

ground among all 10 factors, and in fact there was not a single statement among the 41 we used to which all the factors had the same reaction. But this does not mean that each view is in total conflict with each other view. We know, because we asked people, that many did find sympathy with different factors. Also, some participants' understandings of human rights were mixtures of more than one viewpoint, suggesting that they were able to reconcile two or more perspectives. On the other hand, most participants who we asked to comment on other views found some to which they reacted very negatively.

If there is a mosaic rather than a bedrock of agreement, what are the implications? The lack of any fundamental consensus may well concern those who see a broad coalition on rights as the basis for future furthering of human welfare, much as was the case in the past. But if society itself is moving toward a much more complex state--becoming in general terms a mosaic of views--then we probably need to rethink our approaches to human progress in this new climate. Processes of consultation and negotiation would need to become more developed in the face of a true diversity of views. Being able to articulate this pluralism, as techniques like the one used here make possible, could help in stimulating communication and mutual understanding. Human betterment can flourish through conflicts of ideas just as it can in a more consensual environment--the European renaissance is an obvious case in point. The difference tends to be that while a consensus can progress by appeal to agreed codes (like declarations of human rights), a social mosaic needs to progress in terms of respect for its human diversity.

Rex Stainton Rogers, Department of Psychology, Building 3, Earley Gate, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading RG6 2AL, England

Celia Kitzinger, Centre for Social and Moral Education, School of Education, University of Leicester, 21 University Road, Leicester LE1 7RF, England

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS: GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Project Directors: Ronald D. Brunner and Chris Roberts, Colorado Center for Public Policy Research, 125 Ketchum, Campus Box 330, University of Colorado, Boulder CO 80309.

Located on the eastern slope of the Rockies, home of the state's leading university, and within an hour of Colorado's major urban center--not to mention its clean air and 300+ days of sunshine annually--Boulder has had to face the same population-influx problems of other amenity-rich locales. In reaction to this pressure, the city fathers have sought to manage growth through the institution of various restrictions: Development rights to surrounding land are tightly controlled, for example, housing permits are held to 2% per year, and city water is not delivered above a certain elevation. Inasmuch as several of these measures are of arguable constitutionality, community debate has grown, and it is this controversy which this study seeks to examine.

Effects	Levels	N
Tasks	(a) goals (b) trends (c) conditions (d) projections (e) alternatives	5
Issues	(f) development (g) management (h) employment (i) land (j) housing (k) transportation (l) quality of life (m) promotion (n) power process	9

The 45-item Q sample was drawn from the community concourse, and structured as shown in the table above. The five intellectual *Tasks* of any problem situation are discussed by Lasswell (1971) and consist of (a) goal specification, (b) the tracing of past trends, (c) causal conditions of the current state of affairs,

(d) projection of present trends under the assumption that no changes will be made, and (e) the invention of alternatives. Among the nine *Issues* specific to the situation are (f) economic development, (g) growth management, (h) employment, and the others shown in the table. The $5 \times 9 = 45$ combinations were represented by one statement each, as reported below.

The P set is expected to consist of approximately 35 citizens randomly drawn, plus 35 Boulder elites, including members of the Planning Commission and Council, city administrators, media representatives, and lobbyists. Q sorts will be administered during the summer, and it is anticipated that the results will be disseminated through the media.

References

- Coke, J.G. & S.R. Brown (1976) Public attitudes about land use policy and the impact on state policy-makers. *Publius*, 6, 97-134.
Lasswell, H.D. (1971) *A pre-view of policy sciences*. New York: American Elsevier.

BOULDER GROWTH MANAGEMENT Q SAMPLE (factorial combinations shown in parentheses)

(1dh) Growth in the local economy will produce more and better jobs. (2aj) We should let the market determine the costs and types of housing in Boulder. (3ej) I support City subsidies for low-income housing in Boulder. (4ak) Something must be done about local traffic congestion and parking problems. (5dl) The quality of life will decline if Boulder becomes an undifferentiated part of the Denver metropolitan area. (6ck) Growth management policies account for much of the increase in commuting between Boulder and other cities. (7bg) Boulder's population has grown too slowly in recent years. (8af) Residential, commercial, and industrial growth must be balanced in Boulder. (9an) Opportunities for citizen participation in City and County decisions should be enhanced. (10cj) Restrictions on residential building permits have had little impact on the cost of housing in Boulder.

(1ldi) There are not enough large parcels of industrially zoned land to support future economic growth. (12df) The quality of life in Boulder will be a major asset in attracting new businesses. (13bi) Boulder already owns more than enough open space land. (14dm) Boulder's business image will count less than hard economic facts in the future of its economy. (15bn) Volunteer activists with little stake in the local economy are overrepresented in local politics. (16el) I support diversion of open space funds to other, more pressing needs of the community. (17eh) I support financial incentives from the City government to attract new employers. (18bj) The cost of housing has always been higher in Boulder than in nearby communities. (19cg) Growth is managed in Boulder because a substantial majority of the voters want it that way. (20cn) Support for local growth management policies could be eroded by chronic economic slow-down or recession.

(2leg) I support the assessment of impact fees on new construction to cover the full cost of public services. (22dk) Traffic congestion will grow in proportion to regional economic growth. (23em) I support efforts by the Chamber of Commerce to attract new businesses to Boulder. (24ai) People should have the right to develop their land without interference by government. (25dg) The City government will continue to limit the number of building permits for the foreseeable future. (26ag) The rate of population growth in Boulder should be allowed to exceed 2% per year. (27cm) Advocates of economic growth have done more than anyone else to publicize Boulder's anti-business image. (28ek) I support development of major highways to Longmont, the rest of the County, and the Denver metro area. (29ei) I support an amendment to the City Charter to ensure that only the voters can authorize the sale of open space land. (30ci) Comprehensive planning is necessary for land uses that are economically efficient and environmentally benign.

(31dn) Ordinary citizens find it increasingly difficult to understand how they will be affected by local decisions. (32bl) Maintaining "quality of life" means public interference in natural growth processes. (33bk) Most Boulder residents have been unwilling to