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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Federal support and regulation of education is an accepted means of "attacking broad social issues" (Bailey and Mosher, 1968, p. vii). Since 1917 and the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, the development of vocational education in the United States has been greatly influenced by the federal government. National problems and events affect vocational education across the country. The problems resulting from population growth, depressions, tax pressures, mobility of population, the interdependency of state economic systems and a variety of social concerns have all contributed to a search for new solutions through the involvement of the political process in the education system. As a result, federally funded education "must operate in a complex political environment" (Bailey and Mosher, p. vii).

Background of the Study

This study was undertaken to examine the political environment and explain some of the myriad influences which help determine federal vocational education legislation and policy. Bailey and Mosher state that federally funded education "must function in an intricate web of tensions spun by historical circumstances and by both co-ordinate and cross purposes: congressional, presidential, judicial, group interest, intra-agency, inter-agency, inter-governmental, personal, societal and even international" (p. vii). Vocational education is no exception.
The focus of this study is on the process of developing federal legislation for vocational education. In times of rapidly changing technology and unstable economic conditions, it is important for vocational education to build and maintain programs that meet the needs of the nation. Continued and expanded support at the federal level can help vocational education play a significant role in meeting the human resource requirements of the nation as a whole. The maintenance and expanded support desired from the federal government by vocational education necessitates the acceptance of a competitive role in securing increased financial resources coupled with program requirements which provide for effective and efficient use of those funds at the federal, state and local levels. Seeking to influence the political process through lobbying is an important function and legitimate role for vocational educators to play in obtaining resources required to carry out programs. Only with information provided by those closest to the benefactors of a program can legislation be developed that best meets the needs of both individuals and society.

This study examines the similarities and differences in perceptions of congressional committee staff members and individual interest group representatives as to the effectiveness of various lobbying techniques. A corollary pursuit involves studying perceptions of the influence of specific interest groups in the development of Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-482).
Need for the Study

Much has been written about policy development in general, and more specifically, education policy development. Theories abound as to how legislative proposals originate and how they eventually do or do not become recognized as policy. Political scientists either have a personal theory as to how to influence legislative decision making effectively or are searching for the answer in understanding that decision making behavior.

Norman Ornstein has noted that most often, political scientists look at "how legislators interact with one another" (Heaphey and Balutis, 1975, p. 167). However, there is a range of other possible influences which has not been addressed fully in political science research or in the area of vocational education policy development. According to Ornstein, little is known of the alternative resources from which legislators can gain information and assistance with their legislative work. Ornstein suggests that these alternative resources include committee and office staffs.

Fox and Hammond (1977) point out that there have been few studies of congressional staffs. Most studies that deal with congressional staffing at all treat the topic as incidental to the major focus of the study. Although this may be true, this does not mean that researchers think staff influence in unimportant. Fox and Hammond cite seven books and sixteen articles and unpublished dissertations as having provided valuable information for their brief chapter "Congressional Staffs and Congressional Change" in Heaphey and Balutis' book (1975).
It seems that many authors cite the lack of information on legislative staffing while at the same time offering their opinions on its importance. Saloma, in Congress and the New Politics, says that "the issue of congressional staff is pertinent to all congressional functions" (Heaphey and Balutis, 1975, p. 138). Evans claims that of all the sources of power in Washington today, the most nearly invisible -- yet in some ways the most influential -- is the congressional staff.... A staff of professionals is no less essential to the care, feeding, and orderly operation of Congress than Merlin was to King Arthur or Cardinal Richilieu to Louis XIII (Heaphey and Balutis, 1975, p. 139).

Another similar opinion is offered by Robert Sherrill:

There are plenty of exceptions, of course, and there are degrees of involvement, but as a rule, it is the administrative assistants, the legislative assistants, the staff economists -- not the members -- who think up the legislation, make the deals, listen to the lobbyists, keep back home political pipes flushed out, determine what mail the member sees and what he misses, and determine who gets to see him and who has to settle for a flunky (Heaphey and Balutis, p. 31).

Closely related to the study of congressional staff influence is the concept of lobbying. The purpose of this study was to investigate the lobbying techniques which are seen as effective by congressional staff members and by interest group representatives with regards to influencing vocational education legislation and policy development.

Although Summerfield cites the American Vocational Association (AVA) as the "grandaddy of education lobbies" (1974, p. 11), research concerning how that lobbying effort actually occurs is lacking. It is also important to note that lobbying has become much more crucial in the decade of the eighties than at any other time in history. Ornstein
and Elder cite several structural changes that have occurred in Congress that have had an effect on lobbying. They state "political decentralization brought on by congressional reforms created more points of access for the groups, through newly powerful subcommittees and increasingly significant junior members of Congress" (1978, p. 227). The positive effect of this change is that there is opportunity for more people to be heard. However, the increased access has caused a great increase in legislative activity which has also been augmented by the increased size of congressional staff and decentralization of congressional power. The result has been that sophisticated interest groups hold the power because they can react quickly in assisting overburdened legislators -- no matter how worthy their goals might be (p. 227).

These facts point to the necessity for vocational educators to have knowledge of the most effective lobbying techniques if they are to join the ranks of the "sophisticated interest groups." No longer can vocational education rely on past legislative achievements and assume that someone in Congress will watch out for them. The days of control of legislation by one or two key Senators and Representatives are gone. "The future of American education at all levels is and will in no small measure be shaped by political decision-makers. Correlatively, only those who understand appropriate political influence can be effective in furthering educational policy goals" (Bailey, 1975, p. 1). Bailey describes as a myth the commonly held belief that education and politics don't mix.
This myth cannot continue if education, and more specifically vocational education, is to compete with the increased activity of those who support additional aid to Labor Department training programs to the exclusion of a major role for the public secondary and post secondary institutions. Educators are, in the larger picture, also in competition with other social programs as well as such unrelated areas as defense spending, energy, transportation, and aid to foreign governments.

Given the competition, it is important for vocational educators to be made aware of the vital role they play in obtaining support for their programs. An individual vocational educator's lobbying activities, as well as the activities of interest groups, can help members of Congress and their staffs to learn about vocational education. Knowledge of the most effective ways of conveying enthusiasm and accurate information is vital to the success of the vocational education lobbying effort. Scholarly research is needed to determine the most effective methods and strategies.

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem addressed in this study was to determine the similarities and differences in perceptions of the congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning the effectiveness of various lobbying techniques.

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. What lobbying techniques are used by various interest groups?
2. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the interest group representative?
3. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

4. What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived effectiveness of various lobbying techniques?

5. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the interest group representative?

6. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

7. What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived influence on the development of the 1976 Amendments?

8. What relationship exists between the lobbying techniques used and perceptions of interest group influence held by congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives?

**Delimitations**

The following delimitations serve to place realistic parameters around the study.

1. No attempt was made to determine how an interest group representative gained access to a congressional committee staff member. (More specifically, there is no information available concerning any "favors" that might have been provided to members of either group).

2. No information was gathered concerning other contacts an interest group representative may have made (e.g., with Senators or Representatives; with members' personal staffs).

3. There was no attempt to determine the number or quantity of lobbying contacts made by an interest group or received by a congressional committee staff member.
4. There was no attempt to gather information on contacts regarding specific pieces of legislation other than the 1976 Amendments.

5. Determination of the quality of contact by an interest group was limited to perceptions of effectiveness by both groups.

Limitations

The following are limitations of the study.

1. The data collected are subjective, and, by nature subject to change. Results of the study are based on subjective perceptions of respondents at the time of the survey or interview.

2. The length of time elapsed between consideration of the 1976 Amendments (1975) and conduct of this study (1981) may have affected the results due to the memory limitations of some respondents.

Definitions

The following definitions will assist in understanding the study.

Congressional Committee Staff Member. Professional staff members who perform policy-related tasks such as research, analysis of issues, and drafting of bills for committees and subcommittees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

House Committee on Education and Labor. The authorizing committee of the United States House of Representatives which considers measures relating to education or labor generally.

House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. The subcommittee to which vocational education legislation is referred in the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Influence. "A has power over B to the extent that A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do" (Dahl, in Berry, 1977, p. 274). In this study influence is based on the perceptions of the respondents. As cited by Berry "there is little consensus concerning the best approach to measuring interest group influence" (p. 275). He goes on to state that a firm definition of influence is "beyond the capabilities of contemporary political science" (p. 275).
Interest Group. "A shared attitude group that makes certain claims upon other groups in society" (Truman, 1971, p. 33). For the purpose of this study an interest group refers to a political interest group which "directs its claim through or upon any institution of government (Truman, 1971, p. 33).

Lobbying. The direct effort of interest groups and others to influence legislation and other public officials through personal contact (Metz, 1972, p. 4); "presence of an intermediary or representative as a communication link between citizens and governmental decision-makers" (Milbrath, 1963, p. 7).

Lobbyist. The intermediary or representative who serves as the communication link between citizens and governmental decision-makers (Milbrath, 1963, p. 8).

Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (formerly, 1975, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare). The authorizing committee of the United States Senate which considers legislation relating to education, labor or public welfare.

Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities (formerly, 1975, the Subcommittee on Education). The subcommittee to which vocational education legislation is referred in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Typology of Interest Groups. The following types of education interest groups have been identified by Bailey (1975) and are used in categorizing responses of the interest group representatives in this study.

Umbrella Organizations. Broad based organizations that have highly diverse institutional and associational membership and affiliates. For purposes of this study, an umbrella organization includes diversity in types of members although all members have a vocational education interest in common.

Institutional Associations. Associations of a particular class or type of institution; largely confined to post-secondary education.

Teachers Unions. Groups are organized at the K-12 level and at the post-secondary levels.

Professions, Fields, and Disciplines. Groups structured around a professional field or an academic discipline.

Librarians, Suppliers, and Technologists. Organizations concerned with books and with educational materials and technology.
Religion, Race, and Sex. Groups whose concern centers on 1) the question of government financial assistance to church-related schools and colleges, 2) the educational welfare of minorities; or 3) women's rights in education.

"Lib-Lab" Lobby. Loose association of liberal and labor organizations that share common social values.

Institutions and Institutional Systems. A group of individual colleges, universities, state systems and regional consortia.

Administrators and Boards. Organizations which reflect a variety of particular concerns of subordinate administrators at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education.

Miscellaneous. Includes a variety of groups for which there is no adequate way of categorizing; they include groups that concern themselves with the welfare and rights of pupils and students and their parents and others who are concerned with the promotion and maintenance of quality at all levels of education.

Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. The term used in this study which refers to the Education Amendments of 1976, Title II, Vocational Education (Public Law 94-482).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter focuses on selected studies and related literature in the areas of legislative behavior research methodology, congressional staffing, interest groups and lobbying. Although not specifically examined in this study, the ultimate question implied concerns how vocational education legislation is developed and eventually becomes law. First a brief overview of the types of research that have been used in the past to study legislative behavior is presented followed by reasons for focusing on legislative decision making as the appropriate methodology for this study. Three theories of Congressional decision making are reviewed. Two of the theories refer to the possibility that congressional staff members and interest groups may influence decisions made while the third theory relies more heavily on the content of the issue as the deciding factor to the decision making process.

After having explored the area of congressional decision making, the available research and writing on Congressional staffing is reviewed. There is little empirical research available on legislative staffing at the federal level. However, the literature reveals much conjecture about the importance of staff members. A few studies have been conducted which examine staffing patterns and influence at the State level, however, due to the limited staffs available to state
legislators, the generalizability of such studies to the federal level is questionable. Due to the paucity of research on congressional staffing that section of this chapter is a review of all research done in the area, rather than being focused on the specific relationship between congressional staff members and interest groups.

The final section of this chapter reviews the literature on interest groups and lobbying and moves from general research on lobbying to more specific consideration of the education lobby effort.

This chapter provides an explanation of legislative behavior research methodology as a basis for comparing the perceptions of congressional staff members with representatives of interest groups. Both groups have the potential for great influence in the development of vocational education legislation. In addition, this chapter provides information and analysis of the literature on congressional staffing and interest groups as further explanation and rationale for the research questions being considered in the study.

**Legislative Behavior Research Methodology**

There are several methods which might be used to study legislative behavior. The study of legislative behavior involves both speculation and investigation on the part of social scientists, in order to describe, build theories, and test ideas (Jewell and Patterson, 1966). This study is both speculative and investigative.

Jewell and Patterson cite the emergence of "three fairly discrete types of research: that which focuses upon recruitment, that which emphasizes individual motivations and behaviors, and that which studies
legislative decision making" (1966, p. 528). In approaching the ques-
tion of how vocational educators can increase their involvement in and
impact on federal legislation, it appears that one could use any of
the three types of research mentioned above. This study will focus
on legislative decision making with full understanding that the
decisions made are, of course, influenced by the characteristics of
the individual members of Congress who are recruited and also by the
individual motivations and behaviors of those Senators and Representa-
tives. It is impossible to separate the focus of each of the three
types of research. Studies which analyze legislative decision making
usually try to explain some part of Congressional behavior in terms of
external pressures such as political party affiliation, constituency
characteristics, regional divisions or interest group activity.

In addition to the three types of research generally accepted in
studying legislative behavior, there are three major sources of data.

1) Public documents - a traditional method often used by politi-
cal scientists. Documents are extensive and available in
great detail for the U.S. Congress.

2) Direct observation - a less commonly used source, possibly
due to the large size of the legislature. Jewell and
Patterson state that this method can provide important data
especially when studying a smaller, more easily observed
group such as a legislative committee (1966, p. 531).

3) Systematic interview - may take the form of either the
focused or standardized interview. It had previously been
believed that it is difficult to obtain responses from legislators in an interview situation, however, this view is changing as more and more successful studies based on interviews are being reported.

In establishing the basis for studying the perceptions of congressional staff members and interest group representatives one must look at the research in legislative decision making. The study of the politics affecting foreign trade in the 1950's conducted by Bauer, Pool and Dexter (1972) is considered a classic in political science research. It points out several factors which influence the decisions made by Congress when considering any policy issue. The authors state that "any given issue must compete with other issues for those scarce resources which determine the outcome: time, energy, attention, money, manpower, and good will" (p. 480). Any Congressional decision is based on economics, political factors, self interest, "the good of the people," and myriad other factors. In studying legislative decision making one must ask, "What information is available to the policy-maker? How far do Congressmen know what their constituents want or even what the pressures on Congress are?" (p. 3). Bauer, et.al. also point out that, "the great decisions a Congressman must make are not so much those determining the position to take on individual bills, but rather decisions as to what kind of a Congressman to be, what sorts of things to specialize in, how to allocate time, and how to project himself into a role of leadership" (p. 478). A final caution which Bauer, et.al. offer is that students of political science are encouraged to
report something rather than inattention, indifference, unconcern or ignorance. Often those things left unsaid or undone by a member of Congress can point to areas of great importance. Looking at the times when pressure could have been applied but wasn't can give one an additional perspective in the analysis of influence factors.

It is with these thoughts in mind that various theories of Congressional decision making will be reviewed.

Kingdon, in Congressmen's Voting Decisions (1973), cites several decision making influences including: political parties, the executive branch, constituencies, colleagues in the legislature, interest groups, congressional staff, reading, and other media. Kingdon has developed a "Consensus Decision Model" which can be used to predict a Member's vote based on how controversial the issue is and how the issue relates to his or her field of interest. The Member uses this consensus model on those occasions when complete agreement is not found in the Member's perceptual field. Kingdon believes that this model predicts voting decisions well and is also politically sensible, since voting according to consensus in a field is entirely consistent with avoiding political trouble.

Matthews and Stimson, in Yeas and Nays: Normal Decision Making in the U.S. House of Representatives, (1975) present a theory of cue-taking which is based on a study of House roll-call votes. Roll-call votes are compared to interview responses of members of Congress in which they identify the people from whom they will or have taken cues when voting. The major premise made by the authors is that the vast majority
of voting decisions made in Congress is made on issues about which very little is known and about which an individual Representative cares very little. When looking at vocational education legislation it would seem that this theory carries some weight. The authors point out that most legislative research focuses on "important" issues. It assumes that "'pressures' have impinged on members - from constituents, parties, colleagues, or their own personal preferences. But how do members decide when these conditions do not hold, when the only effective pressure is to make a decision for the public record?" (p. vii). The authors believe that cues from trusted colleagues who do care about an issue are followed to a great extent.

A third theory of Congressional decision making is presented by Clausen in How Congressmen Decide: A Policy Focus (1973). Clausen suggests that most decisions can be classified onto one of five policy dimensions: foreign and defense; civil rights and liberties; social welfare; farm; and economic. After deciding what the policy content of the issue is, the Member chooses a decision rule which is based on following the lead of the party, the executive or the constituency. Clausen points out that the position taken is based on more than personal attitudes and that there is a mix of the components of influence that will affect a policy decision which will be different for different Members and will also change with policy content.

**Congressional Staffing**

The previously cited studies point out several theories of how legislative decisions are made. Although there has been little empirical
research in the area of congressional staff importance in the decision making process, a look at the research that has been done on congressional staffing will provide background and support for including congressional staff members' perceptions in this study.

Attention to the vast amount of information available to a legislator becomes a necessity for the politician who wishes to survive. Patterson has pointed out that "an interesting property of the highly developed political system is that knowledge tends to become power, that policy-making tends to be determined by knowledge rationally used, by scientific information, and decreasingly by political calculations of power, influence, or electoral advantage" (Kornberg, 1970, p. 391). The rational use of knowledge can be seen as one of the major functions of congressional staff. Increased attention is needed to determine how congressional staff is functioning so that theories might be further refined as to how staff might best function. A State Senator from New York has lamented that the new emphasis on staffing that has resulted from legislative reform has created many unsolved problems. He says, "to help us in decision making, we need not just more staff, not just better-trained staff, so glibly urged by the traditional reformers. We need to know what kinds of staff we need" (Heaphey and Balutis, p. 30).

There are several ways of viewing the importance of staff influence. The literature on congressional staffing can be logically divided into several areas of study. These include focusing on the role and function of staff; the influence of staff size; types of staff; staff organizational patterns; influence in the House compared
to the Senate; characteristics of staffs; and the impact of staff. This study does not treat these areas of research further but they have been included as necessary background in understanding the importance of congressional staff members.

**Staff Role and Function.** When one focuses on the role and function of congressional staff one must first consider the fact that conflicting information may result due to the selective perceptions of those from whom the data are collected. As with any research, it is also possible that the person collecting the data may exhibit selective perception. The role and function of staff may be seen from the perspective of the lobbyist (Milbrath, 1963); the member (Kingdon, 1973; Kammerer, 1951 and 1949; Ripley, 1969); the staff member (Kirst, 1969; Milbrath, 1963; Redman, 1973; Ripley, 1969; Heaphey and Balutis, 1975); or from the perspective of an outside observer (Asbell, 1978; Fenno, 1966; Alderson, 1979). Each perspective will differ in how influential a staff member is seen. Ripley (1969) has stated this perception problem especially well when he speaks of the ambivalent attitudes senators have toward staff members. Generally, senators want more staff members responsible to them as it is a symbol of power but they tend to become jealous of their power and are usually reluctant to share it. They may also worry about nonelected individuals performing the work of elected officials. Ripley goes on to state that the conflict is partially resolved by selective perception: senators realize that they delegate some legislative power to staff because of overwork but they usually believe that they retain the final power of
decision. Staff members see it differently: they see themselves as making a number of final decisions for the senators. Ripley does, however, point out that staffers do worry somewhat about getting too far from the senator's general wishes or they might find themselves looking for new employment (pp. 188-189).

Many studies of the roles of staff members have been conducted, however, the generalizability of most of them is questionable. John Manley conducted a study of the role of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the policymaking process. He cited the staff of this committee as being "a body of experts which early in its history was praised for its work on the technical aspects of tax law" (Lowi and Ripley, 1973, p. 337). He goes on to praise the staff as providing the legislature with a "professional, independent, highly reliable source of information" (p. 337). Manley cites several functions of this committee staff. One of these is to serve as a linkage between houses and between committees in each house (p. 338). Staff members are expected to be objective, bipartisan and neutral (p. 339). The objectivity and neutrality of committee staffers is often questioned. Despite the committee Chief of Staff's stated view of himself as a technician who merely supplied analyses and counsel to the decision-makers, there were many senators who saw his expertise as little help because it only helped support the views of their antagonists (pp. 340-341).

Another function served by the staff is that of a "point of contact between the committee and two key participants in the tax-making..."
process: the Treasury Department and interest groups" (p. 344). The primary job of the staff is to discuss various tax proposals, the technical problems involved in drafting the language necessary to put them into effect, and the likelihood of congressional policy-makers responding positively or negatively to them.

Manley continues his comments on committee staff function with the observation that as the complexity of the decisions facing legislators increases so too does the likelihood that the staff will exert influence on the outcomes. Another factor which affects the influence of staff is the scope of the decision. The more important the issue is to a large number of participants the less likely the judgment of the staff will direct the decision. Although Manley does not come to any firm conclusions he intimates that personal factors such as the relationship between the staff and leading members of the committees will be important in determining staff influence. Questions raised by Manley for which he cites no research yet available include 1) the consequences of having an unstable committee membership but a long term professional staff director, 2) differences between highly centralized committees, and those which conduct almost all their work in subcommittees and 3) ways members rely on staff without becoming captives of the staff. Manley concludes that "staff experts perform important functions in the legislative process but, in the final analysis, they take more cues from the formal policy-makers than they give" (p. 352).
Numerous other commentaries on committee staff role and function can be cited. Kirst has observed that the function of the appropriations committee, "appears to be partly investigative and partly to carry subcommittee instructions directly to executive officials (1969, p. 9). Kirst also cites the heavy role played by staff in formulating the committee report. The staffer "must draw up the skeleton form of the report and the bill, and after the full subcommittee review, write the final draft" (p. 122).

Patterson cites several ways that committee staff are utilized. These include legislative research for members, preparation for floor debate and for committee sessions. He found that "Republicans and Democrats do not differ significantly in committee staff utilization, but members with high committee rank make much heavier use of committee staffs than do those with low seniority" (Kornberg, 1970, p. 400). Committee staffs were also used by executive agencies extensively for both information exchange and negotiations with agency staff personnel (p. 402). Patterson believes that lobbyists consume some staff time but that it is "probably less than is suggested by the conventional wisdom about pressure politics" (p. 402).

Milbrath's research has shown however, that Washington lobbyists tend to prefer committee staff contacts to contacts with members, the personal staffs, or executive agency staffs (1963, p. 267). Patterson cites four specific capabilities of committee staffs. These are 1) intelligence - processing information and supplying it to committee members; 2) integration - of committees and subcommittees, inter-cameral
integration and legislative - executive integration; 3) innovation-initiation of new legislation and public policy; and 4) influence - gathering and analyzing much of the information upon which policy is based, planning and executing public hearings, drafting legislation and committee reports (Kornberg, 1970, pp. 403-412).

Kofmehl's well-known work, Professional Staffs of Congress (1962), cites detailed committee staff work in selecting hearing witnesses, preparing questions, briefing committee members, interrogation of witnesses, participation in round-table discussions, drafting bills, preparing reports to accompany bills, participating in executive sessions, preparing for and assisting during floor action and preparing for conference committee sessions. Kofmehl concludes that these functions of committee staff members indicate "the very complex facilitative job to be done by the professional staffs" (p. 126).

Stephen Bailey, in Congress in the Seventies, points out an interesting perspective on committee staff role when he refers to the "touchy sense of jurisdictional interest" that is often developed by staff members as well as legislators. He says that staff members frequently "educate their superiors to positions of intransigence and jealousy which their superiors would not have had the time or inclination to develop on their own" (1970, p. 60). Fenno cites a long list of functions performed by the clerk of a House subcommittee. These include:

... schedule and oversee the routine of the hearings, suggest areas of inquiry for the hearing, make up specific questions for use in the hearings, prepare the transcript for publication, help prepare for the markup session, oversee the routine of the markup,
participate during markup, help write the subcommittee report and the subcommittee bill, participate in full committee, sit with and advise subcommittee members during floor debates, help schedule and prepare for conference committee meetings, prepare materials for use by House conferees, participate in conference proceedings, receive and digest reports from the investigation staff, keep in constant communication, in season and out, with agency officials, and accompany committee members when they travel to visit agency installations (1966, p. 182).

While Horn does not disagree with Fenno's characterization of the role of staff, he goes point out that "different subcommittee chairmen seek various things from their professional staffs" (1970, p. 70). Some chairmen may depend on staff for extensive preparation of hundreds of questions for use in hearings while others may only ask for brief background information and wish to pose their own questions.

In discussing the role of the committee chairman, Oleszek makes reference to several important roles which committee staff members play. The chair can instruct staff to "stack" witnesses testifying for a favored bill and, through control of committee funds and the power to hire and fire most committee staff members, the chair "can effectively block action on a bill by directing staff to disregard it" (1978, p. 62). Oleszek also cites the use of staff by House floor managers since they are allowed "to have five standing committee staff members on the floor during debate, ready to research rules and precedents, draft amendments, or prepare statements" (p. 113).

Matthews and Stimson, in their analysis of decision making in the House, cite several problems with which members must deal when voting
on the floor. One of these is what they call the "limited utility of staff assistance." They feel that what staff a member has is usually directed to constituency and clerical work. Members who do have legislative assistants usually use them for work in their own area of specialization and are not looking at the legislation that is immediately coming up. Even when staff assistance was available, a number of members felt that "staff members might be good researchers but they were not politicians" (1975, p. 23).

The importance of the role of Senate staff members was well stated by Eric Redman in his book The Dance of Legislation. He decried the shortcomings of the literature at the time (1970) by saying "it was as if the academic community had looked at the glamorous and highly visible tip of an iceberg and declared the tip to be the iceberg, the other 97 percent of the individuals who draw their pay from the Senate Disbursing Office, and who support that tip, were simply left in the murky depths ... anyone who knew the Senate would know that to ignore the role of staff is to ignore not only Senate reality but the key reason why the Senate is still capable of vying with the President for legislative leadership" (1973, p. 17).

**Staff Size.** There is little consensus as to the importance of staff size on the influence staff has on legislative decision making. The long accepted notion of "bigger is better" has been refuted several times in the literature on legislative staffing. Dean Acheson has suggested that "what congressmen need is not 'larger staffs and extensive organization' but 'time to inform themselves and to think'"
Bailey, 1970, p. 61). Bailey cites the phenomenon of the increased number of staff provided for by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as apparently resulting in proliferating "the very business they were supposed to limit. In the two years following (the Act), the volume of bills introduced in Congress nearly doubled" (p. 60). Bailey maintains that this increase in congressional business is due, at least in part, to the creation of additional personal and committee staff.

Bertram Gross once commented that "imaginative staff aides often uncover new problems, new opportunities, and new challenges. They tend to create -- or at least attract -- heavier burdens" (Heaphey and Balutis, 1975, p. 31). Increasing the size of staff is sure to increase the opportunities and challenges and hence the work. Balutis cites several authors who have questioned the increasing staff sizes. He says:

... staffing in itself cannot solve many problems. Whether a legislator will initiate an investigation, follow through on hearings and committee action, and actually vote for legislation may depend on a range of factors completely apart from the availability of staff. Staff may offer only an illusory hope that legislators can escape the burdens of uncertainty, difficult choice and continuing frustration (Heaphey and Balutis, 1975, p. 33).

Types of Staffs. Another distinction that can be made in investigating the relative importance of the roles and functioning of congressional staffs is in terms of the type of staff. Depending on the duties assigned to a staff member he or she may have more or less influence on legislative decision making processes. Jewell and Patterson
(1973) identify two broad types found in American legislatures: the housekeeping staff and the professional staff. "The housekeeping staff performs clerical, secretarial, and service tasks of a relatively routine kind" (p. 250). These employees are occupied with records, schedules of witnesses for committees, clerical detail, office supply and management, mail and services for constituents. "The professional staff performs policy-related tasks, although their degree of involvement in policy may vary a great deal" (p. 251). Several subtypes are included in the professional staff category. Research staff gathers data and other information. The bill-drafting staff provides technical services to legislators in the preparation of legislation. These staff people work for the Office of Legislative Counsel and coordinate their efforts with member's personal staffs and committee staffs. Another subtype is the investigating staff which is often comprised of lawyers and accountants. Subject-matter experts such as economists, accountants, lawyers with a special expertise, natural and physical scientists, and political scientists are among those found in the professional staffs of Congress. A final subtype is the political staff. This grouping includes legislative strategists, ghost writers for political speeches and books as well as the political campaigners who are often found in the offices of senators and representatives and sometimes even on committee staffs. The congressional staff members included in this study were those professional committee staff members who performed research and drafted bills related to vocational education.
Staff Organization. Although the literature cites some research on the influence of staff organizational patterns on the roles of committee staffers, this study does not include data on how the committee staffs are organized.

Kenneth Kofmehl's work (1962) on organizational structures of committee staffs is cited by Jewell and Patterson (1973), by Fox and Hammond (1977), and in the Heaphey and Balutis work (1975). Each of these accounts either builds on Kofmehl's work or cites it verbatim.

Jewell and Patterson describe the organizational patterns evident on committee staffs. The hierarchical, Type I staff, is one in which the chair's staff contacts go mainly through the staff director, who commands both clerical and professional staff personnel. The Type II staff has a committee chair dealing with all professional staff of a pretty much equal basis with the staff director or chief clerk directing the clerical staff. Type III involves the dual leadership of a staff director supervising professional staff and a chief clerk directing clerical staff (1973, pp. 269-270).

House vs. Senate. Research has shown many differences between the staffs of the House and the Senate. Several differences have already been mentioned in terms of role and function. It is also important to note that due to the lack of interest until recently in researching legislative staffing patterns, many of the studies that have been done have involved either the House or Senate but not both. Fox and Hammond's work is a notable exception. Although the two authors conducted their research separately, one in the House and the
other in the Senate, their approaches were similar and the resulting book offers several useful comparisons. Oleszek discusses differences in the roles of senators and representatives and carries those differences over to the staff. Because a senator is expected to be more of a generalist a senator places greater reliance on knowledgeable personal and committee staff aides for advice in decision making. Oleszek claims that a representative is "more likely to be an expert on particular policy issues. If not, he often relies on informed colleagues rather than staff aides for advice on legislation" (1978, p. 26). Oleszek also believes that "Senators rely more heavily on staff assistance during floor debate than do representatives. Aides draft amendments and arguments and negotiate with aides of other senators to marshal support for legislation under consideration" (p. 158).

The literature suggests that there may be some significant differences between uses, roles and functions of committee staffers in the House and Senate.

Staff Attributes. There have been several studies which report on the various attributes of House and Senate staff members and on many individual committees in each house. However, these data are descriptive in nature only. Kofmehl reports on interviews with 58 committee staff members from the 82nd Congress. He outlines their experience, training and several other more subjective attributes. He concludes that the staff members were "well fitted" for their posts and "had as good educational and experience backgrounds as comparable
groups of employees elsewhere in government" (p. 96). Most of them "possessed in good measure the attributes of an adaptable, articulate generalist and had suitable personalities" (p. 96).

The Fox and Hammond studies are more objective than the Kofmehl research. They conclude that aides are young, with Senate aides younger than House; aides have usually had specialized training; they are partisan; they tend to share the liberal or conservative attitudes and are often from the home state of the member for whom they work; females are underrepresented in professional positions; and aides are highly educated (p. 46).

Fox and Hammond also looked at staff recruitment and tenure patterns and found that recruitment is generally nonsystematic, based on personal contact, recommendation, knowledge of an opening, and often is facilitated by a congressional sponsor. There is relatively short tenure in lower-level professional jobs which permits rapid advancement and considerable responsibility early in a career. However, this rapid turnover results in time lost to replacement and training. It does appear, though, that careers for congressional aides are becoming more usual and continuity and stability are expected to increase. Data were collected in the present study from Congressional committee staff members concerning job tenure.

Staff Impact. Although there seems to be information, both opinion and research, that points to the importance of congressional staff, measuring the actual impact staff members have is a difficult undertaking. Fox and Hammond believe that factors which have potential for
influencing staff impact include age and tenure; education; prior experience; state of residence; political values; personality; communication patterns and member-staff relationships. One method of relating staff and output is co-sponsorship of bills but this method "does not measure quality of work, nor can co-sponsorship levels easily be linked to staff activity" (p. 149). For measuring committee staff output, one might look at the number of bills reported out of committee. However, one committee may report ten very complex bills and another may report twenty-five which are less complicated. Another method might be to use time surveys and frequency of activity data. There is a rough correlation between staff size and number of hearings but the relationship is not perfect. Ranking the committee by a legislative index (ratio of measures reported to measures referred) can give another measure of output. However, this method does not distinguish differences in complexity of legislation.

It seems that, to date, any measure of quality has been based on members' comments and subjective judgments on staff performance. Everyone seems to have an opinion about the importance of congressional staff and how influential they are or are not in legislative decision making. However, the caution offered by Heaphey in his introduction to legislative staffing is one which should not be taken lightly. He says "what must be avoided in these early stages of understanding the legislative staff role is an itch to 'solve' the legislature's problems by ridding it of its essence, which is that it is a political process" (p. 2). Attempts to make legislative decision making a logical process
rob the process of its very nature. Influence of congressional staff in the decision making process is but one theory for explaining congressional voting behavior. It is a theory that has been too long neglected and considered inconsequential. However, one must avoid the trap of attempting to explain all legislative decision making in terms of staff influence.

**Interest Groups and Lobbying**

The study of interest group behavior is of vital importance to understanding the history of vocational education and to building its future.

David Truman has defined an interest group as "a shared attitude group that makes certain claims upon other groups in society" (1971, p. 33). He further defines it as a group being formally organized on a permanent basis or at least until its objectives are achieved. A group is considered to be a "political interest group" when it "directs its claim through or upon any institution of government" (Truman, 1971, p. 33). Lobbying is one function of interest groups. It consists of the direct effort of interest groups and others to influence legislation and other public officials through personal contact, either in the form of face-to-face or written communication (Metz, 1972, p. 4).

In his book *The Washington Lobbyists*, Lester Milbrath further clarifies lobbying as the "presence of an intermediary or representative as a communication link between citizens and governmental decision-makers" (1963, p. 7). Milbrath also identifies several kinds of lobbyists. These include: Washington, state capital, county, city,
United Nations, executive, legislative, and "built-in" lobbyists (members of Congress) (p. 8).

While the many definitions and functions of interest groups and lobbies may seem confusing, a statement by Clinton Rossiter helps clarify the seemingly conflicting terminology. He states "we call them 'interest groups' when we are feeling clinical, 'pressure groups' when we are feeling critical, and 'lobbies' when we are watching them at work in our fifty-one capitals" (Metz, 1972, p. 4).

Historically speaking, lobbying has its origins in the right to petition which can be traced back to the Magna Carta in 1215 (Eastman, 1977, p. 3). Sagstetter cites the example of "merchants who hung around kings and courts throughout history trying to gain favors" (1978, p. 11). Certainly they would qualify as lobbyists. For Americans, the right of petition was included in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Lobbying has been a part of government in the United States since its beginning. In the words of one commentator:

Lobbying in one form or another has been with us from the beginning.... It has, indeed, been so deeply woven into the American political fabric that one could, with considerable justice, assert that the history of lobbying comes close to being the history of American legislation (Eastman, 1977, p. 4).

The regulation of lobbying in the United States is documented by Eastman. She writes that "the efforts of Congress to regulate lobbying go back over 100 years when the House of Representatives first passed a resolution requiring all lobbyists to register with the clerk of the House" (p. 5). Although there were sporadic attempts at further regulation it was not until 1946 that Congress adopted the first
comprehensive law governing lobbying. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, passed as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, remains today as the only Federal statute regarding lobbyists' activities. Although this law does not restrict lobbying activities, it does require that individuals and groups seeking to influence legislation in the Congress register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, and file quarterly financial reports (Sachs, 1980, p. 1).

Much attention has been focused on lobbying reform but no changes have been made in the 1946 law. Critics maintain that reform is needed because the law requires registration only by persons paid to lobby for someone else, and only by those whose principal purpose is lobbying. This wording allows many organizations to avoid registering because they claim that lobbying is not their principal purpose. Critics also point to the fact that there is no requirement for the House or Senate to verify the information provided upon registration. The Justice Department can prosecute violators of the law but acts only when it receives a complaint. There have been only four prosecutions since 1946 (Sachs, p. 1). In addition, "the Act regulates only those who lobby Congress; there are no registration or reporting requirements for persons who lobby the executive agencies" (Sachs, p. 1). Despite the repeated pleas for increased regulation of lobbies, days of hearings and volumes of testimony that have been generated in the past five years, there has been no agreement on what actual changes should occur. There is extensive pressure on Congress to close the many
loopholes in the law. Milbrath states that "the public and press have a very lively distrust of lobbying" but he goes on to point out that members of Congress "were reluctant to admit that lobbyists have any influence on their decisions" (1963, p. 6).

Lobbying Techniques. The multiplicity of special interests which exist in the United States today is pointed out by Latham who notes that

... in the small town of Amherst, Massachusetts, there are more than one hundred clubs, lodges, tribes, granges, unions, chapters, councils, societies, associations, auxiliaries, brotherhoods, and fellowships (including the specialities of) cards, cameras, stamps, gardens, churches, teachers, speakers, voters, horses, business, service, golf, nature, fishing, gunning, parents, grandparents, ancestors, needlework, temperance, travel, and kindergarten (Metz, 1972, p. 3).

All these various interests are competing for local, state and federal mandates and resources to promote their special interests.

Jewell and Patterson cite four reasons for the power held by interest groups as identified by legislators. These include the group's 1) representational claims; 2) informational utility; 3) lobbying activity; and 4) extra legislative political activity or power (1973, p. 295). Each of these reasons for power is grounded in one or more methods or techniques used to communicate with Congress. One method of direct lobbying is the personal presentation. This method has been shown to be the most highly regarded lobbying tactic by Milbrath, DeVries, Zeigler and Baer, and Berry (Berry, 1977, p. 215). These face-to-face contacts with individuals in the legislature occur most often with staff rather than with Representatives or Senators.
Another form of direct lobbying is offering testimony at congressional hearings. Although Berry's study found this method to be one of the least effective it was also the most widely used. Berry explains the apparent inconsistency by stating that although "testifying does not have a substantive influence, it does seem to have important symbolic value" (p. 223). A third direct lobbying tactic is legal action. Since litigation is usually very expensive, it tends to be used as a last resort after efforts are made by filing complaints with agencies and filing petitions during rule making.

In addition to the several direct methods of lobbying, Berry has identified a series of indirect methods. Political protests and letter writing campaigns are two methods which employ the efforts of constituents. The main purpose for political protests is to gain publicity for a cause while letter writing is seen as an effective method to convey information and opinion (p. 235). Other indirect methods include contributing campaign money, publishing voting records, and releasing research results.

The study by Milbrath reports a breakdown of how lobbyists spend their time. Examining these figures gives one another perspective on techniques used. Lobbyists spend most of their time receiving and sending communications and most often this is done from their offices. Some time is spent traveling about visiting local groups or in personal conversations with members of Congress however, these consume little time. Gifts and entertainment ranked quite low in general emphasis
although there were some lobbyists who placed more confidence in it and spent more time at it than others (p. 121).

A study by Zeigler and Baer (1969) shows that "legislators utilize lobbyists as sources of influence in three ways: by calling upon lobbyists to influence other legislators, by calling on lobbyists to help amass public opinion in favor of the legislator's position, and by including lobbyists in planning strategy in an effort to negotiate a bill through the legislature" (p. 102). The authors conclude that "whatever their image of lobbyists, legislators are more likely to look on them as service agents than as opinion manipulators" (p. 102).

Ornstein and Elder take a different approach in looking at the functions of lobbies. They cite five functions. The symbolic function may be served by promoting or solidifying the visibility of a group, or to promote the legitimacy of a group. Groups can also be seen in terms of their economic function. Some lobbies exist to promote the economic, or self interest of their members. Another function played by some lobbies is ideological. These ideologies may be as broad as being generally liberal or conservative or reflect a narrower ideology such as the World Federalists Association which believes in "the necessity for a world government transcending national governments" (1978, p. 32). As has been previously stated lobbies can serve an informational function by providing valuable substantive data to members of Congress. Ornstein and Elder conclude with an eclectic category which encompasses instrumental functions -- other concrete
goals that are not economic. Examples are anti-war groups, right-to-life supporters, and the March of Dimes (p. 34).

In addition to the functions of lobbies, Ornstein and Elder identify several types of interest groups. These include business, labor, education, farm, environmental, senior citizens, public interest, civil rights, women's, foreign lobbying, and executive branch lobbyists.

The Education Lobby. When one looks more specifically at education interest groups one finds an array of interests. Stephen Bailey cites the following categories of the hundreds of education interest groups: umbrella organizations (e.g., American Council on Education); institutional associations (e.g., American Association of Community and Junior Colleges); teacher unions (e.g., American Federation of Teachers); professions, fields and disciplines (e.g., Music Educators); librarians, suppliers, and technologists (e.g., American Library Association); religion, race and sex (e.g., National Catholic Education Association); liberal labor lobbies (e.g., AFL-CIO); institutions (e.g., Pennsylvania State University); administrators and boards (e.g., AASA, NSBA); and a miscellaneous grouping which includes the National Student Lobby and the National Committee for Citizens in Education (1975, p. 9). There are interest groups with a concern for vocational education in each of these categories.

The methods and techniques identified previously are used by education interest groups to obtain several benefits. Education interest groups desire "1) protection for their clientele against harm, 2) rules and resources favorable to their clienteles' perceived
interests and 3) personal respectability and recognition" (p. 30). Education interest groups often want contradictory things (more money, less control); they often want different things (support for community colleges, support for research universities) (p. 30). Through the give and take of the political process, decisions are made based at least in part on the influence of the most powerful lobbies. This study attempted to show which interest groups are perceived as the most influential in terms of vocational education legislation.

In relating to Congress, Bailey points out that "personal and committee staff members who concentrate on education matters tend to have enormous influence" (p. 63). This is especially true in the Senate where each member has several diverse committee assignments. On the House side the real education expertise is held by a few key members. Consequently, education lobbyists find themselves much more frequently in contact with representatives than with senators.

Summary

This chapter has provided background through a review of the literature for the development of the research questions considered in the study. A brief overview of legislative research methodology provided a basis for examining the problem of this study through analysis of legislative decision making. An extensive review of the literature concerning congressional staffing provides the foundation from which the conclusion is drawn that, although it is difficult to measure, congressional staff members play an important role in the legislative decision making process. A third section focused on the role and
function of interest groups as an external pressure which has impact on congressional behavior. The education lobby is recognized as a powerful influence on the development of legislation and the role it plays in influencing congressional behavior cannot be ignored.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study is designed to assess the similarities and differences in perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives as to the effectiveness of various lobbying techniques. In addition, the perceptions of relative influence of various interest groups on the development of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 were investigated.

The literature review revealed that there has been minimal research concerning congressional staffing. The literature on interest groups is more extensive. However, little attention has been given to the relationship between congressional staff members and interest group efforts at influencing the development of legislation. Although Milbrath's (1963) extensive study shows that lobbyists tend to prefer committee staff contacts to contacts with members of Congress, personal staffs or executive agency staff, he offers only conjecture as to why this might be true.

Research Questions

Based on the potential for influence of both congressional committee staff members and of interest groups in the development of legislation, this study addresses several research questions which are grouped according to their content.
Lobbying Techniques. Determination of lobbying techniques used by interest groups was an important first step in this study. Some techniques are more effective than others in communicating a group's position on an issue. Determination of the perceived effectiveness of the several techniques can help in understanding why some techniques are used more than others and can provide direction for changes in the techniques used in the future as groups investigate means of communicating their positions on issues. The research questions related to lobbying techniques included:

1. What lobbying techniques are used by various interest groups?
2. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the interest group representative?
3. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?
4. What relationship exists between the perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members concerning the perceived effectiveness of various lobbying techniques?

Influencing Issues. Identification of specific interest groups which were perceived to have had influence on the outcome of several vocational education issues was considered second. Although respondents were not asked for reasons for a group's perceived influence it was thought to be important to link the development of specific issues to the groups which perceived themselves as influential and the groups which were cited as influential by congressional staff members. The reasons for the perceived influence might lie in the techniques used, the merit of the position, the personality of the individual or some
other more difficult to identify factor. Answers to the following questions provide an information base for further research into the reasons for the perceived influence of particular groups.

5. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the interest group representative?

6. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

7. What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived influence on the development of the 1976 Amendments?

Relationship Between Techniques Used and Influence on Issues.
The final question posed in this study compared the techniques used by specific interest groups with their own perceptions of influence and those of congressional staff members. Exploring the relationship between the use of effective lobbying techniques and the perceived influence of a group can lead one to an understanding of how best to attempt to influence legislation. The question addressed was:

8. What relationship exists between the lobbying techniques used and perceptions of interest group influence?

Research Design
The research design for this study was descriptive-survey. According to Kerlinger, surveys are used "to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables" (1973, p. 410). He goes on to state that "survey research focuses on people, the vital facts of people, and their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations, and behavior" (p. 411).
Van Dalen (1973) further clarifies the role of survey research which seems appropriate for this study: "Before much progress can be made in solving problems, (one) must possess descriptions of the problems" (p. 193). Moreover, he states that the objective of descriptive studies is to determine "the nature of prevailing conditions, practices, and attitudes" and to seek "accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes, and persons" (p. 193). These statements support the objective of this study: i.e., to provide a description of the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning their involvement in the development of the 1976 Vocational Education legislation.

**Study Procedures**

The procedures used in collection, treatment and interpretation of data included the following:

1. The development of instruments to collect data on the perceptions of effectiveness of lobbying techniques.
2. The development of instruments to determine perceptions of influence of interest groups on the 1976 Legislation.
3. The validation of instruments by a panel of experts.
4. The identification and validation of a list of congressional committee staff members.
5. The identification and validation of a list of interest group representatives.
6. The conduct of interviews.
7. The administration of survey instruments.
8. The organization, analysis and interpretation of data.
Identification of Subjects for the Study

This study included responses from two populations. Different methods of identification and validation of the groups were used and therefore the groups are treated separately in this section.

Congressional Committee Staff Members. The population of congressional committee staff members consisted of those persons who were professional staff members in 1975-1976 of the respective authorization committees of the House and the Senate of the United States Congress during the development of the Education Amendments of 1976. These committees are the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was estimated that there would be five such persons identified for each of the two committees who had direct input into and were potential targets for interest group influence in the development of the Vocational Education portion of that legislation. The data contained in the Congressional Staff Directory (Brownson, 1974) were used for initial identification of the appropriate staff members.

In an effort to confirm the accuracy of the congressional committee staff member population a visit was made to Washington, D.C. to talk with key staff in the House and the Senate. Staff members still in Washington, but no longer in the same employment as in 1975-1976 were considered to be members of the population as well as those still with the committees.

The preliminary information obtained on staff members from the Senate committee led to the development of a list of six persons.
However, it was subsequently learned that there were only two main staff members who would have first hand information and who were directly involved in the work of developing the bills that finally became law. While several unsuccessful attempts were made to contact the six potential respondents directly, further discussion with other staff members led to the realization that in fact there were only two staff members directly involved.

A successful interview was completed with one of them. The other one had taken employment outside the Washington, D.C. area and had not been initially considered as a potential interviewee due to location. However, given the lack of availability of other staff members, it was decided to conduct a telephone interview. However, the potential respondent refused to be interviewed.

Preliminary information for staff members from the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor included the known and confirmed existence of three potential interviewees. Review of the hearings held on vocational education in 1975 yielded the names of four additional staff members who attended some of the hearings. However, further research and inquiry revealed that those staff members played very minor roles in the development of the legislation. One attended hearings because of a concern for educational programs for Indians while another worked for the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee.

Interviews were successfully completed with one of the two key staff members and with one House staff member who was not involved with
the initial hearings but was a key participant in the mark-up of the House bill and with the conference committee consideration. The second key House committee staff member refused to be interviewed, and indicated that any information that might be provided would be a duplication of what other staff in the House and Senate had provided.

In summary, the population of professional congressional committee staff members was a total of five persons. Interviews were completed with three of those persons.

**Interest Group Representatives.** The population of interest group representatives was composed of the interest groups which testified and/or submitted statements for the record of the House and Senate hearings held in 1975 and 1976 in consideration of vocational education legislation. The population was limited to those organizations which have national membership and maintain at least one staff member in Washington, D.C. The list of groups was limited to those who testified or submitted statements on behalf of groups rather than as individual persons or institutions.

It was anticipated that the population of interest group representatives would consist of approximately 35 groups. It was, however, necessary to limit the respondents to those who had involvement with the same interest group and with vocational education legislation development in 1975-1976. Identification of the specific representative from each interest group was determined from reports of hearings and confirmed with phone calls to the organizations.
After eliminating from consideration the groups for which there was no one available who was involved with development and promotion of the group's position on vocational education legislation, there was a total of 26 potential respondents. From that total, interviews were conducted with a random sample of seven groups. The remaining 19 groups received the mailed questionnaire.

**Development of Research Instruments**

Data collection instruments were developed specifically for this study and included interview guides and a mailed survey questionnaire.

The lobbying techniques identified in Part A of the survey instrument were initially identified in research done by Milbrath (1963), DeVries (1960), and Berry (1977).

It is important to distinguish between lobbying technique and lobbying strategy. A strategy is a general, long-range approach to lobbying while a technique is the immediate, day-to-day activities of an interest group (Berry, 1977). While previous research had used a list of 10-16 various techniques this study identified four broad categories of communication techniques with four possible persons who might use each of those techniques.

DeVries and Milbrath considered three broad categories. Direct communication included personal presentation of viewpoints, presentation of research results and testifying at hearings. Communication through intermediaries included contact by constituents, contact by close friend, letter and telegram campaigns, public relations campaigns and publicizing voting records. The third category was methods of
keeping communication channels open which included entertaining, giving a party, bribery, contributing money and campaign work. This study did not concern itself with the methods of keeping communication channels open. Several other responses requested by DeVries and by Milbrath are categorized as strategies and are therefore not specifically addressed in this study.

The vocational education issues in Part B emerged during the development of the 1976 legislation and were determined from the hearings held in the House and Senate. A study done by Christoffel (1975) also provided information on the alternatives being considered in the development phase of the legislation. Further information on each issue is included in Appendix F.

Several resources were used in the development process. Berry's interview guide which was used to assess the political behavior of public interest groups points out several techniques which were important for the interviews as well as types of questions which are appropriate for eliciting information from interest group representatives in the mailed survey. Other useful resources included Berdie and Anderson's Questionnaires: Design and Use (1974) and Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design (Bradburn and Sudman, 1979).

In designing the mailed questionnaire for the interest group representatives, the following suggestions made by Hillestad (1977) were kept in mind.

1. Visualize the respondents.
2. Group together questions dealing with each aspect of the study.
3. Arrange questions in either a psychological or logical order.

4. Make apparent that the questions are related to the purpose of the study.

5. Use an easy-to-answer format.

6. Design an attractive questionnaire.

7. Supply clear, complete directions.

8. Write a good cover letter and follow-up reminders.

Appendixes B and C contain copies of the interview guides and questionnaire. Drafts of the questionnaire and interview guides were reviewed by a panel of experts familiar with both of the populations being studied. This panel consisted of personnel from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education who have experience in working with interest groups and congressional staff members.

Several helpful, though minor suggestions were made to improve both the content and the format of the instrument. The panel members were asked to comment on clarity and format of the instrument and the appropriateness and completeness of the content. Panel members suggested that the sources of the lobbying in Part A of the instrument also include employees of the Executive Branch. The term "friend or associate of legislator" was changed to "close friend of legislator" to be more distinct from constituent. It was also suggested that an "other" category be included in each section of the instrument. Suggestions were also made by panel members for the content of the letter to accompany the mailed survey.
Administration of Research Instruments

Two methods of data collection were used, the personal interview and the mailed questionnaire.

The personal interview. Congressional committee staff members and a random sample of seven interest group representatives were personally interviewed in Washington, D.C. Interview dates and times were established with each interviewee by phone. Each interviewee was informed that participation was voluntary and that responses would be kept strictly confidential. All interviews took place within a two week period. The average length of the interviews was 36 minutes. A guide was used during the interview on which the researcher recorded answers. Brief notes were made on responses to open ended questions. Immediately following each interview, a narrative account of the interview was written including comments made by the interviewee and observed conditions of both the interviewee and the environment. Respondents were assured both in the pre-interview phone call and at the time of the interview, that their remarks would not be personally attributed in the report of the research. The results of the research will be made available in abstract form for those who indicated their desire to receive a copy.

The mailed questionnaire. The interest group representatives who were not chosen in the random sample to be interviewed were surveyed by mail. The introductory letter was addressed to the specific person who was responsible for the group's lobbying efforts with regards to vocational education in 1975-1976. Each respondent was informed that
participation was voluntary and that responses would be strictly confidential. Respondents were not required to identify themselves by name on the questionnaire. The name of the organization each represented was requested both for follow-up purposes and for actual data analysis purposes. A pre-addressed, stamped envelope was included with the initial mailing of the questionnaire. Respondents were requested to return the surveys within ten days from the date the letter was mailed. Twenty days after the initial mailing phone calls were made to all non-respondents requesting that the survey be returned. Approximately one month after the initial mailing a second request was mailed in which a return post card was also included requesting information on the reason for non-response. Samples of these letters are included in Appendixes D and E.

Organization and Analysis of Data

The data obtained from each group were tabulated for descriptive purposes. Frequencies and means for the various responses were computed. When appropriate, the range of responses was also computed.

An important addition to the quantitative data collected in this study is the comments made by respondents regarding their answers. Some of the conclusions drawn in this study result from a comparison of responses from several sources. Patton (1980) describes the method of data analysis referred to as triangulation as "cross-checking consistency of information derived at different times and by different means within qualitative methods" (p. 330). Although this study is not qualitative in nature, it does have some qualitative features. Patton
further explains that "triangulation seldom leads to a single, totally consistent picture" (p. 331). He states that the idea is to study and begin to understand why there are differences in two data sources.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was designed to assist vocational educators in understanding some of the influences which help determine federal vocational education legislation and law-driven policy. Due to the lack of research relating specifically to the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments and, in a more general way, a lack of information on the dynamics of the interaction between congressional committee staff members and interest groups, the data of this study were treated as foundational and investigative and are used for descriptive purposes. In examining the data for similarities and differences in perceptions of the two groups the small size of the two populations must be recognized from the start and caution must be used in interpreting the findings which result from these data.

This chapter reports the data in two sections. The first section describes the characteristics of the two groups, and includes information for respondents and also non-respondents when available. The second section presents the data collected regarding each of the eight research questions.

Profiles of the Populations

Interest Group Representatives. The population of interest group representatives was determined to be those groups which represented national organizations and concerns and which presented testimony and/or
statements included in the hearings held on vocational education in 1975 and 1976. A list of 50 groups was originally identified from the hearings. Through a process of searching addresses and telephone numbers it was determined that 18 of these groups had no staff in Washington, D.C., were no longer in existence, or were in fact affiliates of other organizations in the population and relied upon the same person for their lobbying efforts. The remaining 32 groups were contacted by telephone. Through the telephone calls an additional six groups were eliminated because there was no longer any one currently employed by the organization who had had any contact with the development and promotion of the organization's position on vocational education in 1975-1976. Of the remaining 26 groups, interviews were conducted with a random sample of seven interest group representatives. The remaining 19 groups received mailed questionnaires. Of the 19 mailed surveys 14 surveys were returned, seven of which were usable. The response rate for the population, interviews and mailed survey respondents combined, was 81%. Of the twelve groups from whom no useable data were obtained, seven indicated that they were unable to respond for various reasons. Only five groups did not respond at all. Appendix A contains a list of the 26 groups with descriptions paraphrased from the Encyclopedia of Associations (Akey, 1980).

A limited amount of demographic data was collected from respondents. Table 1 identifies the job titles of the respondents. The most prevalent job title was Executive Director. It would appear, however, that other than the Director, Executive Director and Executive Secretary
titles most of the others were similar positions that specifically related to legislation or government relations within the organization. A total of six respondents (43%) had the title Director, Executive Director, or Executive Secretary. It is interesting to note that the chief executive in many organizations was the person most directly involved with legislation.

TABLE 1

JOBS TITLES OF INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES IN 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative for Federal Assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Representative in Education Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Executive Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director for Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Government Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Executive Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (N) 14 100%*

*Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
Data concerning number of years of employment with the organization were collected. The range was from five years to 18 years. The mean years of employment with the organization was 10.1 years. It should be reiterated that persons employed fewer than five years were previously eliminated from the population since they would not have played a role in the development of the organization's position on vocational education. In nine cases the respondent had been in the same job for the duration of employment. In four cases the person's job title had changed between 1975 and 1981 but they were essentially performing the same job function throughout their employment. One person was in the same department of the organization but a different job than in 1975.

The role played by the interest group representatives in the development of their organization's position on vocational education was requested. Table 2 presents the data concerning these roles.

**TABLE 2**

**ROLES PLAYED BY INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafted Testimony</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with Advisory Boards, Membership and Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Position of Another Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While all of the respondents commented on their own specific roles in detail, the information provided can be grouped according to three general categories. Five (36%) respondents indicated that they played the major role in drafting the group's position. Five (36%) respondents worked extensively with advisory groups and membership in developing their positions while a third group of four representatives (28%) reported that their organization's position had been developed by someone else in the organization or, in some cases, the organization adopted the position of another group.

All respondents reported that their positions on the issues were not developed in isolation. There were varying degrees of participation on the part of others connected to the organization. Some groups formed special, ad hoc committees to work on legislation while others had staff write drafts of testimony and position papers on which the membership, executive boards and other advisory boards were asked to comment. Some respondents also indicated that the positions were voted upon by membership or the executive board when the final draft had been written.

Interest group representatives were asked to estimate the percentage of time spent on developing and promoting their organization's position on vocational education in 1975-1976. Table 3 presents the time estimates. Only two respondents (14%) reported that they spent 25% or more of their time working on vocational education legislation. This suggests that interest group representatives spend a great deal of their time on other duties of their jobs.
TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON LEGISLATION BY INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, it can be said that the most prevalent job title of the interest group representatives responding was Executive Director or Executive Secretary, and that they had worked for the same organization for an average of 10.1 years. While many respondents played a primary role in developing and promoting their organization's position on vocational education, they did so with assistance from membership and advisory groups. The vast majority of respondents spent less than one fourth of their time on vocational education legislation.

Congressional Committee Staff Members. Of the total of three staff members who were interviewed, two worked for the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education and one worked for the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities. Two interviewees had the job title of Counsel to the subcommittee while the third person
was a staff assistant for the subcommittee. The average number of years the interviewees had worked for the subcommittees was ten years.

The role played by each of the staff members in the development of the legislation is important to consider. Two of the interviewees reported that they had played primary roles in drafting the amendments. One of the two cited the scheduling of hearings and then, after the bill had been marked up, writing the committee reports. Both of these primary persons discussed the process of consulting widely with interest groups and individuals. One interviewee spoke of fulfilling the role of providing an "institutional memory" of what had been done in the past in vocational education and why. Also mentioned was the function of framing the issues for members and presenting them clearly and fairly. Another function cited was the handling of negotiations between various groups and also between the congressional staffs of members serving on the subcommittee.

The third interviewee played a less direct, support staff role. This person monitored hearings and assisted the majority counsel in the bill markups by providing background information. This person also provided some assistance with writing of the committee report and was involved in monitoring the conference committee sessions.

In summary, two of the three respondents played major roles in the development of the legislation while the third person provided support to the subcommittee efforts.
Analysis of the Research Questions

The eight research questions posed in this study can be grouped into three areas: lobbying techniques, influencing issues and the relationship between techniques and issues.

Lobbying Techniques

Research Question #1: What lobbying techniques are used by interest groups?

Interest group representatives were asked to identify the techniques they used to influence the development of vocational education legislation. Table 4 presents a summary of the techniques used to communicate positions on vocational education issues.

Of the fourteen interest group representatives responding either through interview or mailed survey, eleven (79%) indicated that they used letters or statements from constituents in their attempts to influence the development of vocational education legislation. Nine (64%) respondents cited the use of letters or statements from a close friend of the legislator. Seven (50%) interest group representatives reported writing letters or statements themselves or from other employees of their organization in their efforts to influence the legislation while only three (21%) groups cited knowledge of the use of letters or statements from employees of the Executive Branch. One interest group representative reported the use of letters from parents of students as being another means used by that group to communicate their position.

When asked about the use of personal visits and presentations, eight (57%) reported that visits from constituents were used. Eight
### TABLE 4

**LOBBYING TECHNIQUES USED BY INTEREST GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Number of Groups Using (N=14)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letters/Statements from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Parent)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Visits/Presentations by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Calls from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Testimony at Hearings by:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups (57%) also cited the use of visits by a close friend of the legislator. Ten respondents (71%) cited visits by themselves or other employees of the interest group. Three (21%) interest group representatives made use of visits or personal presentations by the employees of the Executive Branch while one person (7%) reported that visits by youth were used to communicate their position.

Phone calls to congressional staff members were cited often as being used to present a position or provide information. Nine groups (64%) reported using phone calls from constituents. Nine groups (64%) cited use of calls from close friends of a legislator. Eight respondents (57%) mentioned phone calls from employees of the interest group as being used. Four (29%) interest group representatives made use of calls from employees of the Executive Branch.

With regard to presenting testimony at hearings, seven (50%) groups cited the use of constituent testimony. Three (21%) groups used testimony by a close friend of a legislator. Testimony presented by employees of the interest group was reported to have been used by nine (64%) groups while only two (14%) groups mentioned the use of testimony by employees of the Executive Branch.

Letters and statements were cited the most number of times as being methods of communication used by interest groups to influence and provide information to Congress regarding positions on vocational education issues. Thirteen of the fourteen responding groups said they used both letters or statements and personal visits or presentations by one or more of the categories of people mentioned. Twelve groups
cited use of both phone calls and presentation of testimony at Congressional hearings.

Research Question #2: What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the interest group representative?

Interest group representatives were asked to provide an effectiveness rating for each of the lobbying techniques which they and their organization use in attempting to influence the development of legislation. The five point scale ranged from 1 (not effective) to 5 (extremely effective).

Mean ratings were computed for each technique. The verbal explanations of the numerical ratings which fall between two ratings are described with the term closest to it numerically. For example, a mean of 3.22 is described as moderately effective while a rating of 3.8 is described as very effective. When a mean is in the middle between two ratings it is reported as falling in that range. For example, a mean of 2.5 is described as being slightly to moderately effective. Table 5 presents the effectiveness ratings provided by the interest group representatives.
TABLE 5
EFFECTIVENESS OF LOBBYING TECHNIQUES AS
PERCEIVED BY INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique (N=14)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Selecting Each Rating*</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements from:</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1  5  2  2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2  2  4  1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3  2  1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2  1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Parent)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations by:</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2  2  4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4  3  1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3  5  1</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Youth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls from:</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3  3  2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2  4  2  1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2  4  1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony at Hearings by:</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2  3  2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2  4  2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating scale: 1 = not effective; 2 = slightly effective; 3 = moderately effective; 4 = very effective; 5 = extremely effective.
Phone Calls. Of the eight groups which used phone calls from constituents, three rated them as only slightly effective, three rated them as moderately effective and two gave a rating of very effective. One respondent used the technique but did not rate it. The mean rating for phone calls from constituents was 2.87, moderately effective.

Nine groups reported using phone calls from close friends of legislators. The overall mean for this method was 3.22. Two groups rated it as slightly effective, four groups gave a rating of moderately effective, two groups rated it as very effective and one group gave a rating of extremely effective.

Eight interest group representatives cited the use of phone calls from employees of their organization. Two reported phone calls from interest groups were slightly effective, four rated them as moderately effective and one gave a rating of very effective. One respondent reported using the technique but did not provide a specific rating. The mean rating for phone calls from interest group employees was 2.86 or moderately effective.

Phone calls from employees of the Executive Branch were cited by four groups and received a mean effectiveness rating of 1.5. Two respondents gave this technique a rating of not effective and two rated it as slightly effective.

The overall mean effectiveness rating for phone calls was 2.79, a rating between slightly and moderately effective.

Personal Visits and Presentations. Personal visits and presentations were reportedly used by thirteen groups. The eight groups which
used visits by constituents rated the technique as moderately effective (3.25). Two respondents gave a rating of slightly effective, two gave a rating of moderately effective and four gave a rating of very effective.

Personal visits and presentations by close friends of legislators received an overall rating of 3.63 or very effective. The eight groups rated this technique with four giving a rating of moderately effective, three very effective and one rating the technique extremely effective.

Personal visits and presentations by employees of interest groups were used by ten groups. Of those ten, three rated the technique as moderately effective, five gave a rating of very effective, one gave a rating of extremely effective and one group used the technique but did not provide a rating. The overall mean for personal visits by employees of interest groups was 3.78 or very effective.

Only three interest group representatives cited the use of personal visits by employees of the Executive Branch. Each of those respondents perceived those visits to be only slightly effective.

One respondent perceived personal visits by youth to be moderately effective means of communicating their position.

The overall mean effectiveness rating for personal visits and presentations was a rating of 3.38 or moderately effective.

Letters and Statements. Letters and statements were used by thirteen of the groups responding. Eleven groups reported using letters or statements from constituents and gave a mean rating of 3.5. One
respondent believed this technique was only slightly effective while five interest group representatives perceived it as moderately effective. Two respondents gave a rating of very effective and two also reported letters and statements from constituents to be extremely effective. One respondent used the technique but did not provide a rating.

Letters and statements written by friends of legislators were used by eight groups and were perceived to be moderately effective with a mean rating of 3.44. Two respondents rated the technique as only slightly effective, two gave a rating of moderately effective, four gave a rating of very effective and one rated it as extremely effective.

Of the seven groups which used letters or statements from employees of the interest group, three believed the technique to be moderately effective, two rated it as very effective, one gave a rating of extremely effective, and one respondent did not give a rating. The overall mean for effectiveness of letters and statements from interest group employees was 3.67 or moderately to very effective.

The writing of letters or statements by employees of the Executive Branch was mentioned by three interest group representatives. Two of them gave a rating of not effective and one gave a rating of slightly effective.

One interest group representative cited the writing of letters by parents of students in vocational programs as a technique used by the group. This technique was given a rating of slightly effective by the respondent.
The overall mean effectiveness rating for letters and statements as a technique to influence the development of legislation was 3.17 or moderately effective.

**Testimony.** Presentation of testimony at hearings is a technique which was reported to be used by twelve interest groups. Testimony by constituents was named seven times and received a rating of moderately effective (3.0). Two found the technique to be slightly effective, three believed it to be moderately effective and two reported it to be very effective.

The offering of testimony by friends of legislators was used by three groups. One gave a rating of moderately effective and two rated the technique as very effective for an overall mean of 3.67 or moderately to very effective.

Testimony presented by employees of interest groups was used by nine groups. Of those using it, two believed it to be slightly effective, four found the technique to be moderately effective and two rated it as very effective. One respondent used testimony but did not give a rating. The overall rating for testimony offered by interest group employees was 3.0 or moderately effective as a technique to influence developing legislation.

As was the case with the other techniques, two groups cited the use of testimony presented by employees of the Executive Branch. One group rated this technique as slightly effective and one group rated it moderately effective for a mean of 2.0.
The overall mean effectiveness rating for presentation of testimony at hearings as a technique used to influence the development of legislation was 3.0 or moderately effective.

One respondent cited use of several techniques by the interest group, however the respondent made the general comment that all the techniques were "effective or non-effective depending on time and circumstances and how well they are done." In interpreting these findings one must keep in mind that these are the perceptions of the respondents and can not be generalized to the overall use of the techniques or to the prevalence of use of certain techniques except as related specifically to the questions asked in this study. Another respondent commented that the effectiveness of techniques is dependent upon the people involved, the mood of Congress and the social climate. In reference to the use of close friends of legislators to influence legislation, two respondents were quick to point out that this was a very effective technique but only if the people knew what they were talking about and had a logical reason to be trying to influence vocational education legislation. The example was given that a close friend of the legislator who was also a vocational director could be extremely effective.

Another respondent pointed out that all the techniques, especially personal visits, can be extremely effective if the person making the contact is a representative of a group which was a large contributor to the legislator's campaign.

In summary, the technique receiving the highest effectiveness rating was personal visits by employees of interest groups. This
technique had a rating of 3.78 (very effective). The technique with
the highest overall mean rating was also the personal visit or pre­
sentation with an overall mean of 3.38 or moderately effective.
Letters and statements were next with a mean of 3.17. Testimony at
hearings received a rating of 3.0 and phone calls rated 2.79.

The data can also be examined by the source of the lobbying
effort. Table 6 presents information on the perceived effectiveness
of sources of lobbying as reported by interest group representatives.

The reported use of any of the techniques by employees of the
Executive Branch was very low and the perceived effectiveness of those
techniques was also low. The overall mean for the employees of the
Executive Branch was 1.7, not effective to slightly effective.

The overall mean for use of constituents across techniques was
3.2. For close friend of legislator the rating was 3.5. Employees
of the interest groups received an overall rating of 3.3.
TABLE 6
EFFECTIVENESS OF SOURCES OF LOBBYING AS PERCEIVED BY INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Selecting Each Rating*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>1  5  2  2  3.50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>2  2  4  3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>3  3  2  2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>2  3  2  3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2  2  4  1  3.44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>4  3  1  3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>2  4  2  1  3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>1  2  3.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>3  2  1  3.67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>3  5  1  3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>2  4  1  2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>2  4  2  3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2  1  1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>3  2  2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>2  2  1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>1  1  2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating scale: 1 = not effective; 2 = slightly effective; 3 = moderately effective; 4 = very effective; 5 = extremely effective.
Research Question #3: What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

Congressional committee staff members were asked to rate several lobbying techniques using the same 1-5 effectiveness rating scale as the interest group representatives used. The perceptions they provided were to be based on their contacts with interest groups which attempted to influence the development of vocational education legislation in 1975-1976. Each interviewee gave an overall rating for the technique as well as individual ratings for each category within the technique. The overall rating was not a mean of those within the technique but instead reflected the effectiveness of the technique when compared to the other techniques.

Table 7 provides complete information on the ratings of effectiveness given to the various lobbying techniques by congressional committee staff members.
### TABLE 7

**EFFECTIVENESS OF LOBBYING TECHNIQUES AS PERCEIVED BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting Each Rating*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls from:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony at Hearings by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator (N=2)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale: 1 = not effective; 2 = slightly effective; 3 = moderately effective; 4 = very effective; 5 = extremely effective.
Letters and Statements. Within the letters and statements technique two staff members gave constituents a rating of 3, or moderately effective while one person rated it as a 4, very effective. The mean for letters and statements from constituents was 3.3, moderately effective. One staff member pointed out that the provision of anecdotal information from the constituents' state in letters or statements was a very effective technique.

Letters and statements from close friends of legislators received two ratings of moderately effective and one of extremely effective for a mean rating of 3.7. All three staff members mentioned the importance of the friend being knowledgeable about vocational education. The person who gave the moderately effective rating indicated that a friend of the legislator who was also the State Director of Vocational Education would be more than just moderately effective.

Letters and statements from interest group employees received two ratings of moderately effective and one of extremely effective. The mean rating was 3.7. The staff member who gave the rating of 5 commented that that rating was based on the assumption that the person from the interest group had the trust of the chair of the committee and staff.

Letters and statements from employees of the Executive Branch received two ratings of slightly effective and one of moderately effective. The mean rating was 2.3 or slightly effective. One staff member commented that such letters don't have much impact while another indicated that it depends on the mood of the letter.
The overall mean for letters and statements from all sources mentioned was 3.25 or moderately effective.

The staff members gave an overall rating of letters and statements when compared to other techniques of 2.6. Two gave them a moderately effective rating while one perceived them to be only slightly effective when compared to other techniques.

**Personal Visits and Presentations.** Personal visits and presentations by constituents received a rating of very effective by all three staff members resulting in an overall mean of 4, very effective.

One staff member perceived personal visits by close friends of legislators as moderately effective, one believed them to be very effective while the third rated such visits as extremely effective in communicating one's position. The mean rating was 4 or very effective.

Personal visits and presentations by interest group employees was given a rating identical to that of close friend of the legislator, however the same staff members did not provide the identical ratings. The mean overall rating was again a 4, very effective. One staff member commented on the importance of the interest group having a good reputation from previous contacts in order for the group to be perceived as very effective.

Personal visits by employees of the Executive Branch were rated as slightly effective by two staff members and very effective by one. The mean rating was 2.7 or moderately effective. One interviewee stated that visits by Executive Branch personnel generally did not have much effect except in the case of the commissioner. Another staff
member mentioned that the Executive Branch employees have the advantage of access to legislators which others do not have. The statement was made that "A Senator would never turn down a request from the Executive Branch for a personal visit."

The overall mean for personal visits and presentations from all sources mentioned was 3.7, moderately to very effective.

Staff members gave an overall rating of personal visits and presentations when compared to other techniques of 4.3. Two staff members gave a rating of very effective while the third rated this method as extremely effective.

Phone Calls. Phone calls from constituents received a rating of 3.0, moderately effective. Two staff members gave constituent phone calls ratings of very effective while the third interviewee perceived them to be not effective.

Close friends of legislators who make phone calls in an attempt to influence legislation were perceived to be moderately effective with a rating of 3.3. One staff member gave a rating of extremely effective, one believed them to be very effective while the third person found them to be not effective.

In the case of phone calls from employees of interest groups, a rating of 4.0 or very effective was given. One staff member gave a 3, one rated them a 4 and the third gave a rating of 5. One staff member commented that phone calls can be very effective if the person is backing up information provided in a statement or a personal visit. Another staff member stated that phone calls are often used and "that's the way
business is conducted." It was believed to not be necessary to spend half an hour in person when five minutes on the phone would be enough.

Phone calls from Executive Branch personnel were rated as moderately effective. Two staff members gave a rating of 4 and one rated this technique as slightly effective.

The overall mean for phone calls from all sources mentioned was 3.4 or moderately effective.

Staff members gave an overall rating of phone calls when compared to other techniques of 3, moderately effective. One person rated them as slightly effective, one gave a rating of moderately effective while the third one rated phone calls as very effective.

Testimony. Testimony presented before Congressional hearings by constituents was perceived as moderately effective. Two staff members gave the technique a very effective rating and one believed it to be moderately effective for a mean of 3.6.

Testimony presented by close friends of the legislator received one rating of moderately effective and one of extremely effective. The third staff member did not give a rating for this category. It was stated that close friends of legislators very seldomly testify. The two responses which were given yielded a mean of 4.0, very effective.

Testimony presented in hearings by employees of interest groups received two ratings of moderately effective and one of extremely effective. The mean for testimony from interest groups was 3.7, moderately to very effective.

Testimony presented by employees of the Executive Branch received one rating of slightly effective. One staff member rated testimony as
moderately effective and the third person perceived such testimony to be extremely effective. The mean for testimony by Executive Branch employees was 3.3.

The overall mean for testimony presented in hearings from all sources mentioned was 3.7 or moderately to very effective.

The overall rating for testimony when compared to other techniques was also 3.7, moderately to very effective.

One staff member commented that the effect of testimony depends on the mood of the committee members. If they are asking questions or involved in debate with a witness, then testimony can be very effective. Another interviewee commented that, in the case of interest group employees presenting testimony, the position of the group is usually already known and that other techniques are probably more effective. With regards to Executive Branch personnel the comment was made that such testimony can be very effective if it is honest and not just "parrotting the administration's position." Another interviewee responded that testimony can be very effective but only if it is well prepared.

In summary, several individual techniques received a mean rating of 4.0 (very effective) which was the highest mean. Personal visits from constituents, close friends of legislator and employee of an interest group all received a mean rating of 4. Phone calls from interest group employees and testimony from close friends of legislator also received a mean rating of 4. The techniques which received the highest overall mean ratings when averaging ratings within the
techniques were personal visits and testimony presented at hearings. Each technique had a rating of 3.7 or moderately to very effective. When looking at the overall rating supplied for each technique in comparison to other techniques, staff members rated personal visits the highest with a mean of 4.3, very effective. Testimony at hearings received a rating of 3.7 from staff members while phone calls had a mean rating of 3.0, moderately effective. The lowest mean rating was for letters and statements at 2.6, only slightly to moderately effective.

The data can also be grouped according to the source of the lobbying effort. Table 8 presents information on the effectiveness of sources of lobbying as perceived by congressional staff members.

When looking at the various sources of lobbying one finds that congressional staff members perceived employees of the Executive Branch to be the least effective, regardless of the technique used. The Executive Branch personnel received a rating of 2.9, moderately effective. The overall mean for use of constituents was 3.5. For close friend of legislator the rating was 3.7. Employees of interest groups received the highest mean rating of 3.8, very effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Selecting Each Rating*</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating Scale: 1 = not effective; 2 = slightly effective; 3 = moderately effective; 4 = very effective; 5 = extremely effective.
Research Question #4: What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived effectiveness of various lobbying techniques?

When comparing the effectiveness ratings of the congressional committee staff members with the interest group representatives, some basic similarities in perceptions and a few differences are noted. Comparisons will be made between responses from the two groups by using mean effectiveness rating scores for each technique and for each source of the lobbying effort. Tables 9 and 10 present summary data.

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF LOBBYING TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Congressional Staff Member (X)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interest Group Representative (X)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Statements</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visits/Presentations</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony at Hearings</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
SUMMARY OF PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SOURCES OF LOBBYING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Congressional Staff Member (X)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Interest Group Representative (X)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Friend of Legislator</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Interest Group</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of Executive Branch</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Visits and Presentations.** Personal visits and presentations received the highest overall mean effectiveness rating from both the congressional staff members and the interest group representatives. Personal visits by close friends of legislators and by employees of interest groups were cited as the most effective means of communication by both groups. However, within the personal visits category, neither group perceived personal visits from employees of the Executive Branch to be more than slightly effective.

**Testimony.** Congressional committee staff members perceived testimony presented at hearings to be a very effective technique overall while the interest group representatives saw testimony as only moderately effective. There was a notable difference in the perceived effectiveness of testimony presented by Executive Branch personnel. Although overall, Executive Branch employees were perceived as least effective
by both groups, congressional staff members believed that the testimony presented by them was moderately effective while interest group representatives perceived such testimony to be only slightly effective. It should, however, be pointed out that Executive Branch lobbying efforts were used only one third as often as the other sources of lobbying used by interest groups and therefore their perceptions were based on very limited use of the technique.

**Phone Calls.** There was also a difference in perception of the effectiveness of phone calls. As a general category, congressional committee staff members rated this technique as moderately effective (3.4) while interest group representatives gave a rating of 2.79. Within the phone call category, interest group representatives believed their own calls to be moderately effective (2.86) while congressional staff members perceived them to be very effective (4.0). A similar difference is observed for phone calls from Executive Branch personnel. Congressional committee staff members rated them as moderately effective (3.3) while interest group representatives believed them to be not effective (1.5).

**Letters and Statements.** There was general agreement between the two groups with regard to letters and statements. The overall mean rating from congressional staff members was 3.25 and interest group representatives rated the technique similarly at 3.17. The mean ratings of the sources of the letters and statements were also very similar except for Executive Branch use on which interest group representatives gave a rating of 1.33 and congressional staff gave a rating of 2.3.
Comparison of the overall ratings by source does not reveal extreme differences. Congressional staff members rated employees of interest groups as being overall the most effective while the interest group representatives perceived close friends of legislators to be most effective. However, all the ratings were in the moderately effective range except for the interest group perceptions of Executive Branch personnel effectiveness which were rated as slightly effective (1.7).

In summary, the perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members were generally very similar. Most ratings clustered around the moderately effective range for all techniques of communication and for the sources of those lobbying efforts.

Influencing Issues

Research Question #5: Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the interest group representative?

The ten issues which emerged during consideration of vocational education in 1975-1976 are listed with brief descriptions in Appendix F. Although there were a few additional issues brought up by individual respondents, it is believed that the list of ten does in fact reflect all the significant issues which were being considered. It should also be noted that for each of the issues, at least one of the responding interest groups expressed that it had attempted to influence the outcome.
In order to protect the anonymity of the interest groups participating in this study specific names of organizations will not be used. Appendix A contains a complete list of the population with a brief description of each group. The categorical names used throughout this section (e.g., umbrella organization, institutional association, administrators and boards, etc.) were originally identified and defined by Bailey (1975). Table 11 presents summary data of interest group representative's perceptions of influence.

**TABLE 11**

**SELF-PERCEPTIONS OF INTEREST GROUP INFLUENCE**

**ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ISSUES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attempted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic State Grant Formula</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Homemaking Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Equity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole State Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix F for description of issues.*
Accountability. Six groups reported that they attempted to influence the development of legislation around the accountability issue. There was diversity in the types of groups which made attempts. Those attempting influence were a labor group, a teachers union, two groups representing specific vocational education disciplines, one institutional association and one umbrella organization. The umbrella organization is the only one which believed it had significant influence in determining the outcome of the accountability issue.

Basic State Grant Formula. Attempts were made by five groups from the responding population to influence the formula for determining the basic state grant. There was again a variety in the types of groups attempting influence. Those attempting influence included a labor organization, a teachers union and three groups representing educational professions or disciplines. All three groups representing disciplines believed that they did influence the outcome of this issue.

Consumer and Homemaking Education. Of the fourteen interest group representatives responding, six of them had attempted to influence the inclusion of Consumer and Homemaking Education in the vocational education legislation. Four of these groups represented specific disciplines, one was a teachers union and one was an umbrella organization. Of those six attempts, four groups believed they had significant influence on the development of the issue. These groups were the umbrella organization, the teachers union and two of the groups representing a discipline.
Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides. Six organizations attempted to influence the development of provisions for set-aside funds for disadvantaged and handicapped students. These groups included a labor organization, a group which focuses on religious issues, a teachers union, one group representing a vocational education discipline, an umbrella organization and a miscellaneous group representing students with special needs. Only the umbrella organization and the labor organization did not believe that they influenced these set-asides. The other four groups believed that they had significant influence on this issue.

Guidance and Counseling. Four groups cited guidance and counseling as an issue which they attempted to influence. These groups were an umbrella organization, a teachers union, a labor organization and a group representing a discipline. The umbrella organization and the group representing a discipline believed that they had significant influence on the outcome of that issue in the resulting legislation.

Program Consolidation. Only two groups reported attempts to influence the consolidation of programs. One was an umbrella organization while the other was a group representing a discipline. Neither group believed that they did in fact influence the outcome on this issue.

Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis. A total of seven groups answered that they had attempted to influence the emphasis given to secondary as compared to post-secondary vocational education. These included two institutional associations, one religious organization, a
teachers union, two groups representing disciplines and an umbrella organization. Although these groups represented both secondary and post-secondary interests, all but two groups believed that they had influence on this issue. One of the institutional associations and one of the groups representing a discipline did not perceive that they had had influence.

**Sex Equity.** Five of the responding groups tried to influence the inclusion of sex equity provisions in the legislation. These were an umbrella organization, a teachers union and two organizations representing disciplines and a group concerned with issues of sex. Neither the umbrella organization nor the group concerned with sex issues believed that they had had influence on the legislation with regard to sex equity.

**Sole State Agency.** The sole state agency issue was addressed by five groups. Two groups representing disciplines, one umbrella organization, one teachers union and one institutional organization attempted to influence the development of this issue. Three groups believed that they had influence. These were the two groups representing disciplines and the umbrella organization.

**State Planning Procedures.** The seven groups attempting to influence this issue included one teachers union, one labor organization, a religious organization, two groups representing disciplines, an umbrella organization, and an institutional association. Interestingly, all seven of the groups believed that they had had significant influence on the issue of state planning procedures.
Other Issues. Six groups mentioned one or more additional issues with which they were concerned. Only one issue, that of vocational student organizations, was mentioned more than once.

Some of the interest group representatives made comments regarding their concern for particular issues. One person mentioned the use made by the interest group of an issue as a negotiating tool. One issue was perceived to have the potential for being very divisive so it was reported that, although the group had an interest in the issue, they decided not to pursue it in the interests of unity of vocational educators.

Research Question #6: Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

Congressional committee staff members were asked to name two interest groups which they believed had the greatest influence on the development of each of ten issues. A list of the interest groups which were the population for this study was provided to them as a reminder of the groups which had an interest in vocational education at that time. However, interviewees were informed that their answers did not have to be limited to those groups listed. Two interviewees also mentioned additional issues which they believed were significant.

Accountability. Although reduction of paperwork is an ongoing concern of the Senate, and this issue had the potential for increasing paperwork, the Senate respondent reported that this was a House issue and that there was little if any discussion of it in the Senate. One
of the House respondents believed that the issue emerged as a result of initiation and concern by House members and that if any group influenced its development it was an umbrella organization. The other House interviewee cited one miscellaneous organization and one institutional association as having influenced the development of this issue.

Basic State Grant Formula. This was another issue which it was felt by the interviewee to not have been a significant issue in the Senate. The respondent commented that the Senate had just had a fight on the formula for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) so it did not want to get involved in a similar fight on vocational education. One House member cited an umbrella organization as the most influential but could not name a second organization which had influenced the outcome.

The third interviewee named a group which is an affiliate of the umbrella organization cited by the other House respondent. It is possible that they were referring to the same group.

Consumer and Homemaking Education. Two respondents cited the same organization which represents the discipline of Home Economics as having been most influential on this issue. In addition, all three named the same affiliate organization of an umbrella organization as also having been influential. One of the respondents also mentioned a coalition of groups as having been quite influential. It was pointed out that this issue required much more time during hearings and subsequent negotiations than had been anticipated. One respondent commented that this
issue ended up being "a big battle between family living and white sauce."

**Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides.** Two interviewees named the same group which has a specific interest in the needs of the handicapped. One person mentioned an umbrella organization as having been influential while another mentioned a specific group whose primary concern is the needs of the disadvantaged. The Senate respondent believed that this was a House issue which was prompted by a Government Accounting Office (GAO) report and did not come from the interest groups.

**Guidance and Counseling.** This issue is one of the few on which all congressional staff members were in total agreement. Each mentioned the same group representing the Guidance and Counseling discipline as the only organization which had great influence on the outcome of this issue. One interviewee commented that the interest group wanted more than they got but that they did get a portion of what they wanted. It was also pointed out that Congressional members "like guidance; they think it is good."

**Program Consolidation.** The Senate respondent believed this to be a House issue. The House respondents were unable to cite specific groups which had an interest in or influence on this issue. One commented that no one group realized the importance of this issue. It was observed that many groups have very narrow views of what their interests are.
Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis. All congressional committee
staff members cited the same umbrella organization and the identical
institutional association as having been most important in the outcome
of this issue. In addition, one House and one Senate respondent felt
that a third organization, also an institutional association, was
very important in consideration of this issue.

Sex Equity. One respondent named only one group that came to mind
on this issue, an interest group whose primary concern is with issues
regarding sex equity. Two interviewees named a coalition of groups
to have been most influential. Also mentioned was a civil rights
group. One staff member commented that the groups attempting to
influence this issue were the best organized and that they presented
a united front which was most important in their success.

Sole State Agency. The major "battles" on this issue took place
in the House but the Senate interviewee was able to cite an umbrella
organization as having been influential in the outcome of this issue.
A House interviewee named the same umbrella organization while the
other House interviewee named an affiliate of the umbrella organization.
Both House staff members named the same institutional association as
having been influential.

State Planning Procedures. Two respondents named the same umbrella
organization as an important influence while the third staff member
cited another umbrella organization which had not been mentioned pre-
viously. Also mentioned were two institutional associations. The
Senate respondent indicated that this issue and the sole state agency
issue are where the "Senate battles" were.
Other Issues. One staff member believed that another important issue that was considered was coordination of vocational education with Comprehensive Employment and Training Act programs. It was believed that this was an issue that was a concern of many House members but was not specifically addressed by interest groups. Another issue that was of concern to House members was data collection needs. State administration salaries was an issue of concern in the Senate but also an issue for which specific interest groups were not named as having had influence.

Research Question #7: What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived influence on the development of the 1976 Amendments?

Comparison of responses of the two groups yields some similarities and some differences in perceptions of influence. Table 12 presents data for the two groups.
### TABLE 12

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDING INTEREST GROUP PERCEPTIONS OF INFLUENCE WITH CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF INFLUENTIAL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Groups with Self Perceived Influence</th>
<th>Congressional Staff Perceptions of Influential Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>One staff member named this group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic State Grant Formula</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None of these groups named by staff member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and Homemaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Three staff members named one of the groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged and Handicapped</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two staff members named one of these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Asides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Three staff members named one of these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Consolidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Staff members did not name any groups as influential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary vs. Post-Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Three staff members named one of these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Equity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None of these groups named by staff member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole State Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two staff members named one of these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two staff members named one of these groups; one staff member named another one of these groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability. Agreement on influential interest groups on this issue was mixed. An umbrella organization saw itself as influential and was identified as so by one of the staff members. One responding group was identified as influential by a staff member but did not report having attempted to influence this issue. An institutional association that did not respond was also named as having been influential. Although several other groups reported that they had attempted influence, they did not perceive themselves as influential nor were they named by congressional staff members.

Basic State Grant Formula. There was no agreement on this issue. Only two groups were named by congressional staff members and neither of these groups had reported that they attempted to influence the Basic State Grant Formula development. Three groups representing disciplines perceived themselves to have influenced the outcome but were not named by staff members. It may be that their positions on the issue were reflected in the final legislation which led them to the conclusion that they had influenced the outcome.

Consumer and Homemaking Education. There was agreement on this issue. An affiliate of an umbrella organization was named by all three congressional staff members. The umbrella organization saw itself as having influenced the outcome. A group representing a discipline was perceived to have influenced this issue, however, the group was a non-respondent. Three other groups representing disciplines also perceived themselves as influential; however, they were not mentioned by congressional staff members.
Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides. A miscellaneous group with a specific interest in programs for the handicapped was named by the two House staff members and also perceived itself as having been influential. An umbrella group was named as having had influence but did not perceive itself as having had influence although it had been attempted. One of the House staff members mentioned a group which has interest in racial issues but the group was not part of the population of interest groups in this study. Two other interest groups, one with religious concerns, the other representing a discipline believed that they had influenced the outcome but they were not named by any of the congressional staff members.

Guidance and Counseling. All three congressional staff members named the same group, representing the guidance and counseling interests, as having been most influential in the development of this issue. This group also perceived itself as having been influential. An umbrella group perceived itself as having been influential but was not named by the congressional staff members.

Program Consolidation. Congressional staff members did not name any groups as having had significant influence on this issue. This was similar to the response received from the interest group representatives. Two groups indicated that they attempted to influence this issue but neither believed that they had met with success.

Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis. On this issue there was total agreement between staff members as all of them named the same two interest groups. Two staff members also mentioned two other institutional associations. The umbrella group named by the congressional
staff members also perceived itself as having been influential. The institutional association named by all three congressional staff members was eliminated from the original population because of a personnel change since 1976. An institutional association which was named by one of the congressional staff members also reported to have attempted influence but, interestingly, did not perceive itself to have been influential. One religious organization, one group representing a discipline, one teachers union and an additional institutional association all perceived themselves as having been influential. However, none of the congressional staff members named them as influential groups.

Sex Equity. Congressional staff members named only one group that was part of the interest group population. That group also reported that it had attempted to influence development of the issue but did not perceive itself as having been influential. On this issue the congressional staff members had a difficult time naming other specific groups. They were adamant in their belief of the influence interest groups had on this issue but a united position was presented by a coalition of groups preventing the easy identification of specific influential groups. Two groups were named but they were not members of the population for this study. A teachers union and two groups representing disciplines perceived themselves to have been influential but were not specifically named by the congressional staff members.

Sole State Agency. An umbrella organization was perceived to have been influential by the three congressional staff members and that
organization also perceived itself to have had significant influence on this issue. The two House staff members also named an institutional association as having had influence. Although that association is not included as part of the responding groups, a letter was received from the group which indicated that from the limited knowledge possessed by that individual about the organization's activities in 1975-1976, this was known to have been an issue of great concern for the group. Of the interest groups responding, two groups representing vocational education disciplines believed that they had been influential but they were not named by the congressional staff members.

State Planning Procedures. Two congressional staff members named the same umbrella organization as influential and that organization also perceived itself as having had influence. The third staff member named an umbrella organization that was not part of the population as the most influential. One staff member named an institutional association as influential and that group perceived itself as influential. It is interesting to note that half (7) of the responding groups reported attempted influence on this issue and all of the groups believed that they did have significant influence on the outcome of this issue.

Other Issues. None of the other issues which were named by the congressional staff members were mentioned by the interest group representatives. The same was true of the other issues mentioned by the responding interest groups. None of them were cited by congressional staff members as having been significant issues.
In summary, a total of eleven responding interest group representatives perceived themselves as having had influence on one or more of the issues which were of concern to them. Of those eleven, congressional staff members named only four as having had significant influence on the outcome of the various issues. There were six groups which the congressional staff members perceived as having been influential but which were either non-respondents or for whom there was no representative available who was also present in 1975-1976. There were seven responding groups which perceived themselves as effective but which were not named by congressional staff members as having been influential. Congressional staff members named an additional five groups which were not part of the original population of interest groups. Although these groups were perceived as influential, there was no record in the hearings of submission of testimony, statements or letters from any of them and therefore they were not included in the population for this study. These five groups are cited in Appendix A. It can be noted that four of these five groups are concerned with broad issues such as equity.

There was at least partial agreement on who was influential between staff members and interest group representatives on eight of the ten common issues which were considered in this study. The most striking agreement was regarding the influence of an umbrella organization. The group was named eleven times on seven different issues by congressional staff members as having been influential and saw itself as having had influence on six of the ten issues. There was also at
least partial agreement between other responding groups named by congressional staff members and their own perceptions of influence. However, those perceptions of influence were based on a concern for one issue rather than across several issues as was the case for the umbrella group. The one exception was the group concerned with sex issues which did not perceive itself as influential although it was named by congressional staff members.

Relationship Between Techniques and Issues

Research Question #8: What relationship exists between lobbying techniques used and perceptions of interest group influence held by congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives?

The interest group which was named the most often as having had influence reported the use of all 16 lobbying techniques. There was general agreement between this interest group's perceptions of effectiveness of the various lobbying techniques and congressional staff members' perceptions. On only five of the 16 techniques was there a difference of more than one point between the interest group's rating and the mean rating computed for the congressional staff members.

An interest group which falls in the miscellaneous category and was cited by congressional committee staff members as having had influence reported that it used letters, statements and phone calls from constituents and interest group employees as well as personal visits and testimony by interest group employees. All of these techniques received overall ratings from congressional committee staff members as moderately to very effective indicating that a group perceived as influential used techniques perceived to be effective.
An institutional association which was named four times as having been influential reported using letters, statements, personal visits, and phone calls from constituents and close friends of the legislators. The group also reported using constituent testimony. All of these techniques were rated as moderately to very effective. The mean score, using the congressional staff member ratings for these seven techniques is 3.6.

An interest group representing a discipline was named by all three congressional staff members as having been influential on an issue. The group reported that it had used a variety of eleven different techniques in their attempts to influence the development of several issues.

If a mean score is computed for each responding group using the congressional staff member ratings for the techniques reportedly used by each of the groups the results show a range for the fourteen groups of 3.5 to 3.9. This score places all the groups responding in the moderately to very effective range for all techniques used. This shows that such comparisons reveal little difference between techniques used and the influence the various groups had. Even though one group used moderate to very effective techniques, they were not necessarily named as having been influential. This may be due to the number of times the technique was used or to some factor of quality regarding the technique itself for instance content or clarity of the communication or the merit of the position.

Other factors which may affect how influential an interest group is perceived to be may be more important than the type or quality of
Comments made by some of the respondents reveal some possibilities. One interest group representative pointed out that influencing legislation is a cyclical process in which the people, the mood of Congress and the nation's social climate all affect the compromises which are made in the development of legislation. Another respondent's comments also reflect a potential reality: "all the techniques are effective or non-effective depending on time and circumstances." Timing of lobbying efforts is most important.

Caution should also be exercised in attempting to show cause-effect relationships in situations where logic and rational decision-making processes are often not the most effective or efficient methods to use. The same care must be taken that was recommended by Heaphey (1975) in his discussion of legislative staffing. Attempts to logically explain the influence of specific interest groups rid the process of its essence, which is that it is political.

**Summary**

The findings of this study are based on perceptions of interest group representatives who attempted to influence the development of vocational education legislation and congressional committee staff members who were involved in the development of that legislation.

Letters or statements were named the most number of times of the four techniques to which interest group representatives responded. Thirteen groups cited use of personal visits or presentations to influence the development of legislation. Twelve groups mentioned the use of phone calls and the presentation of testimony.
Effectiveness ratings provided by interest group representatives revealed that personal visits by employees of interest groups were perceived as most effective. The least effective means of communicating an interest group position was perceived to be through the use of communication by employees of the Executive Branch.

Congressional committee staff members perceived several techniques to be most effective. These included personal visits and presentations from constituents, close friends of legislators and employees of interest groups as well as phone calls from interest group employees and testimony by close friends of legislators. As a general category, employees of interest groups received the highest mean rating.

The perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members were generally very similar. Ratings clustered around the moderately effective range for all techniques except use of the Executive Branch for both groups.

Eleven responding interest group representatives perceived themselves as having had significant influence on one or more vocational education issues. Congressional staff members named four of those groups as having had significant influence on the outcome of the various issues. Of the ten issues presented there was at least partial agreement of which groups were influential on eight issues. All four of the responding groups perceived as influential by congressional committee staff members also perceived themselves as having had influence.
Little difference was revealed when the techniques used by interest groups were compared to the perceived influence of those groups.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this study was to supply information to vocational educators, and others with an interest in vocational education, concerning the effectiveness of lobbying techniques used to influence the development of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments. Through the assessment of perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members, the use and effectiveness of various lobbying techniques was determined. An additional purpose was to assess the perceptions of the two groups of respondents regarding the influence various interest groups had in the outcome of several issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 vocational education legislation.

The fundamental problem addressed by this study was:

What are the similarities and differences in perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning the effectiveness of various lobbying techniques used to influence the development of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments.

Research Questions. The specific research questions addressed by this study can be divided into three topics.

Lobbying Techniques.

1. What lobbying techniques are used by various interest groups?
2. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the interest group representative?

3. What lobbying techniques are perceived as effective from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

4. What relationship exists between the perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members concerning the perceived effectiveness of various lobbying techniques?

Influencing Issues.

5. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the interest group representative?

6. Which interest groups are perceived to have influenced the outcome of various issues which emerged in the development of the 1976 Amendments from the point of view of the congressional committee staff member?

7. What relationship exists between the perceptions of congressional committee staff members and interest group representatives concerning perceived influence on the development of the 1976 Amendments?

Relationship Between Techniques Used and Influence on Issues.

8. What relationship exists between the lobbying techniques used and perceptions of interest group influence?

Procedures. The data reported in this study were obtained from responses from two populations. The subjects identified were five congressional committee staff members who were professional staff members in 1975-1976 of the respective authorization committees of the House and the Senate of the United States Congress during the development of the Education Amendments of 1976. Personal interviews were completed with three congressional committee staff members.
The population of interest group representatives was composed of 26 interest groups which testified and/or submitted statements for the record of the House and Senate hearings held in 1975 and 1976 in consideration of vocational education legislation. The population was limited to those groups which have national membership and maintain at least one staff member in Washington, D.C. Personal interviews were completed with seven interest group representatives and seven useable mailed surveys were returned.

The survey instruments, which were used either as an interview guide or mailed survey, were developed specifically for this study. Interest group representatives were asked to identify the lobbying techniques they had used in attempting to influence the development of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments. Four techniques were identified on the instrument. They were letters and statements; personal visits or presentations; phone calls; and testimony at hearings. In addition, for each technique, four sources of lobbying were identified. The sources were: constituent; close friend of the legislator; employee of an interest group; and employee of the Executive Branch.

Interest group representatives were asked to provide an effectiveness rating for each technique they had used. The rating scale ranged from 1 (not effective) to 5 (extremely effective). In addition, they were asked to identify the vocational education issues which they had attempted to influence and to indicate their perceptions as to whether they had had significant influence on the outcome of those issues.
Congressional committee staff members were asked to provide effectiveness ratings for various lobbying techniques used by interest groups. Congressional committee staff members were also asked to name two interest groups which they perceived to have influenced the outcome of ten vocational education issues.

The data were analyzed using descriptive techniques of frequencies and measures of central tendency. The findings also include comments made by respondents.

Summary of Major Findings.

1. Letters or statements were cited most frequently as being a method of communication used by interest groups to influence and provide information to congressional staff members regarding positions on vocational education issues.

2. Interest group representatives gave the highest mean effectiveness rating to personal visits by employees of interest groups. The technique with the highest overall mean was also the personal visit or presentation.

3. Interest group representatives rated contact by close friends of the legislator as the most effective of the four sources of communication used in this study. Executive Branch employees were rated as least effective by interest group representatives.

4. Congressional committee staff members provided the highest mean effectiveness rating to personal visits from constituents, close friends of legislators and employees of an interest group as well as phone calls from interest group employees and testimony from close
friends of legislators. Two techniques received the highest overall mean ratings. These were personal visits and testimony presented at hearings.

5. Congressional committee staff members rated contact by employees of interest groups as the most effective source of communication regarding the development of legislation.

6. The perceptions of interest group representatives and congressional committee staff members regarding the effectiveness of lobbying techniques were generally very similar. The effectiveness ratings clustered around the moderately effective range for all techniques of communication and for the source of those lobbying efforts.

7. A total of eleven responding interest group representatives perceived themselves as having had influence on one or more of the issues which were of concern to them. Of those eleven, congressional committee staff members named only four as having had significant influence on the outcome of the various issues.

8. Congressional staff members named five interest groups which were not a part of the population as having been influential. Although these groups were perceived as influential, there was no record in the hearings of submission of testimony, statements or letters from any of them.

9. Partial agreement was found on eight of the ten common issues between perceptions of the two groups concerning influence on the outcome of various issues. There was agreement the most number of times regarding the influence of an umbrella organization. The group was
named eleven times on seven different issues by congressional staff members and perceived itself as having had influence on six of the ten issues.

10. There was no relationship found between the use of effective techniques and the perceived influence of interest groups. A group using lobbying techniques perceived by congressional staff members to be effective was not necessarily named as having been influential.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected and the previously reported findings, the following conclusions are considered justified.

1. Interest groups use a variety of techniques in attempting to influence the development of vocational education legislation.

Eleven out of fourteen groups reported using all four lobbying techniques in their organization's efforts to influence the outcome of various issues. While use of letters or statements was reported most often (31 times), the use of phone calls (30 times) and personal visits and presentations (30 times) were used to a similar degree. Presentation of testimony was reported 21 times as a technique used by interest groups.

2. Interest group representatives use techniques by sources which they perceive as being effective and do not use those which are perceived as being ineffective.

The Executive Branch as a source of communication for interest groups was used infrequently. When its use was reported, it was
perceived to be the least effective receiving a mean rating from interest group representatives of slightly effective. Congressional staff members also gave the Executive Branch employee the lowest effectiveness rating.

3. Interest group representatives and congressional staff members agree that personal visits and presentations are the most effective lobbying technique overall.

Interest group representatives rated this technique as moderately effective (mean rating of 3.4) while congressional staff members rated it as very effective (mean rating of 3.7).

4. Congressional staff members and interest group representatives agree that contacts made by close friends of legislators and by employees of interest groups are the most effective sources of lobbying.

Both groups perceived these two sources of lobbying to be moderately to very effective.

5. Interest groups and congressional committee staff members do not agree on the influence of various interest groups.

Of the eleven interest groups which perceived themselves as influential, congressional staff members named only four groups as having had significant influence on the outcome of the various issues.

6. It is not necessary to present testimony, written statements or letters in order for an interest group to be perceived as having significant influence by congressional committee staff members.

Congressional staff members named five interest groups which were not part of the population for this study as having been influential.
7. The use of lobbying techniques perceived as effective does not necessarily result in an interest group being perceived as influential.

When a mean score is computed for each responding group using the congressional staff member ratings for the techniques used by each interest group, the results show a range of 3.5 to 3.9 which places all the groups responding in the moderately to very effective range for techniques used. However, only four of those groups were perceived to have been influential and perceived themselves as influential.

8. Congressional committee staff members exert great influence in the determination of the content of vocational education legislation. Although it was found that the number of staff members directly involved in drafting the legislation was only four persons, those staff members determined the content based on extensive contacts with interest groups.

9. There are relatively few letters and statements submitted to the House and Senate authorization committees which consider vocational education legislation. The vast majority of those letters and statements are published in the Hearings of the respective committees.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the previously cited findings and conclusions. It is recommended that:

1. People who want to influence the development of vocational education legislation make use of a variety of lobbying techniques.
Although some techniques were perceived to be more effective than others, the interest groups which were perceived as influential used the same techniques as those which were not named as influential. People should also be aware of the multiplicity of factors which are operant at a given time.

2. Interest groups cultivate the support of close friends of legislators and that supporters of vocational education develop contacts with legislators. Congressional staff members and interest group representatives agreed that close friends of legislators are moderately to very effective sources of lobbying. However, despite the perceived effectiveness of this source, it was not the most frequently used indicating that interest groups may not have access to friends of legislators for lobbying purposes.

3. Constituents and others making contact with congressional committee staff members be trained to provide accurate, complete, yet brief information regarding vocational education. Congressional staff members and interest group representatives commented several times that the effectiveness of any of the techniques was dependent on these quality factors as well as on the source of the lobbying.

4. Interest groups be aware of all the issues being considered, know how they might affect their membership or constituency, and communicate that potential effect to congressional committee staff members and members of Congress.

5. Research be conducted concerning the factors which affect the influence of various interest groups. The fact that five interest
groups were named by congressional committee staff members as having been influential but for whom there was no record of testimony, letters, or statements being presented indicates that there may be factors affecting perceived influence which were not a part of this study.

6. Research be conducted regarding the role and function of congressional committee staff members in the development of vocational education legislation. Increased knowledge of the role and functioning of staff members can assist vocational educators in understanding the need, purpose, and importance of information provided by a variety of sources.

7. Research be conducted to determine the factors which affect interest group decisions regarding which lobbying techniques to use. The frequency of use of a technique may, of necessity, be based on the availability of resources, both financial and human, more than on the perceived potential effectiveness of that technique.

8. Research be conducted concerning the "quality" of the lobbying techniques used by interest groups. Both groups of respondents commented on the importance of the quality of contacts made, however, the factors which determine "quality" need further exploration. Some of these factors include timing, accuracy and clarity of information, and reputation of person presenting the position.
APPENDIX A

POPULATION OF INTEREST GROUPS
Population of Interest Groups

Aerospace Education Foundation (AEF) RN*
Exists for the education of the public at large a greater understanding of the field and the dissemination of information concerning new accomplishments in the field.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) RN
Organization of institutions. Members: 1305.

American Association of School Administrators (AASA) N
Professional association which sponsors numerous seminars annually including inservice seminars for members. Members: 19,000, Staff: 55, Local Groups: 74.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) R
Organized to enable members to express their views regarding national affairs and for other purposes. Members: 370.

American Federation of Labor - Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) R
Federation of national, state, city and local units. Members: 13,600,000, Staff: 600.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT) RN
Conducts research programs on key educational issues. Members: 555,000, Locals: 2100.

American Home Economics Association (AHEA) N
Professional organization works to improve the quality and standards in the field through education, research, cooperative programs and public information; attempts to affect public policy as it relates to the discipline. Members: 45,000, Staff: 54, State Groups: 52.

American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) R
Professional society of workers in schools, community agencies and organizations. Members: 41,000, Staff: 50, State Groups: 53.

American Vocational Association (AVA) R
Organization of teachers, supervisors, administrators and others interested in the development and improvement of the discipline. Members: 57,000, Staff: 50, State Groups: 57.

Association of Independent Colleges and Schools (AICS) R
Organization of institutions. Members: 525, Staff: 15.

*R = Respondent/Useable Data (n=14); RN = Respondent/No Useable Data (n=7); N = Non Respondent (n=5).
Center for Law and Social Policy - Women's Rights Project RN
Institution in which experienced professionals and selected students participate in providing services for previously underserved groups on major problems of public policy.
Professional Staff: 14.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) RN
Organization of professionals which conducts research programs.
Members: 56.

Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) R
Teachers, school administrators, teacher educators and others with a direct or indirect concern for the education of a special group. Members: 63,000, Staff: 95.

Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) RN
Organization of high school juniors and seniors; junior college students. Members: 200,000, Staff: 18, State Groups: 54, Local Groups: 5500.

Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) R
Organization of students and alumni in the discipline. Members: 190,000, Staff: 14, State Groups: 50, Local Groups: 8800.

Future Farmers of America Alumni (FFA Alumni) R
Organization of former active, collegiate or honorary members and present and former professional teachers of the discipline. Exists to promote the discipline on local, state and national levels. Members: 18,000, Staff: 1.

Future Homemakers of America (FHA) R
Organization of students studying the discipline and related occupations in public and private schools. Members: 450,000, Staff: 22, State Groups: 52, Local Groups: 12,626.

Home Economics Education Association (HEEA) R
Seeks to promote effective programs in the discipline; to supplement existing services available to professionals in the field; to cooperate with other associations in related fields and to publish materials of interest. Members: 3700.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) N
Organization which attempts to focus public attention on problems of this special segment of education and on contributions made by these groups. Members: 142, Staff: 20.

National Business Educators Association (NBEA) R
Organization of teachers, administrators and researchers; Members: 23,000, Staff: 7, State Groups: 54.
National Education Association (NEA) R
Professional organization of teachers, professors, administrators, counselors and others interested in American education. Members: 1,600,800, Staff: 600, State Groups: 53.

National School Boards Association (NSBA) N
Provides information on such topics as curriculum development and legislation affecting education and school administration. Members: 52, Staff: 90.

Project on Equal Education Rights (PEER) R
Mobilizes coalitions of citizens' groups to work with their school districts. Keeps parents, community groups and educators informed of developments in Congress, in federal agencies, in the courts and around the country related to the area of concern.

United Cerebral Palsy Association N
National federation of state and local affiliates. Membership is held by official representatives who compose the national delegate voting body. Members: 277, Staff: 100.

United State Catholic Conference (USCC) R
Provides an organizational structure and the resources needed to insure coordination, cooperation and assistance in public, educational and social concerns at the national, regional, state and local levels. Staff: 350.

Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA) N
Federation of state associations and local clubs; organized by a representative group of state club sponsors. Members: 275,000, Staff: 19, State Groups: 48, Local Groups: 12,000.

Additional Interest Groups Cited by Congressional Staff Members

American Council on Education (ACE)
Council of colleges, universities and educational organizations for the advancement of education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary action on the part of American educational associations, organizations and institutions. Members: 1573.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (LCCRL)
Operates through local committees of private lawyers to provide legal assistance to poor and minority groups living in urban centers. Members: 168, Staff: 80, Local Groups: 10.

National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs
Oversees implementation of Women's Educational Equity Act.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund (NAACP LDF)
Legal arm of the civil rights movement functioning independently of the NAACP. Represents civil rights groups and individual citizens who have civil rights claims. Staff: 94.

National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
Functions to unite national organizations in joint actions to strengthen national policies and practices concerning women and girls in education.
APPENDIX B
INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVE
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
DEVELOPMENT OF THE 1976 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION SURVEY

Name (optional) _________________________________ Code No.: ___________
Organization _________________________________________
Address_________________________________________________

Your current job title ____________________________________________
Number of years in this job _________

Your job title in 1975-76 ______________________________________
Number of years in that job _________

Briefly describe the role you played in the development of your organization's position on Vocational Education legislation in 1975-1976.

Briefly describe the roles others in your organization (membership; staff; etc.) played in the development of your organization's position on Vocational Education legislation in 1975-1976.

Approximately what percent of your time was spent on developing and promoting your organization's position on Vocational Education legislation in 1975-1976?

_____ 100%  _____ 75%-99%  _____ 50%-74%  _____ 25%-49%  _____ 0%-24%
PART A

Below are listed various techniques used to influence the development of legislation. In your contacts with Congressional staff members concerning the development of the 1976 Vocational Education legislation, which techniques did your organization use? Please indicate those with a check mark (✓) to the left of each technique. Then, please indicate the effectiveness of those techniques which you have used in influencing staff members by circling the appropriate number using the following scale:

1 = not effective
2 = slightly effective
3 = moderately effective
4 = very effective
5 = extremely effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters/Statements from:</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>slightly effective</th>
<th>moderately effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friend of legislator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of interest group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Visits/Presentations by:</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>slightly effective</th>
<th>moderately effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friend of legislator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of interest group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Calls from:</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>slightly effective</th>
<th>moderately effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friend of legislator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of interest group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testimony at Hearings by:</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>slightly effective</th>
<th>moderately effective</th>
<th>very effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friend of legislator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of interest group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee of the Executive Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are ten issues which emerged during consideration of the 1976 Vocational Education legislation. Please indicate with a check mark (✓) in the first column, those issues which your organization attempted to influence. Then check the second column if you believe your organization had significant influence in determining the outcome of that issue in the resulting legislation. If there are other significant issues which you attempted to influence, please list them and check the appropriate columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attempted to Influence</th>
<th>Influenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic State Grant Formula</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consumer and Homemaking Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Consolidation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sex Equity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sole State Agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State Planning Procedures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ___________________________</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ___________________________</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You may use this space to make any comments you would like concerning this questionnaire.

Please check here if you would like to receive a copy of an abstract of the results of this study (available September 1, 1981).

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

Please return in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to:

Susan E. Klaiber
Department of Vocational-
Technical Education
The Ohio State University
29 N. Woodruff Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210
APPENDIX C
CONGRESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER
INTERVIEW GUIDE
CONGRESSIONAL STAFF INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name ___________________________ Code No.: ____________

Organization _______________________________________

Address _______________________________________

Current job title (if any) _______________________________________

Years in this job __________________________________________

Job title in 1975-1976 (if different from current) ________________

Years in that job __________________________________________

Briefly explain your role in the development of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments.
PART A

A number of possible techniques can be used in trying to influence the development of legislation. Based on your contacts with interest groups which attempted to influence the development of the 1976 Vocational Education legislation, please indicate your perceptions of the effectiveness of each technique listed (on card A) (below). Please use the scale on card B.

Letters/Statements from:

- Constituent: 1 2 3 4 5
- Close friend of legislator: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of interest group: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of Executive Branch: 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: 1 2 3 4 5

Personal Visits/Presentations by:

- Constituent: 1 2 3 4 5
- Close friend of legislator: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of interest group: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of Executive Branch: 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: 1 2 3 4 5

Phone Calls from:

- Constituent: 1 2 3 4 5
- Close friend of legislator: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of interest group: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of Executive Branch: 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: 1 2 3 4 5

Testimony at Hearings by:

- Constituent: 1 2 3 4 5
- Close friend of legislator: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of interest group: 1 2 3 4 5
- Employee of Executive Branch: 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: 1 2 3 4 5
PART B

Listed (on card C) (below) are ten issues which emerged during consideration of the 1976 Vocational Education legislation. For each issue, please name the two interest groups which you believe had the greatest influence in determining the legislation as it was signed into law. The accompanying list of interest groups (card D) may help as a reminder of the groups which had an interest in vocational education during the development of the legislation. Please feel free to name groups which are not included on this list.

1. Accountability

2. Basic State Grant Formula

3. Consumer and Homemaking Education

4. Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides

5. Guidance and Counseling

6. Program Consolidation

7. Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis

8. Sex Equity

9. Sole State Agency

10. State Planning Procedures

___ Check here if respondent would like an abstract of the study.
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO ACCOMPANY SURVEY MAILED TO

INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTATIVES
June 5, 1981

A research project is being conducted concerning the development of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments. The purpose of the study is to supply information to vocational educators, and others with an interest in vocational education, concerning perceptions of effectiveness of communication techniques and perceptions of influence various interest groups had in the development of the legislation. This information should prove helpful as vocational educators attempt to influence policy development at the national, state and local levels.

The Vocational Industrial Clubs of America has been selected from groups which testified or submitted statements for the record of the House and Senate hearings held in 1975 in consideration of vocational education legislation. I would like to request your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire. The purpose of the survey is to determine your perceptions of the effectiveness of techniques used by your organization as well as your perceptions of how influential you were in determining the final bill which was signed into law.

I assure you that all the information submitted by you will be strictly confidential. The data will be used as part of my doctoral dissertation. Once all the data have been collected and tabulated, names of respondents will be destroyed.

Please complete the enclosed survey at your earliest convenience and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than June 15, 1981.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, please feel free to contact me by mail or phone. Although you are free to not respond to this request, I sincerely hope that you can find a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey. Your perceptions are valuable in helping educators understand the role of interest groups in our political system. Since the number of groups available to respond to this request is only 26, each return is very important. Thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Klaiber
Administrative Associate

Enclosures
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER AND POST CARD

FOR NON-RESPONDENTS
June 30, 1981

Recently you were sent a questionnaire regarding your involvement in the development of vocational education legislation. I have not yet received a completed survey form from you. If the completed questionnaire has already been mailed, please mark the enclosed post card accordingly. If not, I would sincerely appreciate it if you would complete and return it as soon as possible or check the appropriate item on the post card and drop it in the mail. Since this study involves a very small population, it is extremely important that I hear from you.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Klaiber
Administrative Associate

Enclosure
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION SURVEY

___ I have returned the survey.

I am unable to return the survey because:

___ I did not receive one.

___ I do not have time.

___ I was not involved with the development of my organization's position on vocational education.

___ Other, please explain. ________________________________

______________________________
APPENDIX F

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ISSUES
VOCA TIONAL EDUCATION ISSUES

Accountability: to what extent states should be required to maintain
and report information to the federal government regarding plans
for and results of vocational education programs?

Basic State Grant Formula: the means by which a state's allocation
of federal funds for vocational education would be determined.

Consumer and Homemaking Education: whether consumer and homemaking
education is a legitimate program to be funded through voca­
tional education legislation.

Disadvantaged and Handicapped Set-Asides: whether and if so, to
what extent, a state's allocation should be required to be spent
on programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students.

Guidance and Counseling: should guidance and counseling activities
be assumed under vocational education programs or should they
be emphasized separately?

Program Consolidation: should categorical programs be consolidated?

Secondary vs. Post-Secondary Emphasis: should post-secondary level
programs receive an increased share of state program funds for
vocational education?

Sex Equity: to what extent should states be required to provide equal
access and participation of students in typically non-traditional
occupational training?

Sole State Agency: should there be one board or agency responsible for
vocational education in a state or should there be a separate
board to represent post-secondary interests?

State Planning Procedures: to what extent should other groups with an
interest in vocational education be required/allowed to partici­
pate in the planning of vocational education for the state?
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