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I. LEGISLATIVE PROFESSIONALISM

Introduction

There has been considerable attention paid recently to the question of legislative professionalism (which includes legislative orientation and resource utilization) by observers who are concerned about the performance of state legislatures. Certain reform groups, such as the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, have led the way in seeking to convert state legislatures "from being largely amateur, part-time representative representative bodies to professional legislatures."¹ Enhancing professionalism entails greater utilization of state funds and an increase in the size of state government. There can be little doubt that since the mid-1960s the increased emphasis on legislative professionalism and on higher levels of state spending on legislatures has led to increase in the output and information-gathering and information-processing capacities of the state legislatures in the aggregate.²

Let us then look briefly at the conditions the legislative reformers consider to be necessary for a more professional legislature. The reformers believe that the achievement of these conditions will lead to better legislative output and will lead to a legislature more independent
from other institutions. It should be noted that legislative professionalism is not an either/or situation, but one laying along a continuum, the more amateur legislature lying at one end of the continuum and the more professionalized legislature lying at the other.

This thesis seeks to examine two sub-areas of legislative professionalism (i.e., legislative orientation and resource utilization) and seeks to examine their possible occurrence in one legislative body: the Ohio House of Representatives. These two separate, yet interrelated sub-areas of legislative orientation and resource utilization are key components of legislative professionalism. This is because research on these two sub-areas can tell us much about attitudes toward "professional" behavior (professionalism) in the legislature. Research on these two sub-areas can also tell us about the information facilities on hand for the legislative office and about the actual utilization of those resources. If "legislatively professional" attitudes and behavior seem to be the dominant modes (legislative orientation) and if the information and staffing resources of the legislature are provided at and utilized at a meaningful level, then these factors (and sub-areas) may well indicate that the Ohio House can be considered to be a legislatively professional representative body.
Hence, to study the question of professionalism and its two sub-areas, I interviewed a sample of fourteen legislators and six staffers. These interviews served as the primary source of data utilized for this thesis.

**Legislative Reform**

The reformers supporting increased legislative professionalism call for a variety of changes. Some of the changes involve making the state legislature a more efficient and more easily manageable institution. An example would be a reduction in the size of state legislatures.\(^4\) Another change sought in these directions is the abolition of the limitations placed on a legislature regarding the maximum number of days/annum the legislature can meet or regarding not allowing the legislatures to meet in continuous (two-year) sessions.\(^5\) Inefficient and poorly managed procedures are targeted as well.\(^6\) Procedures such as having three full readings of a bill for possible passage, overlapping committee jurisdiction, or many committees with very narrow jurisdiction, and a poorly developed committee system generally, are all seen as being counterproductive. To make a better managed legislature, reformers also seek an increase in the physical facilities of the legislature such as office space, desks, telephones, typewriters, air conditioning (for summer session), etc.\(^7\)
In an effort to increase the appeal of the legislature for those who might seek to run for office, or those already in office, the reformers seek greater compensation for legislators, in the form of higher salaries. An increase in staffing is sought as well, partly as an added incentive to be a legislator. Clerical, personal, professional, and committee staff are all included. Another way reformers seek to make the state legislature more attractive (as well as directly more effective) is to give the legislature greater legislative powers by decreasing the state constitutional restrictions on legislative activity and increasing the difficulty of making amendments to the state constitutions.

Legislative professionalism proponents also refer to membership characteristics that the reformers consider to be desirable for state legislators to possess. The reformers prefer to see legislators who have a strong commitment to their job and who are highly competent at that job. The reformers want state legislators to have a low turnover rate and to have longer state legislative careers. This increased longevity is sought not for increased insulation of the legislator from popular preference but to increase the competence, knowledge, and expertise of the legislator. The reformers also desire legislators to see
their jobs as being full-time jobs and psychically to have high dedication to those jobs.

The reformers saw two basic results of the amateur legislature. First, such an amateur legislature was seen as not making policy very well at all. Second, and interrelated, the reformers saw the amateur legislature as being dependent on other institutions, primarily the governor and executive departments and agencies, as well as being dependent on interest groups.

Pressure for this legislative reform has come from several sources. One source of pressure came from outside the state legislatures. The feeling was that state governments, and especially state legislatures, have had more to accomplish (more tasks to perform and more important ones as well) in recent years. With increasing state administration of and involvement with federal programs, this need to become more competent or lose federal funds becomes even more acute. The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures (now Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement) and its book, The Sometime Governments, may have helped push the reform movement.

The other source of pressure for reform was from inside the legislatures themselves. A need was seen for reform. In a self-interested way as well, legislators perceived that they could make life happier for themselves
through increases in salary, staffing, and physical facilities.\textsuperscript{14}

Yet in recent years, a hue and cry has arisen from certain sectors of our society that government at all levels is "too big," spends too much money, and is generally out of control. These protesting groups seek at a minimum to halt the expansion of state spending on state legislatures and often seek as well to curb or reduce the often new-found powers of the now more professional legislatures.

A conflict is brewing between those who seek state legislative expansion and those who seek to curb state spending and often state and legislative power. This conflict may well be reflected in the attitudes and behavior of the members and staff of state legislatures.

Thus given the prevalence of the topic of legislative professionalism in the literature today, and given the current cry to call all levels of government to heel, the topic of legislative professionalism, and especially its sub-areas of resource utilization and legislative orientation, seem not only stimulating to research, but pertinent to the current debate as well.
Methods and Data

As stated, the primary research for this thesis was conducted through personally administering a survey questionnaire to fourteen Ohio House members and six of their staff.

This sample was selected by stratifying all of the 99 members of the Ohio House of Representatives by party (Democrat or Republican) and by seniority. Seniority was based on the number of terms the member had served, including the first session of the 114th General Assembly, which was the session in which this research was conducted. The "Roster of the Members, Officers, Employees and List of Standing Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives 113th General Assembly of Ohio 1979-1980" was used as the primary source for seniority listings. Telephone updating through contacting the respective caucuses of the members was done to update the list to current standing, especially when a member had been defeated, had retired, or resigned. All 99 members were then ranked on a three-tier seniority basis (i.e., junior, middle, senior). Junior ranking was assigned to any member having served fewer than three terms—including the 114th General Assembly. Middle ranking was assigned to any member having served more than two terms but fewer than five terms—including the 114th. Senior ranking was assigned to any member having served
five or more terms—including the 114th. These terms that the representative served did not necessarily have to be sequential. For example, a representative could have served four terms, been defeated in 1978, and then be returned to the 114th in 1980. This representative would be ranked as a senior representative.

After the representatives were stratified by party and seniority, a formula was determined to come as close as possible to sampling accurately in each category (e.g., Democrat-middle). Once a figure had been worked out for each of the six categories (i.e., Democrat—junior, middle, and senior; and Republican—junior, middle, and senior), a random numbers table was used to pick the sample from these categories. The one replacement was also done through the use of a random numbers table.

It should be mentioned that a sample size of fourteen out of 99 may not be large enough to conduct extensive comparisons across categories. Thus the reader should be cautious and conservative in any extensive interpretation of the data. The author has attempted to be cautious and conservative in his analysis of the data as well. The sample is to some degree the size it is due to time constraints in conducting the research.

The representatives were contacted initially by letter and then by telephone. Any representative having
personal or committee staff (not including secretaries or pages) assigned to him or her was requested to allow this staff person to be interviewed as well. This was done so pairing could be carried out between the representative and his or her staff member.

The interviews with the legislators were conducted in their offices at the Statehouse. The length of time to administer the survey ranged from 19 minutes to one hour. The average length for the legislator survey was about 25 minutes. The interviews with the staff were conducted with the staffer in offices at the Statehouse. The range on these was from 20 minutes to 40 minutes, with the average time being about 30 minutes. For both legislators and staff, the questions were asked and the responses were recorded on notebook paper. No tape recordings were used. All legislators and staffers were told in advance that confidentiality would be maintained as to identifying any respondent specifically.

Other sources of information included previous research done on the Ohio General Assembly by Sidlow.15 Informal interviews with various personal staff and one representative with whom the author is acquainted were used, as well as Burns' *The Sometime Governments*, Fox and Hammonds' *Congressional Staffs*,17 Jacob and Vines' *Politics in the American States*,18 Keefe and Ogul's *The American*
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II. STAFFING AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO LEGISLATIVE ORIENTATION AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION

Introduction

The staffing of a legislature is considered by the reformers to be one of the most important variables in legislative professionalism.\(^1\) Staffing, as mentioned, cannot only give a legislature a greater ability to gather and process information, but also can give a legislature a much greater analytical capability.\(^2\) These capabilities, in turn, believe the legislative reformers, allow the legislature greater independence from relying on other institutions as sources of information and analysis.\(^3\) This independence may make the legislature a more competent and powerful body, say the reformers.\(^4\)

Yet the above resource utilization function is not the only function staff has in the legislative professionalism scheme. Staffing contains a component of legislative orientation as well. Aspects of legislative orientation to be examined in this chapter include staff attitudes toward increasing professionalization of professional and personal staff, attitudes toward casework and other legislative activities, and attitudes toward re-election.
Thus staffing in the legislature plays a crucial role in the scheme of legislative professionalism. Yet in order better to understand the scope of staffing in the Ohio House, it is necessary to examine other aspects of staffing as well. These other aspects include staff’s attitudes about staff job permanence and turnover in the Ohio House and include background variables such as the staffer’s prior work experience, education, occupational or professional training.

Thus this chapter will include an examination of staff’s relationship to resource utilization, staff’s relationship to legislative orientation, and an examination of staff attitudes and descriptions of staff job permanence and turnover. Staff background variables will also be examined in this chapter.

Staff’s Attitudes Toward Professional and Personal Staff Professionalism

The six staff members interviewed for this research were asked if they felt that the professional staff (i.e., Legislative Service Commission or Legislative Reference Bureau staff) had become more professionalized in the last six years. If the staffers had not been with the legislature for the last six years, then they were asked whether
they felt that the professional staff had become more professionalized since the staffers had been with the legislators.

Two of the six staff members interviewed couldn't give an answer. Four, however, believed that in general there was a high level of professionalism in the professional staff. One staffer felt that the increasing professionalization was brought about by the professional staff's making itself more accessible to personal staff, with the result being better and "tighter" legislation. Another staffer felt that the level of professionalization had improved. Two staffers commented that having a professional staff to rely upon freed up much of their time to do more pertinent tasks. These staffers felt that being able to leave the drafting of legislation, the advising on legal problems, and the learning of precedent and proper wording up to a full-time professional staff allowed the personal staff to accomplish more. Another staffer said that the LSC has a high level of professionalization, as most of its employees are lawyers. This staffer also commented, however, that efforts were afoot in the legislature to dismantle the LRB, which this staffer believed was not viewed as being very professional.

In general regarding professional staff time, we can say that the sample felt that the professional level of the
professional staff was high. Two of the sample felt the professionalism of the professional staff to be increasing. Again it should be noted that a sample of six may not be large enough from which to draw conclusions on House staff attitudes as a whole.

The sample's attitudes toward personal staff were not as complimentary as their attitudes toward the professional staff were. One of the sample had only been on the House staff (personal staff) for one month and didn't feel he could comment accurately. Only two of the six personal staff interviewed felt that there had been increasing professionalization in the personal staff. Of these two, one staffer believed that any time staff stays longer, then that staff becomes more professional. This, however, separates the individual staffer from the body of personal staff in the sense that unless there is an overall increase in staff longevity, and not merely a few staffers staying longer, then under this sort of response, professionalization does not increase. The staffer most enthusiastic about increasing professionalization for personal staff felt that one improvement to help bring about this increasing professionalization was the greater number of aides for key House members, such as for the Speaker, for the party leadership, and for standing committee and subcommittee chairmen. This staffer also thought that higher salaries
for personal staff and a greater number of pages (97 for the 114th General Assembly, 1st session in the House) were also signs of personal staff increasing professionalization. This staffer believed as well that these increases allowed her boss to get back to his district more often to do more constituent-related activities. As a proviso, however, this staffer also commented that certain members of the House didn't want aides to accumulate little areas of expertise and power. The staffer said that to that end to some degree, aides will not acquire as much expertise as they might otherwise. She also commented that Parkinson's Law might be taking effect in some Ohio House offices, as she felt it was taking effect in the U.S. House (she had been a U.S. House intern). She did not feel this was a problem in her office, however.

Another staffer felt that the level of professionalization hadn't increased for personal staff and commented, "They still hire dumb pages." Another aide said that the level of personal staff professionalization had probably gone down. One problem discussed was that when the Ohio House increased the number of personal staff, many legislators simply promoted their secretaries to aides. Many of these secretaries, said this staffer, do not have college degrees. Thus, this staffer said that now she will often do the research on a bill herself, rather than calling an
aide in the legislator's office having primary dealings with that bill.

Another aide felt that there hadn't been any increase in the level of professionalization. She felt that, to be professional, standards in experience and education must be set. She commented that staff isn't paid enough to keep people very long. Indeed, she felt that the State of Ohio can't afford to pay enough to keep these staffers around. She said that some staffers stay for two or three years. Yet, she stated, if a staffer stays 16 months, and four out of those 16 months are spent learning the job, then the staffer won't be very effective one quarter of his or her time with the legislature. This again is a problem for professionalization.

As versus attitudes toward professional staff, we see a greater range in responses from the sample on personal staff professionalization. Fewer staffers felt there was an increase in personal staff professionalization than felt there was an increase in professional staff professionalization.

Staff Attitudes Toward Staff Job Permanence and Turnover

One aspect the legislative reformers often see as desirable for a professional legislature is a permanent staff rotating among members of the legislature and
accumulating expertise and building "institutional memory." Thus it would be desirable to examine staff attitudes and statistics on staff job permanence and turnover in the Ohio House. To that end, questions were asked to the staff sample regarding whether the staff in that legislative office where the staffer worked would remain in the legislature if the legislator left office. Questions were also asked regarding who was that staffer's predecessor had been at that job, how long the staffer and the staffer's predecessor had been at that job, about turnover in general, etc.

On staff permanence, only one staffer stated that neither she nor the office secretary would stay if the legislator left office. Two of the staffers stated directly that they would stay in the legislature if the legislator left office. Another staffer said that the secretary would stay and that the aide (i.e., this staffer) doesn't view her job as long-term anyway. Another staffer stated that he would stay if his position were still open. The secretary of that office, this staffer believed, would have to weigh what might be a better offer from another employer against having to leave the friends she had made while working in the legislature. The other staffer in the sample felt that the office secretary would stay while the staffer felt that she (the staffer) would not. Yet the
staffer commented that she wasn't planning to stay much longer anyway.

Thus there seems to be a circulating pool of secretaries in the legislature (if one is allowed to draw conclusions from a sample of this size). Those staffers sampled split down the middle regarding whether they might stay on if the legislator left office. This attitude of staying on does not seem to be explainable by either the education level or the full-time status of the legislator (to be examined in chapter three). The staffers' saying they wouldn't stay on range in educational attainment from having a B.A. degree in political science to having completed high school. Those staffers saying they would stay on range from having a J.D. to having a B.A. in consumer services. Of the three staffers saying they would stay on, two are from offices with a "full-time" legislator. Of the three saying they wouldn't stay on, one is from an office with a "full-time" legislator.

Turning to job turnover, all the staffers interviewed knew who the predecessor was as their job and how long the predecessor had been at that job (except for one staffer, whose job was newly created with him being the first person to occupy the position). The predecessors had been at their jobs from one to three years. The staffers interviewed had been at their current jobs from
one month to about two years, averaging around nine months. It would be somewhat difficult to say whether this sample merely catches a turnover period, if these staffers in the sample might stay on as long as or longer than the predecessors, or if turnover is in fact increasing. Yet even if this sample merely catches a turnover period, the short average length of time the predecessors were at their jobs might not speak well for the development of institutional expertise and institutional memory. Again though one should be careful not to extrapolate too much from a sample of this size.

Staff Attitudes Toward Casework and Re-election

The staffers interviewed seemed to have a strong cognizance of the possible tie-in between doing casework and getting votes and winning re-election. Of the six staffers interviewed, three stated getting re-elected and two stated getting votes as a reason why doing casework was beneficial to his or her boss (the legislator). One mentioned that doing casework helps people with things important in their lives. One mentioned that the legislator wants to help his constituents. These categories are not mutually exclusive, as a staff could have mentioned (and often did) more than one benefit for the legislator in doing casework.
Staff Attitudes Toward Legislation Activities

Staffers were asked to rate five legislative activities on three different criteria (see Table 1). As with the earlier question regarding casework (read: constituent services), there was considerable consensus among the staff interviewed as to the importance, time consumption, and relative success of performing constituent services. Constituent services were mentioned five times by itself or with another activity as being the most important legislative activity, five times as being the most time consuming activity, and four times as being the legislative activity that office was most successful at relative to the other legislative activities.

Table 1

Staff Attitudes Toward Legislative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Importance</th>
<th>Time Consumption</th>
<th>Time Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Background

An examination of staff background may help us discover more about the level of professionalism in the staff and may help us to discover to what degree this background, training, and expertise can be put to use to aid the legislature to become more professional. Five factors of staff background will be examined in this section: (1) the prior work experience of the staffer; (2) how the staffer obtained his or her job; (3) the occupational or professional training of the staff; (4) the education of the staffer; and (5) the political party membership and activism of the staffer.

The staffer's prior work experience may be a cue to the staffer's level of expertise in legislative activities. Of the six staffers in the sample, five had had some previous experience either with the Ohio General Assembly (four staffers) or with the executive departments of the State of Ohio (one). Of the four who had had experience with the General Assembly, two had been pages, one had worked her way up from drafter to researcher to editor of the LRB, and one had been the legislator's secretary for two years previous to her becoming her boss' aide. The staffer who had not had any prior experience with the state government had been a check-out person in a grocery store for four
years and had been a nursery school teacher for two. This was the staffer who was an LSC intern.

Of the former pages, one had also been a U.S. House intern, while the other former page had also been a reporter for a local weekly newspaper in the legislator's district for three years. The former secretary to the legislator had, previous to being the legislator's secretary, worked as a secretary in the legislature and as a legal secretary.

As would be expected, the staffers obtained their jobs in various manners. Of the former pages, the one who had also been a U.S. House intern had, before leaving the intern position, been the legislator's page. After returning from Washington from her internship, her legislator worked her as an aide for split hours with another aide, who was winding down his work in the legislature. This staffer split hours with the other staffer for ten months, then took over his position full-time after that. The other former page was a reporter in the legislator's district for three years, where she and her legislator met at various functions and found they had similar views. The legislator knew of her B.A. in political science and asked her to be his aide.

The former LRB editor wanted to be an aide. She knew the person who held the position (aide) and knew that the aide was leaving. She talked to the aide and to the
Executive Secretary of the Ohio House about the job and about that legislator. The legislator reviewed her credentials, talked to her, and she was soon thereafter hired by that legislator. The former secretary to the legislator was promoted to her aide position from her secretarial position. Another secretary was then hired to fill her old position. The former check-out person and nursery school teacher was an LSC intern when interviewed. She applied for the LSC internship program, screening and selection took place, and she was selected. She was then assigned to the House minority caucus and to her legislator, who was in the Republican (minority) leadership. The lawyer who was a former attorney with the Office of Consumers Council heard from friends working in the legislature that a position commensurate with his abilities was being created. These friends set up the interviews for him and he was hired for the position.

All of the staffers interviewed but one had at minimum an undergraduate degree. Three of the staffers had undergraduate majors in political science. One of these same staffers had an undergraduate major in economics as well. One of the staffers had a B.A. in sociology. He also had a J.D. (law degree). One staffer had a B.A. in consumer services. One staffer had a high school education and legal secretary training. Three of the staffers had received
her B.A. from the University of Michigan and one had received her B.A. from Baldwin-Wallace College. The staffer with the law degree received it from the University of Toledo.

**Summary**

The advocates of legislative professionalism might well see the staff of the Ohio House as being somewhat professional. Yet these reformers probably see room for improvement as well.

The staff sample is more in agreement on its evaluation of the professionalism of the professional staff than it is regarding the professionalism of the personal staff. The staff sample was generally complimentary, on the degree of professionalism of the professional staff, yet some of the staff sample expressed reservations about the degree of professionalism of the personal staff.

Regarding the staff sample's attitudes on and descriptions of staff job permanence and turnover, the legislative reformers might not be greatly pleased here. While the reformers would be pleased that the number of staff has increased, the reformers might well see even the one-to-three year turnover rate for this staff sample's predecessors as being too short. The reformers, it will be remembered, seek a permanent staff rotating among the members of the
legislature. This does not seem to be the case as yet in the Ohio House (and especially not for aides, if it is so for secretaries). The reader is again cautioned not to extrapolate too much from a staff sample of this size.

Regarding the staff sample's background and training, the legislative reformers might say that the training was somewhat adequate, but that substantial improvement is still needed. The fact that five of the six staffers had had experience with the state government prior to their becoming staffers would probably be seen by the reformers as being beneficial. Yet, as mentioned, the lack of staff longevity would be a situation the reformers would likely seek to correct.

Thus, taken together, the reformers would quite possibly say the present staff situation in the Ohio House is somewhat adequate, yet could be improved as well. Some improvements that would likely be particularly sought would be increased staff longevity, higher minimum staff qualifications, and a greater number of staffers. The reformers would likely say that the achievement of these three reforms in particular would help to put the Ohio House even further along the continuum toward the "professional legislature" end of the continuum.
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III. LEGISLATORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO
LEGISLATIVE ORIENTATION AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION:
OHIO HOUSE MEMBERS AS FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME LEGISLATORS

Introduction

The debate on legislative professionalism must ultimately center on the legislators themselves, as it is they who make the final decision in the legislature and decide what shape and course the legislature will take. Thus this chapter will examine legislators on various topics. Some of these topics are quite similar to those addressed on staff in chapter two, such as professional and personal staff professionalism, attitudes toward and descriptions of staff job permanence, as well as attitudes toward various legislative activities and legislators' educational backgrounds. Other topics to be examined in this chapter include resource utilization of the LSC, LBO, and LRE by the legislative offices, the structure and function of the legislative office, how casework is processed, and the extent that volunteer staff is utilized.

Introduction to Legislative Orientation

An index of legislative orientation was constructed from two questions asked of the legislators: were they
still active in their occupation and did they consider the job of legislator to be full-time or part-time.¹

The two survey questions of "still-active in occupation" and "full-time/part-time legislator" were utilized as the index due to what the responses, particularly when cross-tabulated to form the index, can tell us about the psychic, monetary, and time commitment the legislator has to being a legislator. Whether a legislator considers himself or herself to be a full-time or a part-time legislator may be an important motivating force in determining a legislator's legislative behavior. Many of the reforms sought by the legislative reformers may be contingent on legislators seeing themselves as being full-time legislators. Seeing oneself as full-time could be particularly important in the area of legislator job commitment and dedication. Likewise, if a legislator does not consider himself or herself to be a full-time legislator, then it stands to reason that a major part of the time a legislator has remaining after performing (with varying degrees of commitment) his or her legislative activities might be devoted to the legislator's "occupation" or "profession." Reformers might say that to the degree that legislators are committed to an occupation other than being a full-time legislator, then to that degree might the legislator's legislative work and might the legislature as a whole suffer.²
Responses from a legislator that he or she was still active in his or her occupation and that he or she was a part-time legislator would rank the legislator at the bottom of the index. Such a legislator was categorized as being a part-time legislator on the legislator index. The next lowest ranking on the index would be a legislator saying he or she was still active in his or her occupation and responding to the "part-time/full-time" legislator question by giving what was coded as a "mixed" response. A typical "mixed" response to the "part-time/full-time legislator" question would be: "The job is part-time, but it's becoming full-time for me." A legislator with these combined responses would be categorized as a marginal full-timer and would be ranked next after the part-time legislator.

Perhaps a more subjective analysis occurred when coding the next response set. Two of the legislators in the sample said they were still active in their occupation, yet gave responses to the "full-time/part-time legislator" question that could be coded as full-time (see Table 2).
### Table 2

**Still Active in Occupation, By Responses To the Full-Time/Part-Time Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time/Part-Time</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Full-Time (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Marginal Full-Time (6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time (3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 11 3 14

### Table 3

**Still Active in Occupation, By Responses to the Full-Time/Part-Time Question, Including Additional Survey Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time/Part Time</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>Full-Time (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Marginal Full-Time (7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time (3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 10 4 14
Two problems arose here. First, these two legislators, whose responses were coded alike, did have some significant differences, enough so that to place them in the same category would be somewhat problematic. Also to put one of these legislators with the legislators in the marginal full-time category seemed not to be correct, as this legislator was the most committed of any of the legislators in the sample to the idea that Ohio legislators ought to be full-time legislators. (A more in-depth review of his comments on this subject can be found below). Also, given the previous occupation of this legislator (i.e., guidance counselor and teacher), it seems unlikely that he could remain active in his occupation in a remunerative sense and still be an Ohio legislator. What seems more likely is that when he stated that he was still active in his occupation, he meant that he kept up with the literature and the personnel of the field. Thus, of these two legislators, the first was placed in the marginal full-time category and the second was placed in the full-time legislator category (see Table 3).

The highest category of legislator commitment on the index was where a legislator said that he or she was no longer active in his or her occupation and considered himself or herself to be a full-time legislator. These legislators were coded as being full-time legislators. The
legislators in this category may well show the psychic and emotional commitment that legislative reformers seek from legislators and may show a concomitant monetary commitment as well, since these legislators are no longer active in their occupations. The exception to the no-longer-active-in-occupation response for those coded as full-time is the one legislator previously discussed who had previously been a guidance counselor and teacher, who stated that he was still active in his occupation even though it is unlikely that he was in a remunerative sense.

When the coding of the legislator sample was completed, four legislators were categorized as being full-time legislators, seven were categorized as being marginal full-time legislators, and three were categorized as being part-time legislators.

When cross-tabulating the index with the party membership of the legislators in the sample (see Table 4), we find that the Democrats in the legislator sample are distributed fairly evenly across the three categorizations of the index, while the Republicans in the sample fall more heavily into the marginal full-time categorization, with four of the six Republicans in that categorization, while only one Republican was in the part-time categorization, and only one Republican was in the full-time categorization.
When examining whether there is any relationship between cross-tabulating the index with the seniority of the legislators in the sample seniority and index score for the legislators (see Table 5), we find that no relationship exists between the two here.

Table 4
Legislator Index by Legislator Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Legislator Index by Legislator Seniority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniority</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Backgrounds of Ohio House Members

While not a direct aspect of legislative orientation, the educational backgrounds of Ohio House members may help to inform us better as to what type of person the Ohio House members is attracting. With this knowledge, we might then be able to tell if the level of legislative professionalism in the Ohio House is yielding the rewards of attracting "well-educated" personnel for membership.

The population of 99 Ohio House members for the 114th General Assembly was used for this analysis. The age and educational background of each representative was recorded. Then each level of education was assigned a value. The value of 1 was assigned to a higher school education, 2 was assigned to having attended a college or university for at least one session but not having graduated, 3 was assigned to having graduated from college, 4 was assigned to having completed an advanced degree, and 5 was assigned to having completed a professional degree. Mean scores were then computed for various combinations of representatives along such categorizations as party, seniority, and both party and seniority. All mean scores were rounded to the nearest tenth. Using this method, an aggregate mean score for all members on educational background of 3.0 was achieved.
When comparing mean scores of the members, categorized by party, and seniority (e.g., junior seniority Democrat mean score for educational attainment), we find that senior Republicans have the highest mean score here (3.7), and that senior Democrats have the lowest (2.5) (see Table 6). Overall, the mean score for Democrats (2.9) was lower than that of Republicans (3.3).

Table 6

Mean Scores of Educational Attainment, Seniority by Party Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99

When combining the Democrats and Republicans in the sample into the three categories of seniority (i.e., junior, middle, and senior), we find that the junior seniority members have the highest mean score with 3.5, followed by the middle seniority members, with 3.2, and by the senior members with a mean score of 2.9.

If we break down the population of members into age brackets, similar results were found. The members were assigned to one of five categories of ten-year age spans (i.e., age 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65-74).
Members falling into the 35-44 and 45-54 bracket were labelled as middle-aged members. Members falling into the 65-74 bracket were labelled as older members. There is little difference between these mean scores and and those from using the junior-middle-senior classification scheme based on years of service in the House that has been used in this thesis.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniority Versus Age, Mean Scores</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniority (Years of Service)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99

The only prominent difference is between the senior by seniority and the "older members" by age, which may well indicate that some of those labelled seniors by seniority do not in fact fall into the older member age bracket. We also know that the senior Democrats, the largest of the six seniority-party groups (e.g., senior Democrats) have the lowest mean scores on educational attainment. Thus the older senior Democrats may have pulled the mean scores down
for the age mean scores, while the younger senior Democrats kept it somewhat higher for the seniority mean scores.

With an aggregate mean score for all members on educational background of 3.0, we see that in the aggregate, the members of the Ohio House have a higher educational attainment than the mean of the population of Ohio. With a 3.0 aggregate score the average Ohio House member has completed four years of college. Thus, all other things being equal, the Ohio House is attracting fairly "well-educated" members.

While it would be problematic to say that legislative competence and educational attainment have any relationship with each other, one might assume that a legislative body with a mean educational score of 3.0 might be more legislatively competent than a legislative body with a mean score of 1.5, for example. It would also seem that as the mean educational score rises, so too might the "professional" flavor of that legislative body in the sense of more "professional people" as members (e.g., doctors, lawyers, etc.). Yet an irony of desiring to see the mean education score rise is that quite possibly, if the legislature becomes too professional and full-time, then these highly-educated people may find it difficult remuneratively, to do nothing but be a legislator and may find it impossible to split their time between being a legislator and being
truly active in their occupations. It is difficult to say whether the move toward increasing professionalism will ultimately demand too much of "professional" people and drive them away from state legislatures, yet if this trend toward increasing professional continues, then we might expect, all other things being equal, that the mean educational score for the Ohio House might not rise too much above 3.0.

**Legislator Attitudes toward Legislative Activities**

As examination of legislator attitudes toward legislative activities may help to inform us of the priorities legislators have in allocating their and their staff's work hours and help to inform us on whether different groups of legislators (particularly those in the three groups of the index) differ in a discernible manner from one another. An examination of legislator attitudes toward legislative priorities may also tell us to what degree drafting legislation, along with committee work (two activities that legislative reformers feel a legislature must be proficient at in order to be professional) are stressed. A considerable difference shows up in the responses of the full-timers on the index and the part-timers on the index in the question about legislative activities (see Tables 8 through 10). As would be expected, the marginals on the index fall between
the part-timers and the full-timers on their range of responses to the legislature activities question. Full-timers showed a greater propensity to choose constituent services on the legislature activities question than did the part-timers. The full-timers also chose constituent services more often than did the marginals.

The full-timers in the sample seem to have a greater emphasis on casework than do the marginals or the part-timers the sample. This could be due to the full-timers' perception that to be a full-time legislator, one must, above all, stay in office. Garnering votes helps to insure that the legislator can retain office. Thus if casework is seen as a way of getting votes (which the next section will show) was the case for three of the full-timers, for three of the marginals, and for one of the part-timers), then it makes sense that the full-time legislators would place a great deal of importance on casework, would commit significant office hours to it, and perhaps would see casework as an activity the office is most successful at, due to a high resolution rate and due to garnering votes by performing casework.

While the part-timers and the marginals may desire to be returned to office as much as do the full-timers, still it seems that the full-timers do seem to put a greater emphasis on casework. If full-timers see casework as an
### Table 8

**Legislative Attitudes Toward Legislative Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Time-Consuming</th>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

**Legislator Index by Legislator Attitudes Toward the Most and Least Important Legislative Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Legislator Index by Legislator Attitudes Toward The Most and Least Time-Consuming Legislative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Time-Consuming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Legislator Index by Legislator Attitudes Toward The Most and Least Successful Legislative Activities

Most Successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Legislation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effective way to be returned to office more so than do the part-timers or the marginals, then the possible full-timer view of the effectiveness of casework may explain the seemingly greater emphasis on casework by the full-timers as versus by the part-timers or by the marginals.

Staff responses on this question, as was shown in chapter two, were more constituent service-oriented than were the responses of the legislator sample as a whole. There, however, was no significant difference between the legislator and his or her staff in responses except in two cases.

Specific Legislator Attitudes toward Casework and Re-Election

The legislators in the sample seem to be somewhat less explicitly oriented to the electoral benefits of doing casework than was the staff sample. Yet seven of the 14 legislators in the sample did comment on some aspect of doing casework to get votes or to get re-elected (six of them explicitly) when asked what they felt the benefits of doing casework were for legislators (See Table 12).

Of the four full-time legislators, three (all of the Democratic full-timers) commented explicitly that doing casework helped to get votes or that it helped to win re-election. The other full-timer gave an answer involving
the idea that it is the duty of the legislator to do casework and that doing casework helps people.

Table 12
Legislators Mentioning Votes or Re-election, by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
<th>Did Not Mention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislators Mentioning Votes or Re-election, by Seniority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniority</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
<th>Did Not Mention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legislators Mentioning Votes or Re-election by Legislator Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
<th>Did Not Mention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea that it is a legislators' duty to perform casework was mentioned the same number of times as votes or re-election were mentioned (i.e., seven). Duty and votes
and re-election were the most frequently mentioned reasons for doing casework.

Yet even among those commenting on votes or re-election, there was a diversity of responses. A part-time senior Democrat said that doing casework was politically a neutralization of criticism. This legislator stated, "I think I'd be remiss if I didn't respond." "I'd be open to legitimate criticism." He also commented that doing casework (presumably helping with and helping to solve the problem) was one of the small satisfactions he got out of the job. Yet this legislator is rated part-time on the index.

A part-time middle Democrat commented that casework was not emphasized in his office (the only legislator in the sample saying this) and that his office did casework only grudgingly. He felt that casework appeared to be beneficial to some legislators in the sense of helping them win re-election. Yet he felt that, overall, doing casework was harmful to the constituency. He also believed that a legislator's emphasis should be on legislation and on how to act in the legislative process. It should be mentioned that this legislator represented a district that was a middle and upper middle class in socio-economic composition. Few requests for social welfare-related casework were received. This legislator's staffer commented that there
were only 300 members of minority groups in the district and that "they all voted for him."

The staff mentioned votes or re-election five times, duty (twice), that the legislator wants to help people (once), that it shows the responsive of government and allows a faith in government (once) and that it deals with matters important to people (once). Of the differences between the legislator and his or her staff person on this question, the largest difference was between a staffer and her boss, who was the part-time middle Democrat who felt casework was beneficial to the legislator in that it garnered votes and good will and helped people. Thus we have a staff sample highly cognizant of casework's electoral advantage--five of the six staffers mentioning votes or re-election--while seven of the 14 legislators in the legislator sample mentioned votes or re-election as a motivation for doing casework.

The reformers, with their emphasis on legislation and committee work, might well be alarmed at this emphasis put on casework by many of the legislators in the sample. Casework, by its conspicuous absence in discussions of legislative professionalism in the literature, would seem to be fairly low on the list of legislative priorities for the reformers. Yet, as noted, casework seems to be high
on the list of legislative priorities for at least half of the legislator sample.

Thus an inconsistency arises between the priorities of the reformers and those of some of the legislators in the sample. What might gall the reformers even more about this inconsistency is that the very legislators in the sample who could come closest to fulfilling the expectations the reformers have for legislators being full-time are also the same legislators in the sample who show the greatest proclivity to do casework and to place the greatest emphasis on it.

The examination of casework in this thesis was motivated in part by my personal subjective observations on the importance of and amount of time consumed by casework in the legislative offices in the Ohio House. One personal impression I had was that casework is seen as one of the primary vehicles for re-election, and thus is given great importance and is given a majority of the office hours in an Ohio House legislative office. My impression was that staff time as well was heavily allocated to doing casework. Thus I chose to examine casework, its perceived relationship to re-election, and staffing, as well as the literature on legislative professionalism.

I found that many of my impressions on casework were borne out in my research. One thing I found
disturbing was the lack of any real discussion of the place of casework in the legislative professionalism literature. As mentioned, if casework does bear the emphasis in the Ohio house that this thesis research seems to indicate, and if the legislators that the reformers would probably place the most faith in (the full-timers) are also the very legislators who seem to place the greatest emphasis on casework, then the reformers may either have dramatically to reorient their conception of what being a full-time legislator entails or attempt to reorient the thinking of full-timers away from casework and toward legislative and committee work, or both.

Summary of Legislative Orientation

We find then that the legislators in the sample seem to fall into three categories: the full-time, marginal full-time, and part time, which comprise the legislator index. It seems that the legislators in these categories have some significant differences from their fellow legislators in other categories in areas involving legislative orientation. Full-timers seem to be much more casework-oriented than the marginals or the part-timers. The full-timers, as a whole, tend to see their job as a legislator as being their only job and do not see themselves, as a whole, as still being active in their occupations.
It may be possible that the full-timers are willing to make the monetary, psychic, and temporal commitments that the reformers are seeking of legislators.

The marginals have some of these commitments to some degree. They appear, as a whole, still to hold strong ties to their occupations. To this degree, reformers would say that the marginals (and the part-timers as well) are allowing their professionalism and the professionalism of the legislative body to suffer. The marginals are somewhat split on their attitudes toward legislative activities. As a whole, the marginals show neither the commitment to casework of the full-timers, nor the lack of commitment to casework of the part-timers. The marginals split, with two or three gravitating more toward an emphasis on casework, with the other marginals gravitating more toward the part-timers and their concomitant lack of emphasis on casework.

Introduction to Resource Utilization

Resource utilization is another area of legislative professionalism that the reformers are most interested in upgrading. The availability and utilization of information-gathering and information-processing facilities and of an analytical capability can allow the legislature to be more independent of other institutions (e.g., the governor,
executive departments, and interest groups), and may allow the legislature to turn out a better legislative product, or at least so the reformers aver.

Thus, in the remaining sections of this chapter, we will examine some of the resources available to the Ohio House member and his or her utilization of those resources. This examination will include: legislator and staff utilization of the LSC, LBO, and LRB; legislator attitudes on the professionalism of the professional and personal staff on the legislature; legislator descriptions on staff job permanence; a view of the use of volunteer staff aides; the structure and function of the legislative office; and how the legislative office processes casework.

LSC/LBO/LRB Utilization

The Legislative Service Commission, the Legislative Budget Office, and the Legislative Reference Bureau represent the main sources of professional staff available to the Ohio House member. Let us examine the extent that the legislators and their offices utilize these resources.

Of these three resource bodies (actually two, as the LBO is a part of the LSC), the LSC was the most heavily utilized in the samples. Even when not including the LBO as part of the LSC for counting purposes here, the LSC remains the most heavily utilized of these three (i.e., LSC,
LBO, and LRB). The range of legislator utilization for the LSC ranged from a high of seven times per week to a low of once every two weeks. Other responses to this question are arrayed across this range. No discernible pattern seems to emerge in LSC utilization, with Democrats collectively using the LSC as sporadically as the Republicans collectively. Neither does having seniority nor having a party leadership position or a committee chair seem to make any discernible difference.

Basically the same can be said for LBO utilization. Here sometimes the legislator could not give a specific answer as to how often he or she utilized the services of the LBO. This is in part due to the fact that the LBO automatically performs a fiscal review of any money bill coming to committee. The LBO automatically provides "fiscal notes" to House members on many bills (the notes being placed on the legislators' desks in the House chamber). Thus the legislators have less reason to contact the LBO directly than one might initially think, because the LSC automatically does much of the analysis a legislator might need. The responses to the LBO utilization question ranged from a high of ten times per week to a low of once per month. Yet five of the legislators (three middle and two senior Democrats) could not give a definite answer to the LBO utilization question.
A pattern may emerge with legislator utilization of the LRB, however. While noting the problems with the number of junior legislators in the sample, still it should be noted that the junior legislators in the sample seemed collectively to use the LRB more than did either the middle or the senior legislators in the sample. The junior legislators gave responses of "two or three times per month," "three times per week," and "five to six times per week." The range for the non-junior legislators was from once per week to once or twice per month. While not a great deal of difference can be seen in these ranges, some difference is discernible. One of the functions of the LRB is to draft commendations, which are often believed to get votes when sent out. It may be that the junior members feel less secure in their seats or that they wish to stay in the legislature for a comfortable time period and are trying to insure that happening through greater use of commendations, or both. Yet without a larger sample of junior members and replication of the question, it would be difficult credibly to place too much weight on the sample results.

When pairing is done between the legislator and staffer on the LSC/LBO/LRB utilization, there was considerable agreement on resource utilization between the paired legislator and staffer. The greatest divergence occurred when the legislator could not give a specific answer to the
LSC/LBO/LRB utilization question, but the staffer could give a specific response. This occurred five times out of the 18 paired response sets (e.g., the legislator's and the staffer's response to the question of how often the office uses the LSC. Their responses would be a paired response set. Since there are six paired legislator-staff sets and each is asked about the three resource bodies of the legislature, then there are 18 response sets).

In some cases there was total agreement between staffer and legislator on the three responses, while in other cases there was some to substantial divergence on one or more responses. Yet on the whole the reformers might be encouraged that the legislative offices are organized well enough that staff and legislator know what is going on in the offices and that the staff and legislator seem to know what the other is doing most of the time.

Legislator Attitudes toward Professional and Personal Staff Professionalism

The survey question on the increasing professionalization of professional and personal staff was meant to contain a dynamic (versus a static) component to test whether the legislators in the sample felt that there had been an increase in professionalism in the last six years. As some of the legislators had not been in the House for six years
or chose only to answer with an evaluation of the professionalism of the professional and personal staff at the time of the interview (a static evaluation), then this section will, for a large part, be an analysis of static staff conditions.

Of the 14 legislators in the sample, eight felt that there had been an increase in professionalism in the last six years (one said in the last ten years). Of these eight, one legislator commented that the professional staff was constantly upgrading, was becoming more proficient, and was responding quicker. Another legislator felt that the computerization of bill status and that the leadership role the LSC had taken nationally all added to an increased level of professionalism. Yet this legislator (a full-time senior Democrat) felt that this increased professionalism had led to the LSC sometimes giving him too much negative feedback on bills constituents of his wanted introduced. He felt that the introducing of bills was one of the functions (although not a primary function) of the legislator. He felt that sometimes the LSC would be better advised merely to draft the bill and let the legislators and the courts worry about its constitutionality. Another senior Democrat (a marginal) stated that the quality of the professional staff had gone up in the last ten years. He was not sure if the increase in quality was due to an increase in the
number of professional staff or was due to an increase in the quality of the professional staffer. This legislator felt that, due to the professional staff's better research and due to their taking more of his load, he had more time to do his tasks, which he said was particularly important, as his time was limited. Of the five Republicans (out of eight legislators believing there had been an increase in professional staff professionalism), one marginal junior Republican commented that there used to be no aides to draft and research bills. This legislator said that there are now specialized services and that there is now computerization to make sure proposed amendments square with existing statutes and to make sure that no legislative "snakes" get through the legislative process. Another two legislators (a full-time middle Republican and a marginal middle Republican) commented on the increased ability of the professional staff to catch legislative "snakes" and to deliver better data. A part-time senior Republican talked about the increased quickness and quality of the professional staff's research. A marginal senior Republican said that the professional staff "had alleviated the problems of the load of the office . . . [which was] a lot of amending and re-writing." Of the six legislators who said there had not been or they had not detected any change in the level of professionalism of the professional staff
(five Democrats and one Republican), four of these legislators gave complimentary comments similar to the above comments. Two legislators (part-time middle Democrat and part-time senior Democrat) stated that they had not noticed any change in the level of professionalism in the professional staff.

Yet there was not this high level of enthusiasm evident when the legislators were asked about increasing professionalism among the personal staff. Of the 14 legislators in the sample, only five felt that there had been increased professionalism in the personal staff. Of these five (three Democrats and two Republicans), one marginal middle Democrat felt that more competition among potential staffers and potential employees having to strive harder for personal staff positions had allowed the legislature to be more selective in its hiring. Another legislator (a full-time senior Democrat) felt that there had been some improvement and that the personal staff position was "looked on a little bit more as a professional position." Another legislator, however (a part-time middle Democrat), felt that the secretaries had stayed about the same in quality, yet felt that there were more bad administrative assistants than there used to be, yet that the good administrative assistants were still good. He felt that no change in professionalism was shown by the interns. This
legislator said that too much latitude had been given to legislators regarding their hiring practices. This latitude, he felt, had led to many legislators hiring their former secretaries as aides. He believed that aides should be hired out of a central pool picked by the Speaker, as was done with interns.

Thus, overall, there seems to be somewhat less satisfaction with the personal staff than there is with the professional staff by the legislators in the sample. Only two legislators actually had negative comments on the personal staff. Also it seems natural that there might be somewhat less satisfaction with personal staff than with the professional staff, as the hiring criteria for the professional staff are considerably higher. Many of the professional staff are attorneys. Yet the reformers would say that standards of experience and education should probably be established for personal staff as well. This is particularly true due to the fact that often there is considerable job overlap between the professional and the personal staff.

Legislator Descriptions of Staff Job Permanence

Of the 14 legislators in the sample, seven (two Democrats and five Republicans) stated explicitly that the
staff in their office would stay in the legislature if they left office. Another two (Democrats) gave a fairly unqualified "yes" to the question of the staff staying in the legislature if they left office. One of these two said that all his staff would stay, except for his part-time aide in his district. The other said the staff would stay if he left office unless he made the staff a better offer. Another Democrat stated that his staff would stay if they wanted to, while yet another Democrat said that her secretary would stay and that her intern was under contract and so would be leaving that job at the end of the year regardless of whether the legislator stayed. A full-time middle Republican said that her aides would not stay, but their secretary would. One marginal senior Democrat said he doubted that his staff would stay if he left office, while another senior Democrat (a part-timer) simply said "no" to the question.

Thus it seems that the legislators see a fairly good chance of the staffers staying, especially secretaries and especially among the Republicans in the sample. Reformers would probably be pleased by the fact that legislators see the staff staying on after the legislator leaves office. Yet, as stated in chapter two, the reformers would not be pleased with the high turnover rate that seems to be present in the staff sample.
Legislator Descriptions of Office Structure and Function

The main factor determining office structure, function, and staff numbers for the sample seems to be the seniority and party of the House member. The pattern seems fairly simple. The higher one rises in seniority in the majority party (the Democrats in the 114th General Assembly in the House), the more staff the legislator receives. This is mitigated by whether one happens to be a committee or sub-committee chairman, since committee chairmen and sub-committee chairmen are assigned an aide. The range of staff for middle Democrats ran from one legislator who had a secretary shared with another member and an intern, to a legislator who had his own secretary and his own aide (a counsel with a J.D.). All senior Democrats (all senior Democrats in the sample were committee chairmen or party leaders) had secretaries and aides. Most legislators in the House have their own pages if they have acquired more than junior status. The Republicans seem to have to acquire party leadership before they can acquire, for themselves, more than half of a secretary's services. Republicans do have access to pages if the legislators have the requisite seniority and Republicans can call on minority caucus aides for some help with casework. The other option for a Republican is to obtain a ranking member
status on a committee, which allows for the ability to share the services of a committee aide.

There is little hierarchy in most offices of legislators in the sample. All of the legislators in the sample stated that all members of their staff had equal access to them. This is comparable to the Type III Individualistic model that Fox and Hammond refer to in Congressional Staffs. Although there was some job separation between aide and secretary, it seemed that there was much more of a cooperative than a hierarchical relationship between aide and secretary. The interaction of legislator, aide, and secretary and their relationship to the processing of casework will be examined in the next section.

Processing Casework: Legislator and Staff Descriptions

Two patterns seem to emerge in the legislator and the staff sample on the question of dealing with casework. One of these patterns is for the constituents to call or write the legislator's office in Columbus, where the legislator or his or her staff notes the request. The legislator may then begin the process of work on the case himself or herself by contacting the proper agency or by contacting the LSC or the minority caucus to assign a staff person to the case. The legislator might, on the other hand, assign
the case to a member of his or her staff, for the staffer to complete and report back to the legislator.

The other pattern that emerges is where the legislator receives a request at his or her home or at his or her office in the district outside of Columbus. This pattern may be more likely to emerge the farther the district is from Columbus. The legislator will then use his or her contacts at home or will perhaps call Columbus (state agencies) to solve the problem before the legislator returns to Columbus for the legislator's Tuesday-to-Thursday stint. The staff of a legislator employing this type of system in essence gets the overflow of cases the legislator has not had time or resources to handle or gets problems that defy quick resolution.

Thus it seems that one factor influencing how a case is processed is the point of entry of a case into the system. Does the case enter via the legislator at home and in his or her district, which is far enough away from Columbus not to facilitate daily travel to and from Columbus. The point of entry factor seems quite important in influencing how a case is processed. Yet another factor that may be quite important in influencing how a case is processed is the legislator's commitment to doing casework. Thus, presumably a full-time legislator and some of the
marginals might well place more emphasis on and place more hours in casework than some of the marginals and particularly than the part-timers would. The range of responses on the question of emphasizing casework can be seen where some legislators saw casework as the primary task of the office, while at least one legislator thinks so little of casework that he usually assigns it to an LSC staffer. This legislator is a part-timer and thus would probably not be able to process as much casework or devote as much time to legislative activities as some legislators. Yet this illustrates the reformers' point about full-time temporal, psychic, and monetary commitment exactly. Therefore we see significant differences in the way a case is processed, not only due to the point of entry of a case, but also due to what legislator the person with the problem goes.

Volunteer Programs: Legislator and Staff Descriptions

Of the 14 legislators in the sample, seven said they had never used volunteer staff aides in their offices and neither did they have nor plan to have a volunteer program in the office. Two legislators (a full-time senior Democrat and a marginal senior Republican) said they had used volunteers in the past. The Republican said he had had two volunteers in the past who got credit in school for
doing it. The Democrat said that when he first came to the legislature, he had had a bad experience with them. He commented that volunteers were not at the office all of the time and naturally were not as responsible as a full-time staffer.

One marginal junior Republican said that she had never used volunteers, but wanted to. Another Republican (a margin middle) said that when he first came to the legislature, he had used them, but not since then. He continued that he wants to use them again and is working up a program for volunteers. A marginal junior Democrat said that he has not used volunteers in Columbus but that he is working up a program. To that end, he has gotten the training manual from another legislator (who was not in the sample), who runs the most extensive volunteer program in the Ohio House—using from five to ten volunteers at a time. A part-time middle Democrat said that if a volunteer came along, he could find a use for the volunteer. He also commented that he had had one volunteer, who did it for credit in school. This research was the basis of legislation this legislator introduced on the topic. Perhaps the most sophisticated volunteer program in the sample was utilized by a marginal senior Democrat. During the time of this research, this legislator had an intern, who was a second-year law student at the Ohio State University Law School.
This intern had been assigned by the law school. This legislator's intern follows legislation from conception to final passage or defeat and does "miscellaneous tasks."

Developing an effective volunteer program at the state legislature level is one way to help to grasp the electoral advantage of processing casework with essentially free staff. It is also one way for the legislator, desiring to be more professional or desiring to be more full-time, to supplement his staff without increased legislative disbursements or without having to wait to use sub-committee, committee, or party leadership staff (or ranking member or party leadership staff for the minority House member). It seems that a good volunteer program could be especially useful for a member of the minority party, as he or she may not otherwise get staff for a long time. Also, an ongoing volunteer program offers a ready pool of present and past volunteers to work on campaigns. Several evenings of 15 to 20 people doing mailings might make a difference in the electoral returns, particularly in low turnout districts in off-year elections. Thus the legislator not employing a good volunteer program may be missing a golden opportunity, not only to become more professional, but also to be able to cash in on the electoral benefits of doing large amounts of casework.
Summary of Resource Utilization

The legislative reformers see the support of and utilization of adequate staff and resources (i.e., resource utilization), along with the proper legislator commitment, as being extremely important to the success of legislative professionalism. For without these staff and resource services, the legislator is severely hampered in his or her ability to collect and analyze information and is burdened with such tasks as bill-drafting and statute-combing, tasks that could perhaps better be assigned to staff.

Keeping in mind the importance that the reformers place on resources utilization, let us look again briefly at how the reformers might feel about resource utilization in the Ohio House. The reformers would quite likely see the support of the LSC (including the LBO) as being quite useful to legislators. The LSC functions of research, bill-drafting, computerized bill status record-keeping, and searching out legislative "snakes" would all be seen as useful steps toward becoming more legislatively professional. The LBO fiscal analysis, providing legislators with fairly detailed analyses and fiscal impacts of bills, would also be seen as being helpful in keeping the legislator informed on important matters and with relatively unbiased information. LRB commendations might not be seen in such a favorable light, however.
Legislator and staff attitudes toward the professionalism of the professional staff certainly seem to reflect the pleasure of the legislators and staff with the performance of the professional staff. Yet the reformers would probably seek explicit standards of education and experience for the personal staff, as well as seeking a lower personal staff turnover rate. The attitudes and descriptions of staff job permanence would be likely to please the reformers by indicating, at least in part, a staff rotating among the members of the legislature. Yet with the staff turnover rate being what it is today (at least for the staff sample), then this rotation may not serve very much of a useful function in and of itself. Thus a rotating staff that is fairly permanent would be sought by the reformers.

The reformers might also approve of a well-managed volunteer program, which would allow legislators greater resources in a legislative environment that might be hostile to a greater allocation of dollars for hiring additional staff. Thus, if a legislator has such a volunteer program that frees up the legislator's time for other legislative activities, then reformers would likely applaud the use of a well-managed volunteer program in the office. Few such ongoing volunteer programs were evident in the offices of the legislators sampled. This lack of
volunteer programs, for the reasons just given, might not please the reformers. Yet the number of legislators saying they wanted to start such a program in their offices might please the reformers.

In summary then, reformers would probably seek more explicit and higher standards of education and experience,¹³ as well as higher pay, for personal and probably for some professional staff as well. The role of the LRB would probably need to be re-examined. Finally, well-managed volunteer programs in the legislative office should be encouraged.
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IV. LEGISLATIVE PROFESSIONALISM AND ITS FUTURE IN THE LEGISLATURE; SOME CONCLUDING ANALYSIS

Introduction

In the preceding chapters we have examined two aspects of legislative professionalism—legislative orientation and resource utilization—with regard to the attitudes, behavior, and resources of Ohio House members and their staffs. In this concluding chapter then, we will summarize the findings of this research and go on to examine, from several perspectives, some of the implications of increasing professionalism in the state legislature.

Summary of Findings

While keeping in mind the limitations that the sample size puts on wide-ranging extrapolation, we, nonetheless, can see a discernible pattern emerging in the responses of the legislators on the still-active-in-occupation question and on the full-time/part-time question. Legislators seem to be able to be categorized in three rather distinct groups: full-time, marginal full-time, and part-time. This categorization was based on responses to the above two questions and to some degree on a subjective
analysis of corollary comments made by the legislators to
the author during the interviews.

The legislators in the sample came from a variety
of occupational and educational backgrounds. No real
pattern emerges here regarding party membership or legis-
lative seniority. Three of the full-timers, however, were
the only legislators in the sample to say that they were no
longer active in their occupations. The occupations of
these three full-timers and of the other full-timer in the
sample made it difficult to split hours between being legis-
lators and staying active in their occupations.

Legislator and staff priorities were scrutinized
through examining which legislative activity the legislators
and staff felt was the most and least important for the
office, the most and least time-consuming, and which legis-
lative activity the office was the most and least successful
at. It was found that full-timers seem to emphasize con-
stituent services more than do the marginals or the part-
timers in the sample.

When examining those legislators who mentioned
getting votes or re-election as being a benefit of doing
casework, we find three of the four full-timers mentioned
votes or re-election, while only two of the seven marginals
and two of the three part-timers mentioned it. This is
not necessarily significant from the categorization
perspective (i.e., full-time, marginal, part-time), but could be significant from a party perspective—for five of the legislators in the sample mentioning votes or re-election here were Democrats, while only two mentioning votes or re-election were Republicans.

In examining resource utilization, we see that no discernible pattern emerges when examining the utilization of the LSC and LBO by the legislative offices in the sample. Junior seniority legislators in the sample, however, did seem to use the LRB more often than did their more senior fellow legislators. We also see that office structure and function and number of staff seem to be determined primarily by the legislator’s seniority and party membership. We find, as well, that casework seems to have two ways of being processed, depending on at what point the case enters the system (i.e., in what way and where) and to a lesser degree on the kind (i.e., categorization) of legislator to whom the case is brought.

Regarding legislator and staff attitudes toward the professionalism of the professional and the personal staff, we discover that legislators and staff in the sample generally praised the professional staff for their quality and efficiency, while commenting that the personal staff was not as professional in its overall quality and in its
level of education and experience. We find a fairly high
turnover rate among the staff sample's predecessors, yet
found, particularly among Republicans in the sample, that
there seems to be a good chance that the personal staff of
a legislator would stay on in the legislature if the legis-
lator left office. It was found that few ongoing volunteer
programs were being conducted in the offices in the sample
(only one in fact). Six of the legislators in the sample
had used a volunteer at least once. Two of the legislators
were actively working on developing a volunteer program.

Thus we see a legislature where, if we can extra-
polate accurately from the sample, a majority of legislators
put in full-time hours and are supported by significant
levels of staff and resources. Yet many legislators still
are active in their occupations. To this extent, they may
lack the psychic (and monetary) commitment that it takes to
reach the professional end of the amateur-professional
continuum.

A legislature whose members possess this sort of
time commitment and whose members have at their disposal
this sort of staff and resource support, can go a long way
toward becoming a truly independent partner in governing
the state. A legislature at this stage of development does
not have to rely to nearly the same extent as an amateur
legislature does on the governor, executive agencies, and
interest groups for information and analysis, that can be at best only slightly biased. One reason for this increased independence is that such a legislature cannot only at this point obtain; to a greater degree, its own information, but also such a legislature can analyze this information in a more rapid and useful manner.

The Implications of a More Professional Legislature

Thus, the legislature with ability to process and analyze information, and the legislature whose members are willing to put in considerable hours at their legislative tasks, can become a potent force in state public policy-making, if it so desires. Yet a powerful and/or competent state legislature does not necessarily have to present a threat to the governor or executive agencies or necessarily mean that a legislative/executive power struggle must ensue. Legislative and executive branches will inevitably come into conflict on occasion, yet this does not necessarily mean that conflict must be the rule of the day. And in some cases conflict may even be a desirable state of affairs, as it may help a greater number of sides to get their positions across and may allow advocacy of certain less than popular positions that might not be taken if an atmosphere of high consensus always prevailed. But again, conflict need not necessarily be the rule of the day.
Yet certain groups might see a more powerful legislature as not being desirable in and of itself. These groups might also see a more powerful legislature, with larger scope, staff, and resources, as a manifestation of a greater trend of which this group disapproves and which this group subscribes. Let us then examine the more professional legislature and its future from the above perspective and from the perspective of the legislative reformers.

Several Perspectives on the Implications of Legislative Professionalism

Opinion on the consequences of increased legislative professionalism (which includes by implication greater legislative scope, staff, and resources) seems to fall into two camps. These two camps will be referred to here as the legislative reformers and the legislative traditionalists. Before examining these two perspectives, however, it might be useful briefly to review some of the comments of the legislators in the sample on this issue. We have already reviewed in some depth in chapter three the extensive comments of the most committed full-timer in the sample on the subject of Ohio House members being full-time legislators. Several of the legislators in the sample commented favorably on the concept of a citizen legislature, with the legislator in this model either representing to
some degree a particular business (occupation) or having
the ability to go back to a job in the district to maintain
contact with his or her constituents. The model of represen-
ting a business interest is similar to the modern
"Agent" model, where a particular business or occupational
interest helps considerably to get its own man or woman
elected to have a voice on the inside of the governmental
process. Even two of the full-timers said they would
rather have the job of Ohio House member be part-time.
Yet this belief is not reflected in their behavior as legis-
lators. Thus there seems to be some confusion, at least
among the sample, as to the direction that the legislature
should be heading.

This diversity of opinion among the legislator
sample reflects the arguments of the reformers and the
traditionalists on the subject of legislative profession-
alism. These two positions are compilations of viewpoints,
so perhaps no one person holds all of the views of one
camp or the other. Yet enough people hold views similar
to and consistent with these archetype positions to justify
utilizing these archetypes.

One of the central tenets espoused by the tradi-
tionalists is not to allow government to grow much larger
in its size, scope, or expenditures. This stance is quite
like that of some conservative Republicans who wish to see
government less involved in people's lives, particularly in the forms of the government intervening in the economy and in the government giving too much assistance to those persons the traditionalist might see as not "deserving" such assistance. Concomitant with this viewpoint would be the idea that the legislature of a state should be held to its "traditional" aggregate role of limited power, scope, and funding. Again we see the idea (contra Madison) that first the government must be watched and only then must the citizenry be watched.

Obviously this position would not reflect the viewpoints of "corporate conservatives" and those who feel that the government should take quite an active stance in surveillance and control of domestic unrest. Also, and perhaps more importantly, there does seem to be an inconsistency in the traditionalist position that the federal government should be kept in tight rein and that many of the federal government's current activities should be returned to the state level, but also that the state legislature should not be allowed to expand in scope, powers, and funding to meet the challenge of handling these former federal programs. Perhaps optimally the traditionalist would also seek a rollback to the earlier position where the legislatures were less powerful than they are today. The inconsistency between these two traditionalist
positions of wanting reduced federal powers in certain areas (e.g., social welfare and the economy) and wanting some of these powers returned to the states, yet at the same time not wanting legislative expansion nor wanting an expansion of state government to handle such programs, could lead to the loss of whatever gain that state control might have brought through a more efficient operation of these programs and through a more direct control over these programs. The possible loss of these advantages could occur due to the states not being able to administer these programs properly, given their current levels of personnel and resources. Such inability has been met with federal judicial intervention before. There is little reason to believe that such intervention might not occur again, if the courts believed that these programs were being carried out too poorly. Also, even if Congress chose to divest itself of these programs, what reason is there to believe that Congress would be willing to return these programs wholesale to the states, when the states had made little effort to upgrade their capacity to handle such programs.

Thus, in one sense, it would seem quite appropriate for traditionalists to want strong state legislatures, not only to be part of an upgraded state capacity to handle such programs, but also to help check the increased state
bureaucracy that would almost inevitably arise if these programs were transferred to the states. What is rather ironic here is that it is the reformers who are working to make the state legislatures more professional, and this action may make it easier for Congress to relinquish control of these programs to the states, a goal the traditionalists seek. Therefore, a situation might arise where the state has a stronger legislature (due to the traditionalists), and finds itself confronted with social programs it has neither the funds nor personnel (due to budgetary constraints) to handle properly. Neither the traditionalists nor the reformers would likely see such a situation as being desirable, particularly if judicial intervention is the result.

Legislative reformers are not seeking an increase in all levels of government activity. They would state that they seek to make state legislatures, in the aggregate, more independent, more efficient, and capable of putting out a higher quality legislative product. The reformers would say that to make the legislature these things would benefit all of the residents of the state, as well as making the state legislatures, in the aggregate, more equal partners with the governors and bureaucracy in governing the states. The Citizens Conference on State
Legislature says that it seeks to make state legislatures functional, accountable, informed, independent, and representative (often using the acronym FAIR here).

The reformers might well assert that many of the goals they are seeking are not necessarily antithetical to the aims of the traditionalists (i.e., that some of the reforms might be policy-neutral). One such reform might be the creation of a more efficient committee system in a legislature. More efficient committees could be used for whatever policy ends those in control wished (perhaps in the direction the traditionalists desire). A more efficient committee system does not of necessity mean one where its participants (members) aggrandize more power for themselves, perhaps expanding the powers of the legislature as a result. Other reforms, such as allowing the legislators offices, telephones, stationery, and typewriters, could also be seen as neutral reforms.

One reform that the traditionalists might object to in particular is giving considerable monetary compensation to the state legislator. This would be the reform that the traditionalists would probably see as being the closest to leeching off the taxpayer. Sometimes the very idea of the standard $22,500 salary for Ohio legislators becomes a campaign issue. Yet most legislators in fact have another occupation besides being a legislator. The
reformers might say that such a situation is, in some ways, the worst of both worlds. As the situation in the Ohio House stands at present, the salary is not comparable with what many legislators could get if they worked full-time at jobs other than being state legislators in Ohio. On the other hand, the amount of legislative work being carried out by most Ohio legislators requires that they put in something close to full-time hours to do a competent job. Thus, those who only work as legislators could be seen as undercompensated, while those who have other occupations might be seen as overcompensated. The constituents of the part-timer are not getting the same quantity of service as are the constituents of a full-timer. It is also costing the state more money to compensate a part-timer with a salary coming closer to a full-time compensation.

The current standard salary of $22,500 for Ohio legislators could be seen as only an inducement to attract better talent to the legislature and not as a figure approximating a full-time salary and implying a concomitant full-time commitment. In such a case, a part-timer might be able to justify his or her actions more easily. Yet there is no indication that those legislators, saying that they would rather have the job of Ohio legislator be part-time, are advocating or willing to take a reduction in salary to a level commensurate with part-time work. Also
there may be little evidence to indicate that an increase in salary (e.g., to $35,000/annum) would induce very many legislators to be truly full-time in hours spent or to be professional in commitment and behavior. Some part-timers would quite probably merely say "Thank you" and continue to work two jobs. Such a salary (i.e., $35,000/annum) would probably seem too high for a legislator unwilling to commit himself or herself to being full-time.

Given the current complexities of the state legislature, its responsibilities, and its somewhat professional status, it is unlikely that there will be a return to the type of legislature the traditionalists might seek. Yet, on the other hand, even given the push for professionalism in the state legislatures currently under way, it is unlikely that the legislature will be willing to give itself a significant salary increase, due to a mood of fiscal restraint and due to fears of rhetoric that "the government has lived too well."

Thus Ohio seems to be stuck with a situation where some legislators are willing to be full-time to such an extent that they put in full-time hours and drop all other employment, yet where others put in hours only coming close to being full-time and remain active in their occupations, while others put in even fewer hours and remain quite active
in their occupations. Yet, for reasons stated above, there is little reason to believe that this situation will change in the near future.

A considerable degree of legislative professionalism exists in the Ohio House of Representatives, particularly in the areas of legislative orientation and resource utilization. Yet, in the opinions of both the legislative traditionalists and the legislative reformers, much remains to be changed in the Ohio House.

Legislative reformers would be pleased with the number of hours put in by most members, with the professional staff, and with the resources available to the legislators, all of these being indicators of a fairly high level of legislative professionalism. The reformers would be only moderately satisfied with the salary of the legislators and the staff and would be only moderately satisfied with the professionalism and turnover rate of the personal staff. The reformers would be dissatisfied with the fact that many legislators still are active in their occupations, that some legislators only put in part-time hours, and that even more legislators would probably like to see the job of Ohio legislator be part-time.

Legislative traditionalists, on the other hand, would see hope in the fact that many Ohio legislators are still active in their occupations and that some legislators
view the job of legislator as being part-time. Yet the traditionalists would be dissatisfied with what may be an increasing number of legislators who see themselves as full-time, say they are full-time, or both. The traditionalists would also be displeased with the level of salary currently being drawn by Ohio legislators. Another item that would quite likely displease the traditionalist is the length of session each year and having continuous two-year sessions. Also the traditionalists would quite possibly be displeased with what they see as some legislators encouraging constituent reliance on the legislator to solve their problems, increasing the scope of government and increasing government's burden on the taxpayer.

We can state then that the present situation in Ohio neither satisfies nor dissatisfies completely either the reformers or the traditionalists on the scene. It also seems likely that both the reformers and the traditionalists will continue their respective legislative strategies into the near future.

Two Staffing Schemes and their Possible Effects on the Ordering of Legislative Priorities

We have already discussed, in chapter three, some of the inconsistencies between the views and desires of the
reformers, which emphasize being full-time and which emphasize committee work and drafting legislation, and what seems to be a more "realistic" picture of the full-time Ohio Representative, when he or she arises, emphasizing casework over committee work and legislation. We have also commented on the need for the legislative reformer to bring his or her views closer to the de facto situation, to attempt to convert current full-timers and other legislators to the reformers' viewpoint, or to do both. Now let us go one step further in our analysis and discuss two staffing schemes that might help to influence the flow of "professionalism" toward, on the one hand, casework, or toward, on the other hand, committee work and drafting legislation, depending on which of the staffing schemes is used.

Two comments should be made first, however. First, extrapolating from the legislator sample, a fairly large majority of Ohio House members do not consider themselves to be full-time legislators and still consider themselves to be active in their occupations. Thus the impact of swaying only full-timers would be somewhat less than dramatic. Yet these two staffing schemes can apply to all members and thus they might have a broader impact than if only full-timers were involved. Second, it should be remembered that casework and committee work/drafting legislation are not by any means mutually exclusive as
legislative activities. Even if one of the two staff schemes, which will be discussed, were adopted fully, it is almost impossible that either casework or committee work/drafting legislation would increase or decrease by extreme amounts. What we are discussing are possible significant marginal changes in emphasis on one or the other of these legislative activities that might occur if one or the other of these staff schemes were implemented full-scale, all other things being equal.

The two staff schemes to be discussed are the committee staff scheme and the personal staff scheme. The schemes are not complex, yet their effects might make significant marginal changes in the priorities and activities of the legislature. The committee staff scheme consists of the staff of the legislature being assigned to committees to perform primarily committee functions such as research, bill-drafting and screening, helping to allocate state funds properly, etc. The idea here is that by the very nature of its set-up, such a scheme would help to insure that staff time was primarily allocated to committee work/drafting legislation and not primarily to casework (assuming the reformers realize the large amount of casework that is now being processed in the legislative offices).
There are, however, several rather obvious drawbacks to the committee staff scheme. One drawback is that such a scheme may still allow the committee staff to be co-opted into doing personal staff types of activities. We know that this is often the case with Congressional committees, where the staffer ends up doing a great deal of work for the Congressperson or Senator who appointed the staffer to the committee staff. We also know that both at the Congressional and at the state levels, committee staff often becomes the tool of committee and sub-committee chairpersons. A second obvious drawback to the committee staff scheme is that such a scheme does not offer nearly the same amount of flexibility for the legislator that the personal staff scheme offers. The committee staff scheme, by its very nature, assures that staff will of necessity do some committee work. This is precisely the reason the reformers might come to see the committee-staff scheme as an advantageous set-up—it marginally decreases the staffer's ability to work on casework. Yet this inflexibility can also be seen as a disadvantage, depending on one's perspective and legislative goals.

The personal staff scheme, on the other hand, offers much of the flexibility that would be lacking in a pure committee staff scheme, yet would allow the legislator the opportunity to maximize his or her chances of
re-election by utilizing his or her staff primarily for casework, for campaign work, or for personal work. Such a utilization of staff might well displease the reformers for two reasons. First, the reformers would likely be displeased that the staff would be used primarily for casework and not for committee work/drafting legislation. (This is of course assuming that the reformers choose to address the subject of casework in their work). Second, the reformers might see the use of staff for campaign and for personal use as a waste of legislative resources that could be allocated to a more useful activity and might even see such staff utilization as a breach of legislative ethics.¹

Thus it is highly likely that the reformers, should they choose to address casework and staffing schemes, might well choose some form of the committee staff scheme, despite its lack of flexibility and the ability of committee staff to be co-opted.

Conclusion, and a Comment on the Future of Legislative Reform

Thus, if the results if the research for this thesis hold true for other legislative bodies as well as for the Ohio House, then we can say that casework receives a significant amount of attention from legislators, an amount far greater than the reformers might approve of or than the
reformers might even realize exists. We also see that those in whom the reformers might be most likely to place the most faith (the full-timers) are the very legislators who seem to have the most commitment to casework, and who, along with their staff, spend the most time on casework.

It seems then that the reformers might be confused on three counts when viewing legislative professionalism in state legislatures (particularly in the Ohio House). First, the reformers might not realize that few legislators actually fulfill all of their conditions for legislative professionalism. Second, the reformers may not realize the considerable extent that casework is done by legislators, perhaps to the detriment of committee work/drafting legislation. Third, the reformers may not realize that those legislators considering themselves to be full-time may well be the legislators who place the most emphasis on casework and a good deal less emphasis on committee work/drafting legislation than their less full-time fellow legislators.

Therefore it seems that the reformers need to conduct a significant reorientation of the legislative professionalism literature, not only regarding the place and importance of casework, but also regarding the number of legislators who are actually professional and full-time and regarding the number of full-timers who view casework as their top priority. Unless this reorientation takes
place, it seems unlikely that the reformers will influence the setting of legislative priorities for legislative activities. Thus, the reformers may be relegated to bringing about merely structural reforms such as longer sessions and procedural changes, important but far from including the entire range of possible reforms sought by the reformers.

Two closing notes. First, it might be interesting to implement each of these two staffing schemes in different states and then compare the results of utilizing each scheme. Yet controlling for intervening variables would, of course, be a significant problem here. Second, if the reformers chose to examine casework in more detail, then it would be interesting to see if a significant sub-group would arise among the reformers, advocating casework over committee work/drafting legislation as a more important priority for the legislature to have.

It is a trying dilemma, and one beyond the purview of this thesis, to try to determine which should be a higher legislative priority, casework or committee work/drafting legislation. What seems clear is that casework needs to be given the research and literature attention that an important legislative activity deserves. Perhaps only then can this dilemma of casework versus committee work/drafting legislation be addressed with the proper frame
of mind and with ample research data to validate any claims made. It is to be hoped that at such a time the dilemma of casework versus committee work/drafting legislation will be resolved, to the satisfaction of constituents and legislators alike.
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SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE - LEGISLATOR

I'd like to ask you some questions about staffing in the Ohio Legislature.

1. How is this office organized? Who holds that position? What responsibilities does each person have? PROBE FOR DUTIES (LEGISLATIVE VERSUS CASEWORK), COMMUNICATION PATTERNS, ACCESS, ANY RECENT CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE.

2. Would you say that the staff in this office is fairly permanent in the sense that if you left office, the staff of this office would remain in the legislature? IF YES, to what degree?

3. Do you feel that the professional staff (i.e., Legislative Service Commission or Legislative Reference Bureau staff) has become more professionalized (i.e., more qualified, more expert, better educated) in the last six (6) years?

4. IF YES, what effect has this increased professionalization had on the functioning of this office?

5. Do you feel that the personal staff (i.e., administrative assistants, legislative assistants, pages, secretaries, volunteer staff) has become more professionalized in the last six (6) years? IF YES, which one(s)?

6. Is casework (i.e., handling constituent requests and solving constituent problems) emphasized in your office?

7. IF YES, how does your office handle (process, deal with) casework?

8. Do you see doing casework as being beneficial to you? IF YES, how? In what ways?

9. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Service Commission (not including the services of the Legislative Budget Office)? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.
10. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Budget Office? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.

11. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Reference Bureau? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.

12. I am going to read you a list of five activities. READ ACTIVITIES. Please tell me which activity you consider to be: (1) the most important for your office; (2) the least important for your office. RE-READ ACTIVITIES. (3) The most time-consuming for your office; (4) the least time-consuming for your office. RE-READ ACTIVITIES. (5) The activity your office is most successful at; (6) the activity your office is least successful at.

THE LIST OF FIVE ACTIVITIES:

DRAFTING LEGISLATION
COMMITTEE WORK
CONSTITUENT SERVICES
CAMPAIGNING
OTHER

13. What use, if any, is made of volunteer interns of volunteer staff aides by your office?

14. IF ANY USE IS MADE OF VOLUNTEERS IN THE OFFICE, is there an ongoing program for volunteers in your office? IF YES, please describe that program.

Finally, I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

15. What is your educational background?

16. Would you please describe your occupational or professional background or training?

17. Are you still active in your occupation?

18. Do you consider yourself to be a part-time or a full-time legislator?
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE - STAFF

I'd like to ask you some questions about staffing in the Ohio House of Representatives.

1. How is this office organized? Who holds what position? What responsibilities does each person have? PROBE FOR DUTIES (LEGISLATIVE VERSUS CASEWORK), COMMUNICATION PATTERNS, ACCESS, ANY RECENT CHANGES IN THE ORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE.

2. Who was your predecessor at this job? When? Has there been much turnover?

3. How long have you been at your current job?

4. What was your prior work experience?

5. How did you obtain your current job? PROBE FOR REWARD, RESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT, ETC.

6. Would you say that the staff in this office is fairly permanent in the sense that if the legislator leaves office, the staff of the office will remain in the legislature? IF YES, to what degree?

7. Do you feel that the professional staff (i.e., Legislative Service Commission or Legislative Reference Bureau staff) has become more professional (i.e., more qualified, more expert, better educated) in the last six (6) years?

8. IF YES, what effect has this increased professionalization had on the functioning of your office?

9. Do you feel that the personal staff (i.e., administrative assistants, legislative assistants, secretaries, pages, volunteer staff) has become more professionalized in the last six (6) years?

10. IF YES, what effect has this increased professionalization had on the functioning of your office?

11. Is casework (i.e., handling constituent requests and solving constituent problems) emphasized in your office?
12. IF YES, how does your office handle (process, deal with) casework?

13. Do you see constituency casework as being beneficial to [LEGISLATOR'S NAME]? IF YES, how? In what ways?

14. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Service Commission (not including the services of the Legislative Budget Office)? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.

15. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Budget Office? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.

16. How often does your office utilize the services of the Legislative Reference Bureau? PROBE FOR WEEKLY INCREMENTS.

17. I am going to read you a list of five activities. READ ACTIVITIES. Please tell me which activity you consider to be: (1) the most important for your office; (2) the least important for your office. RE-READ ACTIVITIES. (3) The most time-consuming for your office; (4) the least time-consuming for your office. RE-READ ACTIVITIES. (5) the activity your office is most successful at; (6) the activity your office is least successful at.

THE LIST OF FIVE ACTIVITIES:

DRAFTING LEGISLATION
COMMITTEE WORK
CONSTITUENT SERVICES
CAMPAIGNING
OTHER

18. What use, if any, is made of volunteer interns or volunteer staff aides by your office?

19. IF ANY USE IS MADE OF VOLUNTEERS IN THE OFFICE, is there an ongoing program for volunteers in your office? IF YES, please describe that program.

20. Are you a registered member of a political party?

21. IF YES, what party? Are you an active member?

22. IF ACTIVE, how long have you been active?
23. What is your educational background?

24. Would you please describe your occupational or professional background or training?