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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of various lobbying strategies for higher education in state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers.

The target population for the study was defined as individuals currently employed as state government relations officers for public institutions of higher education. Data were collected for this study by surveying government relations officers contacted through the 7th Annual State Relations Conference. The total number of usable responses was 109 (74%) of 147 surveyed from 36 states.

The instrument utilized in this study was a researcher designed questionnaire that included a demographic survey to obtain selected characteristics of respondents, their institutions and their legislatures. Respondents used a six point anchored scale to report their perceptions of the importance of roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers, characteristics for success, factors that influence legislators’ decisions regarding appropriations to higher education, utilization of and perceived effectiveness of lobbying strategies and factors that influence an institution’s decision regarding choice of strategies. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Kendall’s Tau and Pearson’s Product Moment correlations coefficients, t-tests, one-way ANOVA’s, and factor analysis.

Findings revealed that the two most effective lobbying strategies were personally presenting arguments to the legislator and having influential constituents contact the legislator. Six of the eight strategies perceived to be the most effective were being used
by 92% of the institutions. Two primary constructs were identified in the lobbying strategies effectiveness scale, labeled as providing information and building relationships.

Fiscal concerns about the budget and the state’s economy were perceived to have the most influence on legislators’ decisions regarding appropriations to higher education. Respondents perceived the nature of the policy issue or budget request and the institution’s determination of what might work best on the current power structure were most important in determining an institution’s choice of lobbying strategies.

The researcher recommended that university officials develop a comprehensive state relations plan for increasing appropriations to higher education, incorporating the most effective lobbying strategies. The researcher further recommended establishing and implementing a grassroots advocacy network and forming coalitions with organized business groups.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Higher education is the key to development of an individual’s intellect and character, is critical to the pursuit of wisdom through knowledge, and is responsible for the improvement of the quality of life for the state’s citizens (Louisiana Board, 1994). These words were penned by the Louisiana Board of Regents in 1994 when they wrote The Master Plan for Higher Education.

Dr. Joseph Savoie, current Commissioner of Higher Education in Louisiana, put it this way:

The social and economic prosperity of our people and our state depends upon a vibrant and engaged postsecondary education system. Education is essential because it empowers people to provide for themselves, their families and communities. (Savoie, 2000a, p. 2)

It’s a simple formula—as the educational levels of citizens improve, the entire quality of life in a state improves. Statistics show that personal income rises with increased educational levels. College graduates earn more than $500,000 more during their working lifetime than a high-school graduate. Additionally, higher education levels mean greater productivity, higher rates of employment, higher savings levels, increased workforce flexibility, greater professional mobility, increased consumption of goods and services, increased taxes and decreased reliance on government support. (Savoie, 2000b, p. 1-2)

Most jobs today require some training beyond a high school education. Future employment opportunities will require new and different skills than those taught in the past (Louisiana Board, 1994). "Higher education . . . contributes significantly to the education, training, and skills of the workforce, thereby contributing to the state’s competitive position and economic base" (Louisiana Board, 1994, p. 52). Historically
and today, the education of a state's citizenry is higher education's most important impact on economic development.

Whereas private institutions of higher education were once thought to be schools for the social elite, the public university made higher education available to the masses. The American people came up with the extraordinary idea of taxing themselves in every state to provide facilities for their children to develop their intelligence in the arts, in science, and in social thinking (Engle, 1960). “Universities bring into contact with the gracious world of pure knowledge hundreds of thousands of students who otherwise would never recognize it. The state university is dedicated to the total life of man . . . it is the sustainer of the western tradition of free inquiry” (Engle, 1960).

Gittell and Sedgley (2000) suggest that the United States has a long tradition of public support for higher education, intended to further economic development and provide access to the common man. According to Professor Engle, “the state university is the most massive attempt in the world's history to make higher education available to any qualified young person who wants it” (Engle, 1960).

The Morrill Act of 1862 and later, the Morrill Act of 1890, gave real impetus to the state-supported school by setting aside federal land to establish land grant colleges--17,430,000 acres of public land were given to states for a state educational system. In addition to land, these acts provided for annual appropriations to these colleges (Engle, 1960; Gittell and Sedgley, 2000). As part of the land grant mission, public institutions of higher education assumed the role of educating the masses, engaged in applied research in
the fields of technology, agriculture and science, and disseminated the research findings to the state’s citizens (Gittell and Sedgley, 2000).

State-supported colleges and universities support and teach society, reflect its needs, refresh it and help it solve its problems (Engle, 1960). The public university, however, has an expanded role in addition to providing continued support for the liberal arts and the contributions of basic research. With the emphasis on economic development, the public university must also direct its resources to applied research, stimulating innovation, and strengthening the entrepreneurial spirit (Louisiana Board, 2000).

In a letter to administrative heads of member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), Peter Magrath, President, wrote the following:

Dramatic changes are ahead in the environment in which higher education must function, not only for fiscal reasons, but also because of the impact of the information technologies that are altering, if not our basic mission, at least the ways in which we acquire knowledge, apply it, and distribute it through teaching and learning. (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000)

Commenting on the changing relationship between government and higher education, Alexander (2000) noted that “state governments are placing an increasing burden on higher education to play a pivotal role in transforming the existing low-wage economic structures into high-performance, technology-based economies” (p. 412). Governments expect higher education to enhance productivity and strengthen the state’s economic position by augmenting learning skills and improving workers’ abilities to
develop and use technology. Government is counting on higher education to be the principal economic engine driving the states’ economy (Alexander, 2000).

Higher education prepares its students to compete in an increasingly competitive global economy. The advancement of technology in society today has created a true global marketplace. Colleges and universities equip students with the knowledge to understand international issues and events, and develop linguistic, business, and cultural skills that will allow them to compete in international markets for goods and services (Louisiana Board, 1994).

Magrath had this to say about how the information technologies are reshaping higher education’s relationships with the world:

We will not only lead new developments in globalization and technology, we will be reshaped by them... the world can now literally be accessed for learning, with U.S. universities partnering through teleconferencing, video technology, and collaborative learning projects. The new ‘classroom’ is the world. (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000)

Magrath (2000) noted that in a recent issue of the British journal, The Economist, that “America gets more than half its economic growth in industries that barely existed a decade ago--such is the power of innovation, especially in the information and biotechnology industries” (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000).

Navigating this change is accomplished with strong leadership at the top. University presidents or chancellors, to lead effectively, must have vision, integrity, and must be risk-takers. During the last LSU chancellor’s search, a graduate student wryly observed that the successful chancellor would be someone who could navigate through landmines.
Yet, despite the importance of the leader of the university, it is the faculty that provides the foundation for the academic enterprise. “Student achievement and program quality are built on the strength of faculty” (Louisiana Board, 1994, p. 46). In order to attract and retain excellent faculty members, the university must be able to pay them a competitive salary which raises one of the most critical issues surrounding higher education today—funding.

Unlike private or parochial colleges, public universities rely primarily on state funding for a large portion of their operating budgets. Other sources include federal funds and self-generated funds which include tuition. Currently in Louisiana, approximately 53 percent of the 1.7 billion operating budget for public higher education is provided by state funds (Louisiana State, 2000).

Unfortunately, Louisiana students now pay a higher proportion of the cost of a college education than their SREB counterparts because of insufficient funding from the state. In 1976, Louisiana students contributed approximately 20 percent of the cost of their education but in 1992, that had risen to 41 percent (Louisiana Board, 1994). “The SREB is a 15-state regional compact designed to share educational programs, data, and facilities to the benefit of all its member states in the Southeast/Mid-Atlantic region of the United States” (Louisiana Board, 1994, p. 14).

Available funding to support operations determines an institution’s effectiveness and its ability to expand. Purchasing power is eroded by inflation and additional funding is required for new initiatives. “[Reduced] state support clearly impacts the overall
quality of higher education in Louisiana and limits the state’s capacity to attract and retain qualified faculty and students” (Louisiana Board, 1994, p. 72).

In 1980-1981, funding for postsecondary education in Louisiana peaked at 103 percent of the SREB average but then, fell to a low of 61 percent in 1989-1990. Postsecondary education in Louisiana sustained 13 devastating budget cuts between 1982-1992. These cuts traumatized the system, causing many of the best and brightest professors to leave the state. Buildings fell into disrepair, and equipment soon became outdated as higher education fought to survive (Savoie, 2000b).

During the last five years, Louisiana higher education has begun to recover under the current state leadership which has made higher education a priority. Over the last six years, postsecondary education has received a 38 percent increase in funding; yet, Louisiana remains last in the South in state funding. During fiscal year 2000-2001, with only modest increases in higher education funding, Louisiana remains more than $250 million below the Southern average (Savoie, 2000b).

In 1999-2000, Louisiana’s appropriation per student at four year universities was $3,803 or 37 percent less than the Southern average of $6,037. In terms of faculty salaries, Louisiana’s average is $46,874 at its four year universities compared to the Southern average of $55,022. That puts Louisiana’s college faculty about 14.8 percent below the SREB average. It is no secret that competitive salaries are the key to attracting and keeping good faculty. Good faculty is a core responsibility of a college or university; without which you cannot have a good school (Savoie, 2000b).
In a memorandum to the LSU Board of Supervisors from the LSU 2000 Committee outlining the 10 Significant Policy Issues Facing Higher Education for 2000 and beyond, it was emphasized that higher education leaders will be faced with trying to provide a top quality education to a growing and diverse body of students with little or no increase in financial resources (LSU, 2000). This aptly describes the public higher education situation in Louisiana as well as in many other states.

Magrath pointed out that there is strong pressure from the state level to cut taxes, to increase spending on elementary and secondary education as well as health care. "And any serious dip in the economy will put enormous pressure on state welfare expenditures—now that states are the primary players in the reformed welfare system" (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000). Magrath also reported recent data gathered from the Nelson Rockefeller Institute of Government and the Tax Foundation that showed public spending for Medicaid and public welfare programs increased 43 percent, spending for prisons went up 28 percent, public school spending rose 18 percent, but higher education spending rose only 10 percent.

Findings from Tucker's dissertation research showed that public funding of higher education was not a priority among the Louisiana Legislature or the state's citizens (Tucker, 1997). She reported data collected by the Louisiana Board of Regents, the coordinating board for higher education, which indicated that "Louisiana consistently ranked at the bottom of the list in funding for public higher education" (Tucker, 1997, p. 3).
Louisiana is not the only state facing funding problems in higher education; therefore, research on efforts to address this problem could have implications nationwide. "If the quality of higher education in the United States diminishes because of lack of funding, then the country's ability to compete in a global marketplace is impaired" (Tucker, 1997, p.3).

Predictions in the mid 90's were that the remaining decade would be a time of diminishing higher education budgets from national and state levels, a "time in which higher education must learn 'to do more with less' and be highly accountable for the financial resources it receives from federal and state sources" (Louisiana Board, 1994, p.16).

One of the major factors affecting the funding of higher education is the economic condition or fiscal status of the state. Unfortunately, the decline of state revenues is becoming a fact of life and the projections are that states will face significant fiscal deficits. In Louisiana, projected shortfalls in the state budget by the Louisiana House Fiscal Division for the next three years are $217 million, $237 million, and $156 million respectively (House Fiscal, 2000).

Reasons for the decline in state revenues are generally blamed on slow economic growth, reduced tax revenues based on a regressive sales tax structure, and state spending increases in other areas such as prisons and health care. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that there will be increased competition for state funds, so higher education must do a better job of telling its story and making a case for increasing or at the least, maintaining state support of higher education.
Another factor that is affecting state funding of higher education is accountability.
The last decade has brought about dramatic changes in the way governments interact with
colleges and universities. "A new economic motivation is driving states to redefine
relationships by pressuring institutions to become more accountable, more efficient, and
more productive in the use of publicly generated resources" (Alexander, 2000, p. 411).

Linking state support of higher education to meeting quantifiable performance
objectives is a current reality or a looming possibility in many states, according to a
consensus of government relations officers attending the 6th Annual State Relations
Conference in 1999 (Performance, 2000). Performance-based funding or budgeting
represents an evolution in the public sector that can be traced back to the 1960's. It was in
the 1970's that performance-based budgeting and funding began to be applied to higher
education. The fact that institutions and policymakers abandoned the idea during the
1990-1992 recession raises two basic questions: Is the resurrection of this accountability
system here to stay and if so, how much of the state funding for higher education will be
tied to it?

The Rockefeller Institute of Government at the State University of New York
(SUNY) defines performance budgeting as "a process by which performance indicators
are used indirectly in determining general fund budgets for colleges and universities"
(Performance, 2000, p. 1). In 1998, 21 states used performance budgeting and 11 others
expected to adopt the system within five years.

Performance funding is defined as "a process by which performance measures are
used directly in determining general fund budget allocations for public colleges and
universities” (Performance, 2000, p. 2). So far, the portion of the budget determined by this method has been no more than 5 percent of an institution’s general fund. In 1998, 13 states were using this system and eight others expected to adopt it in less than five years.

Other organizations’ findings, as reported in the Performance Measurement and Funding/Budgeting summary (2000) indicate these same trends with 35 governors favoring some form of performance funding or budgeting, over half the states reporting significant discussions taking place about revising funding formulas based on enrollment, and more than 66 percent of states not using performance indicators reporting that they would be adopting such in the next five years.

Another factor influencing the public funding of postsecondary education is the public’s attitude toward higher education. In her newest book, *Lobbying for Higher Education*, Constance Cook (1998) noted that there has been a gradual erosion of public confidence in higher education during the 80’s and 90’s. Colleges and universities have been criticized about issues ranging from unfocused curriculum, political correctness, the controversy of teaching versus research to athletic scandals, scientific fraud, low graduation rates, student loan defaults, and high college tuition costs. Higher education has been accused of being self-serving, over indulgent and greedy. “The decline of public confidence in higher education, coupled with budget constraints, means that there will be federal [and state] relations challenges for the foreseeable future” (Cook, 1998, p. 201).
Magrath argued that in a recent survey on higher education by ACE (American Council on Education) that “higher education in America is valued and gets good marks for quality” (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000). Magrath also pointed out, however, that in spite of this, higher education continues to face major challenges in persuading the public that resources are being used wisely and that college is truly affordable for all. His recommendation was to be open about costs, how they are controlled, and to fight for programs and appropriations that make colleges and universities accessible to all (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000).

State higher education policy and budget appropriations are determined by a complex process involving the institution itself, the governing and/or coordinating boards of higher education, the executive branch and ultimately, the state legislature. After conducting research on higher education lobbying on the federal level, Cook noted that “the state level is where policy action is more likely to take place in the future” and she suggested that “state higher education lobbyists could benefit from the lessons learned in Washington” (Cook, 1998, p.195).

Lobbying strategies are those tactics and techniques employed by university administrators, alumni, and government relations officers to communicate the universities’ needs to the appropriate governing bodies. These strategies are ultimately methods of communication (direct or indirect) used to inform public officials and persuade them to support higher education in policy making and appropriations. Knowledge and understanding of effective lobbying techniques used by institutions of higher education in state legislatures across the country may have significance for
determining the best channels of communication to use when seeking to influence educational policy making or secure increased funding for higher education in the state legislature. State government seems to be the most critical to examine since the public university's primary support comes through state appropriations and because the state is increasingly playing a larger role in public policy decisions regarding higher education.

Hunter and his colleagues (1991) recognized a tremendous increase in the amount of legislative lobbying over the past few decades. "Many of the explanations for this phenomenon center on congressional activity and growth in the size of the national government, but there has been an equally extensive increase in state lobbying, which has remained largely unnoticed and undocumented" (Hunter et. al., 1991, p.488).

In light of the above, it appears that studying effective lobbying strategies of colleges and universities in state legislatures would be a productive direction for research and could provide important implications for communicating effectively with decision makers about higher education policy and appropriations for individual universities, higher education systems, coordinating boards of higher education, as well as extension and research organizations of the land grant university system.

In the literature, this researcher found only limited empirical research on higher education lobbying on the state level. The majority of the studies reviewed were based on congressional lobbying on the federal level. Therefore, this is a topic that, in the opinion of the researcher, clearly needs to be addressed.

How can the effectiveness of particular lobbying strategies be assessed? Measuring the amount of money appropriated to higher education would be one way.
However, this does not provide a totally accurate picture since states cannot appropriate what is not available. Legislators could be surveyed; in fact, Cook (1998) argued that "one of the best means of measuring the effectiveness of an interest group’s lobbying is to ask the public officials who are the targets of the lobbying" (p. 196). Cook did not consider that to be a viable option due to the impracticality of surveying legislators in multiple states.

Because of the active role state relations officers in higher education play in the legislative process, this researcher felt that asking them to evaluate lobbying strategies would provide the most accurate analysis. Therefore, because state government relations officers are in the best position to evaluate effective lobbying strategies, it seems that studying these professionals who are on the “front line” during the legislative session would be a productive direction for research designed to address this issue. Such a conclusion is even more compelling when taking into consideration the seriousness of the state funding problem in higher education and the fact that state legislatures are playing a much bigger role in educational policy making.

**Purpose and Objectives**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of various lobbying strategies for higher education in state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers.

Specific objectives formulated to guide the researcher included to:

1. Describe state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education on selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics.
2. Describe state higher education policy domains on selected characteristics of the relationship between the higher education community and the respective state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education.

3. Describe the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions.

4. Determine the importance of selected characteristics for the success of state government relations officers as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions.

5. Determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations to public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers.

6. Determine the effectiveness of selected legislative lobbying strategies as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education.

7. Determine whether or not selected legislative lobbying strategies are utilized by public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers.

8. Determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by public institutions of higher education regarding the choice of legislative lobbying strategies used as perceived by state government relations officers.
9. Determine if a relationship exists between the perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies among state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education and each of the following personal and institutional demographic characteristics:

a. Years employed as a state government relations officer
b. Gender of state government relations officer
c. Educational background of state government relations officer
d. Age of state government relations officer
e. Marital status of the state government relations officer
f. Ethnic background of state government relations officer
g. Size of the university (as measured by student enrollment)
h. Type of institution that employs the state government relations officer
i. Carnegie classification of institution
j. Type of governance of public higher education institutions
k. Role orientation of the higher education community to the legislature
l. Professionalization of the legislature as measured by the number of months the legislature is in session
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In her new book, *Lobbying for Higher Education*, Cook (1998) sites a popular, albeit thought-provoking story told in the halls of Washington that sums up precisely what has been wrong with higher education lobbying:

Three dogs are sitting on the corner outside a restaurant when a meat truck pulls up. As the driver steps out to deliver the meat, the dogs begin strategizing about how to get some for themselves. One dog says, "I used to be a lawyer. Let me negotiate with the driver and talk him into giving us the meat." The second dog says, "I used to be an architect. I know a secret passageway to the kitchen. I can lead us to the meat." The third dog says, "I used to be a college president. I'm sure they will give us all the meat we want if we just sit here on the corner and whine and beg." (preface)

Lobbying for higher education on the federal level has come a long way since 1995-1996. The political turmoil in Washington brought on by the arrival of the first Republican Congress in 40 years forced the higher education community to not only intensify their lobbying activities but to utilize a wider array of techniques as well (Cook, 1998). This Congress wanted to restructure higher education policy and reduce federal funding.

In the past, higher education officials engaged in little lobbying, believing the process to somehow be "beneath them". In some quarters, lobbying was still considered a dirty word (Cook, 1998). But university leaders have come to recognize the necessity of political participation to influence higher education policy and to increase, or at least, to maintain federal funding for their institutions.
Until 1995-1996, the bulk of higher education lobbying on Capitol Hill was done by higher education associations—commonly referred to as the "Big Six"(Cook, 1998). These include the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). Most, if not all, colleges and universities are members of one or more of these associations.

Today, the higher education community has come to adopt many techniques commonly used by other interest groups. Some of the larger research universities have now established a Washington office staffed by a federal relations officer, while others have retained the services of "'hired guns' (i.e., for-profit law, consulting and lobbying firms," Cook, 1998, p. xvi) to monitor and influence public policy and to secure special research grants for their institutions.

Although this study focused on state government relations, there is a lot to be learned from examining the lobbying strategies used to influence federal policy. Cook's book on higher education lobbying and an earlier qualitative study by this researcher on the role of the lobbyist in the Louisiana Legislature provided the inspiration for this study on effective lobbying strategies for higher education on the state level.

Patrick Terenzini (1996), in a presidential address to the American Educational Research Association in 1995, challenged the higher education research community to take a broader view of higher education's larger issues—to look at the educational policies,
actions, and decisions that institutions and legislatures must confront, i.e., to become more involved in policy-relevant research (Terenzini, 1996). It is this researcher's opinion that studying effective lobbying strategies for higher education is one such issue. According to Terenzini (1996), the current financial climate and the emphasis on accountability will not allow public support for research that does not serve public needs. And no one appears to be forecasting an early change in that climate.

**Funding of Higher Education**

A study conducted by the Center for Higher Education at Illinois State University, on state spending on higher education, led by Edward R. Hines, showed that state budgets for higher education, especially in the South, were the healthiest they had been since 1990 (Schmidt, 1998). Five southern states were in the top 10 of those receiving the largest increases for college operations and student aid–Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Virginia. However, South Carolina received less money than two years ago–the reason given was that legislators were hesitant to put more money into higher education until the new performance-based system was up and running (Schmidt, 1998). In the southern states with strong economies, lawmakers increased spending for higher education to fuel economic development. Enrollment increases and state scholarship programs to cover tuition also caused increased appropriations, according to Schmidt (1998).

Alaska and Hawaii, however, had continued to receive standstill or shrinking appropriations for higher education due to declining oil revenues and declining tourism,
respectively (Schmidt, 1998). The states of Montana, Tennessee, and Wyoming failed to keep up with inflation in their appropriations to higher education.

California received the largest increase—a whopping 26.3% increase over the last two years, primarily due to large state surpluses. This state accounted for 25% of the total increase for states nationwide (Schmidt, 1998). The largest one-year increases occurred in states like Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Virginia, where the public college systems underwent major restructuring and/or had new leadership that helped them gain the confidence of conservative lawmakers (Schmidt, 1998).

The survey revealed that overall state appropriations for higher education rose to $52.8 billion, a 6.7% increase from the year before, and a 13.3% increase compared with two years before. Adjusting for inflation, however, the numbers showed a 5.1% increase from the year before and a 9.4% increase from two years before (Schmidt, 1998).

The additional money was being directly primarily toward distance education, workforce development, and making college more accessible to minorities, according to Schmidt (1998). This meant that appropriations for community colleges and student-aid rose somewhat faster, perhaps, than allocations for other areas.

Many institutions are still suffering from the damage done to higher education budgets in the last recession. The Illinois study showed that "when inflation was taken into account, 18 states continued to budget less for higher education than they did 10 years ago, and several others had just begun to pull themselves out of the hole" (Schmidt, 1998, p. 4). Recovery in the New England states had been particularly slow because,
coupled with the economic downturn, the public has traditionally not been very supportive of higher education.

Tom Mortenson, a senior scholar at the Washington-based Center for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education vigorously disagreed with the findings of the Illinois study and argued that states were neither spending more per student nor giving a larger share of the tax dollar to higher education (Schmidt, 1998). Mortenson said that the Illinois study did not take into account increases in population or personal income, which skewed the results. Mortenson looked at state spending for higher education from the perspective of percent of resident’s personal income that states spent on college operations and student aid. He showed that the increase in state support for higher education amounted to a paltry 2% over last year, which doesn’t come close to making up for the 30% decrease in state support that higher education has experienced over the last two decades (Schmidt, 1998).

The health of the state budget plays a large role in the amount of money appropriated to higher education. Hovey (1999) reported that the fiscal forecast for states was less than promising, and the projections were that states will face significant fiscal deficits over the next eight years, assuming normal economic growth. Additionally, lawmakers will have to confront the difficulty of cutting current services, raising taxes, and funding new initiatives. For states to maintain services at current levels, they must increase spending equal to the increase in personal income for all Americans. Unless taxes are increased, state revenues will not grow as fast as personal income because of states’ heavy reliance on sales taxes (Hovey, 1999).
Hovey (1999) predicted the projected budget shortfalls would "lead to increased scrutiny . . . and to curtailed spending for public higher education in many states" (p. vi). He also predicted that if economic growth slowed even more than normal, if taxes were reduced, or if state spending increased in other areas, then the outlook for support of public higher education was even worse (Hovey, 1999).

According to Hovey (1999), estimates were that state spending in higher education would have to increase by 6% just to maintain current services. "Since the percentage of the state budget dedicated to higher education has actually declined over the past decade, continuing to fund current service levels for higher education would represent a significant shift in state budget trends" (Hovey, 1999, p. vii). Assuming that higher education was not singled out for additional cuts to balance the budget (as has often been the case in the past), Hovey (1999) suggested that the only way higher education would see an expansion of funding for programs would be at the expense of a reduction in other programs within total higher education spending (Hovey, 1999).

Magrath pointed to a major funding issue involving sales tax on Internet commerce. Sales on the Internet are growing by leaps and bounds; unless states can come up with a way to tax the sale of goods and services on the Internet, and other claims on spending or revenue shortfalls materialize, it could severely hamper state support for higher education (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000).

The information technology revolution is having a major effect on colleges and universities. Not only is the issue of taxing e-commerce a concern, but information technologies are transforming the way colleges and universities conduct research, teach,
and engage with other communities and the world at large. This revolution is putting added pressure on states to fund universities to help them maintain a leadership position in the information technologies (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000).

Magrath also suggested that public universities were going to have to become increasingly entrepreneurial in their partnerships with other universities, state, federal and local governments, business, and other organizations to attract adequate funding to meet the needs. He predicted these public-private partnerships would emerge from entrepreneurial faculty members, "the true catalysts of discovery and innovation" (P. Magrath, personal communication, September 5, 2000).

**Accountability**

"Improving educational quality has become an increasingly urgent political and educational issue in virtually all state capitols and campuses in recent years" (Morgan, 1992, p. 28). Most efforts by government to improve quality on college campuses have involved various funding enhancements such as performance funding or competitive grants. Morgan (1992) suggests that generous, across-the-board funding to higher education institutions will be eliminated due to other pressing funding priorities and struggling state economies, in addition to the movement for quality improvement.

Morgan (1992) reported that many states established a base-plus-enhancement model where base appropriations were left intact and additional funding from state legislatures rewarded innovation on college and university campuses. This supposedly eliminated competition for numbers of students and instead focused on quality. Although
the programs, for the most part, were fiscally successful, incentive or performance funding is not without its problems. Some university administrators and legislators have disagreed about whether these funds were new or just reallocated money. Others have argued that political patterns tend to lean toward distributive politics, where everyone gets a little something. This goes against the original purpose of the program which was to be selective in rewarding excellence. The political realities suggest, however, that selective funding is difficult to maintain over time (Morgan, 1992).

State-initiated change in public colleges and universities usually takes one of three forms—exhortation to make changes, indirect intervention by providing incentives and some regulation, and extensive or direct intervention that involves executive or legislative action in mandating programs, centralizing budget controls, etc. Clearly, higher education appears to be moving in the direction of increased governmental control and less institutional autonomy, according to Morgan (1992).

Recommendations to the higher education community include a "growth by substitution" pattern advocated by Massey and Zemsky, whereby new programs are added only as old ones are dropped (Morgan, 1992, p. 304). Another possibility would be a reduction in the scope of programs and activities that a university offers to reduce duplication and correct quality problems. Scarce resources coupled with an interest in increasing productivity in higher education makes both of these programs viable options. There is a fundamental belief on the state level that educators lack the inclination or ability to reform themselves but Morgan (1992) suggested that external pressures would
almost certainly impose the reality of selective or targeted funding on higher education (Morgan, 1992).

State legislatures continue to regulate higher education at the expense of autonomy for a number of reasons, as pointed out by Sabloff (1997). These reasons include increasing demands for accountability, internal conflict within the university setting, states' desire for master planning and states' search for methods to evaluate higher education. Sabloff (1997) cited Cope and Rosenthal's prediction in the late 1970's, that more regulations would be imposed on public universities for another reason—the changing political process in the states. This change has been described in the literature by Polsby and Squire as "professionalization" of the state legislature, meaning that the legislature is more like Congress--year-round sessions, increased professional staff, higher educational levels of legislators, better pay scales, standing committees, and legislators' belief that their service is a career (Sabloff, 1997, p. 142). Professionalization is characterized by having legislative sessions that last eight or more months per year.

As a result of new laws passed to make elections more democratic, the political patronage system has inadvertently changed, too, according to Sabloff (1997). The Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) of 1974 limited campaign contributions which spurred the growth of political action committees (PACs). It ultimately had the result of changing the political patronage of the legislator from his/her party to the constituents and the legislative leadership, according to Sabloff (1997). Legislators vote to please their constituents because that is how they get reelected. They cater to their caucus leaders because of their power to distribute PAC contributions and key committee positions plus
provide staff to aid in reelection. Because the political party is no longer the supplier of campaign funds, legislators increasingly rely on PAC and special interest contributions. Reagan's New Federalism and the 1962 U.S. Supreme Court Baker V. Carr decision strengthened the power of constituents and increased the importance of the states in policy formulation (Sabloff, 1997).

Sabloff's quantitative research showed that there was a correlation between laws passed regulating public universities and the professionalization of the legislature. The longer a legislature sits per year, the more laws regulating public universities will be passed. Her subsequent case study of the state of Pennsylvania, characterized by a professionalized legislature, confirmed her findings:

That is, the more strongly legislators feel primary loyalty to constituents and caucus leadership, the more frequently they propose bills and eventually pass laws that they and their constituents feel are responsive to constituent needs, regardless of the consequences to public universities. (Sabloff, 1997, p. 159).

Mahtesian (1995) reported that higher education was under increasingly intense scrutiny to be more accountable for the public dollars that were spent. In the 1960s, the main question legislatures asked had to do with bricks, mortar and access. In Ohio, the governor won broad support with his promise to put a university within 30 minutes driving distance from every resident. Even in the 1980s, when "quality" was part of the higher education debate, there was still not much demand for accountability (Mahtesian, 1995).

In the early 1990s, however, the recession brought about a funding crisis in higher education and in 1993, appropriations to higher education failed to keep pace with
inflation in 75% of the states, reported Mahtesian (1995). Many states could no longer support its vast array of higher education institutions—the system had overreached itself. There were too many institutions doing too much of the same thing. In Ohio, where they had added a total of 57 campuses to the six state assisted schools that were originally in place, a task force recommended a complete overhaul of the higher education system to remove duplication, especially in graduate programs (Mahtesian, 1995).

The new scrutiny of public higher education is part of the state budget process. Because higher education makes up one of the largest parts of the discretionary budget, it has taken some of the worst hits (Mahtesian, 1995). Not only has higher education taken some large budget cuts, legislatures are increasingly asking more questions. In addition to program duplication issues, there are also workload issues. In the 1980s, faculty time devoted to teaching and student advising declined and research increased, due to a reward system that favors research and graduate teaching at the expense of undergraduate instruction. At the same time, tuition and fees were going up. According to Mahtesian (1995), legislators are now demanding an accounting of the time faculty spends teaching. They also want to know what they are teaching, who is teaching, how they are paid, and in some cases, if faculty is proficient in English. Many legislators see performance-based funding as the ultimate weapon—rewarding and penalizing colleges and universities on the basis of predetermined goals and accountability measures (Mahtesian, 1995).

Legislators now want to know what kind of return taxpayers are getting for their money. Once it was just assumed that higher education was a good investment but today, says William Shkurti, a vice president at Ohio State, institutions have to prove that they
are efficient (Mahtesian, 1995). The accountability movement stands as a symbol of the kind of pressure that higher education institutions are under.

Much of the problem can be attributed to media coverage exposing spending excesses at universities and research of dubious value to students and taxpayers. These excesses are not the only thing driving the accountability issue. Many legislators feel that universities have been held to softer standards in the past plus they have resisted efforts to "rein them in" (Mahtesian, 1995, p. 22).

Now universities are feeling the same accountability demands as other state agencies—a majority of states now require an annual performance evaluation report from their universities. The SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board) reported that 12 out of 15 of its member states now had stricter higher education accountability laws. One Ohio legislator summed it up this way, "if they want us to be their sugar daddy, there are going to be some rules" (Mahtesian, 1995, p. 22).

A task force organized in Ohio to restructure higher education recommended that universities concentrate their efforts on economic development and workforce training and then link state funding directly to performance (Mahtesian, 1995). These recommendations have been met with a range of emotions, from healthy skepticism in Ohio to downright hostility in Texas. Part of the problem is that no one has developed a reliable indicator for measuring quality in higher education. Even in Tennessee where they have been using an accountability system for many years, the focus has been on measurable test scores and other easy criteria; yet the accountability system is only tied to 5.45% of the funding (Mahtesian, 1995).
Additionally, many legislators do not appear to have the political will to enforce accountability (Mahtesian, 1995). Although most agree that accountability is necessary, when it comes to a cut in their local university's budget, they part company with the rest of the legislature. Many university officials and legislators alike are grumbling about the increased role being played by the Board of Regents, especially if it means ceding any funding authority (Mahtesian, 1995).

**Lobbying Defined**

The federal Lobbying Disclosure Act (effective January 1, 1996) defined lobbying as "oral or written communications to high level executive or legislative branch officials regarding the selection of federal officials or the formulation, modification, or adoption of federal legislation, regulations, and programs" (Cook, 1998, p.143). "Lobbying," as defined by Keffer and Hill (1997), "is simply an attempt to persuade members of city councils, county commissions, state legislatures, or the U.S. Congress to support legislation favorable to one's goals or desires, or to defeat or repeal legislation unfavorable to one's cause" (p. 1372). As defined in an article reprinted from the Tennessee School Board, "lobbying is the developed skill of persuasion (p. 5) ... a continuous educational process" (Colorado, 1991, p.17).

Dawson described lobbying as "an attempt to influence someone else's opinion or activities" (Dawson, 1990, p. 21). She described good lobbying as the "ability to make your point of view both interesting and relevant--to focus on your topic, argument and strategy in such a way as to make that person you are attempting to influence ... stop short and listen!" (Dawson, 1990, p. 21). In the governmental process, lobbying is
providing public officials, who cannot be expected to know how every law or regulation will affect their constituents, with information they need for decision-making (Dawson, 1990.)

The term "lobbyist" was coined by President Ulysses S. Grant to describe the individuals who hung around in the lobby of the Willard hotel in Washington, D.C. waiting to get to talk to him (Louisiana Governmental, 2000). They would invite him and other lawmakers to join them for drinks or dinner to talk about issues of concern. A common definition of a lobbyist, cited by Hunter and his colleagues, is "someone who attempts to affect legislative action"(Hunter et al., 1991, p. 488).

Benjamin (1994) reviewed Alan Rosenthal's 1993 book, The Third House, that examined the role of the lobbyist in state legislatures. According to Benjamin, Rosenthal's premise was that lobbyists and the work they do are central to the functioning of the democratic process. Opinions on lobbying run the gamut—from a manifestation of the right to free expression in a complex society of organized interests to a corrupt process with linkages between big money, big organizations, and powerful public officials (Benjamin, 1994).

Benjamin (1994) noted, however, that after Rosenthal conducted his study by interviewing 105 lobbyists in six different states, he concluded that lobbyists were activists, members of associations and corporations, government officials, and hired guns (contract lobbyists) doing a job they loved. They were as concerned about convincing their organizations, businesses or clients about political realities as passing or killing a piece of legislation (Benjamin, 1994).
Benjamin also indicated that Rosenthal agreed that having PAC money to hand out was an asset but the real benefit of lobbyists was their expertise and the information they could provide (Benjamin, 1994). Developed as a result of long service in the legislative process, their experience was their greatest asset—they knew how the process worked, who made it work, and how to get to the key players. The information lobbyists provided to the policy makers was essential to the process. Benjamin (1994) says that Rosenthal conveys the irony that good lobbying is dependent upon the trust relationship between lobbyist and legislator, yet the public’s perception of lobbying has been a factor in their overall distrust of government (Benjamin, 1994).

Thomas and Birnbaum (as cited in Keffer and Hill, 1997) provide two additional descriptions of the public’s perception of lobbyists:

Furtive influence peddlers lurking in the lobbies outside government offices . . . ready to pounce on ‘defenseless’ elected officials and ‘buttonhole’ them until they reluctantly agree to sacrifice the public welfare to appease whatever special interests the lobbyists happen to represent that day.

Cigar-chomping men who wine and dine the nation’s lawmakers while shoving dollar bills into their pockets. (Keffer and Hill, 1997, p.1371)

Keffer and Hill (1997) reported "a widespread perception among the general public that lobbying negatively influences the character of legislation, and that anyone who lobbies belongs to a special interest group" (p. 1371). A study by Murphy (1999), however, showed that a lobbyist was critical to the legislative process and those that were the most successful were those with impeccable character and integrity. Indeed, "the extent to which any information offered to alter beliefs is effective depends
on the credibility of the lobbyist to the legislator in question" (Austen-Smith, 1993, p. 800).

Milbrath (1960) examined the lobbying process based on a "communications model" that built on the decision-making theory that said "a decision maker must have access to ideas, arguments, and information before these factors can figure in his decision" (p. 34). He developed this model based on a sample survey of 101 Washington lobbyists. According to Milbrath (1960), "the lobbying process, then, was essentially a communication process, and the task of the lobbyist was to figure out how he could handle communications most effectively in order to get through to decision-makers" (p. 35).

Keffer and Hill (1997) proposed a "business model" of lobbying in 1995, showing that the relationship among lobbyists, clients, and legislators was best represented by a triangular shape, with attributes of relationship selling (Figure 1). In this model, meetings between lobbyist and legislator were analogous to a sales call where the lobbyist
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was the seller and the legislator was the buyer. Thus, the lobbyist's goal was to create a long-lasting relationship in which the legislator would develop confidence in the abilities, expertise and advice of the lobbyist. Here, lobbying was seen as a strategic marketing tool, allowing business to have input into the legislative process and at the same time giving them an opportunity to incorporate future legislative changes into their marketing planning process (Keffer and Hill, 1997).

Keffer and Hill (1997) later outlined an "ethical approach" to lobbying in which they advanced the communitarian movement developed by Etzioni. This approach is one of pluralism-within-unity, which encourages intergroup competition but with a concentration on the common interests of the community. Using this approach, they offered a revised model that extended the concerns of lobbyists, their sponsors, and government officials beyond themselves to include those who were not directly involved but were still impacted by this process (Figure 2). This approach appears to be applicable
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to higher education lobbying. In this scenario, "other parties" would be the public—the students who benefit directly by receiving an education and the public at large who benefit from the knowledge generated by scientific inquiry (Keffer and Hill, 1997).

The Role of the Lobbyist Examined

Murphy (1999) conducted a qualitative research project on the role of the lobbyist in the legislative process using the interview approach ascribed to by Patton (1990) in his book, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Six lobbyists who worked at the Louisiana State Capitol were interviewed—three professional lobbyists, one business association lobbyist, one nonprofit association lobbyist and one university lobbyist. Only one of the professional lobbyists was an attorney. Two legislators and five legislative staff members were also interviewed (Murphy, 1999).

After analyzing the interviews, Murphy reported eight emerging themes. These included:

1. **A lobbyist role is to provide information.** Legislators cannot possibly know about every issue that comes up in a legislative session. They consider lobbyists crucial in providing them with information, preferably backed by solid research, that gives both sides of an issue, and that shows how the legislation will impact business, agriculture, etc. When lobbyists give them both sides of an issue, legislators see this as a measure of honesty. Legislators need to know both sides so that they can ask the right questions or defend an issue on the floor. Lobbyists should make sure that legislators are never blind sided. Legislators also look to lobbyists for guidance in forming an opinion. Staff can only provide information
on the pros and cons of an issue—it is not their role to give an opinion. Lobbyists provide a vehicle for people, businesses and organizations to communicate ideas to the legislators and they provide a feedback link as well. Lobbyists should always be available—to the legislator and the client to answer questions and provide information.

2. **An effective lobbyist is generally a "people person".** He or she is able to communicate well, to sell himself/herself, is intelligent and has knowledge of the issues, the legislators, and the process.

3. **Lobbying is about "building relationships".** Each lobbyist interviewed cited this as a critical component of success. Building relationships is a function of being people oriented, being honest and sincere, and something that is developed over time. This one weapon is the critical element in being able to pass or kill legislation.

4. **An effective lobbyist must have character and integrity.** A lobbyist’s word is his/her greatest asset. One lobbyist put it very succinctly: "Always tell the truth and never tell a lie" (Murphy, 1999, p. 20).

5. **Lobbying is primarily learned by experience.** Education helps, mentoring helps, but it is a "dues paying process". One lobbyist expressed it this way, "You just have to go around the block a few times" (Murphy, 1999, p. 20).

6. **Pre-preparation prior to the legislative session was also cited as a key to success.** Lobbyists should develop a strategy to achieve the client’s goals. This includes research to find out all the information about an issue, its historical
background, where it fits in the legislative process, who is for it or against it and how it will affect various constituencies; making legislative visits in the district; securing legislative votes, and grass roots support.

7. **Teamwork was cited as a critical element of success.** From having a support staff to working cooperatively with colleagues, other organizations and coalitions, legislators, and grass root supporters, the successful lobbyist was a team player.

8. **Grass root efforts are critical keys in the legislative process.** A lobbyist who can marshal grass roots support for an issue will stand a much better chance of achieving the desired results. That is one thing that all legislators respond to—the voice of their constituents. If you have the numbers and the geography (one local voter to every legislator) plus the system to implement a grass roots effort to contact legislators, you have the means of beating a well-financed operation. One lobbyist stated that universities and non-profits should not discount their ability to generate grass roots votes for legislators—the higher education community can get legislators to attend meetings as the guest speaker and legislators want to be exposed to constituents. Votes can be as important as money (Murphy, 1999).

To summarize, these interviews captured the essence of the role of the lobbyist. A lobbyist provides information to legislators and helps guide them in forming an opinion on important issues. An effective lobbyist builds relationships by maintaining character and integrity as well as being personable, articulate and knowledgeable of the people and the issues. Lobbying is learned primarily through experience and requires pre-preparation, teamwork, and grass roots effort (Murphy, 1999).
Lobbying Strategies and Techniques

Cook’s research describing lobbying changes in higher education that occurred on the federal level after 1995-1996, involved a quantitative survey of more than 1,500 college and university presidents as well as 140 qualitative interviews of college presidents, campus lobbyists, presidents, and government relations personnel of the "Big Six" associations, members of Congress and their staff, and executive branch personnel influential in higher education policy outcomes. She found that the political turmoil that ensued as a result of the new Republican Congress brought about changes in lobbying strategies by the higher education community (Cook, 1998).

In addition to the traditional techniques used by the higher education associations such as testifying at hearings, contacting officials directly, informal contacts, presenting research results, sending letters to members, planning legislative strategy, helping draft legislation, and inspiring letter writing campaigns, the associations began to make more use of campus-based resources (Cook, 1998). University presidents began to spend more time in Washington and student organizations mobilized via the Internet for demonstrations. Cook (1998) noted that as the number of Washington higher education representatives mushroomed, the higher education community became more and more reliant on campus-based resources for federal relations activities (Cook, 1998).

Another new lobbying technique employed by the higher education community was the use of ad hoc coalitions. These coalitions used polling and focus groups to gauge public opinion and then participated in political advertising and grassroots mobilization (Cook, 1998). These coalitions were successful because they could respond quickly and
lobby aggressively. The use of campus-based resources and ad hoc coalitions moved the higher education community to a more sophisticated level of lobbying on the federal level and represents the new paradigm for higher education lobbying (Cook, 1998).

So, after 1995-1996, in addition to the traditional lobbying techniques cited above, the higher education community added four more strategies to their arsenal—entering coalitions with other organizations, mounting grass root lobbying, having constituents contact their congressmen and running ads in the media. Public officials noted that "in the future, presidents may want to improve the flow of information about institutional concerns to all campus colleagues, including faculty, students, trustees, and alumni/ae, so they too can contact public officials in an informed manner" (Cook, 1998, p. 200).

Milbrath (1960), in his study of lobbying as a communication process, broke down lobbyist communications into three categories: (1) Facts, (2) Arguments, and (3) Power. He asked Washington lobbyists to evaluate fourteen different tactics for communicating with decision makers, broken down into three broad categories as listed below:

(1) Direct personal communications
   a. Personal presentation of arguments
   b. Presenting research results
   c. Testifying at hearings

(2) Communication through intermediaries
   a. Contact by constituent and friend
   b. Letter and telegram campaign
c. Public relations campaign
d. Publicizing voting records

(3) Opening communication channels

a. Entertaining and parties
b. Direct bribery
c. Contributing political money and campaign work
d. Collaboration with other groups

Milbrath (1960) found that most lobbyists favored "face-to-face conversations with legislators for the communication of facts and the arguments which support them" (p. 53). However, because of the increasing difficulty of meeting with congressmen face-to-face, lobbyists were forced "to seek access through intermediaries, especially the constituents of elected officials who have a power relationship with the decision maker" (Milbrath, 1960, p. 53).

Although most lobbyists rated face-to-face communications with the decision maker as the most effective, they were very careful not to "carry their pitcher to the well too often," as one Congressman told Milbrath (Milbrath, 1960, p. 37). Most lobbyists chose to "save up their good will and access for a time when they want to see the decision maker about something really important" (Milbrath, 1960, p. 38). When lobbyists did make a personal presentation, they made it a point to leave a short written summary behind for future reference. People in Congress reported that they preferred "personal presentations be informative, unbiased, clear, short, sincere, and unaccompanied by pressure" (Milbrath, 1960, p. 39).
Milbrath (1960) found that large farm organizations rated research above arguments, attributing this to the deep-seated respect that the farming industry has for research. He noted with interest that legislative relations staff of the employer, who generally have closer contact with Congress than those in other roles, placed less emphasis on research but "greater emphasis on collaboration, constituent contact, hearings, letters, and so forth" (Milbrath, 1960, p. 40).

Milbrath (1960) noted that constituent contact (especially from a constituent that the official respects) is designed to communicate facts, arguments and especially power. He reported that farm groups gave constituent contact a high rating. Letter writing campaigns and PR campaigns were two other techniques rated highly by big farm lobbyists. Officers of organizations gave PR campaigns the highest rating (Milbrath, 1960).

Milbrath (1960) stressed the importance to the lobbyist of keeping the channels of communication open with the decision maker. Keeping these channels open guides the behavior of lobbyists. Milbrath (1960) noted the "recognized quid pro quo relationship between lobbyist and decision maker" (p. 47). The lobbyist can provide services that the decision maker desires in return for the decision maker lending a sympathetic ear when the lobbyist has a problem. Mutual confidence between lobbyist and decision maker was the lubricant that kept the relationship working smoothly. According to Milbrath, "Access and a confidential relationship with officials are so crucial to the task of the lobbyist that most astute lobbyists would not consider jeopardizing them in any way"
As a result of this relationship, lobbyists are very careful to present accurate information to the decision maker and to never disclose a confidence, knowing that to violate these two unwritten rules would mean the cutting off of access (Milbrath, 1960).

Contrary to popular opinion, entertaining and parties received very low scores on measures of effectiveness. Most lobbyists were aware that decision makers were already overburdened with social events and prized their time at home. Most officials saw entertainment as an imposition (Milbrath, 1960).

Interestingly, having members of their group contribute political money ranked low on the scale of effectiveness. The tactic of collaborating with other groups was generally prized among lobbyists, with full-time legislative relations persons giving it the highest ranking (Milbrath, 1960).

Mullen (1980) conducted a study in Ohio on lobbying strategies in state government and its implications for increasing budget appropriations for the Cooperative Extension Service. His focus, like Milbrath before him, was on methods for communicating effectively with public decision makers. It was his contention that lobbying, when done honestly and effectively, could be "a constructive tool to inform, educate, and assist elected officials in public decision making" (Mullen, 1980, p. 2).

A portion of Mullen's study (1980) involved identifying and rating the perceived effectiveness of various lobbying strategies and techniques by registered lobbyists and legislators. To do this, he used a descriptive-survey to collect his data using the interview technique. Lobbying strategies and techniques identified in the instrument were taken
from Milbrath's study on lobbying as a communication process. Respondents were asked to rate 15 lobbying tactics on a scale of zero to 10, with zero representing no effectiveness and 10 representing maximum effectiveness. The lobbyists were also asked if their organization used this particular strategy (Mullen, 1980).

Mullen included the following 15 techniques in his instrument for evaluation:

1. Testifying at hearings
2. Presenting research results
3. Personal presentation of arguments before individual members of the legislature
4. Getting influential constituents to contact legislators
5. Getting the support of someone close to the legislator
6. Entertaining legislators for an evening
7. Giving a party or dinner
8. Contributing money to a political campaign
9. Contributing work in a political campaign
10. Inspiring a letter writing, telephone call, or telegram campaign
11. Publicizing voting records
12. Creating a public relations campaign to convince the general public of your organization's point of view
13. Using an organization's newsletter or newspaper to convince public officials
14. Offering personal favors and assistance to public officials
15. Collaborating or cooperating with other organizations in gaining the support of public officials (Mullen, 1980, p. 250).
Mullen’s findings also revealed that lobbyists and legislators perceived personal presentation of arguments, on a one-on-one basis, as being the most effective lobbying strategy (Mullen, 1980). They also emphasized the importance of developing personal relationships with legislators, based on trust and accommodation. Respondents stressed that communications should take the form of a regular flow of information through existing channels rather than an increased flow of information just prior to budget considerations (Mullen, 1980).

All study participants agreed that it was important to have an organization’s budget request supported by influential legislators involved in the budget process. Most respondents agreed that lobbying techniques were less effective in gaining support for budget requests than for other legislative activities such as introducing new legislation (Mullen, 1980).

Constituent response was perceived by finance committee members to be an important factor in influencing legislators’ decisions (Mullen, 1980). Effectiveness of the contact, however, was tempered by the person’s knowledge of the issue, the relevance of the argument and the quantity of the responses. Therefore, Mullen (1980) recommended that Extension administrators set up a formal structure for involving lay leaders and professionals in communicating with elected officials on the local level and provide training in methods and protocol for communicating with these decision makers.

The LSU 2000 Committee issued a memorandum in September 2000, to the LSU Board of Supervisors, listing the 10 most significant policy issues that public higher education must address in the coming decade. One of the issues cited was the need for
higher education to build a constituency. The committee noted that Louisiana's public higher education system has been severely underfunded, in good and bad economic times. They stated that when allocating funds to the different agencies supported by the state, it was clear that the Louisiana legislature gave the highest priority to those areas supported by the general public. Therefore, the committee concluded that "there is an enormous need to develop public support, a vocal constituency, for higher education" (LSU, 2000). Unless a true political base is created, higher education will continue to only receive marginal increases, thereby continuing to be last in the South in state funding, regardless of the state's economic condition (LSU, 2000).

Tucker (1997) summarized the higher education environment in the following way:

All signs point to an increasingly competitive future for educational institutions. As competition grows for quality students and faculty, funding, research grants, donations, legislative recognition, alumni support, corporate support, media recognition, and visibility, institutions will become increasingly concerned about their image and public opinion. They will need to maintain distinct positions in the competitive nonprofit marketplace, much as corporations strive to achieve and maintain product positions in the competitive for-profit marketplace. (p.1)

Based on her research, Tucker concluded that Louisiana higher education was going to have to do a better job of selling itself to the legislature and to the public; she recommended a public relations campaign for higher education, coordinated by the Board of Regents. In her research, she looked at two states on the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB) - Florida and Virginia - who had reported increased state appropriations to the higher education community. Reasons cited were (1) building...
coalitions with the business community and (2) a consistent and targeted public relations campaign (Tucker, 1997).

Both are lobbying strategies that could have implications for the overall image enhancement and subsequent improved funding for higher education in Louisiana and the rest of the country. "If the publics of each institution support increased funding for their institution, and they voice these concerns to their local legislative delegations, then higher education funding as a whole should improve" (Tucker, 1997, p. 2).

Some of the most effective lobbying takes place at the grassroots level. Legislators are generally very open to constituents from back home, especially those in positions of influence (Do’s and Don’ts, 1991). Cook cites Schlozman and Tierney's definition of grass-roots lobbying as "efforts of government relations people in Washington to involve the folks back home in contacting their legislators for the purpose of influencing policy making" (Cook, 1998, p.154). Mobilizing grassroots constituents works equally well on the state level (Tucker, 1997; Jackson and Smith, 1997; Dawson, 1990; Mullen, 1980).

In the Extension Journal, Jackson and Smith (1999), described the grassroots effort mobilized by Ohio Extension that resulted in increased appropriations for their organization over and above what other state agencies received. Extension made a concentrated effort to improve communications and build relationships with legislators at the local and state level, keeping them informed about local programs and their impacts by involving them in programs in the counties as featured speakers and guests (Jackson and Smith, 1999). Recognition programs provide excellent opportunities for the clientele
to tell legislators what impact Extension has had on their lives. Some of the activities
Jackson and Smith (1999) outlined in the article included the following:

Legislative planning meetings- Key legislators, Extension personnel, stakeholders and
advisory committee members, and commodity groups meet to decide how most
effectively to share Extension’s message.

Identifying key stakeholders- Influential lay leaders who have a power relationship
with legislators are trained to contact legislators when needed.

Meetings in legislative districts- Local Extension clientele are asked to share program
impacts with legislators.

Statewide legislative breakfast- Agents bring key leaders and stakeholders to the state
capitol for a breakfast meeting with state legislators.

Farm science review- This is hosted by the College of Agriculture and showcases
programs and accomplishments in the college. Legislators, farmers, stakeholders and
county commissioners attend this event.

County commissioner’s day- Commissioners are provided highlights of Extension
programs; this is held in conjunction with their summer board meeting.

Legislative assistant’s tour- Legislative staffs from the congressional offices in
Washington are brought in to find out how national issues impact local people.

National leadership seminar- Lay leaders from across the country meet in Washington
to discuss national issues and visit their congressmen on Capitol Hill.

Their message to legislators was simple: "We are good stewards of the resources
that you give us; our programs have positive impacts on people; we highlight issues of
importance in the legislator's district; and our legislators are appreciated" (Jackson and Smith, 1999).

An article on grassroots lobbying for school board members provided additional insights on lobbying effectiveness (Do’s and Don’t, 1991): (1) Know your legislators, (2) Know the legislation, (3) Know the basic legislative process, (4) Know how to be firm, but friendly, (5) Attack the issue, not the person (6) Don’t underestimate public officials, (7) Don’t look down on government and politics, (8) Be understanding, (9) Be thoughtful, (10) Don’t blame public officials for "failing" to do what you wanted, (11) Avoid selfish requests for special favors and exemptions, (12) Don’t be a busybody, (13) Be cooperative, (14) Be realistic, (15) Be practical, (16) Never break a promise, (17) Never change horses in the middle of the stream, (18) Learn to evaluate and weigh issues, and finally(19) Don’t participate in discussions about legislators being "bought" or paid off (p. 15-17).

Dawson goes even further in providing insight into the fundamentals for effective lobbying, commenting that the proper approach is one of common sense: Be fair and reasonable; kill them with kindness; be realistic and willing to compromise; never leave in anger; contact with regularity, not just for votes; be actual and factual—never lie and never guess (just say "I don’t know but I’ll get back to you"); give credit where credit is due; support your legislator and get involved in campaigns; ask your legislator how he or she stands on an issue and will he or she support your position; and finally, don’t get too emotional (p. 21).
Other tips given by Dawson (1990) when lobbying by phone, personal visit, or letter included the following: Cultivate an ongoing relationship with staff people; make the effort to pay a personal visit to your legislator at the Capitol; be respectful and address them as Senator or Representative, always bring a one-page fact sheet summarizing your issue; offer a solution to your problem; let him/her know if you represent other constituents as well as yourself. When writing, limit your discussion to only one issue at a time and try to base your opinion on personal experience; write original letters, not form letters; time your letters to arrive a few days before the vote, whether in a committee or on the floor; contact only senators when the bill is in the Senate and vice versa; and write thank you notes as appropriate (Dawson, 1990). These tips apply to lobbying on the federal or state level.

Higher education does not use political action committees (PACs) like the profit sector interest groups. They have neither the resources nor the will to get involved in PACs, saying that to do so would move them from the category of a public interest to a special interest (Cook, 1998). Nor did the public officials interviewed by Cook (1998) advise them to do so. In fact, rather than increase funding for federal relations activities, they simply advised "a change in attitude and more strategic use of existing resources" (Cook, 1998, p. 201).

The link between campaign contributions and congressmen has fascinated both political scientists and economists for years (Langbein, 1986). Langbein reports that many studies have been cited in the literature, often with mixed results, on the effect of campaign contributions on congressmen's voting behavior and on access as a
precondition to being able to have influence over public policy. Langbein's empirical research suggests that money does indeed buy access (Langbein, 1986).

According to Wright (1989), "Gaining access to decision makers is a major objective of all political interest groups" (p. 713). Berry's definition of access (as cited in Wright, 1989, p. 714) is "the ability of lobbyists and other group representatives to talk directly with representatives and their staffs about legislative issues." Austen-Smith (1995) in his research on campaign contributions and access cited Sabato:

PAC officials are adamant that all they get for their investment is access to congressmen—a chance to 'tell their story'. Political analysts have long agreed that access is the principal goal of most interest groups, and lobbyists have always recognized that access is the key to persuasion. (p. 566)

There has been concern among scholars and political practitioners that PAC money has replaced district ties in achieving access to congressmen. Wright's research, however, indicated that "organized interests seldom contribute to and lobby members of the U.S. House of Representatives in the absence of geographic ties to their districts" (Wright, 1989, p. 713).

Andelman (1997) reported that the new influence in Washington was knowledge, not money. He reported that money was becoming less important in lobbying efforts in Washington, D.C. and around the country. "The key to getting the attention of political leaders is to convey knowledge, to leverage the ability of the company to influence the public, and to demonstrate the importance of the company in creating jobs and wealth" (Andelman, 1997, p. 45).
Andelman advised putting away the checkbook—"influence now is in the form of knowledge, jobs and the creation of wealth for the nation beyond the Beltway" (Andelman, 1997, p.45). He said that top business lobbyists in the nation's Capitol are advising interest groups to play the constituent angle—what is your impact within a constituency? For example, having the support of all auto dealers was more important than having the support of General Motors, advised lobbyists (Andelman, 1997). "Most often, it's whom, and what you know, not how much you can give, that matters. It's the ability to bring that factory to the home district of the congressman or the home state of the senator"(Andelman, 1997, p.46).

Gray and Lowery (1996b), in their research on contract lobbying, cited Rosenthal's description of the transformation of the lobbying profession:

Long gone are the days when lobbyists set up card tables in the rear of the house chamber in Wyoming to pay for legislators' votes as they were cast. Nowadays, lobbying is professional and sophisticated . . . Lobbying is different today because legislatures have changed so markedly. Lobbying could not afford to be left behind. (p. 31)

Gray and Lowery concluded that "the proliferation of interest organizations and lobbyists in the states is undeniable"(1996b, p. 39). Hunter and his colleagues (1991) analyzed more than 39,000 lobbying efforts and found that the majority of state lobbying comes from business groups—an impressive 53%. They also found that substantial lobbying came from mineral production firms and utilities. Other significant categories included government officials and nonprofit and citizen assistance organizations, professions, and unions (Hunter et.al., 1991). On the national level, more than 72% of the interest groups were business related. Nationally, 46% of lobbying was conducted by
individual firms and they estimated that 39% of state lobbying was by single firms (Hunter et al., 1991).

Findings from Interest Group Research

There are two distinct types of research on interest groups being reported in the political science literature, according to Gray and Lowery (1996a). One has to do with mobilization and organizational maintenance and the other on lobbying and other influence strategies of interest groups. It is the latter type that provided the major focus of this study.

"Interest groups are typically seen to influence policy in two ways: through the giving of campaign contributions and through the distribution of specialist information" (Austen-Smith, 1993, p. 799). The "access" view of campaign contributions holds that groups make contributions to secure the attention of the legislators. Once access is gained, then lobbying becomes a game of "strategic information transmission" as it relates to influencing public policy (Austen-Smith, 1993, p. 799).

One of the assumptions of interest group theory is "the notion that lobbyists accept the need to acquire and maintain access as a central occupational norm" (Browne, 1985, p. 450). In his research on behavior and style of state lobbyists and interest groups, Browne (1985) looked at variations in lobbying styles under different environmental conditions on the state level where environmental variation is more observable. He measured success by comparing the number of bills introduced and the number actually passed. The intent was to measure if one lobbying pattern produced more successful results than another.
He hypothesized that most state lobbyists would work toward an access relationship with the policymakers. Surprisingly, his hypothesis proved false as his findings showed that most state lobbyists "did not seek regular access to policy makers" (Browne, 1985, p. 452).

He found that "different environmental conditions, supported by diverse institutional arrangements, were associated with varying patterns of lobbying. Responsive political environments and access-oriented interests did not appear as necessarily related" (Browne, 1985, p. 451).

Browne (1985) identified three distinct roles of lobbyists (p. 460-463):

1. Policymaker partner role (access orientation)
   a. Establish a continuing dialogue between like interest groups to quiet conflicts
   b. Target key members on special committees associated with their interests
   c. Select and mass member mobilization creating impressions of member support

2. Policymaker opponents (confrontational)
   a. Gain cooperation through threats and exposure; cooperation exists only within the organization
   b. Confrontational lobbying style
   c. Educational campaigns, mass media, and intense lobbying of friends and foes; pressure placed on governor and administration agencies

3. Policymaker dependents (respond to policy initiatives rather than structure them)
   a. Initiatives come from the interest agency
b. Critical legislative contacts are with committee staff

c. Makes use of extensive direct member contacts to secure support

These three different role orientations of interest groups not only supported Milbrath's theory of lobbying as a communication process but gave it new meaning (Browne, 1985). These role orientations showed that the communication interaction could be structured in different ways, not just by developing relationships with decision makers who then would listen to the lobbyist (Browne, 1985).

Analyzing the amount of legislation introduced and passed relative to the three different role orientations of lobbyists, Browne (1985) found that the access style of lobbying brought no observable benefits and the confrontational style brought no noticeable disadvantages. What did seem to matter the most, in terms of amount of legislation passed, was the amount of lobbying activity as opposed to the style of lobbying activity (Browne, 1985).

Browne defined lobbying as the attempt to influence decision makers through the activities of the group representatives of the interest group. He concluded that lobbying "varies with the changing institutional and cultural characteristics of the states" . . . and "must reflect how state government operates rather than a set of techniques always appropriate to a specific occupation" (Brown, 1985, p. 466).

Browne's analysis made clear that interest groups not only determined their strategies based on internal concerns of the organization, but also on "the specific institutional arrangements through which interests are represented and the cultural
expectations about state government's responsiveness and integrity" (Browne, 1985, p.460).

One of the newer higher education lobbying strategies on the federal level reported by Cook (1998) was the use of ad hoc coalitions. In her research on interest groups, Hojnacki (1997) examined "why and when organized interests join coalitions" (p. 62). Her work showed that organizations choose to work alone or with other organized interests based on their assessments of achieving success. The analysis was based on a survey of interest groups supplemented by interviews with representatives of organized interests.

Hojnacki's research ultimately found that when the interest group had a narrow issue and the potential allies signaled that they had little to contribute to a collective advocacy campaign, the costs of joining an alliance outweighed the benefits. On the other hand, she found that when the organization was perceived to be pivotal to the success of an alliance in the face of strong organized opposition, the benefits of a coalition were substantial (Hojnacki, 1997). This may have implications for coalition formation on the state level as well.

Hojnacki (1997) summarized comments by various scholars of interest group research. With the proliferation of interest groups in national politics, leaders must effectively choose strategies that enhance their chances for lobbying success. Joining alliances allows sharing of costs, information, and skills and gives the appearance of broader support for policy goals. On the other hand, competition for resources, support, and access is greater in a crowded environment so organizations may choose to avoid
alliances to enhance their own reputation as advocates and to distinguish themselves from other organizations (p. 62).

The majority of scholars in the more recent literature contend that the following changes in the political system since 1970 make it more advantageous for groups to work together for their advocacy concerns (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 64):

1. policy issues have expanded and are more diverse
2. multiple organizations
3. scarcity of public resources

Indeed, two suggestions given to the higher education community by public officials to help them become more effective in federal relations were as follows (Cook, 1998):

1. Provide better policy analysis. They suggested that colleges and universities didn’t take full advantage of the research resources available within its own community for policy analysis. They also suggested having research results more readily available to policy makers when they needed it.
2. Form better alliances with like-minded policy communities. Reach out to local government groups, parents and students, alumni/ae associations, taxpayers, and even senior citizens.

Both of these goals could be realized by higher education forming alliances with traditional and non-traditional groups. With the emphasis on economic development and institutions of higher education being touted as the engine that drives economic development, an alliance with business groups would be a viable option.
"Alliances provide a means of showing support for a cause or interest and offers a way for groups to gain access to a wider range of decision makers" (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 65). Hojnacki summarizes Hula's comments about why groups join coalitions. Policy oriented groups join to reduce costs, to shape content of policy proposals and to help define the issue boundaries whereas other groups may join to gain information or intelligence about the process. Alliances also show group members and decision makers that a group is active in an issue (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 65-66).

Nownes (2000) conducted research on interest group cooperation and conflict in the states. Finding many studies in the interest group literature on cooperation and conflict of interest groups on the national level, he attempted to fill in some of the gaps about what is known of state interest group politics. He cited Salisbury's definition of interest group politics as "a system . . . defined by interaction among organized groups and between those groups and public officials" (Nownes, 2000, p. 231). His data came from a survey of close to 300 interest groups in three states where he measured the perceptions of conflict and opposition as opposed to levels of actual conflict and opposition.

The results of Nownes (2000) research indicated the following (p. 231):

(1) Conflict is common in many state policy domains.

(2) Most state interest groups do not operate in relative isolation.

(3) Citizen groups have injected uncertainty and conflict into the state policy process.
(4) Many state policy fights are characterized by pitched conflict among citizen groups.

Nownes' data (2000) reflects poorly on "subgovernment theory" and to some extent, "niche theory"—two predominant theories in the interest group literature. A reasonable explanation for this given by Nownes was the fact that these theories were based on data gathered in an earlier era with decidedly different politics (Nownes, 2000).

Nownes' findings (2000) most closely resembled those of Salisbury and his colleagues which suggested that "group politics in the states is coming to resemble group politics in Washington" (p. 240). His findings showed that "in the states, as in Washington, levels of policy conflict are relatively high, citizen groups are active players in many policy domains, and most interest groups have both allies and adversaries" (Nownes, 2000, p. 241). He found that citizen groups (grassroots religious organizations, pro and anti-abortion groups, etc.) were often key players in state policy domains but the evidence suggested that these groups were fragmented and diverse. He also found business to be anything but united (Nownes, 2000).

Nownes' research also suggested that there was a need to look at conflicts that interest groups avoided to fully understand group influence and countervailing power. By paying attention to how groups demobilized opposition, brokered deals with each other and decision makers and kept disputes from going public, scholars could avoid missing important aspects of interest group politics (Nownes, 2000).
"An interest group's lobbying choices are also shaped by its legal status" (Cook, 1998, p. 143). The higher education community is considered a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit enterprise, according to the Internal Revenue Code, which makes them tax-exempt. It means that colleges and universities cannot devote a substantial amount of their activities or resources to lobbying activities (Cook, 1998). "Since this definition does not include informing or educating policy makers, those activities are acceptable under the Code" (Cook, 1998, p. 143).

In 1996, the federal law was broadened to say that "organizations must register if they have staffs who devote one-fifth or more of their time to lobbying and also spend at least $20,000 on lobbying every six months" (Cook, 1998, p. 143).

Other influences on a group's choice of lobbying techniques discussed by Cook (1998) were as follows (p. 138-172):

1. Group's determination of what might work best based on the current power structure
2. Nature of a particular policy issue
3. Nature of the political opposition they might face
4. Potential resources available to the group
5. What has worked in the past

Cook (1998) found that traditionally, higher education has taken a cautious, low-key approach to lobbying but when faced with the threat of reduced funding, the lobbying strategies became much more varied and spirited on the federal level.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as individuals currently employed as state government relations officers for public institutions of higher education in the United States. This included individuals working both in full and part time positions. The initial frame of the population was established as all individuals who were registered for the 7th Annual State Relations Conference who were also currently employed in positions defined as state government relations officers representing public institutions of higher education. This conference was sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). The sample included 100% of the state government relations officers contacted through the conference.

Instrumentation

The instrument utilized in this study was a researcher-designed questionnaire which included sections from the instruments used in the studies by Cook (1998), Krueger (1997), Mullen (1980), and Milbrath (1960). In addition, information was included in this instrument which was derived from the current literature of the field. The instrument included questions related to the following:
1. One section of the instrument included items designed to describe state government relations officers on selected personal and professional characteristics as well as selected characteristics of the institution (Mullen, 1980).

2. A second section included items designed to describe the institution’s cultural characteristics and relationship with the state legislature (Cook, 1998; Browne, 1985).

3. Another section was on the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers. Using roles and responsibilities found in Cook (1998) and Mullen (1980), an anchored rating scale was developed to determine the perceptions of importance of each role or responsibility by the state government relations officers. The response scale utilized with the sub-scale was a 1-6 scale with 1 representing not important and 6 representing extremely important.

4. There was a section on the characteristics for success of a state government relations officer. A 1-6 response scale was used to determine the importance of seven selected characteristics for success as perceived by state government relations officers.

5. Another section included items that influence legislators’ decisions regarding appropriations to public institutions of higher education. Using factors that influence decisions made by legislators garnered from the studies of Krueger (1997) and Mullen (1980), a rating scale was developed to determine the perceptions of importance of each item by state government relations officers. The response scale utilized with the sub-scale was a 1-6 anchored scale with 1 representing not important and 6 representing extremely important.
6. There was a section addressing both the utilization of and perceived effectiveness of legislative lobbying strategies. Using lobbying strategies and techniques listed in Cook (1998), Krueger (1997), Mullen (1980), and Milbrath (1960), a rating scale was developed to determine the perceived effectiveness of each technique by the state government relations officers. The response scale utilized for this sub-scale was a 1-6 anchored scale with 1 representing not effective and 6 representing extremely effective. In addition, respondents were asked to circle Yes or No to indicate whether or not their institution used that particular strategy.

7. Finally, the questionnaire included a section on the factors influencing the decisions made by institutions regarding the choice of lobbying strategies. Using factors influencing choice of lobbying strategies found in Cook (1998) and Browne (1985), a 1-6 anchored rating scale was used to determine the perceptions of importance of each item by state government relations officers. The response scale ranged from not important to extremely important.

Content validity of the instrument was established through a review by a panel of experts consisting of representatives of each of the following groups:

1. State government relations officers/lobbyists not included in the sample used in this study
2. Current and/or former staff members of the Louisiana Board of Regents
3. Individuals who have expertise in the area of instrument design
4. Currently employed administrators in public institutions of higher education
5. Currently serving state legislators

6. Currently serving legislative staff

The instrument was revised based on the suggestions provided by members of the validation panel. It was then prepared for distribution to the members of the research sample. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Reliability of the five sub-scales used in the instrument was estimated using the Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient and the following values were found for each of the scales: 1) Roles and Responsibilities sub-scale: $\alpha = .89$; 2) Characteristics for Success sub-scale: $\alpha = .65$; 3) Influence on Decisions by Legislators sub-scale: $\alpha = .85$; 4) Lobbying Strategies Effectiveness sub-scale: $\alpha = .82$; and 5) Choice of Lobbying Strategies sub-scale: $\alpha = .77$.

**Data Collection**

Data for the study were collected using the following procedures:

Approval was sought to administer the questionnaire to the state government relations officers attending the 7th Annual AASCU/CASE/NASULGC State Relations Conference, November 30-December 2, 2000. These three sponsoring groups are public higher education associations with their national offices in Washington, D.C. Most, if not all, public colleges and universities are members of one or more of these associations. This researcher phoned one of the conference chairs and asked permission to administer the survey to conference participants; permission was granted. The conference chair said he expected around 100 government relations professionals to attend and that approximately 125 questionnaires would be needed to survey the conference participants.
The conference chairperson initially committed to the researcher that she would be permitted to collect the data at the conference; however, the exact details for procedures to be used were not given at that time. Once the panel of experts had reviewed the instrument but before the survey was printed, the researcher called the conference chairperson again to find out about the characteristics of the audience to be surveyed and to determine what specific demographic information should or should not be asked relative to their identity. The conference chairperson recommended that all identifying information should be left off the survey instrument to ensure the most candid responses from the participants. He also stated that approximately 130 people were now registered for the conference and that 150 surveys were needed. Upon consultation with the committee chair, the researcher decided to leave out all identifying information except for the state where the institution was located. The conference chairperson and the researcher decided that the survey would be administered on the second day of the conference around midmorning in an attempt to achieve the highest possible return of completed surveys.

The data for this study was collected at the 7th Annual State Relations Conference held in Miami, Florida, on November 30-December 2, 2000. During the morning of the second day of the conference, the researcher was allowed to make a brief announcement and pass out the survey instrument to the conference participants. The instrument included a cover letter on the front briefly explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their participation. The surveys were provided in brown envelopes to ensure confidentiality and included pencils and return address cards for those wanting a
summary of the results of the study. It was strongly suggested that participants complete
the survey and return to a box on the registration table before leaving the conference.
Additionally, the researcher provided Mardi Gras beads as a token of appreciation for
participating in the study. Of the 129 participants who were registered for the conference
(including the researcher), nine did not attend, so the accessible population was 119
conference participants.

Non-response follow-up procedures used in this study included the following:

After returning from the conference, 55 surveys and a follow-up letter were
mailed to those conference participants who did not return a survey at the conference or
who were registered but either canceled or did not attend (Appendix B). Because
respondent names were not requested on the survey nor were the surveys coded, follow-
up surveys were sent to all those who did not complete a return address card for the
summary of the results of the survey. The cover letter indicated that if they had already
responded, they should not complete the instrument again.

In addition, a state government relations officer who attended the conference
contacted the researcher and suggested that other state government relations officers from
his state would be interested in and willing to participate. The officer made additional
copies of the survey to administer to these participants and the completed forms were
returned to the researcher by mail. State government relations officers in the LSU system
who did not serve on the expert panel were also mailed or hand-delivered a copy of the
survey and asked to participate in the study (Appendix C). Finally, a second state
government relations officer who had attended the conference contacted the researcher
and recommended seven additional state government relations officers from his state that were potential participants. A third mailing with another follow-up letter was then done on December 20, 2000 to these potential participants (Appendix D).

Response rates achieved by the researcher included the following percentages: the initial data collection procedure (administering the survey at the conference) resulted in receiving 81 responses (68%); two were eliminated because their titles, as shown on the registration list, indicated that they were involved in federal relations instead of state government relations work, bringing the initial response rate to 79 or 66%. After the follow-up procedures with the original 119 who attended the conference and those contacted through the conference, the total accessible population increased to 147 state government relations officers. The follow-up provided 30 additional responses, bringing the total number of usable responses to 109 or a 74% response rate.

**Data Analysis**

Objective #1 was to describe state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education on selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics. This objective was accomplished using basic descriptive statistics. Variables which were measured on an interval level of measurement were summarized using means and standard deviations. Variables that were measured on a categorical scale of measurement were summarized using frequencies and percentages in categories.

Objective #2 was to describe state higher education policy domains on selected characteristics of the relationship between the higher education community and the respective state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions.
Objective #3 was to describe the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. This objective was accomplished by reporting the mean (and standard deviation) importance rating of each of the items included in the roles and responsibilities scale. In addition, this scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale responses provided by the respondents. The scale values were further summarized by computing the mean scores for each of the sub-scales identified in the factor analytic procedures.

Objective #4 was to determine the importance of selected characteristics for the success of state government relations officers as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. This objective was accomplished by reporting the mean (and standard deviation) importance rating of each of the items included in the characteristics influencing success scale. In addition, this scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale responses provided by the respondents. The scale values were then further summarized by computing the mean scores for each of the sub-scales identified in the factor analytic procedures.

Objective #5 was to determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations to public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers. This objective was
accomplished by reporting the mean (and standard deviation) importance rating of each of the items included in the factors influencing decision-making scale. In addition, this scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale responses provided by the respondents. The scale values were then further summarized by computing the mean scores for each of the sub-scales identified in the factor analytic procedures.

Objective #6 was to determine the effectiveness of selected legislative lobbying strategies as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education. This objective was accomplished by reporting the mean (and standard deviation) effectiveness rating of each of the items included in the lobbying strategies scale. In addition, this scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale responses provided by the respondents. The scale values were then further summarized by computing the mean scores for each of the sub-scales identified in the factor analytic procedures. These sub-scale scores were then used as the primary outcome measures for subsequent data analysis involving comparisons and relationships.

Objective #7 was to determine whether or not selected legislative lobbying strategies were utilized by public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers. The responses (YES or NO, regarding whether or not they used the strategy/technique) provided for each of the items in the strategies/techniques scale were summarized by reporting the number and percentage of participants that reported using each of the strategies and the total number of strategies used by each of the participants.
Objective #8 was to determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by public institutions of higher education regarding the choice of legislative lobbying strategies used as perceived by state government relations officers. This objective was accomplished by reporting the mean (and standard deviation) importance rating of each of the items included in the factors influencing the choice of legislative lobbying strategies scale. In addition, this scale was factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale responses provided by the respondents. The scale values were then further summarized by computing the mean scores for each of the sub-scales identified in the factor analytic procedures.

Objective #9 was to determine if a relationship existed between the perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies among state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education and each of the following personal and institutional demographic characteristics:

a. Years employed as a state government relations officer
b. Gender of state government relations officer
c. Educational background of state government relations officer
d. Age of state government relations officer
e. Marital status of the state government relations officer
f. Ethnic background of state government relations officer
g. Size of the university (as measured by student enrollment)
h. Type of institution that employs the government relations officer
i. Carnegie classification of institution
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j. Type of governance of public higher education institution

k. Role orientation of the higher education community to the legislature

l. Professionalization of the legislature as measured by the number of months the legislature was in session

To accomplish this objective the sub-scale scores from the factor analysis of the effectiveness of lobbying strategies/techniques scale were used as the dependent variables and each of the demographic characteristics were treated as independent variables in the analyses. For those independent variables that were measured on an interval scale of measurement, the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationships. For those independent variables that were measured on an ordinal scale of measurement, the Kendall’s Tau correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationships examined.

For independent variables that were measured on a nominal scale of measurement, comparative statistical procedures were used to facilitate the interpretation of data. Therefore, if the independent variable was a nominal variable that had two response categories (e.g., gender), the independent t-test procedure was used to accomplish the objective. In addition, for variables that were measured on a nominal scale of measurement with three or more response categories, the one way Analysis of Variance procedure was used with the Tukey’s post hoc multiple comparison procedure used to identify specific differences in groups if a significant F value was found.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

Demographic Characteristics

Findings presented in this chapter are organized by objectives of the study. The first objective was to describe state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education on selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics. Respondents were asked to provide personal background information in the following areas: 1) whether or not they were registered as a lobbyist, 2) postsecondary degrees completed, 3) major areas of study for each degree, 4) prior occupations, 5) marital status, 6) age groups, 7) ethnicity, 8) gender, 9) years employed in present position as state government relations officer and 10) type of political activities respondents participated in over the last 10 years.

Participants were asked whether or not they were registered as lobbyists. Of the sample of 109 state government relations professionals who responded to the study, 46 or 42.6% reported that they were registered as a lobbyist and 61 or 57.4% said they were not. Only one participant did not respond to the question.

Respondents were asked to report all postsecondary degrees they had completed and the major area of study for each degree. The choices included the following: associate degree, bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, doctoral degree, and juris doctorate. Table 1 presents findings related to the degrees completed by the sample of state government relations officers. The majority of respondents indicated that they had completed both a bachelor’s degree ($n = 103, 96.3\%$) and a master’s degree ($n = 55, 69$
51.4%). It should be noted that only 11 or 10.3% had earned a doctorate while sixteen (15.0%) reported that they had earned a juris doctorate. Only two respondents (1.9%) indicated they had earned an associate degree (see Table 1).

Table 1
Levels of Education Completed by Responding State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Yes Frequency</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No Frequency</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doc</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Two state relations officers did not respond to this item.

Regarding major areas of study, respondents were asked to provide information on their major field of study for each of the degrees they reported as having completed. Only two respondents reported having completed an associate degree, and neither of these individuals answered the portion of the item indicating their major field of study. Therefore, no data was available for associate degree majors.

Of the 103 respondents who indicated that they had completed a baccalaureate degree, 73 reported their major field of study for this degree. To summarize this information, the researcher examined the responses provided by the study participants and grouped the majors into areas of study. Every effort was made to maintain the uniqueness of the fields of study reported by the respondents, and only those which were clearly closely related were combined for summary purposes. For example,
psychology, sociology, and social work were combined into a category called social sciences. Based on this summary, the largest group of respondents had completed baccalaureate degrees in the area of business administration (n = 15, 20.5%). In addition, 14 (19.2%) of the reported majors were in the humanities area, and 13 (17.8%) of the majors were in the political science area. Areas of study reported in the baccalaureate programs are presented in Table 2. In addition, a complete listing of all majors exactly as reported by the respondents is presented in Appendix E.

Table 2
Major Areas of Study for the Baccalaureate Degree Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 55 respondents who indicated that they had completed a master’s degree, 48 reported their major field of study for this degree. Twelve or 25.0% of the respondents earned Master’s degrees in Public Administration and nine or 18.8% earned Master’s degrees in Administration and Supervision. Seven or 14.6% of the respondents reported having earned Master’s degrees in each of the areas of Business Administration and Political Science (see Table 3). In addition, a complete listing of all majors exactly as reported by respondents is presented in Appendix F.

**Table 3**

**Major Areas of Study for the Master’s Degree Reported by State Government Relation Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 11 state government relations officers reported having earned a doctoral degree. Of those 11, four or 36.4% received their Ph.D. in Administration and Supervision and two or 18.2% received their Ph.D. in Social Sciences (see Table 4).
A complete listing of all majors exactly as reported by respondents is presented in Appendix G. All 16 of the juris doctorates were earned in the field of law.

Table 4
Major Areas of Study for the Doctorate Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study participants were also asked to provide information regarding their prior occupations. To collect this information, respondents were provided a list of occupations and asked to indicate all of those which they had previously held. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify the other occupation if that response was chosen. The prior occupation which was reported by the largest group of respondents was "Government Relations." Thirty-seven (34.3%) of the respondents indicated that they had previously worked in this occupation. In addition, 36 (33.3%) respondents reported that they had previously worked in "Politics," and 33 (30.6%) had previously worked in "Education." Of the occupations listed, the area of "Sales" was reported by the smallest number of respondents (n = 12, 11.1%) (see Table 5).
Responses reported in the "Other" category were legislative staff, professor and retired academic department chair, negotiator for state assembly, foundation fundraising, grant writing, U.S. Navy, and business owner (see Appendix H).

Table 5
Prior Occupations Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One state relations officer did not respond to this item.

Regarding marital status, the majority of responding state government relations officers (77 or 72.6%) reported they were married. In addition, twenty-one (21 or 19.8%) respondents reported they were single (see Table 6).

Respondents were asked to report their age by marking the most appropriate age category on the instrument. The age category which was reported by the largest number of participants was the 50-59 category (n = 38, 35.2%). Additionally, the 40-49 age category included almost as many respondents (n = 37, 34.3%) as the 50-59 group.
The oldest (70 or more) and the youngest (20-29) age categories were reported by the smallest number of respondents (see Table 7).

Table 6
Marital Status Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency *</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three state relations officers did not respond to this item.

Table 7
Age Groups of State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency *</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One state relations officer did not respond to this item.

Regarding ethnicity, the majority of state government relation officers (94 or 87.0%) participating in this study were white. Eleven (10.2%) respondents were black and 3 (2.8%) were Hispanic. Only one participant did not respond to this item.
Regarding gender of the 108 respondents, 60.2% (n = 65) were male and 39.8% (n = 43) were female.

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years they had been employed in their present position as a state government relations officer. For the 106 study participants who responded to this item, years in present position ranged from 1 to 30 years with a mean of 7.60 (SD = 6.81) years. When this data was summarized in categories of number of years, 46 (43.4%) respondents reported that they had held their position for less than five years. Another 23 (21.7%) fell within the 5-9 year category and 22 (20.8%) had been working in their position for 10-15 years (see Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean years in present position was 7.60 (SD = 6.81)

Three state relations officers did not respond to this item.

State government relations officers participating in the study were asked to respond "yes" or "no" as to their participation in the last 10 years in selected political activities. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other significant participation in elective politics. Of those listed, the political activity
which was reported by the largest number of study participants was "Contributed to political campaigns or political parties" (n = 86, 79.6%). In addition, a majority of respondents (n = 56, 52.3%) indicated that they had "Performed at least 10 hours of volunteer campaign work" in the past 10 years. Of the five political activities listed, the item "Was elected a delegate to a state or national party convention" received the smallest number of "Yes" responses (n = 9, 8.5%) (see Table 9). Responses reported in the "Other" category were consulted in statewide campaigns, managed campaigns for state legislature and at the federal level, held appointive office, held fundraisers, provided support to statewide bond campaign and served on the legislative relations committee associated with the local chamber of commerce (see Appendix I).

Table 9
Participation in Selected Political Activities in Last 10 Years Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to Campaigns</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Volunteer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Caucus</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Elective Office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate to Convention</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a One participant did not respond to this item.
b One participant did not respond to this item.
c One participant did not respond to this item.

In addition to the 10 questions regarding personal characteristics, the respondents were asked to report information pertaining to institutional demographics. Background
information relating to the institution included the following areas: 1) state where their institution was located, 2) student enrollment at institution, 3) type of institution, 4) Carnegie classification of institution, 5) years institution had employed a state government relations officer, 6) number of full and part-time state relations employees at institution, 7) whether or not institution employs a for-profit law, consulting, or lobbying firm or individual for state relations, 8) whether contract lobbyist is full or part-time, 10) institution's degree of success in securing appropriations in the last and previous budget cycles, and 11) how the institution fared in appropriations over the past five to six years.

Each respondent was asked to report the state in which the institution represented was located. Overall, the respondents represented institutions in 36 different states, with states from all geographic regions of the country included among the respondents. Alabama and New York were each found to have nine (8.3%) respondents. Michigan had eight or 7.4% of the respondents and California and Texas had seven each (6.5%) of the respondents. Kentucky had six or 5.6% of the participating state government relations officers. Eleven of the 36 states were represented by one respondent (see Table 10).

Respondents were asked to report the type of institution where they were employed. To collect this information, respondents were provided a list of types of institutions and asked to indicate the type where they were employed. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify the other type of institution if that response was chosen. The largest group of the responding state government relations officers were from 4 year non land-grant institutions (52 or 48.6%).
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Table 10
States Where Institutions of Responding State Government Relations Officers Were Located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One state relations officer did not report his/her state.

In addition, 26 (24.3%) reported that they were employed by a 4 year land-grant institution. Only two specialized institutions (1.9%) were represented. Data regarding the types of institutions employing state government relations officers are presented in Table 11. Responses reported in the "Other" category were 1) adult students, continuing and distance education, 2) comprehensive university center-law, pharmacy, architecture, medical, etc., 3) graduate and undergraduate research with medical school and hospital and 4) higher education advocacy group (see Appendix J).
Table 11
Types of Institutions in Which Responding State Government Relations Officers Were Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Frequency a</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 year non land-grant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year land-grant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTwo state relations officers did not respond to this item.

Participants were asked to identify the size of their institution by indicating student enrollment on their campus. The 18 respondents who indicated that this item was not applicable to them indicated that they were employed in a systems office representing multiple campuses. The majority of the institutions represented four sizes of colleges or universities. Twenty-four or 27.6% indicated they represented institutions with 20,000-29,000 students; 17 or 19.5% represented institutions with student enrollments of 10,000-19,999; 15 or 17.2% represented campuses with 40,000 or more students; and 13 or 14.9% represented campuses with only 5,000-9,999 students. Only three or 3.4% of the campuses represented had student enrollments less than 2,500 (see Table 12).

State government relations officers responding to the survey were asked to indicate the appropriate Carnegie Foundation classification for their institutions. These data are reported in Table 13. Twenty-one of the respondents (19.6%) reported that the
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Table 12
Student Enrollment of Institutions Represented by Responding State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Frequency *</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-4,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 18 study participants who indicated this item was not applicable indicated that they represented a systems office.

* Four respondents did not complete this item.

Carnegie classification system was not applicable to their institution. Slightly more than one third of the institutions (38 or 35.5%) were classified as doctoral/research universities—extensive. Only 13 or 12.1% of the institutions were classified as Masters—I universities and 11 or 10.3% were classified as doctoral/research universities—intensive.

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years their institution had employed a state government relations officer. For the 92 individuals responding to this item, the years ranged from 2 to 70 years with a mean of 18.39 (SD = 13.21) years.

Based on grouping of responses into categories, the category receiving the most responses was 10-15 years with a frequency of 30 or 32.6%. The second highest category was 16-20 years for the position, with a frequency of 19 or 20.7%. Ten (10.9%)
### Table 13

Carnegie Classification of Institutions Represented by Responding State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc/Res–Extensive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc/Res–Intensive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters–I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters–II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate–Liberal Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate–Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A response to this item was not applicable to 21 study participants.

*Two respondents did not answer this item.*

of the respondents reported that their institution had employed a state relations officer from 5 to 9 years. Four respondents (4.3%) cited "more than 40 years" as the length of time their institution had employed a state relations officer. These results are presented in Table 14.

Respondents were asked to report the number of full and part-time employees their institutions employed in state relations. Approximately one-third of the respondents (n = 32 or 31.7%) indicated that their institution employed two full time state relations officers and 31 (30.7%) reported one full time state relations officer. Twenty-five
(24.8%) reported that their institution employed one part-time state relations officer (see Table 15).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Responses ranged from 2 to 70 years (mean = 18.39%, SD = 13.21)

*Seventeen state relations officers did not respond to this item.

State government relations officers were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the question, "Does your institution employ a for-profit law, consulting, or lobbying firm or individual for state relations?" (contract lobbyist). The majority of respondents (77 or 73.3%) reported that their institution did not employ a contract lobbyist. The remaining 28 participants (26.7%) responded "yes" indicating that their institution did employ a contract lobbyist. Four participants did not answer this question.

For those institutions that did employ a contract lobbyist, respondents were asked to indicate whether the lobbyist was employed full or part-time. Of the 28 who indicated...
Table 15
Number of State Relations Employees Hired by Institution as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Eight state relations officers did not respond to this item.

that their institution did hire a contract lobbyist, 24 responded when asked if the lobbyist was full or part-time. Seventeen (70.8%) of the 24 indicated that their institution employed a contract lobbyist part-time and seven (29.2%) reported that their institution employed a contract lobbyist on a full-time basis.

When study participants were asked to indicate the changes that had occurred in their state appropriations in the last two budget cycles, 104 of the 109 respondents provided a response to the questions. Regarding the most recently completed budget cycle, the most frequent response (n = 42, 40.4%) was that their institution had received
an increase in the 4-6% range. Overall, 96 (92.3%) reported that their institution had received an increase during the most recently completed budget cycle, while only six (5.8%) reported a decrease in this cycle (see Table 16).

Table 16
Percentage Change in State Appropriations to Institutions of Public Higher Education in Last and Previous Budget Cycles As Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Last Budget Cycle</th>
<th>Previous Budget Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency a</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6% increase</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6% increase</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3% increase</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3% decrease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6% decrease</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6% decrease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Five respondents did not respond to this item.
b Six respondents did not respond to this item.

When the 103 respondents reported the same data for the previous budget cycle, the results were very similar to those from the most recently completed budget cycle. The most frequently marked category was that of a 4-6% increase (n = 45, 43.7%), while overall, 96 (93.2%) reported an increase in the previous budget cycle. Only two (2.0%) respondents reported a decrease during the previous budget cycle (see Table 16).

In addition to asking their perceptions about state appropriations in the last two budget cycles, state relations officers were also asked "Generally speaking, over the past
5-6 years, how has the institution you represent fared in terms of receiving state appropriations?" The majority of respondents, 55 or 51.4%, reported that their institution had received less than requested. Seventeen or 15.9% of the state government relations officers indicated that they had received significantly less than requested, and another 17 (15.9%) reported that their institution received more state appropriations than requested. Only five (4.7%) reported receiving significantly more than requested (see Table 17).

Table 17
How Institution Has Fared Regarding State Appropriations as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received significantly more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received same</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received less</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received significantly less</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two participants did not respond to this item.

Characteristics of State Higher Education Policy Domains With Respect to State Legislatures

Objective two of the study was to describe state higher education policy domains on selected characteristics of the relationship between the higher education community and the respective state legislatures as perceived by state government relations professionals in public institutions of higher education. Respondents were asked to provide background information in the following areas: 1) type of governance of public
higher education in their state, 2) role relationship between the higher education community and the state legislature, 3) whether or not their institution had a PAC for state relations and if not, the reasons why, 4) whether or not their institution contributes to legislators' campaigns other than through a PAC, 5) months in a year their legislature is in session, and 6) assessment of the effectiveness of the public higher education lobby in their state.

Participants were asked to identify the governance structure of public higher education in their state. Almost a third (34 or 31.5%) of the participating state relations officers reported that their public colleges and universities were under governing boards. Another 30 (27.8%) of the respondents reported that they were governed by governing boards with an overall coordinating board for all of public higher education. Only one of 108 respondents reported that their governance structure was different from the four governance structures listed on the survey. The respondent stated that each institution was independent; the three largest universities each had a publicly elected governing board (Regents), elected using a partisan ballot (see Table 18).

Respondents were asked to indicate the most appropriate category that represented the relationship between the public higher education community and the state legislature in their state. These data are reported in Table 19. The majority of state relations officers (61 or 58.1%) reported a partnership role between public higher education and the state legislature.

Participants were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to two questions involving contributions to legislators' campaigns. To the question, "Does your institution have a
PAC (political action committee) for state relations?", the majority of state relations officers (94 or 87.0%) reported "no" indicating their institution does not have a PAC for state relations. The remaining 14 state relations officers (13.0%) responded that their institution does have a PAC. One participant did not respond to this item.

Table 18
Governance Structure of Public Higher Education in Selected States as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities or Systems Under Governing Boards</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities or Systems Under Governing Board &amp; Coordinating Board</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities or Systems Under Coordinating Board</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Universities Under Governing Board &amp; Planning Agency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One participant did not respond to this item.

Table 19
Role Relationship Between the Public Higher Education Community and the State Legislature as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Relationship</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policymaker Partners (access orientation)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymaker Dependents (confrontational)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymaker Opponents (respond to policy initiatives rather than help structure them)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Three participants indicated that this role varies with the issue at hand.

* Four participants did not respond to this item.
To the question, "Does your institution contribute to legislators' campaigns other than through a PAC?", again, the majority of respondents (87 or 81.3%) reported that their institution does not contribute to legislators' campaigns other than through a PAC. The remaining 20 participants (18.7%) responded "yes" indicating their institution does contribute to legislators' campaigns other than through a PAC. Two participants did not respond to this item.

The 94 respondents who indicated that their institution did not have a PAC were asked to indicate for each of three reasons provided, whether or not it influenced the decision regarding having a PAC. A total of 85 of the 94 participants provided responses to this item. The reason which was reported by the largest number of participants (n = 37, 43.5%) to have an influence on the institution not having a PAC was, "The difficulties of forming and maintaining a PAC would outweigh the benefits" (see Table 20).

Numerous "Other" reasons were noted on the survey but 12 indicated that there would be legal implications (see Appendix K).

### Table 20
Reasons Public Institutions of Higher Education Do Not Have Political Action Committees (PACs) as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of forming and maintaining PAC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outweighing benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming PAC would diminish higher education's status</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving it from public to special interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix K for complete listing of "Other" reasons.
Respondents were asked to report the number of months their respective legislatures were in session during the year. A summary of the findings are presented in Table 21. The reported length of the legislative sessions ranged from 2 to 12 months with a mean of 5.65 (SD = 3.01) in the 36 states represented in this study. When the data was examined in session length categories, the most prevalent category for the length of the legislative session was 4 - 5.9 months with a frequency of 37 (34.2%). The next most frequently reported length for a legislative session was 2 - 3.9 months with a frequency of 30 (27.8%). Twenty-seven respondents (25.0%) reported that their legislature met for 8 or more months per year.

Table 21
Length of Time Selected State Legislatures Are in Session as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months In Session</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A legislature that meets for 8 months or longer is considered to be a professional or full-time legislature.

* One participant did not respond to this item.

Participating state government relations officers were asked to rate the effectiveness of the higher education lobby in their state. More than three-fourths of the respondents rated the higher education lobby as either "moderately effective" (41 or
39.0%) or as "very effective" (40 or 37.7%). Only 3 or 2.8% rated the higher education lobby as slightly effective (see Table 22).

Table 22
Effectiveness of the Public Higher Education Lobby in Selected States as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Effective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three state relations officers did not respond to this item.

Roles and Responsibilities of State Government Relations Officers

Objective three of the study was to describe the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. Information used to accomplish this objective was drawn from the section of the survey in which respondents were asked to rate the importance of 16 items to their work as a state government relations officer. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other roles and responsibilities. If that response was chosen, respondents were also asked to list the roles/responsibilities and then rate them using the same response scale.
Responses were reported on a six-point anchored scale ranging from "not important" to "extremely important". To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

The item that respondents considered most important to their work as a state government relations officer was "Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your organization" with a mean rating of 5.75. The rating was classified as "extremely important." Two additional items that received ratings in the "extremely important" category were "Provide information to legislators in support of your institution's position on particular issues" (mean = 5.70) and "Establish and maintain personal relationships with legislators and members of their staffs" (mean = 5.59).

The item that respondents considered least important to their work as a state relations officer was "Assist in developing legislation, rules and regulations" (mean = 4.48). The rating for this item was in the "moderately important" category. Overall, two of the items in this scale were rated in the "moderately important" category, eight were rated in the "very important" category, and six were rated in the "extremely important" category (see Table 23). Responses reported in the "Other" category were develop grassroots support groups and support in business organizations, develop and maintain community relations, build an advocacy network, work with the staff of the state coordinating board, communicate with campus constituencies, serve as a liaison with lobbying firm and represent legislators to the institution (see Appendix L).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your institution</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to legislators in support of your institution’s position on particular issues</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain personal relationships with legislators and members of their staffs</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitize legislators about needed program budget requests</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as an advocate of and represent your institution’s position to members of the state legislature</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and maintain vigilance over any legislative activity which may have implications for your institution</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build bonds of trust through dissemination of accurate information to legislators</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert university officials about policy issues</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate pending legislation and appropriation issues which may affect your institution’s current operations</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop institutional lobbying strategies in cooperation with university officials</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange meetings between members of the legislative or executive branch and officials of your organization</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascertain legislators’ positions on appropriation issues before planning lobbying or communication strategies</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table cont.)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply legislators with information about program efforts in their districts</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist legislators with constituent problems</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate strategies with other associations, institutions or organizations</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in developing legislation, rules and regulations</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the a’ priori criterion, and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be three. The results of the factor analysis including the factor, its label based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors is presented in Table 24. The three sub-scales were labeled by the researcher as "Direct Relationship with the Legislature," "Duties Performed for the Institution," and "Collaborative Activities." The first factor identified in the scale related to roles and...
responsibilities that required the government relations officer to have direct contact with the legislature. Items in this factor included providing information to the legislators about institutional issues, maintaining vigilance over legislation and carrying that information back to the institution officials. The factor loadings ranged from a high of .85 to a low of .57 and explained 41.7% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor explained an additional 12.1% of the overall scale variance and included items relating to the responsibilities performed for the institution including building and maintaining relationships with legislators. This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from .74 to .51 and was labeled by the researcher as "Duties Performed for the Institution". The third factor identified in the scale, "Collaborative Activities" included items relating to collaborative efforts between the state relations officer and the legislator, institution, or outside groups. This factor added an additional 7.4% of explained variance and yielded factor loadings ranging from .72 to .47.

After the three sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For the first scale labeled "Direct Relationship with the Legislature" the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 5.30 to a high of 5.75 with an overall mean of 5.54 (SD = .79). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating classified in the "extremely important" category. The second scale was "Duties for the Institution" and had individual subject means ranging from 4.88 to 5.59.
Table 24
Factor Analysis of State Government Relations Officers’ Responses to Roles and Responsibilities Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Direct Relationship with the Legislature</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide information to legislators in support of your institution’s position on particular issues</td>
<td><strong>.85</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your institution</td>
<td><strong>.85</strong></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as an advocate of and represent your institution’s position to members of the state legislature</td>
<td><strong>.77</strong></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitize legislators about needed program budget requests</td>
<td><strong>.71</strong></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather information and maintain vigilance over any legislative activity which may have implications for your institution</td>
<td><strong>.70</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate pending legislation and appropriation issues which may affect your institution’s current operations</td>
<td><strong>.58</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert university officials about policy issues</td>
<td><strong>.57</strong></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(41.7% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Duties for the Institution</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply legislators with information about program efforts in their districts</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td><strong>.74</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12.1% of variance explained)

(table cont.)
Arrange meetings between members of the legislative or executive branch and officials of your institution | .08 | .72 | .31
Build bonds of trust through dissemination of accurate information to legislators | .25 | .69 | .18
Establish and maintain personal relationships with legislators and members of their staffs | .41 | .63 | .05
Ascertain legislators’ positions on appropriation issues before planning lobbying or communication strategies | .35 | .51 | .09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Collaborative Activities</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist in developing legislation, rules and regulations</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist legislators with constituent problems</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate strategies with other associations, institutions or organizations</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop institutional lobbying strategies in cooperation with university officials</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7.4% of variance explained)

The mean score for the group was 5.22 (SD = .90), which placed it in the "very important" category. Finally, the third scale "Collaborative Activities" had an overall mean rating of 4.77 (SD = 1.13) with individual subject scores ranging from 4.48 to 5.29. When these sub-scale scores were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the "Direct Relationship with the Legislature" sub-scale (mean 5.54, SD = .79) (see Table 25).
Table 25
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Roles and Responsibilities Sub-Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Relationship with the Legislature</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>5.30-5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties for the Institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.88-5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.48-5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

Characteristics for the Success of State Government Relations Officers

Objective four of the study was to determine the importance of selected characteristics for the success of state government relations officers as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. Information used to accomplish this objective was drawn from the section of the survey in which respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of seven items to the success of a state government relations officer. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other characteristics. If that response was chosen, respondents were also asked to list the characteristics and then rate them using the same response scale.

Responses were reported on a six-point anchored scale ranging from "not important" to "extremely important." To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not important,
1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, and 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

The item which respondents perceived as most important was "Possessing honesty and integrity" with a mean rating of 5.86 (SD = .50). This rating was classified as "extremely important." Three additional items received ratings of 5.50 or higher including "Having 'people's skills" (mean = 5.70), "Understanding the legislative process" (mean = 5.63) and "Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions" (mean = 5.52). The item which respondents perceived to be least important was "Having advanced university degree" (mean = 2.79). The rating of this item was in the "somewhat important" category. Overall, four of the items in this scale were rated in the "extremely important" category, two of the items were rated in the "very important" category and one item was rated in the "somewhat important" category (see Table 26). Responses reported in the "Other" category were having organizational skills, good oral and written communication skills, having the ability to strategize and build coalitions, possessing perseverance, humility, and credibility, being a team player, being responsive to legislators and having a thick skin (see Appendix M).

To further summarize the information regarding the concept measured in this scale, the researcher used factor analysis to identify primary underlying constructs in the scale. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method. The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the
Table 26
Description of State Government Relations Officers’ Perceptions of the Importance of Selected Characteristics for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possessing honesty and integrity</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having &quot;people&quot; skills</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the legislative process</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being thoroughly knowledgeable about the issues one lobbies for</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being &quot;well-connected&quot; to legislators and their staffs</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having advanced university degree</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

*b* 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

latent root criterion, the a’priori criterion, and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be two. The results of factor analysis including the factor, its label based on the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and the factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors is presented in Table 27. The two sub-scales were labeled by the researcher as "Preparation" and "Personal Characteristics." The first factor identified in the scale related to the issues of preparation for the job. Items in this factor included those that related to preparing for the legislative session, and the factor loadings ranged from a high of .83 to a low of .57. This factor also explained 39.6% of the overall variance in
the scale. The second factor explained an additional 17.2% of the overall scale variance and included items relating to personal characteristics of the state government relations officer. This factor yielded factor loadings of .78 and .66 and was labeled by the researcher as "Personal Characteristics."

Table 27
Factor Analysis of State Government Relations Officers' Responses to Characteristics for Success Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item - Preparation</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(39.6% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the legislative process</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being thoroughly knowledgeable about the issues one lobbies for</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being &quot;well-connected&quot; to legislators and their staffs</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessing honesty and integrity</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item - Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17.2% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having advanced university degree</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having &quot;people&quot; skills</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the two sub-scales and the items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for the two identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were defined as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors.
For the first scale labeled "Preparation" the mean scores ranged from a low of 5.36 to a high of 5.86 with an overall mean of 5.57 (SD = .69). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating classified in the "extremely important" category. The second scale was "Personal Characteristics" and had individual subject means of 2.79 and 5.70. The mean score for the group was 4.25 (SD = .98), which placed it in the "moderately important" category. When these sub-scale scores were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the "Preparation" sub-scale (mean 5.57, SD = .69) (see Table 28).

Table 28
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Characteristics for Success Sub-Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>5.36-5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>2.79-5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.
b1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

Factors Influencing State Legislators' Decisions Regarding Appropriations to Higher Education

Objective five of the study was to determine the degree of influence of factors affecting the decisions of state legislators regarding appropriations to public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers. Information used to accomplish this objective was drawn from the section of the survey in which
respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of 20 items in terms of its influence on decisions made by state legislators about appropriations for higher education. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other factors. If that response was chosen, respondents were also asked to list the items and then rate them using the same response scale.

Responses were reported on a six-point anchored scale ranging from "not important" to "extremely important." To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

The item that respondents perceived to have the most influence on legislators' decisions regarding appropriations for higher education was the "Fiscal status of the state budget" with a mean rating of 5.48. The rating was classified as "very important." Two additional items in the "very important" category with a mean rating over 5.0 were "General condition of the state's economy" (mean = 5.37) and "Personal opinions of key members of the legislature" (mean = 5.19).

The item that respondents considered least important on influencing decisions of legislators regarding state appropriations for higher education was "Coordinating board for higher education" with a mean rating of 3.64. The rating was in the moderately important category. Overall, nine of the items in this scale were rated in the "very important" category, and 11 were rated in the "moderately important" category (see Table 29). Responses reported in the "Other" category were a call from a major
contributor, if it is a crisis and whether or not they have an institution of higher education in their district (see Appendix N).

Table 29
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Perceptions of the Importance of Factors That Influence the Decisions of State Legislators Regarding Appropriations to Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal status of the state budget</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General condition of the state's economy</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal opinions of key members of the legislature</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's budget recommendations</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Governor or his staff</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent response from legislator's district</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying efforts by interested parties</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived need based on case presented by higher education lobby</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of state policymakers to fund education adequately</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University government relation professionals</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and students from legislator's district</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion and media coverage</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing material prepared by legislative staff</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of respected and trusted friends outside the legislature</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal beliefs and convictions</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positions supported by special interest groups</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house (legislature) evaluations of institution's operations and effectiveness</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of higher education administrators</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of state party leaders</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating board for higher education</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

*b* 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

To further summarize the information regarding the perceived importance of factors influencing the decisions made by legislators regarding appropriations for higher education, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if primary underlying constructs could be identified in the scale. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method.

The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the a'priori criterion, and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be three. The results of the factor analysis including the factor, its label based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors is presented in Table 30. The three sub-scales were labeled by the researcher as "Personal Opinions," "External Concerns," and "Economic Concerns." The first factor
identified in the scale was related to the personal opinions of various groups that influence legislators’ decisions. Items in this factor included the legislators themselves, their close friends, key members of the legislature, alumni, students, constituents, special interest groups and the media. The factor loadings ranged from a high of .68 to a low of .44 and explained 27.3% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor explained an additional 10.1% of the overall scale variance and included external factors that might influence a legislator’s decision about appropriations for higher education. This factor included such items as the governor’s budget recommendations and the views of university administrators and the coordinating board of higher education. This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from .76 to .36 and was labeled by the researcher as "External Concerns." The third factor identified in the scale, "Economic Concerns" included items relating to the economy and fiscal status of the budget. This factor added an additional 8.2% of explained variance and yielded factor loadings ranging from .83 to .44.

After the three sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For the first scale labeled "Personal Opinions" the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 4.28 to a high of 5.19 with an overall mean of 4.54 (SD = 1.03). Using the interpretative scale, this sub-scale received an overall rating classified in the "very important" category. The second scale was "External Concerns" and had individual subject means ranging from 3.64-4.92. The mean score for the group was 4.34.
### Table 30
Factor Analysis of State Government Relations Officers' Responses to Factors that Influence State Legislators' Decisions Regarding Appropriations Scale Opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Personal Opinions</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(27.3% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal beliefs and convictions</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion and media coverage</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions supported by special interest groups</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent response from legislator's district</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and students from legislator's district</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of respected and trusted friends outside the legislature</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal opinions of key members of legislature</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying efforts by interested parties</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house (legislature) evaluations of institution's operations and effectiveness</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—External Concerns</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10.1% of variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's budget recommendations</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Governor or his staff</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived need based on case presented by higher education lobby</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University state government relations officers</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table cont.)
Views of higher education administrators  .40  .52  .07
Briefing material prepared by legislative staff  .47  .47  .05
Coordinating board for higher education  .33  .42  .18
Advice of state party leaders  .06  .36  .15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Economic Concerns</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General condition of the state's economy</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal status of the state budget</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of state policymakers to fund education adequately</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8.2% of variance explained)

(SD = 1.15), which placed it in the "moderately important" category. Finally, the scale "Fiscal Concerns" had an overall mean rating of 5.13 (SD = .91) with individual subject scores ranging from 4.53-5.48. When these sub-scales were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the "Economic Concerns" sub-scale (mean 5.13, SD = .91) (see Table 31).

**Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies for Higher Education**

Objective six of the study was to determine the effectiveness of lobbying strategies and techniques regarding increasing or maintaining appropriations to higher education in state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers. Information used to accomplish this objective was drawn from the section of the survey in which respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of 16 lobbying strategies in securing appropriations for higher education.
Table 31
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Factors That Influence Legislators' Decisions Regarding Appropriations Sub-Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean a</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Concerns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.53-5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Opinions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.28-5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>3.64-4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

b 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

Responses were reported on a 6 point anchored scale ranging from "not effective" to "extremely effective." To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not effective, 1.50-2.49 = slightly effective, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat effective, 3.50-4.49 = moderately effective, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely effective.

The lobbying strategy or technique that respondents perceived to be the most effective in increasing or maintaining appropriations for higher education was "Personal presentation of arguments to legislators" with a mean rating of 5.26. The rating was classified as "very effective." "Having influential constituents contact legislators" was a second strategy perceived to be "very effective" by respondents with a mean rating of 5.17. The item that respondents perceived to be the least effective regarding increasing or maintaining appropriations for higher education was "Publicizing voting records" with
a mean rating of 2.28. The rating was in the "slightly effective" category. Overall, eight of the items in this scale were rated in the "very effective" category, five were rated in the "moderately effective" category, two were rated in the "somewhat effective" category and one was rated in the "slightly effective" category (see Table 32).

To further summarize the information regarding the perceived effectiveness of lobbying strategies for higher education, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if primary underlying constructs could be identified in the scale. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method.

The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the a’priori criterion, and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be two. The results of the factor analysis including the factor, its label based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors is presented in Table 33. The two sub-scales were labeled by the researcher as "Providing Information" and "Building Relationships". The first factor identified in the scale, "Providing Information", related to lobbying strategies that provided information to the legislators through the institution’s faculty or administrators, public, or constituents. Items included presenting research results, testifying, and presenting personal arguments to legislators as well as organizing a public relations campaign, having constituents contact legislators, or forming coalitions with outside groups.
The factor loadings ranged from a high of .77 to a low of .43 and explained 28.3% of the overall variance in the scale.

Table 32
Description of State Government Relations Officers’ Perceptions of Effective Lobbying Strategies and Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal presentation of arguments to legislators</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having influential constituents contact legislators</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting research results or supporting data</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of institution</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing grassroots constituents with letter writing, telephone, fax or e-mail campaigns</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testifying at hearings</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming alliances / coalitions with other groups</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact by close friends</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations campaign</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing money to a political campaign</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing work in a political campaign</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining legislators for evening or for lunch</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a party or dinner</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering personal favors and assistance</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using institution’s newsletter or newspaper to convince legislators</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing voting records</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Slightly Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scale: 1 = not effective, 2 = slightly effective, 3 = somewhat effective, 4 = moderately effective, 5 = very effective, 6 = extremely effective.

*1.49 or less = not effective, 1.50-2.49 = slightly effective, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat effective, 3.50-4.49 = moderately effective, 4.50-5.49 = very effective, 5.50-6.0 = extremely effective.
The second factor explained an additional 14.1% of the overall scale variance and included methods for building personal relationships with legislators. This factor included such items as providing personal assistance or favors, entertaining legislators, recognizing legislators who have been supportive of the institution, and contributing money or work to legislators' political campaigns. This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from .71 to .50 and was labeled by the researcher as "Building Relationships."

After the two sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the three identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors. For the first scale labeled "Providing Information" the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 4.07 to a high of 5.26 with an overall mean of 4.67 (SD = 1.01). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating classified in the "very effective" category. The second scale was "Building Relationships" and had individual subject means ranging from 2.28-4.61. The mean score for the group was 3.64 (SD = 1.31), which placed it in the "moderately effective" category. When these sub-scales were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the "Providing Information" sub-scale (mean 4.67, SD = 1.01, see Table 34).

**Utilization of Selected Lobbying Strategies in Higher Education**

Objective seven was to determine the perceptions of state government relations officers as to the utilization of selected lobbying strategies and techniques by institutions of higher education. To collect this information, respondents were provided with a list of lobbying strategies or techniques and asked to indicate whether or not their institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Providing Information</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenting research results or supporting data</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations campaign</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testifying at hearings</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having influential constituents contact legislators</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing grassroots constituents</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact by close friends</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal presentation of arguments to legislators</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using institution’s newsletter/newspaper to convince legislators</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming alliances or coalitions with other groups</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28.3% of variance explained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item—Building Relationships</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offering personal favors and assistance</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing work in a political campaign</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a party or dinner</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing money to a political campaign</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing legislators who have been supportive</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing voting records</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14.1% of variance explained)
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Table 34
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>4.07-5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>2.28-4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Response scale: 1 = not effective, 2 = slightly effective, 3 = somewhat effective, 4 = moderately effective, 5 = very effective, 6 = extremely effective.
*b 1.49 or less = not effective, 1.50-2.49 = slightly effective, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat effective, 3.50-4.49 = moderately effective, 4.50-5.49 = very effective, 5.50-6.0 = extremely effective.

used that particular strategy. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other strategies. If that response was chosen, respondents were also asked to list the strategy or technique and then rate the strategy as to "Yes" or "No", indicating whether or not their institution used that strategy. The strategy which was reported by the largest group of respondents was "Personal presentation of arguments". One hundred eight (99.1%) of the respondents indicated that their institution used that particular strategy. In addition, 104 (96.3%) respondents reported that their institution used the strategy of "Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of the institution," and 104 (95.4%) used the strategy "Presenting research results." Of the strategies listed, the smallest number (n = 7, 6.6%) reported using the strategy of "Publicizing voting records" (See Table 35). Responses reported in the "Other" category were higher education association newsletter, staff briefings, helping district offices deal effectively with constituent requests and inquiries, routine personal contact, informal
meetings or events on campus, special technology contacts; personal caring, legislator
attended or taught at school, and maintain non-partisan status (see Appendix O)

Table 35
Description of State Government Relations Officers’ Perceptions of the Utilization of Selected Lobbying Strategies by Higher Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal presentation of arguments</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing legislators who have been supportive</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting research results</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming alliances/ coalitions with other groups</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having influential constituents contact legislators</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testifying at hearings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining legislators</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing grassroots constituents</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact by close friends</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a party or dinner</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations campaign</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering personal favors and assistance</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using institution’s newsletter/newspaper to convince legislators</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributing money to a political campaign</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing work in a political campaign</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing voting records</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a One respondent did not answer this question.

*b Two respondents did not answer this question.

*c Three respondents did not answer this question.

To further summarize the information regarding the lobbying strategies used by state relations officers, the researcher used the data from whether or not each of the listed strategies were used to calculate a lobbying strategies score. To calculate this score, each strategy that was identified as used was assigned a value of one and each strategy reported as not used was assigned a value of zero. The 16 items were them summed to yield a "strategies used" score. The possible range of scores was from a low of zero (defined as no listed strategies used) to 16 (defined as all listed strategies used). The computed scores ranged from a low of six to a high of 16 (the maximum possible score). The mean number of strategies reported to be used by the state relations officers was 11.38 (SD = 2.00).

**Influence of Selected Factors on Choice of Lobbying Strategies by Higher Education**

Objective eight of the study was to determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by public institutions of higher education regarding the choice of legislative lobbying strategies used as perceived by state government relations officers. Information used to accomplish this objective was drawn from the section of the survey...
in which respondents were asked to rate the importance of 10 items on the choice of lobbying strategies made by institutions of higher education. In addition, an "Other" response category was listed with a request to identify other factors. If that response was chosen, respondents were also asked to list the items and then rate them using the same response scale.

Responses were reported on a six-point anchored scale ranging from "not important" to "extremely important". To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.59 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

The item that respondents perceived to be the most important factor in determining an institution’s choice of lobbying strategies was "Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request" with a mean rating of 5.03. The rating was classified as "very important." Additionally, "Institution’s determination of what might work best based on current power structure" was perceived to also be "very important" with a mean rating of 5.02.

The item that respondents perceived to be the least important in determining choice of lobbying strategies by institutions of higher education was "Governance structure of the higher education community" with a mean rating of 4.26. The rating was in the "moderately important" category. Overall, nine of the items in this scale were rated in the "very important" category and one was rated in the "moderately effective" category (see Table 36). Responses reported in the "Other" category were how supportive the
president and chancellor were of an organized, effective government affairs program, the
credibility or image of the institution, advice of contract lobbyists and who is speaking
for the institution (see Appendix P).

Table 36
Description of State Government Relations Officers’ Perceptions of the Importance
of Selected Factors On Choice of Lobbying Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution’s determination of what might work best based on current power structure</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of how legislators will respond</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has worked in the past</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential resources available to institution</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of political oppositions</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal concerns of the organization</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making relationship of higher education to the legislature</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal restrictions of institution (non-profit status)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance structure of higher education community</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

To further summarize the information regarding the perceived importance of
factors influencing choice of lobbying strategies by institutions of higher education, the
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researcher used factor analysis to determine if primary underlying constructs could be identified in the scale. The analysis procedure used was principal components analysis with a varimax rotation method.

The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criterion, the a’priori criterion, and the scree test criterion, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be two. The results of the factor analysis including the factor, its label based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors is presented in Table 37. The two sub-scales were labeled by the researcher as "Influences" and "Status". The first factor identified in the scale, "Influences," related to internal and external factors that influenced an institution’s decision as to whether or not to use a particular lobbying strategy. Items included an institution’s determination of what might work best based on the current power structure, nature of political opposition, nature of the policy issue or budget request, resources available to institution, expectations of how legislators will respond, and what has worked in the past. The factor loadings ranged from a high of .79 to a low of .53 and explained 33.2% of the overall variance in the scale.

The second factor explained an additional 17.3% of the overall scale variance and included factors related to the status of the institution. This factor included such items as the legal status of the institution (non-profit status), the relationship of the institution to the legislature, the governance structure of the higher education community, and the
internal concerns of the institution. This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from .84 to .56 and was labeled by the researcher as "Status".

Table 37  
Factor Analysis of State Government Relations Officers’ Responses to Choice of Lobbying Strategies Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item - Influences</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33.2% of the variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution’s determination of what might work best based on current power structure</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of political opposition</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential resources available to institution</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of how legislators will respond</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has worked in the past</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item - Status</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17.3% of the variance explained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making relationship of higher education to the legislature</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance structure of higher education community</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal concerns of the organization</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal restrictions of institution (non-profit status)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the two sub-scales and items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed scale scores for each of the identified sub-scales. These sub-scale scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors.
For the first scale labeled "Influences" the individual subject mean scores ranged from a low of 4.70 to a high of 5.03 with an overall mean of 4.88 (SD = .95). Using the interpretative scale, this scale received an overall rating classified in the "very important" category. The second scale was "Status" and had individual subject means ranging from 4.26-4.68. The mean score for the group was 4.52 (SD = 1.21), which placed it in the "very important" category. When these sub-scales were examined, the factor which received the highest mean score was the "Influences" sub-scale (mean 4.88, SD = .95) (see Table 38).

Table 38
Description of State Government Relations Officers' Choice of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.70-5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4.26-4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scale: 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = very important, 6 = extremely important.

b 1.49 or less = not important, 1.50-2.49 = slightly important, 2.50-3.49 = somewhat important, 3.50-4.49 = moderately important, 4.50-5.49 = very important, 5.50-6.0 = extremely important.

Relationships Between the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies and Selected Personal and Institutional Demographic Characteristics

Objective nine the study was to determine if a relationship exists between the effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies, as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education, and selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics. The two sub-scales, "Providing Information" and "Building
Relationships," identified in the factor analysis conducted for the items in the lobbying strategies effectiveness scale were used as outcome measures in accomplishing objective nine. Each of the 12 variables in the objective was used as the independent variable and the association between each independent variable and the two sub-scale scores was examined.

a. The first independent variable examined was the number of years respondents had been employed as a state government relations officer. When the relationship between this factor and each of the effectiveness sub-scale scores was examined, a significant correlation was found between one of the two dependent variable measures. A significant positive correlation ($r = .33, p = .001$) was identified between the number of years respondents had been employed as a state government relations officer and the sub-scale titled by the researcher as "Building Relationships." The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who had been employed in the position longer tended to assign higher ratings of effectiveness to the items included in the "Building Relationships" sub-scale. The correlation between the number of years respondents had been employed as a state relations officer and the sub-scale "Providing Information" was not found to be significant ($r = .14, p = .16$).

b. The second variable which was examined for relationships with the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales was the variable gender. To accomplish this objective, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to utilize for maximizing interpretability of the results was to compare the sub-
scale scores by categories of the independent variable. This was accomplished using independent t-tests. No significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores by categories of the variable gender (see Table 39).

Table 39
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies by Gender of State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. The third variable which was examined for relationships with the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales was the variable educational background of the respondent. Since respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had completed each of the degrees listed rather than identifying only their highest degree held, each of the degrees was established as a dichotomous variable with one level being that the respondent held the degree and the other level being that the respondent did not hold that degree. Therefore, five dichotomous variables were used as the independent variables in accomplishing this objective of the study. The researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to utilize for maximizing interpretability of the results was to compare the sub-scale scores by categories of the independent variables. No comparison could be made for the variable whether or not the Associate degree was completed because there were not sufficient responses in the Associate degree category. When the
lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scale scores were compared by whether or not respondents had completed a bachelor's degree, no significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores (see Table 40).

Table 40
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies by Whether or Not State Government Relations Officers had Completed a Baccalaureate Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Degree Completed</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*n = 103
\*n = 4

When t-test results were examined to determine if there was a difference between perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies by whether or not the state government relations officers had completed a master's degree, no significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores (see Table 41).

Table 41
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies by Whether or Not State Government Relations Officers had Completed a Master's Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Master's Degree Completed</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*n = 55
\*n = 52
When the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scale scores were compared by whether or not respondents had completed a doctoral degree, no significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores (see Table 42).

**Table 42**  
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies by Whether or Not State Government Relations Officers had Completed a Ph.D. Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Ph.D. Degree Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a n = 11 \)  
\( ^b n = 96 \)

When t-test results were examined to determine if there was a difference between perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies by whether or not the state government relations officers had completed a juris doctorate, no significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores (see Table 43).

**Table 43**  
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Types of Lobbying Strategies by Whether or Not State Government Relations Officers had Completed a Juris Doctorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Juris Doctorate Completed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a n = 16 \)  
\( ^b n = 91 \)
d. The fourth variable which was examined for relationships with the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales was the variable age. To accomplish this objective, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was Kendall's Tau Correlation Coefficients. The correlation with the "Providing Information" sub-scale score was not found to be significant ($r = .02$, $p = .79$) and neither was the correlation with the "Building Relationships" sub-scale score ($r = .06$, $p = .44$).

e. The fifth independent variable examined was the marital status of the respondents. To accomplish the stated objective, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The variable marital status had five levels which included single, married, divorced, widowed, or separated. As seen in Table 44, the ANOVA ($F_{(3,101)} = .81$, $p = .49$) for the sub-scale, "Providing Information" was not significant. Likewise, the ANOVA ($F_{(3,101)} = .50$, $p = .68$) for the sub-scale, "Building Relationships" revealed no significant difference (see Table 45).

Table 44
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Marital Status of State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sixth independent variable examined was the ethnic background of state government relations officers. To determine if a relationship existed between the perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies and ethnic background, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Although five levels of ethnicity were provided in the survey, only three different ethnic backgrounds were reported in the data, White, Black and Hispanic. As seen in Table 46, the ANOVA \( F_{(2,104)} = .78, p = .46 \) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Providing Information" by ethnic background. Likewise in Table 47, the ANOVA \( F_{(2, 104)} = .16, p = .85 \) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Building Relationships" by ethnic background.

### Table 45
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Building Relationships" by Marital Status of State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 46
Analysis of Variance in the Lobbying Strategies Effectiveness Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Ethnic Background of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47
Analysis of Variance in the Lobbying Strategies Effectiveness Sub-Scale "Building Relationships" by Ethnic Background of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. The seventh variable which was examined for relationships with the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales was the size of the university as measured by student enrollment. To accomplish this objective, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was Kendall’s Tau Correlation Coefficients. The correlation with the "Providing Information" sub-scale was not found to be significant ($r = .03, p = .70$) and neither was the correlation with the "Building Relationships" sub-scale ($r = .09, p = .28$).

h. The eighth independent variable examined was the type of institution that employs the state government relations officer. To accomplish the stated objective, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The variable type of institution had six levels on the survey which included public 4 year institution (non land-grant), 4 year land-grant institution, 2 year institution, specialized institution, systems office, and state coordinating board for higher education. The ANOVA was conducted on five levels of the variable, since no one reported being employed by a state coordinating board for higher education. As seen in Table 48, the ANOVA ($F_{(4,96)} = .92, p = .46$) for the sub-scale "Providing Information" was not
significant. The ANOVA ($F_{(4,96)} = .34, p = .85$) for the sub-scale "Building Relationships" also revealed no significant difference (see Table 49).

Table 48
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Type of Institution as Reported by State Government Relations Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Building Relationships by Type of Institution as Reported by State Government Relations Officers"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. The ninth variable which was examined for relationships with the perceived effectiveness of lobbying strategies sub-scales was the Carnegie Foundation classification of the institution where the state government relations officer was employed. The researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Nine classification levels were collapsed into six separate categories. The two classifications of doctoral/research universities were grouped together, the two classifications of masters colleges were grouped, and the three classifications of baccalaureate
colleges were grouped together. Also, the available response "Don’t know" was maintained as a comparison level. The associate college and specialized institution stood alone. As seen in Table 50, the ANOVA \((F_{(5, 79)} = .26, p = .93)\) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Providing Information" by Carnegie classification. Likewise in Table 51, the ANOVA \((F_{(5, 79)} = .16, p = .98)\) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Building Relationships" by Carnegie classification.

Table 50
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Carnegie Classification of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Building Relationships" by Carnegie Classification of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j. The tenth independent variable examined was the type of governance of public higher education institutions. To compare the perceived effectiveness of lobbying strategies sub-scales by type of governance of higher education institutions, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical technique to use was
one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). There were four different levels of governance provided on the survey which included: universities or systems under governing boards and a planning agency; universities or systems under governing boards; universities or systems under one coordinating board; and universities or systems under governing boards and one coordinating board. Only 1 respondent reported a type of governance structure different from the four above. As seen in Table 52, the ANOVA ($F_{(3,102)} = .17, p = .92$) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Providing Information" by type of governance. Likewise in Table 53, the ANOVA ($F_{(3,102)} = .77, p = .51$) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Building Relationships" by type of governance.

Table 52
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Type of Governance of Institutions of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Building Relationships" by Type of Governance of Institutions of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>80.98</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>82.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
k. The eleventh independent variable which was examined for relationships with the lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales was the role orientation of the higher education community to the legislature. To determine if a relationship existed between the perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies and role orientation, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to use was one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Three levels of orientation were provided in the survey instrument which included: policymaker partner (access orientation); policymaker opponents (confrontational); and policymaker dependents (respond to policy initiatives rather that help structure them). As seen in Table 54, the ANOVA \( (F_{(2,101)} = .32, p = .73) \) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Providing Information" by role orientation. Likewise in Table 55, the ANOVA \( (F_{(2,101)} = 2.09, p = .13) \) revealed no significant difference in the sub-scale "Building Relationships" by role orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.68</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54
Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Providing Information" by Role Orientation of Higher Education to the Legislature

l. The final independent variable examined was the number of months the legislature was in session. When the relationship between this factor and the effectiveness sub-scale scores was examined, the correlation between the length of
the legislative session and the sub-scale "Providing Information" was not found to be significant ($r = .10, p = .32$). Likewise, the correlation between the length of the legislative session and the sub-scale "Building Relationships" was not found to be significant ($r = .13, p = .20$). The length of a legislative session determines the professionalization of the legislature. According to Sabloff (1997), a legislature that is in session for eight or more months a year is considered to be a professional or full-time legislature. To determine if a relationship existed between the professional status of the legislature and the effectiveness sub-scale scores, the researcher determined that the most appropriate statistical procedure to utilize for maximizing interpretability of the results was to compare the sub-scale scores by categories of the independent variable. The number of months a legislature meets was collapsed into two categories, less than 8 months and 8 months or longer. This objective was accomplished using independent t-tests. No significant differences were found in either of the two sub-scale scores by categories of the variable professional status of the legislature (see Table 56).

### Table 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73.80</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Variance in the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scale "Building Information" by Role Orientation of Higher Education to the Legislature
Table 56  
Comparison of the Perceived Effectiveness of Lobbying Strategies Sub-Scales by Professional Status of the Legislature as Measured by Number of Months the Legislature is in Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Under 8 months</th>
<th>8 months or longer</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of various lobbying strategies for higher education in state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers.

Specific objectives formulated to guide the researcher included to:

1. Describe state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education on selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics.

2. Describe state higher education policy domains on selected characteristics of the relationship between the higher education community and the respective state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education.

3. Describe the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions.

4. Determine the importance of selected characteristics for the success of state government relations officers as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions.

5. Determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations to public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers.
6. Determine the effectiveness of selected legislative lobbying strategies as perceived by state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education.

7. Determine whether or not selected legislative lobbying strategies are utilized by public institutions of higher education as perceived by state government relations officers.

8. Determine the influence of selected factors on the decisions made by public institutions of higher education regarding the choice of legislative lobbying strategies used as perceived by state government relations officers.

9. Determine if a relationship exists between the perceived effectiveness of types of lobbying strategies among state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education and each of the following personal and institutional demographic characteristics:
   a. Years employed as a state government relations officers
   b. Gender of state government relations officer
   c. Educational background of state government relations officer
   d. Age of state government relations officer
   e. Marital status of the state government relations officer
   f. Ethnic background of state government relations officer
   g. Size of the university (as measured by student enrollment)
   h. Type of institution that employs the state government relations officer
   i. Carnegie classification of institution
   j. Type of governance of public higher education institutions
k. Role orientation of the higher education community to the legislature

l. Professionalization of the legislature as measured by the number of months the legislature is in session

Methodology

The target population for the study was defined as individuals currently employed as state government relations officers for public institutions of higher education in the United States. The initial frame of the population was established as all individuals who were registered to attend the 7th Annual AASCU/CASE/NASULGC State Relations Conference in Miami, Florida from November 30 through December 2, 2000, who were also currently employed in positions defined as state government relations officers representing public institutions of higher education. The sample included 100% of the state government relations officers contacted through the conference or a total of 147 state government relations officers.

The instrument utilized in this study was a researcher designed questionnaire. Part of the instrument was a demographic survey aimed at describing respondents on selected personal and professional characteristics as well as selected characteristics of the institution of higher education and the legislature of the state in which their institution was located. In addition, respondents were asked to rate a number of factors related to the following aspects of their job: 1) perceptions of the importance of the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers, 2) perceptions of the importance of selected characteristics to the success of state government relations officers, 3) perceptions of the importance of selected factors influencing legislators’ decisions.
regarding appropriations to higher education, 4) utilization of and perceived effectiveness of legislative lobbying strategies used by institutions and their state government relations officers, and 5) perceptions of the importance of selected factors influencing an institution’s decision regarding the choice of lobbying strategies.

Data were collected for this study by surveying the state government relations officers attending the 7th Annual State Relations Conference held in Miami, Florida, on November 30-December 2, 2000. Each participant at the conference was given a copy of the instrument with a cover letter, a pencil, a return address card, and an envelope. Of the 119 eligible population members who attended the conference, 81 surveys were collected.

Follow-up procedures included a mailing to participants who did not return a survey at the conference or who were registered but either canceled or did not attend. Additionally, a mailing was sent to potential participants recommended by state government relations officers who attended the conference. As a result of these efforts, a total of 109 usable surveys were received.

Findings

The first objective of the study was to describe state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education on selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics. It was determined that 46 or 42.6% of the 109 respondents were registered in their states as lobbyists.

The majority of respondents reported that they had completed both a baccalaureate degree (96.3%) and a masters degree (51.4%). Of the 103 respondents who indicated they had completed a baccalaureate degree, 73 reported their major field of study. The
largest groups of respondents had completed their degrees in Business Administration (20.5%), Humanities (19.2%) or Political Science (17.8%).

Of the 55 respondents who indicated they had earned a masters degree, 48 reported their major field of study. The largest groups of respondents had earned a masters degree in Public Administration (25.0%) or Administration and Supervision (18.8%). Eleven of the 109 respondents had earned a doctorate, with 4 or 36.4% earning their degree in Administration and Supervision. Sixteen had earned a juris doctorate. The prior occupations reported by the largest groups of respondents were "Government Relations" (34.3%), Politics (33.3%), and Education (30.6%).

It was determined that most of the state government relations officers responding were white (87.0%) and married (72.6%). The two age categories which were reported by the largest number of participants were the 50-59 category (35.2%) and the 40-49 category (34.3%). Sixty-five (60.2%) of the respondents were male and 43 (39.8%) were female. The respondents reported an average of 7.60 years of experience as a state government relations officer, with 43.4% indicating they had less than five years of experience. In terms of political activity of respondents in the last 10 years, 79.6% reported that they had contributed to political campaigns or parties and 52.3% reported that they had performed at least 10 hours of volunteer campaign work.

Regarding institutional demographic information, respondents were asked to report the state where their institution was located. Overall, the respondents represented institutions in 36 different states from all geographic regions of the country. The states with the most respondents were Alabama and New York (8.3% each), Michigan (7.4%),
California and Texas with seven respondents each (6.5%), and Kentucky (5.6%). Eleven of the 36 states were represented by only 1 respondent.

Respondents were asked to report the type of institution where they were employed, size of the institution as indicated by student enrollment and Carnegie classification of their institution. Almost three-fourths of the respondents reported that they represented four year institutions, either non land grant (48.6%) or land grant (24.3%). Twenty-four (27.6%) respondents represented campuses with an enrollment of 20,000-29,000, 17 (19.5%) of the respondents represented campuses of 10,000-19,999, and 17 (19.5%) represented systems' offices. Over half (57.0%) of the respondents classified their institutions as doctoral/research universities and another 22.1% classified their institutions as Masters I or II institutions.

Respondents reported an average of 18.39 years that their institutions had employed a state government relations officer. Almost a third of the respondents (31.7%) reported that their institution employed two full time state government relations officers and 30.7% employed one. Twenty-five (24.8%) reported that their institution employed one part time state government relations officer.

When study participants were asked to indicate the changes that had occurred in their state appropriations during the last two budget cycles, 92.3% reported that their institution had received an increase during the most recently completed budget cycle and 93.2% reported an increase in the previous budget cycle. The most frequent response in both budget cycles was an increase in the 4-6% range (last-40.4% and previous-43.7%).
However, the majority of respondents (51.4%) reported that their institution had received less than requested.

The second objective was to describe higher education policy domains on selected characteristics of the relationship between the higher education community and the respective state legislatures as perceived by state government relations officers. Approximately a third (31.5%) reported that their institution was under a governing board while 27.8% reported that their institution was under a governing board and a higher education coordinating board. Over half (58.1%) of the respondents reported a partnership role or access orientation between the public higher education community and the legislature in their state. The majority (87.0%) of state government relations officers reported that their institution did not have a PAC (political action committee) for state relations nor did their institution contribute to legislators’ campaigns other than through a PAC (81.3%). A large number of respondents (43.5%) indicated that they felt the difficulties of having a PAC outweigh the benefits. The length of the legislative session in the 36 participating states ranged from 2 to 12 months, with an average of 5.65 months. The most prevalent category for the length of the legislative session was 2 - 3.9 months (34.3%). Twenty-seven (25.0%) respondents reported that their legislature was in session for eight months or longer. Three-fourths of the respondents rated the higher education lobby as either moderately effectively (39.0%) or very effective (37.7%).

The third objective of the study was to describe the roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers in public institutions of higher education as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. Respondents were asked to rate the
importance of 16 items to their work as a state government relations officer. Six items were found to be "extremely important" as a role or responsibility for the state government relations officer and they are as follows: 1) "Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your institution" (mean = 5.75), 2) "Provide information to legislators in support of your institution's position on particular issues" (mean = 5.70), 3) "Establish and maintain personal relationships with legislators and members of their staffs" (mean = 5.59), 4) "Sensitize legislators about needed program budget requests" (mean = 5.56), 5) "Serve as an advocate of and represent your institution's position to members of the state legislature" (mean = 5.55), 6) "Gather information and maintain vigilance over any legislative activity which may have implications for your institution" (mean = 5.52).

To further summarize the data, the researcher factor analyzed the items and extracted three factors in the scale. The three sub-scales were labeled "Direct Relationship with the Legislature," "Duties Performed for the Institution," and "Collaborative Activities." The sub-scale "Direct Relationship with the Legislature" related to roles and responsibilities that required the state government relations officer to have direct contact with the legislature and this sub-scale explained 41.7% of the overall variance in the scale. The overall mean of this sub-scale was 5.54 (SD = .79) placing it in the "extremely important" category.

Objective four of the study was to determine the importance of selected characteristics for the success of state government relations officers as perceived by individuals currently employed in these positions. Respondents were asked to rate seven
factors on a six-point anchored scale from one to six with one representing "not important" and six representing "extremely important." The four characteristics for success that were shown to be "extremely important" were: 1) "Possessing honesty and integrity" (mean = 5.86); 2) "Having 'people' skills (mean = 5.70); 3) "Understanding the legislative process" (mean = 5.63); and 4) "Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions." One item that appeared to have little bearing on the success of a state government relations officer was "Having advanced university degree" (mean = 2.79).

To further summarize the data, the researcher factor analyzed the items and extracted two constructs in the scale. The two sub-scales were labeled as "Preparation" and "Personal Characteristics." The sub-scale "Preparation" related to preparing for the legislative session. This sub-scale explained 39.6% of the variance and had an overall mean rating of 5.57 which classified it as "extremely important."

Objective five of the study was to determine the perceptions of state government relations officers as to the degree of influence selected factors had on decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations to higher education. Again, respondents were asked to rate selected items on a scale of one to six. The item respondents perceived to be the most important in terms of its influence on decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations for higher education was "Fiscal status of the state budget" (mean = 5.48), placing it in the "very important" category. Two additional items in the "very important" category with a mean rating over 5.0 were "General condition of the state's economy" (mean = 5.37) and "Personal opinions of key members of the
legislature" (mean = 5.19). In addition to the three above, there were six more items that ranked in the "very important" category relative to influences on a legislator's decision-making process. These were "Governor's budget recommendations" (mean = 4.92), "Influence of Governor or his staff" (mean = 4.90), "Constituent response from legislator's district" (mean = 4.73), "Lobbying efforts by interested parties" (mean = 4.72), "Perceived need based on case presented by higher education lobby" (mean = 4.62), and "Commitment of state policymakers to fund education adequately" (mean = 4.53).

To further summarize the data, the items were factor analyzed and three constructs were identified. The three sub-scales were identified as "Personal Opinions," "External Concerns," and "Economic Concerns." The first factor identified in the scale related to the personal opinions of various groups that influence legislators' decisions. Items included the legislators themselves, their close friends, key members of the legislature, constituents, alumni, students, special interest groups, and the media. This sub-scale explained 27.3% of the variance in the scale and had an overall mean rating of 4.54 placing it in the "very important" category. The sub-scale, "Economic Concerns", had the highest overall mean rating of 5.13.

Objective six of the study was to determine state government relations officers' perceptions of effective lobbying strategies and techniques for increasing or maintaining appropriations to higher education in state legislatures. Respondents were asked to rate 16 different strategies on a 6-point effectiveness scale, ranging from "not effective" to "extremely effective." The two strategies rated highest in effectiveness by respondents
were "Personal presentation of arguments to legislators" (mean = 5.26) and "Having influential constituents contact legislators" (mean = 5.17). These items were rated in the "very effective" category. Six additional strategies that state government relations officers rated as "very effective" were as follows: 1) "Presenting research results or supporting data" (mean = 4.65); 2) "Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of institution" (mean = 4.61); 3) "Mobilizing grassroots constituents with letter writing, telephone, fax, or e-mail campaigns" (mean = 4.60); 4) "Testifying at hearings" (mean = 4.55); 5) "Forming alliances/coalitions with other groups" (mean = 4.55); and 6) "Contact by close friends" (mean = 4.53). The one strategy that was seen to be only "slightly effective" was "publicizing voting records" (mean = 2.28).

To further summarize the data, the researcher used factor analysis to determine if underlying constructs could be identified in the scale. Two sub-scales were identified and were labeled as "Providing Information" and "Building Relationships." Items in the "Providing Information" sub-scale related to strategies that provided information to the legislators through the institution's faculty or administrators, public, or constituents. This sub-scale explained 28.3% of the variance and had an overall mean score of 4.67, classified as "very effective." The "Building Relationships" sub-scale related to strategies for building personal relationships with legislators. This sub-scale explained 14.1% of the variance with an overall mean rating of 3.64 classifying it in the "moderately effective" category.

Objective seven of the study was to determine whether or not the state government relations officer's institution used each of a group of selected lobbying
strategies or techniques. One hundred or more of the 109 study participants reported using six of the strategies. The strategy which was reported by 108 (99.1%) of the respondents was "Personal presentation of arguments." In addition, 104 (96.3%) respondents reported using "Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of the institution" and 104 (96.4%) used the strategy "Presenting research results." "Forming alliances or coalitions with other groups" was a strategy reported by 103 (94.5%) of the study participants and "Having influential constituents contact legislators" was reported being used by 102 or 94.4% of the participants. One hundred respondents (91.7%) reported using the strategy of "Testifying at hearings." "Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch" and "Giving a party or dinner," two techniques rated as only "moderately effective," were strategies reported being used by 94 and 80 respondents, respectively. "Offering personal favors and assistance" and "Using institution's newsletter/newspaper to convince legislators" were two strategies rated as only "slightly effective" that were reported being used by over 60% of the respondents. The least effective strategy "Publicizing voting records" was only reported as a strategy used by seven or 6.6% of the respondents. A "strategies used" score was computed and ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 16. The mean number of strategies reported by the state government relations officers being used by the institutions represented was 11.38.

Objective 8 looked at factors that influenced the choice of lobbying strategies used by institutions of higher education. State government relations officers participating in the study were asked to rate the importance of 10 items on choice of lobbying strategies. The item that respondents perceived to be the most important factor in determining an
institution's choice of lobbying strategies was "Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request with a mean rating of 5.03. The rating was classified as "very important." Additionally, "Institution's determination of what might work best based on current power structure" was perceived to also be "very important" with a mean rating of 5.02. Overall, nine of the items in the scale were rated in the "very important" category. The one that respondents perceived to be the least important on choice of lobby strategy used by the institution was "governance structure of the higher education community" with a mean rating of 4.26 placing it in the "moderately important" category.

To further summarize the data, the researcher factor analyzed the scale and identified two sub-scales, labeled as "Influences" and "Status." The sub-scale, "Influences" related to internal and external factors that influenced an institution's decision as to whether or not to use a particular lobbying strategy. This factor explained 33.2% of the variance and had an overall mean rating of 4.88, classifying it in the "very important" category. The second sub-scale "Status" pertained to legal and institutional status. This factor explained 17.3% of the variance and had an overall mean rating of 4.52, also classifying it in the "very important" category.

Objective nine of the study was to determine if a relationship existed between state government relations officers' perceptions of effective lobbying strategies and selected personal and institutional demographic characteristics. The associations between each of 12 independent variables and the two lobbying strategies effectiveness sub-scales, "Providing Information" and "Building Relationships", were examined. Of the demographic characteristics examined, the only significant correlation found was between
the number of years respondents had been employed as a state government relations officer and the sub-scale titled "Building Relationships" ($r = .33, p = .001$). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who had been employed in the position longer tended to assign higher ratings of effectiveness to the items included in the "Building Relationships" sub-scale.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions and implications were derived from the findings of the study:

1. The majority of state government relations officers employed in institutions of public higher education are not registered as lobbyists.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 46 or 42.6% of the respondents were registered in their states as lobbyists.

2. The majority of state government relations officers in higher education are highly educated.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 96.3% of the study participants had completed a baccalaureate degree and 51.4% had completed a masters degree. Fifteen percent had earned a juris doctorate and 10.3% had earned a doctorate. It is interesting to note that while state government relations officers are highly educated in relation to legislators with which they work, they also have relatively lower levels of education in relation to the higher education community they represent.

3. State government relations officers are typically politically active with the majority having contributed money or volunteer time to a political campaign.
This conclusion is based on the finding that 79.6% reported that they had contributed to political campaigns or parties and 52.3% reported that they had performed at least 10 hours of volunteer campaign work in the last 10 years. Ten participants had held elective office with one noting on his survey that he had previously served as a state legislator.

4. The majority of state government relations officers represented four year doctoral/research universities.

This conclusion is based on the findings that 73% of the respondents represented four year institutions and 57% represented doctoral/research universities.

5. The majority of institutions of higher education have employed a state government relations officer for many years.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 80.4% of respondents reported that their institution had employed a state government relations officer for 10 or more years. In addition, the mean number of years that a state government relations officer had been employed was 18.39.

6. State appropriations to higher education have been increasing in most states.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 92.3% of the respondents reported that their institution had received an increase during the most recently completed budget cycle and 93.2% reported an increase in the previous budget cycle. The most frequent response in both budget cycles was an increase in the 4-6% range.

The researcher recommends that a qualitative study be done in which the state government relations officers from institutions that reported the highest level of success
in increased funding would be interviewed to provide specific information about their
lobbying techniques and strategies, the demographic characteristics of the state in which
their institution was located and the institution’s relationship with the legislature.

7. Public institutions of higher education have not received the requested level of
funding in state appropriations.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 51.4% of respondents reported that
their institution had received less in state appropriations than requested.

This is consistent with the findings of Schmidt (1998) and Hovey (1997) who
reported that overall state appropriations for higher education have risen but not at a pace
that has kept up with increasing costs and inflation, especially given the damage that
higher education budgets suffered in the last recession.

The researcher recommends that additional research be conducted in which the
most successful institutions and the least successful institutions in acquiring requested
funding be studied through qualitative techniques and compared in terms of demographic
characteristics of the state and the institution, lobbying strategies used, and characteristics
of the state government relations officers.

8. The majority of institutions represented in the study have an "access" orientation
or partnership role with the legislature.

This is based on the finding that 58.1% of the respondents reported a partnership
role or "access" orientation between the public higher education community and the
legislature in their state.
9. The higher education lobby in most states represented in the study is effective. This conclusion is based on the finding that 39.0% of the respondents rated the higher education lobby as moderately effective and 37.7% rated it as very effective.

10. Most institutions of higher education do not participate in political action committees (PACs).

This is based on the finding that 87.0% of state government relations officers in the study reported that their institution did not have a PAC for state relations.

This is consistent with Cook's findings (1998) that higher education does not use PACs like the profit sector interest groups. It is interesting to note that this finding is in stark contrast to the finding that 79.6% of the state government relations officers reported having personally contributed to political campaigns.

11. The most important roles and responsibilities of a state government relations officer are to maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of the institution and provide information to legislators in support of the institution's position on particular issues.

This conclusion is based on the finding that the two most important roles and responsibilities reported by state government relations officers were as follows: "Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your institution" (mean = 5.75) and "Provide information to legislators in support of your institution's position on particular issues" (mean = 5.70).

This conclusion corroborated the findings of Murphy (1999), Mullen (1980), Milbrath (1960) and others who all agreed that a primary role of the lobbyist or state
government relations officer was to provide information. Legislators cannot possibly know about every issue that comes up in a legislative session so they consider lobbyists crucial in providing them with needed information to make an informed decision.

The researcher recommends that university administrators seeking to hire state government relations officers place strong consideration on communication abilities since providing information is such an important role in their job. The researcher further recommends that university administrators seeking to hire state government relations officers use the roles and responsibilities identified as most important in establishing a job description for the position.

12. For a state government relations officer to be successful, he or she should possess honesty and integrity, have "people" skills, understand the legislative process, and be able to communicate appropriately to get the institution's perspective factored into legislative decisions.

This conclusion is based on the finding that four characteristics for success were rated by respondents as "extremely important" and they were as follows: 1) "Possessing honesty and integrity" (mean = 5.86), 2) "Having 'people' skills" (mean = 5.70), 3) "Understanding the legislative process" (mean = 5.63), and 4) "Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions" (mean = 5.52).

This is consistent with the findings from an earlier qualitative study in which lobbyists, legislators, and staff at the Louisiana State Capitol were interviewed regarding the role of the lobbyist (Murphy, 1999). The researcher found that lobbyists agreed that their word was their greatest asset.
13. Having an advanced university degree had little bearing on the success of a state government relations officer.

This was based on the finding that the mean score for "Having advanced university degree" as a characteristic for success was the one with the lowest rating (mean = 2.79), placing it in the "somewhat important" category.

14. The most critical factors influencing the decisions of legislators regarding appropriations for higher education are economic concerns—the fiscal status of the budget and the overall condition of the state’s economy.

This conclusion is based on the finding that the sub-scale "Economic Concerns" had the highest overall mean rating of 5.13 when the items in the influence scale were factor analyzed into three constructs. In addition, the two economic items on the scale received the highest mean scores as follows: 1) "Fiscal status of the state budget" (mean = 5.48) and 2) "General condition of the state’s economy" (mean = 5.37).

This is consistent with the findings of Hovey (1999) who reported that the health of the state budget played a large role in the amount of money appropriated to higher education. Hovey predicted that budget shortfalls would lead to increased scrutiny and to curtailed spending for public higher education. In addition, Mahtesian (1995) reported that higher education would be under increasing scrutiny to be more accountable for the public dollars that they spent. Legislators now want to know what kind of return taxpayers are getting for their money.

An implication of this conclusion is that the two most important influences on a legislator’s decision regarding appropriation requests are totally out of the institution’s
control. This corroborated the findings of Mullen (1980) who found that lobbyists and legislators alike agreed that lobbying strategies and techniques were less effective in gaining support for budget requests than for other legislative activities such as introducing new legislation.

15. Additional factors that influence a legislator's decision regarding appropriations to higher education include the personal opinions of key members of the legislature and constituent response from the legislator’s district.

This is based on the finding that the following items were rated by respondents as "very important": 1) "Personal opinions of key members of the legislature" (mean = 5.19) and 2) "Constituent response from legislator’s district" (mean = 4.73).

This is consistent with the findings of Mullen (1980) who reported that lobbyists, legislators and Extension Service administrators all agreed that it was important to have an organization’s budget request supported by influential legislators involved in the budget process. He also found that constituent response was perceived by finance committee members to be an important factor in influencing legislators’ decisions (Mullen, 1980). Effectiveness of the contact, however, was tempered by the person’s knowledge of the issue, the relevance of the argument and the quantity of the responses.

The researcher recommends that administrators in higher education establish a grassroots advocacy network involving alumni and clientele for the purpose of communicating with elected officials on behalf of the institution. Furthermore, the researcher recommends that administrators of the university establish a communications system for the purpose of keeping alumni and clientele informed about issues critical to
the institution and that training be provided in methods and protocol for communicating
with elected officials.

16. The most critical and effective lobbying strategies are personally presenting
arguments to the legislator and having influential constituents contact the
legislator.

This is based on the finding that the mean score for "Personal presentation of
arguments to legislators" was 5.26 and the mean score for "Having influential
constituents contact legislators" was 5.17 on a 6-point effectiveness scale, classifying
these two strategies in the "very effective" category.

This conclusion was corroborated by the findings of Mullen (1980) and Milbrath
(1960), who reported that lobbyists and legislators perceived personal presentation of
arguments, on a one-on-one basis, as being the most effective lobbying strategy. They
both saw lobbying as essentially a communication process. Milbrath's study was with
Washington lobbyists and Mullen's study was done with state lobbyists and legislators.
Mullen's study participants stressed that communications should take the form of a
regular flow of information rather than just an increased flow of information prior to
budget considerations. Milbrath (1960) noted that constituent contact (especially from a
constituent that the official respects) was designed to not only communicate facts and
arguments but more importantly, power.

Based on this conclusion, the researcher recommends that the administrators of
public institutions of higher education direct their state government relations team or
officer to conduct a strategic planning process involving key stakeholders and lobbyists
for the purpose of developing a state relations plan for increasing appropriations from the legislature using the lobbying strategies of personal presentation of arguments and influential constituent contact as part of the core activities for funding acquisition.

17. Additional lobbying strategies that are very effective regarding increasing or maintaining appropriations for higher education are mobilizing grassroots constituents with letter writing, telephone, fax, or e-mail campaigns and forming alliances or coalitions with other groups.

This is based on the finding that the mean scores for these two additional strategies were also classified in the "very effective" category: 1) "Mobilizing grassroots constituents with letter writing, telephone, fax, or e-mail campaigns" (mean = 4.60) and (2) "Forming alliances/coalitions with other groups" (mean = 4.55).

The finding that "Mobilizing grassroots constituents" was an effective strategy is consistent with the findings of Jackson and Smith (1999), Cook (1998), Tucker (1997) and Mullen (1980) who indicated that mobilizing grassroots efforts resulted in increased appropriations for the institution. The finding that "Forming alliances/coalitions with other groups" was an effective strategy is consistent with the findings of Cook who documented the use of ad hoc coalitions by higher education institutions on the federal level after 1995-1996. Cook found that the use of ad hoc coalitions moved the higher education community to a more sophisticated level of lobbying and represented the new paradigm for higher education lobbying on the federal level. These findings also corroborated the findings of Tucker (1997) who reported that building coalitions with the
business community resulted in increased appropriations to higher education in two states, Florida and Virginia.

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher recommends that the state government relations team or officer incorporate the lobbying strategies of mobilizing grassroots constituents and forming alliances/coalitions with other groups into the institution's lobbying efforts. In addition, with the emphasis on economic development and institutions of higher education being touted as the engine that drives economic development, the researcher further recommends that university administrators consider forming alliances with organized business groups.

18. Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch and giving a party or dinner are not particularly effective lobbying strategies for the higher education community.

This conclusion is based on the finding that the mean score for "Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch" was 3.91 and the mean score for "Giving a party or dinner" was 3.66. These findings are consistent with the findings of Milbrath (1960) who found that, contrary to popular opinion, entertaining and parties received low scores on the effectiveness scale with officials citing entertainment as more of an imposition.

19. The essence of the lobbying process is that of providing information and building relationships.

This conclusion is supported by the finding that the two major underlying constructs identified when the lobbying strategies effectiveness scale was factor analyzed were "Providing Information" and "Building Relationships."
the researcher on lobbying, providing honest and accurate information and building personal relationships with legislators based on trust and accommodation were stressed as being very important (Cook, 1998, Mullen 1980; Milbrath, 1960).

20. Institutions of higher education are using the most effective lobbying strategies.

This conclusion is based on the finding that 92% or more of the respondents reported that their institutions used six of the most effective lobbying strategies as follows: 99.1% used "Personal presentation of arguments," 96.3% used "Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of the institution," 95.4% used "Presenting research results," 94.5% used "Forming alliances or coalitions with other groups," 94.4% used "Having influential constituents contact legislators," and 91.7% used "Testifying at hearings."

"Recognizing legislators who have been supportive of the institution" was not a strategy included in the studies of Mullen (1980) or Milbrath (1960) but proved to be an effective strategy being used by a majority of the institutions, as documented in this study (mean = 4.61, 96.3% usage).

The researcher recommends that university officials develop a comprehensive state relations plan, based on the previously recommended strategic planning process, to include the most effective lobbying strategies for developing support in the state legislature for maintaining or increasing appropriations for higher education.

21. Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch and giving a party or dinner, strategies found to be only moderately effective, are being used by a majority of institutions of higher education.
This conclusion is based on the finding that 86.2% of respondents reported that their institutions used the strategy "Entertaining legislators for an evening or for lunch" (mean = 3.91) and 75.5% reported that their institutions used "Giving a party or dinner," (mean = 3.66) both rated as only moderately effective.

The researcher recommends that state government relations officers at institutions of higher education reduce or eliminate entertaining of legislators since research indicates that it is only moderately effective and some legislators see it as an imposition.

22. Mobilizing grassroots constituents and contact by close friends should be included in an institution's cadre of lobbying strategies and techniques.

This is based on the finding that only 80.2% of respondents reported that their institutions used the strategy of "Mobilizing grass root constituents" and only 74.1% reported that their institutions used "Contact by close friends," both classified as very effective.

The researcher recommends that administrators of institutions of higher education direct their state relations team or officer to implement a grassroots advocacy network and develop a campaign to build support for higher education in the state legislature. The researcher further recommends that administrators and/or state government relations officers identify close friends of key legislators who can be called upon to talk to a particular legislator on the institution's behalf.

23. Institutions of higher education are using a variety of lobbying strategies in their pursuit of increased appropriations from the state legislature.
This is based on the finding that participating state government relations officers reported using an average of 11 of the 16 strategies included in the survey (mean = 11.38).

The researcher recommends that administrators and state government relations officers evaluate the lobbying strategies that are used by the institution, eliminating those that are not as effective in lieu of strategies and techniques found to be more effective regarding acquiring funding for the university.

24. The choice of lobbying strategies used by an institution of higher education partly depends on the nature of the particular issue and a determination of what might work best based on the current power structure.

This is based on the finding that the two highest rated factors on choice of lobbying strategies are as follows: 1) Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request (mean = 5.03) and 2) Institution’s determination of what might work best based on current power structure (mean = 5.02).

25. The longer state government relations officers are employed, the higher the effectiveness rating for lobbying strategies in the "Building Relationships" sub-scale that included such strategies as offering personal favors to legislators, entertaining legislators, and contributing work or money to political campaigns.

This is based on the finding that a significant correlation was found between the number of years respondents had been employed as a state government relations officer and the sub-scale titled "Building Relationships" (r = .33, p = .001).
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December 1, 2000

To: State Government Relations Officers of Public Institutions of Higher Education

Higher education is facing a critical issue in the coming decade—that of sufficient funding of our public colleges and universities. As a government relations officer, you have a critical role to play in communicating to your state legislature the importance of higher education to your state’s economy and the need to fund public colleges and universities in an appropriate manner. Lobbying strategies and techniques are our tools for communicating with legislators and other public officials. Therefore, evaluating effective lobbying strategies, understanding the factors that influence an institution’s choice of techniques and determining other factors that influence a legislator’s decision regarding higher education appropriations are important to all of us.

You have a wonderful opportunity to be part of the solution by providing your perceptions of effective lobbying strategies for public higher education. As a professional in the field of government relations, I am asking your cooperation in completing this survey. There will be no better opportunity than here at this state relations conference, where we have a cross-section of government relations officers from colleges and universities, systems, and coordinating boards from across the country, to help your profession better serve the needs of its members. It is important that you fill out the survey completely.

I can assure you that the information you provide will be completely confidential. The instrument is not coded nor does it ask for your name or institution in hopes that you will be completely candid in your observations. I only ask that you identify your state.

A summary of the results of this research will be made available to you if desired and should be quite useful in planning effective lobbying strategies to use during the legislative session in your state. To receive a summary of the results, please fill out the business reply card with your name and address and drop it in the box at the registration desk when you turn in your questionnaire.

I would be most happy to answer any question you might have. Please contact me anytime during the conference, by phone at 225-933-2562 or e-mail, emurphy@agctr.lsu.edu.

Thank you for your kind assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ellen Murphy
Director, Institutional Relations
Government Relations Officers' Perceptions of State Relations Activities of the Higher Education Community in Selected States

Louisiana State University

This questionnaire asks about your perceptions of the government relations activities in your state regarding the public higher education community. The best answer to each question is your personal opinion; please mark every question. Because I am interested in obtaining your most candid observations, I can assure you that this survey is completely confidential; your name and institution will never be connected with your answers.

Definition: For this survey, a state government relations officer is an employee of a public institution of higher education whose full-time or part-time responsibility is to work with the state legislature on behalf of the institution.

1. What is the type of governance of public institutions of higher education in your state? (mark only one)
   - Public colleges and universities or systems under governing boards and planning agency (Department, Commission)
   - Public colleges and universities or systems under governing boards
   - Public colleges and universities or systems under one coordinating board (Board of Regents)
   - Public colleges and universities or systems under governing boards and one coordinating board (Regents)

2. How would you describe the relationship between the higher education community and the legislature in your state? (mark only one)
   - Policymaker partner role (access orientation)
   - Policymaker opponents (confrontational)
   - Policymaker dependents (respond to policy initiatives rather than help structure them)

3. Does your institution have a PAC (political action committee) for state relations?  
   - Yes
   - No

4. If you answered No to #3 above, please explain why, indicating all the answers that apply:
   - Forming a PAC would diminish higher education's special status, moving it from a public interest to a "special interest".
   - The difficulties of forming and maintaining effective PACs outweigh the possible benefits that might be derived.
   - Other (please specify) ________________________________________________

5. Does your institution contribute to legislators' campaigns other than through a PAC?  
   - Yes
   - No

6. Are you registered as a lobbyist in your state?  
   - Yes
   - No

7. How many months out of the year is your legislature in session?____________
8. Individuals employed as state government relations officers have numerous roles and responsibilities assigned as part of their work. Listed below are some of these roles and responsibilities. Please use the scale provided to rate the importance of each item listed, to your work as a state government relations officer. Please base your rating on the following scale value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Value</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, if there are other roles/responsibilities that are not included in this list, please write them in the spaces provided at the end of the section and rate them using the same response scale.

a. Maintain contact or liaison with the state legislature on behalf of your institution  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Provide information to legislators in support of your institution's position on particular issues  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

c. Gather information and maintain vigilance over any legislative activity which may have implications for your institution  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

d. Serve as an advocate of and represent your institution’s position to members of the state legislature  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

e. Alert university officials about policy issues  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

f. Sensitize legislators about needed program budget requests  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

g. Develop institutional lobbying strategies in cooperation with university officials  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

h. Coordinate strategies with other associations, institutions or organizations  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

i. Supply legislators with information about program efforts in their districts  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

j. Analyze and evaluate pending legislation and appropriations issues which may affect your institution’s current operations  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

k. Establish and maintain personal relationships with legislators and members of their staffs  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

l. Ascertain legislators’ positions on appropriation issues before planning lobbying or communication strategies  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6

m. Assist in developing legislation, rules and regulations  
Rating: 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Listed below are several characteristics that have been identified as being related to the success of a state government relations officer. On the scale provided, please provide your perceptions of the importance of each of the characteristics to the success of a state government relations officer. Please base your rating on the following scale values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not important</td>
<td>slightly important</td>
<td>somewhat important</td>
<td>moderately important</td>
<td>very important</td>
<td>extremely important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Being "well-connected" to legislators and their staffs

b. Understanding the legislative process

c. Communicating appropriately to get your perspective factored into legislative decisions

d. Having advanced university degree

e. Being thoroughly knowledgeable about the issues one lobbies for

f. Possessing honesty and integrity

g. Having "people" skills

h. Other ____________________________
i. Other ____________________________

In addition, if there are other characteristics that are not included in this list, please write them in the spaces provided at the end of the section and rate them using the same response scale.
10. Many factors have been identified as having varying degrees of influence on the decisions made by state legislators. On the scale provided, please provide your perceptions of the importance of each of the items listed in terms of its influence on decisions made by state legislators regarding appropriations to higher education. Please base your rating on the following scale values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Slightly Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, if there are other factors that are not included in this list, please write them in the spaces provided at the end of the section and rate them using the same response scale.

- a. General condition of the state's economy
- b. Fiscal status of the state budget
- c. Commitment of state policymakers to fund education adequately, even if it means cutting other areas or raising taxes
- d. Influence of Governor or his staff
- e. Governor's budget recommendations setting parameters for resources available
- f. Perceived need based on case presented by higher education lobby
- g. University state government relations professionals
- h. Personal opinions of key members of the legislature
- i. Views of respected and trusted friends outside the legislature
- j. Personal beliefs and convictions
- k. Public opinion and media coverage
- l. Positions supported by special interest groups
- m. Coordinating board for higher education
- n. In-house (legislature) evaluations of institution's operations and effectiveness
- o. Briefing material prepared by legislative staff
- p. Views of higher education administrators
- q. Lobbying efforts by interested parties
11. Listed below are lobbying strategies/techniques that may be used by institutions of higher education and their personnel in government relations work with their respective state legislatures. For each of the items listed, please provide two responses. FIRST, please rate the effectiveness of the item regarding increasing or maintaining appropriations to higher education in your state. This response should be provided on the scale printed to the LEFT of the item. Please base your rating on the following scale values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not important</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r. Alumni and students from legislator’s district

s. Constituent response from legislator’s district

t. Advice of state party leaders (Democrats/GOP)

u. Other

v. Other

SECOND, please indicate on the response located to the RIGHT of the item whether or not your Institution uses that particular strategy/technique. This response should be provided by circling either the YES or the NO response printed to the right of each of the listed items.

In addition, if there are other strategies/techniques that are not included in this list, please write them in the spaces provided at the end of the section and rate them using the same two response scales.

a. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Personal presentation of arguments to legislators | Yes | No

b. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Presenting research results or supporting data | Yes | No

c. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Testifying at hearings | Yes | No

d. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Having influential constituents contact legislators | Yes | No

e. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Contact by close friends | Yes | No

f. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Mobilizing grassroots constituents with letter writing, telephone, fax or e-mail campaign | Yes | No

g. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Public relations campaign | Yes | No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not effective</td>
<td>slightly effective</td>
<td>somewhat effective</td>
<td>moderately effective</td>
<td>very effective</td>
<td>extremely effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Listed below are several factors that have been identified as potentially influencing the decision of an institution regarding the choice of lobbying strategies/techniques. On the scale provided, please provide your perceptions of the importance of each of the factors on the choice of lobbying strategies made by institutions of higher education. Please base your rating on the following scale values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not important</th>
<th>slightly important</th>
<th>somewhat important</th>
<th>moderately important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, if there are other factors that are not included in this list, please write them in the spaces provided at the end of the section and rate them using the same response scale.

a. Internal concerns of the organization  
1 2 3 4 5 6

b. Governance structure of the higher education community  
1 2 3 4 5 6

c. Policy making relationship of higher education to the legislature  
1 2 3 4 5 6

d. Expectations of how legislators will respond  
1 2 3 4 5 6

e. Institution's determination of what might work best based on current power structure  
1 2 3 4 5 6

f. Nature of a particular policy issue or budget request  
1 2 3 4 5 6

g. Nature of political opposition  
1 2 3 4 5 6

h. Potential resources available to institution  
1 2 3 4 5 6

i. What has worked in the past  
1 2 3 4 5 6

j. Legal restrictions of institution (non-profit status)  
1 2 3 4 5 6

k. Other ____________________________  
1 2 3 4 5 6

l. Other ____________________________  
1 2 3 4 5 6

13. In general, how effective do you consider the public higher education lobby in your state to be in regard to state relations?

- Extremely effective
- Very effective
- Moderately effective
- Somewhat effective
- Slightly effective
- Not effective
14. Please provide background information on yourself and the institution you represent:

a. Check degrees you have completed and provide the major area of study for each: (mark all that apply)

- Associate ________________________________
- Bachelor's degree _______________________
- Master's degree _________________________
- Doctorate ______________________________
- Juris doctorate __________________________

b. Prior occupation/s: (mark all that apply)

- Law
- Education
- Communications, public relations, or journalism
- Business Administration
- Public Administration
- Sales
- Politics
- Government relations
- Lobbying
- Other, please identify ____________________________

c. Marital Status: Single--; Married--; Divorced--; Widowed--; Separated--

d. Age group: 20-29--; 30-39--; 40-49--; 50-59--; 60-69--; 70+--; No response--

e. Ethnic Group: White--; Black--; Hispanic--; Asian--; Other--; Specify__________

f. Gender: Male--; Female--
g. In which state in the U.S. is your institution located?

h. Student enrollment of the college or university where you are employed:
   Under 2,500; 2,500-4,999; 5,000-9,999; 10,000-19,999;
   20,000-29,999; 30,000-39,999; 40,000 and over; Not applicable

i. Type of institution where you are employed:
   ________public 4 year institution (non land-grant)
   ________public 4 year land-grant institution
   ________public 2 year institution
   ________specialized institution (medical, law, agricultural)
   ________systems office
   ________state coordinating board for higher education
   ________other

j. Carnegie Foundation classification of your institution:
   ________doctoral/research university—extensive
   ________doctoral/research university—intensive
   ________master’s college or university I
   ________master’s college or university II
   ________baccalaureate college—liberal arts
   ________baccalaureate college—general
   ________baccalaureate/associate college
   ________associate college
   ________specialized institution (medical, law, agricultural)
   ________don’t know
   ________not applicable
k. Number of years employed in your present position as a state government relations officer: __________

l. Number of years your institution has had a state government relations officer: __________
m. How many full-time employees does your institution employ in state relations? __________

n. How many part-time employees does your institution employ in state relations? __________
o. Does your institution employ a for-profit law, consulting, or lobbying firm or individual for state relations?  
   Yes ____; No ____ If yes, full-time ____; part-time ____

p. In the most recently completed budget cycle for your institution, what was the percentage change in the state appropriation for the institution/system you represent?  
   _____ 1-3% increase  _____ no change  _____ 1-3% decrease
   _____ 4-6% increase  _____ 4-6% decrease
   _____ more than 6% increase  _____ more than 6% decrease

q. In the budget cycle prior to the one above, what was the percentage change in the state appropriation for the institution/system you represent?  
   _____ 1-3% increase  _____ no change  _____ 1-3% decrease
   _____ 4-6% increase  _____ 4-6% decrease
   _____ more than 6% increase  _____ more than 6% decrease

r. Generally speaking, over the past 5-6 years, how has the institution you represent fared in terms of receiving state appropriations?  
   _____ received significantly more than requested
   _____ received more than requested
   _____ received same as requested
   _____ received less than requested
   _____ received significantly less than requested
Please check whether or not you have participated in each of the following political activities in the last 10 years.

1. Attended a caucus
   - Yes
   - No

2. Were elected a delegate to a state or national party convention
   - Yes
   - No

3. Held an elective office
   - Yes
   - No

4. Contributed to political campaigns or political parties
   - Yes
   - No

5. Performed at least 10 hours of volunteer campaign work
   - Yes
   - No

6. Other significant participation in elective politics:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

If you would like a summary of the results of this survey, please complete the business reply card and drop in the box at the registration desk.
APPENDIX B

FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER

December 7, 2000

Ms. ...:

At the recent State Relations Conference in Bal Harbour, Florida, I surveyed the state government relations officers in attendance on effective lobbying strategies for public institutions of higher education. Unfortunately, I did not get a completed survey from everyone. This is dissertation research and being in higher education, I'm sure you are aware of the importance of an adequate sample size for the research to be valid. I received 80 surveys and I need at least 100 to be able to analyze my data.

If you did not complete a survey, please fill out the enclosed survey (and please answer all questions) and drop in the mail to me in the self addressed envelope before the holidays. I can promise you that it only takes about 15 minutes to fill out—it’s all multiple choice. If you did complete a survey, please accept my sincere gratitude. Is there another state government relations officer in your state that you could conveniently ask to complete the enclosed survey? My goal is to survey a good cross-section of state relations professionals from across the country and the conference in Florida was the best place to start.

I can assure you that the information you provide will be strictly confidential. I am not asking for your name or institution on the survey, only your state. Also, I plan to share a summary of my findings with you if you are interested. Just complete the enclosed card and return with the survey. (If you did not complete a card at the conference, I had no record of you completing a survey.)

Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance. I wish you and yours a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year! For your effort, I have enclosed Mardi Gras beads and a doubloon to remind you of our famous New Orleans hospitality.

Sincerely,

Ellen Murphy
Director, Institutional Relations
LSU AgCenter
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December 13, 2000

Dear Mr. 2:

At the recent State Relations Conference in Bal Harbour, Florida, I surveyed the state government relations officers in attendance on effective lobbying strategies for public institutions of higher education as part of my dissertation research. My goal is to survey a good cross-section of state relations professionals from across the country and the conference in Florida was the best place to start.

I want very much for Louisiana to be included in the survey results; therefore, I am asking those who lobbied the legislature on behalf of higher education in the last session to complete a survey as well. Please fill out the enclosed survey (and please answer all questions) and drop in the mail to me in the self addressed envelope before the holidays. I can promise you that it only takes about 15 minutes to fill out—it’s all multiple choice.

I can assure you that the information you provide will be strictly confidential. I am not asking for your name or institution on the survey, only your state. Also, I plan to share a summary of my findings with you if you are interested. Just complete the enclosed card and return with the survey.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance. I wish you and yours a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year! For your effort, I have enclosed Mardi Gras beads and a doubloon to get you in the party mood for the upcoming Mardi Gras season.

Sincerely,

Ellen Murphy
Director, Institutional Relations
LSU AgCenter
December 20, 2000

Dear Mr. 2 –:

At the recent State Relations Conference in Bal Harbour, Florida, I surveyed the state government relations officers in attendance on effective lobbying strategies for public institutions of higher education. Unfortunately, I did not get a completed survey from everyone. This is my dissertation research and being in higher education, I’m sure you are aware of the importance of an adequate sample size for the research to be valid. I received 80 surveys and I need at least 100 to be able to analyze my data.

Walt Parker, Vice Chancellor for Governmental Affairs at the University of North Texas, completed a survey and sent me your name as a government relations professional that I could contact to participate in my study. Please fill out the enclosed survey (and please answer all questions) and drop in the mail to me in the self addressed envelope by January 8, 2001. I can promise you that it only takes about 15 minutes to fill out—it’s all multiple choice. My goal is to survey a good cross-section of state relations professionals from across the country and the conference in Florida was my starting place.

I can assure you that the information you provide will be strictly confidential. I am not asking for your name or institution on the survey, only your state. Also, I plan to share a summary of my findings with you if you are interested. Just complete the enclosed card and return with the survey.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and assistance. I wish you all the best for the New Year! I am excited about your governor being our next president! For your effort, I have enclosed Mardi Gras beads and a doubloon to remind you of our famous New Orleans hospitality.

Sincerely,

Ellen Murphy
Director, Institutional Relations
LSU AgCenter
APPENDIX E

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE

Major areas of study by state government relations officers who had earned a baccalaureate degree:

• Political Science 13

• Business Administration 10
  
  Accounting 2
  Economics 2
  Management 1

• Public Administration 2
  Urban and Regional Planning 1

• Education 4
  Elementary Education 1
  Physical Education 1

• Communications 2
  Journalism 6

• Humanities
  History 6
  English 7
  Philosophy 1

• Natural Sciences
  Biology 2
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Ornamental Horticulture 1

- Technical Arts 1

- Social Sciences
  
  Psychology 3

  Sociology 1

  Anthropology 1

  Social Work 1

- Math 2

- Art History 1

- Administration and Supervision

  Legal Administration 1
APPENDIX F

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR THE MASTER’S DEGREE

Major areas of study by state government relations officers who had earned a master’s degree:

- Public Administration 12
- Business Administration 4
  - Marketing 1
  - Economics 1
  - Management 1
- Political Science 4
  - Government 1
  - Public Affairs and Politics 1
  - Public Policy 1
- Communications 2
  - Journalism 1
  - Professional Writing 1
  - Political Communications 1
- Humanities 1
  - English 1
- Education 3
- Social Sciences
  - Sociology 2
• Administration and Supervision 1
  Educational Leadership 1
  Educational Administration 3
  Higher Ed Administration 2
  Elementary Ed Administration 1
  Public School Administration 1

• Natural Sciences
  Microbiology 1
APPENDIX G

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR THE DOCTORATE

Major areas of study by state government relations officers who had earned a doctorate:

- Public Administration 1
- Political Science
  - Public Policy 1
- Administration and Supervision 1
  - Educational Leadership 1
  - Higher Ed Administration 1
  - Post-secondary Systems 1
- Medicine 1
- Natural Science
  - Ornamental Horticulture 1
- Social Science
  - Sociology 2
- Education
  - Health Education 1
APPENDIX H

OTHER OCCUPATIONS HELD BY GOVERNMENT RELATIONS OFFICERS

"Other" occupations held by state government relations officers are as follows:

- Legislative staff (2)
- Corporate VP
- Human resources
- Professor of medicine
- Organization management
- Legislative policy analyst
- Travel and higher education administration--finance
- Professor
- Legislator, private sector
- Office holder
- Lead budget negotiator for state assembly
- Foundation fund-raising
- Grant writing/management
- Academic department chair--retired
- U.S. Navy
- Federal employee with U.S. Department of Education; criminal investigator
- Owner of several business operations
- Social work
"Other" political activities by state government relations officers are as follows:

- Held a county-wide elective office (assessor in late "70's)
- Our charter prohibits favoring of any candidate or party, have avoided carefully violating the law
- Managed several campaigns for the state legislature
- Very important in our state to be perceived as one who can and does work equally with all factions for the good of the university. If one sticks to this, it is recognized and respected by all parties.
- Fellowships in state and federal government
- Ran campaigns
- Held appointive office
- Consulted in statewide campaigns; held fund-raisers
- Volunteer consultant
- I work with federal delegates on higher education funding issues
- 1984 delegate to a national convention
- Former chief assistant for a statewide elected officer (12 years ago)
- Ran for elective office unsuccessfully
- Congressional staff member
- Provided support to state-wide bond campaign—$400 million in capital $.
- Precinct committee man
• Serve on legislative relations committee associated with local chamber of commerce
• Ran campaigns at state and federal office level
• Worked for elected officials (employed)
• Served five terms in Texas legislature prior to the 10 year standard
APPENDIX J

OTHER TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

"Other" types of institutions reported by state government relations officers are as follows:

- Adult students, continuing and distance education
- Comprehensive university center—law, pharmacy, architecture, medical, etc.
- Graduate, undergraduate research with medical school and hospital
- Higher education advocacy group
APPENDIX K

WHY HIGHER EDUCATION DOES NOT USE PACS

"Other" reasons by state government relations officers for why their institution of higher education did not have a PAC for state relations are as follows:

- A system PAC is now under consideration
- Not legal
- Legal prohibitions
- We must work with everyone after the election; also campaign finance reform is making it more difficult to contribute
- No support (philosophical or resources) from campus administration
- No recognition, interest in playing this game in process
- Politically unacceptable to legislature
- Don’t know if we could legally do--also, very volatile issue--might be damaging
- Questionable value
- I am not required to register as a lobbyist and make any reports other than to my own institution—record keeping would emerge if I were required to register
- Potential negative PR consequences and IRS implications (legality)
- State tradition leans toward having an office of legislative affairs
- We used to have a PAC but abolished it—too difficult to maintain given the ethical climate in Minnesota
- The faculty have a PAC. The institution could not, by law, have one
- The university system is a quasi state agency and therefore cannot have a PAC
• State legislative, gubernatorial, chancellor concerns
• Law does not permit
• Legal constraints
• Not sure if allowed in state government
• Being considered
• Prefer to operate a conduit, but still looking for a vehicle
• Legislative Affairs committee functions well
• Trustee reluctance to engage in politics
• Politicians and leadership would take defacto charge of PAC
• Would legally be difficult
• Not at an institution. Varies at each VA institution
• System opposition
• In process of forming one
• State policy
• No interest
• No lobbying
• On our campus there are individuals who work on state relations, depending on
  the issue
• Handled outside by alums
• State universities can’t legally have a PAC
APPENDIX L

OTHER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE RELATIONS OFFICERS

"Other" roles and responsibilities of state government relations officers are as follows:

- Develop grassroots support groups
- Develop support in business organizations
- Develop and maintain community relations
- Build advocacy network
- Key contacts and grassroots
- Assist economic development efforts
- Become staff to legislative staff
- Occasionally hold or attend fund-raiser (as a private individual) for key legislators
- Personal and social relationships with legislators
- Represent legislators to institution
- Grassroots development
- Be physically present at hearings and committee hearings—they want to see our faces
- Work with state coordinating board's staff
- Work with staff of Board of Regents and Regents
- Capital Outlay funding
- Community relations
- Alumni relations—develop grass roots advocacy program
• Arrange legislative visits to campus, special events, athletics
• Facilitate local government and federal agenda
• Communicate with campus constituencies; communicate with alumni
• Coordinate advocacy efforts of all institutions within our system
• Build support for the university in the community
• Keep trustees informed of legislative issues
• Maintain visibility when not lobbying for a specific issue
• Liaison with lobbying firm
• Assist legislators that support higher education
• Provide accurate information back to institution regarding pending legislation
APPENDIX M

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS FOR SUCCESS

"Other" characteristics for success by government relations officers are:

- Organizational skills
- Possessing honesty and integrity essential to maintain bonds of trust
- Having good oral and written communication skills
- Ability to strategize
- Ability to build coalitions
- Perseverance
- Humility in treating others
- Responsive and soon
- Having an understanding of opposing views
- Team player
- Listening to officials rather than lecturing them
- Knowing how to leverage state resources/budget and appropriation skills
- Thick skin (2)
- Stamina
- Ability to put ego aside
- Ability to appear and be non-partisan
- Understanding all issues of importance, not just those related to higher education
- Credibility
- Being able to read a situation or person
APPENDIX N

OTHER FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE LEGISLATORS' DECISIONS

"Other" factors that influence legislators' decisions regarding appropriations for higher education by state government relations officers are as follows:

- Advice of state party leaders "growing" in importance
- Major contributor's call
- Major donors to their campaigns
- Crisis or not
- Advice of legislative leadership—Speaker of House/President of Senate
- Committee chair
- Not sure what you want here—trying to answer as though I were a legislator
- Wife's occupation
- Political contributions
- If they have an institution of higher learning in their district
APPENDIX O

OTHER LOBBYING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES

"Other" lobbying strategies and techniques listed by state government relations officers are as follows:

- Higher Education Association newsletter
- Staff briefings
- Helping district offices deal effectively with constituent requests and inquiries
- Routine personal contact
- Informal meetings or events on campus
- Special technology contacts
- Personal caring
- Legislator attended/taught at school
- Maintain non-partisan status
APPENDIX P

OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF STRATEGIES

"Other" factors that influences choice of lobbying strategies by institutions of higher education are as follows:

- How supportive president and chancellor are of an organized, effective government affairs program
- Credibility-image of institution
- "Openness" of college administration/board
- Expectations of what is acceptable by chancellor, legislature, governor, and university board
- Advice of contract lobbyists
- Who is speaking for institution
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