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Abstract

Vancouver Island's old growth temperate rainforest has been the focal point in the conflict between environmentalists and forestry workers. While a substantial body of sociological literature exists on participants in the environmental movement (EM), there is a dearth of literature on participants in anti-environmentalist countermovements. Share Our Resources of Port Alberni (Share) is a countermovement organization that emerged to act as a voice for forestry workers and resource dependent communities and to counter the 'misinformation' being spread by environmentalists. The conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their collective identity – an collective identity characterized by a core of pro-industry, pro-community and anti-environmental sentiments.

This thesis addresses two research questions: First, what are the underlying differences between members of the two movements with respect to their socio-demographics, values, networks, and collective identities? Second, if certain factors are important in explaining identification with the EM, then what factors are important in explaining identification with Share.

Using bivariate correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis, three sources of data are analyzed: self-administered questionnaires sent to both Share (N=129) and EM members (N=381); and a telephone survey of the general public of Port Alberni (N=100). My results show that Share respondents are predominantly older, working class men employed in the forest industry without a great deal of formal education. Share members more highly value anthropocentrism and are more politically conservative. Identification with the forest industry is the strongest and most significant predictor of identification with Share. The most theoretically interesting and surprising finding is that out-group ties or ties to environmentalists, is a positive and statistically significant predictor of identification with Share.
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CHAPTER 1: THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction
Forestry has played a dominant role in the development of Canada. This is not surprising since 53% of our country's total land area is covered by forests. Forests fall under provincial jurisdiction (94% of forest land is publicly owned) and are dominated by large international companies that hold the harvesting rights. While approximately 46 million of the roughly 416 million hectares of forest land have been set aside for wilderness (about 11%), 112 million hectares are classified as commercial, meaning they are productive and accessible for harvest. (Marchak 1995). British Columbia contains a substantial portion of the world’s remaining old growth temperate rain forest. The revenue generated by the exploitation of this precious resource is also the backbone of the Provincial economy (Marchak 1983, 1995). In the 1970s, B.C. accounted for 40% of Canada’s total forestry export dollars (Marchak 1983; Sopow 1985). Ten percent of the B.C.’s labour force was directly employed in the forest industry and forestry accounted for over 60% of B.C.’s total exports (Marchak 1995). Many British Columbians believed the supply of this “lush green gold” (Marchak 1995: 85) was inexhaustible.

While communities whose economies are based on resource extraction industries have typically been characterized by cycles of “boom and bust”, the extent and effect of the recession that began in the 1980’s was unexpected. The forest industry had moved from fordism to flexible specialization in their harvesting and processing technologies (see Barnes and Hayter, 1992) and new products and markets formed the basis of a wood products sector restructuring. Technological change typically benefited larger companies during the boom periods and in turn, unemployment rates were minimized as long as the larger economy was robust. However, the rate and type of change experienced in the 1980s and 1990s had a more profound impact on both workers and forest companies. In attempting to overcome the 1980s recession, industry downsized management and production crews, as well as lowered overall production rates. While providing some temporary relief, the recession resumed in the 1990s, and resulted in the exodus of many forest companies, as well as the closure or sale of mills. As Marchak (1995) shows, the
international forest companies that dominated the industry typically did not invest in new plants that would produce higher value-added wood products, but rather began to diversify their products to enter the attractive and more lucrative Asian markets.

Industry assured British Columbians that the crash of the 1980’s was not long term, but rather a cyclical downturn typical of the resource industry. As the recession became more entrenched, industry began to blame the cost of labour, as well as the actions of environmentalists. When the recession continued in the 1990s and structural changes were undertaken, it was finally acknowledged that the dwindled forestry resource base due to clear cutting (the historically preferred method of timber extraction) and inadequate replanting had resulted in harsh consequences - forestry, as it had been practiced throughout the century, was no longer profitable – or even possible.¹ As Marchak (1995:86) notes, all participants in this process were damaged, but unions and labour bore the brunt of both the depression and restructuring which occurred between 1980 and 1995. The burden of these changes was particularly felt in coastal communities such as Port Alberni (Hayter, Barnes and Grass 1993; Marchak 1995; Broadhead 1984), in which the Share group that forms the focus of this thesis, emerged.

Social and economic hardships continue to plague the community of Port Alberni. Recent figures from BC Stats (2000) examining economic disparity across the province, show that the Alberni-Clayoquot region was the worst off with respect to socio-economic conditions. The Alberni-Clayoquot regional district stands out as the region with the most severe socio-economic problems - economic, health, education, crime, youth and children. Further in 1999, the Alberni Local Health Area (LHA),² ranked the fourth worst LHA in the province in terms of set of social indicators. The most severe social concerns for the area include mental health issues as measured by suicide/homicide rates. Also of concern are negative factors that affect children and youth, namely, a high

¹ Known as the falldown effect. Industry uses this term to describe the lower volumes available from second growth timber stands in which large, older trees have been replaced by younger trees with smaller volumes of wood. Falldown is sometimes also refer to as the basic decline in timber harvesting that has resulted from of over-harvesting at a rate that exceeds its ability to replace itself within reasonable investment time frames (Clapp 1998).
² Has the same geographic boundaries as the Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District.
incidence of children living in families on income assistance, children living in care and high juvenile crime rates. BC Stats (2000) concludes that the 1999 data indicates that there appears to be no signs of improvement.

On the West Coast of Vancouver Island, the ensuing debate and conflict between environmentalists wanting to save and defend the ecological integrity of the remaining old growth temperate rainforest and forestry workers fighting to protect the economic base of their communities, exploded in the early 1990s. Environmentalists stepped up their efforts using a variety of tactics such as the publication and distribution of educational flyers, demonstrating on the lawns of the BC Provincial Legislature, tree sitting, petition and letter writing campaigns, initiating legal actions against forest companies, occupying government and company offices and finally blockading logging roads to prevent forestry workers (and their machinery) from entering planned clear cutting areas.

Both local and national (and even international) media coverage of these events suggests that these tactics had significant impacts. These tactics have increased public awareness and support for the preservation/conservation of the remaining old growth temperate rainforest on Vancouver Island, helped preserve small areas of wilderness, delayed logging operations in other areas of the island, and helped facilitate the establishment (by the Provincial NDP government) of a Commission of Resources and Environment (CORE) to develop a systematic plan for land use in the Province (Tindall 1994, Marchak 1995). As a result of the successes of environmentalists and the environmental movement, a countermovement began to emerge on the West Coast of Vancouver Island. Known as Share Our Resources of Port Alberni, 3 forestry workers, their families and supporters organized to protect forestry jobs and the livelihood of their communities and finally, to combat the “misinformation” that was being spread by the environmental movement.

3 There are also other Share groups scattered throughout the Province.
The American Wise Use Movement
Share is similar to the Wise Use movement that emerged in the United States in the late 1980s (Helvarg 1997, 1994; Baum 1987; Echeverria and Booth Eby 1995; personal correspondence with Alx Dark Jan. 2000). Movement founders Alan Gottlieb, Ron Arnold, and supporters such as Charles Cushman and Grant Gerber declared war on environmentalists – a “holly war between fundamentally different religions. The preservationists are like a new religion, worshipping tress and animals and sacrificing people (Lewis 1995:16).” Preservationists, it was declared, are “anti-Christian and anti-scientific” and environmentalists are “pantheists, like the Druids” and organizations such as the Sierra Club practice “weird science and earth religions (Lewis 1995:16).” They believed that the only way to stop the environmentalists (and their success in lobbying for greater environmental regulation) and protect industry and private property was to create an activist movement. As Lewis (1995) notes, Arnold and Gottlieb believed that industry could not save itself by itself and only an activist movement could defeat an activist movement. The Wise Use campaign was founded on three main themes: the private-property movement; pro-jobs and economic development; and the multiple-use of federal lands.

At its core, the Wise Use movement has been described as a counterrevolutionary movement that defines itself in response to the environmental revolution (Helvarg 1994); the movement has its own social base, idiomatic language, support networks and ideological alliances on the Right. The Wise Use movement is also described as the Property Rights movement; not only are environmental constraints on private property deemed inappropriate, restraints on private use of public land and water are also frowned upon (Roush 1995). Movements members and supporters are diverse and range from unemployed loggers, to off-road motorcyclists, ranchers, corporate farmers, recreational developers, to top level industry and government officials. Using disaffection over environmental regulation and big government, the Wise Use Movement attempts to win the respectability for the argument to “protect jobs, private property and the economy by finding a balance between human and environmental needs” while simultaneously
advocating for a more radical “free-market environmentalism,” “privatization” and the deregulation of industry (Helvarg 1994).

As Roush (1995) and others found, many Wise Use movement groups have corporate support and in some cases, are only poorly camouflaged industry fronts. This is evidenced in a speech made by Ron Arnold to Canadian timber executives in 1989. Perhaps fuelling the creation of Share, he advised his audience not to take the (Wise Use) message directly to the public since the public may be weary of big business, but instead local, grassroots organizations should be organized to spread the message. Local citizens’ groups:

- Can do things the industry can’t. It can speak as public-spirited people who support the communities and the families affected by the local issue.
- Can speak as a group of people who live close to nature and have more natural wisdom than city people. It can provide allies with something to join, someplace to nurture that vital sense of belonging and common cause. It can develop emotional commitment among your allies. It can form coalitions to build real political clout. It can be an effective and convincing advocate for your industry. It can evoke powerful archetypes such as the sanctity of the family, the virtue of the close-knit community, the natural wisdom of the rural dweller and the many others I am sure you can think of.

In the Western United States, the Wise Use movement is concerned primarily with the protection of industrial and agricultural access to public lands and waters at below market costs, with the prime focus on timber, mining and grazing (Helvarg 1994; Ramos 1995). As will be shown is the case of Share, the core Wise Use constituency in the Western United States consists of workers and middle management in resource industries such as timber (and mining) whose jobs and livelihoods are endangered because of industry cutbacks, and fear that environmental protection results in job loss.

I will now turn to an overview of the objectives of my thesis. This succinct overview will be followed by a more detailed discussion of Share.
Thesis Objectives
While past research has examined the rise and characteristics of the environmental movement and its participants on the West Coast of Vancouver Island (Tindall and Begoray 1993; Tindall 1994) little attention has been paid to the emergence and characteristics of the anti-preservationist or countermovement organizations such as Share Our Resources of Port Alberni. The main objective of this thesis is to examine Share Our Resources of Port Alberni (Share) as a case of an anti-preservationist, countermovement organization. Using a cross-sectional survey design method, I examine Share as a case study in an instance of countermovement mobilization to explore whether the theoretical explanations for social movement mobilization are also useful in explaining participation in and identification with the countermovement.

Results from the survey conducted for my thesis show that while Share members understand that most job losses have occurred as a result of mechanization (42% completely or mostly agree), they also believe that industry job losses are a result of the actions of environmental groups (41% completely or mostly agree) and unnecessary environmental protection (52% completely or mostly agree). As in the Wise Use movement in the United States, Share has declared war on preservationists. As a result, the conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their collective identity – a collective identity characterized by a core of pro-industry, pro-community and anti-environmental sentiments. As Friedman and McAdam (1992: 156) state, collective identity of a social movement or in this case a countermovement organization such as Share is a “shorthand designation announcing status – a set of attitudes, commitment and rules for behaviour - that those who assume the identity can be expected to subscribe to.” Furthermore, what compels individuals to participate in movement activities is an individual’s desire to conform – through behaviour – to a cherished identity.5

5 I would like to stress that countermovement participation is subsumed in my discussion and analysis of collective identity in that respondents were participants in the countermovement at the time my survey was conducted. I would also like to note that I use the term collective identity interchangeably with the term identity.
Participation in and identification with Share is grounded on regional and class differences and a historical concern with external domination. In other words, class relations (the working class logger or mill worker and other forest industry workers versus the white collar professional making decisions about forestry jobs and/or 'welfare bums' blockading logging roads), regional identity (and sense of economic disparity and political inequities between their community and areas such as the Lower Mainland and Greater Victoria) have all contributed to the changing social dynamics of Port Alberni and the West Coast of Vancouver Island that gave rise to the mobilization of Share.

This leads to the two central research questions that guide this thesis. First, if the conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their (collective) identity, what then, are the underlying differences between members of the two movements with respect to their socio-demographics (age, education gender, class, region), socio-political values (political, attitudes toward the environment, materialist and post-materialist values), networks, and collective identity? In exploring these differences – and potential similarities – I hope that a more robust understanding of the conflict will be attained. To carry out this objective, this thesis will:

• Compare the profile of Share members with that of environmentalists;
• Examine the extent to which the membership of Share is representative of the general public of Port Alberni.

The second research question centres on Share as a countermovement. If certain factors are important in explaining identification with and participation in new social movements such as the environmental movement, then what factors are important in explaining participation in and identification with a countermovement organization such as Share? In an attempt to answer this question, I examine Share as a case of an anti-preservationist, countermovement organization to flesh out our understanding of the conflict over forestry and conservation on the West Coast of Vancouver Island, but also to expand on the body of countermovement literature. To carry out this objective, this thesis will:
• Examine Share as a case of a countermovement organization;
• Using regression analysis, examine what factors best explain participation in and identification with Share.

Now that my thesis objectives have been outlined, I will turn to a more detailed discussion and description of Share. While I had some difficulty in finding substantial material on the organization, I present the information I was able to gather from interviews with key countermovement organizers, as well as brochures and information packages given to me by Share and the Forest Alliance.

**Share Our Resources of Port Alberni**

*From the 1950s through the 1970s, Port Alberni earned the distinction of having one of the highest per capita incomes of all towns in Canada - and its wealth was directly related to forestry. MacMillan Bloedel was its central employer, with a pulp mill, a newsprint mill and sawmills. Logs came from all over Vancouver Island, from private forest lands (MacMillan Bloedel acquired early railway grant lands on the Island) and Crown lands. In the early 1980s, the town hit hard times. Newspaper headlines read “Hundreds of Forest Jobs Lost Forever” and “Hardtimes Never Worse.” There was a brief rally after that, but things did get worse in the 1990s. This time no one expects a reversion to the good times for forestry (Marchak et al., 1999:24)*

As evident from the Marchak et al. (1999) quote above, the history of Port Alberni is rooted in its strong connection to forestry. Albeit, this relatively small community (1996 census figures show a population of 18,468) is struggling to build a future after being hit hard by a downturn in the forest industry as just described in the introduction above (i.e., low prices for wood products, changing global markets, a reduced timber supply).

---

6 It was rather difficult to obtain material on Share B.C. as well as Share Our Resources of Port Alberni. The information provided was obtained during my field work in the summer of 1988. While working for Dr. D. B. Tindall, I interviewed founding members such as Mike Morton, and I also gathered pamphlets and other material obtained from the Share office in Port Alberni. In preparation for my thesis, I also gathered information from the Forest Alliance.
mechanization, etc.). Coupled with significant job losses due to these changes, the community also became entangled in the maelstrom of controversy over the logging of old growth temperate rainforests in Clayoquot Sound.  

In 1993, the Provincial New Democratic Party (NDP) government designated over two-thirds of Clayoquot Sound for logging. That summer, celebrities, tourists, loggers and citizens from across the province, the country and the world came to the area to protest the province’s decision. Over the course of the summer, over 850 citizens were arrested – unprecedented in Canadian history - for engaging in acts of civil disobedience; namely, blockading logging roads. During the blockades, there were direct, face-to-face interactions between protesters and forestry workers and their supporters. These confrontations sometimes erupted into violence.

In response – or so it would appear - to the blockades and protests, the provincial government has taken a number of steps over the last several years to preserve the integrity of Clayoquot Sound. The province established a Commission on Resources and the Environment, created a number of new parks on Vancouver Island, enacted new legislation regarding forest practices and implemented recommendations for the Clayoquot Sound Scientific panel.

While the NDP has taken steps to preserve the ecological integrity of the Clayoquot Sound, little has been done to ameliorate the conflict between environmentalists and forestry workers. Government’s changes to forest policy and the creation of new parks led to lay-offs for Port Alberni forestry workers. It was felt that the actions by government favoured environmentalists over the forest industry and forest communities. Not surprisingly then, these events strongly affected Port Alberni residents and relations between environmentalists and other community residents in Port Alberni continued to

7 The southern tip of Clayoquot Sound is roughly 90 minute drive from Port Alberni.
8 It should be noted that as this thesis is being written, the provincial government has made some legislative changes (Forests Statutes Amendment Act, 1998; Bill 34) in an attempt to ameliorate the conflict. Under the Jobs and Timber Accord and BC's Forest Action Plan, the government committed to design and pilot a new community forest tenure to increase the direct participation of communities and First Nations in the management of local forests and to create sustainable jobs.
intensify. In response to these series of events, Port Alberni residents – and forestry workers in particular – mobilized because it was felt that action needed to be taken. As a result, Share our Resources of Port Alberni was established.

Share Our Resources of Port Alberni is one of many countermovement organizations across B.C. known collectively as Share B.C. Incorporated in 1990, Share B.C. describes itself as a “coalition of community based Share groups” Share B.C.’s mission statement may be summarized as supporting and promoting the ideal of “sustainable development” based on the premise that “healthy communities” require a “solid economic base” which supports a “good quality of life” and the “integrity of the environment” must be maintained in realizing this goal. To this end, Share supports the concept of “shared – or consensus-based - decision making” and believes that the cost of achieving sustainable development should be “shared equitably”. While the precise number of Share members that currently exists is unknown, in the early 1990s, Share groups throughout the province claimed to have a collective membership in excess of 25,000.

Share emerged because it was felt that there was a lack of community involvement in disputes over conservation and development issues. In other words, Share emerged to be the collective voice for rural communities dependent on the use of natural resources. It was felt that they too must be afforded the opportunity to play a role in solving issues surrounding environment and resource use decision making – issues which they believed had typically involved only government, industry and environmental organizations.

Now that an introduction and overview of Share Our Resources of Port Alberni has been provided, I will present the general outline of the structure of my thesis before turning to the next chapter.

In Chapter Two, I present the theoretical concepts relevant to this study by reviewing the literature. I provide a general overview of the social movement and countermovement literatures. In exploring the characteristics of movement and countermovement members and the reasons why they participate, I examine:
1) traditional grievance or attitude-based models of individual participation (i.e., Relative Deprivation theory);
2) more recent “rationalist” perspectives on movement participation that focus on the micro-structural dynamics of participation (i.e., Rational Choice theory, Structural or Network Theory); and finally,
3) the literature on value orientations toward the environment and forests and the social construction of identity. This is important in that it will provide some context for the more “culturally-based” countermovement hypotheses that are formulated.

In concluding the literature review discussion, I will present a diagram that conceptually represents the theoretical model or framework that serves as the foundation of this thesis.

Chapter Three describes the research methodology used to conduct and analyze the survey. This includes a description of the ethical considerations of anonymity and confidentiality, as well as the sample frame, sample size, sampling methodology and response rates from my three main sources of data.

Chapters Four introduces the main research questions and hypotheses of this thesis. In Chapter Five, I describe the indicators used in the questionnaire and the ways in which the indexes and composite variables were constructed, tested and the method of statistical analysis used.

To meet the first objective of this thesis, Chapter Six includes the results from my first level of analysis. To obtain a more robust understanding of the conflict over forestry and conservation, this first level of analysis compares the profiles of Share and environmental movement members on identified key variables to better understand their differences — and potential similarities. In addition, I provide some comparison data of the general public of Port Alberni in order to determine if Share is representative of the general public of Port Alberni.
To meet the second objective of this thesis, Chapter Seven examines Share as a case of an anti-preservationist, countermovement organization. This chapter presents the results from regression analysis done to explore the factors associated with participation in and identification with Share. As noted earlier, if certain factors predict participation in and identification with the environmental movement, do these same factors hold true for participation in and identification with the Share countermovement? In providing a profile of Share participants and analyzing the factors that best predict countermovement participation and identification, I hope to expand on our understanding not only of the conflict over forestry and conservation, as well as contribute to the countermovement literature.

Finally Chapter Eight provides discussion and conclusions of the findings of my research project. This chapter will revisit the main themes and arguments outlined in my literature review and thesis hypotheses chapters to examine the ways in which my findings support the literature. In this chapter, I will also point out areas that require further research. The appendices contain the two cover letters for the mailed-out Share questionnaire (Appendix A), the Share questionnaire itself (Appendix B), the environmental movement questionnaire (Appendix C); and the general public of Port Alberni questionnaire (Appendix D).

Now that the objectives of this thesis have been stated, and a general overview of the structure of my thesis has been provided, I will turn to the next chapter. In Chapter Two, I review the literature that guides the theoretical framework of my thesis. I begin by providing a review of general theoretical concepts of the social and countermovements and the characteristics of movement participants by examining the social movement and countermovement literature. Secondly, I will review literature that examines why individuals participate in social movements and countermovement. This literature falls

---

9 Share directors also wrote an introductory letter that was included in the mail-out.
10 While a more in-depth analysis of the broader political, economic and/or organizational factors that result in the emergence of a social movement or countermovement is important, the main emphasis of this thesis is placed on individual participation in and identification with Share. Thus while I provide some social and economic context within which Share emerged, my data is limited to the organization at a point in time and thus a broader analysis of countermovement emergence is not possible.
into two broad categories: traditional grievance or attitude-based models of individual participation (i.e., Relative Deprivation theory); and more recent "rationalist" perspectives on movement participation that focus on the micro-structural dynamics of participation (i.e., Rational Choice theory and Structural or Network theory). I also review the literature on value orientations toward the environment and forests, as well as the social construction of identity. This is important in that it will provide some context for the more "culturally-based" countermovement hypotheses that are formulated. At the end of the literature review discussion, I will present a diagram that conceptually represent the theoretical model or framework that serves as the foundation of this thesis.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Movements

New Social Movements:

The environmental movement on the West Coast of Vancouver Island – the movement against which Share mobilized - is often described as a new social movement (Tindall 1994). In addition to the environmental movement, other movements concerned with the social standing of women, gay and lesbian people, animal rights and the peace, or anti-war movement (Touraine 1985; Boggs 1986; Evans and Boyte 1986) have also been characterized as new social movements (NSM).

The emergence of social movements paralleled the growth of the modern nation-states and served as an avenue for individuals to press claims (Tilly 1984). A defining features of new social movements is that they have emerged in postindustrial North American and Western European societies (Melucci 1980; McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1988; Kriesi 1989; Pakulski 1991; Pakulski and Waters 1996; Crook et al. 1992). NSM are said to be 'new' because they focus on cultural change and the improvement of social and physical surroundings, as opposed to 'traditional' social movements such as the workers' or labour movement of the 1930s that were primarily concerned with economic issues. Scott (1990) identifies three defining characteristics of NSM. First, NSM are primarily social or cultural. While the workers' movement was primarily concerned with workers’ rights and with the working class gaining access to the political process, NSM are more concerned with the cultural sphere and a focus on values and lifestyles. The aim of NSM is to mobilize civil society; whereas the labour movement’s aim was to seize power (Feher and Heller 1983). Second, NSM are located within civil society. In other words, NSM ‘bypass the state’ (Offe 1980) in that they are not concerned with directly challenging the state, but rather they seek to defend civil society from the encroachment of an increasingly technocratic state (Touraine 1985) and from the ‘inner colonization’ by

---

It should be noted that new social movements theory has received criticism for exaggerating the differences between “traditional” and “new” social movements. Critics argue that new social movements are not so different from traditional movements in that they focus on many of the same issues – for example economic issues (Macionis 1994).
society's technocratic substructure (Habermas 1987). Third, NSM seek to bring about change through changing values and developing alternative life-styles. NSM are concerned not so much with changing the political system, but rather challenging traditional values by focusing on symbols and identities in creating new life-styles. Table 2.1 below summarizes Scott's (1990:19) key points of contrast between NSM and the more traditional labour or workers' movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers' Movement</th>
<th>NSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Increasingly within the polity</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Political integration/economic rights</td>
<td>Changes in values and lifestyle/defence of civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Formal/hierarchical</td>
<td>Network/grassroots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of Interaction</td>
<td>Political mobilization</td>
<td>Direct action/cultural innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another characteristic that has lead scholars to label movements such as the environmental movement 'new' is that their adherents typically belong to the "upper-middle class" or "new class" as opposed to the working class. This new class is comprised of highly educated white collar professionals often employed as "knowledge workers" and are mobilized against the still dominant "old class" of business owners and executives in the fight for power and status (Kriesi 1989, Brint 1984; Offe 1985). While members of this new class are "class aware," they are not "class conscious" (Offe 1985). As Cohen (1985:669-70) argues, NSM differ from traditional movements such as the labour and workers' movement in that 1) they have no desire to return to an undifferentiated community free of power and inequality; 2) participants maintain universalistic principles yet respect autonomy; 3) their values are somewhat relativistic; and, 4) actors accept the democratic state and market. While traditional movements sought to protect a pre-modern existence from the advances of modernization, NSM are taking action against a modernized life-world (consisting of the nuclear family, an egalitarian society and a universalistic cultural tradition) that has been penetrated by the market and the state.
What fuels participation in NSM is discontent with the nature of postmodern society (Kreisi 1989). Theorists such as Inglehart (1990) and Dalton (1988) argue that these movements have emerged because of a qualitative shift in the nature of socio-political action in the western hemisphere since the end of the second world war. The emergence of new social movements, it is argued, is facilitated by the rise of new values. New social movement participants hold “post-materialist” – as opposed to “materialist” – values and this provides the ideological basis for motivating individuals to participate in new social movements such as the environmental movement. Post-materialist values include a desire for community, self-actualization, personal as opposed to occupational satisfaction and quality of life (Offe 1985; Melucci 1985; Inglehart 1990; Scott 1990; Touraine 1981, 1983).

Now that an overview of NSM has been provided, I will turn my attention to countermovements which more aptly characterize Share.

**Countermovements:**
Definitions of social movements stress the collective identity of challengers, the mix of institutional and non-institutional tactics and the sustained dynamic interaction with mainstream politics and culture (Diani 1992). Following Tarrow (1994:3-4), a social movement is defined as the “collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities.” In turn, a countermovement may be defined as a “movement that makes contrary claims simultaneously to those of the original movement.” Or simply stated, a countermovement is a movement mobilized against another social movement (Turner and Killian 1987).

Terms such as “anti-movements,” “neo-conservatism,” the “radical right,” and “countermovements” have often been used in confusing and inconsistent ways (Nash 1979; Rossiter 1962). In defining Share as a countermovement, I am suggesting that Share is a social movement with the objective of maintaining the status quo, status, honour and traditional social values or differences. The goal of Share is to preserve long-standing institutions and values through minimizing reforms brought about in part by the
successes of the environmental movement (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996). However, some scholars have stressed that countermovements such as Share have limited goals and attract relatively small groups of people in a regional or local setting, and should therefore be distinguished from movements such as the environmental movement which seeks fundamental and comprehensive changes to the social order (Aberle 1966). Countermovements such as Share, it would be suggested, do not strive to create new social patterns (as social movements do), but rather they seek to preserve the status quo or return to past social patterns.

The concept of a countermovement originated when scholars observed that opposition to movements of the 1960s was often launched by similarly organized social movements. Originally, it was felt that these movements arose in isolation and were entirely different from the movements they opposed. Their efforts were reactionary and were directed at the state and society rather than the original movement (Useem 1980). In other words, it was believed they were merely “particular kinds of protest movements which were responding to social change advocated by an initial movement...a conscious, collective, organized attempt to resist or to reverse social change (Mottl 1980:44).” However, this notion was soon challenged. Lo (1982) argued that while these countermovements can be either progressive or reactionary, the defining characteristic of countermovements is their dynamic engagement with and relation to the movement which they oppose. Zald and Useem (1987) further argue that what makes countermovements particularly interesting as agents of social change advocacy, is precisely their dependence on and reaction to the initiating movement.

Countermovements consist of networks of individuals and organizations that are concerned about many of the same issues as the movements they oppose. As Zald and Useem (1987) and Lo (1982) argue, the critical characteristic of a countermovement such as Share is its dependence on and reaction to the initiating movement (in this case, the environmental movement). As Zald and Useem (1987: 247-48) state,

“...movements of any visibility and impact create the conditions for mobilization of countermovements. By advocating for change, by attacking the established interests, by mobilizing symbols and raising costs to
The environmental movement has also had a “demonstrating effect” as Share not only vies for attention from the mass media and the broader public, but as other countermovements, Share also actively makes competing claims on the state on matters of policy and politics (Gale 1986). I would argue that the founders of Share and individuals such as Ron Arnold (Wise Use movement) are “organizational entrepreneurs,” in that they recognized the power of the social movement form. In their research, Meyer and Staggenborg (1996) found that in the event that a movement poses a real threat to powerful interests, elites sometimes sponsor or heavily support countermovements since they are aware of the effectiveness of social movements as a political tool. Both the nuclear power and tobacco industry sponsored the formation of countermovements to protect their interests (Useem and Zald 1987; Troyer 1989).

While I do not have any direct evidence that Share was financially supported by powerful industry interests, I do argue that the industry and its allies played a crucial role in the mobilization of Share. I will more fully elaborate on this argument in the next sections.

Now that a brief description of new social movement and countermovement concepts have been provided, discussion will turn to theories that attempt to explain movement emergence, as well as the theoretical arguments that account for participation, and thus countermovement identification.

**Grievance or Attitude-Based Movement Participation Model**

**Relative Deprivation Theory:**

Relative deprivation theory (Morrison 1973) suggests that countermovements such as Share mobilize because its members see themselves as being deprived of things such as income, satisfactory working conditions, important political rights, or basic social

"others, they create grievances and political opportunities for organizational entrepreneurs to define countermovement goals and issues. Movements have also a 'demonstration effect' for political countermovements – showing that collective action can effect (or resist) change in particular aspects of society."

The environmental movement has also had a “demonstrating effect” as Share not only vies for attention from the mass media and the broader public, but as other countermovements, Share also actively makes competing claims on the state on matters of policy and politics (Gale 1986). I would argue that the founders of Share and individuals such as Ron Arnold (Wise Use movement) are “organizational entrepreneurs,” in that they recognized the power of the social movement form. In their research, Meyer and Staggenborg (1996) found that in the event that a movement poses a real threat to powerful interests, elites sometimes sponsor or heavily support countermovements since they are aware of the effectiveness of social movements as a political tool. Both the nuclear power and tobacco industry sponsored the formation of countermovements to protect their interests (Useem and Zald 1987; Troyer 1989).

While I do not have any direct evidence that Share was financially supported by powerful industry interests, I do argue that the industry and its allies played a crucial role in the mobilization of Share. I will more fully elaborate on this argument in the next sections.

Now that a brief description of new social movement and countermovement concepts have been provided, discussion will turn to theories that attempt to explain movement emergence, as well as the theoretical arguments that account for participation, and thus countermovement identification.

**Grievance or Attitude-Based Movement Participation Model**

**Relative Deprivation Theory:**

Relative deprivation theory (Morrison 1973) suggests that countermovements such as Share mobilize because its members see themselves as being deprived of things such as income, satisfactory working conditions, important political rights, or basic social
dignity. Gurney and Tierney (1982:36) further argue that the theory assumes "an underlying state of individual psychological tension that is relieved by participation in the movement." Deprivation, however, is relative (Stouffer et al. 1949), thus regardless of an individual's absolute power, money, etc., s/he will likely evaluate him/herself in relation to some category of others. As argued above, just as countermovements emerge in reaction to social movements, relative deprivation is the *perceived disadvantage arising from some specific comparison* which in turn results in countermovement mobilization.

While Relative Deprivation theory (RDT) has broad common sense appeal, it has also garnered critique. Simply because someone feels discontented does not mean that s/he will participate in a social movement (or countermovement). As Jenkins and Perrow (1977) argue, relative deprivation theory is based on circular reasoning. Relative deprivation is assumed to cause social movement participation; but the only evidence of deprivation is the social movement itself. There is also little empirical evidence to support RDT. Mueller (1980) conducted an extensive survey of the literature and found that the psychological attributes of individuals such as frustration or alienation have minimal direct impact in explaining participation in movements/countermovements.

Forestry workers have historically enjoyed job security and relatively high wages for work which requires little formal education. In recent years however, the forest industry has undergone significant change (mechanization, changing world markets, and increased environmental protection, due in part to the success of the environmental movement) that has had serious impacts on forestry based communities and has negatively impacted the stability and relative prosperity of forest industry jobs. In turn, the RDT asserts that forestry workers and their families have a heightened sense of relative deprivation. Does this sense of relative deprivation serve as an explanation for identification with and participation in Share? While Relative Deprivation theory may overstate the importance of individual attitudes, they remain important in that they demarcate a "latitude of rejection" or a "latitude of acceptance" within which individuals are likely to participate.

---

12 Albeit, in conversations with key Share people, it was acknowledged that in addition to money raised through memberships fees, etc., forest companies also provided some funding.
This thesis will explore the extent to which individual attitudes and values influence participation in and identification with Share.

**Rationalist Perspective and Movement Participation Model**

**Rational Choice Theory:**

As the name suggests, this theory implies that individuals participate in movements or countermovements based on *rational* cost-benefit calculations. Rational Choice Theory (RCT) assumes that individuals have given goals, wants, needs, tastes and utilities and because all of these goals cannot be satisfied because of scarcity (such as time and resources), each individual is constantly doing a cost-benefit analysis in order to determine which action s/he will take in order to maximize wants and utilities (Friedman and McAdam 1992). In other words, collective action, according to RCT, can only be understood by examining individual-level dynamics. When deciding to participate in collective action, individuals first must determine what feasible actions are possible given their constraints (of time and resources) and then, s/he must choose a course of action (Elster 1979). Thus an individual will participate in collective action only if they believe that the benefits will outweigh the costs.

RCT has been criticized because of what has been termed, the “free-rider problem.” If collective action seeks collective goods for its members, then few *rational* individuals would choose collective action as a means of obtaining public goods, since they could expect to benefit whether they participated or not. Several studies have highlighted instances in which the “free rider” assumption has been overcome (Olson 1965; Oliver 1984; Fireman and Gamson 1979; Friedman 1983, 1988; Knoke 1986). The most important finding of these studies is the use of selective incentives to tip the balance by increasing the private benefits over the costs of participation. Friedman and McAdam (1992), however, expose further criticisms of RCT. First, RCT is largely a post-hoc description of behaviour. The theory offers no explanation as to why individuals value certain ends over others; nor does it explain how they rank priorities. Without this understanding of values, determining which incentives would sufficiently predict
participation is impossible. Secondly, Friedman and McAdam (1992) criticize RTC for its atomistic view of the individual. The theory fails to recognize that individuals are embedded in the movement or countermovement through their prior ties or group affiliations. They point out that the failure of recognizing this embeddeness distorts the nature of the choice process since these ties and affiliations might offer a host of quite decisive incentives.

**Structural and Network Theory:**
This account of individual participation in social movements and countermovements highlights that fact that “however reasonable the underlying assumption that some people are more... susceptible than others to movement participation...this view deflects attention from the fact that recruitment cannot occur without prior contact with a recruitment agent (Snow, Zurcher and Ekland-Olson 1980: 789).” In other words, individual disposition does not account for movement participation, but rather, an individual’s structural proximity or network connections to a movement determine movement participation. In contrast to RCT, this theory asserts that it does not matter whether or not an individual is ideologically or psychologically disposed to participation, what matters is their networks or ties to individuals – participation is conditional on a structural vehicle that has the ability to pull them into participating in a movement. More specifically, it has been empirically demonstrated that three structural factors are linked to movement participation.

The first of these factors is prior recruitment by a movement member. The primacy of this structural or network factors in accounting for movement participation has been demonstrated empirically by scholars investigating movements as diverse as the Mississippi Freedom Summer Project (McAdam 1986), the Nichiren Shoshu Buddhist movement (Snow 1976) and peace groups (Bolton 1972).

Not only are these prior ties important for the recruitment into a movement, but membership in organizations has also been found to be empirically linked to participation (Orum 1972; McAdam 1986; Barnes and Kaase 1979; Von Eschen et all 1971; Walsh
and Warland 1983). Friedman and McAdam (1992) offer a number of possible explanations for this finding: membership in a number of organizations results in increased communication and the dissemination of information; individuals involved in organizations feel a greater sense of personal efficacy (Sayre 1980; Neal and Seeman 1964); more active individuals may believe that activism is potentially effective and worthwhile; and finally, individual membership in a number of organizations increases their range of interpersonal contacts thereby increasing the chance of personal recruiting appeals for participation.

History of prior activism is the third structural or network factor that serves as an important predictor of participation. While evidence for this relationship is somewhat limited, there is support available for the likelihood that a history of prior activism increases the likelihood of future activism (Gamson, Freeman and Rytina 1982). For instance, in follow-up studies to the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project, McAdam (1986) found that those individuals that had participated had higher levels of activism prior to civil rights activism than those that withdrew from the project; and that the second strongest predictor of current activism among participants was their level of activism between 1964 and 1970 (McAdam 1988). Possible explanations for the importance of prior activism in future participation include: past experience and know-how may result in a greater sense of comfort or familiarity with the social behaviour and thus result in future participation; socialization into an "activist" role (Lofland 1977) and as the importance of that role increases, so does the likelihood of participation to confirm or reinforce that aspect of one's identity.

The principle criticism of this account for movement participation is its failure to be grounded in an implicit model of the individual (Friedman and McAdam 1992). In other words, it fails to take into account how individual actions are impacted by the structural proximity to a movement. Despite this criticism, movement-based personal (i.e., egocentric) networks of Share members plays a key role in my analysis since these networks have a substantial impact on the emergence and collective identity – the main dependent variable – of a movement (Friedman and McAdam 1992). Before turning to the
discussion of the more culturally-based theoretical explanations of movement/countermovement participation, I elaborate on the characteristics of personal networks.

In my analysis, I focus how the structure of personal (or ego-centric) networks is related to level of countermovement identification. In reviewing the literature, a distinction is made between weak ties and strong ties. Weak ties refer to ties of low emotional intensity; ties to an acquaintance for example. Strong ties refer to ties of high emotional intensity; ties to close friends or family for example. The research on these personal networks is diverse. Some scholars have focused on the importance of personal network size (i.e., total number of direct ties). Other research has examined how the existence of any strong ties (as opposed to the absence of such ties) is important to cognitive and behavioral outcomes.

Granovetter (1973) and Mcadam (1986) argue that tie strength is, under certain conditions, the most important network correlate of movement participation. Examining a community, Granovetter (1973) argued that weak ties served to connect otherwise isolated cliques in the larger social grouping. In other words, these weak ties served as links (or “bridges” as Granovetter (1973) called them) that enabled the flow of communication and other resources needed by groups to participate in collective action. Granovetter’s (1973) analysis can also be useful in examining individual mobilization. The more people an individual knows, or is acquainted with within an organization, the more likely s/he will hear about and participate in movement activities.

While weak ties between movement members are crucial to ensure the sharing of information and resources needed for movement participation, McAdam (1986) argues that a distinction must be made between low-risk and high-risk activism when examining what factors are important in determining movement participation. He argues that strong ties are in fact more important than weak ties in determining participation in high-risk activism. McAdam (1986) argues that the social support that flows through strong ties (i.e., support and encouragement from close friends or family) is crucial for high cost/risk
activism (albeit, he does not provide empirical evidence for his findings). While most research has focused on the relationship between high cost/risk activism (McAdam 1986; Mcadam and Paulesn 1993; Gould 1991; Erickson, Nepstad and Smith 1999; Kitts provides an exception), there is a dearth research on the relative importance of strong versus weak ties under conditions of low-medium cost/risk activism. The focus of my analysis is to examine how both weak and strong ties are associated in micromobilization processes – specifically in level of countermovement identification – in conditions of low-medium cost/risk activism.

I will also focus on the relative importance of network range versus network degree. Burt (1980) defines network range as the number of ties one has to different types of people (or social groups). Network degree, on the other hand, refers to the total number of ties one has to others (Freeman 1978/79). Network degree is important because the greater the number of ties, the greater the frequency of interaction with other individuals. This is important because it has implications for the frequency of information dissemination, social pressure and attitude formation). Network range is important to the diversity of interactions. In other words, a diversity of interactions will result in variation of the types of information an individual receives. Researchers have found that positive associations between network range (number of organization memberships/ties) and social movement recruitment and participation (Fernandez and McAdam 1988, 1989). Of particular relevance to my thesis, network range is also important for more complex cognitive processes such as identity formation.

Now that an overview of several the key theoretical explanations for movement participation have been provided, a review of the literature on value orientations towards the environment and forest and the social construction of identity will be provided.

**Culturally-Based Theories for Movement Participation**

**Changing Value Orientations Towards the environment and Forests:**

The conflict between members of the environmental movement and members of Share may in part be attributed, in part, to the differing philosophical and normative views
about forests and the environment and humans’ relationships to them. I argue that Share members hold more anthropocentric or instrumental values orientations towards forests, while members of the environmental movement hold more eco-centred or biocentric value orientations.

It has been argued that the emergence of the environmental movement occurred with a shift from valuing forests solely in terms of an economic product to valuing forests for their wildlife, wilderness, recreation, spiritual and other values (Wondolleck 1988; Steel, List and Shindler 1994). One the one hand are traditional foresters who have a utilitarian or anthropocentric view towards forests and advocate wise use of forests for the betterment of human kind. On the other hand, is a more biocentric view born from the ideas of John Muir and Aldo Leopold that favors the extension of ethical consideration to all parts of the ecosystem (soil, trees, air, plants, water, etc.).

**Anthropocentric or Instrumental Value Orientation:**
Steel, List and Shindler (1994) compare and contrast the anthropocentric assumptions towards forestry management of early foresters with the more biocentric or “ecocentred” values that fueled the emerging conflict over forestry and conservation. The anthropocentric view can be thought of as a “human centred orientation toward the non-human world (Eckersley 1992)” that values forests in terms of how they can benefit human needs, desires and wants. This orientation views the non-human world not of value in and of itself, but rather only for its utility to humans (Eckersley 1992, Scherer and Attig 1983). Thus forests and the ecosystem of which they are an essential component, are valued only in that they provide “material to be used by humans as they see fit (Scherer and Attig 1983).” Steel, List and Shindler (1994) argue further that while humans form an ethical community with other human beings that encompasses duties and responsibilities, these ethical considerations do not extend to the non-human world. That is, the non-human world is not valued for its intrinsic worth, but is only valued for its ability to provide humans with commodities (e.g., timber extraction) or aesthetic, spiritual or physical benefits (e.g., wilderness and outdoor recreation). Traditional forestry management practices were based on this anthropocentric orientation and
grounded on the following principles: the wise human use and development of resources; the preservation and protection of those resources for future generations; and the democratic allocation of those resources for the greater public good, as opposed to monopolistic economic interests in society (Clary 1986, Hays 1959, Nash 1973 and Pinchot 1910).

**Biocentric Value Orientation:**
As public concern over environmental issues increased in the 1960s, a philosophical re-orientation of human relationships to the nonhuman world emerged that was based on "eco-centred" or "biocentric" values (Nash 1973, Worster 1977). A biocentric orientation recognizes the intrinsic value of the nonhuman world. While human needs, wants and desires are still important, they do not supercede the importance of other species and organisms. Instead, human needs and desires are placed within a larger ecological context and nature as a whole is also given moral consideration (Goodpaster 1978; Stone 1998). Thus anthropocentric values associated with traditional forestry practices which place human economic uses and benefits above all other considerations is denied. A biocentric orientation gives importance to the inherent value of forests – noneconomic values are as important if not more important than human economic rationales and social benefits. It was the ideas of John Muir and Aldo Leopold that stressed the importance of nature's non-economic values. They raised awareness of the aesthetic and spiritual values of wilderness and rejected the notion that nature was created for the human use. Leopold's famous land ethic principle stressed the value of wild creatures because of their "natural" beauty and their importance in the functioning of the ecosystem. Leopold stressed the importance of an ethic to deal with human's relation to the nonhuman world. He stressed the importance of moving away from a land-relation based strictly on economics and privileges to one that also includes obligations. In other words, "a land ethic changes the role of Homo Sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow-members, and also respect for the community as such." For Leopold, "a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, beauty and stability of the biotic community (Leopold 1949)."
This thesis hypothesizes that those individuals who have anthropocentric, or a utilitarian orientation towards forests will more strongly identify with Share, while individuals who have a more biocentric, eco-centred value orientations will be more strongly identify with and participate in the environmental movement.

However, I must clarify that in thinking about biocentric and anthropocentric values, I am not suggesting that they are mutually exclusive, but rather these philosophical orientations towards forests occur on a continuum and are multidimensional. The conflict between environmentalists and members of Share must be understood by examining the cultural context – and the associated assumptions - within which environmental movement and Share members understand “the facts” (i.e., the technological and professional debates over best forest management practices). The way in which a person understands and participates in the debate over forestry and conservation is affected by the way in which that individual understands the issues and it is this understanding that is shaped by our underlying values. Thus it is crucial that in order to understand the conflict between members of Share and members of the environmental movement, it is necessary to examine these values and their connections to other relevant social, political and cultural factors.

Before turning to a discussion of the theoretical framework and hypotheses that form the core of this thesis, a review of the literature on the social construction of identity is provided.

**Collective Identity**
In order for social movements and countermovements to exist, the interacting collectivity must share a set of beliefs (McCarthy and Zald 1977) and identity (Touraine 1981, 1985; Melucci 1985, 1989; Tilly 1988, 1984) and must have a sense of belongingness (Diani 1992) and ‘solidarity’ (Melucci 1985, 1989). If we examine each of these theoretical concepts of a social or countermovement it becomes clear that they are all interrelated. For example, in examining social movements, Turner and Killian (1987) find that the continuity of a social or countermovement is dependent upon ‘group identity’ and
ideologies' which can broadly be defined as a set of shared beliefs. The notion of collective identity and solidarity share commonalities in that one likely cannot exist without the other – a sense of belongingness and sympathetic feelings associated with the perception of a common, shared fate (Melucci 1984).

Friedman and McAdam (1992: 156) define collective identity of a social movement or countermovement as “a shorthand designation announcing status – a set of attitudes, commitment and rules for behaviour – that those who assume the identity can be expected to subscribe to.” Furthermore, it is argued that what compels individual participation in movement activities is an individual’s desire to conform – through behaviour (i.e., participation) – to a cherished identity.

Social movements or countermovements can be conceptualized as evolving through three life stages (Friedman and McAdam 1992). The first stage entails the emergence of a movement; typically, movements grow out of preexisting organizations and institutions. During the second stage, the networks with the original organizations and institutions are replaced with formal movement organizations. In other words, the newly created movement or countermovement now takes on a life with a focus of retaining old members and attracting new one. The third stage, witnesses the decline of the movement. As Friedman and McAdam (1992:162) describe the process, “formal social movement (or countermovement) organizations remain the core of the movement, but increasingly the diffusion of collective identities and cultural symbols associated with the movement has blurred the boundary between social movement organizations and the public.”

What I find interesting and relevant to the focus of my thesis is Friedman and McAdam’s (1992) analysis of the way in which networks impact the emergence and collective identity of a movement (i.e., stage one). As their review of the literature shows, the impetus for the emergence of new movements typically grows out of existing, established

---

13 Pizzorno (1978) was one of the first scholars to use the term ‘collective identity’ to challenge Olson’s (1965) well known hypothesis on the irrationality of collective action (Diani 1992).
institutions\textsuperscript{14}. In examining why these preexisting networks to organizations and institutions are important in the emergence of a new movement Friedman and McAdam (1992:1962) state that firstly, these institutions and organizations grant the emerging movement with a crucial resource – the collective identity associated with them. Secondly, the “control mechanisms that serve to tie the identity to participation and at the same time, preclude free riding. In short, the emergence of Share can be attributed in part to a redefining, or reaffirming of existing roles within an established organization or institution – namely the IWA.

The sociological literature suggests that the concept of occupational community may serve to flesh out a better understanding of Share members collective identity. Simply stated, an occupational community is one in which members of some occupations come to share a common (or community) life that is set apart from others in society (Salaman 1974). Moreover, this common – or community – life transcends the every day work place and working hours and is independent of the neighbourhood or a particular geographic location in which the member resides. As Salaman (1974:22-23) argues, this process is “unlikely to occur among people who are in occupations that do not have occupational communities and it is extremely unlikely among those workers who wish to escape totally from their work once they leave the work place.”

More importantly to the main focus of this thesis however, is the notion that a defining characteristic of an occupational community is that its members’ sense of identity is closely tied to their occupation. As Herbert Blumer (1969) so eloquently explains, “meaning is a social product”; something which is created as opposed to “inherent in things” (Blumer 1969:4). It is through “meaningful interaction” with other members of the occupational community that a forestry worker develops and defines his own identity and sense of self. Simultaneously, the opinions, attitudes and values of “insiders” are more valid and important than those of “outsiders” – e.g., urban environmentalists against whom Share members mobilize and define themselves.

\textsuperscript{14} For example see Curtis and Zucher (1973) on their research on the Texas anti-pornography movement; Hicks (1961) on the Populist party; Lipset and Wolin (1965) on the Berkley free speech movement and McAdam (1982) on the American civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s.
Members of an occupational community therefore not only come to identify themselves in terms of their occupational role, but will also value this self-image. In defining what “is” a group – Tajfel (1978) suggests that it consists of a range of three interrelated components: a cognitive component (knowledge that one belongs to the group); an evaluative component (an individual’s notion of the group or membership in the group may have a positive or negative value connotation); and finally, an emotional component (the cognitive and evaluative aspects of a group and/or one’s membership in a group may be accompanied by emotions such as love, hatred, like or dislike which is directed at one’s group or towards others that stand in certain relation to it).

In exploring the conflict between environmentalists and forestry workers, forestry workers claim that environmentalists have triggered a series of forest policy decisions that have “endangered” a unique “way of life” that will ultimately destroy the forestry and rural community “lifestyle” (Brown 1995; Carroll 1994; Dumont 1991; Dunk 1994; Walls 1987; Warren 1992). Forestry workers and their supporters argue that even though many hardships must be overcome to continue working in the woods, they do so because they love working and spending time in the forests. Share members view themselves as “true environmentalists” while protestors and members of the environmental movement are simply (urban) preservationists with no true, firsthand knowledge of forests, or the true changes that need to take place in the forest industry.

As a result, in the debate over forestry and conservation it has been argued that forestry workers do have a distinct culture of common values that should be maintained. In their study of forest workers’ culture, Carroll and Lee (1990) show that forestry workers do share common values. Forestry workers’ values and shared meaning constitute a “group-based world view” that is founded on 1) individualism, 2) know-how and common sense, 3) disdain for cities, and finally, 4) forestry as a lifestyle with highly developed traditions and shared values that have been passed down through the generations.
Their research shows the ways in forestry workers view themselves as “extreme rugged individualists” in both a physical and an economic sense. Forestry workers believe that survival and prosperity is based solely on individual initiative, skill and hard work. Simultaneously, this sense of individualism is linked to conservatism; a “belief in the righteousness of entrepreneurship and a corresponding disdain for government regulation (Carroll and Lee 1990: 148).” In turn, forestry workers view government employees, and individuals with university educations (environmentalists) as being “impractical” and/or “lazy”. Similarly, forestry workers have a strong work ethic in that they’ll “do what it takes to get the job done.” Carroll and Lee (1990) also found that forestry workers have little patience for formal arrangements and abstract rules and highly value the ability of figuring things out on one’s own and having the ability to solve problems using “common sense”. Forestry workers also strongly value the rural lifestyle while expressing a strong disdain for cities. Cities represent crowded and unhappy places where individualism and freedom are curtailed. And finally, forestry workers strongly value the sense of tradition associated with being a forestry worker – traditions and values that have been passed down through the generations. For instance, it has been shown that an accepted and even time honoured custom among western forestry workers is frequently changing one’s job (Hayner 1945; Holbrook 1926, Williams 1976 and Stevens 1979). As such, job security is not based on a long-standing relationship with an employer, but rather a forestry worker’s marketability is based on his reputation in the occupational community. Thus this occupational reputation is primarily a product of his work and serves as the basis of both his identity and his job security.

Now that an overview of the relevant theoretical literature has been provided, the theoretical model that will serve as visual representations of the key hypotheses of this thesis is shown below. Figure 2.1, provides a visual representation of the theoretical model of the anticipated relationships between key variables predicting participation in and identification with Share. In the following two chapters, attention will turn to the research methodology used in conducting my research as well as the hypotheses formulated for this thesis. Chapter Three, includes a description of the type of data collected, ethical considerations related to confidentiality and anonymity, as well as the
sample frame, sampling size and methodology. Chapter Four provides an overview of the hypotheses formulated in light of the literature review provided in this chapter.
Figure 2.1: Theoretical Model

**DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES**
- Gender
- Age
- Education

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION**
- Length of residence (Newcomer)
- Rural vs. urban upbringing (CMA)

**STRUCTURAL VARIABLES**
- Occupation/class
- Sector of Employment (interest)

**FOREST VALUE ORIENTATIONS**
- Anthropocentrism

**SOCIO-POLITICAL VALUES**
- Socio-political values
- Post/materialist values

**NETWORK VARIABLES**
- Range of ties
- Organization memberships
- Strong/weak ties

**DEPENDENT VARIABLE**
- LEVEL OF COUNTERMOVEMENT IDENTIFICATION
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CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the research methodology I used in conducting my research. I describe the type of data collected, ethical considerations related to confidentiality and anonymity, as well as the sample size, sampling frame, methodology and response rate for the three sets of data used.

Data Collection
This thesis is based on three main sources of data:

1) A self-administered questionnaire distributed to a random sample of Share members in fall of 1998 (N=129);

2) a self-administered questionnaire distributed to a random sample of members belonging to three environmental movement organizations (The Sierra Club of Western Canada, The Western Canada Wilderness Committee, and the Carmanah Forestry Society) in the Greater Victoria Area in 1992 (N=381);15

3) a telephone interview survey with a random sample of the Port Alberni general public (N=100) in 1998/1999.

In addition, data collected through face-to-face interviews with a quota sample of Port Alberni residents involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation (N = 13) will also be used to supplement and provide context for some of the quantitative findings. These data, collected in 1998, are a subset of respondents from a larger interview study conducted in Port Alberni, Uclulet and Tofino. It is also worth noting that in the summer of 1998, I spent four weeks on the West Coast of Vancouver Island (Ucluelet, Tofino and Port Alberni) conducting field research and interviews for David Tindall. This afforded me the unique opportunity of meeting a variety of individuals involved in the conflict.

15 Both the Share and Environmental Movement questionnaires included similar questions: socio-demographic questions, attitudinal and value questions relating to forestry and conservation, networks, movement/countermovement participation, activities and behaviours and finally questions about level of movement and countermovement identification. The Environmental Movement data was collected by Dr. David B. Tindall.
over forestry and conservation and in turn, gaining a better understanding of the complexities of the conflict.

**Ethical Considerations: Anonymity and Confidentiality**

This thesis is methodologically committed and founded on two ethical principles. The first principle is that research procedures are designed within a framework that respects the respondents as individuals and respects their right to privacy. The second principle, is that the results of the study should be of interest and some benefit to the subjects of the study and other persons with similar experiences.

In order to meet the requirements of the first principle, a number of steps were taken in ensuring the confidentiality of respondents. Share Executive Board members were reluctant to provide us with their confidential membership list. As a result, they did not provide us with their membership list, but agreed to participate in the study and administer the questionnaire on our behalf.\(^\text{16}\) Instructions were developed that allowed the Share staff person to randomly select individuals from the Share membership list in constructing the sample. I assembled the questionnaire packages which included\(^\text{17}\):

- the questionnaire and return self-addressed and stamped envelop for the questionnaire;
- two covering letters (the first from Share Executive Board members informing their members that they agreed to assist us in our research project, as well as a second letter I composed to introduce and explain the survey’s purpose);
- two consent forms (one for the respondent’s records and a second copy to be returned in the self-addressed and stamped envelope provided);
- follow-up reminder letters (sent two weeks after the initial mail-out).

I then hand-delivered the questionnaire packages to the Share office in Port Alberni. At the office, some time was spent going over the instructions and summarizing the

\[^{16}\text{We reimbursed the organization for the staff time used to administer the survey.}\]

\[^{17}\text{Please see Appendix B for the contents of the questionnaire package.}\]
objectives of the sampling method with Carol Lundy, Share Secretary and the individual
that responsible for administering the survey.

In order to ensure the anonymity of individual respondents, questionnaires contain case
numbers and not the names of individuals; this thesis or any other documents produced
will not contain any identifying information about any respondents; and finally, all
questionnaires and research documents are kept in a locked filling cabinet in the
Department of Anthropology and Sociology.

In order to meet the requirements of the second ethical principal, I also wanted to ensure
that Share Executive Board members had some input into questionnaire design. This not
only provided them with the opportunity to obtain a better understanding of their
membership, but it also allowed me to gain their confidence and willingness to participate
in the study. At their request all questions pertaining to an individuals’ incomes were
removed.

After data collection was completed, and data had been entered into SPSS (Statistical
Program for the Social Sciences), my thesis Supervisor (Dr. David B. Tindall) and I
completed a summary report of our findings for Share Executive Board members. It was
hoped that this would benefit not only Share Executive board members, but that
interested respondents would also have the opportunity to review the findings of the
study they participated in. Upon completion of this thesis – as well as any other
documents or reports that are generated as a result of this research - notices will be posted
in the local media so that Share members, or other interested parties and members of the
general public may contact me for a copy of the material.

In summary, every attempt was made to be accountable to our respondents in
terms of guaranteeing their anonymity, as well as ensuring that the information gathered
is of some interest and use for participants and others.
**Sample Frame, Sampling Size and Methodology**

The main population this thesis seeks to examine and generalize findings to, are members of Share Our Resources of Port Alberni. As discussed above, Share Executive Board members would not provide us with a membership list. We therefore developed a list of instructions so that Executive Board members could randomly select 400 Share members to include in the mail-out. In order to ensure an acceptable high response rate, follow-up reminder letters were sent two weeks and four weeks after the initial mail-out. A total of 129 questionnaires were returned.

A systematic sample with a random start was used to select Share members. This sample selection method entails the listing of each member of the study population (i.e., the Share membership list). A random start is designated (in this case, it was the 25th member) to ensure every Share member had the chance of being equally selected. After the selection of the first randomly designated start member, members of the population were selected at every 13th interval. As cautioned by Henry (1990), a problem can occur with the systematic sample method if the population listing is arranged in a cyclical fashion and the cycle coincides with the selection interval. So for example, if the interval is 7 and data are listed by the week, data from the same day of the week would be selected. In order to avoid this problem in my sampling method, I consulted with Share Executive Board members to discuss the order or arrangement of the Share membership list. Members were listed alphabetically. To ensure proper systematic random sampling methods were adhered to, a small interval was used order to ensure that in selecting respondents, the membership list was run through until 400 members were selected and thus every Share members had an equal opportunity of being selected.

The procedures involved in data collection through surveys are not error free. Designing a survey involves a number decisions that need to be made; these decisions can ultimately affect the accuracy (or precision) of survey estimates. As Fowler (1993) argues, decisions that would lead the researcher to obtain “better” data typically involve more money, time or other resources. Bearing these constraints in mind, this thesis is based on the principles of a total survey design (Fowler 1993). This approach takes into
account three salient methodological techniques that require careful consideration when attempting to develop a good survey that results in credible data:

1. Sampling: The aim of systematic sampling with a random start (a type of probability sampling) is to select a subset of a population representative of the whole population. A random sample of Share members was selected so that all members (or nearly all) had an equal chance of being selected. Random sampling thereby ensures that results can be generalized to the broader population (i.e., Share).

2. Question design: To ensure reliability and validity, questions used in the survey were based on a review of the literature, as well as being taken from previous surveys. In addition, questionnaires were pre-tested to ensure that the questions were comprehensible to respondents.

3. Interviewing: While data collection involved self-administered questionnaires, a small sub-set (N = 15) of face-to-face interviews are included in the data analysis for this thesis. However, in both the face-to-face interviews, as well as the questions posed in the self-administered questionnaire, standardized questions were used whenever possible.

Thus while survey methodology is not without problems, the considerations taken in a total survey design help maximize the quality of the data collected.

**Response Rate**

**Share Our Resources of Port Alberni:**

Four hundred and twenty (420) self-administered questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of Share members, of which thirty five (35) were undeliverable (due to incorrect addressing). One hundred and twenty nine (129) questionnaires were completed and returned. The response rate was 34%, calculated by dividing the 129 completed and returned questionnaires by the 385 questionnaires that were mailed. All completed and returned questionnaires were included in data analysis.
Environmental Movement:
The primary data gathering procedure was a self-administered questionnaire mailed to members of three formal environmental organizations (the Sierra Club of Western Canada, the Western Canada Wilderness Committee and the Carmanah Forestry Society), in the Greater Victoria area (Tindall 1992). For two of the organizations a systematic random sampling procedure was used, while for the third smaller organization, a census of members was conducted. The response rates for the three groups were Group A 35% (N=146), Group B 35% (N=64) and Group C 11% (N=187). The quantitative analysis presented in this thesis is based on the aggregation of data collected from these three samples (N=381).  

General Public of Port Alberni:
One hundred and ninety-eight (198) telephone interviews were conducted with a random sample of the general public of Port Alberni, of which one hundred and one individuals refused to participate. The response rate is calculated by dividing the 100 completed interviews by the 198 total number of calls made, for a 51% response rate. All completed interviews were included in data analysis.

Before turning to the next chapter, I should acknowledge that the response rates for both Share and the Environmental Movement surveys are relatively low in absolute terms, though not in comparative terms. Other research has resulted in similar response rates. For instance in their research on citizen participation in rebellious political behaviour in New York, U.S.A. and Hamburg, West Germany, Mueller and Opp (1986) also obtained a relatively low response rate of 32%. In another study of participation in the Anti-Nuclear Movement in Hamburg, West Germany, Opp (1986:106-107) obtained a relatively low response rate, but argued that “since theoretical (and not descriptive) hypotheses were tested, we expect them to hold even for samples that are not necessarily representative.” I follow Opp (1986) and other scholars (Mueller and Opp 1986; Opp

---

18 See Tindall (1994) for further detail.
19 A Port Alberni telephone book was used to sample residents.
and Gern 1993) and argue that because I am focusing on theoretical relationships between variables and not parameter estimates for particular variables, that the relatively low response rates for both Share and Environmental Movement surveys are acceptable.

In the next two chapters, I focus more specifically on the questionnaire and my data analysis. In Chapter Four, I provide an overview of the main hypotheses that form the core of this thesis. In Chapter Five, I will discuss the indicators used, index and typology construction and the methods used in data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR: THESIS HYPOTHESES

In this chapter, I discuss the hypotheses that form the core research questions of this thesis. Prior to doing so, however, the central research questions and main objectives of this thesis should again be re-stated:

1. If the conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their (collective) identity, what then, are the underlying differences between members of the two movements with respect to their socio-demographics (age, education gender, class, region), values (political, attitudes toward the environment), networks, and collective identity? In exploring these differences – and potential similarities – I hope that a more robust understanding of the conflict will be attained. To carry out this objective, this thesis will:
   - Compare the profile of Share members with that of environmentalists;
   - Examine the extent to which the membership of Share is representative of the general public of Port Alberni.

2. If certain factors are important in explaining strength of identification with and participation in new social movements such as the environmental movement, then what factors are important in explaining participation in and identification with a countermovement organization such as Share? In an attempt to answer this question, I examine Share as a case study to not only to also flesh out our understanding of the conflict over forestry and conservation on the West Coast of Vancouver Island, but also to expand on the body of countermovement literature. To carry out this objective, this thesis will:
   - Using a cross-sectional survey design method, examine as a case of an anti-preservationist, countermovement organization;
   - Using regression analysis, examine what factors explain participation in and identification with Share.

As summarized in the first chapter, this thesis is based on two levels of analysis. The first overall objective of this thesis is to examine the root of the conflict between members of Share and members of the environmental movement. This will be done by providing univariate data to examine the similarities and differences between Share and Environmental movement members on key variables (please see Figure 2.1). In addition, comparisons will be made between Share and the general public of Port Alberni in order to determine whether or not Share members are representative of the general public of Port Alberni.
The second objective of this thesis is more focused on Share as a case of an anti-preservationist, countermovement organization. Using a cross-sectional survey design method, I examine Share as a case study in an instance of countermovement mobilization to explore whether the theoretical explanations for social movement mobilization are also useful in explaining countermovement mobilization. By doing so, I hope to expand on the countermovement literature; to date there is a dearth of research on ‘anti-environmental’ or countermovements. In addition, this second objective focuses on expanding our understanding of the conflict over forestry and conservation by analyzing the general factors that explain level of identification with and participation in the countermovement. As shown in my review of the literature, various theoretical arguments exist that attempt to explain why and how social movements such as the environmental movement emerge and who is likely to participate in movement activities. I will use multivariate regression analysis determine whether these same factors are good predictors of participation in and identification with the Share countermovement (please see Figure 2.1: Theoretical Model). In addition, some qualitative data will be presented in order to provide context for some of the quantitative results.

Discussion will now turn to the formulation of hypotheses in examining these key factors and their association with level of countermovement identification.

Socio-demographic Variables:
A review of the literature shows that numerous scholars have identified key socio-demographic variables as important predictors of new social movement (i.e., environmental movement) membership and participation (Tindall 1994; Dunlap et al. 1983; Milbrath 1984; Siegelman and Yanarella 1986; Van Liere and Dunlap 1980, 1981). Specifically, age, education and gender have been identified as good predictors of participation.

Igelehart (1990) found that cohort was a significant indicator in predicting concern for the environment. More specifically, he found that those individuals born in Western democracies post World War II were more likely to support “post materialist” (as
opposed to “materialist”) values and are more concerned with environmental issues than older generations. Possible explanations for support of this shift in values among these younger cohorts is that they have experiences of recent environmental disasters such as Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, the discovery of holes in the ozone layer and resultant hazards associated with ultra-violet radiation, global warming and the “green house effect.” Coupled with the fact that these cohorts have had greater exposure to environmental education in schools may have resulted in the growing awareness of environmental problems and thus a commitment to changing attitudes and behaviours that are environmentally destructive. Another possible explanation for environmental movement participation by younger cohorts is biographic availability. This argument suggests that because younger individuals have fewer obligations (family, parenting, careers, etc.) they are more able to participate in movement events and activities.

While membership in younger cohorts are significant in predicting new social movement (i.e., environmental movement) participation, I predict that Share members will belong to older cohorts. Countermovement participants, I hypothesize, are those individuals who are forestry workers or have a direct interest in the forest industry (i.e., their occupation is dependent on or tied to the forest industry) and they have mobilized to save their jobs and the economic livelihood of their community. I hypothesize that Share participants belong to older cohorts since long-time forestry workers have limited options if they lose their jobs, therefore providing the needed impetus to mobilize against environmentalists.

Gender has also been identified as an important variable in predicting new social movement membership and participation. The sociology of environment and eco-feminist literatures suggest that women hold strong leadership roles in the environmental movement. Gilligan (1982) argues that because women are socialized to be nurturers and caregivers, they will address environmental degradation with “ethics of care” while men, who are socialized differently will address the issues with appeals to the rules of justice and rights. While the environmental movement includes many female participants and members, I hypothesize that men will play a more significant role in the
countermovement since Share is mostly comprised of forestry workers and forestry occupations are held mostly by men.

**Education** has also been identified as an important characteristic of new social movement participants. The higher the level of education attained, the more likely the individual will have value orientations that are sympathetic to environmental issues (Gallup Report 1989, Inglehart 1990; Milbrath 1984; Steel et al. 1990, Tindall 1994), as well as supporting post materialist values. Offe (1985: 850-851) offers a possible explanation for this effect of education:

> Two factors may contribute to the direct correlation between levels of education and unconventional forms of political participation. One is that a high level of formal schooling leads to some (perceived) competence to make judgements about complicated and abstract “systemic” matters in the fields of economic, military, legal, technical and environmental affairs. The other is that higher education increases the capacity to think (and conceivably to act) independently and the preparedness to critically question received interpretations and theories about the world. In other words, educated people would not only be more competent to form their own judgement but also less bound by rigid reliance on the judgement of others.

Or, as Howell and Laska (1992: 141) argue, it makes sense that individuals with higher levels of education will be more concerned with environmental degradation because “evidence on both sides of an environmental issue frequently addresses a very complex etiology of causes comprehended more easily by the better educated.”

Forestry jobs, on the other hand, have traditionally not required high levels of educational attainment. Studies show that forestry workers’ occupational community and shared culture view a university education as unpractical and not relevant to the “real education” associated with becoming a forestry worker (Carroll and Lee 1990).
In short, these socio-demographic variables are important factors in any study attempting to analyze identification with and participation in social or countermovements. I will now turn to the geographical local (length of residence, and urban versus rural upbringing) hypotheses I have formulated.

**Geographical Location:**
Geographical location has been identified as an important factor predicting level of identification with a movement or countermovement. A review of the literature suggests that individuals living in urban areas are more likely to hold pro-environmental attitudes. For example, Nash (1973) argues that concern for wilderness preservation has in fact grown out of urban culture. It is argued that urban residents are more concerned with environmental issues because they are more directly impacted by environmental degradation (e.g., air and water pollution) while also having better access to information and educational opportunities (Howell and Laska 1992). Simultaneously, forestry workers - who predominantly have rural backgrounds - view urban environmentalists as posing a threat to their rural lifestyles - a lifestyle that is grounded in more traditional values and practices. If this relationship is true, then geographic location is an important factor predicting participation in and identification with Share and I hypothesize that a non-urban\(^{20}\) upbringing is positively associated with identification with Share.

In addition to differing value orientation and movement identification between urbanites and rural residents, research has also been conducted on the ways in which population growth and in-migration can lead to conflict in rural communities. As shown in the quote from Coleman’s (1957:7) classic study *Community Conflict* below, reverse migration – migration from urban to rural communities - can lead to conflict because of the diversification of values:

> At some time or another, mass migration may deposit a whole new group of people into an existing community. Often these newcomers differ from

\(^{20}\)“urban” is defined as an individual living in a Census Metropolitan area, while “non-urban” are individuals living outside CMAs as defined by Statistics Canada. These definitions will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.
the natives in their "styles of life"...The resulting "community" consists of two very dissimilar parts...Whenever a difference in values and in interests is created by the influx of new residents, it becomes a potential basis of conflict.

While it is not the case that there has been "mass migration" to Port Alberni in particular, the West Coast of Vancouver Island communities such as Tofino and Uclulet are increasingly attracting newcomers. Typically, newcomers to rural areas are attracted by quality of life factors such as aesthetic amenities and recreation opportunities (Graber, 1974; Price and Clay 1980; Wellman and Marans 1982; Voss 1980; and Fly 1986). As a result, I hypothesize that newcomers\textsuperscript{21} are less likely to identify with Share.

Price and Clay (1980) use the term "culture clash" to describe the tension between long-term rural residents and newcomers. Research has also shown that evidence for this culture clash also exists with respect to environmental concerns. For example, Ploch (1978) found that newcomers were more likely than long-term residents to oppose development policies and to be concerned with preserving the environmental integrity and the rural atmosphere of the community. In sum, the literature shows that newcomers are typically opposed to community growth and resource development in order to retain the qualities that drew them to the rural communities in the first place (Graber 1974; Frankena 1980; Voss 1980; Fliegel, Sofranko and Glasgow 1981; Wellman and Marans 1982). I hypothesize that the urban oriented values of newcomers will clash with the more traditional, utilitarian values of long-term residents who favour economic growth and development (Buttel and Flinn 1977; Ploch 1978).

Blahna (1990) has shown, however, that the empirical evidence for the relationship between growth and conflict in rural areas is not completely consistent. Several studies have shown that there are few demographic and attitudinal differences between newcomers and long-term residents (Wellman and Marans 1982) and thus the validity of the assumption that reverse migration results in increased social conflict must be

\textsuperscript{21} "Newcomers" are defined as living in the community 10 years or less. This definition will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.
questioned. This thesis will test the "culture clash model" as well as explore other factors that lead to conflict over forestry and the environment. While Blahna (1990) found inconsistencies in the research on reverse migration and environmental conflict, his research did show that the conflict could be explained by the differential participation rates of the two groups. While participation in local organizations was approximately the same for newcomers and long-term residents, newcomers were more likely to belong to conservation or preservation groups and property owner groups. In addition, Blahna's (1984; 1990) research showed that newcomers were more likely to participate in different types of environmental action (signing petitions, joining or donating money to a group and attending public hearings) than long-time residents.

Now that I have described the theoretical arguments that guided the formulation of my geographic location hypotheses, I will turn to a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the structural hypothesis that I have formulated.

**Social Structural Factors:**
Studies have shown that participants in the environmental movement are disproportionately comprised of the upper-middle and upper classes (Humphrey and Buttel 1982). More recent studies of contemporary or "new" social movements show that participants are more likely to come from the "new middle-class" and are highly educated white collar professionals often employed as "knowledge workers" (Offe 1985; Kriesi 1989). Therefore, I hypothesize that *class position is negatively associated with identification with Share* and that *individuals that with a direct interest*\(^{22}\) *in forest industry will more strongly identify with Share.*

While Share members understand that most job losses have occurred as a result of mechanization, they also believe that job losses in the forestry industry are a result of the actions of environmental groups and unnecessary environmental protection. The conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the "other" against which Share members mobilize and construct their collective identity. In this case, the

\(^{22}\) They are either employed in the industry or in a occupation that is dependent on the forest industry.
“other” are described as young urban hippies on welfare, with nothing better to do than blockade logging roads, or university educated urbanites with no real understanding of forestry practices and the rural forestry lifestyle. In other words, forestry workers perceive environmentalists and white collar workers or professionals as individuals with higher (albeit less ‘practical) education, more valued knowledge and typically from larger metropolitan area such as Vancouver and Victoria. This interpretation has clear class connotations, as well as denoted spatial relationship based on regional differences and a historical concern with external domination.

I will now review the hypotheses I formulated in examining the relationship between forest values and level of identification with Share.

**Forest Values (Anthropocentrism):**
An individual’s value orientation towards the non-human world is an important predictor of level of identification with Share. As discussed in Chapter two, Steel, List and Shindler (1994) compare and contrast the anthropocentric assumptions towards forestry management of early foresters with the more biocentric or “eco-centred” values that fueled the emerging conflict over forestry and conservation. The anthropocentric view can be thought of as a “human centred orientation toward the non-human world (Eckersley 1992)” that values forests in terms of how they can benefit human needs, desires and wants. This orientation views the non-human world not of value in and of itself, but rather only for its utility to humans (Eckersley 1992, Scherer and Attig 1983). Thus forests and the ecosystem of which they are an essential component, are valued only in that they provide “material to be used by humans as they see fit (Scherer and Attig 1983).” In other words, the non-human world is not valued for its intrinsic worth, but is only valued for its ability to provide humans with commodities (e.g., timber extraction) or aesthetic, spiritual or physical benefits (e.g., wilderness and outdoor recreation). Traditional forestry management practices were based on this anthropocentric orientation and grounded on the following principles: the wise human use and development of resources; the preservation and protection of those resources for future generations; and the democratic allocation of those resources for the greater public good, as opposed to
monopolistic economic interests in society (Clary 1986, Hays 1959, Nash 1973 and Pinchot 1910). Thus I hypothesize that anthropocentrism is positively associated with participation in and identification with Share. More formally stated, I hypothesize, that the more strongly an individual holds anthropocentric forest values, the more strongly s/he will identify with SOR.

In the next section, I discuss the hypotheses I formulated to examine the relationship between socio-political values and level of identification with Share.

**Socio-Political Values:**
While Lo (1982) states that countermovements can either be right-wing or left-wing, he argues that they are most often right-wing. Calvert (1987) and others (see Guppy, Blake and Urmetzer 1996-1997) have found that individuals on the liberal/left spectrum of political support environmental protection, while individuals leaning on the conservative/right side of the political spectrum are less supportive, if not hostile, towards environmental concerns. While conservative/right wing political adherents advocate the status quo and the use of the market place to allocate values, liberal/left political adherents are more likely to critique the existing political and economic systems and be more responsive to the objectives of the environmental movement. It is the combination of these values and attitudes that contribute to an individual’s identification with a movement or countermovement. Thus, I argue that individuals on the political right will have a greater level of identification with Share and hypothesize that class position is negatively associated with politically conservative values; and, politically conservative values are positively associated with greater identification with Share.

Now that I have discussed the socio-political values hypotheses that I have formulated, in the next section, I discuss the hypotheses I formulated to examine the relationship between materialist values and level of identification with Share.

**Post-material versus Material Values:**
Following Inglehart (1990), materialist and post-materialist values are important factors
in to consider when examining the characteristics of movement – countermovement participants. Thus the following hypothesis is formulated in examining the relationship between materialism and level of identification with Share: Materialism is positively associated with identification with Share.

The research of Inglehart (1990) and Dalton (1988) has shown that certain sociopolitical issues cut across traditional ideological cleavages. Inglehart (1990) uses the term “post materialism” to describe the defining characteristic of the post World War II generation. This value orientation is more concerned with Maslowian “higher order” values such as love for the aesthetic qualities of the environment than with economic growth and security. In turn, the emergence of these new values gave rise to the environmental movement. Thus if environmental movement members place greater importance on post-materialist values, do Share members place greater importance on materialist values? In summary, this thesis argues that being employed in the forest industry is positively associated with materialism, political conservatism and identification with Share.

As noted in Chapter Two, networks are also important predictors in micromobilization processes. The following section will discuss the hypotheses formulated to examine the relationship between personal networks and level of identification with Share.

**Network Variables:**
As introduced in my discussion of the literature, my analysis will focus on how the structure of personal (or ego-centric) networks is related to the collective identity of Share members. To this end, I consider the relative importance of network range (number of ties one has to different types of people) and degree (total number of ties one has to others), as well as strong (close friends or family) versus weak ties (acquaintances). The guiding hypothesis that my network analysis centres on is that movement-based personal network centrality is positively associated with level of Share identification.
As discussed in Chapter Two, network degree is important for frequency of interactions with others, which in turn has implications for the dissemination of information, social pressure, attitude formation. The range of ties one has to others is important for the range — or diversity — of interactions which has implications for the type of information one receives and thus is important for more complex cognitive process such as the formation of collective identity; it also gives greater sense of personal efficacy because active individuals may believe that activism is potentially effective and worthwhile (Sayre 1980; Neal and Seeman 1964); and finally, individual membership in a number of organizations increases the range of interpersonal contacts thereby increasing the chance of personal recruiting appeals for participation. Network range (using number of organization membership) has also been found to be empirically linked to participation and movement identification (Orum 1972; McAdam 1986; Barnes and Kaase 1979; Von Eschen et al 1971; Walsh and Warland 1983). Therefore, the total number of ties one has to others (Freeman 1978/79), as well as the number of ties one has to different types of people or social groups (Burt 1980) are important predictors of level of movement identification. Thus I hypothesis that the range of forestry organization ties an individual has is positively associated with identification with Share and, the range of forestry organization memberships an individual has is positively associated with identification with Share.

In examining network degree measures, a further distinction is made between number of movement organization weak ties and number of movement strong ties. As noted in my review of the literature the strength of ties also play an important role in participation and level of identification in a movement or countermovement (Granovetter 1973, McAdam 1986). Others scholars (Freeman 1973; McAdam 1982; Oppenheimer 1989) have empirically demonstrated that greater diffusion of collective action is dependent on diffuse networks of weak bridging ties and that movements may die, if they lack such ties (Jackson et al. 1960). Granovetter (1973) in particular has shown the importance of the “strength of weak ties” in the diffusion of collective action. He argues that the more informal links (or weak ties) and the greater their degree in an organization, the more cohesive and effective the organization will be in achieving its objectives since these ties
serve as essential communication channels and other resources needed for mobilization to occur. While Granovetter (1973) focused his research at the community level (as noted earlier, he studied otherwise isolated cliques in larger social groupings), his theory also has implications for micromobilization processes in that these weak ties or "bridges" are also crucial for communication related processes and the collective identity. Thus weak forestry ties are positively associated with identification with Share.

As also discussed in Chapter Two, ties strength, it has been argued is perhaps the most important network correlate of activism (Granovetter 1973; McAdam 1986). Ties also serve as critical sources of social influence (Stryker 1981). The stronger a tie, the stronger the potential influence exerted on the recruit. One of the main arguments I make is that a respondent's strong identification as a forestry worker is an important predictor of level of identification with SOR since the identities embodied in each are highly salient. Thus having strong ties (close friends or family) in other organizations associated with the Share community (i.e., forestry organizations) provides strong support for an individual's expressed identification with and participation in Share. I hypothesize that strong forestry ties are positively associated with identification with Share.

While most research has focused on the relationship between ties strength (i.e., strong versus weak) and movement participation under conditions of high cost/risk activism (McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Gould 1991; Erickson, Nepstad and Smith 1999; Kitts 1999 provides an exception), little is known about this relationship under conditions of low-medium cost/risk activism\(^\text{23}\) (Tindall and Mauboules 2000). As shown above, this study will examine the relative importance of both strong and weak ties in the micromobilization processes under these conditions.

Another important piece of my analysis centres on the ways in which the pressures of conflicting social ties mediate level of identification with Share. As McAdam and Paulsen (1993:641-642) state, this represents a significant gap in the literature:

\(^{23}\) My research showed that Share activities typically revolve around low-medium cost/risk activities such as rallies, petition signing, buying and selling of merchandise, etc.
...existing studies fail to acknowledge conceptually or treat empirically the fact that individuals are invariably embedded in many organizational or associational networks or individual relationships that may expose the individual to conflicting social pressures... studies of movement recruitment start by surveying activists after their entrance into the movement. But showing that these activists were linked to the movement by some preexisting networks does not prove the causal potency of that tie. No doubt there are many others who had ties to the movement but did not participate in its activities. We suspect one of the principal reasons for the failure of the tie to impel participation in these cases is the existence of other, perhaps more salient ties that are constraining involvement. But to date our lack of conceptual models of recruitment processes and the tendency to study activists after the fact of their participation has left the effects of these “multiple embeddings” unexamined.

While their focus is on recruitment, I will focus on how ties to other movements (i.e., the environmental movement) impacts level of identification with Share.

The hypotheses I have discussed in this chapter will comprise the core of my analysis that are to follow in chapter six and seven. Before turning to my analysis however, the next chapter discusses the ways in which I operationalized the variables used in the analysis.
CHAPTER FIVE: OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES

In this chapter, I discuss how and why I have transformed the basic theoretical concepts I discussed in Chapter four into empirically testable hypotheses discussed in the last chapter. This chapter is organized seven sections, each corresponding to the ‘blocks’ of variables shown in Figure 2.1. Each section will include a description of the indicators used and why and how indexes (if any) were constructed.

I begin this chapter with the discussion of the operationalization of the dependent variable (level of countermovement identification).

Identification

The focus of this thesis is to explore the strength of identification with Share. In other words, the focus is not on the individual and how s/he constructs his or her own identity, but rather the extent to which s/he agrees with the collective identity of the Share. As discussed in Chapter two, collective identity of a social movement or countermovement as “a shorthand designation announcing status – a set of attitudes, commitment and rules for behaviour – that those who assume the identity can be expected to subscribe to.” Furthermore, it is argued that what compels individual participation in movement activities is an individual’s desire to conform – through behaviour (i.e., participation) – to a cherished identity.

I follow Stryker (1968) and other scholars who argue that the idea of the self is made up of a hierarchy of identities. As Stryker (1981:23-24) states, “identities are conceptualized as being organized into a hierarchy of salience defined by the probability of the various identities being invoked in a given situation or over may situations.” Stryker (1981:24) adds that an individual’s “commitment” to a particular identity is defined “as the degree

---

24For example, see McCall and Simmon (1978) for their discussion of “role salience” and Rosenberg (1979) and his concept of “psychological centrality.”
to which the individual’s relationships to specified sets of other persons depends on his or her being a particular kind of person.”

Hence, the concept of identity salience is useful in accounting for the importance of the role of an established organization in the initial emergence of a movement or countermovement (Curtis and Zurcher 1973; McAdam 1982; Morris 1984; Oberschall 1973; Rosenthal et al. 1985). Scholars have shown that if the identity invoked by the organization (e.g., forestry worker, member of the Port Alberni community) is highly salient among its members, it is easier to recruit members into the emerging movement or countermovement.

In light of these arguments, I constructed four measures, three of which are indexes:

1) Level of identification with Share Our Resources,
2) Level of identification as environmentalist,
3) Level of identification as member of forestry community,

The statements and the rating scale used to construct the indexes are summarized in Table 5.1 below.

---

25 Stryker's (1968) arguments also show the importance of networks - a key variable that will be discussed shortly.
26 Respondents were only asked to self-identify as members of the Port Alberni community and not whether others identified them as community members therefore no index was constructed for this measure.
Table 5.1: Identification Index Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX/VAR.</th>
<th>INDEX/VAR. LABEL</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of identification with Share</td>
<td>Share_id</td>
<td>Q41. I identify myself as a member of Share our Resources of PA. Q44. Others identify me as a member of Share.</td>
<td>2 = Very Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Agree; 0 = Somewhat Agree/Disagree; -1 = Mostly Disagree; -2 = Very Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of identification as Environmentalist</td>
<td>Env_id</td>
<td>Q36 I identify myself as an environmentalist. Q37. I identify myself as a member of the Environmental movement. Q42. Other people identify me as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td>2 = Very Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Agree; 0 = Somewhat Agree/Disagree; -1 = Mostly Disagree; -2 = Very Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of identification as member of forestry community</td>
<td>For_id</td>
<td>Q38. I identify myself as a forest worker. Q39. I identify myself as a member of the forestry community. Q43. Other people identify me as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td>2 = Very Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Agree; 0 = Somewhat Agree/Disagree; -1 = Mostly Disagree; -2 = Very Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of id. As a member of P.A community</td>
<td>Comm_id</td>
<td>Q40. I identify my self as a member of the Port Alberni Community.</td>
<td>2 = Very Strongly Agree; 1 = Strongly Agree; 0 = Somewhat Agree/Disagree; -1 = Mostly Disagree; -2 = V.S. Disagree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Identification with Share:
Level of identification with Share is the dependent variable in my analysis. In measuring level of identification with “Share Our Resources,” respondents were asked “how strongly do you identify yourself as a member of Share Our Resources” (q41) and “how strongly do you think others identify you as a member of Share Our Resources” (q44). Table 5.2 shows a moderately strong correlation between these items, so the items were summed to create an index score for what I will hence forth term “identification with Share” (r = .56, p < .01).
Table 5.2: Relation between Identification as Member of Share items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlations</th>
<th>Q41</th>
<th>Q44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(q41) “I identify myself as a member of Share our Resources of Port Alberni”</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q44) “Other people identify me as a member of Share”</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Two additional identification indexes were constructed because they were considered essential to my analyses—identification as an environmentalist, identification as a member of the forestry community. While level of identification as environmentalists may not seem relevant to the analysis, I argue it is important in that it is anticipated that the more strongly an individual identifies him/herself with as an environmentalist, the less strongly s/he will identify with Share.

**Level of Identification as Environmentalist:**

As discussed earlier, the conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their identity. In determining level of identification as an environmentalist, respondents were asked “how strongly do you identify yourself as environmentalists” (q36), “how strongly do you identify yourself as a member of the environmental movement” (q37), and finally, respondents were asked “how strongly do you think others identify you as an environmentalist” (q42). Using correlation analysis, a moderately strong correlation between these items was found, therefore, the items were summed to create an index score for what I will hence forth term “identification as environmentalist.” Please see Table 5.3 for a summary of the correlation coefficients and tests of significance corresponding to each item.
Table 5.3: Relation between Identification as Environmentalist items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlations</th>
<th>Q36</th>
<th>Q37</th>
<th>Q42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(q36) “How strongly do you identify yourself as an environmentalist?”</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q37) “How strongly do you identify yourself as a member of the environmental movement?”</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q42) “How strongly do you think others identify you as an environmentalist?”</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

As shown, the ‘identification as an environmentalist’ index was created because the three items are strongly and significantly intercorrelated (self-identification as environmentalist (q36) and self-identification as member of the environmental movement (q37) r = .38, p < .001; self-identification as environmentalist (q36) and other-identification as member of environmental movement (q42) r = .21, p < .05; and finally self-identification as member of the environmental movement (q37) and other-identification as member of environmental movement (q42) r = .59, p < .001).

Level of Identification with Member of Forestry Community:
In determining identification as a member of the forestry community, respondents were asked “how strongly do you identify yourself as a forestry worker” (q38) and “how strongly do you identify yourself as a member of the forestry community” (q39) and “how strongly do you think others identify you as members of the forestry community” (q43). Again, correlation analysis revealed a strong and significant correlation between items. In turn, an index score was created for what I will henceforth term “identification as member of the forestry community.”
### Table 5.4: Relationship between Identification as a member of Forestry Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Pearson Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q38) &quot;How strongly do you identify yourself as a forestry worker?&quot;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q39) &quot;How strongly do you identify yourself as a member of the forestry community?&quot;</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q43) &quot;How strongly do you think others identify you as members of the forestry community?&quot;</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

As shown in Table 5.4 above, the ‘identification as member of forestry community’ index was created because factor analysis revealed a strong and significant intercorrelation between three variables (self-identification as forest worker (q38) and self-identification as member of forestry community (q39) $r = .53$, $p < .01$; self-identification as forest worker (q38) and other-identification as member of forestry community (q43) $r = .58$, $p < .01$; and finally self-identification as member of forestry community (q39) and other-identification as member of forestry community (q43) $r = .65$, $p < .01$).

**Level of Identification as Member of the Port Alberni Community:**
In measuring respondents level of identification as members of the Port Alberni Community, respondents were asked “how strongly do identify yourself as a member of the Port Alberni community” (q40). As a result, no index was created for level of identification as a member of the Port Alberni Community. Please see Table 5.1 for a summary of statements and ratings associated with each index or variable.

The independent variables used to assess the relationship between socio-demographic, social-structural, socio-political values and network variables on level of countermovement identification (Share identification) are discussed below.
Socio-Demographic Variables:
The socio-demographic variables used in predicting participation in and identification with Share: age (cohort), gender and level of formal education.

With respect to age, respondents were asked to indicate “years of age on last birthday.” Respondents were also asked to indicated their gender (male or female). Finally, level of education was measured by the question “What is the highest level of formal education you have completed?” Table 6.4 provides a summary of questionnaire items, response categories and finally, how the variables were coded for my analysis.

Table 5.5: Operationalization of Socio-demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Category and Coding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Demographic Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62. Age</td>
<td>Respondent’s age at last birthday (in years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63. Gender</td>
<td>0 = Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q67. Education</td>
<td>Level of formal education:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 years = primary school to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 years = postgraduate degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Location:
In order to determine an individual’s geographic background, respondents were asked series of questions. To determine whether an individual had an urban or non-urban upbringing, respondents were asked their “Place of residence during teenage years” (Q77). In defining “urban” and “non-urban” Statistics Canada’s “Census Metropolitan Area” (CMA) concept was used. A new CMA variable was then created. Statistics Canada defines a CMA as a very large urban area (known as the urban core) together with adjacent urban and rural areas (known as urban and rural fringes) that have a high degree of social and economic integration with the urban core. A CMA has an urban core population of at least 100,000, based on the previous census. Once an area becomes a CMA, it is retained as a CMA even if the population of its urban core declines below 100,000. All CMAs are subdivided into census tracts. A CMA may be consolidated with adjacent census agglomerations (CAs) if they are socially and economically integrated. This new grouping is known as a consolidated CMA and the component CMA and CA(s)
are known as the primary census metropolitan area (PCMA) and primary census agglomeration(s) [PCA(s)]. A CMA may not be consolidated with another CMA. Canada contains 25 CMAs. BC contains two CMAs: Vancouver and Victoria. Alberta also contains two CMAs: Calgary and Edmonton. Manitoba contains only one CMA: Winnipeg. Saskatchewan contains two CMAs: Saskatoon and Regina. Toronto contains nine CMAs: Toronto, Hamilton, London, Kitchener, WindShare, Oshawa, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, St. Catharines–Niagara, and shares one with Quebec: Ottawa–Hull. Quebec contains five CMAs: Montréal, Québec, Chicoutimi–Jonquière, Sherbrooke, Trois-Rivières. Finally the three Maritime provinces each contain one CMA: Halifax (Nova Scotia), St. John's (Newfoundland), Saint John (New Brunswick). Please see Table 6.5 for a summary of the questionnaire items and variable definitions used.

Another important variable for my analysis is the distinction between “newcomers” and long-term residents. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had lived in their community (q63). An “newcomer” dummy variable was then created. If a respondent had lived in his or her community for 10 years or less, s/he was coded as a “newcomer”, if the respondent had lived in the community longer than 10 years, s/he was not a new comer. Table 5.6 provides a description of the “newcomer” variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Category and Coding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban/Non-Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to determine an whether an individual had a rural or non-urban background, respondents were asked to name of town, village, municipality, or city “where they lived during their teenage years” (q77). Their responses were then coded according to Statistics Canada definition of Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs).</td>
<td>“Urban” (within CMA) 0 = “no” 1 = “yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newcomer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents were asked “how long they had lived in the community” (q62) and asked to respond in years. A dummy “newcomer” variable was then created.</td>
<td>Newcomer: 0 = No (10 years or more) 1 = Yes (less than 10 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Structural Factors:**

In measuring occupation and class, respondents were asked to state: 1) their occupation (Q68); 2) the industry they work in (q71); and finally 3) type of employment position s/he holds (q80). In asking respondents about their type of employment (Q80), they were asked to indicate whether they were a) a business owner; b) a manager; c) a supervisor; d) an employee in a non-management position; and, e) other. The Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupation codes (Statistics Canada 1980), was used to categorize respondents’ occupations.

In addition, an index was created that reflects Brint’s (1985) “old and new class” definition scheme. Since Brint’s (1985) formulation of class categories centres on socio-cultural specialists and their participation in new social movements, an additional class category was developed to more accurately reflect Share members. This second class scheme is based on Wright, Costello, Hachen and Sprague (1982) categorization of the American class structure. The two main categories in this scheme include owners and working class. There are also two contradictory class locations that are reflected by the small employer and manager, supervisor or semi-autonomous wage earner categories. Please see Table 5.7 for a description of the combined class schemes that is used my analyses.

This thesis also argues that those individuals how have occupations directly tied to the forest industry, will also have a higher level of identification with Share. As shown in Table 5.7, an interest dummy variable was created to reflect whether or not respondent’s occupations were either directly or indirectly dependent on the forest industry. If an individual’s occupation was directly related to the forest industry, that individual was coded as having an “interest” in the forest industry.
Table 5.7: Operationalization of Structural Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Category and Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Q68) (Q71) (Q80)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class (scheme 1 and 2):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner – includes business owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers – includes all salaried managerial professionals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Middle-Class – includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Service Professionals – includes lower-status “helping professions” such as teaching, social work, nursing and health therapy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technological Professionals – refers to a “technological and applied-skills group”; this category includes business economic specialists, engineers, college graduate technicians, private-sector doctors and lawyers and nonacademic scientists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social and Cultural Specialists – includes academics, nonacademic social scientists, arts and culture professionals, architects, clergy, and traditional professionals (e.g., doctors and lawyers) working in the public and non-profit sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class – includes skilled and unskilled employees</td>
<td>The four new class categories included in the analyses are dummy variables where: 1 = membership in category, and 0 = non-Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – includes those not in paid labour force (besides retired), retired and Students</td>
<td>Dummy variable: Interest 0 = no 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to their occupations, respondents were classified as being dependent on the forest industry for their or not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forest Values - Anthropocentrism:**
One of the main dependent variables in this thesis is anthropocentrism. I argue that one of the main reasons for the conflict over forestry and conservation are because environmentalists and Share members value the forest differently. In measuring anthropocentrism and biocentrism, respondents were asked to rank six forest value items (where 1 represents the *most important* value, 2 represents the *second most important* value, 3 represents the *third most important* value and so on down to 6 for the *sixth most important* value). Both conceptually and statistically, a distinction is be made between human or anthro-centred values versus bio or nature-centred values. Table 5.8 provides
an overview of the forest value items respondents were asked to rank in order of
importance.

Table 5.8: Forest Values items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Catg. and Coding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q21.1) A place for recreation and relaxation (A)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q 21.2) A source of economic wealth and jobs (A)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q 21.3) As a habitat for a variety of animal and plant life. (B)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q 21.4) Balancing the global ecosystem (B)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q 21.5) Protecting Canada's water, air and soil (B)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q 21.6) Wilderness preservation. (B)</td>
<td>1 = very important 6 = least important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
“A” and “B” at the end of each item indicates whether the item is a measure of anthropocentrism (“A”) or biocentrism (“B”).

The items constituting the forest value variables were analyzed using factor analysis. Principal component analysis reveals two factors; one stronger than the other. The scree plot reveals a substantial drop off between factor one and two. Factor one can be interpreted as an anthropocentrism/biocentrism dimension. For the second factor or dimension, the loadings show that recreation, wilderness and habitat are correlated – suggesting an outdoor recreation dimension (e.g., hunting, fishing, and other forms of recreation such as hiking, etc.). On factor one, the anthropocentric forest value items loaded negatively and the biocentric value items loaded positively.

For the purposes of my analysis I am only concerned with the first dimension. I use the two anthropocentric forest value items (recreation and economic) to create an anthropocentrism index. The anthropocentric value items loaded -.6 or higher in the first dimension of the rotated factor matrix. The eigen value for the anthropocentric/biocentric factor is 2.1, and this factor accounts for 34% of the variance in the individual factor items. Pearson’s correlation analysis was also conducted with the
two anthropocentrism items and showed a moderately high correlation between the items of .48 (p > .001) suggesting that responses to these items is similar and therefore it is useful to combine these items into an index.

I will now discuss the operationalization of the socio-political value orientation index.

**Socio-political Values:**
According to Marchak (1988), an individual is defined as having a liberal political orientation if s/he sees government as being responsible for the regulation of the market place, while also ensuring that the rules are fair and equitable. Governments are also viewed as being responsible for the welfare of citizens’ (reduce inequalities, maintain health, education and protect the environment). With respect to the questions noted above, respondents holding liberal political orientations would have less confidence in people running major companies, banks and financial institutions; would feel that government does have a responsibility to do something to reduce income differences between the rich and the poor; and would also feel that government is should spend more on health, education and protecting the environment.

Further, Marchak (1988) states that an individual is considered to hold a conservative political orientation if s/he believes government controls (e.g., protecting the environment) should be minimized (in fact many would argue for government deregulation) and would advocate the establishment of unhampered free market activity. So in response to the questions noted above, respondents holding conservative political orientations would have a great deal of confidence in the people running major companies, banks and financial institutions; would argue that government should concern itself less with income differences; and finally, would suggest that government is perhaps spending too much on health, education and protecting the environment.²⁷

²⁷ With respect to the discussion presented here, while some individuals distinguish between economic versus social issues (e.g., someone may be economically conservative but a social liberal in that s/he does support gay rights but also wants to cut taxes), I focus on the economic dimension.
In measuring the political orientations, a series of political attitudinal questions taken from the review of the literature were included in the questionnaire. A “conserv” index was then created by summing respondents answers to transformed rankings\(^{28}\) of six questions:

- “How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies?” (Q22);
- “How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and major financial institutions?” (Q23)
- “Should the government (a) do something to reduce income differences between the rich and poor or (b) should it not concern itself with income differences?” (Q24).
- “What do you think about government spending on health?” (Q26);
- “What do you think about government spending on the environment?” (Q25);
- What do you think about government spending on education (Q27).

A summary of the questionnaire items and the coding scheme is provided in Table 5.9.

### Table 5.9: Operationalization of Political Value Orientation Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Catg. and Coding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative political value orientation</td>
<td>Q22t and Q23t (t = transformed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire items Q22, Q23, Q24, Q 25, Q 25, Q 27, were first re-coded (t), then summed and divided by six to obtain the mean. As a result, a positive score is associated with liberal political values, while a negative score is associated with conservative political values.</td>
<td>1 = -1 (great deal of confidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 0 (only some confidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = 1 (hardly any confidence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q24t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = 1 (should concern itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = -1 (should not concern itself).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q25t, Q26t, Q27t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = -1 (too much money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 0 (too little money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = 1 (about the right amount)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{28}\) Transformed so that a positive mean score indicated conservative political orientation and a mean negative score indicated a liberal political orientation.
Correlation analysis determined that there is a strong and positive correlation between the first three index items (Q22, Q23, Q24). There is also a strong and positive correlation between the last two index items (Q26 and Q27). Table 5.10 provides an overview of the analysis, showing the intercorrelations between items. As shown, there is a strong, positive correlation between the first three items: Q22 ("confidence in people running major companies") and Q23 ("confidence in people running banks and financial institutions") r = .43, p < .01; and Q22 ("confidence in people running major companies") and Q24 (government should reduce income differences between rich and poor") r = .36, p < .01; Q23 ("confidence in people running banks and financial institutions") and Q24 (government should reduce income differences between rich and poor") r = .21, p < .05. There is no significant correlation between Q25 ("govt. spending on environment") and the other items. There is a strong, positive correlation between Q26 ("govt. spending on health") and Q27 ("govt. spending on education") and r = .47, p < .01. These correlations are summarized in Table 5.10 below.

Table 5.10: Relationship Between Conservative Index Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22 &quot;How much confidence in people running major companies?&quot;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 &quot;How much confidence in people running banks and financial institutions?&quot;</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 &quot;Should government should reduce income differences between rich and poor?&quot;</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 &quot;Government spending on environment?&quot;</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 &quot;Government spending on health care?&quot;</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 &quot;Government spending on education?&quot;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Items in which there were strong positive correlations were combined to create the conservative index. I will now discuss how I operationalized the materialist values index.
Materialist Values:
As noted in previous sections, the sociological literature has, in part, argued the emergence of new social movements such as the environmental movement is the result of a qualitative shift in the nature of socio-political action in the West. In other words, new social movements have emerged as a result of certain modernization processes in advanced capitalist societies that have given rise to new values (see Inglehart 1971, 1977, 1990). The environmental movement has emerged as a result of new middle class discontentment with post-modern society. The values associated with the emergence of new social movements such as the environmental movement include: quality of life over economic standard of living; a concern with the quality of the environment and a concern with self-actualization.

The main focus of this thesis, however is on a countermovement organization; namely, Share. Therefore, if the logic used to explain the emergence of new social movements such as the environmental movement is inverted, it would be anticipated that Share members not only would be likely to have greater preference for “materialist” values, but also that materialist values would be positively associated with countermovement identification.

To determine whether an individual holds materialist or post-materialist values respondents were asked to rate or rank 13 materialist and post-materialist value items in terms of their importance or value as societal goals. For Share respondents an index of support for materialist values (“material”) was created by summing together the transformed ratings (where 1 = most important goal and 10 = least important goal) for each of the six “materialist values”:

- “Maintaining a high rate of economic growth” (Q61a);
- “Making sure that this country has strong defence forces”(Q61b);
- “Maintaining order in the nation” (Q61e);
- “Fighting rising prices” (Q61g);
- “Maintaining a stable economy”(Q61i);
- “The fight against crime” (Q61k).
These items were then summed together and divided by 6 in order to obtain the mean. Thus the lower the index score, the higher one’s support for materialist values. Correlation analysis was then conducted using a subset of these items.

Table 5.11 below provides the correlations for the materialism index items.

**Table 5.11: Relationships between Materialism index items:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlations</th>
<th>Q61a</th>
<th>Q61b</th>
<th>Q61e</th>
<th>Q61g</th>
<th>Q61i</th>
<th>Q61h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q61a “High economic growth.”</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61b “Strong defence force.”</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61e “Maintain order.”</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61g “Fighting rising prices”</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61i “Stable economy”</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61K “Fight against crime”</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

Two indexes were created. “Matval1a” – the index used in the multiple regression analysis conducted in Chapter Seven, was created by excluding one item (Q61b “Making sure this country has a strong defence force”) from the index. This was done because it was ranked substantially lower than the other items in the index. In addition, t-tests for differences in means was significant for “Matval1a” when comparing it will all other materialism items.

In addition, “Matval1b” was created in order to compare Share members with members of the general public of Port Alberni. The questionnaire used in the Port Alberni survey used only a subset of “materialist” items (Q61a “high economic growth” Q61g “fight
rising prices” and Q61k “fight crime”. Please see Table 5.12 for a description of the index items.

In order to compare Share data with the general public of the Port Alberni Community and Environmental Movement data, a post-materialism index was also created. The “postmat” index was created by summing together the transformed respondents ratings (where 1 = most important goal and 10 = least important goal) for each of the seven “post-materialist value” questionnaire items:

- “Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities” (Q61c);
- “Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful” (Q61d);
- “Giving people more say in governmental decisions” (Q61f);
- “Protecting freedom of speech” (Q61h);
- “Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society” (Q61j);
- “Progress toward a society where ideas count more than money” (Q61l);
- “Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted” (Q61m).

These seven items were then divided by seven in order to obtain the mean. Therefore, the lower the index score, the higher one’s support for post-materialist values. Correlation analysis was then conducted to evaluate the items comprising the index. Table 5.12 provides the correlations for the post-material values (“postmat”) index. As shown, the items have moderate, positive correlations.
Table 5.12: Relationships between Post Materialism Index Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q61c</th>
<th>Q61d</th>
<th>Q61f</th>
<th>Q61h</th>
<th>Q61j</th>
<th>Q61l</th>
<th>Q61m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q61c) “Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61d) “Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful.”</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61f) “Giving people more say in governmental decisions.”</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61h) “Protecting freedom of speech.”</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61j) “Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society.”</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61l) “Progress toward a society where ideas count more than money.”</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q61m) “Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.”</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

A “Pmval1b” index was also created. “Pmval1b” was created in order to compare environmental movement participants with members of the general public of Port Alberni, since the Port Alberni survey used only a subset of “post-materialist” items. This index included three items (Q61c “Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities;” Q61j “Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society;” and, Q61m “Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.”

I will now turn to a discussion of the operationalization of the network variables.

**Network Variables:**
As discussed in my review of the literature, analysis of network variables are essential when examining participation in and identification with a movement or countermovement. In determining the number, type and strength of networks respondents had to both the movement (environmental movement members) and countermovement
(Share members), as series of questions were asked regarding the range of organizations respondents were members of, and the types of ties, or networks, respondents had to others in various environmental and forestry based organizations.

**Range of Memberships and Ties to Forestry and Environmental Organizations:**
In determining the range of memberships respondents had to various forestry and environmental organizations, an index was created by summing together the number of both forestry organizations and environmental organizations that respondents' stated they were members of (Q51a5 through Q51m5). The range of ties measure is based on the number of ties the respondent had to people in different organizations.

**Strong and Weak Ties:**
In determining the range or types of ties or networks respondents' had to other countermovement participants, both weak and strong ties were measured. Strong ties refer to the number of close friends or family ties the respondent has in the organization s/he belongs (Q48c and Q48F). Strong ties were measured by summing together respondents' answers for number of close friends (Q48c) and family members (Q48f) the respondent had in the organization. Weak ties refers to the number of acquaintances (someone with which the respondent can hold a casual conversation) the respondent knows that belongs to the same organization as s/he does (Q48a). Weak ties were measured by subtracting the number of strong ties from the total number of ties the individual had in the organization (Q48a). In other words, the number of close friends or family the individual has in the organization (strong ties) was subtracted from the total number of individuals the respondent knew in the organization (Q48a).

The movement integration variables/indexes discussed above are summarized in Table 5.13. below.
### Table 5.13 Network Variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name and Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Response Catg. and Coding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization membership:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An index was created by summing together the transformed rankings for both forestry organizations and environmental organizations that respondent is a member of.</td>
<td>Environmental organization memberships: $\text{EORGMEM} = (q51a6 + q51b6 + q51c6 + q51e6 + q51f6 + q51g6 + q51h6 + q51l6 + q51m6)$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry organization memberships: $\text{FORGMEM} = (q51d6 + q51l6 + \text{ShareM} + q51k6)$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Ties:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “sties” index was created by summing together the number of “close friends” (Q48c) and “family members who live in your household” (Q48f) the respondent had.</td>
<td>$\text{sties} = (\text{cfriend} + \text{ifamily})$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Ties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “wties” index was created by subtracting the number of strong ties from the total number of ties the individual had to others in the organization. In short, “sties” were subtracted from the “number of Share members you know” (Q48a) to obtain the number of weak ties the individual to others in the organization.</td>
<td>$\text{wties} = (\text{tties} - \text{sties})$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that I have reviewed a description of the ways in which variables were operationalized, I will move on to the next Chapter. In Chapter Six, I turn my attention to the first level of analysis: *If the conflict over forestry and conservation is fuelled as environmentalists become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their identity, what then, are the underlying differences between members of the two movements with respect to their socio-demographics (age, education gender, class, region), values (political, attitudes toward the environment), networks, and collective identity?* In exploring these differences – and potential similarities – I hope that a more robust understanding of the conflict will be attained. To carry out this objective, Chapter Six will compare the profile of Share members with that of environmentalists; as well as
provide comparison data to examine the extent to which the membership of Share is representative of the general public of Port Alberni.
CHAPTER SIX: MOVEMENT COUNTERMOVEMENT COMPARISONS (FIRST LEVEL OF ANALYSIS)

The objective of the first level of analysis I conduct in this chapter is to examine the underlying differences – and potential similarities - between members of the two opposing movements. In other words, I explore each movement organization with respect to their membership’s socio-demographics (age, education gender, regional location), structural variables (occupation and class), values towards the environment (anthropocentrism), socio-political values (political, materialist versus post-materialist), networks, and collective identities. In exploring these factors I hope that a more robust understanding of the conflict will be attained. To carry out this objective, Chapter Six will provide univariate data to compare the profile of Share members with that of environmentalists; as well as provide comparison data to examine the extent to which the membership of Share is representative of the general public of Port Alberni. In some instances, I will also provide some qualitative data to provide context to some of my quantitative findings.

Before I begin, it should be noted that in some instances data for general public of Port Alberni are not available, as a result Census data will be used. I should also caution readers that some variables are measured differently in the three data sets, so direct comparisons between data sets is not always possible. In these instances, I will provide explanations of the specific measurement differences. For brevity, environmental movement member respondents will hence forth be referred to as “EM” and respondents of the general public of Port Alberni survey will be referred to as “PA”.

Socio-demographic Variables:
Table 6.1 provides comparative univariate statistics on age, gender, education and geographical location from the sample of Share, EM and PA respondents.

---

29 Albeit, for some of these key variables, comparisons cannot be made since the data does not exist.
Age:
With respect to the age distribution of the three samples, Table 6.1, shows that the majority (60%) of Share respondents fall in the 45-64 year old category. In comparing the Share sample with the EM sample, Table 6.1 shows that EM respondents are typically younger (47% of the sample are between the ages of 15-44) than Share respondents. In comparing the age distribution in the sample of Share respondents with the general public of PA respondents and the 1996 Port Alberni Census, those aged 15 - 24 are slightly under-represented in the Share sample, while those aged 45 – 64 are considerably over-represented in the Share sample.

Scholars have empirically demonstrated that new social movement participants are typically younger. This is attributed to factors such as biographic availability - younger participants are less tied to careers and family responsibilities and are therefore more able to participate. In some respects, this finding also supports Share members' charge that many of the individuals blockading logging roads are young 'hippies' with nothing better to do. As I predicted, Share members are typically older. I would argue that this is due in large part to the fact that Share mobilized to give voice to forestry workers and forestry dependent communities. It makes intuitive sense that older workers, and those most likely to participate and identify with Share, would be those that are long time forestry workers that are entrenched in the forestry lifestyle and would have the most difficulty adapting to new types of employment.

Gender:
As shown in Table 6.1, comparisons on gender provide some interesting differences between the Share sample and the EM, PA sample and the 1996 Port Alberni Census (henceforth referred to as the “Census”). When compared to EM, PA respondents and the Census population, the countermovement has a disproportionately higher percentage of males. The majority (75%) of Share respondents are male, compared with 47% of EM respondents, 54% PA respondents and 50% of the Census. As noted earlier, Share is an
organization with the objective of giving voice to forestry workers. I hypothesized the majority of Share members are male since men dominate the industry.\textsuperscript{30}

**Education:**

With respect to education, Table 6.1 highlights some striking differences between the Share, EM, PA samples and Census population. As shown, 44% of Share members have partially completed, or completed high school, while 37% have obtained some post secondary education. EM respondents have significantly higher levels of education than Share respondents. The majority (52%) of EM sample respondents have received some post secondary education or have obtained a bachelor degree. Further, 41% of EM respondents (compared to only 6% of Share respondents) have received a post graduate degree.

In comparing Share respondents with PA respondents and the Census population, Table 6.1 shows that the distribution of the highest level of education obtained amongst Share and PA respondents are roughly equal. The majority of PA respondents (55%) have partial completion of or completion of high school (compared with 44% of Share members), while 34% have received some post secondary education (compared with 37% of Share members). In comparing Share and the 1996 PA Census population, Table 6.1 shows that the majority has obtained a higher level of education than Share members - 72% have received some post secondary education, compared with only 37% of Share respondents. Comparing these percentages with respondents of the Share sample, only (15%) of Share respondents had obtained a Bachelors degree and only 6% of Share respondents had obtained any post graduate training.

These findings support the literature, particularly Dunk’s (1994) research showing that forestry workers have little use for ‘formal’ education and that ‘practical’ knowledge is far more important and useful than a university education. Historically, most forestry

\textsuperscript{30} Conversely, it has been argued that women are symbolically associated with the environmental movement and also play an important leadership roles in the movement; particularly in the environmental movement on the West Coast of Vancouver Island (Tindall, Mauboules and Bates 1997). Albeit, as data
based occupations have required no post-secondary education. Differences in educational attainment between Share and EM respondents are also consistent with past research findings that environmental movement members typically have higher levels of education than the general public (Tindall 1994). What is interesting in the differences in educational attainment between movement and countermovement participants is that research has empirically demonstrated that education is an important predictor of new social movement participation. As will be examined in more detail in the next chapter, I hypothesize that educational attainment is negatively associated with participation in and identification with the countermovement. Again, I argue that the average Share member is older, and has less formal education than an average environmental movement participant. As described in the Chapter One, the forest industry boomed at the end of the second world war and many forestry workers were able to obtain well paying jobs that required little formal education. Indeed, ‘practical’ knowledge was believed to be far more important and useful than a university education (Dunk 1994).

**Geographical Location**

If you recall from the last chapter, I created two geographic location variables: CMA (Census Metropolitan Area) and Newcomer (lived in community 10 years or less). Table 6.1 provides data for the Share and PA samples only since this question was not asked in the EM survey. As shown the Share sample largely reflects the PA sample. I wanted to know where respondents had spent the majority of their teenage years and I found that the majority of both Share respondents (71%) and PA (76%) respondents spent their teenage years in non-Census Metropolitan areas and the majority (88% and 84% respectively) were long-time (10 years or more) community residents. As shown in Table 6.1, Share respondents are slightly less likely to be newcomers compared to PA respondents. In general however, the Share sample largely reflects the general public of Port Alberni.

Presented in Table 6.2 shows, the distribution of men and women in the EM sample is roughly equal (51% female 47% male).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Share Survey¹</th>
<th>Environmental Movement Survey¹</th>
<th>General Public of Port Alberni Survey¹</th>
<th>Port Alberni 1996 Census¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Population²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 15 – 24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 25 – 44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 45 – 64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 65 +</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of or completion of high school</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post secondary³</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbringing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (CMA)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban (non-CMA)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-time resident</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. Numbers are rounded to nearest percentage and therefore may not add to 100%.
2. I have not included the 0-14 age category (accounts for roughly 20% of population).
3. This includes colleges and technical school certificates and diplomas.
4. Includes university bachelor degree and higher.

**Structural Variables:**

Table 6.2 provides comparative univariate statistics for occupation and class background for the samples of Share, EM and PA respondents.
Occupation

Table 6.2 shows the occupational distribution of respondents from the Share, EM surveys and the 1991 Port Alberni Census. The occupational categories are derived from the 1980 Classification Scheme (Census Canada 1980). As shown, the largest percentage of Share respondents (38%) fall into the “Other Primary Occupations” category, while 11% fall into the “Management and Administrative” occupational category. What is most striking in comparing the occupations of respondents in the Share and EM samples is that 38% of Share respondents are employed in “Other Primary Occupations” compared to only 1% of EM respondents. EM respondents are typically employed in “new middle class” (Brint 1985) occupations, while Share members tend to be employed in working class occupations (i.e., primary and processing occupations). As shown, only 3% of Share respondents work in teaching, medicine, health and related occupations, 30% of EM respondents fall into these categories. In addition, 17% of EM respondents work in “management and administration” occupations (compared with 11% of the Share sample), 15% work in “natural sciences, engineering and mathematics” occupations (compared with 7% of the Share sample) and 6% work in “social science and related fields” occupations (compared to 0% of the Share sample).

With respect to the occupational distribution, Table 6.2 shows that the Share sample and the 1991 Census population are quite similar. While Share respondents are over represented in the “Other Primary Occupation” category, the Census data shows that 11% of the population is also employed in this category (note that “Farming, Horticulture and Animal Husbandry” occupations are also included in this percentage). According to the Census data, individuals employed in “Service Occupations” were over represented when compared with Share respondents (15% compared to 3%), as were individuals employed in “Clerical and Related Occupations” (12% compared to 2%). Finally, the 1991 Census data shows that individuals with “Management and Administrative” occupations were under represented when compared to Share respondents (5% compared to 11%).
These findings support the literature. As discussed earlier, new social movement (i.e., the environmental movement) participants are predominately employed in “new middle class” occupations and are highly educated white collar professionals often employed as “knowledge workers” (Offe 1985; Kriesi 1989). Conversely, my findings show that Share respondents are typically employed in lower-middle class and working class occupations. Since Share is an (countermovement) organization with the objective of acting as the collective voice for rural communities dependent on the use of natural resources, the majority of their membership have interest in or are employed in forestry related occupations. Share members are dependent on these occupations not only for their economic well-being, but I argue that their occupational community is a highly salient features of participation in and identification with Share. In the following chapter, I will more closely examine this argument.

### Table 6.2: Occupational Profile of Samples (Share, EM, PA Census Population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Categories</th>
<th>Share Survey</th>
<th>EM Survey</th>
<th>1991 Port Alberni Census$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Of Sample$^2$</td>
<td>Percentage Of Sample$^2$</td>
<td>Percentage Of Sample$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Management and Admin.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occupations in the Natural Sciences, Engineering and Mathematics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Sciences and Related Fields</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching and Related Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Occupation in Medicine and Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Art, Lit., Rec. and Related Occupations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clerical and Related Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sales Occupation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Service Occupation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Farming, Horticulture and Animal Husbandry Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other Primary Occupations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11$^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Processing Occupations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Machine, Product Fabrication, Assembly &amp; Repair Occupations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Construction Trades Occupations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Transportation Equipment Operator Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^1$ Source: 1991 Port Alberni Census

$^2$ Percentage of Sample

$^3$ Due to rounding

$^4$ Due to rounding
Class:

Table 6.3, provides the class backgrounds of respondents of the Share and EM samples (data was not available for the PA sample). What is most striking about the data is that the predominant class in the Share sample are “Working Class” (50% of Share respondents are “Skilled Workers” and 12% are “Unskilled Workers”) while predominant class in the EM sample is the “New Middle Class” (13% “Technical Specialists”; 15% “Human Service Professionals”; and 9% “Socio-Cultural Specialists”). As also shown in Table 6.3, Share respondents (10%) are slightly more likely to be business owners than EM respondents (8%).

Again these findings support the occupational categories of respondents in both samples. Countermovement participants may be characterized as working class, while new social movement participants may be characterized as belonging to the new middle class.
Table 6.3: Class Profile of Samples (Share and EM Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Position</th>
<th>Share Survey</th>
<th>EM Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Middle Class (total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical Spec.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human Service Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socio-Cultural Specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skilled employees</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unskilled employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not in paid labour force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(besides retired)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retired</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages have been rounded to nearest number.

I argue that being a forestry worker and being a member of the occupational community is a highly salient component of the collective identity of Share. As noted in my literature review, Carroll and Lee’s (1990) research found that forestry workers share common values and a “group world view” that is founded on individualism, know-how and common sense, a disdain for cities and they highly value forestry as a lifestyle with highly developed traditions and shared values that have been passed down through the generations. As shown by the demographic and geographic location variables, the majority of Share members belong to the working class, have lower-levels of education and have spent the majority of their lives in rural communities. In the next section, I will examine forest values amongst respondents of the Share and EM samples (question not included in the PA survey) in more detail. If being a forestry worker and a member of the occupational community of occupational community are highly salient with level of
identification with Share, I hypothesize that Share members more highly value anthropocentric forest values.

**Anthropocentrism:**
In the discussion to follow, I examine both biocentrism and anthropocentrism because I am comparing Share and EM respondents. However, in the multiple regression analysis that follows, I will focus on the anthropocentrism index discussed in the last chapter because both conceptually (Share is the main focus of my thesis and I argue that they will hold more anthropocentric values) and statistically (using factor analysis) it is most relevant to my analysis. In Table 6.4 below, I provide descriptive, univariate data on all items – both human or anthro-centred values and bio or nature-centred values.

Table 6.4 provides the rank order of means for both anthropocentric and biocentric forest values for respondents in the Share and EM surveys. Please note that data are provided only for the Share and EM survey since this question was not included in the PA survey. What is most interesting when comparing Share and EM respondents is their ranking of the *most important* forest value. As anticipated in my review of the literature, Share members ranked the anthropocentric forest value “a place for economic wealth and jobs” as the most important value, while EM respondents ranked the same value the lowest. For EM respondents, the biocentric forest value “balancing the global ecosystem” is the most important value a forest provides.

However, both Share and EM respondents ranked the biocentric forest values “a habitat for a variety of plant and animal life” and “protecting Canada’s air, water and soil” as the second and third most important values respectively. Thus while respondents of the two organizations differ in their most important value, there are similarities between them with respect to the second and third most important values. While these individual rankings are interesting in that they provide an overview or comparison of respondents from the two surveys, the anthropocentrism index will be more important to the multivariate analyses that follows in the next chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Value</th>
<th>Share Survey</th>
<th>EM Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A place for recreation and relaxation.*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A source of economic wealth and jobs.*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As a habitat for a variety of animal and plant life. **</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Balancing the global ecosystem. **</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Protection of Canada’s water, air and soil. **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wilderness preservation. **</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* denotes anthropocentric forest values
** denotes biocentric forest values.

I will now compare and contrast respondents in the three samples with respect to socio-political values.

**Socio-Political Variables**

**Conservatism:**

In the following section I provide univariate statistics to examine socio-political values, as well as materialist versus post-materialist values of respondents in the Share, EM and PA samples.

Table 6.5 examines the socio-political values of respondents in the Share, EM and PA samples. Respondents were asked a series of questions taken from the literature attempting to measure liberal/conservative orientations and a “conserv” index was created (please see Chapter Five). In examining the table below, please note that a negative mean number is associated with conservative socio-political values, while a positive mean number is associated with liberal socio-political values.

In comparing respondents from the Share sample, with EM and PA sample respondents, it is apparent that Share respondents hold a more conservative political value orientation.
(mean of -.31), while both EM and PA (to a lesser degree) respondents hold more liberal political value orientations (mean of .34 and .16 respectively).

These findings generally support the literature. As discussed earlier, research has shown that typically, countermovements are right-wing (Lo 1982). In addition, Calvert (1987) and others (see Guppy, Blake and Urmetzer 1996-1997) have found that individuals on the liberal/left spectrum of political support environmental protection, while individuals leaning on the conservative/right side of the political spectrum are less supportive, if not hostile, towards environmental concerns. Furthermore, Brint’s (1994) research shows that individuals in employed in the new middle class that hold jobs in the social and cultural occupational categories. While conservative/right wing political adherents advocate the status quo and the use of the market place to allocate values, liberal/left political adherents are more likely to critique the existing political and economic systems and be more responsive to the objectives of the environmental movement. It is the culmination of these values and attitudes that contribute to an individual’s identification with a movement or countermovement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.5 Socio-Political Variables (Share, EM and PA Respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Political Values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.31 (.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A positive mean score is associated with liberal political values while a negative mean score is associated with conservative political values.

**Materialist versus Post-Materialistic Values:**
Table 6.6 examines support for “materialist” versus “post-materialist” values for respondents in the Share, EM and PA samples. The social value categories shown in the rows in column one are taken from Inglehart’s (1977) study of value changes in Europe.
In column one, each social value category is followed by one or two stars. One star (*) denotes materialist or conservative values, while two stars (**) denote post-materialist values. The rank order of the mean is provided for the Share, EM and PA samples.

It is important to note that the social value categories were measured differently in all three surveys. Share respondents were asked to rate each perspective value (total of thirteen social value categories) where 1 indicated the most important goal and 10 indicated the least important goal. PA respondents were also asked to rate each perspective value, but from a total of six social value categories, where 1 indicated the most important goal and 10 indicated the least important goal. EM respondents were asked to rank each perspective value first, second or third in order of importance from a list of thirteen values. As a result lower mean scores are associated with strongly held or cherished social values.

Table 6.6 provides the rank order of the mean ratings (Share and PA samples) and rankings (EM sample). This thesis argues that Share, and to a lesser degree PA respondents will more likely hold materialist values, while EM respondents will likely have more post-materialist values. As shown in Table 6.6, these assertions are supported. Share and PA respondents most strongly value the materialist values of "maintaining a stable economy," (ranked 1st by Share) as well as "the fight against crime" (ranked 2nd by Share and 1st by PA), while EM respondents ranked these values quite low (7th and 9th respectively). In examining EM respondents' most strongly held values, Table 6.5 shows that the post-materialist values of "protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted" and "progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society" and "progress toward a society where ideas count more than money" were ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd.

It must be noted, however, that there is also considerable overlap. Respondents in all three surveys ranked "Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted" – a post-materialist value – quite high (Share respondents ranked it 5th, while PA respondents ranked it 3rd). In addition, both Share and EM respondents ranked the materialist value of
“making sure this country has strong defence forces” 13th in order of importance. While these individual rankings are interesting in that they provide an overview or comparison of respondents from the three surveys, the indexes of materialism and post-materialism will be more important to the multivariate analyses that follows in the next chapter.

<p>| Table 6.6 Material versus Post-Material Values (Share, EM and PA Respondents) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Value</th>
<th>Share Survey</th>
<th>EM Survey</th>
<th>PA Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Maintaining a high rate of economic growth.</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Making sure that this country has strong defence forces.</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Seeing that more people have say in how things get done at work and in their communities.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful.</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Maintaining order in the nation.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Giving people more say in governmental decisions.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Fighting rising prices.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Protecting freedom of speech.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Maintaining a stable economy.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. The fight against crime.</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Progress toward a society where ideas count more than money.</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
* denotes “materialist” or “conservative” values
** denotes “post-materialist” values.
N/A denotes that value category was not included in questionnaire.

In the next and final section of this chapter, I will examine the ego-centric or personal networks of Share, EM and PA members.
Network Variables:
Table 6.7 and Table 6.8 examine the number and types of persona networks Share, EM and PA respondents have. As described earlier, the greater an individual’s ego centric (or personal) network ties to a movement (in both range and strength of the ties), the more an individual is integrated into the movement. This thesis argues that these networks are important predictors of both participation in and identification with the countermovement. The more ties an individual has to the countermovement, the more likely s/he will identify with the movement and support movement objectives and shared values.

Weak and Strong Ties and Range of Organizational Ties and Memberships:
Table 6.7 below provides the mean and standard deviation for a number of movement integration variables: number of weak and strong ties to organization; range of organizational ties and memberships. To examine the personal networks countermovement (Share) and movement (EM) members have to others within their own organizations, respondents where asked to identify the number of close friends or family members (strong ties) they had within the organization and they were also asked about their networks or ties to others in the organization such as friends or acquaintances (weak ties).

As shown in Table 6.7, Share respondents have both a greater number of weak ties (mean 15.49) and strong ties (mean of 4.07) to individuals in their organization than EM respondents (mean of 4.24 and 1.68 for weak and strong ties respectively) do to individuals in their organization. In short, Share respondents have a greater number of friends and acquaintances, and a significantly greater number of close friends and family in the countermovement than EM respondents do to individuals within their own organization. As noted in the literature review, a possible explanation for this finding is that when the countermovement emerged, it grew out of and I would argue, remains

31 While the hypotheses and model used in this thesis implies a unilinear effect, I acknowledge that a reciprocal influence exists between these variables.
32 Many scholars have demonstrated that network-based interactions – interpersonal interactions such as greetings and conversations and rituals - provide the basis for the formation of a social identity (McAdam et al. 1988; Collins 1981, 1988; Tilly 1978; Melucci 1988; and Diani 1992).
dependent upon established institutions and organizations; namely, forestry based organizations such as the IWA and the close-knit forestry community in Port Alberni. As scholars have shown, many social movements (and in this case, also countermovements) find their impetus in existing organizations. Another possible explanation for finding that Share members are more embedded in their movement networks (in Port Alberni) than are environmentalists (in Victoria) is that Port Alberni is a relatively small, close knot forestry community. Share members are more likely to work together, see each other at the local grocery store, or at their children’s high school basketball game. In addition, since Port Alberni is a forestry dependent community, forestry issues are likely a frequent topic of discussion in situations as diverse as a visit to the dentist’s office to a Share meeting. Victoria, on the other hand, is an densely populated urban area and EM members may therefore not have the same types of interactions with other members.

---

33 See Curtis and Zucher (1973) for their discussion of the Texas Anti-pornography effort; Hicks (1961) and his discussion on the Populist Party; Lipset and Wolin (1965) for a discussion of the Berkley free speech movement; and finally, McAdam (1982), Morris (1984) and Oberschall (1973) for their discussion of the 1950s and 1960s American civil rights movement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.7 Number of Strong and Weak Ties, Range of Ties and Organizational Memberships (Share, EM and PA respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Weak Ties to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean (SD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources of Port Alberni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Movement¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Number of Strong Ties to** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Share Our Resources of Port Alberni** | 4.07 (8.65) | N/A | N/A |
| Environmental Movement¹ | N/A | 1.68 (3.01) | N/A |

| **Range of Memberships to** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Forestry Organizations** | 1.34 (.49) | N/A | .49 (.72) |
| Environmental Organizations² | .01 (.0009) | 1.85 (1.00) | .09 (.35) |

| **Range of Ties to** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** | **Mean (SD)** |
| **Forestry Organizations** | 1.87 (.90) | N/A | 1.49 (.92) |
| Environmental Organizations² | .76 (1.42) | 1.27 (1.73) | .63 (1.24) |

**Note:**
1. Refers to Sierra Club of Western Canada – the environmental group that was surveyed.
2. In order for comparisons to be made between the Share and PA samples, a shortened list was used which contained the same environmental organizations. Please note that this was not done for the EM sample and therefore caution must be exercised in comparing Share and PA respondents with EM respondents.

Table 6.7 also examines the number of ties (people they know) respondents in the three surveys have to various forestry and environmental organizations, as well as the number of memberships respondents have in the two types of organizations. In comparing the Share, EM and PA samples, caution must be exercised. Direct comparisons can be made only between the Share and PA samples because both surveys listed the same
organizations.\textsuperscript{34} The EM survey, however, did not list any forestry organizations and did not list entirely the same environmental organizations.\textsuperscript{35} Table 6.7 shows that both Share and PA respondents generally have ties to a greater number of organizations and have more memberships in forestry based organizations than they do in environmental organizations. Since Port Alberni is a forestry-based community, these findings seem logical. As would also be anticipated in comparing Share and PA respondents, Share respondents have a greater number of memberships in forestry organizations (mean of 1.34) then PA respondents (mean of .49) and Share respondents also have a greater number of ties to forestry organizations than PA respondents do (mean of 1.87 compared to mean of 1.49). Share respondents also have fewer memberships (mean of .01) in environmental organizations than PA respondents (mean of .09).

It is interesting to note that Share respondents have a greater number of ties to environmental organizations than PA respondents (mean of .76 and .63 respectively) – albeit the difference is not significant. A possible explanation for this finding is that because Share respondents belong to a countermovement organization that is involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation, Share respondents would be in more contact with other environmental organizations because of meetings, rallies, protests, etc. In other words, because of their participation in the movement/countermovement struggle, they have a greater number of ties to opposing movement organizations (i.e. environmental organizations) than the average citizen of Port Alberni might.

\textbf{Number (\%) of Strong Ties and Weak Ties}
While Table 6.7 examines the mean and the standard deviation for the number of strong ties and weak ties respondents in the three surveys have to both forestry and environmental organizations, Table 6.8 examines the percentage of Share and PA respondents who have \textit{at least one} tie to Share our Resources of Port Alberni. While examining the range of ties an individual has to other organizations is important, another

\textsuperscript{34} Environmental orgs: Alberni Environmental Coalition, Carmanah Forestry Society, Friends of Clayoquot Sound, Greenpeace, Sierra Club of B.C., WC\textsuperscript{2}. Forestry orgs: Forest Alliance, IWA, Share Our Resources of Port Alberni, and Share the Clayoquot.
way to think about networks and an individual’s level of integration in a movement is whether or not an individual has any ties to others in the movement. As anticipated, not only do a greater percentage of Share members (44%) have close friends or family in the movement (only 12% of the PA sample), but the majority of the sample (65%) also know at least one person in the countermovement. However, a significant percentage of the PA sample (35%) also know an individual that belongs to Share, perhaps providing some support to the argument that Port Alberni is a strong and closely-knit forestry community.

Table 6.8: Number of Strong and Weak Ties (Share and PA Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share Survey</th>
<th>PA Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with at least one tie to Share Our Resources of Port Alberni</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong tie</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak tie</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that univariate statistics have been provided for the main independent variables, Table 6.9 provides univariate statistics to examine level of identification of respondents in the Share, EM and PA samples.

Level of Identification

Table 6.9 examines Share, EM and PA respondents level of identification with 1) Share Our Resources of Port Alberni; 2) the environmental movement; 3) the forestry community, and finally, 4) the community of Port Alberni. Respondents were asked if they “very strongly,” “strongly,” “somewhat agree/disagree,” “strongly disagree,” “very strongly disagree,” with statements regarding their level of self identification and the level that others identify them with Share Our Resources of Port Alberni, the environmental movement, the forestry community, the community of Port Alberni (please see Chapter Five for an explanation of how these level of identification variables were operationalized).

35 Carmanah Forestry Society, Environmental Youth Alliance, Friends of the Carmanah and Walbran,
Table 6.9 provides the mean and standard deviation for respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with the identification label (as a member of the environmental movement, the forestry community, Share Our Resources of Port Alberni and finally, the Port Alberni community). In examining Table 6.9, a negative mean number indicates that the respondent (very strongly or strongly) disagrees with the statement and therefore has little or no level of identification with the label. If the mean number is positive, the respondent (very strongly or strongly) agrees with the statement and therefore does identify with the label. Finally, the greater the mean number, the greater the level of identification s/he has – or does not if the mean number is negative – with the identification label.

Since Share is a countermovement organization focused on forestry and conservation issues, it seems logical that Share respondents would most strongly identify with the Share and forestry community labels, but would disagree the environmental movement label. As shown in Table 6.9, Share respondents did disagree with the environmental movement label (mean of -1.78), but very strongly agreed with the Share label (mean of 1.25) and even more strongly with the forestry community label (mean of 4.01).

In comparing Share with PA respondents, it is interesting to note that PA respondents identify themselves even less with the environmental movement (-2.01) than do Share respondents (-1.78). A possible explanation for this finding is that some Share respondents claim to be environmentalists, while suggesting that those individuals belonging to the environmental movement are simply preservationists. With respect to level of identification with the community of Port Alberni, PA respondents have a greater level of identification (1.41) compared with Share respondents (.680). These variables will be examined in greater detail in the multiple regression analysis conducted in the next chapter.
Table 6.9. Level of Identification (Share and PA respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Identification as member of</th>
<th>Share Survey Mean (SD)</th>
<th>PA Survey Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental movement</td>
<td>-1.78 (2.32)</td>
<td>-2.01 (2.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry community</td>
<td>4.01 (2.82)</td>
<td>.938 (3.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources of Port Alberni</td>
<td>1.25 (2.38)</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Port Alberni community</td>
<td>.680 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.41 (.805)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Too few cases in this cell to report.

While this section examined Share, EM and PA respondents level of identification with 1) Share Our Resources of Port Alberni; 2) the environmental movement; 3) the forestry community, and finally, 4) the community of Port Alberni. It should be noted that in the next chapter, identification with Share is treated as the dependent variable in my analysis. Before turning to the next chapter, I would like to conclude by summarizing my findings in comparing profiles of Share, EM and PA respondents.

So what similarities and differences are found in the profiles of the two organizations? And how representative are Share respondents with the general public of Port Alberni? My results show that Share respondents are typically older males that have less formal education than environmental movement respondents. Most Share respondents are long-time residents and spent the majority of their teenage years in rural areas. Share respondents are typically working class individuals who are employed in primary occupations (i.e., resource extraction), while EM respondents tend to belong to the new middle class and are employed in occupations related to teaching, medicine and health, management and administration.

---

* The Share sample is fairly representative of the general public of Port Alberni.
* This question was not included in the EM survey, thus I have no comparison data.
Politically, Share respondents are more conservative in orientation, than both EM and PA respondents. With respect to anthropocentrism and Inglehart's (1977) conceptualization of materialist and post-materialist values, Share and EM respondents differ. Share respondents hold more anthropocentric forest values and rank the materialist value (maintain a stable economy) the highest. EM members are less anthropocentric (i.e., hold more biocentric values) and rank the post-materialist value (protect nature from being spoiled and polluted) as the most important goal in society.\(^{38}\)

When I examined the network variables, and in-group ties, Share respondents have both a greater number of weak and strong ties to individuals in their organization than EM respondents do to individuals in their organization. Share respondents belong to a greater number of countermovement organizations than PA respondents. This may in part be due to the fact that everyone in the Share sample belongs to the countermovement organization under investigation (i.e., Share). However, as will be discussed in more detail in the next section, having at least one countermovement organization membership should, theoretically, have an effect on participation in and identification with the countermovement.

In comparing Share and PA respondents (comparison data not available for EM respondents), Share respondents and PA respondents have roughly the same number of ties to environmental organizations. PA respondents are slightly more likely to have a membership in an environmental organization. These findings support my hypotheses that countermovement members are more integrated into the movement through their range of ties to and memberships with countermovement organizations. Therefore, my analysis also verifies the literature on the importance of networks or ties for participation in and identification with a movement (Orum 1972; McAdam 1986; Barnes and Kaase 1979; Von Eschen et al. 1971). The next chapter will more thoroughly examine the extent to which these networks effect participation in and identification with the countermovement.

\(^{38}\) However, it should be noted that there is a lot of overlap and similarity between them with respect to the second and third most important values.
Finally, with respect to level of identification, Share respondents disagreed with the environmental movement label, but very strongly agreed with the community of Port Alberni label and even more strongly with the forestry community label (comparison EM data was not available). The next section will examine in more detail, the importance of these hierarchy of identities. As Stryker (1981) argues, the concept of identity salience is useful in accounting for the importance of the role of an established organization in the initial emergence of countermovement. In the next section, I will discuss in more detail the extent to which the identity invoked by the pre-existing organization (forestry worker, member of the Port Alberni community – a resource dependent community) is a good predictor of participation in and identification with the countermovement.

Now that general profiles and comparisons have been made between Share, and the EM and PA survey respondents, attention will turn to multivariate analysis of the factors predicting level of countermovement identification. Chapter Seven focuses on the second objective of this thesis: If certain factors are important in explaining strength of identification with and participation in new social movements such as the environmental movement, then what factors are important in explaining participation in and identification with a countermovement organization such as Share? This second objective focuses on expanding the countermovement literature, as well as our understanding of the conflict over forestry and conservation. I will use multivariate regression analysis determine what factors best predict participation in and identification with the Share countermovement (please see Figure 3.1: Theoretical Model). In addition, some qualitative data will be presented in order to provide context for some of the quantitative results.
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE RELATIVE EXPLANATORY POWER OF KEY FACTORS DETERMINING LEVEL OF COUNERMOVEMENT IDENTIFICATION (SECOND LEVEL OF ANALYSIS)

In this chapter, I focus analysis on the Share countermovement. In reviewing the literature on new social movements (as the environmental movement has been characterized), systematic analysis has been conducted on why and how such movements mobilize and develop a sense of collective identity. In reviewing the countermovement literature, this type of systematic analysis is lacking. Using regression analysis, I will attempt to determine whether these same factors are important in predicting countermovement participation by assessing the relative explanatory power of each variable as a predictor of level of countermovement identification, while also controlling for the effects of other variables. I will also include qualitative data where relevant in order to provide context for the some of the quantitative findings.

The results discussed here are based on a series of regression equation analyses predicting level of countermovement identification among Share members. In other words, using multiple regression analysis, I will specifically test the hypotheses formulated in Chapter Four. The analysis begins by comparing the relative explanatory power of the socio-demographic variables (gender, age, education), geographic location variables (CMA, newcomer), social structural variables (class, interest), forest values (anthropocentrism), socio-political orientation (liberalism, materialist/post-materialist) and network variables (range of organization ties and memberships, strong and weak ties), and level of identification (with the forestry community, the community of Port Alberni and the environmental movement) in predicting level of countermovement identification.
Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Level of Countermovement Identification

I will describe two Tables (Table 7.1 and 7.2) that represent two levels of analysis. To begin, Table 7.1 provides a summary of five separate regression analyses predicting level of countermovement identification. In other words, each block of variables (e.g., Block 1: socio-demographic; Block 2: geographic location, etc.) is entered in isolation so that I can evaluate the predictive power of the variables making up each block.

In the second part of my analyses (shown in Table 7.2), I include all of the variables found to be strong and significant predictors of countermovement identification (Table 7.1) into one hierarchical regression model. This type of modeling is hierarchical in the sense that I only enter blocks of significant variables (as determined in my results shown in Table 7.1) to see how the model changes overall. The purpose of my thesis is to determine which variables are the best predictors, or have the greatest explanatory power in predicting countermovement identification so that I can develop a model that provides a good statistical explanation of identification with the countermovement. In other words, hierarchical modeling will allow me to determine if the standardized beta coefficient is significant and the $R^2$ changes substantially with the addition of new blocks of significant variables.

Before proceeding, I should again stress that level of countermovement identification refers to the strength of agreement that the identification label applies to them (the respondent). For example, in Table 7.1, education is negatively associated with identification. This means that people with higher levels of education tend to identify less strongly with Share (or are more likely to disagree that the label applied to them), while those with lower levels of education tend to more strongly identify with Share (or are less likely to disagree that the label applied to them).

In Model 1, the socio-demographic variables are entered (gender, age and education). As discussed earlier, the (new) social movement literature shows that these variables are important in predicting movement identification and participation (i.e., younger cohorts are more likely to participate, and those with greater levels of education support and
participate in new social movements such as the environmental movement). In the last chapter, it was shown that Share members are older than environmental movement participants and also have lower levels of education. Results shown in Model 1 of Table 7.1, show that the regression slopes for the three demographic variables are all in the direction I expected: gender and education are negative, age is positive. In other words, older men with lower levels of education identified more highly with the countermovement. While these results support my hypotheses, only education is statistically significant in predicting level of countermovement identification (age and gender are non-significant). In other words, when controlling for the three demographic variables, education is the best predictor of identification with Share. As shown by the R², however, the demographic variables comprising Model 1 explain only 4% of the variance in level of identification with the countermovement.\(^{39}\)

In Model 2, I enter the geographic location variables (CMA and new comer). Based on my review of the literature, I hypothesize that long-time residents (i.e., 10 years or longer) and those with rural upbringings (i.e., communities not designated as Census Metropolitan Areas by Statistics Canada) would more highly identify with Share. Results in Table 7.1, Model 2, show the correlation slopes for both variables are negative and the coefficients are very small and non-significant in predicting level of countermovement identification. A possible explanation for these results is that most respondents are long-term residents and the majority have had rural upbringing. Table 6.1 shows that 88% of Share respondents were long-time residents, and 71% had spent the majority of their teenage years in rural communities. The null results of the multiple regression analysis may have occurred in part because there is not much variation in the sample for these variables. As shown by the R², Model 2 of Table 7.1 explains only 1% of the variance in level of identification with the countermovement.

In Model 3, I enter the class variables (worker and interest). Again, in reviewing of the social movement and countermovement literature, participants in the environmental

\(^{39}\) Table 7.1 and 7.2 provides the reader with both the R² and the Adjusted R². However, because of the small sample and large number of variables some shrinkage occurs between R² and the Adjusted R². I will therefore focus on the R².
movement belong to the "new middle class" and are highly educated, white collar professionals often employed as "knowledge workers" (Offe 1985; Kriesi 1989). Again, Share members stand in sharp contrast to participants in the environmental movement. Chapter Six showed that the majority (56%) Share members belong to the working class and most are employed in primary occupations such as forestry (38%). In addition, 74% of Share respondents had a direct interest in the forestry industry (i.e., their jobs are dependent on or directly related to forest industry). Results in Table 7.1, Model 3, lend some credence to the economic determinist argument of countermovement participation and identification (i.e., conflict based on the jobs versus trees). Results in Table 7.1, Model 3, show that the regression coefficients for both the class variables (class and interest) are positive and significant predictors of countermovement identification. In other words, respondents who belonged to the working class more highly identified with Share. Similarly, those respondents who had a direct interest in the forestry industry also more highly identified with Share. As shown by the R², these variables account for 7% of the variance in predicting level of countermovement identification.

In Model 4, I enter the socio-political value variables (liberalism, materialism and anthropocentrism). In entering these variables, I am testing the culturally-based hypotheses predicting countermovement identification. The new social movement literature argues that environmental movement participants support "post-materialist" values, as well as hold a biocentric value orientation toward the non-human world (humans as part of nature, intrinsic value of nature) and are more liberal in their political orientations. In comparing EM respondents and Share respondents in Chapter Six, I found that EM respondents give a higher ranking to biocentric and post materialist values, and have liberal political value orientations (please see Table 6.4 6.5 and 6.6).

Share, on the other hand, mobilized as an organization to protect forestry jobs and way of life. As a forestry worker commented on the survey,

"I am very concerned about the loss of working forests at the expense of working people. I strongly feel enough areas have been set aside for parks and wildlife.... In fact, I feel that the Clayoquot sound decision was a
disaster for the working people of BC. A few rich people visiting does not make up for the local job loss. Misinformation, the Forest Practices Code, government interference, negative attitudes and illegal blockades have cost the working people dearly and thus the social fabric of our island and province. For everyone's sake, we need a healthy, stable economy. (SOR 030)

Model 4, Table 7.1, shows regression results for using the “culturally-based” variables (liberalism, materialism and anthropocentrism) to predict level of countermovement identification. The regression coefficients for both the liberal variable and materialism variable are negative and non-significant, while the regression coefficient for the anthropocentrism variable is positive and significant. These results support my hypothesis that respondents who are more politically conservative identify more highly with Share. As expected, anthropocentrism is a positive and significant predictor of countermovement identification: those respondents who more highly rated anthropocentric forest values, more highly identified with Share. As shown by the $R^2$, these variables account for 6% of the variance in predicting level of countermovement identification.

In Model 5, I enter the network variables (ties forestry and environmental organizations, memberships in forestry organizations, weak and strong ties). As noted in the literature review, scholars have found that the more integrated an individual is in a movement through his/her ties with other movement members, participation in movement activities and discussion of movement issues, the stronger his/her level of identification with the movement. Thus I hypothesized that the greater the range of ties to and memberships in forestry organizations, the greater the level of identification with the countermovement. In addition, the greater the number of strong (close friends or family) and weak ties (acquaintances), the greater the level of identification with Share. I would argue that out-group ties (ties to the opposing movement) – or ties to individuals in the environmental organizations - would mediate level of countermovement identification. In other words,

---

Please note that the signs for the regression coefficients reported in the tables are reversed so that positive beta coefficients indicate that greater support for anthropocentric values is associated with a stronger level of identification.
ties to individuals in environmental organizations would be negatively associated with countermovement identification.

As the results from model 5, Table 7.1 show, membership in forestry organization is strong, positive and the most significant predictor of countermovement identification. In other words, the more memberships an individual has in forestry organizations the more highly s/he will identify with Share (or agree that the label applies to them). While this finding supports my hypothesis, the results found Table 7.1 also reveal a finding I didn’t anticipate: ties to environmental organizations is also a positive and significant predictor of countermovement identification (albeit, the regression coefficient is relatively small .13 and only significant at the .10 test of significance).

I hypothesized that ties to environmental organizations would mediate countermovement identification, but as shown in Model 5, it actually does the opposite – the greater the number of ties to individuals in environmental organizations, the more strongly an individual with identify with Share. A possible explanation for this finding is that because Share respondents belong to a countermovement organization that is involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation, Share respondents are in more contact with other environmental organizations because of meetings, rallies, protests, etc. In other words, because of their participation in the movement/countermovement struggle, they have a greater number of ties to opposing movement organizations thus reinforcing their identification with Share. In the next chapter, I will explore the possible explanations for this finding in more detail.

Finally, in Model 6, I enter the identification variables (level of identification with the forestry community, the environmental movement and the community of Port Alberni). Port Alberni has witnessed a dramatic shift in its once booming forestry-based economy. As noted earlier, many Share members (rightly or wrongly) blame job loss on the direct action of environmental groups (blockades, protests, etc.), as well as the success of their lobbying efforts (increased environmental protection, the creation of parks, and the boycott of old growth forest products by many European companies). Many Share
respondents expressed outrage at the actions of environmentalists and felt that they were, in part, to blame for job loss:

"conservation has become a priority at the expense of families, communities and the economy." (SOR034)

"...because of environmental groups...within 10 years (or sooner) there will be no more forest industry." (SOR001)

"...as with many of the people who work in the industry and live in the rural communities, our concern has always been that decisions are dictated wholly from Victoria and by the efforts of world organizations – i.e. Green peace, sierra club - without our involvement." (SOR007)

"...the forest industry thrived prior to the “new religion”. By that I mean the worship of trees. Tree worship has practically brought the forest industry to its knees. Before the people that worship trees convinced government to change the “old order”... forest workers were among the highest paid in the world..." (SOR115)

Share emerged to be a voice for forestry workers and resource dependent communities. Since the majority of members are forestry workers, they strongly identify with the forestry community (please see Table 6.9). As noted in the literature review, the collective identity of a countermovement organization such as Share is a “shorthand designation announcing status – a set of attitudes and commitment for rules of behaviour – that those who assume the identity can be expected to conform to (Friedman and McAdam 1992:56).” In addition, it is suggested that what compels a person to participate in countermovement activities is precisely that individual’s desire to conform – through behaviour – to a cherished identity. I believe that Share emerged out of pre-existing organizations and institutions – namely forest industry organizations such as the IWA – and the newly created Share identity was a redefinition and reaffirmation of the collective identity associated with these pre-existing institutions and organizations (i.e., identification with the forestry community).

I therefore hypothesize that strong positive associations exists between countermovement identification and identification with the forestry community and the community of Port Alberni and a strong negative association exists between identification with the environmental movement (strength of agreement that the label applies to them) and
identification with Share. Model 6, Table 7.1, shows that indeed, the regression slope for both identification with the forestry community and the community of Port Alberni are strong and positive, while the slope is negative for identification with the environmental movement. In other words, those individuals that more highly identify themselves as members of the forestry community and the community of Port Alberni will more highly identify with Share. Conversely, those individuals that more highly identify with the environmental movement will less strongly with Share. All the identification variable are significant. The $R^2$ in model 6 is relatively large and significant; the ‘identification variables explain 25% of the variability in a respondent’s level of identification with the countermovement. In the next section, I will discussion the hierarchical model I construct to analyze the significant factors predicting countermovement identification.
### Table 7.1. Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Level of Countermovement Identification. Standardized Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Comer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Political Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialism</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropocentrism</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to Forestry Orgs.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Forestry Orgs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Ties</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Ties</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to Environmental Orgs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry community</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental movement</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .10; ** p ≤ .05; *** p ≤ .01; ****p ≤ .005

* Positive coefficients mean respondents hold more liberal political values, while negative coefficients indicate more conservative political values.

* Sign for regression coefficients reversed so positive beta sign indicates greater support for Anthropocentric values.
In light of the findings reported in Table 7.1, I conducted a second multiple regression analysis, this time using only those variables that were found to be significant predictors in level of countermovement identification. I did this because my results (from the regression analysis in Table 7.1) show these factors to be strong and significant predictors of countermovement identification. Since I want to develop a model that best predicts countermovement identification I should chose only those variables that are significant.

In Model 1, Table 7.2, education is entered into the regression equation. While it has been shown that education is a significant predictor of new social movement participation and identification, this does not hold true for participation and identification with the Share countermovement. Results in Table 7.2, Model 1, show that the standardized beta coefficient for education is small and non-significant (.06). In addition, the adjusted $R^2$ is negligible. In other words, almost none of the variation of an individual’s level of identification with the countermovement can be explained by years of formal education. If education is not significant in explaining countermovement identification, that what factors are? I would anticipate that because Share is an organization whose membership consists largely of forestry workers and those with a direct interest in forestry, that the class variables will be of some significance.

In Model 2, Table 7.2, I enter the worker and interest variables while controlling for all other variables. As predicted, the standardized beta coefficient for the interest variable is positive and the strongest and most significant predictor of countermovement identification. While the worker variable is positive and significant at the .10 test of significance level, the standardized beta coefficient is relatively small (.11). In short, those respondents who belong to the working class and those who have a direct interest in the forestay industry will more highly identify with Share. As shown by the change in $R^2$, when controlling for all other variables, the class and interest variables account for roughly 7% the variation in identification with the countermovement.

---

41 I found this result rather curious since education was a significant predictor in my analysis found in Table 7.1. As a result, I conducted further analysis and found that there are fewer cases available for the regression analysis conducted in Table 7.2, possibly explaining why the coefficient for education is lower and insignificant.
As noted, most Share members are employed in resource extraction industries – working class occupations which have historically required little or no formal education. I would argue that an collective identity of Share members is confirmed through their “meaningful interaction” (Blumer 1969:4) with other members of the occupational community. Again, this working class occupational community develops and defines the individuals own identity and sense of self. Simultaneously, the opinions, attitudes and values of “insiders” are more valid and important than those of “outsiders” – or urban environmentalists against which Share members mobilize and define themselves. I argue that it is precisely because of their occupational community and sense of identity as forestry workers that they will more strongly identify with Share – these identities are highly salient.

In Model 3, Table 7.2 I enter anthropocentrism to the regression equation – while controlling for interest, worker and education. As shown by the standardized beta coefficient, there is a strong and positive correlation between anthropocentrism (albeit at the .10 test of significance) and identification with the countermovement. In short, those respondents who more highly ranked anthropocentric forest values, more highly identified with Share. While significant, the change in $R^2$ shows that when controlling for all other variables, anthropocentric forest values account for only 2% of the variation in identification with the countermovement.

In Model 4, Table 7.2, I enter the network variables (ties to forestry organizations and ties to environmental organizations), while controlling for all previously entered variables. My results show that the standardized beta coefficient for memberships to forestry organizations is relatively strong and significant (albeit at the .10 level). Ties to environmental organizations, however is the strongest, positive predictor of countermovement identification (.21). This is an interesting finding in that I anticipated the relationship (or slope) to be negative. That is, ties to environmental organizations would mediate the strength of identification with the countermovement. My findings, however, show that ties to environmental groups is positively associated with
countermovement identification. In other words, ties to environmental organizations appears to actually reinforce identification with Share. I have suggested elsewhere that this finding may be due to the fact that precisely because respondents are involved in the countermovement organization, and also encounter environmentalists in their daily work routines (blockades, protests, etc), that Share respondents typically have more *out-group* ties or ties to environmentalists. In other words, because of their participation in the movement/countermovement struggle, they have a greater number of ties to opposing movement organizations (i.e. environmental organizations) which in turn reinforces their identification with Share. In examining the change in $R^2$ in model 4 (Table 7.2), these network factors are significant and explain roughly 6% of the variation in the dependent variable.

Finally, in Model 5, Table 7.2, I enter the identification variables identification with the forestry community, with the environmental movement and with the community of Port Alberni) into the regression equation, while controlling for all other variables. As hypothesized, results in Model 5, Table 7.2 show that both identification with the forest community and identification with the community of Port Alberni are strong, positive predictors of countermovement identification. In other words, those individuals that highly identified themselves with both the forestry community (strongest predictor $b = .41$ significant at the 0.005 level) and the community of Port Alberni also highly identified themselves with Share. As anticipated, the regression slope for identification with the environmental movement is significant and negative. The more strongly an respondent identifies with the environmental movement, the less strongly s/he will identify with the countermovement. Controlling for all previously entered variables, the change in the $R^2$ shows that the identification variables account for 14% of the explained variance in predicting level of countermovement identification.

In examining other variables included in Model 5, Table 7.2, what is most interesting in my results is that ties to environmental organizations is positive and the second most significant predictor of countermovement identification (standardized beta coefficient of .18). So in controlling for all other variables, ties to environmental organizations is still
positively associated with countermovement identification – albeit decreased slightly from model 4 to model 5 (from .21 to .18). I suspect that the effect for ties to environmental organizations is somewhat mediated by the effect of the identification variables. Finally, the coefficient for the worker variable (.12) is a strong and significant predictor of countermovement identification.

Overall, the results of Table 7.2 show when controlling for all other variables (education, worker, interest, anthropocentrism, membership in forestry organizations, identification with the environmental movement and identification with community of Port Alberni), identification with the forestry community and ties to environmental organizations are the best predictors of countermovement identification. Table 7.2 also shows that Model 5 has the greatest explanatory power in predicting countermovement identification – accounts for 29% of the variance in predicting countermovement identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.11+</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.15+</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Political Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropocentrism ^a</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.16+</td>
<td>.13+</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Forestry organizations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.16+</td>
<td>.11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties to environmental organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest community</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental movement</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.14+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R^2</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p. ≤ .10;  * p. ≤ .05;  ** p. ≤ .01;  ***p. ≤ .005

^a Sign for regression coefficients reversed so positive beta sign indicates greater support for Anthropocentric values.
I also would like to briefly point out that while interest and class factors are positive and significant in predicting level of countermovement identification at the zero order level, my findings will show that when controlling for all other variables in the equation, the effect for interest disappears (and in fact the slope of the standardized beta coefficient reverses). One possible explanation for this finding is that other factors – namely the network and identification variables – become more important than the class and interest variables as they are entered into the regression equation predicting level of countermovement identification.

As I noted at the beginning of this thesis, I believe that one of the main reasons for the conflict over forestry and conservation is that Share members and environmental movement members have differing attitudes towards the non-human world. My findings support this hypothesis. However, I should point out that while anthropocentrism is important at the zero level order, Table 7.2 shows that when other variables are controlled for (i.e., network and identification factors), the effect for anthropocentrism washes out. As Mueller (1980) found, there is no direct effect between feelings of alienation, frustration and participation in and identification with countermovements as asserted by many traditional grievance and attitudinal-based theories. Rather, stronger empirical evidence exists that structural or network factors best predict countermovement participation and identification.

Now that I have completed my analysis, I will turn to a more thorough examination of the ways in which my results support the literature, as well as the hypotheses I formulated in chapter five. The following final chapter of this thesis provides this overview and interpretation and discussion of my findings, as well as my concluding comments.
In this chapter, revisit the main themes in the literature and discuss in more detail the ways in which my results support the hypotheses formulated. I will then do some additional interpretation of my results and provide concluding comments.

As I discussed in Chapter One, Share mobilized in opposition to the environmental movement – environmentalists became the “other” against which Share mobilized and constructed their collective identity. Share serves as a voice for rural forestry and resource dependent communities in general, and forestry workers and their families in particular – a voice they feel is lacking in the decision making processes directly effecting them. Technological changes, the implementation of the Forest Practices Code, environmental regulation, the creation of parks and other changes have had a significant impact on Port Alberni. Job loss and resultant economic hardships can sometimes lead to other community problems such as increased rates of alcoholism and violence in the home. Results from my qualitative findings, reveal that many respondents feel a sense of despair and helplessness with respect to having control over their lives and decision-making processes in their communities. As one forestry worker summarized:

"There is a lot of despair in this community... Right from losing his or her job to the possible break-up of the home, loss of self worth, etc. These communities have only one main base for the economy and that is forestry and when it suffers, the whole community suffers." (SOR067)

The “other” became the main impetus for mobilization and collective identity formation. As a female Share member comments:

"The year of Clayoquot Sound was one of the most unpleasant in my life. The self righteous rhetoric and preaching from urban and European environmental missionaries was oppressive. The emotional polarization of the “save our trees” issue even impacted on long-term friendships. For a while we successfully relied on humour to deflect some of the oh-so serious missives and barbs aimed at society and me personally. But the sense of that attack didn’t abate. Felt drawn into the fray, which resulted in feeling angry and personally attacked. Didn’t like the feeling – it wasn’t healthy and counterproductive so I tried to protect myself by establishing some distance..." (SOR023)

I heard such stories again and again as I conducted research for Dr. Tindall in the summer of 1998.
While much research exists on participation in and identification with the environmental movement, there is a dearth of literature in participation in and identification with the anti-environmental countermovement. In this thesis, I attempt to address this gap in the literature by examining Share as a case of such a countermovement. I do not examine Share as a case study per say (an in-depth examination of the countermovement), but using a cross-sectional survey design method, I explore the underlying differences – and potential similarities – between movement and countermovement members. If environmentalists are the “other” against which Share mobilize and construct their collective identity, then who are Share members in terms of their demographics, socio-political values, their personal networks and their level of identification with various organizations and communities. While these comparisons provide a better understanding of the make-up of movement participants, I am also interested in examining the factors that best explain participation in and identification with Share. Much research has focused on the factors that are important in explaining participation in and identification with the environmental movement, therefore I test whether these same factors are important in predicting countermovement participation.

Before turning to a further interpretation and discussion of those factors best predicting participation in and identification with the countermovement, I will first compare profiles of movement and countermovement members.

The “Other”
As evidenced by the quotes above, environmentalist and European ‘outsiders’ become the “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their identity. So what then, are the similarities and differences in the profiles of the two organizations? And how representative are Share respondents with the general public of Port Alberni? As I found in chapter seven, Share respondents are typically older males that have fewer years of formal education than environmental movement respondents. Thus in many ways Share is a countermovement in that the characteristics of its members stand in direct contrast to participants of the environmental movement. While explanations such as
biographical availability serve to explain why environmental movement participants tend to be younger, I would argue that precisely because Share emerged as a countermovement to give voice to forestry workers and forest dependent communities. In other words, it makes intuitive sense that long time forestry workers (older males working in jobs that require little formal education) would comprise the majority of the countermovement members. My finding also supports Dunk’s (1994) research showing that forestry workers have little use for formal education and that ‘practical’ knowledge is far more useful than a university degree.

As also shown in the research of Carroll and Lee (1994) forestry workers share common values and a “group world view” that is founded on individualism, know-how and common sense, a disdain for cities and they highly value forestry as a lifestyle with highly developed traditions and shared values that have been passed down through the generations. The majority of Share respondents are long-time residents and who spent their teenage years in rural areas. This question was unfortunately not included in the EM survey. I assume that most EM respondents do live in urban areas (the survey was conducted in the Greater Victoria Area), but I would be curious to see if EM respondents has spent the majority of their teenage years in rural or urban areas.

Share respondents are typically working class individuals who are employed in primary occupations (i.e., resource extraction), while EM respondents, as characterized by the literature, tend to belong to the new middle class and are employed in occupations related to teaching, medicine and health, management and administration. The “other” against which Share members mobilize and construct their collective identity is the unemployed blockader, as well as the white collar worker or government bureaucrat and corporate executive making forest policy decisions. Forestry workers perception of the “other” as white collar workers or professionals with higher (albeit less practical) levels of education, more valued knowledge and residing in urban areas is warranted. This interpretation has clear class connotations, as well as denoted spatial relationships based

43 The Share sample is fairly representative of the general public of Port Alberni.
on regional differences. Evidence of these perceptions are summarized nicely by two Share members:

"People in the forest industry are environmentalists. Those who live in Victoria and Vancouver should maintain their own communities. Let them look after their own backyards." (SOR032)

"Environmental protests are usually directed and led by people who reside outside the area of concern. Consequently, they are not directly affected by the results of their own actions." (SOR033)

Politically, Share respondents are more conservative in orientation, than both EM and PA respondents. As Lo (1982) found, most countermovements are right-wing (i.e., or conservative according to my definition). Guppy, Blake and Urmetzer 1996-1997) found that those on the liberal/left political spectrum support environmental protection, while individuals on the conservative/right side of the political spectrum are less supportive. While I believe that Share respondents understand what is meant by the term environmentalist (an individual belonging to an environmental organization), the above quote is interesting in that some Share members find the term problematic from their point of view. Typically, these members characterize environmentalists as ‘preservationists’. As one Share member stated:

"I totally believe in responsible, sustainable forestry... I believe in the environment (clean air, water, balanced responsible resource use). If this qualifies me as an environmentalist then I am. But I am not a preservationist." (SOR037)

With respect to forest values (anthropocentrism and biocentrism) and materialist versus post-materialist values (Inglehart 1977), Share and EM respondents also differ. Share respondents more highly value anthropocentric forest values, while EM respondents more highly value biocentric values. Share members rank the materialist value (maintain a stable economy) the highest, while EM rank the post-materialist value (protect nature from being spoiled and polluted) most important goal in society.44

44 Albeit, there is a lot of overlap and similarity between them with respect to the second and third most important values.
With respect to the network variables, and in-group ties, Share respondents have both a
greater number of weak and strong ties to individuals in their organization than EM
respondents do to individuals in their organization. Share respondents belong to a greater
number of countermovement organizations than PA respondents. This may in part be due
to the fact that everyone in the Share sample belongs to the countermovement
organization under investigation (i.e., Share). As shown in the multiple regression
analysis conducted in the last chapter having at least one countermovement organization
membership has an effect on participation in and identification with the
countermovement. In comparing Share and PA respondents (comparison data not
available for EM respondents), Share respondents are slightly more likely to have a tie to
an environmental organization than PA respondents. PA respondents are slightly more
likely to have a membership in an environmental organization. These findings support
my hypotheses that countermovement members are more integrated into the movement
through their range of ties to and memberships with countermovement organizations.
These findings support the literature empirically demonstrating the importance of
networks or ties for participation in and identification with a movement (Orum 1972;
McAdam 1986; Barnes and Kaase 1979; Von Eschen et al. 1971). In the next section, I
will examine in more detail the possible reasons why the extent of these network effect
participation in and identification with the countermovement.

While comparison EM data with respect to level of identification is not available, Share
is quite representative of the general public of Port Alberni. Share respondents disagreed
with the environmental movement label (PA respondents identified themselves even
less), but very strongly agreed with the Share label and even more strongly with the
forestry community label (PA respondents identified themselves even more with the
community of Port Alberni). As shown in my regression analysis in chapter Seven, these
identities play an important role in predicting participation in and identification with the
countermovement. As Stryker (1981) argues, the concept of identity salience is useful in
accounting for the importance of the role of an established organization in the
development of a countermovement. In the next section, I will examine why the identity
invoked by the pre-existing organization (forestry worker, member of the Port Alberni
community – a resource dependent community) is a good predictor of participation in and identification with the countermovement.

Now that profiles of the movement and countermovement have been provided, I will discussion of my results in answering the second objective of this thesis; namely, what factors best predict participation in and identification with the Share countermovement. In the discussion I will link my findings back to the literature I reviewed in chapter three.

Factors Best Predicting Participation in and Identification with the Countermovement
In attempting to determine which factors best predict participation in and identification with the countermovement, the literature falls into two broad categories: traditional grievance or attitude-based models of movement participation and identification and more recent “rationalist” perspectives that focus on the micro-structural dynamics of movement/countermovement participation and identification. In addition, I also examined literature on value orientations toward the non-human world, as well as the literature on the social construction of identity in order to provide some context for the more ‘culturally-based’ countermovement hypotheses.

Traditional grievance or attitude-based models of movement participation and identification such as relative deprivation theory argue countermovements such as Share mobilize because their members feel deprived of things such as income, satisfactory working conditions, important political rights or basic social dignity (Morrison 1973). It is further suggested that this “underlying state of individual psychological tension is relieved by participation the movement (or this case, countermovement) (Gurney and Tierney 1982:36).” As noted above, Share emerged to be an active voice for forestry workers and resource dependent communities in the decision making processes that ultimately impacts their lives and social and economic well being. As two respondents so succinctly stated:

"Share offered the people of port Alberni a voice in the debate over land use in areas that directly affected them." (SOR015)
"Share brought awareness to both sides of the issue. People need to hear our side." (SOR030)

While forest workers in Port Alberni historically had some of the highest paying jobs in the province, the downturn in the industry undoubtedly engendered a sense of relative deprivation not only from their past job security, but also in relation to other regions of the province. Some respondents stressed the importance of giving more weight to the local voice when government makes land use decisions. In addition, respondents blamed government for trying to appease all special interest groups, especially "loud and the well financed" environmental groups (SOR023). Again, participation in and identification with Share is fuelled in part, to this sense of relative deprivation and lack of voice of forest dependent communities. As stated by one forestry worker:

"I deeply resent people from outside our community (Victoria, Vancouver, North America, Europe) dictating how we should practice their method of forestry. I believe in forest dependent communities. "
(SOR037)

As noted in my review of the literature, relative deprivation theory has been criticized for its circular reasoning. If relative deprivation causes someone to participate then the only evidence that someone feels deprived is participation itself (Jenkins and Perrow 1977). Little empirical evidence exists that would support the argument that countermovement participation can be solely attributed to an individual’s frustration or sense of alienation (Mueller 1980). In light of some of the comments offered by Share respondents as noted above, I argue that this sense of deprivation and alienation do demarcate a “latitude of rejection” or a “latitude of acceptance” (Petty and Cacioppo 1981; Klandermans and Oegema 1984) within which individuals will participate in countermovement activities.

The next main body of theoretical literature I explored to account for participation in and identification with the Share countermovements is the “rationalist” perspective. Rational choice theory falls within this theoretical perspective and argues that individuals participate in movements or countermovements based on cost-benefit calculations. An individual will participate only when they believe that the benefits will outweigh the costs (Friedman and McAdam 1992). As noted in chapter three, the theory has been
criticized for its post-hoc description of behaviour; its atomistic view of the individual and its failure to recognize that individuals are embedded in countermovement though their prior ties or group affiliations (Friedman and Mcadam 1992).

The results of my regression analysis most strongly support the arguments made by structural and network theory. Structural and network theory attempt to overcome the limitations of rational choice theory by arguing that an individual's proximity or network connections to a movement determine their participation in and identification with a movement or countermovement. In short, it does not matter whether an individual is psychologically or ideologically disposed to participation, but what matters is their networks or ties to individuals in the movement or countermovement (McAdam 1986; Snow 1976; Bolton 1972). I found support for this theoretical argument, as well as an interesting and surprising finding. As shown in Table 7.1 the soci-political variables of materialism and liberal political orientation were not significant predictors of countermovement participation and identification, but anthropocentrism was a significant predictor. However, when anthropocentrism was entered in the hierarchical model (Table 7.2), it's effect also washed out when the network variables and identity variables were entered. The remainder of the discussion will focus on a more in-depth interpretation and discussion of the network and identity variables since they were found to be the best predictors of countermovement identification.

My results contribute to the already existing empirical evidence supporting structural or network theory's assertion that membership in organizations is critical for movement participation and identification (Orum 1972; McAdam 1986; Barnes and Kaase 1979; Von Eschen et al. 1971). My results suggests that membership in other forestry organizations is a strong and significant predictor for participation in and identification with the countermovement (Table 7.2). This finding may be attributable to a number of reasons: membership in other (forestry) organizations increases communication and the dissemination of information; individuals involved in organizations feel a greater sense of personal efficacy (Sayre 1980; Neal and Seeman 1964) and more active individuals believe that participation is potentially effective and worthwhile; and finally,
memberships in other forestry organizations increases the range of interpersonal contacts thereby increasing the chance of personal recruiting appeals for participation. More importantly, I argue that Share grew out of pre-existing and established forestry-based organizations and institutions (IWA, Forest Alliance). As a result, not only are memberships in these organizations essential for the reasons just noted, but more importantly, memberships in these organizations serve a critical function by granting the emerging Share countermovement with a crucial resource — the collective identity associated with them. If we accept Friedman and McAdam (1992:156) definition of collective identity as a “shorthand designation announcing status — a set of attitudes, commitment and rules for behaviour — that those who assume the identity can be expected to subscribe to, then what compels individuals to participate in Share is precisely an individual’s desire to conform — through behaviour (participation) — to a cherished identity.

I argue that a component of this cherished collective identity is the belief that working in forestry is more than a job, it is a lifestyle — 82% of Share respondents would completely or mostly agree that forestry is a lifestyle. Stryker (1968, 1981) and others have argued that the idea of the self is made up of a hierarchy of identities. These identities are conceptualized as being “organized into a hierarchy of salience defined by the probability of the various identities being invoked in a given situation or over many situations (Stryker 1981:23-24).” The focus here is not on the individual and how s/he constructs his or her own identity, but rather the extent to which s/he agrees with the collective identity of Share. In other words, what I am arguing is that because the identity invoked by the pre-existing organization (e.g., forestry worker, member of the Port Alberni community) is highly salient among its members, the more likely they will participate in and identify with Share countermovement. My results validate this argument in that both identification with the forestry community and identification with the community or Port Alberni were positive and significant predictors of participation in and identification with the countermovement. Simultaneously, identification with the environmental movement is negatively associated with participation in and identification with Share. This makes intuitive sense in that Share is a countermovement that emerged
to lobby on behalf of forest workers and resource dependent communities and to counter the ‘misinformation’ that environmentalists were spreading.

Perhaps the most interesting and surprising results I found is that the second most statistically significant predictor of participation in and identification with the countermovement is not ties to individuals within the organization (i.e., Share), but rather out-group ties, or ties to individuals in the opposing (environmental) movement (see Table 7.2). This result is surprising because based on my review of the literature I anticipated that ties to individuals in the opposing movement (out-group ties) would mediate participation in and identification with the countermovement organization. Instead, my findings show that ties to environmentalists actually reaffirms participation in and identification with Share.

This network range measure is based on the number of individuals the respondent knows in an organization (e.g., their tie is at least weak). In further examining the Share data, I found that there are an estimated 103 weak environmental ties and only 7 strong environmental ties (data not previously presented). So the question is why are weak environmental ties a significant predictor of participation in and identification with Share? While some might argue that the mediating effect would only seem reasonable with respect to strong ties (close friends and family may have a greater ability to exert their influence over another family member than a mere acquaintance). Others may suggest that it seems at least plausible that weak out-group ties would have a small negative effect on identification with the countermovement. These arguments, however, are not supported by my findings. My results show that weak out-group ties actually have a moderately strong positive effect in predicting participation in and identification with Share.

As I alluded to earlier, I believe this finding may have something to do with the interactions between the movement and countermovement. Through participation in countermovement activities (rallies and other events, information booth, etc.), Share members interact with environmentalists. These interactions that are often quiet
adversarial. Thus by participating, Share members create ties to individuals in the environmental movement and once established these relationships also serve to reinforce the individual's sense of commitment to the collective identity of Share. Again, this is the idea that environmentalists become the "other" against which Share members mobilize and construct their identity. These network effects of out-group ties facilitates this process.

This leads to me to examine another aspect of the interactions between movement and countermovement participants. The importance of these out-group ties is also critical in trying to understand the context in which environmentalists become the "other" against which Share members mobilize and construct their identity. As noted in the Share respondent quotes above, countermovement respondents define the "other" is in terms of class relations (the working class forester versus the white collar professional making decisions about forestry jobs and/or 'welfare bums' blockading logging roads) and regional identity (and sense of economic disparity and political inequities between their community and areas such as the Lower Mainland and Greater Victoria). Port Alberni contains only one environmental organization with roughly twenty members, and therefore, relatively few members of the environmental movement live in the community. Indeed many of the environmentalists Share respondents interact with are not from the local community, but from other parts of the Island or province.

In surveying the general public of Port Alberni, I also found Share is largely representative of the Port Alberni Community (please see Chapter Six). While PA respondents had ties to individuals in the forestry organization, as well as memberships in forestry organizations, few had ties to environmental organizations. As a result, the dominant ideology of the community in general, and amongst Share members in particular, is pro-forestry and anti-environmentalism.

45 Originally, Dr. Tindall wanted to conduct a quantitative research project on both Share and local environmental organizations. We realized that this would not be possible since only one local environmental organization existed and their membership was relatively small. In turn, we conducted face-to-face interviews with key organization members.
Conclusion:
Share emerged as a countermovement opposed to the gains made by the environmental movement and to be a voice for forestry workers and resource dependent communities, such as Port Alberni in land-use decision making processes. Communities such as Port Alberni have been hard hit by the downturn in the forest industry. As workers and community members saw hundreds of individuals from other parts of the Island and province (and even the world) participate in blockades and demonstrations protesting the logging of old growth forests, Share mobilized. As shown, the socio-demographic (gender, age, education, CMA, newcomer), class (occupation, class and interest), socio-political values (liberalism, materialism and anthropocentrism) profile of Share members is basically the mirror opposite of EM members thus reinforcing their collective identity. Identification with the forest industry is the strongest and most significant predictor of share. This makes intuitive sense in that Share emerged to counter environmentalists – to identify with the forestry community is a highly salient component of identification with Share. Based on the literature, the most interesting and theoretically surprising finding of my research is that out-group ties to individuals in the environmental movement is a strong, positive and statistically significant predictor of participation in and identification with Share. While I have provided some analysis of why this may be the case, more sophisticated theoretical and empirical research, including more in-depth interviews, focusing specifically on the interactions and network effects between movement and countermovement participants is needed. My research serves as an initial step in demonstrating that the conflict between the movement and countermovement and intense dislike that Share members have of the “other” leads to reinforced commitment to participation in and the reaffirmation of identification with Share. What would also be instructive is that future research examine an anti-preservationist countermovement such as Share, through its three life phases (Friedman and McAdam 1992) in order to see how these out-group tie data change as the movement/countermovement cycle of protest and counter-protest change.
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APPENDIX A:
COMMUNITY CONCERNS ABOUT FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION ON VANCOUVER ISLAND QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Share Our Resources member,

We are sending you this questionnaire to collect data for a study of individuals and organizations that are concerned about forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information on people's attitudes, values, organizational activities, backgrounds and social networks and how they are related to concerns about forestry and conservation.

This is an academic research project based at the University of British Columbia. We hope the results of this research will enable us to better understand the role that values play in the conflict over forestry and conservation. In addition, we hope to identify common interests among different groups. The questionnaire is being sent to a variety of people in Port Alberni, Ucluelet and Tofino.

Even if you are not an active member of Share Our Resources at present, we would strongly encourage you to complete the questionnaire.

As with most survey research, our findings will be of higher quality if everyone who receives a questionnaire completes it. Further, it is important that we receive opinions and feedback from a variety of people, including both those who are active and those who are presently inactive so that our findings better reflect the diversity of people in Share Our Resources, and in the wider community.

Your participation in the project will provide information that is of both theoretical and practical significance. The information gathered from this questionnaire will be used in a number of ways. Celine Mauboules will use the data collected through this questionnaire for her Masters thesis. Dr. Tindall will use the data in writing scholarly journal articles and reports. A report summarizing the results of this survey will be presented to Share Our Resources of Port Alberni.
APPENDIX B:
For the following statements please indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Most jobs in the forest industry have been lost because of a reduced timber supply due to over-cutting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to unnecessary environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to necessary environmental protection (e.g., the creation of parks, the Forest Practices Code, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most jobs that have been lost in the forest industry are due to things like mechanization and market conditions (e.g., supply and price of wood fibre).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Most job losses in the forest industry are due to the actions of environmental groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Government has a responsibility to assist displaced forestry workers in obtaining comparable work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Forest companies have a responsibility to assist displaced forestry workers in obtaining comparable work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have)
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Most environmental problems are a result of societal over-consumption of resources (e.g., over-use of paper products, over-packaging, reliance on single occupancy vehicles, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>In order to have low unemployment and a more stable economy in this region, many forestry workers will have to accept lower levels of pay doing other kinds of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It is important for men to be able to earn enough money to support their families, including their spouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>In today's world, it is necessary for both parents to work full-time in the paid labour force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>In today's world, it is desirable for both parents to work full-time in the paid labour force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The children of forestry workers have a right to earn wages comparable to those earned by their parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Working in forestry is a lifestyle as well as a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Replacing lost forestry jobs with jobs in tourism is an appropriate solution to the unemployment problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Replacing lost forestry jobs with jobs in tourism is an economically viable choice for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>'Sustainable forestry,' means that forestry workers' children can continue to work in the forest industry doing similar jobs as their parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have in the space provided below.)
We would like to know how you feel about different kinds of protests which might be used to get the government to change its policies. (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often justified</th>
<th>Sometimes justified</th>
<th>Never justified</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>What about strikes? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>What about boycotts? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>What about legal and peaceful demonstrations, like marches, rallies, and picketing? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>What about illegal but peaceful demonstrations, like sit-ins? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>What about direct actions such as blockades of logging roads? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>What about direct actions against environmental groups who threaten forest industry jobs? (E.g., stopping the Greenpeace ship from leaving port, dismantling boardwalks and research stations installed by environmental groups on crown lands slated for timber harvesting.) Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>And finally, what about violent demonstrations including actions such as fighting with the police and destroying property? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have in the space provided below.)
The following questions were designed to obtain your opinion regarding environmental quality. For the following statements indicate whether you believe the issue is very serious, somewhat serious, not serious, not serious at all, or have no opinion. (Please place a check mark under the column that best expresses your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Serious</th>
<th>Somewhat Serious</th>
<th>Not Serious</th>
<th>Not Serious At All</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>How serious a problem do you feel air pollution is in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>How serious a problem do you feel water pollution is in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>How serious a problem do you feel liquid waste disposal (i.e. sewage) is in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>How serious a problem do you feel that solid waste disposal is in your community (e.g., using land fills to dispose of solid waste)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have in the space provided below.)

Below are listed some different values that Canadians have expressed regarding the importance of forests. How would you rank these values? (Place a 1 next to the most important value, place a 2 next to the second most important, a 3 next to the third most important, and so on down to 6 for the least important value.)

- A place for recreation and relaxation.
- A source of economic wealth and jobs.
- As a habitat for a variety of animal and plant life.
- Balancing the global ecosystem.
- Protection of Canada’s water, air and soil.
- Wilderness preservation.
22. How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a great deal of confidence
   b. only some confidence
   c. hardly any confidence

23. How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a great deal of confidence
   b. only some confidence
   c. hardly any confidence

24. Should the government (Circle one of the following.)
   a. do something to reduce income differences between the rich and poor, or
   b. should it not concern itself with income differences?

25. What do you think about government spending on improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending: (Please circle one of the following)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount

26. What do you think about government spending on health care? Are we spending: (Please circle one of the following)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount

27. What do you think about government spending on education? Are we spending: (Please circle one of the following)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount
For the following statements please indicate whether you completely agree, mostly agree, partly agree/disagree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree. (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Partly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Mostly Disagree</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. We should relax our efforts to control pollution in order to improve the economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. There has been too much emphasis on conserving natural resources and not enough on using them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Pollution control measures have created an unfair burden on industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Where natural resources are privately owned, society should have no control over them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. We should maintain our efforts to control pollution even if this slows down the economy and increases unemployment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If an industry cannot control its pollution, the industry should be shut down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Managers and owners of polluting industries should be punished with fines or imprisoned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Natural resources must be preserved for the future, even if people must do without.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have)
For the following statements please indicate whether you very strongly agree, strongly agree, somewhat agree/disagree, very strongly disagree, or have no opinion. (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I identify myself as an environmentalist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I identify myself as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I identify myself as a forest worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I identify myself as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I identify myself as a member of the Port Alberni community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I identify myself as a member of Share Our Resources of Port Alberni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Other people identify me as a member of the environmental movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Other people identify me as a member of the forestry community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Other people identify me as a member of Share Our Resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have in the space provided below.)

45. What type of membership with Share Our Resources do you hold? (Please circle one of the following).
   a. Individual
   b. Family
   c. Business
46. Approximately how long have you been a member of Share Our Resources? (Please write the approximate number of years you have been a member below.)

[ ] ___________

47. Please indicate which of the following statements best describes your level of involvement with Share Our Resources. (Circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. I pay dues but do not participate in any other way.
[ ] b. I participate in some Share Our Resources activities such as attending meetings or outings.

48. About how many people from Share Our Resources do you know? (For example, count all the people whom you know that you could hold a casual conversation with.)

[ ] Please specify approximate number of Share Our Resources members you know. __________

Of these people, how many are:

[ ] How many of these are women? __________

[ ] Close friends? __________

[ ] Acquaintances? __________

[ ] Coworkers? __________

[ ] Family members who live in your household? __________

[ ] Other relatives? __________

[ ] Other? __________ (specify type of relationship below.) __________

49. About how often do you talk with someone about forest industry issues (e.g., logging methods, government policies regarding the forest industry, lay-offs, etc.)? (Circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. Every day
[ ] b. At least once a week.
[ ] c. At least once a month.
[ ] d. Several times a year.
[ ] e. Once a year or less often.
[ ] f. Never.

50. About how often do you talk with someone about conservation and other environmental issues? (This could be with the same person, or with different people.) (Circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. Every day
[ ] b. At least once a week.
[ ] c. At least once a month.
[ ] d. Several times a year.
[ ] e. Once a year or less often.
[ ] f. Never
For each organization listed on the left, please place a check mark under the applicable box or boxes. If applicable, check multiple columns. Tick under column 1 if you have never heard of the organization. Tick under column 2 if you have heard of the organization. Tick under column 3 if you know a member of the organization. Tick under column 4 if you have a close friend or relative who belongs to the organization. Tick under column 5 if you are a former member of the organization. Tick under column 6 if you are currently a member of the organization. Tick under column 7 if you are currently an active member of the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberni Environmental Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Youth Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Carmanah and Walbran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Clayoquot Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Tsitsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources (Port Alberni)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the Clayoquot (Ucluelet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you a member of any groups involved in forestry or environmental issues not listed above? (Circle yes or no.)

| a. yes | b. no |

If yes, please list them.

- [ ] __________________________________________________________________________ |
- [ ] __________________________________________________________________________ |
- [ ] __________________________________________________________________________ |

Are you an active member?

| a. Yes | b. No |

| a. Yes | b. No |

About how often does someone encourage YOU to participate in Share Our Resources activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

| a. At least once a week. |
| b. At least once a month. |
| c. Several times a year. |
| d. Once a year or less often. |
| e. Never. |

About how often do you encourage SOMEONE ELSE to participate in Share Our Resources activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

| a. At least once a week. |
| b. At least once a month. |
| c. Several times a year. |
| d. Once a year or less often. |
| e. Never. |

Have the actions of Share Our Resources made a difference in trying to achieve a balance between the needs of forest communities having access to timber and ensuring that environmental and other non-timber values in the forest are protected? (Circle yes or no.)

| a. no | b. yes |

In a few sentences, briefly describe how:
56. Have your actions made a difference in trying to achieve a balance between the needs of forest communities having access to timber and ensuring that environmental and other non-timber values in the forest are protected? (Circle yes or no.)

|   | a. no | b. yes |

In a few sentences, briefly describe how:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

57. In setting out to achieve group goals, what sorts of barriers have you personally encountered? How have these barriers been overcome?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

58. Have you ever been approached by Share Our Resources to participate in an activity (attend rallies, write letters, etc.)? (Circle yes or no.)

|   | a. no | b. yes |

If YES, in a few sentences, please describe the activity.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Did you participate? (Circle yes or no.)

|   | a. no | b. yes |
Have you ever contributed to, or participated in, actions designed to support forestry on Vancouver Island? See the list provided below and place a check mark in the column for each activity you have participated in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I HAVE participated in this activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Be a member of Share Our Resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donate money to a community organization that has concerns about forestry issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Write a letter to a government official regarding a forestry issue (such as the controversy over Clayoquot Sound or the Carmanah Valley).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Send a letter, fax or e-mail to a newspaper about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Send a letter, fax, e-mail or phone a logging company about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Send a letter, fax, e-mail or phone an environmental organization about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Send a letter, fax, e-mail or phone another organization regarding a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sign a petition regarding a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attend a community meeting about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attend a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Participate in an information campaign for the general public about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Advertise in the media to promote a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Make a presentation to a public body about a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Give a lecture on forestry to a school group or voluntary organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Participate in a press release/conference regarding a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Serve as a representative on an advisory board around a forestry issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Purchase a book, t-shirt, poster, bumper sticker, mug or other merchandise to support forestry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Boycott individuals or organizations associated with radical environmental groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Vote for someone because of their views about forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Work to elect someone because of their views about forestry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. OTHER ACTIVITIES: (Please describe in the boxes below and click off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you ever contributed to, or participated in, actions designed to help preserve or protect the environment? See the list provided below and place a check mark in the column for each activity you have participated in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I have participated in this activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recycling at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recycling at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Regularly walking, bicycling or taking public transport instead of driving a single occupancy car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Car pooling on a regular basis (e.g. to work, school, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reusing and/or refusing unnecessary packaging and plastic bags.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conserving Energy (e.g. turning off unused lights).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Buying organic or local produce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Growing your own vegetables and/or fruit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Using environmentally friendly household cleaning products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Regularly re-using and mending things instead of discarding them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Planting trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Picking up litter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Using a re-usable mug instead of paper or styrofoam cups for beverages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Helping to maintain parks or natural habitats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Composting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Conserving water in the home or yard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Participating in the clean up of streams, lakes and watersheds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. OTHER behaviours designed to protect the environment (Please describe in the boxes below and check off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about Social Issues

61. Below is a list of some goals which are frequently thought of as being important to society. For you personally, how would you rate these goals? Please circle the most appropriate number in row where 1 indicates the most important goal, and 10 indicates the least important goal. (Circle one number per row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a high rate of economic growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sure that this country has strong defence forces.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining order in the nation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving people more say in governmental decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting rising prices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting freedom of speech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a stable economy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fight against crime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress toward a society where ideas count more than money.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS: (Please provide any additional comments you might have in the space provided below.)
Questions about your background

62. How old were you on your last birthday? ____________ (Years.)

63. What is your gender? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. Female    b. Male

64. What city, town, village or municipality do you live in? (Write name of place below.)

65. How long have you lived there? ____________ (Years)

66. Where did you live before that? __________________________ (Name of city, town or municipality)

67. Where did you live during your teenage years? __________________________ (Name of city, town or municipality)

68. What is your marital status? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. married
   b. living common law with someone
   c. in a relationship but not living together
   d. single (never married)
   e. separated
   f. divorced
   g. widowed

69. How many children do you have? _____

70. How many are living at home? _____

What are their ages and gender?
(eg., boy 10, girl 11, etc.)

_______ / _______ / _______ / _______ / _______ /
What is the highest level of education you have received? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. part of primary school
- b. completed primary school
- c. part of high school
- d. completed high school
- e. some college or university
- f. received a college or technical school certificate
- g. Please specify major or subject: __________________________
- h. some postgraduate training
- i. Please specify discipline: ________________________________
- j. received a postgraduate university degree
- k. Please specify type of degree and discipline: ____________________
- l. other (please state) ____________________________

What is your occupation? (If you are a homemaker or a student please state this. If you are retired, or unemployed please state this and list your former occupation.)

- ____________________________ (Occupation.)

Please describe your position and the paid work you do in detail.


Did you have any special training for your job? (Circle yes or no.)

- a. yes  b. no

If yes, what sort of training?


What does your company (or employer do)?


What industry do you work in? ____________________________
Do you work full-time or part-time? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. full-time
- b. part-time
- c. unemployed
- d. other (please specify) ____________________________

If you are employed, how many hours did you work last week? ______

Do you work for: (Circle one of the following.)

- a. a government department or ministry
- b. a large company
- c. a small business
- d. an institution
- e. yourself
- f. other (please provide a brief description below)

Do you work in the public or private sector? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. public
- b. private

Do you supervise the work of other employees? (Circle one of the following.)

- a. yes
- b. no

If you supervise others, how much say do you have in their hiring, firing, pay, or promotions? Would you say ... (Circle one of the following.)

- a. no say
- b. some say
- c. a great deal of say

Does anyone else supervise your work? (Circle yes or no.)

- a. yes
- b. no

How much say do you have in what you, yourself, do in your work? Would you say ... (Circle one of the following.)

- a. no say
- b. some say
- c. a great deal of say

How many years have you been doing this kind of work? ____________
80. Would you say you are: (Circle one of the following.)

[ ] a. a business owner
[ ] b. a manager
[ ] c. a supervisor
[ ] d. an employee in a non-management position
[ ] e. other please specify

Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any additional comments to make about any items on this questionnaire about forestry and conservation, about Share Our Resources or any other more general issues, please write them on the space provided below and on the back of the questionnaire (or and them on a blank piece of paper).
APPENDIX C:
Questions about Forestry, the Environment and Wilderness Preservation

1. Compared with other aspects of your life (e.g. your job, your hobbies), how important is wilderness preservation to you? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. Most Important
   b. Very important
   c. Fairly important
   d. Not very important

   Why (or why isn't) wilderness preservation important to you? (Please describe your views in a few sentences.)

2. What would you say about the use of clear-cutting as a forestry method?
   a. It is used too widely.
   b. Its level of use is just right.
   c. It is not used widely enough.

3. What percentage of British Columbia do you believe should be protected as wilderness? (Please write a percentage from 0% to 100% in the space provided)
   I believe _____ % of British Columbia should be protected as wilderness.

4. Do you actively encourage friends, family, or coworkers to participate in helping to protect the environment? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes   b. no

5. Do you think of yourself as being a member of the wilderness preservation movement? (Please circle the response that best describes how you personally feel about yourself regarding the wilderness preservation movement.)
   a. I identify myself very strongly as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
   b. I identify myself somewhat as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
   c. I do not think of myself at all as a member of the wilderness preservation movement, nor do I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.
   d. I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.
6. Thinking about your friends, family, and coworkers - how strongly do you think they identify you as a member of the wilderness preservation movement? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. Other people identify me very strongly as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
   b. Other people identify me somewhat as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
   c. Other people do not think of me as a member of the wilderness preservation movement.
   d. Other people think I oppose the wilderness preservation movement.

7. Did you agree with the decision to turn half of the Carmanah Valley into a park? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. I strongly agreed with the decision
   b. I agreed with the decision
   c. I disagreed with the decision
   d. I strongly disagreed with the decision
   e. I am undecided

   Please write a few sentences below to explain why you agreed, disagreed, or are undecided.

8. Below are listed some different values that Canadians have expressed regarding the importance of forests. How would you rank these values?

   Place a 1 next to the most important value, place a 2 next to the second most important, a 3 next to the third most important, and so on down to 6 for the least important value.

   ____ A place for recreation and relaxation
   ____ A source of economic wealth and jobs
   ____ As a habitat for a variety of animal and plant life
   ____ Balancing the global ecosystem
   ____ Protection of Canada’s water, air, and soil
   ____ Wilderness preservation

9. In your opinion, what are the most important environmental problems facing the country?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
10. How do you feel about the present N.D.P. provincial government's actions with regard to forestry policy. (Circle one of the following.)  
   a. the government is doing a very good job.  
   b. the government is doing a good job.  
   c. the government is doing a poor job.  
   d. the government is doing a very poor job.

11. How do you feel about the previous Social Credit provincial government's actions with regard to forestry policy. (Circle one of the following.)  
   a. the government did a very good job.  
   b. the government did a good job.  
   c. the government did a poor job.  
   d. the government did a very poor job.

12. I would like to know how you feel about different kinds of protests which might be used to get the government to change its policies ... (Please place a check mark under the column that best reflects your opinion.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often justified</th>
<th>Sometimes justified</th>
<th>Never justified</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What about strikes? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What about boycotts? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What about legal and peaceful demonstrations, like marches, rallies, and picketing? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What about illegal but peaceful demonstrations, like sit-ins? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. What about direct actions such as blockades of logging roads? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. And finally, what about violent demonstrations including actions such as fighting with the police and destroying property? Do you think they are ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in environmental organizations

13. Approximately how long have you been a member of the SCWC? (Please write the approximate number of years you have been a member below.)

14. Please indicate which of the following statements best describes your level of involvement with the SCWC. (Circle one of the following.)

   a. I pay dues but do not participate in any other way.
   b. I participate in some SCWC activities such as attending meetings or outings.
15. Why did you join the SCWC? (Please answer by providing a few sentences below.)

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

16. What do you find rewarding about being a member of the SCWC? (Please answer by writing a few sentences below.)

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

17. About how many people from the SCWC do you know? (For example, count all the people whom you know that you could hold a casual conversation with.)

Please specify approximate number of SCWC members you know. _________

Of these people, how many are:

Close friends? _________ How many of these are women? _________
Acquaintances? _________ How many of these are women? _________
Coworkers? _________ How many of these are women? _________
Family members who live in your household? _________ How many of these are women? _________
Other relatives? _________ How many of these are women? _________
Other? _________ (please specify type of relationship below.) How many of these are women? _________

18. About how often do you talk with someone about wilderness preservation and other environmental issues? (This could be with the same person, or with different people.) (Circle one of the following.)

a. Every day  
b. At least once a week.  
c. At least once a month.  
d. Several times a year.  
e. Once a year or less often.  
f. Never.

19. Have you ever talked with a park warden or nature guide about wilderness or environmental issues?

a. yes  
b. no
20. For each organization listed on the left, please check under the applicable columns. Tick as many columns as are applicable.
Tick under column 1 if you have never heard of the organization. Tick under column 2 if you have heard of the organization. Tick under column 3 if you know a member of the organization. Tick under column 4 if you have a close friend or relative who belongs to the organization. Tick under column 5 if you are a former member of the organization. Tick under column 6 if you are currently a member of the organization. Tick under column 7 if you are currently an active member of the organization.

Please refer to the organizations listed below in ticking the applicable columns to the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Youth Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Carmanah and Walbran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Cletquot Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Talika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of Western Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Besides being a member of the SCWC, are you a member of any groups involved in environmental/wilderness issues not listed above? (Circle yes or no.)

a. yes  b. no

If yes, please list them. Are you an active member?

a. Yes  b. No

22. About how often does someone encourage YOU to participate in SCWC activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

a. At least once a week.
b. At least once a month.
c. Several times a year.
d. Once a year or less often.
e. Never.

23. About how often do you encourage SOMEONE ELSE to participate in SCWC activities? (Please circle one of the following.)

a. At least once a week.
b. At least once a month.
c. Several times a year.
d. Once a year or less often.
e. Never.
24. Was your decision to become a member of the SCWC in response to any of the following: (Place a check mark beside any of the following as they apply to you.)

a. _____ You read a newspaper or magazine article about the SCWC's activities.

b. _____ You read a newspaper or magazine article about a wilderness preservation issue (e.g., the Carmanah or Walbran).

c. _____ You read a flyer produced by the SCWC.

d. _____ You saw a poster about the SCWC's activities.

e. _____ You saw a poster about a wilderness preservation issue (e.g., the Carmanah or Walbran).

f. _____ A friend who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.

g. _____ A family member who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.

h. _____ A coworker who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.

i. _____ An acquaintance who belonged to the SCWC asked you to join.

j. _____ You received a mailed request from the SCWC to join.

k. _____ You attended a pro-wilderness preservation rally and decided to join the SCWC.

l. _____ You heard about the "Carmanah Giant" and decided something had to be done to preserve old growth forests.

m. _____ You heard about the threat to the Marbled Murrelet's nesting grounds.

l. _____ Other (please describe below).

25. Have the actions of the SCWC made a difference to wilderness preservation on Vancouver Island? (Circle yes or no.)

a. no b. yes

In a few sentences, briefly describe how:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
26. Have you ever visited:
   a. the Carmanah Valley? (Circle yes or no.)
      a. yes   b. no
      If yes, how many times? ________
   b. the Walbran Valley? (Circle yes or no.)
      a. yes   b. no
      If yes, how many times? ________

27. Have your actions made a difference to wilderness preservation on Vancouver Island? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. no   b. yes
   In a few sentences, briefly describe how they have or have not:
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

28. Have you ever been approached by the SCWC to participate in an activity? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. no   b. yes
   If yes, was the most recent request:
      a. by phone
      b. by mail
      c. face to face
      d. other (please describe)
   ____________________________________________
   In a few sentences, please describe the activity.
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ________________________________
   Did you participate? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. no   b. yes
29. Have you ever contributed to/participated in actions designed to help preserve wilderness on Vancouver Island? Would you be willing to participate in such actions in the future? See the list provided below and place a check mark in column 1 for each activity you have (in the past) participated in, and a check mark in column 2 for each activity you would be willing (in the future) to participate in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I have participated in this activity in the past.</th>
<th>I would be willing to participate in this activity in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Be a member of the SCWC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donate money to a wilderness preservation or other environmental organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Write a letter to a government official regarding a wilderness preservation issue (such as preservation of the Carmanah or Walbran).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Write a letter to a newspaper about wilderness preservation (or forestry related issues).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Write a letter to a logging company about a forestry (or wilderness) issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Write a letter to another organization regarding a wilderness preservation issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Sign a petition to preserve a wilderness area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participate in trail building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attend a community meeting about wilderness preservation and/or forestry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attend a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature to support wilderness preservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Participate in an information campaign for the general public about wilderness preservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Advertise in the media to promote wilderness preservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Make a presentation to a public body about wilderness preservation and/or forestry-related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Give a lecture on wilderness preservation and/or logging practices to a school group or voluntary organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Participate in a press release/conference (regarding wilderness preservation and forestry-related issues).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Serve as a representative on an advisory board formed around wilderness preservation or forestry-related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Purchase a book, t-shirt, poster, mug or other merchandise from an environmental organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. OTHER ACTIVITIES (please describe in the boxes below and check off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Behaviour and the Environment

30. Have you ever contributed to/participated in actions designed to help preserve or protect the environment? See the list provided below and place a check mark in column 1 for each activity you have (in the past) participated in, and a check mark in column 2 for each activity you would be willing (in the future) to participate in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>I have participated in this activity in the past. (1)</th>
<th>I would be willing to participate in this activity in the future. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recycling at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recycling at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Regularly walking, bicycling, or taking public transport instead of a car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Refusing unnecessary packaging and plastic bags.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conserving Energy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Buying organic produce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Using environmentally friendly household cleaning products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Regularly re-using and mending things instead of discarding them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Planting trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Picking up litter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Using a re-usable mug instead of paper or styrofoam cups for beverages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Helping to maintain parks or natural habitats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Composting organic waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Other behaviours designed to protect the environment (please describe in the boxes below and check off the columns to the right as they apply to you.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. I would like to ask you about some kinds of clubs, organizations or groups that people may join. Please indicate whether or not you are NOW a member of each, and if you are a member, indicate whether you are very active, fairly active or inactive.

Please place a check mark under the applicable columns for each organization listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NO, I am NOT a member of this type of group</th>
<th>I am an INACTIVE member of this type of group</th>
<th>I am a FAIRLY ACTIVE member of this type of group</th>
<th>I am a VERY ACTIVE member of this type of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Business, professional, or occupational associations other than labour unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Labour unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious or church-related organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Charitable organizations, such as the United Way or Cancer Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Credit unions or co-ops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ethnic clubs or organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fraternal or service organizations, such as the Rotary Club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Public interest group, such as a consumer group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neighbourhood organizations, such as a ratepayers association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Education or school-related organizations, such as a Parent Teachers group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Political organizations, such as a party association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Entertainment and social groups such as card clubs or dance groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sport or fitness groups such as a softball or exercise group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Youth groups such as boy scouts/girl guides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Volunteer organizations, such as hospital auxiliary groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hobby groups, such as a photography or gardening club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Regimental or veterans organizations, such as the Canadian Legion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Women’s organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Self-help groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other types of groups or organizations (please describe below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Other types of groups or organizations (please describe below)
Questions about Business, Politics, Government, and Public Policy

32. Below is a list of some goals which are frequently thought of as being important to society. For you personally, how would you rank these goals? Place a 1 next to the most important goal, place a 2 next to the second most important, a 3 next to the third most important, and so on down to 13 for the least important goal.

   ____ Maintaining a high rate of economic growth
   ____ Making sure that this country has strong defence forces
   ____ Seeing that people have more say in how things get decided at work and in their communities
   ____ Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful
   ____ Maintaining order in the nation
   ____ Giving people more say in governmental decisions
   ____ Fighting rising prices
   ____ Protecting freedom of speech
   ____ Maintaining a stable economy
   ____ Progress toward a less impersonal, more humane society
   ____ The fight against crime
   ____ Progress towards a society where ideas count more than money
   ____ Protecting nature from being spoiled and polluted

33. How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a great deal of confidence
   b. only some confidence
   c. hardly any confidence

34. How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a great deal of confidence
   b. only some confidence
   c. hardly any confidence

35. Should the government: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. do something to reduce income differences between rich and poor, or
   b. should it not concern itself with income differences?
36. What do you think about government spending on improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount

37. What do you think about government spending on health care? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount

38. What do you think about government spending on education? Are we spending: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. too much money
   b. too little money
   c. about the right amount

39. Did you vote in the last Provincial election? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes  b. no

   If yes, which party did you vote for? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. The Social Credit Party
   b. The Progressive Conservatives
   c. The Liberal Party
   d. The New Democratic Party
   e. The Green Party
   f. Other (please name) ____________________________

40. Did you vote in the last Federal election? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes  b. no

   If yes, which party did you vote for? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. The Progressive Conservatives
   b. The Liberal Party
   c. The New Democratic Party
   d. The Reform Party
   e. The Green Party
   f. Other (please name) ____________________________

41. Do you consider yourself: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. upper class
   b. upper middle class
   c. lower middle class
   d. working class
   e. other (please provide a brief description).
42. What country were you born in? __________________________ (Country)

43. While most people in Canada think of themselves as Canadians, what would you say is the main ethnic background (or nationality) of your ancestors? (Please circle the number corresponding to the applicable category or if "other" write in your ethnic background on the line below.)

1 Australian
2 English
3 Irish
4 Scottish
5 Welsh
6 Chinese
7 Czech
8 Finnish
9 French
10 German
11 Hungarian
12 Italian
13 Japanese
14 Jewish
15 Native Indian
16 American
17 Netherlands
18 Polish
19 Russian
20 Scandinavian
21 Slovak
22 Ukrainian
23 West Indian
24 African
25 Korean
26 Vietnamese
27 East Indian
28 Pakistani
29 Portuguese
30 Spanish
31 Greek

32 Other (please write in) __________________________

44. Do you have any religious affiliation? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. no  b. yes

   If yes, please name __________________________

   If yes, how often do you attend your church, synagogue or temple? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. once a week
   b. 2 or 3 times a month
   c. once a month
   d. a few times a year or less
   e. never
45. Personal Network: I am interested in whether you know people in certain lines of work in the Greater Victoria Area. If you know anyone in a certain type of work who is an acquaintance (rather than a close friend or relative) tick under “acquaintance”; if you know someone in a certain type of work who is a close friend, tick under “close friend”; if you know someone in a certain type of work who is a relative, tick under “relative”. If any of the acquaintances, close friends, or relatives in a given occupation you know also belong to the SCWC, tick under “SCWC MEMBER”. As in the example below, you may tick off more than one box per line. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>ACQUAINTANCE</th>
<th>CLOSE FRIEND</th>
<th>RELATIVE</th>
<th>SCWC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 1: secretary ...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: teacher ...</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1, would indicate that you know at least one acquaintance and one close friend who are secretaries, but you do not know any relatives or SCWC members who are secretaries.

Example 2, would indicate that you know an acquaintance who is a teacher, a close friend who is a teacher, and at least one of these people is also a SCWC member.

Now please complete for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>ACQUAINTANCE</th>
<th>CLOSE FRIEND</th>
<th>RELATIVE</th>
<th>SCWC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>business owners (outside your own company) ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business managers who run an establishment (other than your own company) ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawyers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university or college professors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary or secondary school teachers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional writers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisors ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bankers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truck drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretaries ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountants ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus drivers ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION 45 CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF JOB</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gardener/landscapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auto mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiters/waitresses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loggers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mill workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail sales clerks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministers/priests/rabbi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economists/financial specialists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer/electronics technicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharmacists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional painters/sculptors/artists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional writers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physiotherapists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishermen/fishermen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipal politicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provincial politicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal politicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university or college students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Do you know anyone who works in the following industries in the Greater Victoria Area? (Please answer this question in the same manner as the previous question.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INDUSTRY</th>
<th>TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>construction</td>
<td>ACQUAINTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fishing</td>
<td>CLOSET FRIEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail sales (e.g. a department store)</td>
<td>SCWC MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a newspaper, magazine, television or radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a hotel, motel, or restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a utility (e.g. B.C. Hydro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a primary or secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a university or college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the federal government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the provincial government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health related fields (other than in hospital)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the forest industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a nursing home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a library, museum, or art gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a religious organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related industries not listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feelings toward other groups

47. I would like you to think about your feelings about some groups. Below are listed a number of groups. Please indicate how you feel about each group on an imaginary thermometer that runs from 0 to 100 degrees. Ratings between 51 and 100 mean that you feel positive toward the group. 50 means that your feelings are neutral toward the group. Ratings between 0 and 49 mean that you feel negative toward the group. You may use any number from 0 to 100 to indicate how you feel.

For example:

0. How do you feel about Santa Claus? 90

The example above would indicate that you feel very positively toward Santa Claus.

Now please put a number beside each of the following statements to indicate your feelings toward that group.

48. How do you feel about small business?

49. How do you feel about labour unions?

50. How do you feel about native peoples?

51. How do you feel about feminist groups?

Questions about your background

52. How old were you on your last birthday? (Years.)

53. What is your gender? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. Female  b. Male

54. Do you live in Greater Victoria? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes  b. no

   If yes (to above), what municipality do you live in? (Write municipality below.)

   ____________________________

   If no (to above question), what city, town, or district do you live in? (Write city, town, or district below.)

   ____________________________

55. What is your marital status? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. married
   b. living common law with someone
   c. single (never married)
   d. separated
   e. divorced
   f. widowed

56. How many children do you have? ____

   How many are living at home? ____  What are their ages? ________________________________
57. What is the highest level of education you have received? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. part of primary school
   b. completed primary school
   c. part of high school
   d. completed high school
   e. some college or university
   f. received a college or technical school certificate
      Please specify major or subject: ____________________________
   g. received a university bachelor's degree
      Please specify major or subject: ____________________________
   h. some postgraduate training
      Please specify discipline: _________________________________
   i. received a postgraduate university degree
      Please specify type of degree and discipline: ________________
   j. other (please state) ________________________________

58. Have you ever had taken a course (or other related training) in environmental studies?
   a. yes   b. no
   If yes, please describe below:
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

59. What is your occupation? (If you a homemaker or a student please state this. If you are retired, or unemployed please state this and list your former occupation.)
   ________________________________ (Occupation)
   Please describe your position and the paid work you do in detail.
   __________________________________________________________________________
60. Did you have any special training for your job? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes  
   b. no  
   If yes, what sort of training?

61. What does your company (or employer) do?

62. What industry do you work in?

63. Do you work full-time or part-time? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. full-time
   b. part-time
   c. unemployed
   d. other (please specify)

64. If you are employed, how many hours did you work last week?

65. Do you work for: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a government department or ministry
   b. a large company
   c. a small business
   d. an institution
   e. yourself
   f. other (please provide a brief description below)
66. Do you work in the public or private sector? (Circle one of the following.)
   a. public
   b. private

67. Approximately how many people, besides yourself, are employed at your work place?
   (Print number in space provided.)

68. About how many people, besides yourself, are employed by your company, or institution? (Print number in space provided.)

69. How many people are working under you? (Print number in space provided.)

   If there are people working under you, do you supervise their work? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes    b. no

   If you supervise others, how much say do you have in their hiring, firing, pay, or promotions? Would you say ...
   (Circle one of the following.)
   a. no say
   b. some say
   c. a great deal of say

70. Does anyone else supervise your work? (Circle yes or no.)
   a. yes    b. no

71. How much say do you have in what you, yourself, do in your work? Would you say ...
   (Circle one of the following.)
   a. no say
   b. some say
   c. a great deal of say

72. How many years have you been doing this kind of work?
73. Would you say you are: (Circle one of the following.)
   a. a business owner
   b. a manager
   c. a supervisor
   d. an employee in a non-management position
   e. other please specify

74. Now I would like to ask you something about the things which seem to you personally most important if you are looking for a job. Here are some of the things people usually take into account in relation to their work. Please RANK all of the following by placing a number from 1 to 4 to the left of each response, with 1 being most important, 2 being the second most important, 3 being the third most important, and 4 being the least important to you.

   _____ A good salary so that you do not have any worries about money.
   _____ A safe job with no risk of closing down or unemployment.
   _____ Working with people you like.
   _____ Doing an important job which gives you a feeling of accomplishment.

75. Below are listed several categories of Income. Please circle the category that gives the best estimate of your personal income before taxes.

   a. no personal income
   b. under $5,000
   c. $5,000 to $9,999
   d. $10,000 to $14,999
   e. $15,000 to $19,999
   f. $20,000 to $24,999
   g. $25,000 to $34,999
   h. $35,000 to $44,999
   i. $45,000 to $54,999
   j. $55,000 to $64,999
   k. $65,000 to $74,999
   l. $75,000 to $84,999
   m. $85,000 to $94,999
   n. $95,000 to $114,999
   o. $115,000 to $134,999
   p. $135,000 and above

76. Using the same categories would you please circle the category that gives the best estimate of total household income before taxes.

   a. no personal income
   b. under $5,000
   c. $5,000 to $9,999
   d. $10,000 to $14,999
   e. $15,000 to $19,999
   f. $20,000 to $24,999
   g. $25,000 to $34,999
   h. $35,000 to $44,999
   i. $45,000 to $54,999
   j. $55,000 to $64,999
   k. $65,000 to $74,999
   l. $75,000 to $84,999
   m. $85,000 to $94,999
   n. $95,000 to $114,999
   o. $115,000 to $134,999
   p. $135,000 and above
77. The Sierra Club of Western Canada would like you to answer the following question to help it develop future strategies:

In your opinion, what are currently the most important environmental issues that need to be addressed? (Please write your answer below.)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

78. I would like to conduct a phone interview with a sample of participants who have completed this questionnaire. The questions I will ask will be similar in nature to those above, but will provide a bit more detail and give you a greater opportunity to present your views in your own words.

If you would be willing to participate in such a phone interview please write your first name and telephone number on the spaces provided below.

Your identity, and the information you provide will remain completely anonymous. Also, please note that your participation in this aspect of my research (as with the questionnaire you have just completed) is purely voluntary.

First name (only): __________________________

Phone number: __________________________

What are the best day(s) of the week to call you: __________________________

What is/are the best time(s) to call you: __________________________

Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any additional comments to make about any items on this questionnaire, about wilderness preservation more generally, or about the SCWC please write them below, and on the back of the questionnaire (or add them on a blank piece of note paper).

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

The End! Thank you again for your time and participation.
Hi, my name is ____________ and I am calling on behalf of Dr. David Tindall at the University of British Columbia, in the Departments of Forest Resources Management and the Department of Sociology.

We are asking a group of Port Alberni residents about their concerns regarding forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island and related social and political opinions. There are also some questions about your background (such as your age and education).

I would like to speak to an adult in the house who is over 18. Could you please tell me which adult in the house had the most recent birthday? Could I speak to that person?

[If person on phone is the correct one, proceed with Section A below, otherwise repeat introductory script with appropriate adult OR ask when is a good time to call back the appropriate person.]

Section A

The questions will take up about 10 minutes of your time. I want to let you know that I do not know your last name or address and so your answers will be anonymous. You have the right to refuse to answer any question at any time during the interview. Do you have any questions? Are you willing to proceed with the interview?

For one of the questions you will need a scrap of paper and something to write with, do you have access to that?

The format of many of the questions I will ask you will require you to choose the response that best describes your answer from a set of alternatives (such as strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree). I would like you to answer in this format but please feel free to provide additional information if you would like to.
The next two questions are about your confidence in people running companies and financial institutions.

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Great Deal Of Confidence (a)</th>
<th>Only Some Confidence (b)</th>
<th>Hardly Any Confidence (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. How much confidence do you have in the people running major companies? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How much confidence do you have in the people running banks and financial institutions? Would you say:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next few questions are about your opinions regarding government spending.

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about government spending on:</th>
<th>Too Much Money (a)</th>
<th>Too Little Money (b)</th>
<th>About The Right Amount (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Improving and protecting the environment? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Health care? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Education? Are we spending:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Now I am going to read to you the names of some organizations that have been involved in the conflict over forestry and conservation on Vancouver Island. For each group, I'm going to ask you if you've ever heard of it, if you are a current or former member, and if you know anyone who belongs to it.

(Interviewer, place a check mark in the appropriate cell).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee:</th>
<th>Has R ever heard of the group? Yes or No.</th>
<th>If R has heard of group, are they currently a member. Yes or No.</th>
<th>Does R know anyone who belongs to the group? If yes, are they a &quot;strong tie&quot;?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberni Environmental Coalition</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmanah Forestry Society</td>
<td>No, NEVER heard of this group (1)</td>
<td>No, not currently or formerly a member of this group? (3)</td>
<td>Do you have a CLOSE friend or relative who belongs to this group? (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Alliance</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Clayoquot Sound</td>
<td>No, NEVER heard of this group (1)</td>
<td>No, not currently or formerly a member of this group? (3)</td>
<td>Do you have a CLOSE friend or relative who belongs to this group? (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Our Resources (Port Alberni)</td>
<td>No, NEVER heard of this group (1)</td>
<td>No, not currently or formerly a member of this group? (3)</td>
<td>Do you have a CLOSE friend or relative who belongs to this group? (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the Clayoquot (Ucluelet)</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of B.C.</td>
<td>No, NEVER heard of this group (1)</td>
<td>No, not currently or formerly a member of this group? (3)</td>
<td>Do you have a CLOSE friend or relative who belongs to this group? (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada Wilderness Committee</td>
<td>Yes, Have heard of this group (2)</td>
<td>Yes, currently or formerly a member of this group? (4)</td>
<td>Do you know a member of this group? (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next question is about whether you have ever contributed or participated in actions designed to support forestry on Vancouver Island.

Have you ever:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Been a member of Share B.C. or a local Share group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Donated money to a community organization that has concerns about forestry issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sent a letter, (fax or e-mail) to a newspaper about a forestry issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Signed a petition regarding a forestry issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Attended a community meeting about a forestry issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Attended a rally or protest demonstration on the lawns of the legislature about a forestry issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Served as a representative on an advisory board around a forestry issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Purchased a book, t-shirt, poster, bumper sticker, mug or other merchandise to support forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Voted for someone because of their views about forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These last set of questions is about your background.

30. How old were you on your last birthday? ____________________ (Years.)

31. How long have you lived in the Port Alberni area? ____________________

32. Where did you live as a teenager? ____________________

33. While most people in Canada think of themselves as Canadians, what would you say is the main ethnic background (or nationality) of your ancestors? (E.g. Australian, First Nations, English, Scottish, French, Korean, Slovakian, etc.) Interviewer note below.

34. What is the highest level of education you have received? (Interviewer circle one of the following.)
   a. part of primary school
   b. completed primary school
   c. part of high school
   d. completed high school
   e. some college or university
   f. received a college or technical school certificate
      Please specify major or subject:
   g. received a university bachelor's degree
      Please specify major or subject:
   h. some postgraduate training
      Please specify discipline:
   i. received a postgraduate university degree
      Please specify type of degree and discipline:
   j. other (please state)

35. What is your occupation? Interviewer note if R is a homemaker or a student. If R is retired, or unemployed ask R's former occupation.

   ____________________ (Occupation.)