. At the same time he has been offered some methods to use which can help him to bring about a consensus of opinion on a decision. And, he has also been given some idea of how groups work to keep their membership in line. Determining the extent, the height, breadth and depth of commitment is important if a decisionmaker is to make an accurate resolution of where public opinion lies on any given point. Let us turn our attention now to a deeper look into the clues that tell an administrator how committed a group is to a position.

---

[22]Leon Festinger, "Behavioral Support for Opinion Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVIII (1964), pp. 404-418.

# CHAPTER VI

## CLUES TO COMMITMENT

Many decisions being made today by the Forest Service and other government agencies will commit resources not only for today, but for generations yet to come. The public has a vital interest in these decisions that may limit or expand the possibilities of its children. Great debates swirl around major issues. Minor issues generate heated arguments. The public wants its interest heard by the decisionmakers. Too often decisionmakers cannot hear the public interest for the noise of debate. Decisionmakers must learn to sort out the noise to determine if the loudest groups truly speak for the people or if they are just loud.

Modern communication theory provides the decisionmaker with tools to sort out the debate. An individual who appears at a public hearing, or in any other way involves himself in the debate, offers a number of clues which the decisionmaker can use to sort out the meaning of the presentation, and to determine for how much of the public the individual speaks. By ranking each individual involved in the debate by the extent of his public support

and other factors, the decisionmaker may be able to reach a rational and logical decision as to what the public feels its interest is.

Each individual who appears in a debate speaking for himself or representing a group offers certain clues in his behavior as to how committed he is to his position. As we saw in preceding chapters, such clues delve into the origin of his commitment, the size and cohesiveness of the group he represents, his defensiveness, his use of language, the amount of participation in his group to determine his position, and the continuity of his expressed interests. Each behavioral factor must be weighed carefully by the decisionmaker who wishes to properly place an individual within the great variable called the public interest.

Commitment

Commitment means the strength of the emotional attachment that a person has for a position. A person may become committed at the moment he adopts a judgmental attitude toward an issue, that is, at the moment he decides that one side of a debate is the "good" side and the other is the "bad" side. From the point of becoming committed, a person will demonstrate rigid, unbending behavior.

As we saw in the preceding chapters, commitment varies in strength depending upon the factors working upon each individual and upon the source of the commitment. Internal commitment is made by the individual either

publicly or privately. External commitment is that which is attributed to a person by someone else. The intensity of an internal commitment which has not been made public is impossible to measure and cannot be weighed in decision-making. However, once a commitment has been stated publicly, the decisionmaker can take steps to evaluate the intensity of the commitment. Despite the successful voices that have cried in the wilderness in human history, an individual, no matter how strong his commitment, may not matter much in the context of public interest if he is alone against an imposing array of other voices. But when a leader speaks for and publicly commits his group, whether that group has adopted a formal stand or not, the factors involved in the theory of cognitive dissonance come into play to sway members of the group toward that commitment. In determining the extent of the group commitment to a position, the decisionmaker might well ask himself just how cohesive the group has been in the past in forming itself behind commitments made by its leaders. On a five-point scale, the group that adheres strictly to its leader's proclamations might rate a five. A group that has dissolved in frustrating arguments or even deposed its leader in similar past situations might rate a one.

A second factor which the decisionmaker must determine to assess the intensity of commitment is the duration for which it has been held. If the commitment is new and represents a radical change from the group's previous

positions in similar circumstances, perhaps it rates a one. If the commitment is similar to long-held group policies, then it could be weighed a five.

By separately weighing each factor of commitment, a decisionmaker may sum up on a similar five-point scale the extent to which an individual's emotions are bound up in what he or his leader says concerning an issue. How likely are the members to change the position during debate?

Reference Groups

As we have seen in an earlier chapter, the extent to which an individual's memberships are present in his mind determines the strength with which he holds a position. Each person belongs to a number of groups in our society, each of which puts pressures on him to follow certain beliefs and each of which puts pressure on society to support its interests. When a businessman who is also an environmentalist testifies at a public hearing, is he testifying as a businessman or as an environmentalist? Certain clues may indicate which group is most present in his mind at the moment he testifies.

How strong is his need to belong to the specific group? If it has taken him years of effort to attain the membership that he holds in one group and much less effort to obtain his membership in the other group, he may be more dedicated to the ideals of the group toward which he has expended the most effort. While the idea of

compiling dossiers on individuals is repugnant in our society, a decisionmaker must have some idea of the background of the individuals who will affect his decision. To make a decision the maker must know just how much effort it has taken for a witness to attain the position that makes him a spokesman and what other memberships and roles may play a part in his position. Is the witness, by his various memberships, creating potential conflict within himself by his testimony?

The presence of other members of the group within a hearing room may have a bearing on what a witness says. A businessman speaking for an environmental group, for instance, may be reluctant to cite any doubts he feels as a businessman if the hearing room is packed with fellow environmentalists. If he is speaking as a businessman, he may be reluctant to make his assertions as strongly as he feels them, if his fellow members of an environmental group are listening.

Actual physical presence of other members of the group point directly to the salience, or awareness and control of the group upon the speaker. At other times, in public utterances when other members of the group involved are not present, an individual will display indications of which group is uppermost in his mind and so controls his remarks.

The words a spokesman uses are a strong indication. Each group in our society develops a jargon, that is, a

way of using common words so that they have specific meanings to members of the group which are not necessarily the same as the common meanings. How is the individual using those words? In the case of the businessman-environmentalist, is he using words as an environmentalist or as a businessman?

Dress can be another clue. Different groups in society wear different uniforms. Is a spokesman wearing the garb of the environmentalist or the businessman when he speaks? Does his dress definitely identify him with one group or the other?

Still another factor depends upon how recently a spokesman has interacted with members of one group or the other. Has he just come from a business meeting or an environmental gathering? Did he spend the moments prior to taking the stand huddling with other businessmen or with other environmentalists?

By developing an insight into the reference groups to which a spokesman belongs and the salience of particular groups within his consciousness, a decisionmaker can attempt to determine what the person is saying and how strongly he means it. To rate him against other segments of the public we may weigh the power of a spokesman's reference groups on a five-point scale. A five is for the person who speaks for a reference group that is the only important one in his life. A one would be the person

whom the decisionmaker might suspect is paying lip service to a proposal to which he is not committed.

Defensiveness

Commitment involves making a judgment about an issue. Making a judgment involves the type of "I-believe" statement that places an individual's ego behind what he is saying. He puts himself, the person he is, behind what he believes. An attack on his position seems to be an attack on his ego. The natural reaction of a threatened person is to defend his position with all the powers at his command. The processes of debate may push a spokesman for one side or the other into a position of defensiveness where his assertions become more of a defensive reaction for his own threatened ego than a rational statement.

The decisionmaker must be aware of when a spokesman's statements are defensive and when they are not. The question that becomes paramount when attempting to place the spokesman's statements on a five-point scale is: How strongly would he continue to assert his position if he had been allowed a pathway of retreat? If the answer to the question is that the spokesman would retreat very quickly if given the opportunity, the strength accorded his position must be ranked very low, probably a one. If, on the other end of the scale, the answer is that he would not retreat at all, then the ranking must be a five.

Language

The words we use and how we use them can mean more to a decisionmaker than a simple matter of identifying a particular use to determine from which of many roles a member of the public is speaking. The more frequently a speaker uses labels, the more he may be speaking from a general position than from a specific position on a specific issue. Tied very closely to the concept of labeling is the concept Lee[1] calls "signal reaction." Here an individual reacts immediately to what seems to be happening as he identifies it rather than delaying his reaction until he has had time to properly study the situation. A third use of language to signal the source of a position, reasoned data or general concepts, quick response or delayed thoughtfulness, is the way in which speech is punctuated. Language patterns point the way to whether spokesmen are speaking from their own beliefs and judgments, intensionally, or from the facts they have observed, extensionally.[2] Each of these clues indicates to the decisionmaker how seriously the issue has been considered by the spokesman, and how much weight should be given to the spokesman's arguments. Each factor is interrelated and in some respects is similar to the others, yet each is also slightly different.

---

[1]Irving J. Lee, Language Habits in Human Affairs (New York: Harper & Row, 1941), p. 195-204.

[2]Ibid., pp. 77-83, 91-94, 140-144, 126-138.

The act of labeling solves for the labeler the necessity for thinking seriously about the issues involved.[3] If an issue, an event, or a thing can be conveniently labeled "a wild-eyed scheme," or an aspect of the "communist conspiracy" or a short-sighted "reactionary plot," it can be conveniently forgotten; the label suffices for any further thought concerning it. Unfortunately for the decisionmaker, determining whether the individual is relying only on labeling is not enough. The decisionmaker must determine how deeply the spokesman believes that the label fits and how much effort he will expend to preserve or oppose the issue on the basis of the label he has attached to it.

One of the most colorful labels in America today is that of the "knee-jerk bleeding-heart liberal." Conservative elements sneeringly use the label to degrade support for social issues. Once conservatives have tagged the issue with the label, they can consider the support the issue has as negligible. Unfortunately, because liberals in our society are also human, the label sometimes fits because the liberal elements act on the basis of a "signal reaction" rather than giving thought to whether the issue is, in truth, a social advance, or more importantly, without giving thought to whether whatever is advocated

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 57-61.

is potentially workable. If the measure is tagged "liberal," the members of the "liberal community" fall into line behind it without thought and have, on occasion, found themselves in conflict with some of their more thoughtful leaders who may take opposite tack. An example of signal reaction occurred within the past few years in the Congress. A bill was introduced to insure students the right to inspect their school records and the right to seal those records against unwarranted invasion of privacy. A wide variety of the political spectrum of our society supported the measure and the bill was rather quickly passed. Conservatives and liberals knee-jerked in support of open files. Even before the date that it became effective, leaders of the academic community and members of the Congress including the prime sponsor of the bill, a conservative, realized that it was in conflict not only with prior agreements of confidentiality but, in some cases, with federal and state laws that ordered federal and state agencies to open their records to public inspection. It produced a conflict as to goals which the bill's backers would have seen more quickly had they not reacted on a signal basis. As a result, the bill's chief sponsor led an attempt to amend the measure. The decision-maker, facing a variety of public input on an issue of public interest, must measure how much thought into the aftereffects and the resultants has gone into each statement.

He must be aware of the factors of labeling and signal reaction to determine how much of what he is hearing is thoughtful and how much is, as it were, off the top of the head.

Punctuation is another factor in analyzing the language a speaker uses. Does his punctuation indicate certainty about the facts he is discussing? Is he thoughtful? Or is he emotional? Where does he place the stress when he speaks? By analyzing a speaker's punctuation, a decisionmaker can ascertain certain facts about a speaker's statement. Chief among these facts is whether he is comfortable with what he is saying and just how committed he is to what he is saying.

The final factor to be considered is what Lee calls cognitive style. Is the spokesman speaking from inside himself, from his emotional makeup or is he speaking from the facts, basing his comments upon the reality? Intensional speaking tends to be based upon the individual's background and beliefs and less upon the facts. Extensional speaking is speaking to the facts, describing the situation as it exists.[4] In a sense, extensional speaking is describing the situation as the facts appear after they have been filtered through the image that a spokesman has. Intensional speaking is what results after a situation or individual has been labeled. The spokesman discusses the

---

[4]Ibid., p. 123.

niche into which he has placed the item, rather than describing his view of the item. The decisionmaker's role is to determine how the spokesman is speaking and to what extent his true attitude is reflected in his manner of speaking.

Each of the clues that exist in language is, as mentioned previously, intertwined. Some of the same factors exist in each clue. Basically, language clues give an insight into the extent to which a spokesman has given reasoned consideration to the facts of the case and to what extent his image of the case has been distorted by his emotional field of existence. In each case, however, the decisionmaker cannot pass the statement off as an emotional reaction. Instead, the decisionmaker must determine the strength of the emotional reaction and how much bearing it will have upon the public emotion. The concept of freedom which led to the founding of the United States owes much more to emotion than to reason despite pages of philosophy texts. The reasons for which wars have been fought generally owe more to emotion than to reason. If he is to be effective and to make decisions which are truly in the public interest and meet the public desires, the decisionmaker must be aware of when emotion holds a tighter grip on the public mind than reason.

Participation

As we have seen earlier, men tend to react to things in groups. They make decisions and carry them out, in most cases, in a group setting. The larger the role they have in forming the policy decisions of the group, the stronger the commitment they seem to have to the decisions.[5] A decisionmaker faced with a variety of spokesmen reputing to speak for the public interest needs to look at the amount of participation which went into forming the opinion. Is the group democratic in its operations or does the leader speak for all members in an authoritarian manner? Does he use "we" or "I"?

The number of persons for whom a spokesman speaks is an important factor in considering what he says. Is his group large or small? Is it effective or is it ineffective? In a democratic society decisionmakers at all levels of government must listen to numbers. "He's only out for the votes," is a derogatory statement applied to a politician but the truth is that if our society is to pay more than lip service to democratic ideals, the politician must listen to the voters. The decisionmaker who consistently refuses to listen to numbers when he is making a decision on a public issue may not long be making those decisions.

---

[5]See pages 64-68.

Yet the numbers game can be overrated. Mere numbers do not add up to much unless there is a commitment by each of the persons those numbers represent. Therefore, the number of persons for whom a spokesman speaks is important, but even more important is the kind of participation those persons had in determining what he is saying. Were they polled? Was there an overwhelming vote in favor of a resolution at the group's annual meeting or was the decision carried by a one-vote majority? Were members asked their views or did the leaders determine the position the group would take? In general, the membership will be committed to the group's position in direct proportion to the extent to which it participated in determining that position. Other factors may have to be taken into consideration, such as the importance of the group to the individual and the individual's commitment to the statement of his leaders. But the general rule a decision-maker must follow is to determine the type of participation members had in a statement in order to determine the strength of commitment which might be represented by the numbers in the group.

Continuity

Closely related to the factor of participation is that of continuity. Essentially continuity can be discussed in two ways: first, with regard to history of the group involved and, second, the continuity of the group in carrying out what it says. Each factor can give

some clues to the intensity of the commitment of the group to the position ascribed to it.

In a western town several years ago, a developer announced plans to build a huge commercial development on a very scenic spot. An ad hoc group formed to oppose the development and succeeded in forcing a public hearing on several steps that the county government had to take to clear the way for the commercial development. Opponents of the project packed the hearing room. In the end, the county government reluctantly refused to take the steps necessary to allow the development. The community's citizenry went back to their daily duties. A few years later, another developer announced plans to build a residential development in the same area. Little opposition developed, partly because the residential development did not need county permission. The few murmurs of protest that did arise indicated, however, that there may have been little opposition under any circumstances. The opponents seemingly had little continuity in their stand. The decisionmakers may have incorrectly judged the public interest in making the earlier decision. Or, the opponents may have been opposed only to commercial development. The question the earlier decisionmakers had to answer was the extent to which the group would adhere in the longrun to the positions it took in the shortrun. In other words, how strong was the commitment of the opposition? The

fact that the group was a one-issue group formed to oppose one project was one clue. The duration of an interest is an indication of the continuity of public commitment.

A second type of continuity revolves about how well a person or group follows through on its assertions. Does a group act on what it says? The assumption may be that appropriate behavior follows commitment, but this does not always hold true. Some persons may hold a very strong belief but may not act in such a way to indicate any practical commitment. A housewife of a few years ago may have indicated a strong verbal commitment against phosphate poisoning of our lakes and streams, and yet continued to buy a phosphate detergent. Another example might be a doctor who tells his patients to quit smoking, yet continues to smoke two packs a day himself.

However, a person who says one thing and acts in another fashion may be creating a form of dissonance within himself. Certain studies indicate that an individual's beliefs will move in the direction of his actions more or less in inverse proportion to the rewards he receives for his action. In other words, the less reward he receives, the stronger is the push to move his beliefs in agreement with his actions. The dissonance which exists between beliefs and actions in an individual or in a group gives the decisionmaker clues as to how strongly committed the individual or group is to a particular action. Thus, the

testimony expressed in one form or another begins to take on the shape of the public interest.

Weighing Commitment

"I had a dream," one man said in front of the Washington Monument and touched off the dreams of millions of others in a continuing reevaluation of each man's place in our society. Martin Luther King was a man fully committed to his dream. From a little-known pastor in a Negro church in the South, he rose to become a figure who swayed millions and toppled power structures. Those decisionmakers who, early in his career, made their decisions on the basis of their calculation of the public interest may have regretted those decisions later. Martin Luther King led a movement that at the beginning was small in numbers and by the end of his life was fragmented by jealousies and internal power struggles. Yet, because of the strength of his commitment, Dr. King made a deep impression upon the people of the United States. There was no doubting the intensity of Dr. King's commitment, but many doubted the duration, and that may have been one reason the decisionmakers failed to foresee the future.

In this chapter we have touched upon the fact that understanding the intensity of a commitment is based on a number of factors. The decisionmaker must determine that level of intensity if he is to make a proper decision. Forecasting the duration of a commitment is also based on a number of factors, some deriving from the same date used

to recognize intensity. Duration of commitment is also an important element in making a decision. An intense commitment at one point in time does not necessarily mean that commitment will be maintained at the same intensity at every point in time. A decisionmaker who fails to recognize the possibility of change may find that his support has disappeared at a crucial point. The decisionmaker who fails to take into consideration both the intensity and probable duration of a commitment may live to see his decisions reversed, perhaps violently.

Clues to intensity, as we have seen, are transmitted by the group or individual through a number of elements pinpointed in this chapter. Language clues, reference groups, defensiveness, continuity, and participation all point toward the intensity of the commitment of a group or individual. What is not so apparent is that many of these same clues also give an indication of the probable duration of the commitment. Continuity is, of course, perhaps the most important. If the group or individual expresses a belief known to have been held for a long period of time, the decisionmaker can properly assume future commitment will also be of long duration. Participation is a second key element in assessing duration. How likely is the group to disagree with what the leader is saying? Defensiveness is another element important to duration. Defensiveness may indicate that the spokesman

is defending a position he does not like but cannot escape. If a path out is provided, the intensity of his commitment to a stand may be lessened. Reference groups play a key role, particularly the element concerning the membership need. The larger the role the reference group for which he is speaking plays in a spokesman's life, the more likely his commitment will last. Language clues provide a lesser determination of duration, primarily from the approach that the more reasoned the language and the more the spokesman speaks from the facts, the less likely he is to change his commitment

In this chapter, clues have been furnished to help a decisionmaker determine the strength and probable duration of a commitment to a position on an issue. The weight which a decisionmaker gives to the strength of each factor of commitment must be based on his judgment. We must stress, however, that in evaluating commitment, there are no absolutes. The commitment of one group cannot be rated as an absolute set of figures. What we will be attempting to establish in the remainder of this paper is a method by which a decisionmaker may evaluate the differing inputs from the public in relationship to each other and to the effect on the proposed solution. Evaluating commitment becomes relative among various groups. By ranking the various groups in order of their intensity and duration of commitment, we can establish the probable reactions to

any decision and obtain an indication as to what extent and in what manner groups or individuals are most likely to react to that decision.

Not every man can be a Martin Luther King. Through his commitment, Dr. King achieved results few others can attain. But without the support of powerful political figures, Dr. King's movement would not have succeeded. The decisionmakers who overlooked Dr. King not only ignored his commitment but failed to properly ascertain more practical matters as well. The practical matters involve such things as numbers and voting strength, political influence and the need to use it. To evaluate the practical matters we need to ascertain commitment, which sets a foundation for the willingness of a group to use what political influence it has. Willingness to use power, however, is not enough if the group or individual has little power; or if the impact of the decision is such that the group or individual has no need to use the power available to it. In the next few pages we will look at factors which a decisionmaker may use to ascertain indications of whether a group will feel it must use its power, and those factors by which a decisionmaker can gain hints of the power a group or individual has available to use.

# CHAPTER VII

## THE USE OF POWER

Whenever the public provides input to a controversial issue, individuals and groups present before a decisionmaker different viewpoints, statistics and statements. In the last chapter a series of clues were offered which a decisionmaker might use to determine the relative commitment of groups or individuals to the position they put forward. But decisionmakers are faced, particularly in decisions involving government, with what might be termed the practical positions of the groups or individuals. The decisionmaker, in simpler language, must deal with the power available to the group or individual to affect the decision.

Several factors are involved in the ability to use power. Certainly a prerequisite for determining the power of a group or an individual depends upon an assessment of the group's or individual's willingness to use the power it possesses. Essentially, judging the willingness to use power depends upon a correct assessment of the factors outlined in the previous chapter: How committed is the group or individual to the position advocated? Is

the group or individual so deeply committed as to put all its power on the line to gain its position?

Whether a group will use its power is not entirely a factor of its willingness. A second determining factor revolving around the use of power involves the necessity of using it which, in turn, gives an indication of how the power will be used if it is. A group or individual which fully supports a decision may be extremely powerful but will find little reason to use that power except to ward off attempts of the opposition to erode the decision. This is a simplified example. What happens more frequently is that none of the sides will get all they want from a decision. The decisionmaker may wish, however, to have some indication of how much compromise would be necessary before the group or individual would feel it did not need to use its power. But willingness and need are of little use if there is little power available. Let us turn first, then, to the observations concerning the availability of power.

If a decisionmaker judges that a group or individual is willing and believes it necessary to use all the power it has available to affect a decision, then the decision-maker needs to assess as correctly as possible the power that will be used. More than one decisionmaker has been caught short by an incorrect assessment of the amount of power available to a group or an individual. In the early days of the environmental movement, for instance,

decisionmakers frequently misjudged the power that lay behind the environmentalists' concerns. Elected officials were particularly susceptible to this misjudgment. Senators and representatives, some of whom held years of seniority in the U. S. Congress, were abruptly denied their seats when they misjudged the power available to the environmentalists who relied on sheer numbers at the ballot boxes to make their point. Once the environmentalists had their seats in the Congress, however, the usage of their power moved into a second phase. They had the political clout as represented by the Congressmen with power over federal budgets and other prerequisites to reach into the federal agencies to gain their point. Decisions thought to have been firmly established were overturned.

A decisionmaker who fails to take into account the effective power of the group or individual speaking may find himself in the position of having a great number of his decisions reversed by powers beyond him, and be found wanting in the ability to reflect what the public wants. Of course, the public at times fails to realize exactly what is in its best interests and may be swayed for short-term gain at the expense of long-term objectives. A decisionmaker may in such cases decide to make what he feels is the "right" decision with full awareness that he may be overruled. But the decisionmaker should have

enough facts to be aware of the possibility that his decision will be changed.

Still another factor to be considered is the impact of a decision that goes against the public interest as expressed in the power of various groups and their commitment to an objective. What effect will the decision have upon future decisions? Exactly what will be sought by the losing groups? Some truth appears to adhere to the adage that in our society the pendulum always swings in the other direction, a concept that says society is always moving between the extremes. As a part of his consideration of a decision, the one who makes it must concern himself with the potentials of a complete swing of the pendulum to the other extreme if those who oppose his decision have sufficient political power. In government agencies decisionmakers must take into consideration not only the effect upon natural resources of a decision, but the effect upon the people concerned.

Numbers, political influence, the extent to which the expressed public needs and desires differ from the objectives of the decisionmaker, and the impact of the decision as it relates to the resource and to the people involved must all be considered in making the decision. Each factor needs to be looked at in more detail.

Numbers

Except when the votes are counted, sheer numbers may be difficult to calculate. A decisionmaker who attempts

to judge the power of a group does not need to be concerned with absolute figures. Instead, the decision-maker needs to determine the relative strength of opposing factions. Can this group call forth larger numbers to do its bidding than the other? In calculating numbers, a decisionmaker must first discount sheer noise. A few shrill voices make more noise than the reasoned tones of many. A decisionmaker who confuses volume with numbers is bound to be misled.

Relative numbers can be almost as difficult to calculate as absolute numbers. A good place to start is with group memberships. Most organizations have membership lists which include all dues-paying members. If the organization is an industry where jobs will be changed one way or another by a decision, the numbers of employees in that industry can substitute for the membership list of an organization. Although membership lists provide absolute numbers, such lists cannot be directly compared. How many members of the group are fully committed to the group's position? How many members have supported the group fully in using its power to attain its goals in the past? Is there unanimity within the group on this issue? Within an industry, management and labor frequently take opposite poles. Has labor been with or against its management in similar issues in the past? Each of these questions must be considered in evaluating the importance of membership lists.

A second, much vaguer facet of numbers has to do with the group's powers of persuasion. Some groups small in actual membership have power to persuade large numbers of nonmembers to support their position when the issue comes to the ballot box. The past can be indicative of how well the groups have persuaded voters on similar issues. In this case, financial power may be a valuable indicator. Who has the most money to spend on persuasion? Sheer wealth is not enough, however. If a message, no matter how often repeated, is not believed, then its persuasion must be judgmental, but there are certain places where a decisionmaker can find clues as to what is happening. An important source of information is the mass media. Newspapers, magazines, television and radio stations, in general, reflect the opinions of their readers in editorials and to a lesser extent in the news. A decisionmaker must concern himself with the way in which the mass media approaches a given issue. When the story appears on the top half of the first page, what aspect is highlighted? When it appears on the lower half of the first page, what aspect is featured? What aspect of the issue is stressed when the story is put on the inside page? How much length is devoted to each story? What size headline is put on the different facets of the story? If the media takes a stand on the issue on its editorial page, what is it and what type of reaction does it bring in the letters-to-the-editor columns? Letters to the editors are important to a decisionmaker because

they are one of the few places in a newspaper where the general public expresses itself on an issue. Again, a decisionmaker must discount noise. Check the names of the letter writers against the membership lists of the organizations involved, if possible. How many letters are from members and how many from the general public? Members' letters may be expected to support the position of the group. A large number of membership letters opposing the group's position is significant. Letters from the general public may have even more significance, however. Electronic media provide no such easy way to gauge strength. However, the position of a story in a newscast and the approach to it, will provide some input into evaluation. It is important, when considering the electronic media in particular, to determine the audience a given station reaches in order to determine how it reflects the public interest.

A third consideration in evaluating numerical strength between opponents on an issue is to determine if they have ever opposed each other in previous tests of similar issues. Who won? A group which has a high proportion of its members among groups traditionally reluctant to vote, may be strong numerically, but its numbers may have little or no value in deciding an issue. An administrator must consider the numbers, but he may weigh them less heavily than the numbers of a group which has had good success in getting out the vote for its position.

Political Influence

Perhaps more decisive than numbers is the effect of those numbers. Particularly on a short-term basis, the power of numbers may be limited. As we have seen on numerous occasions involving environmental struggles over the past few years, the power of numbers may be futile if the smaller numbers in opposition have the ear of powerful political figures and there is no election in the near future. Sometimes political figures respond to numbers because they fear what may happen at the ballot box. At other times the political figures may miscalculate the strength of one side or the other, or may be called upon to pay off political debts by responding to an issue in a certain way.

A person or group who has the ability, for whatever reason, to gain the backing of a powerful political figure, such as a U. S. Senator, has the power to exert considerably greater influence on a decision than a larger group without such power would have. A good administrator must calculate who has the political clout if he does not wish to see the decision he makes overturned in such a manner that he is unable to influence the decision. Except in extremely unusual circumstances, then, the political power or clout of those who take sides on an issue must influence the decision.

Short-term power comes down to consideration of which side can marshal the most effective soldiers over a

period of time which may extend up to many years, depending upon the offices held by those who rally to support the group or organization. Political power we have defined earlier as meaning the power that groups or individuals can bring to bear to make changes in their environment, or to prevent changes in their environment. It relates to the individuals who wield power in our society and their needs and desires as related to the proposals which surface in our governmental processes. Because political clout adheres so tightly to the individuals concerned, and because individuals who have different needs and desires are constantly succeeding each other, the political clout of each individual or group becomes a shifting, changing element and must be redefined for each issue. In practical terms, consider a senator who has depended for many terms on the votes and support of cattle, mining, and timber interests. Politically and philosophically he has been committed to the development of our natural resources in industry, perhaps to the detriment of the development of recreation. Suddenly, a number of issues surface which pit strong environmental and ecology-minded feelings against the plans of developers. With the senator's help, the developers win the early rounds and send the environmental groups to defeat. The developers are wielding political clout through the senator, and their strength on the issues is too much for environmental groups. Each new defeat, however, gives the environmentalists material with

which to attempt to persuade voters to join the ranks and increase the numerical strength. When the senator's term expires, the environmental groups throw all their strength, not only from the senator's home state but from all over the nation, into the support of his opponent, an environmentalist. This is where numbers come into play. If the senator retains his seat, political clout may remain in the hands of the developers, but if the election is close, the senator will be less ready to risk further confrontation. If the environmentalist wins, we might reasonably expect the power to pass to the environmentalists when the two groups are face-to-face on an issue. One caution, however, when such a change of elected faces occurs: The newcomer may not have the political expertise, at first, to capture the strength the incumbent had developed over several terms.

Needs Versus Objectives

Each decision which a public official must make is based upon the objective set for his agency. In determining the impact of public input upon his decision, the decisionmaker must calculate how closely the input relates to the objectives he has outlined. Invariably, some public input into the decision process will fit more closely with the objectives of the decisionmaker. Other statements made by members of the public will signal objectives exactly opposite to those of the decisionmaker. In other cases, members of the public will signal objectives similar to or identical with those of the decisionmaker although the

means to attain those objectives will be different. The extent of difference in objectives will determine the group's need to react.

In considering how he should react to the public input, the decisionmaker should take into consideration where the public input stands in relation to his objectives. For instance, a forester may determine that overcrowding of trees in a forested area is undermining the overall health of the area, or turning it into an aging forest instead of a young, vigorous stand. His objective will be to bring the forest back to health. His proposal is to harvest timber in sections by the clear-cut method, so that there will be room for young growth. The proposal is duly published and public input invited. At least four types of responses may reasonably be expected. Some members of the public will charge that he is being too cautious in his approach and assert instead that the entire forest should be logged and seedlings planted to replace the trees taken. A second group will take the opposite stance that no logging should be allowed. A third group will wholeheartedly support the proposal in method and objective and a fourth group will support the idea of logging aging timber to give new growth a chance, but will demand selective cutting as the method of thinning. Other shades of belief may appear between these four positions, but these will be the general shapes of the input the decisionmaker receives.

At this point the decisionmaker has several options open to him. He may decide to carry out his original proposal. He may decide that those who advocate a clean sweep of the forest have presented adequate arguments and, therefore, decide to modify his proposal in that direction. He may decide that the supporters of a full-fledged wilderness proposal have the best arguments and modify his proposal in that direction. Or, he may continue with his original objectives but decide that the advocates of thinning represent a stronger public voice than those who advocate clear cutting. In other words, he may change his objectives or the means he uses to carry out the objectives.

The importance of public input related to the objectives of the decision is clear-cut. As a member of government, the decisionmaker has been asked to carry out a public mandate, in this case, to manage public resources so as to attain the objectives of the people without destroying the resource. If the resource manager, the decisionmaker, does not attain the objectives of the public, then the public will be justified in hiring a new manager. The decisionmaker must balance this consideration against his objectives to use and yet conserve the resource. For the decisionmaker the question becomes one of determining how closely the weighted input of the public fits into his objectives, or to what extent he can modify his objectives toward those he has determined

are the public's. The factors of commitment of numbers and of political clout must be taken into consideration as he weighs the options. The option he selects should provide the best balance between the objectives he had set, the public objectives as expressed by the various public inputs and the power of the various groups represented by input to change his objectives in the direction of theirs.

Impact

From the public input, the decisionmaker will obtain an image of the effect his objectives will have upon the public. The value of the impact may be measured in two primary ways: rationally and emotionally. Emotional overtones will overhang the rational impact, but rational impact may be measured in actual terms. For instance, a decision not to do any logging in a forested area may cause lumber mills to close and put residents out of work. A lack of income will decrease the living standard not only of those directly affected but also those with whom those put out of work will trade. The closure of mills will cut off a supply to more distant parts and may result in a price increase which may mean that some people who wish to buy lumber cannot afford it. Thus, the impact of a decision may be rationally measured not only in its immediate impact but as it spreads. The temptation for most decisionmakers is to limit the study of the impact to a rational basis.

One other factor enters into the question of importance. The strongest commitment to a position on an issue may come immediately after the position is adopted. If the facts later do not fit the position, some of those holding a position may move away from it. In other words, a group such as a logging association might see itself threatened by a proposal that seems to be opposed to its needs, and take a position of opposition based on that apparent threat. But later the direct impact of the proposal when implemented may be much less than foreseen and thus, lessen the necessity to use political clout. A decisionmaker must study, rationally, the effects of the proposal upon the group and at the same time, determine how rationally the group studied the impact of curtailment of logging upon its operations.

To look more closely at the logging association, for instance, consider two alternate situations. The first is that the area in which logging is to be curtailed is the only operating base the industry has in the area. The second situation might be that the Forest Service has recently opened up another area nearby to logging but because the first area already has roads, and is closer to the sawmills of the community, costs of logging are somewhat cheaper and only a few bids have been received from small new operators to log the new area. The loggers might react in much the same fashion to both proposals but the first alternative's impact is much more

drastic than that of the second. The first alternative, if implemented, would virtually wipe out the industry. The second would require higher costs in terms of various developmental work to gain access to the timber, but it would only be a temporary setback for the industry. In the first instance, the logging industry would battle realistically against something that could wipe it out. In the second instance, the industry might claim the move would wipe it out but a realistic view of the impact would indicate otherwise.

Emotional effects must be given weight also. Environmental considerations have received much more weight over the past few years, including such immeasurables as aesthetics and an awareness of solitude. For the decisionmaker the impact upon aesthetics is impossible to measure with any exactitude. Aesthetics lodges more in the emotions than in the reason. Although many people say they can tell why something is beautiful to them and something else is not, they cannot also tell from descriptions of two things which one they will find beautiful and which they will not. For the emotional levels involved, the decisionmaker may have to return to the question of commitment discussed in the previous chapter and make his determination of emotional impact in the same terms as he does the commitment. In a sense, commitment and emotional impact upon individuals and groups have the same parameters and may be expressed in similar terms although the end

result of commitment may be determination and the end result of emotional impact may be appreciation and stability.

The decisionmaker may determine that one side of the issue involves a great deal of money that can be measured, but generally has a low commitment index among its supporters. The total impact may be equivalent to a side where there is little financial impact, but a great deal of commitment to an aesthetic. Either, however, can produce a need to react from the supporters. A decisionmaker cannot overlook the aesthetic or the emotional impact of a decision when he is trying to determine who will find it necessary to react to a given decision.

In this chapter we have been looking at power in two ways: first, the power available to groups; and second, in relation to the necessity of groups to react by using the power available to them. Two factors seem to be predominant in determining the strength of various groups: numbers and influence. Numbers relate primarily to the battle of the ballot box. Influence relates to the status of the support the various groups may be able to call upon. Two factors also seem to predominate in a discussion of the necessity to use power: the distance between the decisionmaker's objective and that of the public speaking; and, the impact of the decision upon the group. Although the two factors appear to be and are related, they can be differentiated for purposes of measurement.

So far we have discussed the willingness and necessity to use power and the power available. At this point, let us turn to the measurement of the different factors in relationship to the field of input.

# CHAPTER VIII

## MEASURING THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In the past few chapters we have seen how the effect of a proposal upon an individual or a group depends upon the image the group or individual has of the change the proposal will make upon his life or his beliefs. The image of a group or individual is the sum of all the stimuli--physical and mental--which the group or individual has experienced during the course of existence. The image can be understood as a mental set or position, largely unconscious, which acts as a filter in determining which aspects of a proposal will impinge most strongly upon the consciousness of the group or individual. For example, a bill may be before the U. S. Congress to provide food for poor people in this country. If a rider is attached, insisting upon limiting family size of poor families through family planning and contraception, certain religious and secular groups throughout the country will react more to the rider than to the gist of the bill because their mental set is such that the family planning measure will trigger the strongest reaction in their consciousness.[1]

---

[1]See Chapter IV, pp. 59-68.

The image held by a group or individual will do more to determine the stand that group or individual takes upon a proposal than will the facts of the proposal. This is not to say that the image will filter out the facts. Rather, it begs the question of facts. The statement asserts that the position a group or individual takes upon an issue may be firmly based upon facts or it may not. The image that the group or individual has about similar situations will determine how closely the position taken by that group or individual fits the facts. The more closely a decisionmaker can make all groups or individuals involved in a decision speak to the facts, the more closely he will be able to gauge the impact of his decision upon the public interest. But the way in which a group will react to a decision and the force which it will use in reacting to that decision depend more upon what has been filtered through the image than upon the facts of the proposal. The group or individual will take its stand based upon its commitment to its image of the world and the importance that it places upon that commitment.

Commitment, as we have seen, is a factor which grows out of the emotional content of the world image. The strength of commitment is dependent on the need for and the salience of reference groups upon the person doing the speaking; it is dependent upon the defensiveness of the person; it is dependent upon the duration and participation of the person speaking in the position he advocates;

and it is dependent upon the source of the commitment. The depth of each aspect of commitment can be measured in terms of certain clues. Is the commitment internal, or has someone else said the group or individual is committed to a specific stand? How strong are the needs of the members to belong to the group which is uppermost in their minds when they take a certain position? Has the group or individual been pushed into a position where its internal integrity is threatened so that it is speaking primarily as a defensive reaction? Is the language used based on the facts of the situation or does it contain labeling, signal reactions and a cognitive style based on emotions? How much and what type of participation has been involved in the selection of the position? What has been the duration of this or similar positions? Does the individual or group carry out in his actions what he advocates? Each of the answers to these questions provides a means of determining the extent of the commitment which a group or individual holds toward a position on a proposal. Each of these answers is measurable, at least in relation to other groups speaking on the same issue.

Measurement can also be applied to the practical factors. The difficulty of properly measuring numbers, political clout, the distance between goals as compared to the objectives of the agency, and the impact of the decision on the objectives of the public and the agency have been discussed. Measurement is never easy. With

proper data, however, the factors of importance can also be compared to each other in a relative manner in such a way that a decisionmaker can become aware, in some measure, of the public interest, or at least the interest of that public which expresses any interest at all. The decisionmaker can also come to some determination of the probable consequences of his decision as far as creating opposition to the implementation of the program, either through political action or open hostility. In either case, the decisionmaker will have some method of properly weighting the input he receives from sources outside his own agency.

Method of Measurement

When dealing with relative differences in attitudes between two or more individuals or groups, a decisionmaker can often assert that this group seems more militant, this one seems to have more political clout, this group seems to have the most numbers but is the least effective. The decisionmaker is intuitively sorting out the commitment and strengths of the various factions commenting on the proposal. He may discount some and listen to others. This paper represents an effort to put the weighting of the elements from each group on a more formal basis.

One of the most intriguing measurement procedures to come into intensive use over the past few years is the five-point scale. Social scientists have used it in several different ways. One very common usage is similar to a

teeter-totter. A teeter-totter type of scale frequently is used to measure likes and dislikes so that the central point becomes neutral; i.e., the central point is for responses from those who have no feeling on the matter one way or the other. One extreme in this type of scale is for those who like whatever is involved very much, and the other end of the scale is for those who dislike it very much. Points two and four are for those who like it or dislike it but not intensely.

The second most common usage measures intensity on a zero-to-five scale. In this type zero is an indication that the quality being measured is of little concern to the individual or group. Five, at the other extreme, indicates that the quality being measured is of the utmost concern. As an illustration, let us take five groups speaking out on an issue at a hearing and measure just one factor of commitment--reference groups. Group A is a national group being represented by a member of its local chapter. Group B is a corporation represented by its local office manager who is being advised by a lawyer sent out from the home office. Group C is a local citizen's group formed to oppose the issue and is represented by its chairman accompanied by some 25 or 30 members. Group D is a national organization represented by its national chairman. Group E is a local private, limited-membership club represented by its president. Since we are measuring the extent of the group's commitment we might take a look

first at who is speaking for the group. Obviously Groups C, D, and E would have to be placed at a five rating, since all appear to consider the issue important enough that their most important officer is acting as their spokesman. Group B might rank as a three depending upon what rank the local office manager holds in the company hierarchy. Local office managers for some firms report to the president of the firm. For other firms, local office managers report to a district manager who in turn reports to a regional manager who reports to an assistant vice president in the home office. A local office manager of the latter type might indicate the company's interest is that of about a two, of the former type would put the company's interest at about a three. Personnel from the center office, in that case, would be a four and company officers would rank a five. Group A sent a member who holds no official rank and would seem, therefore, to have little interest in the outcome.

However, the main considerations in determining the commitment of the groups revolve not around who is acting as spokesman, but rather around how closely the spokesman is speaking for his group and how much need the individual members have to belong to that group. As we have seen, one measure of the membership need for the group is the difficulty of joining it. A second factor which relates to membership need relates to the internal discipline of the group. A closely knit group which requires

a great deal of effort to join appears to mold its members' views in such a way that, in general, it has a strong disciplinary hold. The membership feels such a need to belong that it falls in line behind whatever the group decides. Groups A and D are dues-paying groups open to anyone who wishes to belong and pay dues. Group B is a corporation whose members earn their living by working for it. Group C is an easily-joined group with no dues and membership open to anyone in opposition to the proposal. Group E opens its membership only when a present member drops out or dies and is extremely selective in whom it admits to membership. Given these details, ranking the membership need of the group's members can be accomplished to some extent. Greater ease of ranking would be possible with specific groups but what is outlined here provides some indication of how to select rankings. Groups A and D will rank low. Several characteristics are involved. First, they are open to anyone who will pay dues. This indicates a limited power to discipline, to hold members to a stand. They fulfill some requirements of the members in order to attract them; however, members can pay dues and still speak out in opposition to the general stand without formal consequences within the group. A rating of membership need for Groups A and D might be a two. Group B is a corporation which constitutes a separate problem. In general, corporations hold little disciplinary control over their employees except in the executive ranks.

Executives who publicly oppose the company's position may find themselves out of a job. Rank and file workers, particularly if they are protected by a union contract, are quite free to speak out in opposition to their company's position. Since most workers depend upon the company to do well so that it can increase their wages, they may tend to support the company's stand. If the company is known to pay well and have only a small turnover so that its jobs are desirable but limited, workers may support its stand with greater vigor. And if the company is located in a depressed area where there are fewer jobs available for those persons who might lose theirs, workers will tend to support the firm's position more strongly. Here again, the history of specific firms in similar situations is important. In no case, however, should a firm rank higher than a four in this element and, more probably, will be a three. Group C will have, most likely, the lowest in membership need. Group C's membership is free to do as it wishes. For the moment a particular proposal has united the group. But after hearing other positions members may freely change their minds, become less interested, or cease participating for other reasons. Group E appears to have the highest ranking when it comes to membership need. As a limited-membership group with high qualifications for membership and, probably, the ability to drop members for various reasons, it would take an extremely strong commitment

by a member before he would publicly oppose the group's stand. Most likely, membership need, the need to belong, would place Group E in the five ranking.

A second major consideration is group salience.[2] In an earlier chapter it is pointed out that most of us belong to many groups. Salience differs from membership need in that it is an indication of which group is uppermost in a speaker's mind at the moment he is speaking--which membership, in other words, controls his statement. Considerations mentioned in connection with membership need and consciousness of group demands listed in the preceding paragraph make it evident that Group E probably would retain its five ranking in this category. At the moment, Group C should apparently also be ranked as a five or, perhsps, a four. A large number of Group C members has turned out and is cheering its spokesman. The spokesman, obviously, is well aware of the presence of the group and its feelings will be uppermost in his mind when he speaks. Rank Group C as a five for salience. Groups A, B and D pose additional problems. The question is to determine how much each group's position is in the forefront of the speaker's attention. Certain clues of language and dress assist the decisionmaker. Does the speaker seem positive on the position he advocates or is he hedging? Does he admit that he cannot speak for his total membership? Does he qualify his

---

[2]See Chapter IV, p. 57-59.

statements to an excessive degree? Is he dressed in the costume of the group he represents; that is, for example, is the local office manager in a business suit or in more informal garb? Does he react surely and positively to support his group's stand under impromptu questioning? If the answers to these questions are yes, then salience may be presumed to be high. If the answers are no, then the salience of the group for which he is speaking may be low. In this particular example, let us rank the spokesman for Group A as a three for salience and for Groups B and D at a five.

It now becomes possible to rate the various groups for their relative positions in one factor of commitment--reference groups. The easiest way is to add up their rankings on each of the three criterion used and take the average. The answer is not an absolute. At other times, when other proposals are being considered, the rankings could change. The answer begins to give us an image of the strength of the commitment each of these groups has toward its side of the particular issue in relation to the other groups. As a result the decisionmaker might determine that at this time, Group A may have less support for its spokesman than Group E, while the others would range in between. However, this is only one factor of commitment and the relative positions could change considerably when we begin to add the remaining factors.

We must remember when we are putting figures into place that what we are trying to determine is the relative rankings of the groups. An attempt to provide any absolute measurement of a group's commitment is presumably doomed to failure since the scientific knowledge on which measurement is based is too limited at this time. We cannot be absolutely certain since our input is too imprecise. However, the very fact that we are working with relationships rather than absolutes helps in another way. Certain factors we have been discussing probably play a larger role in the determination of commitment than do others. The fact that a reward is offered for a public commitment may be more important in its effect than the fact that a person finds a dissonance between what he says and does. In the present state of knowledge, however, it is impossible to say which is more potent in determining commitment. When we try to add the effects of the two factors we may not be able to weight them properly. What we are adding, however, is not the two factors, but the relative effect that they appear to have upon the group or individual speaking. Language clues may be a more important indication of commitment than reference groups. We just don't know yet. But since we are measuring relative influence upon the groups or individuals involved we may not need to know as long as the relationships do not appear to be changed. Therefore, we can work with averaging out various factors which most likely

carry differing weight in their effects. But, bear in mind, that we are not talking absolutes.

One more consideration could affect the accuracy of the relativity rating, a consideration that may be apparent from the example above. A decisionmaker who is going to use this formula to assist in judging the quality and intensity of public input needs to be certain that the information he puts into the formula is consistent and in depth. Only when the input is of a consistently high quality will the output be reliable.

Reliability of Data

Similar information will be used to rate different factors of the formula. Some of this material, because of the type of overt behavior from which it derives or because of differing clues as to covert behavior may not be identical. At times, information from various sources may seem to be inconsistent. Inconsistency may be a clue in itself. But the decisionmaker who is going to use that clue must first be certain that it is inconsistent behavior, and not two actions tied together through a basic philosophy. For instance, a group which supports wilderness concepts yet takes large numbers of people on horseback into wilderness areas might seem to be inconsistent. The basic philosophy of the group, however, might tie the inconsistencies together through the concept of providing wilderness enjoyment for the greatest possible number. If the decisionmaker accepts the apparent inconsistency as a clue without

probing into the basic philosophies of the group involved, the data he plugs into the formula may not be reliable. Inconsistencies in data, no matter how significant they seem, should raise questions in the decisionmaker's mind which he would need to answer before he could determine the validity of his information. "How do I know this?" should be uppermost in any decisionmaker's mind when he attempts to use the material as a basis for a rating.

The inconsistency mentioned in the last paragraph can be explained to some extent, perhaps, by compiling in-depth material on the group being evaluated. The depth of material compiled on each group involved in a proposal becomes another factor of reliability. How does this proposal relate to the stated objectives of the group? Have the stated objectives changed over the years without ever being formally revised? Who composes the group's leadership? How are the leaders selected? In what way is the group involved so that it has taken a position on this issue? In our society it has become repugnant to compile dossiers on individuals and groups. Yet the decisionmaker who is to judge with any accuracy the public interest involved in the proposal before him must compile a great deal of material about the groups involved. The object is not to find material to vilify the opponents or to obtain their silence, but rather to have the proper, in-depth information by which to make an accurate decision on public input.

As a decisionmaker is reviewing his information preparatory to placing the data into the formula, he will find it advisable to write out the information in specific terms. In other words, why should Group A rate as a one in terms of reference groups and Group D a five? Write down the specific reasons. If the decisionmaker does not have adequate data, such inadequacy will become apparent as he struggles to become specific. At that point he needs to go back to his sources for more information.

# CHAPTER IX

## TESTING COMMITMENT

Making decisions on the use of our nation's natural resources is not an easy task. Upon our natural resources depends a great deal of our national wealth. Logging, mining, recreation and other economic activities take place on the national forests which include millions of acres of resources, some of which are renewable, some of which when once used are gone forever. As a result of the economic interest in the use of natural resources, almost any decision made by the Forest Service concerning public lands generates some opposition. Generally, it also draws some support as different groups seek to benefit from the forest lands in different ways. What I have tried to develop in these pages is a method by which a Forest Service decisionmaker, or decisionmakers in other public bodies, can weigh what they hear from the various groups to determine the extent and interest of the public in a particular proposal. The method is keyed to determine the strength of conviction of the group extending the interest and that group's ability to react to an adverse decision in a forceful way, in other words, a measurement

of the importance of the decision to the group and to the agency.

Now let us consider an example. A Forest Service decisionmaker has concluded that an area of forest land near a small western community has been harvested for timber to the extent that further harvesting at the same rate poses extreme danger to the ability of the forest to reproduce, and as a consequence poses hazards to other resources such as recreation, wildlife and water. To resolve the problem he poses a solution which will involve a substantial reduction in the board feet to be harvested. Some of the factors he takes into consideration involve the presence of heavy snows in winter which provide large amounts of water each summer for the use of downstream agriculture, industry and urban usage; the presence of excellent cover for wildlife; and the presence of streams which are considered some of the finest fishing water in that area. Removal of more timber will change the environmental factors for the wildlife and may create runoff problems which will disturb the quality of the fish habitat in the streams as well as the quality, timing and amount of water available downstream. He is also aware that logging is the second major industry in the nearby town after agriculture and that most of the timber used is supplied by the area of national forest in which he proposes to curtail timber cutting. But present trees are small and the industry is marginal and severely

troubled by even small changes in prices. In accordance with Forest Service procedures he publishes the proposal and asks for public reaction.

Response is swift and, at first, adverse. The logging association replies that the proposal will destroy it. The community chamber of commerce vigorously supports the logging association. The sawmill workers' union joins in the opposition with scathing remarks about the Forest Service's lack of sensitivity toward the working man and his need for a job. But on the heels of opposition comes support: a national wildlife group and its local chapter support the proposal; the state health agency which has charge of water pollution problems points out that it is already concerned about an increase in the amount of silt in water downstream; downstream farm and urban organizations send in messages in support of the proposal. At a hearing called by the Forest Service, each group presents testimony and papers to support its stand. Each group presents itself as speaking for the broader interests of the public. The decisionmaker needs to know how much commitment each group has to its stand and how much importance each group places upon the decision. Only with a proper judgment as to the public's interest in and position upon the curtailment of logging within a given area can he make a proper judgment. Although he feels strongly that the resources he has been called upon to protect can be protected only through the

measure he has outlined, perhaps there will be some compromise he can make if needed.

For the sake of simplicity we can put the advocates in four broad groups: the loggers who believe that any change will cost them money, the community businessmen who are willing to compromise if some alternative is provided to insure the economic well-being of the community, the board of health and the downstream water users who will compromise as long as water quality and volume remain constant or are improved, and the wildlife group which prefers to see the forest land remain untouched. Which has the most public support? At this point, the decision-maker will sit down to make his evaluation of each group's commitment and the importance it places on the issue. He will consider each item in moving toward a weighted summary of the attitudes.

Reference Groups

As far as spokesmen are concerned, each group sends its top men to the hearing to testify and calls in supporting witnesses to strengthen its stand. The caliber of those speaking is such that each must be rated a five and for averaging purposes the information can be dropped.

Membership need is a second factor in rating the importance of the reference groups. The logging association members would seem to have a strong need to belong to that group. To be out of step with fellow members on an issue as crucial to what they see as their survival could bring

economic sanctions. The chamber of commerce, however, is more likely to allow members to oppose its stand, particularly if they hold some economic power in the community or are pushing an alternative plan for economic growth. In an actual situation, the decisionmaker would have to look much more closely at past instances of a similar nature to see just what has occurred and how it affected the membership. Rank the chamber membership need as a three. A similar ranking might be made for the board of health and the downstream groups. These groups are willing to compromise and, indeed, may be split between several proposals that will keep their water supply adequate and clean. Membership is loosely knit in support of the proposal but could change drastically if an acceptable alternate proposal is put forth. The weakest membership need of the four belongs to the national wildlife group and its cohorts. The national group is open to all who would pay their dues and while its members obviously share similar concerns they are free to leave the group or to oppose its stand while remaining a member. Rank this group as a one. At this point the decisionmaker is beginning to see some differences between the groups. He moves on to the third factor under reference groups: salience, or the importance that the group has within the speaker's consciousness at the time he is speaking.

A number of loggers have crowded into the room; in fact, they outnumber the environmentalists who have

taken up most of the remainder of the space. As logging spokesmen follow each other on the stand, their fellow members in the crowd have to be gavelled into order frequently because of their loud encouragement of the witnesses. Later, when environmentalists take the stand, they receive similar expressions from their cohorts. In both cases there is a high degree of salience. The groups exert maximum influence on their witnesses. Members of the local chamber of commerce tend to go their separate ways more often in their testimony although they seem to be more aware of their membership than are the members of downstream water users. Loggers and environmentalists, primarily the wildlife group, rank as a five, the local chamber as a four, and the downstream groups as a three.

At this point we have some figures by which to compare the strength of reference groups in committing speakers to their testimony. As the chart shows, loggers rank the highest, the local chamber is next, and the two outside groups are last.

Reference Groups

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loggers | | | | | X |
| Local Chamber | | | | X | |
| Downstream | | | X | | |
| Wildlife | | | X | | |

Defensiveness

Two of the four groups testifying at the hearing assert that if the decision goes against them they will file suit in court. The loggers stridently claim that the Forest Service will not have acted properly in that it will have taken their livelihood without due process of law. The board of health spokesman, although speaking in mild tones, submits that if the Service does not take steps to prevent the siltation of downstream waters because of the logging activities it will have to ask an injunction against all further logging activities. Both exhibit to a greater or lesser degree all the appearance of groups which have been pushed to the limit. Because of the strength of its language, however, the logging association will have to be rated more highly in defensiveness than will the board of health and its downstream allies. Rate the loggers as a five and the downstream groups a four. The local chamber of commerce uses more reasonable language and asserts that although it may join the logging association in a suit it is more amenable to an alternative that will keep the community as a whole economically healthy. While exhibiting some of the appearances of defensiveness in language and use of words, the chamber ranks low in that category. Call it a two. Perhaps surprisingly, the least defensive group is that represented chiefly by the wildlife group. The spokesman is calm, assured and makes no threats nor exhibits any other aspects of defensiveness. He submits that his

group may initiate a suit or join in another group's court action, but he proposes several methods for curtailing the logging but not eliminating it so that the timber is cut but the streams remain clear. Rank the wildlife group as a one.

The groups' rankings on defensiveness appear in the chart below.

Defensiveness

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loggers | | | | | X |
| Local Chamber | | X | | | |
| Downstream | | | | X | |
| Wildlife | X | | | | |

Language

The phrase "free enterprise" appears ten times in one brief statement by the president of the logging association and the words "socialism" or "socialist" appear six times. Other speakers for the logging association use the same or similar terms almost as frequently. Obviously, the loggers are labeling the proposal with terms of bad connotation and without giving due concern to what those words mean. On the other extreme, the spokesmen for the wildlife groups toss out the terms "the people" or "the people's rights" just as often. Both groups are using labeling to extreme. Rate them both as five. The

board of health and downstream groups use few labels. To some extent they lean a bit to the wildlife language as they speak of "the people's right to clean water," but the use is not extensive, perhaps once or twice a statement. For the most part, the downstream groups talk primarily about the effects that they foresee from increased siltation of their streams and rivers if the logging is allowed to continue. At the most, rate them a two. The chamber of commerce evokes some labels. Chamber spokesmen refer to high unemployment that will force "proud men onto the welfare rolls." Chamber spokesmen also refer to "socialism" and "free enterprise." But the chamber and its supporters also speak to the facts of the proposal on the number of jobs and the income of the community. To some extent, the chamber spokesmen support their allegations that might otherwise be called labeling. At the most, class them as a three.

The logging association spokesman speaks quickly, without hesitation, and frequently without taking pause to breathe. He reflects a high degree of anger. His punctuation reveals that he believes fully not only in the "facts" he is presenting but the charges he is making. His supporters use similar terms. The loggers are at the extreme of commitment as shown by the punctuation and tone of their statements. Rank them a five on punctuation. The other three groups are, for the most part, represented by persons who speak firmly but without the emotional

overtones. The wildlife representative several times approaches anger but never spills over into it. He might be a four. The other two are not more than three. They are not happy with the situation, but they are more calm about it. Rank them no more than a three, probably a two.

Signal reaction seems extremely limited. While the loggers are using labeling and name-calling, their reaction seems to be based on the effect of the proposal to end logging upon their jobs. A few of them, obviously, are responding to the names and labels being tossed about, but none seems to have succumbed wholeheartedly to confusing the labels with the facts. The loggers might rank as a three, the other groups as no higher than a two, perhaps a one depending on the specifics of their formal and informal testimony.

The style of the loggers' speech is harsher than that of the other groups, however. Their cognitive style will set them at the extreme as far as the other groups are concerned. Spokesmen for the wildlife group also use a narrow viewpoint, that of the angler, and speak from the point of view of what will happen to fishing in the streams. Both groups speak somewhat from their beliefs rather than directly to the facts. They speak of their own internal experiences, not of the external results of cutting off the logging. The loggers seem to be responding more strongly in this direction than are the wildlife advocates, however, and they rate a five while the wildlife group

is a four. Both the chamber and downstream groups speak to the facts, of what will happen to the community's economy or to their water supplies if the logging continues. Both relate what they say to the facts rather than how they feel about the facts. Chamber spokesmen, at times, speak to their internal feelings about their community rather than the external facts of what they foresee happening if the area's number two industry is curtailed. Rate the downstream groups as a one. The chamber is no higher than a three, and most likely a two.

At this point we have used the clues which language has offered us to arrive at some indication of the relative extent of the commitment of each group. As the chart below indicates, an average of the ratings we have given each group on each clue indicates that the loggers are more intensely committed to their viewpoint, as far as it shows in their language, than any other group. The loggers rate a four and one-half on the scale, the wildlife advocates rate three and three-fourths, the downstream communities and the board of health are two and the local chamber ranks as two and one-half.

Language

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loggers | | | | | X |
| Wildlife | | | | X | |
| Local Chamber | | | X | | |
| Downstream | | X | | | |

Participation

Each of the groups speaking before the hearing has taken a stand upon the proposal. The decisionmaker can find some guidelines to each group's commitment from a knowledge of the extent the membership of each group participated in the development of the group's position. Some of this may be apparent at the hearing. For instance, representatives of the loggers' association repeatedly assert that their group's stand was taken only after a unanimous vote of the membership. From the unanimity of the witnesses and the amount of support which is apparent within the hearing room, the decisionmaker can assume that participation is very high in the decision to oppose any curtailment of logging in the area involved in the proposal. The loggers easily rank as a five. The wildlife advocates present a different picture. At the group's last general convention its membership went on record by a lopsided vote as supporting the establishment of wilderness or primitive areas wherever possible, and as opposed to any proposals which might degrade the quality of wildlife habitat in any area, and to support those proposals which will result in the upgrading of habitat. Spokesmen for the wildlife group and its supporters point to this vote as their reason for supporting the proposal to curtail logging in the given forest. While a decisionmaker must respect the strength of the vote, he must also realize that it was taken on a general statement of policy and not on the specific issue.

If the specific issue was taken to a vote of the membership of the different groups supporting the wildlife advocates, the outcome might change.

Participation of the membership in the group's response to the present proposal must be limited in the decisionmaker's calculations by the realization that it was the operating board or the officers who decided to support the curtailment of logging, acting on the basis of a general policy which received a heavy support from the membership. Participation here must be rated no higher than a four, but because of the general support the policy received from the membership, probably no lower. The local chamber ranks even lower. Spokesmen for the chamber admit that the group's response to the proposal was made by its board of directors without consultation with the membership. In rating such a group, however, the decisionmaker must realize that while the lack of membership participation may mean a lack of solidarity behind the chamber's position, it may mean that the membership would support a stronger stand rather than a weaker one. In either case, the chamber's stand lacks strong participation. The rating in this case might depend upon the history of support the chamber's board has received from its membership on past issues. If the chamber membership has a history of supporting its board positions, then the chamber might rank as a three. If the membership generally fails to support board positions, rank it as a one. If

the history is blurred because there is no clear-cut evidence either way, rank it as a two. For the purposes of this example, rank the chamber as a two on participation.

To rank the downstream coalition becomes still another problem. Obviously, they belong to the coalition because they share in the belief that the proposal would assist them in maintaining the quality and amount of the water that flows to them. However, each group may be willing to settle for a compromise that is somewhat different from the compromise that another group might deem reasonable. Each group member of the coalition operates somewhat differently in arriving at its stand on a position. Some members of the coalition are groups that poll their members on issues such as this; others let the board of directors decide on a position, as the local chamber did; still others consist of city governments where elected officials have determined that stand that the local government will take on the issue. Because of this diversity, the decisionmaker who is to get an accurate picture of the amount of participation behind the various positions, and thus a picture of the participation behind the coalition, must rank individual groups by looking into their methods of position taking. Then a weighted average must be taken by comparing membership to participation. By weighing each component member of the downstream coalition as to the size of its membership compared to the coalition as a whole, it is possible to arrive at an indication of

how much weight each group has within the coalition and how much weight should be given to its commitment within the coalition. Thus, a farming group which has polled its 2,000 members might have a strong weighting on participation but have little effect on the overall participation ranking of the coalition when counter-balanced by a city of 200,000 in which participation seems limited. By theorizing a poll of the farm group, an election in which clean water played a decisive role in a small-city member of the coalition, and a council decision in the large city supported by the weight of newspaper letters to the editor, we might attain a ranking of just below three for the coalition as a whole. The farm group and the small city would be four or five while the large city would lower the ranking because of little participation within a group which in size dominates the coalition.

The overall evaluation of all groups on the factor of participation is shown on the chart below.

Participation

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loggers | | | | | X |
| Wildlife | | | | X | |
| Downstream | | | X | | |
| Local Chamber | | X | | | |

Continuity

One factor which is extremely important to a decisionmaker who may base part of his decision on the extent of the commitment of the various individuals and groups is how long they will maintain the positions they have taken. If the decisionmaker, for instance, depends on the support the downstream groups present, only to find that they have changed their minds when a legal or political battle erupts, he may find himself in a situation on which he had not counted, with powerful political or legal resources on one side while he is virtually by himself on the other. Continuity is basically an extension of history. For example, the logging association has a long history of opposing any curtailment of timber cutting and of using all the resources at its command to battle curtailment. Such a history would indicate that the logging association will not now cease its long-maintained position. Rank it as a five.

The history of the downstream coalition appears to be just the opposite. The particular proposal has created the first grouping of these particular organizations. Within the coalition are forces that might serve to divide the groups in the near future, such as the type of compromise they would be willing to accept. A long-term position appears to be unlikely with the coalition. The administrator might rank that group as a one. For the local chamber, a slightly different position exists. If

a compromise provides the community with some form of economic base comparable to the logging industry, the chamber would probably abandon its opposition to the curtailment of logging, or at least lower the level of importance it attaches to the logging. The position here is such that a decisionmaker could probably rank the local chamber as a three.

History again plays an important role in determining the continuity of the position which the wildlife group has taken. In the past, the wildlife group has made an all-out effort to sway decisions in its favor with all the power it commands. When a decision adverse to its stand is made, however, the group generally backs off to some extent while maintaining a back-burner effort to bring the issue to a boil again. Its continuity is strong on a position, weaker on the amount of pressure it will apply over the long term. Let us rank the continuity factor of the wildlife group at about a four, less than the logging association, but more than that of the local chamber.

The relative positions we have assigned each group appear on the chart below.

Continuity

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loggers | | | | | X |
| Wildlife | | | | X | |
| Local Chamber | | | X | | |
| Downstream | | X | | | |

Summary of Commitment

At this point we have established a ranking of the groups on a relative basis for each of the clues we have set up to attempt to determine commitment. We can now draw a chart for each group.

Logging Association

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | | | X |
| Defensiveness | | | | | X |
| Language | | | | X | |
| Participation | | | | | X |
| Continuity | | | | | X |

Wildlife Group

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | X | | |
| Defensiveness | X | | | | |
| Language | | | | X | |
| Participation | | | | X | |
| Continuity | | | | X | |

Local Chamber

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | | X | |
| Defensiveness | | X | | | |
| Language | | | X | | |
| Participation | | X | | | |
| Continuity | | | X | | |

Downstream Coalition

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | X | | |
| Defensiveness | | | | X | |
| Language | | X | | | |
| Participation | | | X | | |
| Continuity | | X | | | |

As we indicated earlier, what we wish to determine are the intensity and the probable duration of the commitment. Intensity is indicated primarily by language, reference groups, defensiveness, continuity and participation. Probable duration of the commitment is indicated by continuity of the commitment, participation, defensiveness and reference groups. Continuity is probably the most important single factor while the other three have lesser weight. Continuity probably has as much weight as the other three combined. In figuring duration of commitment

then, let us figure continuity three times and divide by six to get our average. The charts for each group would look something such as the following.

Logging Association

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | | | X |
| Duration of Commitment | | | | | X |

Wildlife Group

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | X | | |
| Duration of Commitment | | | | X | |

Local Chamber

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | | X | |
| Duration of Commitment | | X | | | |

Downstream Coalition

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | X | | |
| Duration of Commitment | | X | | | |

With no further operations, one point becomes apparent immediately. The logging association is by far the group that is most strongly committed to the position

it has taken and most likely to maintain that position in the future. We may get a relative picture in the following two charts.

Overall Intensity of Commitment

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | | | | X |
| Wildlife Group | | | X | | |
| Local Chamber | | | | X | |
| Downstream Coalition | | | X | | |

Overall Probable Duration of Commitment

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | | | | X |
| Wildlife Group | | | | X | |
| Local Chamber | | | X | | |
| Downstream Coalition | | | X | | |

Perhaps the most surprising element of the chart is the ranking of the local chamber. For the decisionmaker, the ranking presents a question of the validity of his information. Because it is a local group strongly tied to the logging industry, the local chamber might be expected to be more strongly committed to the proposal to curtail logging. The decisionmaker should return to his data to ascertain that he has been properly sensitive to the nuances presented by chamber spokesmen. If he is convinced that his data is accurate, the decisionmaker might then doublecheck

his definitions and, perhaps, rework the chart under other definitions. For instance, what the chart is measuring now is the commitment that each group has to the stand it has advocated at the hearings. The local chamber announced its opposition to the curtailment of logging but its commitment to that opposition was leavened by its willingness to compromise if a replacement can be found that will continue to sustain the community's economy. What the decisionmaker might do at this point is to ascertain from his information what commitment the chamber would have to opposition of curtailment of logging if no replacement is forthcoming. A rough estimate from the data indicates that the commitment factor might jump as high as two points. A similar profile might be done for the downstream coalition, the other group which has offered to compromise. Although certain factors such as participation would not change, the ranking for the downstream coalition in favor of limiting logging might go up as much as a point. To properly measure the extent of commitment, the decisionmaker must be assured that he is asking the proper question to which he wants an answer. Only then can he get the proper output which allows him to weigh the strength of the commitment of the various factors involved.

Commitment measures an emotional level. Emotion will be present in all the presentations and on all sides. At any point during the debate on a proposal the commitment level may change, either because one group is pushed into

a more defensive position or because another group begins to take a more rational view, or because of a number of other elements which effect the interaction of individuals and groups during a debate. A decisionmaker must be ready to change his evaluation of the extent of commitment at all times during the debate. However, even in the usual interim between the time of the hearing and taking of statements and the announcement of the decision, a time when debate abates, a decisionmaker who determines the extent of commitment has not completed his task of weighting the extent of public interest in the outcome of the decision. Commitment measures the extent to which a group or individual is committed to a stance and likely to react to a decision adverse to that individual or group. Now, the decisionmaker must begin to be aware of the power of the individual or group to modify or reverse his decision. The next chapter will discuss methods of weighting the relative power of the groups involved in an effort to determine what changes in a proposal are most likely to be made by the various processes that follow the making of a decision adverse to one group or the other.

# CHAPTER X

## THE IMPORTANCE FACTOR

Some groups with small memberships have the ear of powerful members of Congress. Some groups with large memberships are unable to get their members out with any consistency to vote on an issue or a candidate on which the group has taken a position. Numbers are important in determining the power which a given group can wield to support its position. But political clout, the power of the group to obtain the backing of elected local, state and federal officials to make changes in its environment, or to prevent changes in that environment is perhaps much more important. Sheer numbers when effectively used at the ballot box may effect a change in political clout as we have seen in some recent elections where environmentalists have been involved against those whom they feel had betrayed environmental interests. Numbers and political clout must be balanced by a decisionmaker seeking to understand the forces involved in opposing or supporting a decision.

At the same time, the decisionmaker must also understand how the group's position relates to what the proposal would accomplish. This determines the group's need to react.

What are the group's needs as compared to the objectives sought? Perhaps more important, the decisionmaker must be aware of the extent that a compromise may create a lesser gap between those needs and the objectives. And finally, he must be aware of what the rational rather than the emotional impact will be of the decision. What actually will the decision do to the individual or group?

As we did in the last chapter, it appears to be possible to weigh each of these factors to determine to what extent each factor is involved in the position of each group, and thus, sort out the relative power structure which may be called into play to revoke or change the decision. Clues to some of these appeared during the hearings. Each group carefully alluded to its membership, giving the numbers of dues-paying members or the numbers of citizens involved in the membership of its various components. The logging association obtained lukewarm support from its congressman who is also the representative of some of the downstream cities and reaffirmed his support for the cleanliness of their water while speaking on behalf of logging. Each group implicitly, if not explicitly, outlined how its position differed from or agreed with the proposal to curtail logging and each group, surprisingly for the extent of the commitment in some cases, provided a fairly accurate account of what might be expected to happen to its interests if the proposal was adopted. The decisionmaker must look beneath the surface, however, if

he is to have objective data on hand by which to make his decision. Let us look separately at each of the factors involved.

Numbers

The logging association claims 75 members employing an average of ten men apiece. In addition, several independent loggers have appeared in support of the association's position that there should be no limitation on logging in the area concerned. Beyond that, the loggers have gotten some assistance from the local chamber but that has been dependent upon the potential of replacing the industry's role in the local economy. The chamber's membership roll is at 200 with each of the members employing an average of ten people. Under questioning the chamber's executive secretary admits that only half of the dues-paying members are active supporters. For the wildlife groups, the dues-paying membership is claimed at 200,000 with slightly more than half believed to be active members in the local chapters. The president claims, however, that whether the members are active or not they are basically in agreement with the group and tend to follow its positions on various issues. The groups making up the downstream coalition, excluding the State Board of Health, comprise a mixed constituency ranging from groups with dues-paying memberships to those municipal representatives who represent cities of up to 50,000 or more people.

The total support claimed is somewhere in the region of 300,000 people. All the figures listed are gross figures. The decisionmaker begins to adjust them. He discovers that historically the logging association has had little success in leading its employees on any issue except that directly related to jobs. Representatives of the workers have indicated that they believe jobs are involved in the current controversy. From history, the decisionmaker believes that the gross figure for the loggers on this issue will be in the neighborhood of 750 the group claims. By adding in family members such as wives of loggers plus those who appear to be in agreement with the association's view, he estimates numerical support for the logging association in the neighborhood of 2,000. All he can do is make the estimate; the logging association has never been in a situation where a similar issue has become the center of a vote. For the chamber, the decision is easier. Both state and local chambers have been involved in vote issues previously. The general history of such issues is that the local chamber has been able to swing no more than 2,500 votes out of its potential of more than 4,000. On an issue such as this which involves the disruption of a local activity by what might be called outside interests the decisionmaker believes the chamber might be able to set a record but he still feels that the total vote for the chamber's position would not be more than 3,500 votes. The wildlife group is still another problem because it

is a national group with local chapters. The local chapter in the community involved is small and its representatives essentially supported the national stand. The local chapter's membership is less than 100, however, and on an issue such as this might have a certain potential to split its vote. An real power exerted through the ballot box probably will be on a state or national level. The decisionmaker knows that he has to involve not only the local chapter but the state and national membership in his calculations. State membership has been reported as 3,000. In the past, this membership appears to have been solidly behind the leadership in the only state issue that came up as an issue at the ballot box. On that issue the wildlife group's chapters spearheaded the opposition to a controversial state proposal and managed to turn out more than 100,000 votes to win its case. On the national scene the group has spearheaded two efforts to overturn incumbent senators and, in both cases, was victorious. The downstream coalition is another story. In the one city where the issue was fought out during an election campaign, those who supported limitations on logging won easily. Larger cities involved, however, are historically in question. Several have on similar issues gone both ways.

The decisionmaker needs another source of information. He turns to the mass media. Letters to the editor in the region's publications, he finds, tend to support the curtailment of logging except in the newspaper published

in the city primarily involved. When he checks out the sources of letters, a sampling indicates that the majority of letters in the outside newspapers are from those not directly connected with any of the groups represented in the controversy, while letters appearing in the hometown newspaper are primarily from those who have a stake in the decision. From this, he calculates that well over half of the supporters claimed by the downstream coalition may be effective members. Now he can begin to weigh the numbers factor for each group as seen on the chart following.

Numbers

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | X | | | | |
| Local Chamber | | X | | | |
| Wildlife | | | | X | |
| Downstream Coalition | | | | | X |

Political Clout

Political clout is held in the hands of elected officials and their aides. From news reports and from the hearing, the decisionmaker can be reasonably certain in this case that the state's two U. S. Senators and its elected state government are staying out of the controversy. Nothing has surfaced to indicate differently. The State Board of Health, an appointed group, stands on one side where it is exercising responsibilities given to it by the state legislature to oversee state water quality. The

statements presented at the hearing by board witnesses confirm a high degree of commitment by the board to that duty and to the stand it has taken that steps must be taken to lower the silt content of the river draining the logging area. On the other side, the U. S. Congressman for the district has made a statement which, when tested, indicates a low commitment for his support for the logging association. State senators and legislators testify on both sides, depending upon the area represented and with a high degree of commitment to what they say. Numerically, however, more state legislators are lined up on the side of the downstream coalition than on that of the logging association. And, finally, the wildlife group has not been represented by witnesses holding any degree of political power. Ranking the groups starts with this information.

Historically, the logging association has had a great deal of success in the use of political influence. However, a year ago the association's long-term friend in the U. S. Senate returned and a friendly congressman was defeated in a bid to replace him. Although the new young congressman is known as a man who makes up his mind on environmental issues as each issue develops, his lack of total commitment to his testimony at the hearing indicates he is not the same type in Washington that the loggers have had for so many years. With less than a year in office, his inexperience may count in the final result if he supports the loggers in a battle against some group with stronger and

longer-term support in congress. At the state level, a quick head count indicates that high-ranking elected officials have taken no stand and that legislators are more than likely to line up against the loggers. The logging association has a certain amount of political clout, but that clout seems limited depending upon the strength other groups can amass. The loggers' strongest support comes from the local chamber. The chamber, in this case, appears almost as weak as the loggers to prevent action to curtail the logging. The chamber has enough strength within the statement of the congressman and from those of legislators to wield much more power in its attempts to discover a replacement to the logging industry. Because of these factors, the local chamber can add little to the political clout of the loggers, but it apparently will be able to exert much more power on its own behalf. The ranking of the chamber on this issue must be higher by at least one step than that of the loggers.

On the opposition side, the numbers of those within his district who are members of the downstream coalition appear to be what tempered the congressman's statement on behalf of the logging association. The congressman appeared to be much more committed in his talk to the element of clean water than to the element of industry. If the two groups become direct opponents on a political issue, the congressman may move more toward the downstream coalition

than to the logging association. In addition, the coalition has drawn the support of far more state legislators than either the local chamber or the loggers could wheel into place. On the state level, the downstream coalition seems to have more influence. The coalition's potential ally, the wildlife group, at first study seems to have little political clout in this particular instance. None of its speakers at the hearing or in the media are holders of elected office, either state or national. Beneath the surface, however, the decisionmaker finds a different situation. Within the recent past, the wildlife group has won a considerable number of votes in Congress. On a national level, the group appears able to swing more political clout than any of the other three groups although its power has not always been decisive on any given issue. Because the logging is on a national forest administered by a federal agency, the decisionmaker knows that any effective political clout must occur on the federal level. He knows, also, that the logging association will be able to call upon its national organization to work on its behalf but that the national logging association has been rendered somewhat ineffective during the last decade when several of its strongest friends in elected government have been deposed by the voters. On a basis of head-to-head issues which have been recently voted upon in Congress, the decisionmaker concludes that the wildlife group will be more powerful in the Congress than will the logging

association. He is ready to rank the groups as to political clout as shown in the following chart.

Political Clout

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | X | | | |
| Local Chamber | | | X | | |
| Downstream Coalition | | | | X | |
| Wildlife | | | | | X |

Needs Versus Objectives

Commitment may be said to indicate how dedicated a group is to its stand on an issue. Numbers and political clout measure how much power a group can exert. Yet in many instances, the group will not find it necessary to exert its power on a proposal advanced to manage natural resources because the objectives of the proposal will fit snugly into the group's own needs. In the simplified example we are developing, it is obvious that the curtailment of logging will fit the needs of both the wildlife group and the downstream coalition. Both want the waters clean, the downstream coalition for drinking, bathing and industrial and agricultural uses; the wildlife group for fishing and hunting. In addition, the wildlife group's objective of having more lands available for wildlife will be met. In that sense, the objectives of the proposal may seem to fit even more closely the needs of the wildife group than those of the coalition.

At the other extreme the objectives of the proposal are exactly opposite the needs of the logging association. The loggers want no curtailment of their operations--the proposal will curtail logging. Needs and objectives are far apart. The needs of the local chamber are more difficult to spell out but essentially that group is not opposed, per se, to the curtailment of logging but rather to the economic impact that curtailment would mean to the community. If a satisfactory replacement could be provided, the chamber's needs would be met with little consideration of the objectives of the proposal to curtail logging. The chamber thereby might be ranked in distance between needs and objectives as of somewhat less intensity than the logging association, of somewhat more intensity than the downstream coalition and the wildlife group.

Measurement here involves the question of distance rather than closeness. The further apart the needs and objectives the more important the issue is likely to be to an involved group and the more likely that group is to use its political clout. A five on this scale would mean that the objectives of the proposal and the needs of the group being measured are diametrically opposed and there appears to be no way to reconcile them. Thus, the rankings appear as those in the following chart.

Needs Versus Objectives

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | | | | X |
| Local Chamber | | | | X | |
| Downstream Coalition | X | | | | |
| Wildlife Group | X | | | | |

Impact

An important element of the decisionmaker's weighting of the public input depends upon the impact the decision will have on the groups affected. The impact of a decision helps determine to what extent the group needs to react to the decision. Impact needs to be studied on the basis of how realistic it is. If a group has a realistic view of the impact of a decision upon it, the group's need to react should reflect that view and remain almost constant in the future. If the view is unrealistic, the group may still feel it needs to react to the decision, but that reaction may lessen as the future unveils the real impact. A realistic view of the impact that indicates a need to react probably should be weighted slightly heavier than an unrealistic view on the basis of long-term usage of power. The unrealistic view may not create any less reaction in the short term, but the urgency to react will wither as time passes. With that in mind, let us turn to ranking the groups in our hypothetical case as to their awareness of the impact on them.

The logging association has what might be considered a realistic view of the impact. The local chamber also appears to have a clear view of what the end of the logging industry in the area would mean to the community. To protect its economic base, the community must either continue to have logging, or it must find an alternative. Both the loggers and the chamber might rank as fives.

For the opponents of logging, the impact of the proposal might be much less. Both of them fear siltation in the water. In addition, the wildlife group hopes to provide more area for wildlife habitat. The impact of the proposal acts upon them in a negative way. There can be no doubt that the amount of timber cut has somewhat increased the amount of silt in the stream and deprived certain types of wildlife of habitat. But curtailing timber cutting, which is the extent of the present proposal, will not have an effect on the present siltation. Nor will it increase the amount of water retained in storage during the winter. And while some types of wildlife are losing their habitat with the cutting of the timber, other types are thriving because there is more room for them in the forest. As far as can be predicted now, the single impact that the proposal will make upon the downstream coalition and the wildlife group positions will be to prevent the further loss of timber which could cause increased siltation and a quicker spring runoff. The negative impact here is small. In the impact ranking, both groups must be

rated low, not more than a two. The following chart shows the ratings.

Impact

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | | | | X |
| Local Chamber | | | | | X |
| Downstream Coalition | | X | | | |
| Wildlife Group | | X | | | |

Importance

Each of the factors we have discussed in this chapter are related to determining how important an issue the proposal is to those involved in it, and how important it will be for the groups involved to use the force they have at their hands to upset, support or modify the proposal. Numbers and political clout relate to the amount of force each group has at hand. Needs versus objectives and impact relate to the necessity of each group to use that force. At this point the decisionmaker may begin to put together a composite ranking to indicate the relative power and importance of each group involved in the issue. First chart each group on each factor.

Logging Association

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | X | | | | |
| Political Clout | | X | | | |
| Needs Versus Objectives | | | | | X |
| Impact | | | | | X |

Local Chamber

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | X | | | |
| Political Clout | | | X | | |
| Needs Versus Objectives | | | | X | |
| Impact | | | | | X |

Downstream Coalition

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | | | | X |
| Political Clout | | | | X | |
| Needs Versus Objectives | X | | | | |
| Impact | | X | | | |

Wildlife Group

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | | | X | |
| Political Clout | | | | | X |
| Needs Versus Objectives | X | | | | |
| Impact | | X | | | |

With the basic chart in mind, let us now look at the two items we need to know -- the power available and the necessity to use that power.

Logging Association

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | X | | | |
| Necessity to Wield Power | | | | | X |

Local Chamber

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | | X | | |
| Necessity to Wield Power | | | | X | |

Wildlife Group

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | | | X | |
| Necessity to Wield Power | | X | | | |

Downstream Coalition

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | | | X | |
| Necessity to Wield Power | | X | | | |

From the composite chart for each group some things can be said about that group. For instance, the chart makes it obvious that the logging association, with high rankings in needs versus objectives and in its assessment

of the impact of the proposal upon its membership will probably find it necessary to react but its reaction will be weak both because of its small numbers and because of its low political clout now. The same can be said of the local chamber although its power will be greater and its need to react is somewhat less. Almost the opposite is true of the downstream coalition and the wildlife group. They have the power available, but for the present proposal they have little need to react. Their supporters, however, may be available to counter any attempts by the opponents to modify the proposal. By averaging each of the factors we may come up with a composite of the groups as shown in the charts below.

Power Available

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | X | | | |
| Local Chamber | | | X | | |
| Wildlife Group | | | | X | |
| Downstream Coalition | | | | X | |

Necessity to Wield Power

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Logging Association | | | | | X |
| Local Chamber | | | | X | |
| Wildlife Group | | X | | | |
| Downstream Coalition | | X | | | |

Historically, the western logging industry has carried a great deal of power and used it to gain access to timber. In essence, a chart such as we have compiled here would indicate a trend away from strong logging interests on the part of the public in other directions. A decisionmaker who finds himself with a chart such as this, in which a group he expected to have a great deal of power is shown to be losing its political power, is like a dog off a leash. His decisions no longer must follow the paths of tradition.

The data used in this simplified example is not as detailed as that which would be available to the decisionmaker. The more detailed and complex the input, the more judgment the decisionmaker will have to exercise in interpreting and relating that information to the problem at hand. But with some experience in utilizing the model presented in this paper, he can successfully use this formula to ascertain the relative rankings of public inputs to the decision-making process in an effort to determine who is speaking for the people and what the people feel is truly in their best interest. Some of the results may be surprising. A decisionmaker might then go back to his data to doublecheck the input. From these charts he may find out how intensely a group feels about a particular proposal, how important the proposal is to it and how each group is likely to react and how intensely it will react in comparison to other groups or individuals involved.

# CHAPTER XI

## A CASE HISTORY

By using a simplified example we've seen how a decisionmaker can use measurement to understand what the public is saying. Now let us use the actual case to see how a decisionmaker could have used measurement to get a picture of what the public was saying that might have cooled what turned into a rather spectacular controversy. To do so, let us use the paper cited previously on the Lincoln Back Country Controversy by R. W. Behan.

### The Background

Behan describes the setting:

> The Lincoln Back Country is a roughly rectangular tract of relatively undeveloped forest land about eight miles wide and 15 miles long, containing some 75,000 acres. It lies 12 miles due north of Lincoln, Montana, in the northwestern part of the state, and comprises the northernmost portion of the Lincoln Ranger District, Helena National Forest.[1]

More important in the development of the controversy is that the small town of Lincoln which is the primary access to the Back Country was not reached by a paved road until

---

[1]Behan, op. cit., p. 1.

1957. Prior to that the only way to reach Lincoln was over a narrow dirt and gravel road braved by few. As a result, development and managerial evolution within the Forest Service came late to Lincoln. At the beginning of the controversy, Behan writes:

> Such developments as there are within the Back Country include an obsolescent Forest Service Fire Guard Station at Webb Lake, the hunting camps of two commercial outfitters, one on Meadow Creek and one on Middle Fork Creek, and a trail system that penetrates all the major drainages. There is no road access; the Landers Fork road out of Lincoln ends about three miles short of the Back Country border, at Indian Meadows.[2]

The town of Lincoln by 1963 had developed into a community which lived off logging and off its access to the forest land which provided a living for its hunting guides. The inhabitants of Lincoln were conscious of where their living came from. They watched as other parts of the Lincoln Ranger District were developed for logging and recreation. In 1960, three men formed the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association.

> They had printed a ream of letterheads that gave the association an aura of potency rather beyond its numbers, but the three originators maintained the bluff, picked up a fourth and then a fifth member, and stood by, watching.

Although unknown to the association, planning came to the Lincoln Back Country in August of 1962. That was

---

[2]Ibid., p. 9.

[3]Ibid., p. 11.

the month the Helena Forest Supervisor and the Lincoln District Ranger presented to the Helena National Forest Advisory Council a plan for full-scale development of the Lincoln Back Country that involved development of campsites and harvesting of timber. The council heard the plan, flew over the Back Country and conducted some interviews in Lincoln before voting 6-2, with four members not voting, in favor of the plan. The advisory council included representatives of grazing, timber, mining, and business interests.

In Lincoln the interviews aroused suspicions of some members of the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association. Although the association was almost defunct, one of the originators began to stir up local and area interest in what the Forest Service had planned. He approached various groups, especially sportsmen's organizations in Missoula. The detailed plan had not been released, but people knew some sort of development was being proposed for the Back Country.

> On March 13, 1963, the president of the United Sportsmen Association of Montana, a Missoula man, sent a letter to the Montana delegation in Congress. In it he categorically opposed any development of the Back Country and requested a public hearing be held on the as-yet-unannounced proposal.
>
> On March 16, a similar letter was sent to the Regional Office of the Forest Service in Missoula, this from the president of the Jefferson-Madison Wildlife Association.[4]

---

[4] Ibid., p. 13.

On March 18, copies of the plan were sent to the Montana Congressional Delegation and to a number of people throughout Montana. Replies were received primarily from business, professional and industrial sources, most of whom either supported the plan or made no comment.

> There was a conspicuous lack of replies from Wildlife and Wilderness groups, the organizations which would later become so vocal. Whether the lack of replies resulted from these groups' failure to answer or from their failure to receive copies of the Plan in the first place was open to speculation.[5]

But on March 27, when the Forest Supervisor made the first public presentation at a meeting of the Lincoln Lion's Club, the opposition was vocal. The Supervisor reported to his superior, as quoted by Behan:

> I am certain that you and the congressional delegation will soon receive a deluge of letters expressing opposition to the development of this area. Major emphasis will be placed on obtaining a public hearing on our proposal. It is likely that requests for a public hearing will become irresistible.[6]

The Supervisor was accurate in his estimate and a meeting or a hearing (Behan says there was some dispute as to which it was) was held in Lincoln April 19. There were approximately 300 people present. The Helena National Forest Supervisor presented the plan in detail. It called for a sophisticated and highly-developed system of roadways,

---

[5]Ibid., p. 14.

[6]Ibid., p. 15.

campgrounds and logging proposals. The reaction was warm. Behan describes it thus:

> Opposition to the roads in the Back Country ranged from spiritless to spirited, and then to the almost spiritual. One opponent simply said he was "not for or against the plan entirely," but he registered a mild protest. Another said quite caustically, "Opening up the Back Country and promising more work to the community is a fool statement." And a third invoked a sense of righteousness by stating, "People for the Plan . . . are here on expense accounts. The others speak from the heart."
>
> The statement of one gentleman foretold precisely a subsequent consensus of opposition to development of the Back Country. "I wish to make it clear to everyone here," he said, "that I do not propose that the Lincoln Back Country be forever locked up as a wilderness. I understand the Forest Service's view that such timber as may be back there will eventually be needed to sustain the local economy, but I do not believe the need is urgent and immediate."
>
> This position was taken again later, and reflected in varying degrees . . . by a number of individuals and organizations, including finally, Montana's congressional delegation. And, subsequent to the April 19 meeting, the opponents and supporters of the Plan divided along pretty well established lines of interest. The mining industry, stock growers, and timber groups favored the road proposition. The wildlife and wilderness groups and the packers and guides insisted on the area remaining roadless. Non-affiliated citizens, it seemed, were about evenly split; some preferred road-access for family camping, others feared their favorite fishing holes would be swamped with motorized competitors. Overall, support and opposition appeared to be about evenly balanced. This may have been due to a rigid "equal-time" rule, imposed by the Forest Service, which allocated alternate half-hours to one side, then the other.[7]

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 17-18.

Behan points out that the opposition did ask that a vote be taken so that some idea could be obtained of those attending who were for the plan and those opposed, but the chairman turned down the request. As a result of the meeting, Behan says, the Forest Service came in for considerable criticism concerning failure to listen to the public.

What happened after the meeting is that the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association swelled to a group of 55 dues-paying members. It formally organized and put out a pamphlet asserting its purpose. The new president went to Missoula and joined several sportsmen's organizations, where he sought to sell his group's ideas. On April 22, the president of the United Sportsmen of Montana wrote to the Montana congressional delegation opposing development and condemning the Forest Service handling of the April 19 meeting. On April 30, the Montana Wilderness Association asked the Regional Forester to consider the Lincoln Back Country as a separate entity for planning and development in the Lincoln Ranger District, proposing that the northern and southern halves of the district be considered separately and advocated delayed development. Two weeks later, the president of the Western Montana Fish and Game Association, the largest in the state, made the same request of the Helena Forest Supervisor and proposed a ten-year delay in development. Similar letters from a Great Falls lawyer on May 22 and from the United Sportsmen of Montana on May 22

were followed on June 11 by a letter from Senator Lee Metcalf, the state's junior senator, supporting the half-and-half split and proposing delayed development. What Behan does not mention is that at that time Metcalf was a member of the Interior Committee of the Senate, the group which votes on and controls a great deal of public land legislation.

> . . . the existence of a consensus was beyond question. The office of the Regional Forester was flooded with letters and telegrams opposing the Long Range Plan. For more than two months following the April 19 meeting, for that matter, there was not one single written expression received supporting it. Senator Metcalf had deliberately sought a consensus: As early as March 18 he had queried the Western Pine Association seeking the potential opposition to the Wildlife and Wilderness groups and apparently found it lacking.[8]

On June 14 the Forest Service modified its plan slightly to shorten one road and to delay construction of a part of another road for several years. The Forest Service had not been listening. The only support for the plan, and that was in favor of the unmodified plan, came late in June when the president of a lumber company wrote to Senator Mike Mansfield, Montana's senior senator, then the majority whip of the Senate, and within a few short months to become the Senate Majority Leader. Then:

> On June 28, the Lumber and Sawmill Workers' Union resolved in favor of "multiple use" of

---

[8]Ibid., p. 21.

> the Back Country. Having delivered these two quivers, the timber industry lapsed into apathy and silence once more. And the livestock and mining interests hadn't made--and didn't subsequently make--even this much fuss.[9]

This was the public input the Forest Service decisionmakers had on hand. They seemed to ignore it,[10] although the apparent overlooking of the public viewpoint may have been more in appearances than in actions, because development of the Lincoln Back Country subsequently was delayed several years.

Measuring the Conflict

In attempting to measure the commitment of the groups involved in the Lincoln Back Country controversy as reported by Behan we have several advantages over the decisionmakers of the time. In a sense we are Monday-morning quarterbacking with a knowledge of what happened throughout the conflict. We can look back and see things that may not have been apparent to the decisionmaker at the time. And, because we are drawing on a case study which has already limited the salient points of the controversy, our input is more limited than was that of the man on the spot. Items that should be worked into the matrix might not be mentioned in Behan's paper. Yet, it is obvious that with the knowledge born of hindsight,

---

[9] Ibid., p. 23.

[10] See Chapter III.

he has picked out the factors we wish to identify in a controversy, the very factors so important to a decisionmaker faced with conflict. The question we are attempting to answer is whether there is any objective way the decisionmaker on the spot could have identified the importance and the commitment factors of the public input and arrived at the same conclusions Behan has drawn from hindsight.

In this particular case, simpler than most that a decisionmaker may run into, we can essentially divide the public into those for and those against rather than attempting to break down those groups into their constituent parts. The reason for being able to work with these two groups is that for all practical purposes, the opponents can be lumped into what we can call "outdoor" groups, primarily sportsmen or sports-minded persons with a sprinkling of environmentalists. The backers are too few to be analyzed with any consistency.

Statements from those which supported the Forest Service plan are easily identified. As Behan reports the case there are three that need to be considered. Spokesmen for the Advisory Council said, "We feel it is a good plan and that it should be carried out."[11] As mentioned above, one lumberman expressed opposition to locking up the Lincoln Back Country forever and the lumber workers union

---

[11]Behan, op. cit., p. 8.

resolved in favor of the "multiple use" of the Back Country. In addition, Behan says, the original distribution of the plan brought replies in favor of the plan from a cafe owner in Lincoln who was a member of the Advisory Council; an advertising-public relations firm in Helena; a Helena District Judge; a Great Falls lawyer; a sawmill; the business manager of the Helena Chamber of Commerce; the manager of the Missoula Chamber of Commerce and a few others who seemed to favor the plan in a lukewarm manner.

As far as those who spoke in favor are concerned, the commitment seems to be internal although the chamber managers may be committing their membership to some extent. Reference groups seem at this point to play only a small role in determining degree of the commitment except for the lumberman and the member of the advisory group. The supporters of the Forest Service plan do not appear to be feeling defensive. Their language, mild in tone and with a lack of intensity in punctuation and little labeling or strong feelings expressed from within, reveals little commitment. Participation is limited. Continuity is strong since the reaction from most of these who speak on the issue is what can be expected from lumbermen, commercial interests and others generally in favor of development. In fact, some of the respondents appear to be offering signal reactions rather than well thought

out positions. These latter might include the lumbermen and the chamber managers.

In general, the reaction of the supporters of the plan, on a five-point scale in which one is a weak commitment and five is an intense commitment, would rank as a one or two in reference groups, perhaps as a one or two in defensiveness, because of signal reactions perhaps a three in language clues, a one in participation and a four in continuity. The resultant commitment for the supporters of the plan comes out essentially as slightly higher than a two. In other words, the first indication for the decisionmaker was that the support for the plan, at the beginning and throughout the controversy, was essentially luke-warm.

Now let us compare the commitments of the various groups at the various stages of the controversy. At the beginning, of course, with the presentation of the plan to the Advisory Council and its vote in August of 1962, there was little opposition to the plan. Even the luke-warm favoritism of the Advisory Council (a six-two vote in favor with four members not voting) balanced the scale in favor of the plan. But by March 1963, before the plan had been made public, opposition began. On March 13, came the letter cited earlier from the president of the United Sportsmen Association of Montana and on March 16 the letter from the president of the Jefferson-Madison Wildlife Association in which both opposed development of the

Back Country and requested a public hearing. Although the two letters were only a whisper at this time, there were clues in what Behan calls their categorical opposition to development. Based primarily on the language and on signal reactions, the opposition's commitment to its position should measure out at the level of a two without much more input. Already the level is equal and the question begins to center on numbers and importance. With the input the supervisor had, however, at this point, the importance factor of the proponents for numbers would be a five in relation to the opposition one or two. From past reactions, the political clout of the supporters is a four compared to the opponents' two. The decisionmaker was right in going on with his planning. From this point on, however, the situation begins to change. On March 27, the plan was presented to the meeting of the Lincoln Lion's Club attended by more than members of the club. Opponents were vocal and the Forest Supervisor wrote to his superior, "It is likely that requests for a public hearing will become irresistible."[12] At this point, the decisionmaker could have added a different figure into the calculation. He apparently knew the opposition would be strong. A new figure was needed for commitment and that should be at least a four. While we do not know from our source which of the various factors that affect commitment showed up at

---

[12]Ibid., p. 15.

the meeting, we do know that whatever they were, the supervisor measured them at a high level. The Regional Forester was also aware of the extent of the commitment as he wrote to Washington that the road construction was planned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and that he expected, "a continuing running fight on this subject."[13]

By April 10 the public meeting or hearing had been called for April 19. The meeting was attended by about 300 people, and the opponents felt that they were numerically strong enough that before the evening was over they had asked the chairman to call for a vote which was refused. As quoted before, Behan cites three particular statements made by opponents:

> One opponent simply said he was "not for or against the plan entirely," but he registered a mild protest. Another said quite caustically, "Opening up the Back Country and promising more work to the community is a fool statement." And a third invoked a sense of righteousness by stating, "People for the Plan are . . . here on expense accounts. The others speak from the heart."[14]

The decisionmaker can find a number of clues at this meeting. First, an estimate of the positions of the people attending can be made. Second, an estimate of the commitment can be made on the basis of salience and of language and of participation. Salience and participation

---

[13] Ibid., p. 16.

[14] Ibid., p. 17.

from the opposition seemed to be high that night. Although there were no clear-cut estimates of how the attendance at the meeting was split between supporters and opponents of the plan, it is possible to estimate that over half of those attending were in opposition. This estimate can be made from several levels. Lincoln is a small town, yet about 300 people attended the meeting, a large group for the size of the town. Some of these people may have been from out of town, yet drove to Lincoln for the night. In general, those most inclined to attend a meeting of this type are those in whom some form of strong feeling has been generated. Supporters of the plan had so far given little hint of strong feelings, but the language of the opponents quoted above contains more than hints of strong feelings. A second hint of the salience of the group in opposition was the call for a vote asked by the opposition. A third is the feeling of participation that would have been engendered by opponents attending up to and including the man who said he was not for or against the plan. Based on this estimate of size and salience, the reference groups of the opposition compared to the support should have been counted about a four.

The language used by the opponents was strong. Although the first speaker, who Behan says registered only a mild protest, gives no indication of a strong commitment to opposition, the next two Behan cites indicate strong signal reactions and strong intensional styles; in other words, they are using emotional words drawn from within

and not necessarily speaking from the facts. In the context of the meeting "a fool statement" and "expense accounts" are both language which involve labeling, signal reactions and speaking from within. In addition, the "fool statement" signals some defensiveness. The commitment of the two persons making these statements would have to be measured as a four or a five.

Behan cites a fourth speaker:

> "I wish to make it clear to everyone here," he said, "that I do not propose that the Lincoln Back Country be forever locked up as a wilderness. I understand the Forest Service's view that such timber as may be back there will eventually be needed to sustain the local economy, but I do not believe the need is urgent and immediate."[15]

This statement is calm and reasoned. The speaker's language is neither emotional nor uninvolved. The speaker indicates a willingness to compromise and perhaps even a willingness, in the last sentence, to be convinced that he is wrong. Perhaps his commitment level, when compared to the two cited before him, should be labeled a three. But the commitment of the opposition cited so far has rounded up to at least a four. And, because of the numbers of opposition that have developed, the importance factor has become at least a three. For the first time, the opposition seems to be stronger and more committed to its stand than the support.

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 17-18.

Certain elements introduced into the meeting may have played a part in obscuring the positions taken, Behan believes. He notes that the establishment of an equal time rule for supporters and opponents may have distorted the strength of the numbers involved. However, this difference should have become much more apparent after the meeting. One of the first indications of the strength of the opposition came when the Lincoln Back Country Protective Association held a recruiting campaign and swelled its members from a handful to 55 dues-paying members, an indication of at least four that the group could get the support of those not necessarily its members. In addition, the protective association drew strong support from sportsmen's groups throughout the State of Montana. Within a few short weeks after the meeting, the United Sportsmen of Montana, the Montana Wilderness Association, the Western Montana Fish and Game Association which Behan calls the largest in the state, and other groups and individuals were opposing immediate development. Most groups were supporting a delayed development by which the Lincoln Ranger District would be split into northern and southern areas. The northern area included the Back Country and would not be developed for at least ten years. The plan for the Back Country had run head-on into an expression of sentiment from the people that while not opposing eventual development did ask for a delay. In fact, the letters cited by Behan did not breathe fire. They were moderate and, in most cases,

do not per se indicate a strong commitment to the position taken if it could be proved the Back Country resources were needed immediately. Even the protective association, in a letter dated May 17, took a moderate stand:

> . . . The officers were directed by the membership to present the following plan to you and to request the courtesy of a definite answer within one week.
>
> This is a plan which we feel is workable and will better suit the needs of Lincoln and all interested Montanans than would the original plan which you offered recently. It is a compromise between the immediate all-out development on the one hand, and keeping the Lincoln Back Country permanently inviolate on the other. We propose that the Forest Service hold the area designated as the "Lincoln Back Country" in reserve together with all its resources, in an undeveloped state for the 10-year period ending July 1, 1973. The timber resources within this area should be retained in the timber inventory with a view to eventual logging and no reduction should be made in the allowable cut of timber on the Lincoln District, for these resources will still be there ten years hence and can be used if the demand for them exists at the time.[16]

The only language which might be considered to indicate a strong commitment is the phrase "to request the courtesy" which holds hints of a deep emotional feeling toward the Forest Service, speaking as it does from an internal feeling that hints of a belief that there has been a lack of courtesy. Were it not for a series of other letters sent to the Montana congressional delegation and the Forest Service during the same period, a decisionmaker

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

might overlook the commitment indication in this letter. Behan cites a letter from the president of United Sportsmen to Montana Congressman Arnold Olsen:

> It seems to me . . . as though the Forest Service has set itself apart as a bureaucracy and no longer believes it need be held accountable as an agency of the people.[17]

In other words, the commitment that was developing was not only to the idea of delayed development, but also to the concept that the Forest Service was unresponsive. Because of the intensional style of the language and the defensiveness of the tone of the letter commitment has to be rated high. At this point, coming up to mid-June, the opposition, or rather the proponents of delayed development in the Lincoln Back Country had a commitment that could be measured as over four, very near to five, while the supporters of immediate development were still around two. On the importance factor, sheer numbers would give the supporters of delayed development a measurement of three or four, perhaps a slight edge on the importance factor expressed by supporters of immediate development. In June, the supporters of delayed development obtained a boost in political clout. Senator Lee Metcalf, Montana's junior senator and a member of the Senate Interior Committee which votes on Forest Service projects and appropriations along with those of other agencies, identified and joined a consensus

---

[17] Ibid.

asking for delayed development. The power factor of the supporters of delayed development suddenly zoomed to a five.

Within a few days of Senator Metcalf's letter outlining his stand, immediate development received a blow in the form of support from a timber industry leader who felt the development plan should not be modified and from the lumber workers' union favoring multiple use. While these statements were essentially support for the Forest Service plan, neither used language or any other expression of strong commitment and, more importantly, neither indicated a strong need to counter delayed development. The immediate need of the industry, in other words, was not for the timber in the Back Country, as long as that timber was not locked away for good. The lumber industry indicated the importance level was not yet very high. On June 14, the Forest Service made a minor modification of its plan which delayed construction of some of its development roads for a short time. So unimportant did the change appear to the supporters of delayed development that they again accused the Forest Service of " . . . high-handed bureaucracy management . . ."[18] Again the language of the subsidiary issue seems to indicate a strong commitment to the primary position.

---

[18]Ibid., p. 23.

The Measurement

By mid-June, the public had essentially all been heard from. The decisionmaker, who has been measuring the input continuously, is now in a position to rank his measurement. On the commitment index for the support he gets something like this:

Commitment of Supporters

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | X | | | |
| Defensiveness | X | | | | |
| Language | | X | | | |
| Participation | | X | | | |
| Continuity | | | X | | |

The commitment index of the supporters of the plan will range in the area of two. Measurement of reference groups is based on the apparent strength of the groups, defensiveness and language on the extent appearing in the sources cited, participation based on the extent to which both lumber executives and laborers agree, and continuity on the knowledge that keeping forest land open for development is a long-time goal of the lumber industry.

If we put this on a chart as to intensity of commitment and duration it works out as follows:

Commitment of Supporters

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | X | | | |
| Duration of Commitment | | | X | | |

Obviously, the supporters of development are, at the moment, not deeply committed.

The importance factor for the supporters of the plan is something like this:

Importance of Supporters

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | X | | | |
| Political Clout | | X | | | |
| Needs Versus Impacts | X | | | | |
| Impacts | X | | | | |

If we chart these factors on the basis of the two power relationships, the amount and the need to use power, we see the following relationship:

Power of Supporters

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | X | | | |
| Need to Use Power | X | | | | |

At this point in time, the power of those who may support a decision for development is low. But, even more surprising, is that those who support development see a very small need

to stand behind a decision to open up the Lincoln Back Country for development. The duration factor under commitment above, indicates that this may change in the future, but right now the lumbermen and other developers don't need the resources of the Lincoln Back Country. To develop these points further we can see that the factor of numbers is low, not necessarily because sportsmen outnumber loggers but rather to indicate that very few lumbermen had any input and those who did appeared to be fewer than those of the sportsmen. Political clout of the supporters is low because three of the four members of the Montana congressional delegation were opposed to immediate development. The need to react is low because the supporters' objectives do not include the Back Country at this time and the impact figure is low because all concerned seemed to have taken a rational look at what is happening.

The general view is that commitment to the plan of developing the Lincoln Back Country immediately, the importance of it, and the need to take action are low for the supporters of development. The decisionmaker must be aware that this could change rapidly given a change in need on the part of the lumber or mining interests. But at the moment, which was mid-June, 1963, development of the Lincoln Back Country had little strong support from the members of the public most likely to benefit.

Now, let us look at the status of the opposition. A matrix for opponents might look something like this:

Commitment of Opponents

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | | X | |
| Defensiveness | | | X | | |
| Language | | | | X | |
| Participation | | | X | | |
| Continuity | | X | | | |

It is obvious from some of the letters cited in this chapter that reference groups are high in the minds of those speaking against development and for delay, that they feel they have been pushed into various corners by a failure of the Forest Service to respond, that the use of strong language indicates a strong emotional involvement and that there has been considerable participation by memberships in the development of decisions. Continuity may be said to be low only because some of the groups in the forefront of the opposition were formed over the one issue. But the groups seem much more committed, even when the measurement factors are conservative, to delayed development than do the supporters of development.

If we look at the intensity and probable duration of the commitment we get the following chart:

Commitment of Opponents

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | | X | |
| Duration of Commitment | | | X | | |

The intensity of the commitment is much higher than that of the supporters the decisionmaker may call upon for help, and the duration of commitment seems high enough that it will not dissolve immediately, probably not until any developmental work is completed.

What may be more revealing to the decisionmaker appears in the importance factors. The basic factors appear in the chart below.

Importance of Opponents

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | | X | | |
| Political Clout | | | | X | |
| Needs Versus Objectives | | | | | X |
| Impacts | | | | X | |

The opposition seems to be much stronger than the supporters because of numbers and the assistance of three-quarters of the congressional delegation. The need to react is much stronger, since the needs of those who support delayed development are diametrically opposed to immediate development. And the vision of the impact of the development upon the needs of the opposition seems highly rational.

Immediate development will have a strong impact on the Back Country. This may be charted as follows:

Power of Opponents

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Available Power | | | X | | |
| Need to Use Power | | | | X | |

Obviously, a decisionmaker willing to go against this group stands a good chance to have his decision overthrown.

The public is not the only factor which the decisionmaker must take into consideration. The decisionmaker must also consider what he feels is the proper management of the resource for its own sake. In the Lincoln controversy, the decisionmaker had to consider the impact of his final decision on the resource. But public input and public power were key factors if only that it seemed apparent the public might be able to swing a great deal of political influence to change the decision. In this case, the decisionmaker might have been wise to compromise, to curtail his plans for immediate development. In a sense, this is what happened. The District Ranger and the Forest Supervisor were both transferred within a year although not in connection with the Back Country controversy and the plan seemed to die, at least as far as consideration of immediate development was concerned. But the residue of the controversy was unfavorable to the agency even though the public seemed to have gotten what it wanted.

The result seemed more of an accident than a deliberate taking into consideration of public inputs. The Forest Service image was tarnished among outsiders. What could have been a positive relationship between agency and public left both sides with a sour taste.

Conclusion

As has been indicated in working through the measurement of an actual controversy surrounding a Forest Service proposal for a particular patch of forest land, the decisionmaker cannot make his measurements at a particular point in time and then stop. It must be an ongoing thing and measurements made at a particular point in time must be changed as the input changes. The whole balance in the Lincoln controversy could have been changed had either the lumber or mining industries had a strong need to develop the Back Country right away. The public consensus might still have sought to delay development, but there would have been much more need to carefully weigh the input. Lee points out that facts may be true only at one specific point in time. We may be close friends with one person in 1963 and by 1973 be close friends with another and drifted away from the first. To say that we are a close friend with the first person is not true unless we date it.[19] The input from the public may change in much the same way. The decisionmaker must be cognizant of this potential for change in facts.

---

[19]Lee, op. cit., p. 5.

What we have seen here is what might be called a formal taking of the public pulse. Such formal inputs must be made because of the need to allow all publics to speak on a certain matter. But perhaps more important, the members of the Forest Service and other governmental agencies involved with determining what the public wants must also operate on an informal basis. Measurement may be given to informal inputs in much the same manner as described so far. The basic difference is that it must be an ongoing thing relating to the needs of the community. If the District Ranger, for instance, had been talking with members of the community so that he was fully aware of their plans for the Lincoln Back Country and had been measuring the informal inputs he was receiving from them, the entire controversy might have been headed off before it developed because delay would have been built into the plan and the Back Country would have been recognized as a separate entity. This has been touched on by others[20] and is not properly a subject of this paper except as it touches upon the question of measurement of input from the public.

What the author has attempted to do is to give the agency decisionmaker a method of weighting the inputs he receives on both a formal and informal level so that he can look beyond the noise, beyond the images to discern

---

[20]Most notably by Bolle, op. cit.

the desires of the public. In this age of militancy and public involvement in the executive branch of government, the decisionmaker who cannot see through these veils will be handicapped. The one who can will be more successful in carrying out the wishes of the people on a local, state and national basis.

# CHAPTER XII

## SUMMARY

The social sciences--psychology, anthropology, history, sociology--are still in early stages. A great deal of what man does and why he does it is still unknown. But the sciences are making some advances, enough to begin theorizing about how man reacts to various stimuli. Theories can assist the manager to obtain indications of how the public or publics feel about any given proposal. For this discussion, I have limited the proposals to those involving public resources and, more specifically, to those involving the Forest Service.

The social scientists have identified some key factors in the way individuals commit themselves to positions on the various decisions confronting them. There seems to be an indication, for example, that each of us tends to filter "facts" we obtain through our image of what is or what we think should be in the world. Based on our image of the world we judge the facts as good or bad and become committed to that judgment. Most of the time, those of us who hold similar judgments band together to operate in various pressure groups. We take our stand as a group.

What that stand is depends to a great extent, it seems, upon a number of factors. The more effort we have to make to obtain membership in a given group seems to be a key determinant in how intensely we become committed to that group's stand. How strongly we identify ourselves with the group seems to be another key element. A third element seems to be the amount of participation we have in choosing the stand. The more participation the more intensely we seem to be committed. Certain other elements have also been identified as contributing to the intensity of a commitment. If we interpret an attack on our position as an attack on ourselves, then we become defensive and as a result we also become much more committed to our position. If the public stand to which we are committed is different from our basic, underlying beliefs we create a form of dissonance within ourselves which must be alleviated by changing one or the other. Certain factors such as external rewards and the amount of temptation to change are controlling factors in whether we change the public commitment or the belief. The more reward we receive to change our commitment, the weaker the new commitment; the more tempted we are to change, the stronger the commitment we make. A key to the strength of our commitment is the time it has lasted. If we have had a long-term commitment to a goal, then the degree in which our commitment on a specific issue coincides with our long-term commitment can pinpoint the intensity of our issue commitment. The closer the fit, the stronger the commitment.

The intensity of commitment is an internal thing. But there are a number of external clues which we present to the world concerning our commitments. A manager may use these external clues to determine the intensity of a group or individual commitment to a position on any public issue. Certain clues will take research to discover; others are evident in the manner in which a person dresses and speaks. Five major areas seem to have the most importance. These five are reference groups, defensiveness, language, participation and continuity. These are the areas selected to be the key factors in creating a matrix by which to measure the intensity of commitment.

Defensiveness usually is indicated through language. The language involved speaks to defending the "I" behind the position rather than the position. It may counter-attack using personalities rather than facts. The question for a decisionmaker is whether the speaker would retreat or change his position if he was not defensive. Language used by a spokesman in written or oral testimony at a hearing or in published material also indicates other factors. A speaker who, to use an extreme example, tags everything reactionary or communistic is using labels which really don't speak to the facts but may indicate a powerful reaction against the proposal.

Speakers also react to signals. Signals differ from labels in that a reaction to a signal happens instinctively, without thought, and may change, or at least weaken a commitment when more thought is given. The general outward clue to depth of intensity as signaled by language is the emotion expressed. The more calm and reasoned the statement--and here the decision-maker must look for labeling and signal reaction as clues to the reasoning process--the stronger the commitment may be in the longrun. Punctuation can also indicate commitment. Do words run together? Do they indicate strong emotions? What aspects of a statement does the speaker stress? Does the speaker indicate uncertainty as to the facts? All of the language clues point toward intensity of commitment. Emotions as expressed in language, however, may signal opposite things at the same time. Remember that anger, for instance, may indicate an intense commitment or one that is intense only at the moment. The decision-maker must look to the other clues for hints as to what the emotion does indicate.

Measurement

Measurement is seldom exact in the social sciences. Unlike oil or wheat or timber there is no absolute in the measurement of behavior. Quantities are always relative, either in relation to some reference point which is arbitrarily selected as a norm and does not exist in reality, or in relation to the same quality measured between several

groups. Social scientists have developed a scalar system of measurement, where qualities are measured against each other. Most of us have seen tests where we are asked if we like something strongly or a little, don't care, or dislike something strongly or a little. We have also seen tests where qualities are measured on an ascending scale in which the higher the choice the greater the quality being measured. There are other variations.

To measure the various factors involved in public input into decisionmaking I have established a five-point scale in which the factor being measured increases in intensity from one to five. Thus, a placing of the intensity of commitment at a five would indicate an intense commitment; a one would indicate little commitment.

The problem which most users of this system may face is in placing the input they have received from hearings and briefs into the context of measurement. To assist in placing the input into measurement factors, I have provided a format. Form 1 (Figure 1) guides measurement of the groups or individuals which have spoken out about an issue. Form 2 (Figure 2) allows comparison of the ratings of the various groups. By using both forms, a decisionmaker should be able to determine how committed any group or person is on an issue and how much power that group or individual can bring to sway the decision in the direction desired. Form 2 allows the decisionmaker to compare the

stands of the various groups or individuals speaking out so he may attain an indication of the overall impact of the decision as finally made.

Form 1--Measuring Public Input

The first item on this form is a definitive identification of the group or individual speaking. The second is the written identification of the position the group is taking. Is the group or individual for the proposal against the proposal or somewhere in-between? If we are to discriminate between public inputs, we must have an accurate picture of where each of the groups or individuals speaking on an issue stands.

The sheets you will fill out on input information should be extremely specific. If a statement written in as the answer to a question does not cite times, locations, numbers or other specific details, then you may not have the necessary information on which to rank each group. The more specific your information, the more likely you are to be able to rank the groups in proper relationship.

Intensity of Commitment

Section A of Form 1 seeks to measure the intensity of the commitment toward the stand taken. We will base our measurement of intensity of commitment on five factors: reference groups, defensiveness, language, participation and continuity.

Reference Groups: The importance of a spokesman's reference groups should not be underestimated. Which of many memberships does a spokesman represent? Does the group for which he is speaking appear to be uppermost in his thoughts? How long has it been since he has met with other members of the group for which he is speaking? Language can be an indicator here. Is the spokesman speaking the jargon of the group supposedly represented or of another group? Clothing, too, is a clue. Is the spokesman wearing the clothing of one group and speaking for another? Are other members of the group in the room? Another question for the decisionmaker to ask is how much difficulty the speaker had to go through to join the group. Membership need may determine commitment to the position expressed, both for the speaker and the general membership. Under "reference groups" in Section A questions are provided to help a decisionmaker arrive at answers which will help in assessing the contribution of this element in relation to intensity of commitment: What group appears to have the strongest control of what the speaker is saying? What group does his manner of dress most represent? What group does his manner and style of language and choice of words most represent? Are other group members present in the room when he is speaking? Has he met recently with other members of the group? How difficult was it for him to join this group? Do any other factors appear to contribute to the dominance of any particular group over another?

When answers have been ascertained to these questions, measurement of this factor becomes a matter of scaling the input. The more closely the answers indicate that the speaker is identifying with the group he represents, the more closely will the commitment expressed approach a five. In other words, the more bearing his reference groups seem to have upon his statement, the stronger his commitment to that statement.

Defensiveness: The questions on the form are: Does the speaker appear to be defensive? Does the language he uses appear to indicate that he has been challenged, or threatened? Does he seem to be labeling items rather than referring to them as individual events? Does his statement contain a great deal of personal references? Do any other factors appear which seem to indicate that he may be feeling defensive? A strong feeling of defensiveness may strengthen a commitment that would be weakened if the defensiveness was alleviated. But we must always speak of the now. On the form we are measuring the contribution which defensiveness makes to the intensity of commitment at the moment a statement is made. Therefore, the more the answers to the questions indicate defensiveness, the more nearly the measurement of intensity must be a five.

Language: Language is involved in all other clues. By itself it may indicate a depth of commitment its use in the other clues does not. Punctuation is important. Punctuation indicates a depth of anger, or commitment

that tone or word choice may not. Questions on the form are designed to illuminate language factors pointing toward intensity. Does the language appear to indicate depth of feeling? Does the spokesman speak in a casual voice or does he speak intently? Does he lean forward? Does his punctuation indicate an emotion such as anger? Do his word choices indicate a precision indicating a factual approach, or an angry approach? Does he label? Labeling is difficult to define as to its relationship to commitment. Labeling is a phenomena which indicates sufficient thought was not given to the facts. However, it is extremely difficult to change an individual's mind once a label has been given because he may be unable to see the facts except as they are filtered through the label. Therefore, labeling may indicate a stronger depth of commitment. Personal references in the statement point to defensiveness. The more personal references, the more the language points to a strong commitment. Are there any other factors in language which may point toward intensity of commitment? The greater the intensity of each of these answers, the more the measurement of intensity of commitment should approach five.

Participation: Participation involves a feeling of a membership that it has had a chance to have a say in the taking of a stand. The decisionmaker must try to uncover the extent of that participation. How much participation does the speaker say has been involved? What was the type

of participation? If the members voted, what was the vote? If the executive board made the decision, what was the basis for it doing so? Had the membership adopted a general policy which was being followed? What indications are there that the membership will back up its spokesman? Under what conditions? Does the need to belong to this particular group have any effect upon participation? The greater the participation, the greater the commitment of the individual members of the group, including the spokesman. The more participation in the selection of a position, then, the more closely the ranking must approach a five.

Continuity: Does there appear to be continuity with other positions taken in similar instances by the group or individuals speaking? How closely does the position relate to previously taken positions? Does the position appear to be contradictory to previously established positions? In what way? How long has the group been established? How long do I believe the group will continue to exist? What is my basis for thinking so? Are there any other factors which would indicate a short or long-term run for this group's position?

It is possible the elements selected to measure intensity of commitment may not have equal weight. However, the state of the art is such that at the present time, we must consider them equal. At the bottom of Form 1, Section A, we measure intensity of commitment by adding the measurement for each of the factors and dividing by five.

A group that had all ones on individual clues would end up with a measurement of one on overall intensity of commitment. A group which had all fives would end up with a five indicating a high intensity of commitment. Very few groups involved in an issue at all will come out on the low end of the scale. However, some groups may not come out as high as the decisionmaker might expect.

Intensity of commitment is a measurement of how a group feels about a particular position it has taken or a proposal it or others have made. Before a decisionmaker can consider a commitment significant, however, he must consider how long that commitment will last. If a person knows, for instance, that a bridge will only support his weight for five minutes before it collapses, he may well want to get off the span sometime before four minutes and fifty-nine seconds have elapsed. If a public says it wants something, a decisionmaker may want to be aware if that public is likely to change its mind in the future. Section B of Form 1 is an attempt to guide a decisionmaker to a measurement of the likely duration of a commitment.

Duration of Commitment

Some of the same factors used to measure intensity of commitment will be used to measure duration. To estimate duration of commitment, we will use the rankings for the elements of reference groups, defensiveness and participation. All give some indication of duration. The fact that the commitment is strong and that the spokesman is

totally committed to his group and his group seems totally committed to its position may indicate that the commitment would last for some time. The more defensive the position, the more participation that has taken place, the longer we might expect the commitment to endure. However, the prime factor in duration is continuity. Continuity must be given a heavier weight than the other factors. Use the same questions as we did in Section A. How long has the group been established? What were its previous stands in similar circumstances? How does the present stand reflect the general policies? The weight of continuity in determining duration probably outweighs the other three factors together. To give proper weight to continuity, let us multiply it by three, add it to the other factors' assessment and divide by six. Thus, a group which seemed to have a one under reference groups, a two for defensiveness and a three for participation, but had a five under continuity, would come up with a four in the probable duration of its commitment. The indication would be that a less intense commitment, at that point of measurement, would be a long-range thing.

Now we may combine the results of Sections A and B on one chart to get an overview of the group's commitment. A group which measures a strong commitment with short duration may reflect the public's desire to a lesser extent than a group which has a long-term but less intense

commitment. The public could come to share the lesser commitment over a period of time.

The Power Factors

The decisionmaker cannot make a decision just on what the public says it wants. The decisionmaker must also consider the effect of the decision upon the resource. There may be times when the public is wrong in how it believes the decision will affect its goals. The decisionmaker may have to make a decision that he knows is not what the public says it wants. At such times, however, the decisionmaker must know how much power the public has available to change the decision and how strongly it will feel it has to use that power. No matter how strongly the decisionmaker feels he must go against what the public says it wants, there may be little reason to do so if the public has the power and the need to change that decision. It may be more effective to compromise in an effort to maintain the good points of the proposal or to mitigate the bad ones of the other choice.

Power is related to the numbers involved in a commitment and to the political clout of those committed. Numbers determine effective strength in such areas as the ballot box. Political clout or influence determines effective strength in such areas as legislatures, capitols and city halls. In a sense, numbers refer to group strength while political clout relates to strength applied to a sensitive area. Each must be studied if a decisionmaker

is to make a fair assessment of how much power can be brought in the long and short runs to change a decision. Let us look now at Section C of Form 1.

Numbers: Gross numbers are the totals of all individuals believed committed to each side to a greater or lesser extent. Effective numbers refer to those each side may count upon to support its position in a test of strength. To determine the difference between gross and effective numbers the decisionmaker must look to habit patterns, cultural differences and membership needs. Habit patterns are related to history. How have the groups acted in the past? What is the membership of the group? How many members will support the stand? How many members will vote? How persuasive is the group among nonmembers? Has the group ever been called upon to marshall its forces? What happened? Do the members support the leadership? Cultural patterns are related to habit patterns. Certain cultural groups in our society, the poor and ethnic minorities in particular, have shown a limited ability to get their members to the polls. Others such as the working middle class (labor unions) have been able to show an effective solidarity election after election. Membership need is a third important factor. A group open to anyone who will pay the dues has a more limited strength than one whose membership is highly selective so that members had to make a great deal of effort to join. The latter's members are much more likely to support the group

stand. The decisionmaker begins with gross numbers and allows for the other factors to determine effective numbers.

The less effective the group appears to be at arousing its members the lower it will score on the five-point scale. A group with few gross numbers but greater effectiveness may rank higher than a group with a larger number of members which has shown less effectiveness in getting its members to support the group position. Numbers basically relate to tests at the polls. On many issues, however, there is no test of brute strength. The question of effective power hinges on the amount of influence the group or individual may bring to bear.

Political clout is more refined than numbers. It is the ability to use power at the point where it can be most useful. A group or an individual with an interest in legislation before Congress, for example, can be said to have political clout if congressmen are among its allies. The extent of this influence depends both upon the numbers of its allies in Congress and the position of these allies. An ally who heads an important congressional committee for instance, will wield more influence in that body than a first-term representative. The extent of political clout depends to a great deal upon numbers; that is, a group or individual supported by large numbers has a better chance of electing its allies to influential positions, or at least influencing them. The decisionmaker

hoping to get a readout on power available must ask himself questions about the allies each group calls upon or has been able to call upon in previous situations. What is the political rank of avowed supporters? Of lukewarm supporters? If a politically powerful person spoke for this group did he hedge his support? Has this group ever been tested in a political situation? What happened? How do opposing political forces rank? In other words, what we're looking at is how powerful each group's allies are. How do they rank in relation to each other? Have any recent changes affected those allies? When you have answered those questions you will have an indication of how much political clout each group has and to what extent each group will be able to change a decision.

The form of power to weigh most heavily in any given issue depends upon a determination of the duration of the effect of the decision. When the effects will exist only for a short period of time that does not include an election, political clout may be the most important. When the duration of the results of a controversial decision will last for a longer period of time during which an election will occur, numbers may be the key to the power available. Numbers of course always play a role in determination of political clout since an elected representative will normally be sensitive to numbers. Political clout may have long-term effects in limiting the effect of numbers. In American politics, however, issues which

normally should have short-term effects sometimes surface to haunt the electorate and/or the candidates during a campaign. For that reason it is extremely difficult to weigh power factors separately.

If we are attempting to weigh public input, political clout will give an indication of how immediately the group will affect a decision. If it is our effort to determine how the public feels about an issue, we must look at numbers. The decisionmaker must weight the two power factors equally to arrive at an indication of the power available to a group. He must be aware, however, that to some extent each of the factors, numbers and clout, relate to duration and must be understood in that respect as elements of the total image of the power available to a group or individual.

Need to Use Power

There is still another aspect of public input that must be taken into consideration. How important will it be for the group or individual to use its power? A group or individual may have a deep, long-term commitment to a position. But the specific decision being considered may not be important enough to cry "wolf" about. In some cases, the decision under consideration may be in line with what the group wants, or only slightly different. In this case, the group or individual may have a great deal of power but find it unnecessary to use that power. The decisionmaker may find the group or individual as allies for the proposal.

Two factors to be considered seem elemental but may be overlooked. The two factors are the distance between the objectives of the proposal and the needs of the group or individual, and the actual impact the proposal will have. The needs of the group or individual compared to the objectives of the proposal are important because the distance between them will form the basis for the reaction of the group or individual. At times the proposal will be extensively different in objectives and methods from the needs of the group. At other times the proposal may fit in well with the needs of the group but the methods proposed may be contrary. Sometimes the decisionmaker may be able to find a compromise that will satisfy him and yet decrease the distance between the group's needs and the decision to the extent that the group will not need to react. At other times, the decisionmaker's estimate of the distance will indicate what reaction he may expect from any given decision.

Impact differs from needs versus objectives in that it must be based on rational calculations of the consequences. What will be the economic impact? What will be the emotional impact? How many people will be affected by the decision? Do the groups speaking on the proposal have a rational viewpoint of the impact? If the groups do not have a rational viewpoint of what will happen, if they have foreseen impossible consequences, then their need to react will become less as that becomes obvious. While an irrational

view of the impact upon their values by the group speaking may create a strong immediate reaction, the reaction may weaken with time. An unrealistic view that would indicate a lesser need to react would receive a lesser ranking than a realistic view.

Needs Versus Objectives: What are the objectives of the proposal? What are the asserted needs of the group? What would need to be done to reconcile the proposal to the needs of the group or individual? These three questions should satisfy our measurement. If we know the objectives of the proposal and the needs of the group then we measure the distance between them. If the proposal would need little or no change to fit within the needs of the group then the score would be low on the scale. If the proposal would require reversal to meet the needs then the ranking would be high. On the second point, impact, the questions are similar. What do we believe the decision will cause to happen? What are the reasons behind each position? Which appears most valid? How far apart are the beliefs in the short term? In the long term? The distance between the beliefs is what we measure on the scale. A short distance is a low score, a great distance is a high score. Add up the factors, and divide by two to determine the need to use the power available.

Form 2--Ranking Public Inputs

By determining strength and duration of commitment, the power available and the need to use power, we can get an image of what each group is saying and how well it represents the amorphous collective known as the public interest. Form 2 is an effort to weigh the various groups which have spoken on an issue to see which group or groups may be the most powerful, or which group may speak for the largest segment of the public. At this time, we have a picture, somewhat in focus, of what the public may feel and how it will react to the implementation of a given proposal.

Weaknesses

When you are working with the forms in an effort to rank opposing groups as to the extent of their commitment and the power they have to enforce that commitment, certain factors must be kept in mind. The chief factor is that this is not an absolute method. It depends to a great extent upon the quality of the information which you put into it. Most administrators are sincerely trying to read what the public wants. But many of us tend to be so overwhelmed by the necessity to sort out so many voices of the public that we are unable to determine what the public wants. We may feel it is impossible to read the public mind. As long as we feel this way, we will be discouraged in our efforts to use the material presented here and, if we do,

may be tempted to use general rather than specific statements. We must do the proper research to insure the quality of our information.

Certain other weaknesses adhere to the method of measurement. A period of time will always exist between the time statements are made and the moment that the decisionmaker will attempt to put the information into the measurement device. During this interval, positions may change either because of successful attempts at persuasion or because other conditions change. The decisionmaker must try to keep up with the various changes. In addition there is a weakness inherent in the method of measurement. No matter how objective the information a decisionmaker has, a certain amount of subjective opinion comes into the rankings of each group against another. The decisionmaker must guard against letting his opinion of one group or another sway his judgment as to how they rank. The most important weakness in the measurement system lies in the state of knowledge concerning human behavior.

We know that there appears to be a number of factors which influence the beliefs of individuals and groups and determine how they act in given situations. What we cannot really be certain of, yet, is how these various factors react with each other. What is the most important factor in determining commitment? What is the most important factor in changing someone's mind? We

don't know. And, as a result, in attempting a measurement such as this we may be in the position of assigning each factor the same weight when, in fact, one should be weighted to a much greater extent than others. Experience in the use of this system may indicate enough information to warrant changing weights. But, at the moment we can't do that. We do know, from studying the sample case histories that a decisionmaker who attempts to use the system in good will should arrive at an estimate of the various factors that point to how the majority of the publics affected by a possible decision feel about that decision. But we must remember that it is a relative, ever-changing estimate and not one that is based on absolutes.

Conclusion

By using various factors which are known to relate to the intensity and duration of a group's commitment to a position on an issue, I have developed a tentative method of ranking those commitments to some extent so that a decisionmaker in a government agency can have some idea as to what the public believes and wants in a given situation. There are certain weaknesses inherent in the system; it will not provide an absolute answer. We must remember that any estimate will be good only for that point in time at which it is made.

There is no doubt in my mind that we will be able to refine the attempt contained here as more knowledge about the dynamics of group and individual commitment and

interaction becomes available within the future. Perhaps the brightest vision of the future comes from the popular press. There, amidst the novels of disillusionment, we can find a large number of popular books on the actions of men and women. We can be sure, I believe, that when such books are assuming best-seller proportions among the general population that there will be increasing support for research into the actions of groups and individuals. The answers we need to create a more refined method of making decisions on public input may be forthcoming from the increased support for basic knowledge of any kind. In the meantime, we use the tools which we have in hand, always with an awareness that we are working with a crude instrument.

Table 1. Form 1--Measuring Public Input.

---

Organization or individual speaking_____

Position asserted_____

SECTION A: Intensity of Commitment

(Answer all questions as specifically as possible.)

Reference Groups:

What is the speaker's primary reference group?_____

---

What group appears to have the strongest control of what the speaker is saying?_____

What group does his manner and style of language and choice of words most represent?_____

Are other members of the group present?_____

---

Has the speaker recently met with other members?___

---

Did the speaker have difficulty joining the group?

---

Do other factors indicate dominance of one group over another?_____

How closely does the speaker appear to identify with the group he represents? 1 2 3 4 5

Table 1 (cont'd).

Defensiveness:

Does the speaker appear to be defensive? In what ways?

_____

Does the language he uses appear to indicate he has been threatened?_____

Does he seem to be labeling?_____

Does the statement contain a great deal of personal references?_____

Does the speaker appear threatened? 1 2 3 4 5

Language:

Does the language appear to indicate depth of feeling?

_____

Does the speaker speak casually or intently?_____

_____

Does he lean forward as he speaks?_____

Does his punctuation indicate an emotion such as anger?

_____

Do word choices indicate a precision indicating a factual approach?_____

Indicating anger?_____

Does the speaker label?_____

Are there large numbers of personal references?____

_____

Do other factors in language indicate intensity?

_____

Does language indicate commitment? 1 2 3 4 5

Table 1 (cont'd).

Participation:

How much participation does the speaker say was involved?_____

What was the type of participation?_____

_____

If the members voted, what was the vote?_____

_____

If the executive board made the decision, on what authority?_____

Has the membership adopted a general policy?_____

_____

Will the membership support the spokesman?_____

Under what conditions?_____

Does membership need affect participation?_____

How much participation took place? 1 2 3 4 5

Continuity:

Does there appear to be continuity with past positions?

_____

How closely does the position relate to past positions?

_____

Does the position appear to contradict previous positions?_____

In what way?_____

How long has the group been established?_____

_____

How long do I believe the group will exist?_____

Table 1 (cont'd).

What is my basis for that belief?_____

What other factors may affect long or short-term continuity?_____

_____

How closely does the position approach past positions?

1 2 3 4 5

INTENSITY OF COMMITMENT

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | | | |
| Defensiveness | | | | | |
| Language | | | | | |
| Participation | | | | | |
| Continuity | | | | | |

Add all figures, divide by 5 to calculate intensity.

1 2 3 4 5

SECTION B: Duration of Commitment

DURATION OF COMMITMENT

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reference Groups | | | | | |
| Defensiveness | | | | | |
| Participation | | | | | |
| Continuity | | | | | |
| Continuity | | | | | |
| Continuity | | | | | |

Add all figures, divide by 6 to calculate duration.

1 2 3 4 5

Table 1 (cont'd).

SECTION C: Power

Numbers:

What is the total number of supporters each group claims?_____

Have the members supported the group in the past?

_____

How many members will vote?_____

How persuasive has the group been among nonmembers?

_____

What happened in previous tests?_____

_____

What habits do the members of the group exhibit in the use of power?_____

How important is membership to the members?_____

_____

How effective is the group in marshaling support?

1 2 3 4 5

Political Clout:

Who does the group claim as allies?_____

_____

What political rank do supporters hold?_____

_____

Were political supporters strong advocates of the group stance?_____

How has the group fared in previous decisions?_____

_____

Table 1 (cont'd).

How does the political influence of this group rank when compared to that of others speaking on this issue?

_____

Have any recent changes affected political influence?

_____

To what extent will the group be able to bring political influence to bear to change the decision?

1 2 3 4 5

THE POWER AVAILABLE

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbers | | | | | |
| Political Clout | | | | | |

Add both figures, divide by 2 for power ranking.

SECTION D: Need to Use Power

Needs Versus Objectives:

What are the objectives of the proposal?_____

_____

What are the asserted needs of the group?_____

_____

What would need to be done to reconcile the proposal to the needs of the group or individual?_____

_____

What is the relative amount of distance between objectives and needs? 1 2 3 4 5

Table 1 (cont'd).

Impact:

What do I believe the proposal will cause to happen?

_____

What does the group believe the proposal will cause to happen?_____

What are the reasons behind each position?_____

_____

Which position appears most valid?_____

How far apart are the beliefs in the short term?____

_____ In the long term?_____

What is the relative amount of distance between the beliefs? 1 2 3 4 5

NEED TO USE POWER

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Needs Versus Objectives | | | | | |
| Impact | | | | | |

Add both figures, divide by 2 for ranking of need to use power.

Evaluation:

(NAME OF GROUP)

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intensity of Commitment | | | | | |
| Duration of Commitment | | | | | |
| Power | | | | | |
| Need to Use Power | | | | | |

Table 2. Form 2--Ranking Public Inputs

Take rankings from Form 1.

INTENSITY OF COMMITMENT

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Name of Group) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

DURATION OF COMMITMENT

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Name of Group) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

POWER

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Name of Group) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

NEED TO USE POWER

| Value | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Name of Group) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Conclusions:

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

_____. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin and Dorsey, 1962.

Aronson, Elliot and Mills, Judson. "The Effect of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. 2d ed. New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

Barlund, Dean C. and Haiman, Franklyn S. The Dynamics of Discussion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Behan, R. W. The Lincoln Back Country Controversy, A Case Study in Natural Resource Policy and Administration. Unpublished study, University of Montana, 1963.

Blaisdell, Donald C. American Democracy Under Pressure. New York: The Ronald Press, 1957.

Bolle, Arnold W. "Public Participation and Environmental Quality," Natural Resources Journal. July 1971.

Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image, Knowledge in Life and Society. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1969.

Chodorkoff, Bernard and Chodorkoff, Joan. "Perceptual Defense: An Integration with Other Research Findings," The Journal of General Psychology, LVIII (1958), 75-80.

Coch, Lester and French, J. R. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. 2d ed. New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

Cotter, Cornelius P. ed., Practical Politics in the United States. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Festinger, Leon. "Behavioral Support for Opinion Change," Public Opinion Quarterly. XXVIII (1964), 4040-418.

_____. "Cognitive Dissonance," Approaches, Contexts, and Problems of Social Psychology. Edited by Edward E. Sampson. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Fisher, Seymour; Rubenstein, Irvin; and Freeman, Robert W. "Effects of Immediate Self-Committal in a Continuous Social Influence Situation," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), 200-207.

Gibson, Dr. Duane. "Small Group Interaction, Sociology 448." Class Notes, Michigan State University, January 1973.

Hobart, E. M. and Hovland, C. I. "The Effect of 'Commitment' on Opinion Change Following Communication," American Psychologist, IX (1954), 394.

Homans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Hart, David K. University of Washington, talks about "participatory democracy," but offers no method or discussion on one. (See "Theories of Government Related to Decentralization and Citizen Participation," Public Administration Review, XXXII, October 1972.

Jennings, Dr. E. E. "Management 806." Class Notes, Michigan State University, November 1972.

Kelley, Harold H. "Salience of Membership and Resistance to Change of Group Anchored Attitudes," cited in Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research. Edited by Herbert H. and Eleanor Singer. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Kolz, Daniel; McClintock, Charles; and Sarnoff, Irving. "The Measurement of Ego Defense as Related to Attitude Change," Journal of Personnel, IIV (1957), 465-474.

LaPiere, Richard T. "Attitudes vs. Actions," Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Edited by Martin Fishbein. New York: Wiley and Company, 1967.

Lee Irving J. Language Habits in Human Affairs. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1941.

Lewin, Kurt. "Group Decision and Social Change," Readings in Social Psychology. Edited by Eleanor E. Mccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley. 3d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1958.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1961.

Maier, Norman R. F. Problem-Solving Discussions and Conferences: Leadership Methods and Skills. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1963.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1960.

Rokeach, Milton. "Attitude Change and Behavior Change," Public Opinion Quarterly. XXX (1966), 529-550.

Rosenbaum, Milton E. and Zimmerman, Isabel M. "The Effect of External Commitment on Response to an Attempt to Change Opinions," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIII (1959), 247-254.

_____, and Franc, Douglas E. "Opinion Change as a Function of External Commitment and Amount of Discrepancy from the Opinion of Another," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXI (1960), 15-20.

Ruddock, Ralph. Roles and Relationships. New York: Humanities Press, 1969.

Sappenfield, Bert R. Personality Dynamics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Schachter, Stanley and Hall, Robert. "Group Derived Restraints and Audience Persuasion," Human Relations, V (1952), 397-406.

Schubert, Glendon. The Public Interest. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960.

Select Committee of the University of Montana. A University View of the Forest Service, S. Doc. No. 115, 91st Congress, 2d Session (1970), 2-3.

Simon, Herbert. "Recent Advances in Organization Theory," Research Frontiers in Politics and Government. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1955.

Stieglitz, Harold. "Barriers to Communication," Business and Industrial Communication: A Source Book. Edited by Charles Redding and George A. Sanborn. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

Truman, David B. The Governmental Process. New York: Knopf, Alfred A., 1959.

United States Code Annotated. West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Vohs, John L. and Garrett, Roger L. "Resistance to Persuasion: An Integrative Framework," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 32, 1968, 449.