5.3 Objective III: Relationship between percent alteration and public acceptance

This section examines the predictive value of percent alteration for determining public acceptance.

In order to determine if there is a cause and effect relationship between percent alteration and PAR, the data was analyzed using various statistical techniques including linear, exponential, polynomial (2 & 3 power) and logarithmic.

A relationship was found for the data and the best fit was a logarithmic regression (see Figure 3). This relationship was consistent across the province for all Forest Regions.

The analysis shows that 59.7% of the total variation in the PAR can be explained by the percent unit alteration. (The provincial average for the $R^2$ for the logarithmic regression is 0.597.) Therefore, percent alteration can be used as an effective predictor of public acceptance.

**Percent alteration can be a useful predictor of public acceptance.**

**Key points for Figure 3:**
- Alterations of 6% or less were rated as neutral to acceptable.
- Alterations greater than 6% were rated as neutral to unacceptable, with acceptability decreasing further as the percent unit alteration increased.

*Figure 3  Regression analysis of % Unit Alteration vs PAR – Entire Province*
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5.4 Objective IV: Assessment of regional differences in public acceptance ratings

This section addresses the question, “Are there any regional differences in Public Acceptance Ratings?”

Table 5 and Figure 4 show that there are regional differences. In all regions and communities, however, the trends are the same; public acceptance is higher for Preservation vs Retention, Retention vs Partial Retention, and Partial Retention vs Modification.

Campbell River had consistently higher tolerance of clearcuts in all EVC classes, while New Westminster had consistently lower tolerance of clearcuts in all EVC classes.

There were regional differences in PAR, however the trends were the same.

Table 5 Average Public Acceptance Rating (PAR) by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Partial Retention</th>
<th>Modification</th>
<th>Maximum Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell R</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New West</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithers</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Lk</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Av</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Average Public Acceptance by EVC and Region
5.5 Sample study photographs and Public Acceptance Ratings

Using the study photographs

This page explains how the sample photographs are organized and what the accompanying data refers to.

The photographs are organized by EVC class, with three photos from each class, including three showing non-harvesting disturbances.

Public Acceptance Rating graphs

Participants were asked to rate each slide on a scale of 1-7 according to “the appearance of the scenery as it would affect your enjoyment of it.”

The seven point Likert scale was:

1 = Very Unacceptable  
2 = Moderately Unacceptable  
3 = Slightly Unacceptable  
4 = Neutral or No Opinion  
5 = Slightly Acceptable  
6 = Moderately Acceptable  
7 = Very Acceptable

The PAR graph accompanying each photo is a visual depiction of the percentage of the response received for each rating (1-7). For example, in the graph on this page, participants gave the following ratings:

(1) Very Unacceptable  2%  
(2) Mod Unacceptable  4%  
(3) Slightly Unacceptable  6%  
(4) Neutral/ No Opinion  8%  
(5) Slightly Acceptable  18%  
(6) Mod Acceptable  32%  
(7) Very Acceptable  31%

EVC (Existing Visual Condition):

This letter gives the EVC class of the slide, as determined by Ministry of Forests visual landscape specialists:

P = Preservation  
R = Retention  
PR = Partial Retention  
M = Modification  
MM = Maximum Modification

Please refer to the glossary for definitions for each class.

Av PAR (Average Public Acceptance Rating):

This is the average of all the PAR ratings received by the slide. This is calculated as the arithmetic average of each slide [Σx/n].

% Alt (Percent Unit Alteration):

This is the percent of the forest cover removed expressed as a percentage of the dominant landform or landscape unit. (For details, see Appendix 2: Calculation of percent alteration).