In this issue:
* New report – *The 12 Values Modes* (Part One)
* The New Freedom Machine – how Generation Y may prefer phones to cars
* Google, Egypt and Occupy: Now, Where Did I Put My Paradigm?
* We Told You So, Pessimists: the consequences of under-estimating values signals for behaviour change

The 12 Values Modes: Part One – The Settlers
Readers of this Newsletter will be aware of the motivational values system 'Values Modes' developed by my friends at CDSM (Cultural Dynamics Strategy and Marketing www.cultdyn.co.uk) and used by an increasingly wide range of organisations.   Visit www.campaignstrategy.org and you'll find many reports and studies using the model and applying it to campaigns and communications. *Newsletter 77* (http://bit.ly/yiAb9k) linked to some new Guidelines on communicating with the three big Maslow Groups, Settlers, Prospectors and Pioneers.

These three groups and their dynamics are described in some detail in *What Makes People Tick: The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors, and Pioneers* (http://bit.ly/nuNWK8). If you've read that, you may be interested to know more about the next level of definition: the twelve Values Modes which make up the three large Maslow Groups. I'm hoping write another book about these Modes, which are a bit like four 'languages' within the three Worlds but I don't know when we'll have the time or resources to to do that, so I've put together a description of each 'Values Mode', and will be publishing these notes in three parts. I hope campaigners find it useful. This month we start with the Settlers.   You can find it at http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/12vm_1_settlers.pdf

*   *   *

The New Freedom Machine
Is the smart phone becoming the new Freedom Machine, replacing the car?   An article by Greg Hanscom in the excellent Grist Magazine http://bit.ly/ywmWUm points to growing evidence that young people would rather have internet access than a car. (*"Research company Gartner finds that 46 percent of 18- to 24-year-old Americans would rather have access to the internet than their own car".* In Germany it was 75%).

There's been a lot of discussion about the cost of owning and running a car, due to higher fuel prices, and especially for the young, the cost of insurance. There's been much less talk about social factors: what a car gets you.

For the 'Boomers a car was a passport to freedom: a way to escape from your home or home town, to see your friends, and to do different things from your parents, without your parents. Fuel was affordable, if not cheap and the road was relatively 'open'. By Generation X, the road was increasingly congested but drugs aside, travel was still the magic key to many social experiences and mobile phones were limited and expensive. Now Generation Y is at the leading edge of consumer aspiration, and the internet, especially the personal, mobile, social online world, has become the gateway to socialising.

Campaigners concerned to change transport habits – such as driving to work or taking the bus – might use this to tip the balance of emotional rewards. Have a look at Global Cool's innovative project to add value to bus travel by teaching you how to chat people up on a bus, by 'reading a book' http://bit.ly/A6gOHN. But the implications go much wider than influencing 'modal shift'. As Hanscom says, for many young people the car has lost its cool, and it is the social primacy of the car which has underpinned the political power of society's 'addiction to oil'.

Today's auto industry is not run by Gen Y but by Gen X and the Boomers, so don't expect them to pack up shop anytime soon but the re-positioning of cars is a trend that will be hard to avoid. For one thing, Gen Y can get a smart phone well before they can buy a car. Social habits formed without cars may not be easily reversed, even when owning one becomes a possibility.

The car will not vanish but unimaginable as it may seem now, its influence may be on the wane. Remember that when petroleum first started to be commercialised, it was seen not as a way to provide mobility but as a competitor for lighting, up against whale oil for lamps and candles. And don't expect political leaders to be the first to grasp the significance of social innovation. Recall the early C20th Pennsylvania Mayor who said of that novelty, the landline phone: "I can foresee the day when there will be one of these in every town".

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

Google, Egypt and Occupy: Now, Where Did I Put My Paradigm?
It would be surprising if putting the world online had no effect on the interplay of politics, power and communication, just as printing, tv and radio did. Invoking a 'paradigm shift' always spices up a bit of commentary. Thus far though, it's hard to discern any coherent new pattern, just a combining of old trends and new actors, and a lot of conjecture, ranging from those who announced that 'the revolution had been tweeted', to 'James the anarchist' [1]. Having helped start the London Occupy protest at St Paul's, James pithily observed as it wound down, that it "was never going to be an agent of change" but "a *portent* of change". A fairly safe bet perhaps. Something is afoot – it's just not very clear quite what it is.

Lots of commentators have pointed to the way the 1% v 99% framing shifted the blame for economic woes, from the poor, to the rich. That provided a dividing line for politicians to get onto the 'right side' of, and Obama used it in his State of the Union speech to begin his re-election campaign.

Even if it achieves nothing else, causing that shift was no mean feat for a network so loose that it had no obvious central 'brain' or thoughts that could be interrogated and tested. Indeed that's probably why the feat was possible. The protests persisted long enough to have a 'plebiscite' effect because they managed to resist attempts to pigeon hole, categorize and dismiss them, partly because of social networking recruited and publicised the protests rather than analysing and critiquing them.   Many would-be revolutionary movements have foundered in long debates of theoretical tracts. It's hard to do that in 140 characters.

Tactically, the protests of Occupy and Egypt had a number of things in common. They both used mass phsyical demonstrations to manifest dissent, in one case against an economic system, in another against a political one. Both used social networking and in particular Twitter, to

organise, announce and prove their level of support. In a way both were calling for regime change, although Egypt was obviously more about political freedom and human rights, whereas Occupy was more about economic social justice.

So what of Google?
You probably noticed that a week or so ago, Google found itself at the centre of a public row about its new 'privacy' rules. Does that have anything in common with the political dynamics of the uprisings in Egypt and of Occupy? BBC Correspondent Paul Mason might argue that it does. Interviewed about his new book '' *Why It's Kicking Off Everywhere: The new global revolutions*" [2] Mason stated that:

I've interviewed people who've read hardly anything, students who are determinedly unread. They say, I don't need a newspaper because I know everything happening in my world is on twitter before it's going to get into a newspaper. What they are also revolting against is the processing of information.

Mason suggests that they had something else in common, figures at the centre of events who he identfies as "graduates without a future", along with a rejection of hierarchies, which he calls 'horizontalism', itself made possible by the new communication capabilities of social networks.

"The reason that this horizontalism is such a prevalent ideology is because the technology and the expanded power of the individual allows you to create something in between: areas of autonomy, either in your personal life, or among a smaller community. The Occupy camps are a physical expression of what people experience when they're online: negotiated, benign, hierachy-free spaces. I see a camp as an analogue social network".

As Mason himself notes, the internally tolerant 'hierarchy free' ideal is hardly new, going back at least to the 'hippy' movements of the 1960s and 1970s. He cites a "straight line through from hallucinogenic drugs to computer design that leads directly to the internet and social media", and Ron Inglehart at the World Values Survey has measured the rise of 'self-expression' values which underpins this, and predicted that it will, within a decade or so, lead to China becoming a democracy [3].

If this isn't yet a new political paradigm, it could be one in incubation. Technology has made some of the dreams of the 1960s achievable, at least momentarily. Whether it has a lasting effect on politics, and campaigns, may depend on how long those moments can be made to last, because then the tactics can be used strategically. Until now, experience has tended to show that organisation, inevitably to some degree hierarchical, has been necessary to focus efforts and plan to achieve strategic effect. Perhaps that will change, although whether an obvious hierarchy with formalised roles and authority is really any different from a network with some nodes and individuals who are much more influential than others, must be a moot point.

A New Can of Worms
So far I haven't heard of any protests outside the Googleplex in California although at least one privacy campaigner has started a legal action against Google's aggregation of his data - http://bit.ly/z95ZE0 - based on the cost of his using a non-Android phone to avoid their clutches. With people are still losing their lives in the 'Arab Spring' it may seem bizarre to link

that struggle with what sounds like a consumer technology issue but although at very different points, they are linked by the spectrum of politics and the freedom, or not, to use information technology, and who processes information.

So far this has mainly been the policy domain of campaign organisations like the Open Rights Group (http://www.openrightsgroup.org/); niche, tiny, and dealing with what seem to be esoteric issues (in the UK they are presently opposing government plans for 'intercept modernisation', or reading and analysing your email and web traffic) but it would not take much for those to be promoted to much more popular concerns.

Google has inadvertently shone a light on the implications of who owns, controls and can exploit your online data (and behaviour) with its attempts to inform its users of its new 'privacy rules' and, presumably, so gain their implicit consent, if not their understanding. The trouble is that in so doing, it alerted people to something they'd not given much thought to, and the more they heard about it, the less it sounded like a good idea.

When the BBC's UK Radio 4 'Today Programme' ran an interview with a Google spokesman on 1 March, the company expressed surprise at the outcry over the changes. Google claimed to be bewildered by the intervention of France and the EU, saying that it had discussed the changes with a European Commission 'Working Group'.

The thing is that such 'Working Groups' exist in closed corridors. Rafts of 'International Standards' and countless government policies and inter- or supra-governmental policies are drafted or even written by such 'working groups', almost all dominated by vested commercial interests. It's all 'too complicated' for the media to cover.   All that is the antithesis of the dreams of 'negotiated, benign, hierachy-free spaces' described by Paul Mason, and indeed the claimed values of the Google brand. It's the philosophical divide between the web, or any other public governance, run by participative citizens and the web run by a guardian class of 'experts'.

Google's privacy debate may surface the hitherto obscure question of who owns and controls personal data generated by life online, in an understandable way. Back in the early 1990s there were similarly abstruse debates over 'genetic engineering'. Mainly conducted in terms of intellectual property rights and unfathomable concepts such as the difference between uncertainty and inceritude in risk, they had no public salience.   Then companies started to try and market GM foods, and the choices suddenly became real, and the risk politics very personal, and campaigns became possible. Google may have accidentally opened a similar can of worms. Politics, online information and freedoms are now closely inter-twined, and there probably is a new paradigm in there somewhere, struggling to get out.

[1] Laurie Penny, The last days of Occupy. New Statesman, 30 January 2012
[2] Liz Else, The revolution will be tweeted, New Scientist, 4 February 2012
[3] The Power Behind the 'Arab Spring' - Possible Implications for Human Rights Campaigns; Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69, 2011; Maslow Goes To War: Terrorism, Strategies, Values and Democracy, Campaign Strategy Newsletter 54, 2009

<p align="center">*   *   *</p>

We Told You So, Pessimists
This example is about behaviour, policies and solar power but the psychological dynamics are relevant to campaigners uninterested in climate or energy, so please bear with me.

It's good news and bad news. The good news is that positive change can often be much faster than 'people' assume. The bad news is that those assumptions can be hard to shift. The further good news is that if campaigners and communicators understand values dynamics, they can plan out to trigger cascades of change. The further bad news is that these dynamics are often ignored, sometimes deliberately. The result can be that positive behaviours or technologies are treated as 'more difficult' to implement than they really are, and that change-pessimism becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

A story in the February 2012 issue of *ENDS Report* (Environmental Data Services [1]) illustrates the point. ENDS describes what it calls 'DECC's Solar Surprise'. DECC is the UK Department of Energy and Climate Change and has presided over a controversial introduction of 'Feed in Tarrifs' for renewable energy. In this system, businesses, organisations and householders are paid for renewable electricity which they generate from photovolatic panels (and energy from other renewable technologies).

The idea is to stimulate the transition to a renewables-powered energy system. Similar systems have been used in countries such as Germany for years, and the UK system has proven 'unexpectedly' effective.

'Surprising' Growth
There were three times as many solar installations under the scheme as DECC had expected. Consequently, as ENDS notes, under its 'central estimate' for growth in pv electricity, 'DECC now expects 3.3 million properties to have panels by 2020. When tariffs were first launched in 2010, DECC had only expected a few hundred thousand homes and businesses to install solar panels'. Hence the 'surprise'.

After decades of remaining a tiny niche industry, the UK's fledgling solar pv business grew 41-fold between 2010 and late 2011. The number of solar businesses grew from 450 in 2010 employing 3,000 people to 4,000 employing 25,000 people.

The UK Government has quickly exhausted the money it earmarked for the FIT and now plans to halve FIT payments, just as the installation industry is taking off. This isn't really government money: it's money taken from the electricity supply companies, effectively taxing dirtier forms of energy to invest in renewables but the government controls the regulation. Hence the controversy, as Friends of the Earth and companies from the booming solar pv installation industry have challenged the decision [2].

While debate focuses mainly on budgets and the minutae of legal challenges, there is little discussion about why uptake has been so enthusiastic. It is generally assumed that this is simply because the FIT tarrifs represented an irrestistible economic opportunity, and for some this undoubtedly true. With low interest rates on savings, a return of 7-8% (being reduced to 4 – 4.5% for new installations) guaranteed over 20 years is very attractive.

But that's probably not the whole story and here's the 'told you so' bit. In February 2010 [3] the *Campaign Strategy* paper 'Keep Calm But Don't Carry On' predicted that the introduction of Feed in Tarrifs would provide just the sort of values signals needed to attract Prospectors and Settlers (as in most countries, the majority of the population in the UK), and not just the innovatively minded Pioneers:

As a direct result of years of campaigning by NGOs in the UK Government's Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) is now following the German example and plans to introduce a 'Feed in Tarrif' for rooftop renewables such as solar pv and wind, this April. Next April it is due to introduce one for renewable heat (solar thermal, heat pumps, biomass etc). Encouragingly - because it is more in line with Settler and Prospector language - they are calling them 'Clean Energy Cash Back Schemes'.

Already there is rapid growth in these technologies albeit from a small base and already you can sell your electricity to the grid or even get a credit for heat from at least one company but it's not a lot. Sending a new signal that you can make much more money from installing domestic renewables will provide Prospectors and Settlers with a reason that translates straight into their terms (getting ahead/ success, and reducing risk/ safety/ resilience respectively). If that is, it is sold and marketed in the right way, as opposed to being promoted in universalist ethical terms (ie in terms only liked by Pioneers). I do not know how much response DECC expect to get but I suspect it will be very large. Let's hope they are not planning for the response to be small, repeating the mistake of DEFRA on recycling.

Well they were planning for a small response, and they have repeated the mistake. At least the first phase of it.

Similarities Between Solar and Recycling
DEFRA is another government department, and it's error [4] had been to under-estimate the willingness of householders to recycle their 'rubbish'. As a result central and local government plans were made to build incinerators and other 'waste management' options which are more polluting than recycling, and created a contractual lock-in to systems that the government supposedly wanted to avoid, even though recycling rates turned out to be much higher than had been assumed.

So what were the similarities between the change-pessimism on waste and the change-pessimism on FITs?

First, and a root cause, it seems likely that little thought was given to behaviour or psychology. On recycling, an essentially arbitrary assumption was made that rates would never rise above 50% and planning was conducted on that basis. I don't know what happened on solar pv but it was probably down to looking backwards and assuming that past growth rates could be more-or-less projected into the future.

Second, the introduction of FITs and 'doorstep' recycling collections both sent powerful psychological signals that gave all the Maslow Groups, (described in the book *What Makes People Tick: the Three Hidden Worlds Of Settlers, Prospectors and Pioneers*

http://www.campaignstrategy.org/threeworlds/) a stimulus to change behaviour, even though in this case, there was no payment involved.

Both systems made a 'new' behaviour very *visible*. Seeing separate coloured bins outside every house made it very obvious if you were recycling or not. Seeing solar panels appear on the roofs of houses in your area meant that it was no longer a remote theory or an idea or something for electricity companies (eg offshore wind turbines) but a practical reality. Without a word of argument or advocacy, the "but do renewables work?" debate simply evaporated.

Prospectors in particular tend to try and avoid debate about ideas and controversy but are very influenced by visual proof. If a behaviour is not visible, it's harder for them to take it up.

Seeing lots of other people doing something also made the behaviour seem 'normal' (the no.1 self-identifier of Settlers) and invoked the Social Proof heuristic [5]: others are doing it, so it must make sense, so maybe I will too.

The more the behaviour was approved of, and presented positively, the more it hit the button for esteem-of-others, a prime motivator for Prospectors [6]. Where these panels were put up on expensive homes, the Prospector signal is increased: "that's the sort of house and lifestyle I'd like, this is something that successful people do". In the case of recycling, it's avoiding a negative, knowing that you'd be looked down upon (or even prosecuted) if you weren't doing it, and knowing that everyone in your street will now be able to see whether you do or not.

Because the behaviour became *locally* visible, it would also have triggered the 'Similarity Heuristic' [7]: it was being done by people like us, something that would also play more with Settlers and Prospectors than Pioneers. Not only that, if neighbours or people you knew were doing it, or friends of friends (a few links in the network), then you could easily get their opinions: "does it work?", "yes it does"; "are you pleased with it?", "yes we are". These are often more trusted messengers than sources like the government, companies or even NGOs.

Of course there are also many other factors in play. For example, the 'Scarcity Heuristic' would have been prompted by widespread publicity that the government intended to scale back payments, leading to a sudden rush of orders.   Then there's the question of whether people are more motivated to act by taking the opportunity of a *certain* revenue (in this case FIT payments) or avoiding possible losses (for example by using energy efficiency measures). Some have argued that this is why even though it may be 'economically rational' to first cut your waste before deciding to invest in generation, it's more psychologically *attractive* to do the reverse [8]. (An interesting experiment would be to now offer help with energy efficiency to people who have installed pv and offer it to a similar sample who haven't, and see which are more likely to implement efficiency measures).

New Targets
What all this means for the development of solar and renewables and the politics of climate change responses is more than interesting. On 27 February China announced [9] yet more plans to reduce the cost of solar pv panels (see also the previous edition of this *Newsletter*): to $0.13 per kwh by 2015. This compares to more than $2 in 2009 which then fell to around $1.50 in 2011 [9]. Ben Warren, the author of a report for Ernst and Young, suggested in 2011 [10] that

'within 10 years companies with large electricity demands will find it cheaper to install unsubsidised solar than to buy energy via the grid in the traditional way'.   With renewable electricity clearly likely to undercut the cost of fossil fuel energy within the planning period of most current energy investment decisions, climate campaigners could have short term economics on their side, and a whole new set of targets and power relations. The main problems in delivering political change on energy systems will be vested interests, entrenched thinking, availability of capital to those who would like to change, and inertia.

Wider Implications

The early stages of *any* innovative behaviour are located in Pioneer World. The Pioneers are not held back from experimentation by the concern to avoid risk (Settlers) or controversy or failure (Prospectors). On the other hand, their love of debate and ideas can actually hold back the spread of new technologies or behaviours if Pioneers are dogmatic and try to spread them only on their terms. So change can languish for long periods without making the jump to adoption, via the Prospectors, to the other Worlds. Sometimes Pioneers seeking change are their own worst enemies.

A week or so ago someone writing a 40th Anniversary review of the work of the Alternative Technology Centre in Wales (now CAT – www.cat.org.uk) asked me why I thought the Centre's initial ideas of an alternative economy had succeeded (eventually) with respect to energy systems but not in respect of social change (communal living etc).. Part of the answer may be that the technology was, after a long lag period where it was seen as tied to an ethically determined lifestyle, able to be framed, repackaged and sold in Prospector and Settler terms, whereas the lifestyle prescription was doctrinaire and Pioneer-exclusive.

Making the new thing visible and aspirational is the single most important step in achieving contagion across Values Worlds. To use economic jargon, it gives you 'gearing'. A solution implemented invisibly does not invoke psychological gearing. Consequently it has low political salience. One that touches many people and triggers many 'heuristics', and especially one that engages all three Maslow Groups, can set off a sudden wave of change.

Ironically, DECC could probably have done all that with a much lower tarrif payment. The one they now propose for example, although now it's been framed as 'low'. It is *how* the offer is communicated, as much as the income, which will determine behaviour.

Aspirations

Writing in the current Green Alliance 'Inside Track' [10] Carlota Perez, author of *Technological revolutions and financial capital: the dynamics of bubbles and golden ages,* says that for a technological revolution to go from its scratchy speculation fuelled finance driven bubble-ridden "installation phase", to the more beneficial "deployment phase" (golden age etc), the new technologies must become aspirational.

"What history teaches us … Is that such changes take place, not by guilt or fear, but by desire and aspiration. For a green style to propagate, it must become the luxury life".

Paradoxically, for those who seek ethical clarity in all things, and who therefore eschew the idea of 'luxury goods', this means that in order for something to most quickly spread to all parts of society, it has to pass through a phase where it is seen as a luxury choice.

After aspiration comes normalisation, where the Settlers pick up the new behaviour too, because it's becoming 'normal'. At this point, introducing a 'rule' or a routine helps embed the change.

As for policy makers, they and campaigners need to pay as much attention to the psychological dynamics of change as they do to power relations, vested interests and economic rationalism. There is plenty of evidence there in the history of past projects, so long as they take notice of it. As Edmund Burke said, "those who don't know history are destined to repeat it", even if it is their own.

 [1] 'DECC's Solar Surprise'/ Solar boom could limit growth of more expensive offshore wind, ENDS Report 445
[2]http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/press_releases/government_feed_in_tariff_review_07022011.html;
http://www.foe.co.uk/ ; http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/feed-in-tariffs
[3] http://www.campaignstrategy.org/climate_campaigns_keep_calm.pdf
[4] ref [3] op cit
[5] Social proof: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_proof
[6] See *What Makes People Tick: The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors, and Pioneers*
http://www.campaignstrategy.org/threeworlds/ or http://amzn.to/rNfM6Q Paperback or Kindle -
http://amzn.to/w14n0f Kindle
[7] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Similarity_heuristic
[8] http://www.greenrhinoenergy.com/blog/?p=168, see also thinking Fast and Slow, Daniel Kahneman, Allen Lane, 2011 and Robert Cialdini, Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion, Collins, 1984
[9] http://www.pv-magazine.com/news/details/beitrag/china--rethinking-pv-on-a-global-scale_100005877/
[10] http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/jun/20/solar-panel-price-drop
[11] http://bit.ly/Anq4KY

Recent books by Chris Rose
How to Win Campaigns: Communications for Change (Earthscan 2010, 2nd edition).
http://amzn.to/xA291I

'Full of wit, wisdom and the essential insights that only hard-won experience delivers this book is a must-read for any campaigner, from eager first-timer to seasoned veteran. From the fundamental basics of structure and tactics to the creatively nuanced subtleties of framing and values, Chris delivers practical evidence on what does and doesn't work.' Ed Gillespie, Co-Founder, Futerra

'How to Win Campaigns is a vital resource.' Tony Juniper, writer and campaigner.

'Anyone who has already plumbed the depths of 'the Art of War,' will find much to learn from this how-to manual on the art of campaigning' Kelly Rigg, Executive Director, Global Campaign for Climate Action

'Read it -- but remember, as far as campaigns is concerned, this is Pandora's Book' Martin Turner

'This is the best book on campaigning I have read - and I think I have read them all., A must-read for campaigners everywhere.' Des Wilson, Founder, Shelter

What Makes People Tick: The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors, and Pioneers (Troubador, 2011) http://www.campaignstrategy.org/threeworlds/ or http://amzn.to/rNfM6Q Paperback or Kindle - http://amzn.to/w14n0f Kindle

'a must read for any campaigner looking to make sure that their message is listened to and adopted' Aaron McLoughlin

 'There is nothing I can say to recommend this book more highly. If you don't understand its argument you don't understand modern politics. Buy it, read it, absorb it, and then think about what it means in practice. It will challenge your assumptions and change the way you look at things completely.' Anthony Painter *Labour Uncut* http://bit.ly/pIUYT7

The Campaign Strategy Newsletter - Copyright Chris Rose.
You are free to reproduce all or any part of this newsletter if you credit the source.
http://www.campaignstrategy.org is a non-profit website on campaign techniques & strategies, designed to help NGOs. To subscribe to this free newsletter visit http://www.campaignstrategy.org.
To offer contributions or comments contact the author chris.rose@campaignstrategy.org
HOW TO WIN CAMPAIGNS pub April 7 2005 Earthscan by Chris Rose see
http://www.amazon.co.uk/exec/obidos/ASIN/1853839620/ref=ed_ra_of_dp/202-6151204-2796606 or from
http://www.earthscan.co.uk/?tabid=102418