INTERNATIONAL EVENTS, FOREIGN POLICY AND
PUBLIC OPINION: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Academic research into public opinion and its effect on foreign policy is to some extent the recent phenomenon. Classical notions of statecraft of which genesis can be traced to the aftermath of the Westphalia treaty have discouraged such research analysis. An international environment is generally perceived by analysts to be anarchic in which the prime goal of a country's foreign policy in the survival of state itself. "The principle of primacy of foreign policy over domestic affairs was", according to Edward L. Morse, "a norm of statecraft that served to free the sovereign rulers of Europe to act in foreign policy autonomously of domestic interests". However, the domestic environment could not be completely discarded in formulating and pursuing foreign policy. For this reason, many scholars have called for more rigorous research techniques in the study of politics. Herbert McClosky suggested that public opinion data could help balance traditional political and historical studies, which would often infer a nation's climate of opinion from a relatively small number of books, articles, speeches, editorials or legislative acts. When one observes political phenomena anecdotally, one's eye is drawn to whatever is dramatic and exciting, which means often, to whatever is idiosyncratic and atypical. Systematic use of
public opinion data could help provide a more accurate view of a nation's climate of opinion. ³

The systematic breach of the Westphalian theoretical framework took place after the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The reform-minded English journalist and scholar, J.A. Hobson was the first analyst to have started this pioneering work. In his 'Imperialism: A study', Hobson gave concession that a government's foreign policy may be, at least in part, shaped by forces outside the apparatus. Hobson argued that the influencing public was an exceeding narrow group, constituted of the wealthy who were influencing states in order to find profitable employment for their capital which would otherwise be superfluous. ⁴ This external expression of the influential public has been argued to have had a domestic analog in the policies of the turn of the century Republican party in the United States. ⁵

After Hobson, there have been two analytical schools: one is represented by those who felt that the views of the public have too much weight in the formulation of the policy, while the other by those who felt that such attitude had too little impact. After the World War II interest in the subject of public opinion and foreign policy has further increased. Many reasons may be accounted for it. The technical developments in polling, data handling and survey have allowed for a clearer consideration of this field. The experiences of the 1940's had also an important effect on many scholars: the fight against totalitarian dictators in
World War II, the use of propaganda as an instrument of foreign of USSR after World War II and the question of democratic policy-making in the West etc. However, all analysts have not drawn the same conclusion from these events. Lester Maikel argued for an end to white shuttered diplomacy and for more public input into foreign policy formation. While Thomas A. Bailey has concluded that the degree of popular control of foreign policy would have to be lessened in the post-War period.

The US involvement in Vietnam war is another factor in stimulating interest in the field of public opinion and foreign policy. Analysts by taking this involvement have demonstrated both the strengths and weaknesses of the public in dealing with their leaders. To this may also be added the growing perceptions of economic inter-dependence a process that, if occurring, will serve to increase the domestic repercussions of acts in the international arena. Some writers, however, see such interdependence as more academic illusion than a reality. Most of such research into the impact of public opinion on foreign policy provide the dynamics of individual situations and they must be recognized for what they are—assertions, not proven facts.

The international events have their considerable impact on the public opinion in the country concerned. They provide intensity in the opinion for or against that country's options and policies vis-a-vis event(s). The American
involvement in Vietnam war led to many works in which opinion was both praised and condemned as regards its influence on America's Indo-China involvement. Thomas Power has traced the war's end to ordinary citizens who simply refused to tolerate the war or the official assumption that there was no alternative war. Richard Nixon, the former US President recalled, "nobody can know what it means for a President to be sitting in the White House working late at night and to have hundreds of thousands of demonstrators charging through the streets. Not even earplugs could block the noise".

Thus the fear of a domestic political backlash resulting from an Indo-China withdrawal led to the prolongation of USA's stay in South-East Asia, despite government's knowledge that the hope of eventual victory was an illusion. Daniel Ellsberg (1971) has concluded that "we have elected and been led by presidents who were willing to kill large numbers of Asians, destroy Asian society and sacrifice large number of Americans from time to time, mainly for the reason that their party and they themselves would be in political trouble if they did not". Hans Morgenthau did not consider the Eisenhower's policies towards the Chinese mainland rational since Washington recognised what should be done but was prevented from adopting these moderate policies due to fear of a public outcry. The Republican Administration of the 1950s was too responsible to do what the opposition wanted it to do but prevented by its fears of public opinion from devising and executing a positive policy of its own.
Some scholars have disapproved the role of public opinion in the policy-process. Walter Lippmann remarked: "the unhappy truth is that, the prevailing public opinion has been destructively wrong at critical junctures. The people have imposed a veto upon the judgements of informed and responsible officials. They have compelled the governments.... to be too late with too little, or too long with too much. too pacific in peace and too bellicose in war neutralist or appeasing in negotiation or too intransigent. Mass opinion has acquired mounting power in this century. It has shown itself to be dangerous master of decision when the stakes are life and death". While others recognise it vital in the decision making. The government officials in USA rarely tire of noting that "the long range foreign policy of the US is determined by the American people". Dean Rusk (1961) made similar comment on 20th February: "if we sit here (State Department) reading editorials and looking at public opinion polls and other reports that cross our desks, we should realise that this is raw, undigested opinion expressed in the absence of the leadership. We cannot regard public opinion until the President and the leaders of the country have gone to the public to explain what is required and have asked them for support for the necessary action. I doubt, for example, that three months before the leadership began to talk about what came to be the Marshall plan. an public opinion expert would have said that the country would have accepted such proposals". According to V.O. Key Jr., "the interaction between government and public opinion in the day
today work of government presents, it must be conceded, a phenomenon about which systematic data are limited. 19

Some analysts make distinction between the mass public and elites and thus give less importance to public opinion in foreign policy. The mass publics do not have a cohesive unity with common attitudes, prejudices and views but consist of people holding diverse, often, conflicting opinions. So they do not always exert much influence on foreign policy, while elites are well-informed and well-organised and wield considerable influence in the foreign policy formulation. Gabriel Almond splitted the public into segments—attentive and non-attentive to external policy concerns. He has concluded that only a fraction of the public could be considered interested in the issues of foreign policies. The vast majority of persons—seventy to ninety percent were seen to be relatively untroubled by foreign policy concerns and were thought to only participate in policy-making in indirect and primarily passive ways. 20 The attentive public, however, also had a somewhat constrained role in the policy-process. It entered into this process only at two and four year intervals, when it bought or refused to buy the policy products offered by the competing elites. 21 James N. Rosenau also conceives of the attentive public, at the low end of his estimate, as comprising ten percent of a nation's adult population. 22 The rest he considers passive. As a passive mass, he says, "the mass public lies virtually outside the opinion policy relationships. Its only function is that of
setting the outer limits within which decision-makers and
opinion-makers feel constrained to operate and interact". A
number of researchers have examined such proposals. Donald
Devine, after reviewing policy and opinion in seven areas,
has concluded the attentive public does have a greater impact
on policy than does the public at large.24

Thus it may be said that the public opinion even if it
is split between segments—mass public opinion, elite
opinion has considerable say in the formation of foreign
policy. Mainly due to methodological concerns, no causative
conclusions can be drawn here. Before it, it shall be
worthwhile to deal with nature, meaning and extent of public
opinion, its formation and the way it can be elicited.

NATURE, MEANING AND EXTENT OF PUBLIC OPINION:

Though the importance of public opinion has been
recognized from the earliest times in the writing of
political philosophers, there was no explicit formulation of
the term prior to the 18th century and no systematic
treatment prior to the 19th.25 Although Plato, Aristotle and
others writing during the early classical period did not use
the term public opinion with its modern meaning, they
frequently referred to mass opinion and its significance.
Plato questioned the competence of mass opinion— "Good men.
and they are the only persons who are worth considering will
think of these things truly as they occurred...[mass publics]
cannot make a man either wise or foolish: and whatever they
do is the result of the chance". Aristotle tried to define more precisely the sphere of its competence. The Romans, in general, held the masses in contempt but during the medieval period such writers as Alcuin, William of Malmesbury and later Machiavelli emphasized the importance of the mass opinion. During this period the phrase vox Populi, vox Dei became current. Tributes to the power of the mass opinion became numerous during the 17th and 18th centuries, notably in the writing of Pascal, Voltaire, Hobbes, Locke and Hume and even Shakespeare, William Temple. Montaigne, James Madison, Glanvill, Descartes & C.

The most significant thoughts on public opinion during the 18th century were those of Rousseau and of Jacques Nekar. Rousseau recognized the power of public opinion and suggested that even a despotism rests on public opinion. He is the first political theorist to have used the term l'opinion publique. In addition to three kinds of laws upon which the state is built—public law, criminal law, and civil law—Rousseau explained, "the forth law is public opinion, which is graven not in marble or bronze, but in the hearts of the citizens: which forms the real constitution of the state; which day by day acquires new strength; which revives or replaces the other laws when they grow old or are extinguished, which preserves the people in the spirit of its original institutions and imperceptibly substitutes the force of habit for that of authority". In order that public opinion may be protected from corruption and delay he in the
Social Contract invents a special tribunal, the "censor", an office created for the sole purpose of public morality. He defined public opinion "as a species of the law which the censor administers and which he like the prince, merely applies in specific cases". Rousseau also explains to what effect the censor is an instrument. "The censorship preserves manners and morals by preventing opinions from growing corrupt, by preserving their rectitude through wise applications, sometimes even by making them definite when they are still uncertain". In a word, Rousseau regarded public opinion as the guardian of morality and traditions and as the protector of society and the enemy of individuality. Although his General Will is closely related to the idea of public opinion, he never indicated specifically the relation nor the relation of public opinion to law.

Neker is the first writer to have discussed in details the place of public opinion in statecraft. The public opinion which was considered of prime significance was that of the bourgeoisie "an invisible power which, without treasures, without a bodyguard and without any army give laws to the city". The nature and force of public opinion, to him, varied according to the form and type of government but is the principal safeguard against abuse of power.

The French Revolution of 1789 led to the widespread discussions of public opinion, particularly in Germany and England. The framers of the US constitution also had it in their minds. In Germany C.M.Wireland and Christian Grave
highlighted the importance of public opinion in general. Jakob Fried related the concept of public opinion to a general theory of state and made it the basis of the rule of law. Hegel held that "it is essentially contradictory to nature, deserving to be respected in part and to be despised in part, and that it is the task of the great man to find truth in public opinion for his generation". Jeremy Bentham referred to public opinion as the moral sanction that can never be ignored by any legislature. Public opinion to him was a means of social control and its free expression is the main safeguard against despotism. He found that the most important factor in the formation and expression of public opinion to be the newspaper, press etc. Earlier David Hume in his treatise of Human Nature, 1739 had also held that, "because people have a natural tendency to heed opinions and to conform to the environing opinions, opinion is vital to state affairs. The concentrated power of similar opinions held by private persons brings forth a consensus and this constitutes the actual basis of any government. It is, therefore, on opinion only that government is founded: and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments, as well as to the most free and most popular". James Madison, in the Federalist examined the implications of the principle that "all governments rest on opinion". He wrote: "if it be true that all governments rest on opinion, it is no less true that the strength of opinion in each individual, and its practical influence on his conduct,
depend much on the number which he supposes to have entertained the same opinion. The reason of man like man himself is timid and cautious when left alone; and acquires firmness and confidence, in proportion to the number with which it is associated."

By the end of the first quarter of the 19th century, the writers were divided over the extent of the virtue and competence of public opinion. The optimists' views were expressed by Fredrich Ancillian, Karl Rosenkranz, War Mackinnon, Henery Thomas Buckle, Charles Dollxus, Karl Biederman and J.C.Bluntschli, While Fredrich Julius Stahl, David Urquhart, Sir Henery Main and Rudolf Von Gneist expressed the opposite view. Among the important classical works on public opinion during the 19th century, James Bryce's, the American Commonwealth is most significant. He has discussed the nature of public opinion and the stages in its formation, government and public opinion and definite stages in its development - acquiescence, conflict, popular control, directly ascertainable will etc.

The 20th century has witnessed the tremendous spreading out of interest in public opinion. Gabriel Tarde's L'opinion et la foule (opinion and the crowd, 1901, Graham Wallas' Human Nature in politics, 1909, A.V. Dicey's lectures on the Relation between Law and Public opinion in England during the 19th century and A.F. Bentley's The Process of Government, 1908 which stressed the role of organised groups in the opinion forming process and gave an impetus to the study of
pressure groups in their relation to public opinion and public policy—all together with press and advertising provided the field of public opinion various analytical tools. Furthermore, A.L. Lowell’s Public Opinion and Popular Government 1913, the propaganda activities of the Allies and the Central powers which stimulated the scholars of all disciplines of social sciences to give serious attention to public opinion like H.D. Lasswell, F. Schonemann, Ferdinand Tonnies, Norman Angell, Walter Lippmann, Clyde King, W.D. Graves, A.B. Hall, Peter Odegwell and E.L. Bernays, Lucy M. Salmon etc. various surveys like customer survey and reader’s interests studies, the study of pressure groups by A.F. Bentley, A.G. Dewey, F.W. Cocker, Herman Finer etc. the emergence of the Soviet Union using propaganda not only as a weapon of war and foreign policy but also as an instrument of domestic control, the widespread statistical studies of public opinions and the emphasis placed upon quantitative methods—all made the field of public opinion more interesting, richer and necessary for solving people’s practical problems.

During and after the World War II there emerged scholarly interest in pressure groups, government information and propaganda, public opinion measurement and theory, the psychology of opinion formation and the many other aspects. Several new dimensions were added—the potentiality of radio as a means for winning support of government’s policies abroad as well as home, birth to the public opinion polls.
newspaper and magazine polls, scientific and nation-wide surveys of opinion on political, economic and social issues etc. In the 50's (later) the principal area of interest on the part of students of public opinion included: (1) public opinion surveys—evidence by the increase in number of government, commercial and non-commercial agencies devoted to this work; (2) psychological warfare; (3) mass communication; (4) public opinion and foreign policy; (5) public relations. Since 1950 public opinion studies have emphasised on public opinion polling and surveying with further specialised studies of survey designs, sampling procedure, interviewing and similar other technical questions. The study has also focussed on how public opinion is formed and the role and impact of mass-media like television, press printed publications, comics, radio and motion pictures on public opinion. 33

**WHAT IS PUBLIC OPINION:**

Being an elusive term public opinion is particularly hard to define. As the historical survey has demonstrated, the difficulty is compounded by the fact that an attempt to arrive at a definition involves at times the use of concepts which are themselves vague and abstract. 34 So, in the fifties and sixties, there was an increasing demand to abandon the concept. In 1962 Jurgen Habermas also commented that "not only colloquial usage... clings to it, but so do scientists and scholars especially those in Jurisprudence, political
studies, and Sociology, who are apparently incapable of replacing traditional categories such as public opinion with more precise terms". 35 W. Phillips Davison also says that "there is no generally accepted definition of public opinion. Nevertheless, the term has been employed with increasing frequencies... efforts to define the term have led to such expressions of frustration as public opinion is not the name of something, but a classification of a number of something". 36 Hermann Oncken, the German Historian also expresses: "whoever desires to grasp and define (the concept of public opinion) will recognize quickly that he is dealing with a Proteus, a being that appears simultaneously in a thousand guises, both visible and as a phantom, important and surprisingly efficacious, which presents itself in innumerable transformations and is forever slipping through our fingers just as we believe we have a firm grip on it... That which floats and flows cannot be understood by being locked up in a formula... After all, when asked, everyone knows exactly what public opinion means". 37

Attempts to define public opinion, although endlessly varied in their specific wording, fall more or less readily into two categories: limited, or all-inclusive definitions. Limited definitions, born in the rationalism of the eighteenth century, arose out of a new faith in the possibility of an enlightened popular opinion. 38 Some of the definitions in this context are as follows.

Public opinion may be said to be that sentiment on any given subject which is entertained by the best
informed, most intelligent and most moral persons in the community, which is gradually spread and adopted by nearly all persons of any education or proper feeling in a civilized state - William Mackinnon.

Public opinion is the social judgement of a self-conscious community on a question of general importance after rational public discussion - James Y. Young.

Public opinion is the social judgement reached upon a question of general or civic import after conscious, rational, public discussion - Clyde L. King.

(Opinions which are based on) a substantial part of the facts required for a rational discussion - A.W.Holcome.

In each of the above selected definitions meaning of public opinion is restricted to collections of individual opinions having a certain degree of excellence, maturity, intelligence or rationality. It is useful but such restriction on the meaning of public opinion in this manner is not warranted. This had earlier been recognised by scholars and there were many attempts to distinguish a rational, mature, balanced public opinion from something else called sentiment, or prejudice, or factitious clamour. These limited interpretations have not completely disappeared. Even now some insist on restricting the term public to rational, informed, interested or involved members of society, with implications that it is only such publics that participate in public opinion.

There is still another version of the limited meaning which lays emphasis on the democratic process, indicating that public opinion is an exclusive property of liberal democracies, especially those having the US model. "There
could be no public opinion, wrote Hans Speir. In autocratic regimes, because public opinion was opinion on matters of concern to the nation freely and publicly expressed by men outside the government who claim a right that their opinions should influence or determine the actions, personnel, or structure of their government. Speir regards public opinion as communication from the citizens to their government and could not exist in the absence of free and public expression. Key also thought of public opinion as those opinions held by private persons which governments find it prudent to heed. In a word, this version clearly demonstrates that only in an environment of democratic consensus politics that public opinion can exist.

The broader or all inclusive view of public opinion has been given by James Bryce who used the term to cover the entire gamut of widely held views, rational and irrational, informed and misinformed. To quote him: "what is public opinion? The term is commonly used to denote the aggregate of the views men hold regarding matters that affect or interest the community. Thus understood, it is a congeries of all sorts of discrepant notions, beliefs, fancies, prejudices, aspirations. It is confused, incoherent, amorphous, varying from day to day and week to week. But in the midst of this diversity and confusion every question as it rises into importance is subjected to a process of consolidation and clarification until there emerge and take definite shape certain views, or sets of interconnected views, each held and
advocated in common by bodies of citizens". Notwithstanding the fact that Bryce has included the prejudices and fancies of the uninformed, he believed in the ultimates rationality of man and in the triumph, in the long run of truth over self-interest, prejudice and ignorance. He also talked of ideal democracy in which an intelligent and interested citizenry would be the source of a wise and tolerant public opinion. F.G. Wilson has commented that Bryce thus had no systematic theory of public opinion and, until after 1918, seemed unaware of the potential for its deliberate manipulation by the propagandist. Bryce was therefore unable to resolve his own dilemma. After Bruce F.G. Wilson, after outlining some of the earlier limited approaches, rejected the restriction of the term to rationally formed, socially responsible opinions and took the broader approach that "an opinion is simply an opinion: Some opinion is the affirmation of knowledge and some is the assertion of prejudice and irrationality: some opinion is based on a concept of the common good and some is merely the satanic projection to others of the evil within the individual". An ever more all encompassing definition is given by A.D. Monroe: "public opinion is the distribution of individual preferences within a population. In other words, public opinion is simply the sum or aggregation of private opinions on any particular issue or set of issues". There is also the Eulogistic Theory of public opinion having some manifestations of democratic ideology. It
assumes that the product of group discussion is not only different in character from the product of individual minds, but also as inherently superior to it. The meeting of enlightened minds will expose and eradicate error, so that higher truth will in the end prevail. A natural corollary of the eulogistic theory of public opinion is the common attempt to ascribe to it some sense of organic unity, to conceptualise the public as some kind of super entity, with a mind, or will, of its own. Key expressed a disposition to personify public opinion as an initiating entity that pulls strings to actuate governments. However, such concept is fraught with many problems. May be that over some period of time there exist a certain continuity of ideas, traditions, or customs in a community—a reservoir of accepted beliefs and practices. The personification of public opinion creates a dangerous fiction. There is no harm in regard to popular discourse but the personification of public opinion implies some kind of group mind, but groups as such do not think, only individuals think, although they may share or aggregate their thoughts in groups. The implication of organic theories is the assumption that there exists a will of the people being the will of all the people, which needs only to be discovered and expressed. In reality people at large do not have, on any particular issue, knowledge of the issue, no opinion about it and thus no will on it. "The will of the people, says Walter Lippmann, can never be anymore than the will of some of the people".
However at the hands of many liberal democratic theorists public opinion has found expression and formation in democratic ideal society. Says for instance Bogardus. "In a democracy every person may have a part in making public opinion to the extent that each individual has access to the necessary facts and is free to form his personal opinions and also to express freely these opinions, a democratic public opinion functions and people develop the principles both of democracy and of a peace making world".58 This is a lovely sentiment, but is of no proper use in the realistic world. Because all the facts are not impartially available to all citizens. Even the behaviour of partisan political leaders shows that they do not desire an informed, rational, unbiased electorates. Also media controllers regard political education as an appropriate subject for part time television. The whole of the modern electoral practice concentrates not on informing the electorate but on creating favourable images. As regards democratic tradition, there was a revitalized and strengthened elitist theory. Alexis de Tocqueville questioned the intellectual capacity or morality of public opinion: "the moral authority of the majority is partly based upon the notion, that there is more intelligence and wisdom in a number of men united than a single individual".59 If it be admitted that "a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should not a majority not be liable to the same reproach? The power to do everything which, would refuse to one of my equals. I will never grant to any number
of them". John Stuart Mill in his Liberty and in Representative Government attempted to justify democracy and to retain effective political control in the hands of the propertied, educated middle classes. In a word, the common attitude within the 19th century intellectual circles can be summarized in the phrase of Earnest Barker: "the man of letters remains by nature a Platonist in politics".

In the beginning of the 20th century Walter Lippmann rejected the very concept of democracy in regard to public opinion: "the mass of absolutely illiterate, of feeble minded, grossly neurotic, undernourished and frustrated individuals, is very considerable... a wide popular appeal is circulated among persons who are mentally children or barbarians, people whose lives are a morass of entanglements, people whose utility is exhausted, shut in people, and people whose experience has comprehended no factor in the problem under discussion. The stream of public opinion is stopped by them in little eddies of misunderstanding, where it is discolored with prejudice and far fetched analogy. Lippmann sees public opinion as "varied pictures in the minds of individuals: those features of the world outside which have to do with the behaviour of other human beings, in so far that behaviour crosses ours, is dependent upon us, or is interesting focus, we call roughly public affairs. The pictures inside the heads of these human beings, the pictures of themselves of others, of their needs, purposes and relationships are their public opinions. Those pictures
which are acted upon by groups of people or by individuals acting in the name of groups are PUBLIC OPINION with capital letters." In Phantom Public, Walter Lippmann expressed that most public issues of significance were beyond the capacity of ordinary individuals without access to specialised information. "What is left for the public is a judgement as to whether the actors in the controversy are following a settled rule of behaviour or their own arbitrary desires. The public's involvement was thus largely directed to procedures and to the overt external forms of behaviour and not to the intrinsic merits of concrete issues." Lippmann says nothing about the role of pressure to conform in establishing a consensus and nothing about people's fear of isolation and their fearful observation of their environment. Under the tremendous influence of the first World War, however, Lippmann identified the cornerstone of public opinion, the crystallization of conceptions and of opinions, in emotionally loaded stereotypes. A public opinion process is enhanced by stereotypes; stereotypes spread quickly in conversation and immediately convey negative or, in some cases, positive associations. They guide perceptions; they draw attention to certain usually negative elements and lead to selective perception. Stereotypes may also cause the political demise of candidates for national leadership. Stereotypes hover over the public opinion landscape for a certain time and then may disappear completely. Walter Lippmann argues that through stereotypes
public opinion penetrates into everything. Its creation could totally dissolve with time. And the pictures of public opinion in our heads are but a pseudo world whose reality we swear by. Overall the greater achievement of Lippmann was to show how public opinion is transmitted, how it can be booked upon us. The stereotypes, whether positive or negative, that are indispensable in getting conformity process in gear.

In the post-War era research into public opinion developed along two major, often overlapping lines. One emphasised the influence of public, its impact on policy, its actual or potential role in the democratic process. The other concentrated on discovering and measuring the substance of the people's opinions, on questions of how they came into being, and how they might be controlled or changed. Further interest in the study of the actual operation of public opinion was stimulated by George Gallup's American Institute of Public opinion: "there can be little doubt that continuous polling has thrown much light on the nature of public opinion itself. Older conceptions of public opinion as the social conscience, as some super individual force which controls and moulds men's mind, rather than as the interaction of individual points of view, are out of harmony with the facts. The idea that public opinion is compounded of the opinions of individuals in all walks of life outmodes older conceptions, and places the modern emphasis squarely on the rational and irrational factors in individual thought... The discovery of ignorance or confusion, as well as the
discovery that people are often wiser than many critics of democracy think is of equal significance for the successful working of democracy". 67

Harold Lasswell also argued the close and vital two way connection between government and public opinion in democracy. By contrast, in dictatorial states, the relationship was entirely one way from government to the public. 68 From Lasswell on, more and more studies began to demonstrate that propaganda was not a monopoly of dictators or subversives. Even within a well ordered democracy public opinion could also be managed. Further investigation into how public opinion might actually influence official policy led to a distinction between different kinds of public and to the realisation that the public is not an undifferentiated amorphous mass. This led to the weakening of public opinion as a collective force which was further weakened by the low salience of publics to the mass public. 69

James Best, after an extensive review of literature noted that one could only conclude that the only public opinion which is relevant in the policy-making process is the opinion of the attentive public or the opinion elite. 70 Due to the conflicting nature of public opinions, arising from opposing class and interest and making conflicting demands upon the system has led to the pressure group approach to public opinion. But the members of the government, when drawn from the same population as other members of the public, may share many of the same values. On the receiving
end, public opinion can have an impact on policy to the extent that the existing machinery is used by the decision-makers to listen to public opinion and to attempt to understand what it says.

The literature on discovering and measuring public opinion is very extensive covering theoretical and methodological concerns as well as endless case studies. The focus of this chapter is only to examine what is public opinion and its formation. The term may generally be used to refer to any collection of individual opinions. But, as public opinion has become in large part the game of psychologists and sociologists, many crucial questions have been pushed aside. The scholarly controversy has now swirled around both public and opinion. So, now we shall deal in brief with these concepts and then will give a precise analysis of the concept and its formation.

OF PUBLICS AND OPINIONS:

The term public, a matter of individual inclination, is defined both narrowly and broadly. Narrowly it may be thought of something much smaller than the total population possessing some special character or quality or the total population being divided among several specialised publics. Broadly the public is treated synonymous with whole population having all manners of divisions or conflicting characteristics. Elisabeth N Neumann gives three meanings of public: the legal sense of public which emphasis the
etymological aspect of its openness, it is open to everyone—a public place, a public path, a public trial—as distinguished from the private sphere. Something distinguished or set aside as one's own. A second meaning can be found in the concepts of public rights and public force. Here "public" expresses some involvement of the state. According to this usage, "public" has to do with public interests... This means we are dealing with issues or problems that concern us all... The third meaning of "public" could be characterised as social psychological. (individual's) life is also turned outside. The collectivity as a whole...(the) fear of isolation, fear of disrespect, or unpopularity makes a person want to focus his attention on the environment thus leading to an awareness of the "public eye". 72

The first problem is the question of numbers. Actually the number of publics is legion. There are organised and unorganised publics, primary and secondary, large and small, powerful and impotent, wise and foolish, important and unimportant. 73 Those concerned with public opinion greatly differ in the face of their interest. No matter how crucial, or how intensely debated an issue may be there would always be some number who know nothing about it and do not desire to know. Some writers have strongly advocated this. V.O. Key noted: one is taken aback by the frequency with which common political terms are not understood by the citizenry. 74 W.P. Davison also commented the extent to which people can remain
ignorant in the face of easily available information is impressive.75 The judgments of most of the people on an issue or problem are thus made on the basis of slogans, catchwords, habits, or images instead of on factual knowledge.

The commonest form of discrimination between the public and the rest is based on the proposition that there is a public opinion only when a large number of people hold an opinion on a specific topic. So, the term public should be confined to those who have an opinion on the issue.76 Robert Weissberg has maintained that long historical traditions support the contention that the public, i.e., those whose opinions are politically relevant must be distinguished from the masses, those who merely inhabit a geographical area.77 William Albig also defined opinion as the expression of all those members of a group who are giving attention in any way to a given issue.78 However, we can not take such view as valid in all its entirety. The whole population may be treated as the public and then we can inquire how many of what kinds of members of that public hold what opinions on what issues.79 To this may also be added the distinction between crowds or masses focused on the idea that the divisions of opinion, the existence of debatable demands, were essential characteristic of a public.80 E.J. Baur asserted that structurally, the public is a large group divided into factions by an issue.81 While Kimball Young has defined public as any loose association of individuals held together by common interests, a common cultural base and
various mechanical means of communication. Robert Maclver has also suggested that there is no public opinion unless an area of common ground lies underneath and supports the differences of opinion, finding of expression in the traditions and conventions and behaviour, patterns characteristic of the folk. Thus the concept of public emphasises some common ground as well as factions of and on an issue among the population. The study of public opinion is therefore the study of collection of individual opinions wherever they may be found.

The term opinion is generally related to matters of doubt and controversy. As early as Plato describes the state of opinion thus:

"Thank you then, said I, that opinion is more obscure than knowledge, but clearer than ignorance. Far, said he. Does it lie then between behaviour them both? Yes. Opinion then is between the two! Entirely so".

Opinion takes a middle position. Kant characterized opinions as insufficient judgement, subjectively as well as objectively. It has also been differentiated negatively from knowledge, belief and conviction. "An opinion", said A.L.Lowell in 1928, "is the acceptable of one among two or more inconsistent views which are capable of being accepted
by a rational mind as true". William Albig argues that, "although an opinion is a view that can be rationally held, all opinions are not acquired by a process of reasoning". The process of acquiring opinion is very complicated with reason De logical deduction from objective premises or the empirical observation of verifiable data only seldom being a factor. However, it is observed that the less an opinion is based on knowledge and reason, the firmly or intensely it is likely to be held. This has led many to draw a distinction between rationally based or real opinion and irrational opinions, informed and uninformed opinions. As a matter of fact, uninformed public opinion very often prevails. The existence of a diffuse badly informed, but intensely held set of opinions within any large public is one of the facts of life, one of the hazards to be faced upto by the better informed political leaders. Whatever its origins in fact, in a particular situation a judgement which could be made by a rational mind is an opinion.

The substantive issues have also been raised in regard to an opinion. "An opinion" says V.O.Key "become a public opinion when it involved an issue of some substantive concern". This has led to the distinction between mass opinion and elite opinion. An issue, however, becomes public, not because it is intrinsically important, but because some large proportion of the public are interested in it. Notwithstanding, opinions involve the expression of views. William Beuer distinguished between public opinion
proper and opinion which is voiced in public. Tom Harrison also suggests: "public opinion is what you will say out loud to anyone. It is an overt, and not necessarily candid, part of your private opinion". Elisabeth Noelle Neumann in introducing the concept of the "spiral of silence" which determined when opinion could become public, defined public opinion as that opinion which can be voiced in public without fear of sanctions and upon which action in public can be based.

Many writers have insisted that opinions are verbal expressions. Childs defined an opinion "as an expression of attitude in words. An attitude may be said to be person's disposition or tendency to act or react in a particular manner". E.P. Bettinghaus defined opinion as "a verbalized evaluation of some object, person or event." The implication of verbalization have been highlighted by F. A. Allport: "The common stimulating object or situation must be something that can be expressed in words: it must be capable of being immediately and clearly named. There can be no such thing as opinion without stating the content of the opinion in language form. The response of individuals to this common stimulating situation may be either verbal or non-verbal. It may, for example, be a grimace gesture or emotional expression. This reaction however must be capable of being readily translated into words, such, for example, as expressions of agreement or approval". Elisabeth Noelle Neumann defines public opinions as "attitudes or behaviours
one must express in public, it one is not to isolate oneself; in areas of controversy or change, public opinions are those attitudes one can express without running the danger of isolating oneself. 96

Public opinion is differentiated. Some attention may be paid to its properties to be explored with many dimensions. The main points of emphasis are: nature and intensity of opinions, their content and distribution, their salience to different respondents and the strength with which they are maintained. The intensity with which an opinion is held as important as its direction. Both are likely to determine where an individual stands in relation to public opinion generally on the issue. 97 An opinion context may consist of the model opinion, extremity of an opinion or its stability. Opinion cluster consists of: an informational content—degree of differentiation employing discrimination among events or people on an issue and awareness of the implications of an opinions, organization degree of integration or isolation of various opinions, notion of breadth and frame of reference within which scheme of values is an opinion held; and consistency the degree of internal consistency among the constituent opinions in an opinion cluster. 98 Opinions may range from a preference barely above the level of indifference to a position deeply felt and tenaciously held. 99 A minority with deeply held attitudes can exert greater pressure on government policy-makers than a majority whose opposing opinions are only weakly maintained.
At a second level there are questions of direct importance to the propagandists and manipulators of opinion questions relating to the stability of opinions, how readily, and by what mechanisms different kinds of opinions respond to changing stimuli. A third level of analysis deals with latency, a concept based on a recognition that opinions did not arise spontaneously or afresh with each new stimulus. Expressed opinions are found to be manifestations of deeper psychological states varying from individual to individual, but for each person persisting over a long period.

Most of our knowledge about public opinion is derived from research conducted in the United States and Western Europe. In this respect there has been a great deal of controversy over terminological distinction among various concepts for examples attitude, belief, value, etc. The space does not permit here to deal with all these factors. On the whole it is quite adequate to deal with a multi-level system of attitudes and to use beliefs and values simply as alternative terms, with possibly the idea of belief carrying the connotation of the more cognitive components of attitudes and values the more fundamental judgement components. A belief system, an attitudinal system, or an attitudinal complex become synonymous terms. Implying some dispositions of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object or event or anything in favourable, unfavourable or natural manner. However, three important factors must be noted in this respect: there is some magnitude of dissonance
in opinion. Within any individual's total system there are some number of subsystems which can exist more or less independently of each-other. The more central the belief the more likely it is that dissonance will be high and the individual will move to reduce it. The Converse's studies point out that inconsistent opinions are more likely among those with low levels of information and those with little capacity or training for abstract thought; those who lack the conceptual grasp to understand that the specific case and the general principle belong in the same belief system. People with low intensity beliefs will also be more tolerant of dissonance than others. A common governing or central attitude may impose a degree of uniformity. Secondly, attitudes are not merely passive attributes of the individual. They have a dynamic or motivational or avoid the objects about which they are organised. And thirdly opinions have an ideological underpinnings. Albig uses the term ideology to denote general popular thought system. In all societies there exist structures of popular convictions and beliefs that are fundamental and decisive for the life of a time. Feliks Gross defines ideology as a system of political, economic and social values and ideas from which objectives are derived. These objectives form the nucleus of a political program. Ideologies define the criteria of the opinions of their adherents and play an important role in the creation and maintenance of both community and individual values. The ideology also provides a framework in
which one events interprets the world and the interpretation of and statements about them become part of the experience and of ideology. However, all members of society do not experience the same events in the same way. Finally public opinion along with the ideology overlaps the related notion of myth. George Sorel was the first to have used it for any deeply held belief, existing as a faith and as an inspiration for action, independent of any objective evidence of its validity. Mussolini called right as "a faith, it is passion. It is not necessary that it shall be a reality. It is a reality by the fact that it is a good, a hope, a faith, that it is courage." The believers simply act upon myths notwithstanding they are proved or not. However, all behaviour is not governed by the myth. "For true believers, i.e. for those whose predispositions are most deeply affected, it constitutes a code of political behaviour. For others who are not deeply affected, it supplies at least an anchoring point to legitimise their conduct or programs. Myth is indeed at once a conscience keeper of its believes and the handmaid of its manipulators. The concrete instance of myth being used by the government are Nazi racial myths before World War II.

Now a days we witness vast differences in the information held by different strata of society because of the impact of ideologies or manipulative communications upon society. Many writers have pointed out this concept of a stratified public opinion: The politicians and activists in
the top: Below them is a slightly wider stratum of professional communicators who form the attentive, involved public. Below that is the largest stratum, embracing everyone from the occasionally interested to the totally indifferent. With such framework it is clear that opinion that is voiced and listened to is only of the upper strata. It is our primary thesis says, P.E. Converse that, as one moves from elite sources of belief systems downwards on an information scale that constraint declines across the universe of idea-elements and that the range of relevant belief systems become narrower and narrower. Instead of a few wide-ranging belief systems that organise large amounts of specific information, one would expect to find a proliferation of clusters of ideas among which little constraint is felt, even quite often, in instances of sheer logical constraint. Converse's argument, which is also supported by other studies, is that large numbers of people are untouched by political debate, even that which arouses deep passions among the elites. The controversy over internal communism provides a classic example of a mortal struggle among elites that passed almost unwitnessed by an astonishing portion of the mass public.

To conclude it may be said that the study of public opinion is the study of collection of individual opinions on a given issue in a particular society or state. There is no single opinion in a society but multiplicity opinions held by different individuals and groups each commanding its own
public support of that opinion. It is also an understanding on the part of people in an ongoing community concerning some affect or value-laden question which individuals as well as governments have to respect at least by compromise in their overt behaviour under the threat of being excluded or losing one's standing in society. A particular type of public is distinguished from others in its aims and objects and it offers its own solution of political problems confronting the country in accordance with its ideological approach. But a public opinion must be public rather individual or sectional. Notwithstanding there are all kinds of opinions, good, bad, indifferent opinions formed in this way and that, opinions about this and that opinions that will exert influence and those that will not. The arithmetical or algebraic sum of the individual opinions with a given public or group is the state of public opinion in that group alone.

SOME METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS:

We have analysed the state of public opinion, but the main question is how it can be elicited from what source in a given society? The development of fairly accurate polling techniques toward the end of World War II and content analysis of various mass media have provided an impetus for the scientific study of public opinion that has carried through to the present day. In addition, academic specialists have developed both the methodological and theoretical aspects of survey research well beyond a concern with simple tabulations of responses to quality simple
questions. The spread of democracy, the tremendous growth and speed of educational facilities, technical improvement in communication and transportation which have greatly enlarged the numerical size of publics, socio-economic changes and sense of national security, development and peaceful regional and world order—all have increased emphasis on the study of public opinion.

The research into public opinion is made to enquire: what is the state of opinion over a period of time over a particular subject? How public opinion is formed and what is the relative influence of various factors in its formation process? Who holds certain types of opinions and what influence they exert on the policy formulation etc. In a word, one could ask this question, what (information) is communicated by whom (agency) to what kind of person (traits) where and when (situation) and with what effects (predispositions) and behaviour. For our purpose it will be worthwhile opinions concerned with events which is in turn associated with actors and institutions, ideas and ideologies in the geographical, socio-economic and communicational frame of a society. The policy implication of opinions are also significant.

Survey research conducted in the U.S. and Western countries has shown that there is no single public opinion on any particular issue: political issues are often salient for one group and irrelevant for another. Also there are various
contingencies—personal having, influence of family, religion, socialization etc., environmental including influence of geography, climate, population dynamics; mass media; socio-economic and socio-psychological factors etc. In addition, various formulas have been given by many writers of opinion formation process. E. Jackson Baur concluded that public opinion is formed through suitable process of changing kinds of knowledge, affectivity level and relatively salience of values and interests rather than as a logical confrontation and persuasion by rival proponents in public debate.120 L.A. Froman, Jr. and J.K. Skipper, Jr. have identified: the type of issue, education, party identification and strength of issue organization.121 Erich Reigrotsky and Nels Anderson have emphasised national stereotypes as the basis of opinion formation.122 Edward A. Scichman and others identified three basis dimension of attitudes regarding Korean War: ideological conviction (belief that Korean war was fought for an ideal, partisan allegiance, views regarding international relations) and political knowledge (information about Korean war). Some writers have given the pat formula. Prof. Clyde King has given four stages of opinion formation: the first stage in public opinion is discontent in a matter believed to be capable of remedy by group action. Then, this discontent finds general expression and there emerges an awareness of a common need. This is followed by a third in which issues are crystallized following discussion and controversy in the press. Finally, the stage of judgement and decision is
According to W.P. Davison, issues take root when communicated from one person to another; discussion becomes generalized and an issue arises and takes shape; the issue is taken over by a hospitable group; party leaders take up the issue; mass media and professional agents enter the arena; ideas are simplified and generalized; the issue is now brought to the attention of many; public opinion may or may not arise; more face to face discussions begin and a kind of circular process of action and interaction starts through personal contract, influence of personal expectation. Finally, the issue as such disappears because new goals are found, new issues arise or the issue becomes embodied in law, custom or social norms. E. J. Baur specifies three main stages in the formation of public opinion: the mass behaviour stage, when opinions take form in dispersed primary groups; the stage of public controversy when the newly formed opinions are transmitted to large, secondary groups and finally; the institutionalized decision making stage. Hadly Cantrill has reached a number of psychological principles: an opinion is formed when and only when you face a frustrating situation, where a judgement is required on which you must base action that will help you carry out a purpose; an opinion is built up from past experience as a guide to purposive action; an opinion is based chiefly on unconscious cues which are mustered together and integrated when their relevance in forming a value judgement for
purposive action is aroused by some situations; (4) knowledge and rational thought serve the function of bringing into the process of value judgement (opinion formation) more uses to be weighed; (5) knowledge must not be confused with understanding. Understanding as distinguished from knowledge means that knowledge has been put to some concrete test in purposive action. Cantrill says that the starting point for any analysis of opinion formation is accepting of the premise that man is by nature purposeful and it is only when purposes are frustrated that opinions are formed. Frustration starts the process and other factors guide it such as past experience, unconscious cues, knowledge, rational thought, understanding, change of purpose, failure of opinion to work, test of concrete opinions by self and others sense of surety, former standards, new and emergent situations, expectations, events, relative importance of purposes, and the purposes of others. However, difficulties arise in assessing their relative influence or even stating the conditions when they exert influence. Lane and Sears provide that the public as a whole is for the most part marked by relatively modest interest in political matters and relatively low levels of information. Furthermore many of the persuasive attempts which are of interest to us must be carried out at a distance, through messages over TV and radio and reports in the press. Occasionally the influence attempt is more personalized. Dany influence situation, some one (the source) is attempting to persuade some one else (the influence in the audience) to adopt a given position... In
simple influence situation, the influence has three basic sets of cognitions or thoughts: his evaluation of the source, his judgement of the source's position and his own opinion on the issue. There is strain toward consistency among these three sets of cognitions leading to dissonance for the reduction of which various measure are there viz: reputation of the source derogation, distortion of the source incredulity, cognitive reorganization, etc. Besides a leaders' reputation including personal loyalty, partisan loyalty, ethical trust and technical trust, may also create a climate for opinion either positive or negative.127

PUBLIC OPINION STUDY AND RESEARCH:

There are many steps involved in the public opinion research. It begins with the selection of publics for study. The second step is the selection of topic and subject about which opinions are elicited. The third step involves, framing of questionnaire followed by survey interviews. In the next step there is collection of opinions, the filling up of the ballots, the asking of questions, listening post techniques and setting up of machinery for mass observation. Then follows the task of summation and analysis through statistical treatment. In reality, there are many basic problems associated with public opinion research. For example, identification of masses is the crucial problem followed by the relative importance of determinants of public opinion and conflicts of various opinions therein. Further,
there is the problem of relationship between public opinion and private opinion. to what the Individual says or thinks in private. There may be cultural distinctions here—different cultures having different ways of dealing with conflicts between a dominant public opinion and private convictions.
In certain cultures people may have a forked tongue, if this is so, the relationship between public and private opinion constitutes a serious problem for survey research. 128 "Knowledge about the internal structure of public opinion, says P.W Davisen, nevertheless, is still limited and lays for behind measurement". 129 Furthermore, there is the problem of the climate of opinion which depends on who talks and who keeps quiet. "Willingness to express and display their convictions, argues Elisabeth Noelle Neumann, make people observe the events. Observations made in one context spread to another and encourage people either to proclaim their views or to swallow them and keep quite until, in a spiraling process, the one view dominated the public scene and the other disappeared from public awareness as its adherents became mute. This is the process that can be called a spiral of silence. There are two ways of checking the reality, the validity of a process like that envisioned in the spiral of silence hypothesis. If something like this really exists, if this is truly the process by which ideologies and social movements prevail or are swept away, then many authors from earlier centuries must have noticed and commented on it. A second way of testing the legitimacy of a hypothesis is to investigate it empirically". Empirically
there are problems in regard to public opinion polls, survey questionnaire and interview and policy contexts.

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS:

When dealing with opinion polls we should be aware of the fact that many people simply do not have opinions on a number of questions, particularly those that begin to get complicated, remote or vague. When the respondent is pressed by the interviewer for an opinion, therefore, many responses are likely to be capricious. Considerable attention has been given in the past to the problem of sampling and to the relative merits of quota and probability sampling. Framing questionnaires has given rise to studies of question meaning and complexity, projection devices and other types of question design, pre-testing questionnaires, experiments in wording questions and studies of question validity. Opinion polls further serve to distort the public preference through their forced choice design. Subjects are rarely allowed to structure their own responses. Costs, coding problems and limitations on usefulness reduce the number of alternatives presented to a sampling population. The abstraction of issues from a rank ordering and due to law level of information, there remain some problems with respondents. A final difficulty in interpreting poll responses involves the discrepancy between individual and collective desires. It is often unclear when persons answer polling items whether their response has individual or the society as a reference point.
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133 Further, there is possibility that differing reference points may vary systematically across a society. 134

So far as questionnaire is concerned, it ranges from open-end to ranked, rated or scaled statements which make possible the classification of opinion along an attitude or opinion continuum. The survey interview involved in questionnaire is not quite scientific tool because it is subject to a variety of disturbances and contaminations. We cannot be certain about how many respondents really do not understand the thrust of a question, how many interviewers do a poor job of reading the questions in the proper order and sticking to the prescribed wording or how many make independent improvements and free improvisations or provide explanations that get out of hand when the respondents seem uncertain as to the sense of the question. Besides, everything depends on how the question is read, how the answer is transcribed, and how humanly responsive and talkative the particular subject happens to be. All of these unknowns introduce uncertainties in the results (An interview is an approach that provides relatively weak kinds of stimuli and is difficult to control. Nevertheless, the method includes the possibility of observing a representative sample of the population. 135 With open-ended questions which free respondents from the rigidity of uniform standardized questions, group discussions, mail ballots along with special types of surveys as well as telephone and telegraph communication, this problem may to great extent be solved.
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Further, it is not possible to deal with all the population. So, the sampling method is used incorporating: Quota method—distributing the population in terms of age, sex, income, residence and a few other factors; random or probability sampling—selecting sample by pure chance by defining the role and giving each unit in the whole an equal chance to appear in the samples; and, multi-staged method—dividing the whole public into large sub-groups is reached where a complete census or a pure random sample of individuals is taken. In the end, data collected are given the statistical treatment for classifying and correlating. 136

OPINION AND POLICY CONTEXT:

A major difficulty in dealing with policy-measures arises out of the restricted accessibility of much of data, in regard to foreign policy. Through archival research and a close comparative reading of historical accounts, this concern can be somewhat alleviated. The content analysis of press and other media can also shed light. Nevertheless much of the data collected will still remain observer rather than actor-based. This necessity to infer motivations can lead to problem. Such difficulty is compounded by the ambiguous nature of many policy moves. 137 Robert Weissberg examining opinion and policy on Vietnam has illustrated this problem:

how do we really know, for instance, whether a President's loudly proclaimed offer to meet with the North Vietnamese to negotiate a peace settlement constitutes a pro-withdrawal policy? Similarly, a threat to step up the bombing if certain actions are not taken might under certain circumstance be interpreted as a
Dovish policy. Moreover, how do we compare policy pronouncement that have not immediate impacts i.e. "I am willing to make great concession to the enemy" with actual events.138

"It is not in common says Murray Edelman, (for the government) to give the rhetoric to one side and the decision to the other".139 Furthermore there may be external constraints on a nation in the international arena. So, a nation's leadership may be unable to follow the wishes of its people because the behaviour of other states makes such overt compliance impossible. This leads the analyst to focus on the motivations of policy makers and on the less public initiatives.

Is there perfect responsiveness between opinion and policy: Donald J. Devine says, "since democracy concentrates on a majority, fifty percent plus one should be used as the threshold of policy acceptance. When a policy has the support of over fifty percent of the public being considered the policy will be said to have been accepted by that public.140 However, a government may follow different policy lines in the climates of an opinion. It necessitates the analyst to go beyond a singular focus on majority opinion to come up with a more sensitive measures of responsiveness.141 The directional method involves looking for satisfactory significant opinion changes and then examining government policy to see if a similar direction move was undertaken.142 This directional approach can be undertaken only with identically worded items.143 This allows for the harmony
that exists between opinion and policy resulting from the government's heading the public preferences. If opinion and policy are found to be in accord, then close attention to the temporal asymmetries involved in such instances allows for the problem of causation to be talked. This method, thus enables us to see when opinion changed before policy and when the opposite temporal sequence occurred. This allows for a closer consideration of the problem of causation than is true in most past studies.144 In a word, all government's policies have the public opinion contents which set limits to their behaviour and in certain conditions initiate and direct them.

To conclude and summarize the foregoing discussion very briefly, it can be stated that public opinion is the collection of various individual opinions on a given issue in any society (whether democratic or authoritarian). The public includes the whole population divided, for analytical purposes, into many parts through sampling and opinion includes all the expressed views, beliefs, values, thoughts, prejudices notwithstanding their respective terminological distinctions. The sources of public opinion are two: first hand observation through eyes and observation through the eyes of the media. The former can be elicited through the methods of survey research involving sampling questionnaire, interviews and statistical treatment, etc., and the later through content analysis and by decoding the language of visual signals. In addition, source for material includes all
published and unpublished polls relating to problem, various institutions and surveys conducted by them, various reports and archives, original documents, private papers and other secondary materials in one fashion or another.
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