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CHAPTER 1: THE STUDY OF RESEARCH UTILIZATION
IN THE PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS

NORMATIVE ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The social sciences have for well over a decade been increasing their involvement in applied or "action" research programs as compared to the more traditional basic research typically conducted in academic institutions. This movement away from basic research toward applied research has generated many questions and issues within the various social science disciplines such as:

--the desirability of such a trend,
--the suitability of academic institutions for the conduct of applied research, and
--ethical and moral considerations implicit in applied research.

While each of these questions has been, and continues to be, hotly debated, another question has rather recently emerged and is gaining the attention of increasing numbers of social scientists. This question is the extent to which the findings of the applied research undertakings are, in fact, being utilized by the public policy makers for whom this research is typically conducted. Pursuit of this question quickly spawned another basic question--what is it that facilitates or impedes the utilization of applied research findings by policy makers. It is these questions to which the research undertaken here is directed.
In its broadest context, the question of research utilization can be seen as a subset of an even more fundamental question—that of the role and responsibility of nonelected "expertise" in the public affairs of a democracy. This perennial question concerned the Founding Fathers and has ebbed and flowed as a subject of concern for both practitioners and students of government ever since.

In this century, it was of concern to Woodrow Wilson who wrote:

What I fear is a government of experts. God forbid that in a democratic society we should resign the task and give government over to the experts. What are we for if we are to be scientifically taken care of by a small number of gentlemen who are the only men who understand the job? Because if we don't understand the job, then we are not free people. (Quoted in Rich, 1979a:18)

President Eisenhower seemed to express the same concern in his "Farewell Message" when he warned of public policy coming more and more under the control of a scientific/technological elite.

Although there are those who continue to fear the supplanting of democracy by a technocracy, the primary focus of those who see a dark cloud lurking over "expertise" has shifted to efforts to clearly delineate the boundaries within which expertise does (or should operate), the relationship of expertise to other policy inputs, and the dangers of blind adherence to expertise. Cast more precisely in the area of research (or research findings) as expertise, this critique begins by questioning what is seen as at least an unstated but nevertheless real premise behind much of the work that has taken place in the area of research utilization, namely, that research used to inform and direct public policy is "good" while...
nonuse is "bad." The use of research after all is a mark of a "scientific" or "rational" society, and research used for purposes of public policy surely will lead us toward informed, enlightened public policy and away from ignorance and prejudice.

Perhaps the best known assault on this position has come from Lindblom and Cohen (1979). Their primary argument is that an unquestioned assumption that public policy should somehow be based on the findings of researchers is naive for ignoring the reality (and desirability) of other inputs, notably politics, to the policy making process. Research is only one input and, they maintain, not necessarily superior to any other input in its ability to contribute to "good" public policy. In fact, common sense or casual analysis will often prove superior to research as a basis for deciding public policy issues if only because research frequently is unable, using existing tools, to answer the most important questions facing policy makers. Further, research findings themselves often appear to be no more than common sense, or are verified by their ability to withstand scrutiny from a common sense perspective.

Rich (1979a:22) has even questioned the desirability of using the best available research for decision making under certain circumstances. He cites an example:

In the area of sexual assault ... [the] value of the research to public policy decisions would be of no advantage. Despite the alarmingly increasing statistics of rape and wife abuse, we may be better off if the programs promulgated to deal with these problems are premised on grounds other than the available research. Probably no area of social science research is so steeped in victim blame. With few exceptions, from Von Hentig's (1941,1948)
work on rape as victim-precipitated crime to the present, researchers have concluded that the woman is to blame.

Continuing on the same theme of tempering the notion that research "ought" to be used, Weiss (1981:21) lists several factors that might (should) dim one's enthusiasm for use. These include research (or research findings) that are inconclusive, fraudulent, irrelevant, biased, not practical to implement, or shoddily done. Weiss cites research on race relations and school desegregation as an example of an area made more complex and inconclusive as a result of more research.

THE GENESIS OF CURRENT INTEREST IN RESEARCH UTILIZATION

In spite of the interesting and valid issues raised by those who seek to question the uncritical acceptance of research use as "good," this is a relatively minor theme (at least as measured by the amount of work being done) in the area of the study of research utilization. Primary attention is directed to seeking an understanding of what it is that promotes or impedes the use of research and thereby determines the amount of influence research will have in the public policy arena.

Although one can track the intellectual genesis of the concern with research utilization in the United States back to at least the Hoover Administration (Finsterbusch and Motz, 1980:3), I would identify the "Great Society" as the starting point for the current concern with research utilization. The mid-to-late 1960's saw an explosion of federally sponsored social programs aimed at improving the quality of life available to those disadvantaged segments of
the American population. Almost as soon as the billions of dollars that were to be devoted to these programs began to be spent, the question of whether or not they were working began to be asked (Aaron, 1978).

The prevalent mood was one of optimism in the capacity of the social sciences to help answer these questions. A report issued at that time by the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation asserted, in fact, its "doubt that this country can successfully solve its challenging and diverse social problems unless it draws upon the increasing capabilities of the social science community" (National Science Foundation, 1969:4). (Nevertheless, the overall thrust of the report was to the effect that the nation was woefully underutilizing the social sciences.)

Not only was government turning to the social sciences for help with program evaluation, but this was also the time other analytic devices such as PPB, ZBB, and MBO were being looked to optimistically to help bring economy, competence, rationality, (and even less politics) to the public arena.

Almost overnight the desire to evaluate the new social programs of the Great Society created research funding opportunities for social scientists that were unprecedented. By 1978 the National Research Council estimated that the federal government was spending at least $2 billion a year on research on "social problems."

Many social scientists in academia, in nonprofit research institutes, and in newly created for-profit applied research organizations, answered the call and a wide variety of federally supported
studies—cost/benefit analyses, surveys, policy analyses, social experiments—began to appear. Typically, the study in question was an effort to evaluate the contribution of a particular program—did it accomplish what it was supposed to? Was academic performance enhanced as a result of preschool enrichment efforts? Did job training lead to placement (and retention) in "meaningful" employment?

Unquestionably, the involvement of the social sciences in what were matters of public policy infused new life into the disciplines. Questions of research methodology, data manipulation, data interpretation, among others, took on a new, more vital meaning; these questions were no longer strictly "academic." New journals devoted to these topics were born. New curricula and new graduate programs were designed in colleges and universities to meet the challenges and opportunities now being offered. "Relevance" became a watchword of this new movement (Rich, 1981:24).

All was not well, however. Sometime around the mid-1960's among the proliferation of evaluation studies, there began to appear critical self-appraisals of the whole enterprise. Perhaps the most critical of these appraisals was the charge that, in spite of good intentions and early promise, evaluation research specifically, and social research generally, had proven to be literally useless in that its hoped for link to the policy making process never materialized.

Soon there was a significant accumulation of literature making such charges (see for example, Williams and Evans, 1969; Wholey, 1971; Weiss, 1972b; and Cohen and Garet, 1975). In part, this
criticism was directed to the alleged lack of quality of many of the research efforts that sought to provide guidance to policy makers (Lynn, 1978:5). Also in part, and more important from our perspective, the criticisms were an indictment of the prevailing paradigm for the study of research utilization which equated "use" with the straightforward acceptance and implementation of the findings and recommendations (or at least implications) of a research study by a policy maker (Larsen, 1980:423).

Perhaps, the argument went, one reason why utilization was so slight and infrequent was because the basic concept of "use" that was driving the research enterprise was too narrow and ill-defined to allow for more subtle, but perhaps no less important, instances of research utilization than the prevailing "research-into-action" model. Perhaps, some felt, the study of utilization had been unwittingly led astray by the early studies of the utilization of agricultural research findings within the framework of the Cooperative Extension Service where "use" was defined as the adoption of the latest improved farming technique (Larsen and Werner, 1981:150).

In fact, concern was not limited to the meaning of the concept of "use." The whole field of research utilization study was now felt to be in need of clear, consistent conceptualization of its subject matter. Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980:xiv) for example went so far as to say "that most earlier discussions of 'the utilization of research in decision-making' founder on conceptual ambiguities in all three terms--utilization, research, and decision-making. Each of the concepts is more complex than most of us imagine."
The original critiques of research utilization studies were followed by two developments that are still continuing. The first, and by far the most prominent development (measured by the amount of work being done), was the response to the call to give greater conceptual clarity to utilization research by specifying the key concepts (variables) that underlie the utilization process. The second but no less prominent trend was an increase in the number of empirical studies of research utilization.

CONCEPTUALIZING RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The Meanings of "Use"

At the conceptual level much attention has been paid to questions such as what are the dependent and independent variables in the study of research utilization, and what are the measures or indicators of these variables. The most striking development, however, has been the broadening of the meaning of the concept "use."

It is now generally accepted that "utilization" is not synonymous with the straightforward acceptance and implementation of research findings by policy makers. Although this common sense notion of utilization continues to be looked for by researchers (along with the factors that help or impede it), it is now granted that a richer conception of utilization is required so that the variety of important uses to which social program research is put will not be missed.

Let us take two examples to amplify this point. The first deals with the indicators of research use; the second deals with the type of use made of research. An examination of the literature
on research utilization indicates that research can be said to have been used if it:

1. is merely considered
2. influences thinking on subject
3. causes opinions to be changed even if the direction is not consistent with the research
4. reinforces opinions
5. influences action taken
6. is the cause of action taken
7. causes action to be taken in the direction suggested by the research
8. is "accepted" and/or applied in toto
9. is at least partly "accepted" and/or applied.

It is easy to imagine that this list can be readily expanded. Such an effort is not necessary or particularly important at this point. What is important is the realization that "use" can and does have many specific meanings. Obviously, two studies, each looking at the same phenomenon, could reach quite different conclusions about the extent of research utilization simply as a function of the definition of "use." Unfortunately, many early research utilization studies failed to state precisely the kind of use they sought or, as stated earlier, simply looked for evidence that a study's recommendations were completely adopted and implemented without change. New studies, while suffering less from the flaw of an overly simple conception of use, often are flawed by failure to specify clearly the indicators of use. Further, even when such indicators are specified, the multiplicity of meanings
employed for the key concept of "use" has made it difficult to
develop a cumulative, synthesized understanding of the utilization
phenomenon. In fact, no such synthesis has been published.

I am not prepared to say that the field of research utiliza-
tion study must settle on a common indicator of use simply because
synthesis of past research has been difficult--the concept is too
rich to be so arbitrarily limited. I am saying that, at mini-
mum, each researcher is obligated to be most explicit about the
indicator(s) of "use" employed in a study if that study is to be
helpful to others and represent a step forward in our attempt to
understand research utilization.

The Types of Research Utilization

Concerning conceptualization of the types of use made of re-
search, Larsen (1980:428) has said that "a generally accepted
classification of the types of utilization and their definitions,
and the specification of which type of utilization is being studied
or discussed is one of the most pressing needs in the field."
Actually, although there are a number of formulations of "utiliza-
tion" to choose among (for example, Caplan et al., 1975:xii; Rich,
1975; and Dunn, 1983:121-122), Weiss (1977b:11-15) provides a con-
ceptualization that is comprehensive, and has been gaining accep-
tance by other researchers. This typology has been adopted for
use in the research reported here. Doing so will permit me to draw
more readily comparisons between my research findings and those
of others.
According to Weiss, research can be used in the following ways:

1. **Instrumental Use**—This is the straightforward application of research generated to help solve a policy problem. This is the typical image of "research utilization."

2. **Knowledge-Driven Use**—Here, research is not commissioned to solve a policy problem but, the research rather serendipitously presents an opportunity that can be capitalized upon in some policy area.

3. **Interactive Use**—Here, research is only one of several inputs to problem solving that also includes inputs from experience, insight, and pressure, to name a few.

4. **Political Ammunition Use**—This is the selective use of research to help support policy positions that have been taken or maintained even in the face of contrary evidence.

5. **Conceptual Use**—In this instance, research is not used to solve any immediate problem but rather to help an individual think (or rethink) about a policy issue or, to sensitize policymakers to new issues or opportunities.

6. **Miscellaneous Use**—This catch-all category includes using research for such purposes as to avoid taking responsibility for a decision, or to delay taking an action.

---

**The "Two Cultures" and Research Utilization**

The second most prominent development at the conceptual level of research utilization studies has been the impact of C. P. Snow's "Two Cultures" perspective.

By the "Two Cultures" Snow was referring to those who are trained as scientists, and those who are humanists. As Snow saw it (1969:2-4), although these two groups were:

- comparable in intelligence, identical in race, not grossly different in social origin, earning about the same income,
- [they] had almost ceased to communicate at all [and had little] intellectual, moral and psychological characteristics in common.... Between the two was a gulf of mutual incomprehension. They have a curious, distorted image of each other.
As Dunn (1980:515) points out, the Two Cultures view, while not a theory or a hypothesis in the strict sense as some utilization researchers have claimed (for example, Caplan, 1979; Rich, 1979a; and Rothman, 1980) has served as a metaphor, a constructive analogy that permits claims to be made about research utilization or nonutilization by arguing that relations between the social science and policy making communities are similar to those between the natural sciences and humanities.

The importance of the Two Cultures metaphor as it relates to research utilization is that it has suggested concepts/variables related to the policy maker's research use decision. For example, the Two Cultures analogy suggests that concepts such as differences in language, values, authority, and incentive systems may help to explain use/nonuse, as well as concepts like linking agents/mechanisms, reality tests, relevance, and problem identification/problem solution, and evaluation techniques.

Important as the Two Cultures metaphor has been to the study of research utilization by suggesting a number of insights that might be helpful in understanding the problem in question, its weakness has been that its breadth as a metaphor has been able to encompass a variety of competing explanations of the use/nonuse phenomenon (Dunn, 1980:517). Hence, while the Two Cultures metaphor has lead to a variety of insights useful to the study of research utilization, it has not contributed to the formation of commonly shared definitions or approaches to guide empirical research.
Dunn (1980:517), in fact, has identified five separate "models" of utilization research each compatible with the Two Cultures metaphor. These models, which seek to identify the key variables associated with the use/nonuse of research findings are:

1. **Product-Contingent Model**—The characteristics of products of social science research (form, content, language, length, reliability, validity, timeliness) determine the amount and type of research use by policy makers.

2. **Inquiry-Contingent Model**—Differences in modes of inquiry used to acquire, process, and interpret information (research design, analytic techniques, observational methods, sampling) determine the amount and type of research use by policy makers.

3. **Problem-Contingent Model**—The characteristics of policy problems (levels of conflict, uncertainty, and risk associated with attempts to satisfy needs or realize opportunities) determine the amount and type of research use by policy makers.

4. **Structure-Contingent Model**—Variations in the structure of organizations (authority, responsibility, power, and incentive systems) determine the amount and type of research use by policy makers.

5. **Process-Contingent Model**—The nature of interaction (authoritarian, delegative, collaborative) among producers and potential users and beneficiaries of research determines the amount and type of research use by policy makers.

One can question whether or not Dunn's Problem-Contingent Model (and perhaps the Structure-Contingent Model also) is necessarily derived from the Two-Cultures perspective. Further, it would appear that there are other models (or, perhaps more appropriately, variables and variable clusters) inherent in this perspective that seeks to account for the use/nonuse of research. For example, educational background (type and amount) could be an important explanatory variable within a Two-Cultures perspective,
as might decision making style. Still further, outside of the Two-Cultures perspective other models of research use/nonuse have been proposed. Mitroff and Mitroff (1979), for example, hold that the primary set of factors accounting for research use/nonuse involve the basic attitudinal/personality traits of both the producers of the research and the potential users of the research.

The Current State of Conceptual Development

Although the recent work that has taken place at the conceptual level has helped to establish research utilization as a distinct field of study, it is still a field that has not yet "matured." We have already referred to the problems inherent in the multiplicity of conceptualizations of the indicators and types of research use. The model building process is still in its infancy. Those models that do exist are in skeletal form at best. Relationships between what have to be seen as competing rather than complimentary models have not been explored. In fact, the interrelationships of variables within models are typically unspecified and unstudied. The concern is simply to identify links to the dependent variable(s) of use/nonuse. In many respects the current state of affairs resembles a free-for-all with practitioners from many disciplines applying the concepts and techniques they are most comfortable with to the study of social research utilization.

Interdisciplinary approaches to the study of social research utilization appear nonexistent. Furthermore, strong links have not been established between the study of social research utilization
and more established, related fields of study such as innovation
diffusion, organization behavior, public planning, technology
transfer, and personality theory.

As a consequence of the current conceptual free market that
characterizes the study of research utilization, there is no agreed
upon boundary to what constitutes the precise area of study nor are
there agreed upon approaches to the phenomena in question.

These are not intended to be harsh criticisms. The busyness,
noise, and confusion that abound are undoubtedly characteristics
of any developing field. Although it is sometimes difficult to
maintain enthusiasm in the face of such a situation, it should be
recalled that the more subtle conceptualizations that now charac-
terize the field of research utilization are truer to the phenom-
emon it seeks to study than was the simpler research-into-action
image that characterized earlier thinking in this area. The model
building efforts are at least a start in the long process of more
rigorous study and the development of clearer understanding of the
factors that influence research utilization. Yet, much work
remains to be done.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Approaches to the Study of Research Utilization

It should go without saying that the state of empirical re-
search on research utilization reflects the conceptual state of
affairs in this area. Although the amount of systematic empirical
work is relatively small, perhaps no more than two dozen (good)
studies, comparability among these studies is limited because
standardized concepts and research methods are not employed. Longitudinal studies are quite rare, and less than a handful of replication studies appear to exist. Furthermore, and as is the case regarding the conceptual literature, no synthesis of the empirical work that has been done has been written to describe the state of knowledge regarding those factors that influence research utilization (Beyer and Trice, 1982:591).

The empirical research that has been done has utilized interviews or surveys almost exclusively as the basis for data gathering. Two other approaches--content analysis, and participant-observation have been used much less frequently.

Within the interview and survey approaches, considerable variation can be found. Some studies, for example, have used highly structured interview instruments to probe past research utilization behavior often in a case study setting. Other studies have applied the same approach to inquire about the expected future research utilization behavior of the respondent in some hypothetical setting. Both kinds of interview or survey-based studies frequently explore attitudes toward research and research utilization in addition to the behavioral ramifications of these attitudes.

The validity of the retrospective studies is threatened by potential bias in the selection of the study sample, by weakness of the respondent's memory, or the possibility of (un)conscious distortion of responses toward some sense of what is "expected" or "acceptable." Prospective studies also are prone to this latter distortion. Unfortunately, it is quite rare to find studies
that seek to validate the respondents answers to interview ques-
tions concerning research utilization attitudes/behavior by
examining written records such as agency policy statements, posi-
tion papers, and internal memoranda for corroborating evidence of
research use or nonuse.

Participant/observer studies are typically characterized by
a stream-of-consciousness approach to their subject. These studies
are heavily anecdotal in nature and most often do not proceed
from a prior theoretical perspective. Needless to say, any
"generalizations" reached by these studies are to be taken with
considerable caution. Nevertheless, the value of these studies is
that they can, at their best, provide rich contextual information
often missing from interview or survey-based studies. They can
also offer (again, when at their best) insights which are helpful
in suggesting factors that may be related to research utilization
that may merit more systematic study.

Content analysis has been rarely used in the study of re-
search utilization. This approach involves the examination of
agency documents such as policy statements, studies, and internal
memoranda in search of evidence that particular research studies
have been used to help establish agency positions. The weakness
of this approach when used exclusively is the loss of contextual
information that relates to the mechanisms that facilitate or im-
pede research use in organizations, and the inability to judge
whether or not the research was used merely as "window dressing"
to defend decisions reached on other grounds.
The study reported here uses primarily an interview/case study approach. This approach has hopefully been strengthened by combining a rich contextual sense gained from over three years of research into the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit, and a review and consideration of the key documents relating to this program. I agree with Weiss (1981:31) that such a mixed strategies approach will make for progress in the study of research utilization.

**What is Known About Research Utilization?**

What do we know about research utilization and the factors that influence it?

Concerning research use, it is generally agreed that conceptual use is the dominant form. This was Caplan's et al. (1975) conclusion based on a survey of 204 high-ranking federal officials in various agencies. Uliassi (1977:88) found this to be the case with State Department Officials as did Patton et al. (1977:145) in their study of the use of research by a group of federal "decision makers" in the mental health programs area.

Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980:383), also looking at research utilization among mental health program administrators, likewise found far more conceptual rather than instrumental use of research. They speculated that because their respondents did not see themselves as "decision makers," the occasion for instrumental use was simply not present—a speculation that points to the reasonable possibility that different types of potential users, having different needs and constraints, may use research in different ways.
Rich's study (1977:202-205) of research use by policy makers in several federal agencies found that time was a factor that appeared related to the type of use to which research was put. He identified two phases of research utilization. The first phase immediately followed the receipt of research-based information and was characterized by heavy instrumental use. The second phase—three to six months later—found the same research now characterized by conceptual use.

Evidence for other than instrumental or conceptual use of research is scant and inconclusive. Knorr (1977:179), for example, found no evidence that research was used by a sample of Austrian bureaucrats as "political ammunition" to legitimize decisions reached on other grounds although one may well question the clarity of her definition of such "symbolic" use of research. Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980:159) also concluded that examples of noninstrumental/nonconceptual use of research were rare. However, they did not pursue such use directly in their research. On the other hand, Larsen and Werner (1981:78) concluded that "symbolic" use of research is a frequent occurrence. No data are provided, however, to support this conclusion.

Dunn's review of past utilization research (1980) is one of only two studies to look deliberately at utilization in terms of the stages of the policy process. He concluded that most instances of research use occur in the areas of problem definition, goal setting, and evaluation. Approach selection and program implementation are the areas where research is least used. Weiss and
Bucuvalas (1980:152) concluded that research was as likely (or unlikely) to be used at one stage of the policy process as another. Once again, different approaches to seeking the same information may account for differences in findings.

**What is Known About the Factors That Influence Research Utilization?**

Concerning the factors that influence research utilization one thing we know, as Larsen (1980:438) points out, is that "There are seemingly endless variables which interact to influence utilization in any of its forms, some variant of them, or nonutilization. At this point, one may be overwhelmed with the totality..." Nevertheless, a review of the empirical literature does reveal a number of recurring themes regarding the factors that influence research utilization.

Like previous researchers in this area, I find the Two Cultures perspective a helpful way to view the question of research utilization. It is a conceptual framework within which to organize the more promising variables that may be hypothesized as related to research use/nonuse. I begin with the simplified image of a public official responsible for some aspect of the development and/or administration of a public policy. This person may be of sufficiently high rank as to be called a "policy maker," or in a lower position such that he/she may be seen serving as support to those in a policy making position. In the course of carrying out their responsibilities, these officials form judgments, establish and defend positions, and make decisions. The question becomes how does the potentially useful information developed in the
world of the researcher enter and inform the world of the public official. What are the linkages?

My review of the empirical literature on research utilization suggests a number of variables that merit further investigation concerning their potential to help account for the linkage (or nonlinkage) of the worlds of government and research and, hence, for variations in research utilization. For convenience, I cluster these variables into three categories. These are:

**Characteristics of Potential Users**

- Attitudes toward research-based knowledge
- Needs for research-based knowledge
- Educational background
- Position within the organization

**Characteristics of the Organization**

- Organization's attitude toward research utilization in relation to decision making practices
- Organization's efforts to encourage and facilitate research use
- Organization's efforts to encourage personal contact with researchers
- Organization's efforts to encourage personal involvement in research
- Presence of an in-house research staff
- Constraints (including political ones) on the organization
Characteristics of Research/Research Reports

Timeliness
Relevance
Reliability/Validity
Action-orientation
Practicality
Presentation
Political acceptability
Consistency with past research findings
Consistency with commonly held assumptions
Consistency with potential user's established position
Consistency with potential user's intuition

It should be noted that the breaks between these variable clusters are not always clean. For example, what can be seen as an organizational constraint can, from another perspective, be seen as a constraint on the potential user. Nevertheless, the convenience of use offered by clustering the variables outweighs the occasional overlap to be found among them.

Characteristics of Potential Users

In general, studies have shown that potential users see research as having the potential to help policy makers perform their jobs better. For example, Caplan et al. (1975:24) found in their survey of 204 high ranking officials in various federal agencies that 85% of them expressed the belief that social science research could contribute to the improvement of public policy. A 1977 survey by the Comptroller General of the United States of policy
makers in various federal agencies confirmed that, in general, research was seen as needed for the variety of users described earlier, and as ideally having a substantial impact on the policy process although the consensus view was that actual use of research for such purposes was low. This basic proresearch attitude has also been found by Rothman (1980:157) and Alkin et al. (1979:223).

Exceptions have been noted however. A study by the National Academy of Sciences (1975:23) of the role of research in the Department of Labor found "only scant acceptance" of the need for research by officials of that agency. Even the Caplan et al. study (1975:16) found, within a basically positive view of the potential of research to be of help in the policy process, variations in the levels of actual use among agencies. (Use in the Department of Labor was among the lowest levels noted.)

Nevertheless, the overall conclusion reached based on the findings of basically proresearch attitudes on the part of potential users has been that if actual low levels of research utilization are observed, they must be accounted for by factors other than the potential users' attitude toward and need for research.

The basic information processing style or decision making strategy of an individual has been suggested as an important factor in the research utilization decision. Caplan et al. (1975:36), for example, found that those committed to understanding the logic of a problem were more inclined to use the results of research to help them than were those who viewed the world from an "advocacy" perspective where all information and arguments were seen as
either supporting or attacking positions established on other grounds.

The Caplan et al. data suggested that the differences in information processing styles might be related to differences in educational background with those having a science-based education being more inclined to use social research than were those without such a background.

Badura and Waltz (1980:378) also concluded from their study of West German Government officials that educational background (modified by organizational culture) influenced an individual's inclination to make use of social science information. Those whose educational training included a strong measure of the social and behavioral sciences were much more inclined to use information generated by these disciplines (by their own self-reports) than were those who did not have such training.

The importance of educational background is not universally accepted, however. No such relationship was found, for example, in the 1980 study by Weiss and Bucuvalas of practitioners and researchers in the mental health field. Differences in the nature of these studies (for example, prospective versus retrospective oriented questions, questions directed at attitudes versus actual behavior) might help to account for the discrepancies in findings about the importance of educational background. Also, the amount of variation in educational background found in the Weiss and Bucuvalas study was rather slight thus not affording a good test of the power of this variable.
Although studied rather infrequently, there is some suggestion in the literature that the position a person occupies in an organization is related to the amount and type of research use. Rich (1979b:98), for example, has noted that lower level staff in a sample of officials from several federal agencies were more attentive to research emanating from outside of their organization than were upper level officials. Caplan et al. (1975:40) found that those who identified themselves as "in andouters" were more inclined to use research than were those who saw themselves as committed to a career in the federal service. The research of Badura and Waltz (1980:375) pointed to the increasing conformity to organizational attitudes toward research use that accompanied an increase in the length of tenure an individual had in the organization suggesting that a condition for moving up the organizational hierarchy is conformance to basic organizational attitudes. This view is compatible with Rich's finding that senior level officials tended to favor research generated in-house.

Characteristics of the Organization

Organizations have been presumed to have developed, as a result of a myriad of forces, basic predispositions or attitudes toward the use of research-based information. Badura and Waltz (1980:375), for example, in their study of officials in West German social welfare agencies found not only that there were differences in organizational attitudes toward the usefulness of social science-based knowledge, but that such "organizational culture" was strong enough to affect (via the socialization that occurs
over the years spent with the organization) an individual's basic attitude toward the social sciences as originally determined by his/her educational background. The longer an individual was with an organization, the greater the likelihood that his/her views of social science research would reflect those of his/her organization.

A study by the Comptroller General of the United States (1977:26) also pointed to the importance of the organization's predisposition toward research-based information. Hargrove's study (1980) also found that the basic attitudes toward social science knowledge held by senior officials in the Department of Labor had a significant impact on the amount of research used by that agency. This same finding was noted in an earlier study of the Department of Labor conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (1975:25).

The structuring of an organization to encourage and facilitate the use of research has been assumed to be positively related to such use. Rothman (1980:46) reported that those British social service agencies that organized in such a way so as to include an in-house research function made greater use of research than did those agencies without such internal capability. Utilization was further facilitated if an organization took steps to create multiple reporting mechanisms such as newsletters and oral presentations for their research (Rothman, 1980:49-51). The importance of such efforts to research utilization highlights the obvious but sometimes overlooked point that the accessibility of the research undoubtedly affects the extent to which it will be used.
Other studies have pointed to the organizational preference for in-house generated/conducted research. For example, utilization was shown by Van deVall's and Bolas' (1981) study of research use by social welfare agencies in The Netherlands to be facilitated if the research was from an in-house source rather than entering the organization from an external source. Such a finding is seen as consistent with the Weberian concept of bureaucracy where "expertise" is seen as residing within the organization.

Dunn (1980:527) found the use of internal "change agents" or "knowledge brokers" to be an effective mechanism to promote research utilization in organizations. Ballard's and James' research (1983:421), however, explicitly rejects the idea that "mechanical" means such as the use of "knowledge brokers" or "change agents" by organizations can do much to increase levels of research utilization. As they see it, the critical factor is "trust" on the part of the potential user of research in the research producer (or the products of the research producer).

Patton et al. (1977:158) also concluded that organizational efforts to facilitate research use need not be formalized to be effective. Rather, the mere presence of an individual in an organization who was determined to see that relevant research was brought to the attention of the appropriate person greatly increased the chances of that research being used. In fact, Patton et al. concluded that this "personal factor" was the most important variable related to research use, outweighing such considerations as the quality and presentation of the research. Only
the political impact of the research came as close to the presence of the personal factor in explaining variations in research use.

Supporting this view, Yin and Gwaltney (1981:567) concluded from their study of research utilization in the areas of social service programs for the elderly, and primary and secondary education that the most prominent factor accounting for utilization was the presence of informal interpersonal networks of communication among the producers and users of research. The work of Lucas (1983:380) also has supported the informal "network" view of research utilization as did a study by Rich (1979b:99) who found that the existence of informal information exchange networks working within and across agency lines facilitated research usage. Rich's study is especially interesting because it juxaposed the informal network against the formal stance of the organization toward research—a stance that emphasized the use of in-house generated information and a suspicion of "outsiders."

The idea of linking users and, especially, users and researchers is quite compatible with the Two Cultures metaphor that is concerned with identifying the nature of the gap that is said to exist between the two cultures. The 1978 study by the National Research Council refers to actual hostility between researchers and government policy makers. Caplan (1979:460) saw the problem in terms of lack of sufficient and appropriate communication between the research producers and potential research users. Rich (1977b:89) viewed the gap as essentially one stemming from the nature of bureaucracy which structurally mitigates against
the infusion of "outside" information. Regardless of the precise reason for the gap, two mechanisms have been suggested to force a coming together of the world of research and the world of government—increase the personal contact between researchers and potential users, and increase the involvement of potential users in research.

Almost half of Caplan's et al. (1975:33) sample believed that it was necessary to know the social scientist in order to adequately judge the value of his/her work. Some (for example, Rothman's 1980 study of research use in twelve British social service agencies) have suggested that efforts to bring researchers in contact with potential users does, in fact, promote such use. This conclusion has been supported by the work of Seidel (1981:239) into the basis of research use by architects; Van de Vall's and Bolas' (1981:476-477) study of policy makers in The Netherlands; and Yin's and Gwaltney's (1981:562) research into knowledge utilization in the areas of education and services to the elderly. Zaltman's (1979:103) review of "social change" literature also supported this view.

The research conducted by Rothman (1980:90), and Ballard and James (1983:412) supported the view that research use will be enhanced if the potential user can have some meaningful role in the research itself—typically in the selection of the topics to be investigated. Yin and Gwaltney (1982:563), on the other hand, saw contact between the researcher and potential user during the
conduct of the research as the most important factor enhancing research use rather than actual participation of the potential user in the research effort. Larsen and Werner (1981:94), in their study of the research use behavior of local mental health agency officials, also concluded that user participation in itself was insufficient to lead to greater levels of utilization. Rather, user knowledge of and trust in the researcher was the critical use-determining factor.

Lastly, constraints an organization imposes on itself or has imposed on it have been shown to affect research utilization. Weiss (1978:37-38) has commented on the action-limiting characteristics of bureaucratic politics, incentives, funding levels, and limited authority. Often, action may be limited because of conflicting or unclear programmatic goals—a problem that can plague the researcher as well. These problems have, in fact, been found to account for at least some of the low levels of research use in the Department of Labor (Hargrove, 1980:158), and in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Comptroller General of the United States, 1977:15). Of all of the constraints faced by an agency, however, "politics" has been the one emerging most often as the most important impediment to research use. (See, for example, Caplan et al., 1975:35; Weiss, 1977b:14; Patton et al., 1977:152, and Rothman, 1980:58.) "Politics" is used broadly here to refer to a variety of conflicts such as those involving budgets, turf, inter/intra agency rivalry, and ideology.
Characteristics of Research/Research Reports

Researchers have studied the importance to the utilization decision of a variety of factors related either to the nature of social science research, or to the typical output of a research project—the research report.

Perhaps no factor has been deemed more important to the utilization decision than the relevance of the research to the potential user. Rothman (1980:132-133) has concluded, in fact, that to be relevant the research must contain timely, practical, action-oriented recommendations. Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977: 220-221) also concluded that relevance was a precondition to usefulness but found that relevance did not imply a necessary connection to timeliness, action-orientation, or practicality. (These latter traits, except for timeliness, were found to be related to the utilization decision—they simply were not found to be related to relevance.) The apparent reason for the discrepancy in findings is that Weiss and Bucuvalas were more sensitive to the conceptual uses of research than was Rothman who was preoccupied with instrumental use. Clearly, a factor such as timeliness will be germane to the instrumental use of research, but not necessarily so to conceptual use. Likewise, a piece of applied research may be immediately relevant to a particular problem being experienced by an agency official, but information obtained from basic research may have a more lasting impact by influencing the way in which whole classes of phenomena are viewed.
The way in which research is reported is repeatedly offered as a reason why some research is used and some is not. Rothman (1980:153) and Seidel (1981:239), for example, report that clear, concise reporting in a language understandable to a layman enhances the chances of research being put to use. The absence of such a reporting style may be enough to obviate the benefits of other positive characteristics of the research such as its relevance or practicality. Ballard and James (1983:414), in fact, suggest that to focus on a "manipulable" such as report style will do more to facilitate research utilization than trying to change such relatively nonmanipulable factors as "organizational barriers." Other researchers have taken some exception to the idea that all research must be reported in a simplified format to insure its usefulness. Alkin et al. (1979:253), in fact, concluded on the basis of their research that the form of the research report by itself had no power to explain the utilization decision. Rather, successful utilization was characterized by a process of continuous interaction between the researcher and the potential user on a wide variety of issues among which was included the topic of the report format. This kind of dialogue can lead to report products that have no resemblance to any "cookbook" formulations but nonetheless prove quite useful.

One further point to keep in mind not only when considering the potential importance of the report format to the utilization decision, but the importance of the other research/research report characteristics as well is that the conclusions about the
importance of these factors that are found in the empirical literature are typically based on responses to questions worded in such a way as to make any variation in response unlikely. Seidel (1981:239), for example, simply asked his respondents whether or not the inclusion of a "summary," "checklist or easy-to-understand design," or "graphics" would contribute to or detract from the quality of a particular research piece.

Sometimes research may be relevant, point to practical solutions, and be packaged nicely but otherwise be of questionable quality. The empirical literature on the importance of the quality of research to the utilization decision presents somewhat of an unclear picture. Caplan et al. (1975:30), Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977:222) and Rothman (1980:140), for example, found that potential research users were very much concerned about the quality of the research that they considered. Van de Vail and Bolas (1981:476), Dunn (1980:525), and Alkin et al. (1979:241), however, found no relationship between research quality and use. Once again, however, slightly different questions and/or approaches probably account for the discordant findings. In the first three studies cited, respondents were asked directly whether or not the quality of research (defined slightly differently in each study) played a role (or would play a role) in their decision to use the research. The latter three studies assigned "quality" scores (again using slightly different definitions) according to objectively determined characteristics of the research and then looked for a correlation between quality and use (a use-score also having
been assigned according to different definitions in each study). In these instances no relationship was found between the quality of the research and the use of the research.

In addition to pointing to the difference in results that can be obtained from questions that probe intended or ideal behavior, as compared to results obtained by using more "objective" measures of research use, the discrepancies between these two sets of studies also point to the distinct possibility that "quality," like "use" itself, may have different meanings to different persons. Also, even if we were to grant that a common definition of research quality existed, the importance of this factor may vary according to the circumstances of the potential user. For example, a harried administrator watching the collapse of some highly-valued program may be quite willing to institute changes based on research that may have certain "faults" such as a non-randomly selected sample, or a particularly small sample. Under other circumstances, for example, if the program is viewed as successful or is otherwise not under attack, the same potential user may reject the same research out-of-hand because of its limitations. Further, the apparently contradictory findings between the two sets of studies points to the need to see the research utilization decision as multidimensional. Quality is at best a necessary but not sufficient factor leading to research use. It combines with other factors to produce the utilization decision.

Only the research of Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980:101-106) has seriously attempted to break the univariate (or sequential
consideration of multiple variables) approach that characterizes the empirical literature on research utilization. In that study the authors concluded that both a "truth test" (the quality of research especially its reliability and validity, and the extent to which the research conforms to the user's expectations), and a "utility test" (the extent to which the research provides guidance for action on a relevant issue or challenges the status quo) were applied by their respondents to research studies.

Some attention has been paid to the question of whether or not utilization is enhanced if the research is consistent with either the potential user's established position or intuition; with commonly held assumptions; or with past research findings. The work that has been done suggests that consistency is of most importance in the area of the conformity of research to the potential user's intuition. (See, for example, Caplan, 1975:34; Seidel, 1981:240; Rothman, 1980:102, and Weiss and Bucuvalas, 1977:222.) Simply stated, it is one thing if a research study contradicts the findings of another research study, it is quite another matter if a research study contradicts a potential user's intuited sense of reality. In the latter instance, the potential user will probably be reluctant to immediately give up deeply felt beliefs on the basis of the findings of one study. This same reluctance to change will also be true of the individual's established position on a particular issue if that position has been determined by his/her personal beliefs/intuition as opposed
to, for example, being established for reasons of convenience, on agency policy.

Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977:224) in their study of the importance of the consistency (or conformity) of research to a wide variety of other factors presumed related to the utilization decision noted one finding that came as a surprise. Contrary to their expectation that research that challenged the status quo in terms of existing assumptions, and organizational/political arrangements, or that offered new perspectives on old problems/issues would be little-used by mental health program administrators, these respondents indicated that such challenge would actually be more of an inducement to use the research in question than would be the case if the research supported the existing arrangements and understandings. Weiss and Bucuvalas concluded that the presence of the "challenge" factor may well be the most important of the research/research report characteristics enhancing research use.

The Weiss and Bucuvalas finding on the importance of the challenge to the status quo factor points to the distinction between those research/research report characteristics that impact the individual (for example, counter intuitive findings), and those findings that impact the organization (for example, those that challenge existing organizational arrangements). For these authors, this latter area is synonymous with the importance of politics to the research utilization decision.
"Politics," as I have already commented, is seen by many researchers as a potent explanatory variable in the research utilization decision. The Caplan et al. study (1975:35) found, for example, a very strong tendency of potential users to reject research that pointed in the direction of a politically unpopular action and, conversely, to accept findings that were politically desirable. In fact, Caplan et al. concluded that the political acceptability of research dominated all other use-related factors including those such as relevance. Patton et al. (1977:1^9) reached the same conclusion about the primacy of political considerations although such considerations could be tempered by the "personal factor." Research conducted on West German legislators (Mayntz, 1977:59), and in British social service agencies (Rothman, 1980:59) has also supported the importance of political factors to the research utilization decision.

When Weiss and Bucuvalas claim that research that challenges the status quo is positively related to the use decision are they disagreeing with those authors who have found research rejected because it was politically unacceptable? In part, yes; in part, no. That is, while the typical study that has investigated the importance of politics to use has found research accepted and used when it was politically acceptable, and rejected when it was unacceptable, Weiss and Bucuvalas found that their respondents would, at times, accept and act upon the findings of a hostile study as a way of taking some sort of preemptive action before they found themselves at the mercy of their enemies. Such action
was seen by these respondents as agency-supportive and, hence, politically acceptable. Other researchers have commented (see Rothman, 1980:137-138, and especially Seidel, 1981:234) that such readiness to change in the face of organizationally challenging research may have reflected an ideosyncracy of mental health practitioners rather than more universally accepted behavior.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The review of the empirical literature has shown, perhaps not surprisingly for a new field of inquiry, that much remains unknown about the extent and type of research utilization in the public policy arena, and the factors that influence this use. Also, much that we think we know rests on a foundation of a handful or less of empirical studies.

We have seen that the concept of "use" itself has expanded to include more than the direct instrumental application of research findings. Research can be used for other purposes such as to help one think more clearly about a subject, or as ammunition to fire at political opponents. In fact, such uses are now seen as occurring more frequently than instrumental use.

A wide array of factors are suggested in the literature as influencing research use in its various forms. For convenience, I grouped what seemed to be the most promising of these variables into three categories: 1) the characteristics of the potential user; 2) the characteristics of the potential user's organization; and 3) the characteristics of the research itself or of research reports.
Those characteristics of the potential user that appear to have some impact on research utilization are: attitudes toward research-based knowledge, educational background, and the position occupied within the organization.

Organizational factors apparently related to research utilization are: the organization's attitude toward and experience with research; efforts to encourage and facilitate research use by means such as promoting personal contact with researchers and involvement in the research enterprise; the presence or absence of in-house research capability; the presence of research-based information sharing networks within and among organizations; and constraints on the organization such as those stemming from budget, authority, or political factors that serve to channel or limit the ability to respond to research.

Several characteristics of research or research reports were seen as influencing use. Among the obvious were relevance and practicality. Among the more interesting factors because of the complexity of their relationship to use were the quality of the research, its political acceptability, and its consistency with the organization's position and the potential user's beliefs.

Finally, it should be remembered as we consider the variables that appear to influence research use that practically no work has been done to determine the relationships among these variables, or the relative importance among them to influence research use. Further, those relatively few empirical studies from which
conclusions are derived often utilize somewhat different research methods, or different meanings and indicators of "use."

In the next chapter I will discuss the relationship between the findings based on my survey of the empirical literature on research utilization and my approach to this topic in the area of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC).
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. There is a well-developed literature—theoretical and empirical—dealing with this subject. See, for example, Bell (1973), Benveniste (1972), Eulau (1973), Straussman (1978), and Goldwin (1980).

2. The history of the federal government's involvement with the social sciences in general may be found in Lyons (1969).

3. A particularly stimulating discussion of the promise and problems inherent in the social sciences involvement in applied research may be found in Charlesworth (1972). Coleman's essay (1972) also is especially insightful concerning the points of similarity and difference between research conducted in the social sciences from a disciplinary perspective, and social science research conducted for policy purposes.

4. An example of an innovation diffusion approach to research utilization is Lucas (1983). A technology transfer perspective can be found in Ballard and James (1983). Mitroff and Mitroff (1979) have applied personality theory to research utilization.

5. It will be pointless to continuously make reference to the somewhat incompatible bases on which generalizations such as "conceptual use of research is the predominant form" rest. Nevertheless, in this instance such a comment seems appropriate. For example, Uliassi considered only the use of research generated in-house. Patton et al. provided their respondents with no definition of "use," and conducted their interviews two to three years after the respondents would have had an opportunity to make use of the research in question. Weiss and Bucuvalas asked their respondents to comment on the kind of use they would expect to make of research, rather than the kind of use they had made of research at some time in the past.
CHAPTER 2: THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

In this chapter I will describe the purpose of the study of research utilization in the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit area. Key terms will be defined, and the design and conduct of the study will be discussed. I will also provide a brief description of TJTC, and a review of the empirical research that has been conducted in this area.

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

There are two primary purposes of this study. The first is to explore the nature, extent, and importance of research use by those individuals responsible at the national level for the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program. The second primary purpose is to search for those factors that appear to have facilitated or impeded research use in the TJTC area.

Why study research utilization in the area of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit? There are several reasons for doing so. The first is ideosyncratic. As part of a team of Ohio State University researchers who have investigated the implementation of employment and training programs since 1975, I have participated in the development of many research reports to sponsoring agencies. I have had a continuing curiosity in knowing what impact these reports have had on the potential users, and what accounted for variations in impact among these users. In short, what impact did our research have on the policy issues we studied?
TJTC seemed to provide a good opportunity to pursue my interests in the area of research utilization. In the first place, based on two years of research into the implementation of the tax credit, I had become quite familiar with the substance of the program and its changes over time, had identified the relevant actors at the national level, and had developed a good rapport with most of them. I was also familiar with the research that had been done on TJTC and its predecessor programs. This immersion in TJTC is in contrast to much of the research that has been conducted on research utilization where the investigator's only contact with his/her subjects and their programs comes via the administration of a one-shot questionnaire. Hopefully, my experience with TJTC would yield a richer understanding of the utilization phenomenon than would be possible without such experience.

I saw another benefit to my studying research utilization in the TJTC area. Frequently, the areas chosen for the study of research utilization have been "exemplary cases" as Yin (1981:101) has called them. That is, the areas chosen for study were picked because they were known to have had successful research utilization experiences. Although there is nothing inherently wrong with such an approach (and it does have some positive aspects especially in an area of study that is still in its infancy as is research utilization), it may not shed much light on utilization behavior in more "normal" or "representative" areas of public policy. In fact, the study of research utilization in the area of TJTC provides the opportunity to explore (especially by way of disconfirming) the theories/predictions
stemming from the exemplary cases. This, in fact, is yet another benefit of the TJTC-based study of research utilization.

Another benefit I perceived from studying research utilization in the area of the TJTC program was that because this program was one of low visibility and salience (one Department of Labor official told me in 1981, "I don't think you will find a program having less priority in the Department than TJTC") it was ipso facto representative of the bulk of public policy activities where issues are discussed, and decisions made far from the glare of the public spotlight. In short, my study was an opportunity to glance at research utilization behavior in what is undoubtedly an environment that characterizes most public policy issues. Further, the study would contribute to the woefully meager empirical literature on research utilization behavior at the national level of the federal government.

A final benefit perceived from a study of research utilization in area of TJTC stemmed from the fact that because of the low salience of the tax credit, relatively few actors had any extensive involvement with it. It therefore seemed possible that I had a rather rare opportunity in the study of research utilization in the public policy area and that was the possibility of studying the full universe of relevant actors and, hence, of gaining a more accurate picture of research use in this area than would be possible if I had to rely on only a sampling of actors.

KEY TERMS DEFINED

It is important at the onset to establish the meaning of two terms -- "research" and "use" -- as they are used in this study.
"Research" as used here refers to those efforts systematically to gather empirical, verifiable information about a particular phenomenon. As such, I exclude by definition studies that are exclusively theoretical in nature or are otherwise devoid of empirical content. The definition of research is broad enough, however, to encompass empirical studies that seek either simply to describe a particular phenomenon such as a survey would, or a study that attempts to explain the genesis or outcomes of that phenomenon. Casual, unsystematic (unscientific) efforts to describe or explain events, efforts that give too much play to "experience" or "intuition" or otherwise make little or no effort to control for bias are excluded from the definition of research. Hence, my concern in this study will be to look for those factors associated with the use and impact of empirical studies of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit. As we have already seen, the concept of "use" is much discussed among those who have studied the various aspects of research utilization. For the purpose of this study I have chosen to apply a broad definition to the concept of "use" that will permit me to look for evidence that the research in question has been applied to any of several different purposes. Nevertheless, most of my attention will be focused on the common understanding of "use" which in the context of this study will mean the application of the findings of TJTC-related research studies to help make one or more decisions or establish one or more positions regarding TJTC. "Use" will not include merely having "looked at" or "considered" a piece of research. Thus, "use" implies some impact, however defined.
I should comment too on the use of the phrase "to help make a decision or establish a position regarding TJTC." The reason for adding the "or establish a position" part of this phrase was to help protect against the possibility that by using the words "make a decision" I would force an underreporting of research utilization since we know from studies in public policy and organization behavior that many persons do not see themselves as "decision makers." By adding the phrase "establish a position" I hoped to be able to capture those instances where an individual had formed a clear opinion on some aspect of TJTC on the basis of the research he/she had encountered.

DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

I began with the desire to interview all relevant actors at the national level concerning TJTC. By "relevant" actor I meant one that had either a policy making, policy recommending, or policy support responsibility for some aspect of TJTC. My earlier research together with the recommendations of informed individuals had indicated that such actors could be found in the Department of Labor, Treasury Department, Congress, and interest groups.

Most of the original data upon which specific findings from this research are based came from interviews conducted during the week of May 23, 1983. I would judge myself to be mostly, but not completely successful in meeting my original goal of interviewing the full universe of relevant actors concerning their research utilization behavior. I was unable to interview any high ranking political appointees in the administration, or any Congressmen who have taken an
interest in TJTC. However, in the Department of Labor I interviewed all but one individual having TJTC as at least a part of their duties. In Congress I interviewed four of the five staff members identified as having a significant responsibility for TJTC. Responsible, knowledgeable individuals from the seven interest groups most actively involved with TJTC were also interviewed. The sole individual in the Internal Revenue Service with an operating responsibility (his only responsibility) for TJTC was interviewed. A total of 25 individuals were interviewed during the week of May 23, 1983. I am confident that this represents a significant majority of the knowledgeable, relevant actors at the national level.

Those interviewed were knowledgeable about TJTC, held opinions (sometimes quite strong opinions) about a variety of aspects pertaining to the tax credit, and were in positions that permitted (or even required) that they make policy recommendations to their superiors. They were not, however, the individuals who could be referred to as the formal decision makers concerning TJTC except in the case of the Department of Labor where, of necessity, staff with operating responsibility must make day-to-day decisions that singly and in aggregate give shading, and sometimes even meaning, to existing policy. Most importantly, the persons interviewed were in a position to be considered potential users of TJTC-related research and observers of the role that research played in the development and implementation of TJTC.

Each interview lasted an average of approximately 75 minutes. All interviews were based on the questions from an interview guide
found in Appendix A. The interview guide itself was developed on the basis of the literature reviewed on the subject of research utilization and was designed to gather information on the extent and nature of research use in the area of TJTC, and on a number of factors the literature suggests might be important to the research utilization decision.

Specifically, questions 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were used to gather information concerning the extent, nature, and importance of research use by the respondents. My review of the literature on research utilization suggested three categories of variables having a potentially important impact on research use. Questions 1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 14, 22, and 23 provided information concerning the characteristics of the individual that might facilitate or impede research use. The characteristics of the organization potentially impacting research use were probed by way of questions 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, and 22. The importance of research and research report characteristics to research use was sought through questions 3, 8, 12, 14, 20, 21, and 22. (Responses received to several questions, namely numbers 2, 3, 8, 12, 14 and 22, provided information useful in more than one area of inquiry.) Where appropriate, I gathered supplemental information primarily from various public records such as congressional hearings, agency policy statements, and interest group position papers.

In addition to the interviews conducted during the week of May 23rd, two earlier waves of interviews were conducted during the summers of 1980 and 1981 that provided background information on the
implementation of TJTC. From the perspective of the current research effort, those earlier interviews served as the basis for identifying the important actors in the TJTC policy area, and for familiarizing me with the issues, questions, and problems associated with this tax credit. Also, a preliminary version of the interview guide used in the present research was tested on selected individuals in the second wave of interviews during the summer of 1981. Table 1 shows the number of persons interviewed by agency affiliation and by year.

Implicit in Table 1 is the fact that some persons were interviewed two or even three times. Table 2 depicts the number of persons interviewed by agency affiliation regardless of the number of times any individual was interviewed.

The agency affiliation of the persons upon whom the current research is based is shown in Table 3.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Toward the end of the interview session (hopefully after some rapport had been developed), I asked the respondents to provide me with information concerning their educational background, and the number of years they had been with their organization.

This information supplemented that obtained from the first question in the interview that asked the respondents to describe their job responsibilities, and job title, and provided me with the basis for describing certain characteristics of those interviewed.

In general (and admittedly somewhat arbitrarily), I would identify five of the 25 respondents as occupying upper level positions in their organizations; 11 occupied upper-middle to lower-upper
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Congress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Services Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accounting Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Alliance of Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Counties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Employment Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governors' Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast - Midwest Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Conference of Mayors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Congress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Services Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accounting Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Alliance of Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Counties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Employment Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governors' Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast - Midwest Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Conference of Mayors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

Number of Persons Interviewed on Research Utilization
By Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>N=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Congress</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

level positions; and nine held middle level positions. Table 4 displays the position level of the respondents by their organizational affiliation.

Another way of viewing the organizational status of the respondents is by their responsibility for supervising professional staff.

TABLE 4

Position Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle/Lower Upper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5 shows, 13 respondents were in positions that required them to supervise other professional staff; the rest did not have such responsibility. Not surprisingly, all but two supervisors
TABLE 5
Supervisory Responsibility of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsupervisors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

could be classified as holding upper or upper middle/lower upper positions in their organizations.

In terms of the number of years the respondents had been with their organizations, none had a tenure of less than two years. Eight had been with their current organizations for 10 or more years. Of course, many of the respondents had changed both the level and the type of responsibility they carried over time.

There was a range of educational backgrounds among the respondents. The basic distinction I made was between those who had an educational background in the social sciences and those who did not. (My interest in this distinction, as we have seen, was based on a factor the literature suggests might be important in helping to explain differences in research utilization among individuals.) Fourteen of the respondents had at least a bachelor's degree in a social science; the remaining 11 did not. The social science field most represented among the respondents with an educational background in this area was economics. Nine of the fourteen respondents with at least a bachelor's degree in a social science had a degree in economics. Four were trained in political science; one in psychology.
Overall, the respondents were a well-educated group. Only four had less than a bachelor's degree, 15 had masters or doctorate degrees. Table 6 shows the level of educational attainment of the respondents by their organizational affiliation.

**TABLE 6**

Educational Background of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a BA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA in a Social Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree in a Social Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Not in a Social Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree Not in a Social Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These background factors, along with others, will be considered again later in this study when I attempt to find explanations for the research utilization behavior observed which, along with providing an in-depth description of the nature, extent, and importance of research use, constitute the main purposes of this study. The later objective—in-depth description of research utilization behavior—is almost nonexistent in the literature and should help contribute to the development of a base-line understanding of research utilization behavior.
OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY

It is appropriate to comment on two other features of this study.

First, I will be relying primarily on the self-reported attitudes and behavior of the respondents. As has already been noted in the first chapter, these reports are subject to bias introduced by lapses of memory or more deliberate attempts to respond in what may be thought of as "acceptable" ways. Hopefully, minimizing at least this latter potential problem was the rapport I built up with the respondents in some cases over several years and the in-depth knowledge I had of TJTC at the national level. This made implausible answers readily apparent and easily challenged—an extremely rare occurrence however. Further, the ability to probe for confirming or supporting evidence, and the ability to cross check responses with those of other knowledgeable persons also served to reduce bias as did the opportunity to consult written records.

Second, throughout the later chapters of this study I will be reporting two sorts of data and at times moving rather freely from one to the other where that seems appropriate. In the first instance, a good deal of the reporting will be that of the direct responses received to the various questions asked about research utilization attitudes and behavior. In the second instance, however, I will be reporting my own judgments on the various topics usually in the form of noting the relationships observable among the responses, or among the responses and the demographic variables I have included as part of this research. My point here, of course, is to embark upon an effort to offer explanations for the opinions and behavior reported
by the respondents. This exploratory effort will put me in a position to offer comments on the appropriateness of the various factors suggested by the literature as influencing research utilization. It will also enable me to offer in the last chapter of this study a model of research utilization behavior which hopefully will have explanatory value as well as value in helping direct future research to be conducted in this area.

TJTC OVERVIEW

It seems appropriate to provide both of brief description of TJTC, and a discussion of the research that has been conducted on this topic. Aside from the very obvious reason of giving the reader some sense of what the substantive area is like within which my research took place, there is one other reason for offering this information. As will be seen, TJTC was a rather complicated and difficult program to administer. Further, it was generally agreed that TJTC was failing to achieve its purposes. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume, lacking any information to the contrary, that those persons responsible for TJTC would be inclined to take advantage of whatever help might be offered by the research conducted on this subject. In this section and the one to follow I will show that there were reasons for needing the help that research could provide, and research available that could provide this help.

The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit was created by the Revenue Act of 1978. Its purpose was to increase private sector employment opportunities for selected categories of individuals. Specifically, an
employer was eligible for a tax credit for hiring from among seven categories of individuals:

1. Recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments;
2. Handicapped individuals referred from vocational rehabilitation or the Veteran's Administration;
3. Economically disadvantaged Vietnam-era veterans under 35;
4. Economically disadvantaged youth 18 through 24 years old;
5. Economically disadvantaged ex-convicts convicted of a felony and hired within five years of either release from prison or date of conviction, whichever is later;
6. Recipients of approved state or local general assistance;
7. Youth, 16 through 19 years old, participating in an approved cooperative education program.

Eligible individuals in the targeted groups received a "voucher" from an authorized public agency--Employment Service offices, CETA Prime Sponsors, State Vocational Rehabilitation Departments, General Assistance Programs, the Veteran's Administration, Social Security Administration District offices, and Cooperative Education programs. Employment Service offices and CETA Prime Sponsors were permitted to issue vouchers to all but Cooperative Education students. The other agencies could only issue vouchers to their client groups or (with the exception of Cooperative Education) they could refer them to an Employment Service or Prime Sponsor office, depending on what arrangements had been made locally.

The voucher was valid for 30 days or up to the last day of the month--whichever occurred first. If the individual was hired, the employer completed a portion of the voucher and sent it to an Employment Service office where it was reviewed to insure compliance
with regulations. Assuming no problems were identified, a "certification" was returned to the employer to provide necessary documentation for tax purposes.

The law also permitted employers to apply for a tax credit on a retroactive basis, that is, after an employee had already been hired. The retroactive eligibility of these employees had to be confirmed by one of the vouchering agencies, in the sense that a voucher had to be issued, and the Employment Service, which was the only agency authorized to issue certifications, had to review the vouchers and issue certifications for retroactive hires just as it did for "new" TJTC hires.

TJTC allowed employers to claim tax credits of 50% of first year wages up to $6,000 (i.e. $3,000), and 25% of second year wages up to $6,000 (i.e. $1,500). However, because an employer's normal deductions for wages must be reduced by the amount of the credit claimed, net TJTC savings depended on the employer's tax bracket. Actual first year savings ranged from $900 for an employer in the 70% tax bracket to $2,580 for one in the 14% bracket, for each eligible employee paid $6,000 for the first year employment.

The consensus view of TJTC was that it had done very little to reorient the hiring decisions of private employers--its primary purpose. Relative to the universe of need, very few individuals were served. For example, one estimate made of the benefit given by TJTC to the most populous target group, economically disadvantaged youth, was that only five percent of those individuals finding jobs were involved in earning a tax credit for their employers. (See
Further diluting the impact of TJTC was the ability of an employer to receive a tax credit for persons already hired—presumably without consideration of the credit. A very conservative estimate would place the proportion of "retrocerts" at 50% of all certifications issued. In addition, those positions for which certifications had been issued went primarily to whites, and were primarily in high-turnover areas, at least as measured by the relatively low wages paid.

RESEARCH ON TJTC

Introduction

Most of the empirical research that has been conducted on TJTC can be seen as attempting to gain an understanding of the reasons why the credit was performing as it did. In this sense, the take-off point for this research was the widely shared view that TJTC was a failure. In this section, I will review some of the important research findings concerning TJTC.

There are two points to be noted at the onset. First, any attempt to understand the success or failure of TJTC must distinguish between those contributing factors that are based on the nature of the tax credit itself, and those that are due to agency implementation efforts. The latter ought to be more subject to agency control and change than the former which would probably require legislative action. Second, the empirical research discussed here covers those reports that were available through 1983. However, as stated earlier, all of the empirical research that was
available at that time was carried out in the early phases of the implementation of TJTC. As a consequence, all of the empirical research referred to here covers the period from the beginning of TJTC through July 1981—prior to the effective date of legislative changes enacted in August 1981.

Agency Response to TJTC

In general, the agencies responsible for implementing TJTC were skeptical to hostile toward the credit and, consequently, un-enthusiastic in their efforts to implement it. Relatively very little was being done to attract business or eligible clients to participate in the program. There were a number of reasons for this situation.

In part, this basic attitude stemmed from a failure to provide sufficient financial resources for the implementation effort—a perception most keenly felt in the Employment Service which was undergoing budget and staff reductions at the time it was expected to implement TJTC. A program that was apparently presumed by its designers to be of low or no cost administratively to the implementing agencies simply was not experienced as such at the local level. Significant costs were experienced in issuing (and explaining) the vouchers, verifying eligibility, and marketing the credit to business (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, November 1981:11-17). In fact, many observers remarked that there were neither identifiable incentives for agencies to make an effort to successfully implement TJTC, nor were there penalties for a lack of such effort.
In part, the negative attitude of the implementing agencies stemmed from the perception of TJTC as a threat to existing programs designed to help disadvantaged persons to become employable. That is, if a tax credit, by itself, could be used to stimulate employers to hire significant numbers of disadvantaged persons, of what value were the more costly job training programs offered by most of the agencies now charged with helping to implement TJTC? This view was most prominent among CETA Prime Sponsors (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1980b:17).

Negative agency attitudes toward TJTC were exacerbated by certain structural features of the program. These included the end of the month expiration of the voucher (some agencies simply would not issue a voucher toward the end of the month); the lack of centralized effort to coordinate the use of the credit at the local level which contributed to further confusion on the part of the business community; and the demoralizing impact of retroactive certification which rewarded employers for decisions made independent of the tax credit (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, July 1980:8-15, and U. S. Department of Labor, 1980c:4).

Concerning retroactive certification, agencies appear to have had mixed views toward it. On the one hand, it represented in the extreme view, an unconscionable windfall to business. On the other hand, it was a way agencies could easily meet whatever numerical goals for certifications that were set for them by the U. S. Department of Labor. Further, some hoped that retroactive certifications would help change negative attitudes of employers toward
"government programs," and lead them to voluntarily seek target group employees. However, this hoped for "wedge effect" never came to pass (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, July 1980:32-33).

As experience was gained with TJTC another factor surfaced that helped account for the general attitude of the service delivery agencies. This was the perception that, to a large extent, in spite of whatever efforts that the delivery agencies might make, employers were unwilling to change significantly their attitude or behavior toward TJTC. This in turn contributed to a decline, at least in some areas, in implementation efforts (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, May 1981:27-41).

Actually, within the context of a program that was in general not achieving the goals set for it, some evidence was available that local efforts might make some modest difference in the levels of success in implementing TJTC. For example, a strong Employment Service effort at the local level (Bishop, 1982:26), or state/Regional level (U. S. Department of Labor, 1980b:6) could make a difference in the take-up rate of the credit.

The Ohio State University study (May 1981:67-78) found evidence that differences in local Employment Service goals for TJTC relative to retroactive certification, appeared related to the level of retroactive certifications and the percentage of planned certifications achieved.

Success in achieving relatively lower levels of retroactive certification, and high levels of planned certifications also appeared to be positively affected by the active involvement of
multiple vouchering agencies at the local level and by the use of multiple strategies to market TJTC to business especially strategies that involved face-to-face contact between the implementing agency and business representatives. Most other research that has looked into marketing has also supported the importance of an active effort in this area (Bishop, 1982:40, and U.S. Department of Labor, 1979: 47).

Again, the differences made by these differences in implementation were typically modest and were typically perceived by the local program implementers as not worth the effort in terms of the costs/benefits (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, May 1981:80).

In spite of the perceptions of local implementers that their efforts on behalf of TJTC were not cost effective, there is a paucity of hard data to support this conclusion. The Department of Labor planned to conduct a study of the net impact of TJTC but the effort was terminated because of the expected cost (at least $1 million), methodological difficulties and, most importantly, lack of interest due to the low priority given to TJTC.

Only one study is available that makes an attempt to estimate the overall costs/benefits of TJTC. Lorenz (1982) conducted a "costs/savings" study of TJTC in the State of Maryland. Factoring out retroactive certifications, Lorenz traced a sample of persons certified under TJTC over a two year period, one year before and one year after employment. He also obtained estimates of the administrative costs of the program, the credits earned by employers
of the certified sample, the taxes paid by the employed sample, and the reduction in transfer payments. Based on these data the "quite tentative" conclusion was reached that TJTC had been cost effective from both the federal and State perspectives. Although Lorenz provides detailed information on the computation of the savings resulting from employment gained presumably by way of TJTC, no figures are provided on the computation of the administrative costs of the program. This omission should serve to emphasize the "quite tentative" nature of the conclusions reached.

**Employer Response to TJTC**

We have already seen that the implementing agencies perceived the business community as, in general, unresponsive to the TJTC initiative except to the extent that some businesses enthusiastically participated by way of claiming retroactive certifications. Even here, however, only a small fraction of the businesses that could take advantage of the credit retroactively did so. Bishop (1982:xv) estimates that less than 10% of all firms eligible for retroactive certifications claimed them.

What were the reasons for the dismal response of the business community? The available research suggests a number of factors were operative beginning with the most obvious reason for lack of participation—ignorance of the tax credit. For example, in a survey conducted in December 1979 of over 4,000 firms, Bishop (1982:21) determined that only 17% of all businesses were familiar with TJTC. (Only 23% were aware of the WIN credit which had been in existence since 1967.) Bishop (1982:27) concluded, in fact, that
ignorance of the credit was the major barrier to its use even though he estimated that only 13% of all firms familiar with TJTC were actually using it. Low levels of awareness were also found in a March 1980 survey of businesses by the Congressional Budget Office (Amey, et al., 1980:11); in a December 1980 survey conducted by the Department of Labor; and in a May 1981 survey carried out by the General Accounting Office (1981:8).

Bishop (1982:21) found that the size of the firm was the best predictor of familiarity with TJTC. The larger the firm, the greater the chance that it was aware of the tax credit. It can be speculated that only large businesses can afford to have in-house tax experts to be alert for programs like TJTC. The problem is that it is now assumed that most new jobs are being created by the small businesses which are more likely to be ignorant of TJTC. This problem was made worse by marketing efforts that focused on the more visible, easily reached larger firms in a particular area.

Perhaps the most important reason for nonparticipation among those firms that knew of the tax credit was pervasive fear of government. This fear was expressed in a variety of ways. Some businesses, for example, were concerned about excessive "red tape" if they chose to participate in the program. Others feared that accepting the credit increased their chances of being audited by IRS. Still other firms were concerned that participation in the TJTC program would somehow surrender some of their control over hiring/firing decisions to the government (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, January 1981:47-50).
Fear of (or prejudice toward) the kind of worker eligible for the credit led many employers to shy away from the program. Often, TJTC-eligible persons were seen as "losers," unskilled or otherwise unsuited for employment (Burtless and Cheston, 1981:2, and Bishop, 1982:91).

Some employers were concerned that any effort on their part to determine the eligibility of potential employees for TJTC might somehow violate state or federal fair hiring or privacy laws (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1980b:20, and The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, January 1981:50).

From the perspective of these fears it is easy to see that the financial benefit of the tax credit was weighed against a number of real or potential costs and more often than not the size of the credit was not enough to induce involvement in the program.

Yet other factors were identified by research that served to inhibit employer participation in the TJTC program. For example, it is estimated that 55% of all firms have no tax liability hence no financial incentive to hire TJTC-eligible job applicants (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1980b:34). Given the economic recession that was in place at the time the research into the implementation of TJTC was taking place, many firms simply were not in a position to hire anyone. Even if the firm was hiring, the hiring decision may have been made by someone who was not involved with or informed about tax considerations, or even if involved was motivated more by the desire to hire the "right person" for the job rather than seek a future tax credit.
Client Response to TJTC

Relatively little direct information is available on the reaction of TJTC-eligible job seekers to the tax credit. Not surprisingly, given the response of local implementing agencies to TJTC, Bishop (1982:91) reports that the vast majority of eligible persons were unaware of the existence of the credit. Even when the job seeker was aware of the tax credit and encouraged to use it in his/her job seeking efforts, there was evidence that many would not do this for fear of being stigmatized as undesirables (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, May 1981:58). Still more concerning was evidence from two studies (Burltless and Cheston, 1981, and the Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, 1982) that efforts by job seekers to market the tax credit to potential employers actually reduced their chances of gaining employment.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Based on the empirical research conducted on the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit it must be concluded that the program was, in general, unsuccessful in achieving its goals. What was supposed to be a self-administering, simple program in reality was a complex, costly and confusing involvement of multiple agencies of government and multiple levels of government. The financial and other resources provided were seen as inadequate to the task. As a result, implementing agencies and employers were unenthusiastic about the credit and did little to help make it a success. Consequently, very few
of the universe of TJTC-eligible job seekers were ever benefited by the credit.

The research that documented the disappointing performance of TJTC also pointed to a number of reasons that appeared to help account for the program's lack of success. Many of these factors appeared remediable by either administrative or legislative action and, as we know, such action was subsequently taken on several of these barriers to success. The questions I will address in the remainder of this study are the extent to which the empirical research on TJTC was used by those national-level decision makers charged with helping to make TJTC a success, and the identification of those factors that appeared to facilitate or impede the use of this research.

The remainder of this study has been organized and will be presented in the following manner:

**Chapter 3 - Research Utilization with Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Policy Area**

This chapter describes and discusses within the TJTC policy area:

1) the extent and type of research utilization;
2) the issues to which research was applied;
3) the research that was used;
4) the factors other than research that were considered by the respondents, and
5) the perceived importance of research to decision making/position taking.

**Chapter 4 - The Impact of the Personal Characteristics of Potential Users of Research on Research Utilization**

The impact of basic attitudes toward, and needs for, research on research utilization are examined. Within this context, the impact
of "ideology," and what I have called the "manager's mentality" are also noted. The relationships of one's position in an organization, and one's educational background to research utilization are also discussed.

Chapter 5 - The Impact of Organizational Characteristics on Research Utilization

In this chapter, factors such as: 1) the importance of research to an organization; 2) the efforts of an organization to encourage and facilitate research use; 3) the existence of "networks" within and among organizations; 4) personal contact with researchers; 5) personal involvement in research; 6) and the source of research are examined for their impact on research utilization.

Chapter 6 - The Impact of Research Characteristics on Research Utilization

The literature on research utilization identifies a number of characteristics of research, or the typical product of this undertaking--the research report--as influencing the utilization decision. This chapter explores the importance of several of the most prominent research characteristics to research utilization in the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit policy area.

Chapter 7 - Summary and Conclusion

The findings of the previous chapters are summarized and discussed. An effort is made to produce a comprehensive view of the research utilization phenomenon and the factors that appear to influence it. The contribution of this study to the field of research utilization study is noted. Areas that this study suggests may be promising for future investigation are described.
1. The only systematic empirical studies dealing with the national level of the federal government I have identified are Caplan et al. (1975), Rich (1977), The Comptroller General (1977), Patton et al. (1977), and Rich (1979b).

2. The sometimes difficult task of locating a "decision maker" in the context of research utilization studies has been noted before. See, for example, Weiss (1977b:11).

3. Although other federal agencies have a modest role to play in TJTC, my earlier research showed them to be (with the possible exception of the Department of Education) uninterested in TJTC and certainly not concerned about influencing the course of public policy in this area.

4. I have in this chapter used the terms "policy maker" and "decision maker" for convenience to characterize those persons highly placed in the administration (or Congress) who are in especially influential positions concerning TJTC. For example, in the case of TJTC, two such individuals would be John Chapoton, the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, and Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania. I do not wish to imply that even for a policy as relatively low-profile and unimportant as TJTC is that the richness and complexity found elsewhere in the public policy process is somehow missing here. Granted that policy making is not typically a discrete event but a process in which a few visible acts attributable to identifiable individuals combine with many less visible acts (or non-acts) of agency administrators, lobbyists, Congressmen and their staff, and others to make up the ingredients of a public policy, TJTC is no less the product of this process than other, more salient, policies that can be studied. In the case of TJTC, those individuals found on the more highly visible side of the equation are fewer in number than would be found on more prominent policy issues. In fact, relatively minor policies like TJTC no doubt significantly outnumber major policies.

5. The respondents were classified according to the position they occupied within their agency's hierarchy. In the Department of Labor, I deemed political appointees to be in the "upper" rank; individuals having the title "Director" or "Chief" of an Office/Division were placed in the "upper middle/upper lower upper" category; all other were placed in the "middle" group.
Those persons holding the position of "Director" of an interest group were placed in the "upper" category. The "upper middle/lower upper" category was reserved for those who had responsibility for running a functional unit within the interest group. (I interviewed no one in this category.) All others interviewed in the interest groups were classified in the 'middle' group. Without exception these were persons functioning as staff researchers reporting either to a unit supervisor or the chief executive officer.

In Congress persons with the titles of "Administrative Assistant" or "Legislative Assistant" to a Congressman, or "Chief Economist/Senior Economist" to a committee were classified as holding "upper" level staff positions. "Staff Economist" was put in the "upper middle/lower upper" category. Staff members serving as "Staff Assistants," "Researchers," and anyone reporting to someone in the "upper" or "upper middle/lower upper" categories would be classified as holding a "middle level" position. (No one was interviewed in this category.)

6. TJTC has been amended three times since its creation. Because the empirical research on TJTC upon which this study relies covers the period up to July 1981—prior to any substantive legislative changes being made—I will limit my description of the tax credit to those salient characteristics of the program as it was up to July 1981. Appendix B may be consulted for a description of the substantive legislative changes later made to the tax credit.

7. A description of the experience in the United States with prior employment tax credits may be found in Bishop, 1982:81-95; Hammermesh, 1978; and Haveman and Palmer, 1982:257-296. The European experience with employment tax credits may be found in Haveman and Palmer, 1982:297-327.

8. There is one exception to this statement. The work of Lorenz (1982) covers the period through fiscal year 1982. However, the primary contribution of this study is its effort to estimate the net impact of TJTC. It does not focus on the issues of implementing the tax credit as do the other empirical studies used here.

9. One notable exception, however, was an experiment conducted in Wisconsin (Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, 1982) that compared local areas that were aggressively marketing TJTC to those that were not. No differences were found in the take-up rates of the credit between the two classes of locations.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH UTILIZATION IN THE TARGETED JOBS TAX CREDIT POLICY AREA

This chapter examines the type and extent of research utilization by the respondents in the Department of Labor, Congress, and interest groups. I will look briefly at the respondents' use of research in general, and then turn to research use in the TJTC policy area. I will describe the amount of research used, and the issues to which it was applied. I will then examine the nonresearch-based factors that were also used by the respondents to help them make decisions or establish positions in the TJTC policy area. Last, I will investigate the perceived importance of research to the decision making/position taking behavior of the respondents.

THE EXTENT OF RESEARCH USE

Research Use in General

Only one of those interviewed indicated that he never used research in the course of carrying out his job duties. This was the Internal Revenue Service official responsible for TJTC. Research was something that was perceived by him to be unnecessary to doing a good job. In his words, "I am not interested in what researchers have to say about TJTC. I only care about what Congress wants. It is the law that is important to me." This respondent did acknowledge, however, that "on occasion" he would look into the
record of congressional hearings held on TJTC if the law was silent or unclear on a technical matter that he had been asked to rule on such as the definition of a vocational rehabilitation program, or the eligibility of convicted felons who were on parole. He insisted that his examination of the record was limited to discovering congressional intent; the comments of researchers, the reproductions of research reports, would be skimmed at best. Interestingly, this respondent was aware of several of the empirical studies of TJTC indicating that at least in this case, the nonuse of research was not synonymous with ignorance of relevant research.

Although all but the one IRS respondent indicated that they used research to help them carry out the responsibilities of their positions, there was a wide range of such use. As Table 7 shows, 11 respondents stated that they used research "very often" in their jobs while at the other extreme, nine indicated that they used research only "sometimes," or not at all.¹

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
The interest group and congressional representatives stated an overall greater use of research than did the Department of Labor respondents suggesting that, in general, those groups had incorporated such behavior into their job routines. In contrast, one of the Department of Labor respondents in the 'Sometimes' category indicated that his use of research was limited to those materials that were provided to him by someone else rather than obtained by way of routine search procedures on his part. Others in this category clearly conveyed that they too relied heavily on others for research materials although they would at least occasionally supplement this with their own search efforts.

Research Use in the TJTC Policy Area

As is shown in Table 8, the general research utilization behavior of the respondents was rather closely matched by their use of research to help them establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC.

TABLE 8
The Use of Research to Help Establish a Position or Make a Decision Concerning TJTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Use Only, No Specific Examples Given</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Use Examples Given</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Used</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but three of the respondents by their self-reports had used TJTC-related research to help them establish a position or make a decision. Seventeen persons interviewed cited specific examples of the use of research to help them establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC. (I will discuss the areas to which TJTC-related research was applied in a later section of this chapter.)

Four respondents indicated that they had used TJTC-related research but were not able to give any examples of this use. Examples of these responses follow:

I know we looked into this thing when it was up for renewal. We were concerned that it [TJTC] would be killed-off. We even did our own original piece on the program, published it, and gave it wide circulation. I guess though that all the research we did just confirmed what we already knew about the program. (Interest group representative)

Everything we do here is based on research and that includes TJTC. Our positions were based on our research. (Interest group representative)

By and large I would say that research did not help me make any specific decisions concerning TJTC. Maybe a newcomer to this business might have been more affected. I guess in my case all it did was help me gain a better appreciation of what is involved in the use of this kind of a tool. (Department of Labor representative)

Two comments are in order concerning the respondents who were unable to cite any specific examples of the application of the TJTC research they claimed to have used. First, in all fairness, it must be understood that during the time these interviews were conducted (late May 1983) TJTC was a rather dormant subject. The last flurry of activity on it had taken place months before when Congress was considering its extension and certain technical amendments to the
basic legislation. Thus, it was quite possible that these respondents may simply have forgotten the more precise uses to which they put the research they reviewed. Second, and the last comment quoted above provides a good example of this, there may very well have been no precise application of TJTC-related research findings to any specific issue. Rather, the research would have served the "conceptual" purposes described in Chapter 1.

Documented Evidence of the Use of TJTC-Related Research

One other measure of the use of TJTC-related research that is independent of the self-reports provided by the respondents comes from an examination of the public record concerning TJTC. As part of the field research conducted for this project, I made an effort to acquire internal agency (particularly Department of Labor) documents that referred to or otherwise made use of TJTC-related research. I also reviewed all congressional hearings concerning TJTC to look for evidence that research findings were made a part of the deliberations.

There is no question that an examination of the written record supports the reports of the respondents that TJTC-related research was, in fact, used by the relevant participants. In October 1979, for example, a memorandum from a staff member of the Domestic Council to the Department of Labor said in part:

Attached you will find an article by Kazis and Sabonis that suggests little or no action in Boston and New Orleans and slow action elsewhere. Even more disturbing is the suggestion that the TJTC, like the WIN credits before, are seen by CETA staff as more of a stigma than an incentive. The tentative conclusions from the Department of Labor's evaluation appear to confirm this finding.
In any case I need... an updated detailed report about how we are doing and what actions we are taking to overcome difficulties.

It would also be helpful if a reply to the charges in the Kazis and Sabonis piece could be prepared.

The response requested by this memorandum was forthcoming a month later and itself relied heavily on existing research. At this same time the staff member on the Domestic Council wrote again to the Department of Labor saying in part:

I am interested in plans to have the Department of Labor continue a process evaluation of [TJTC].

If as the early reports suggest, the complexity of the program at the local level has made it difficult to administer, we should also be prepared to document these findings and propose a modified vouchering and certification process. Staffing and resource constraint should also be addressed.

Let's keep in close touch on this. I would appreciate receiving the monthly status reports and hope you will share the evaluation reports as they become available.

In another example of documented use of TJTC research, an internal memorandum was sent to a senior Department of Labor official transmitting the OSU study and pointing out the "policy sensitive" issues in the study.

No congressional hearings on TJTC were without at least some infusion of research (or researchers). Perhaps most striking was the April 1981 testimony of Department of Labor Officials before the Senate Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Employment and Revenue Sharing calling for the end of TJTC because it was not working. Three research studies, including the OSU study, were cited as supporting evidence (U.S. Congress, 1981a:
These same hearings saw research based testimony coming from the Urban League, National Alliance of Business, and the California Employment Development Department. The testimony of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce emphasized the need for additional research into the effectiveness of TJTC.

We must remind ourselves that an examination of the written record for evidence of the use of TJTC-related research has its limitations. It is not possible to know how, exactly, the research was used or how important this use was. For example, it is possible that instead of helping to form opinions about TJTC, research was used only when expedient, as political ammunition, or served simply to reinforce pre-existing opinions about the tax credit.

Why TJTC-Related Research Was Not Used

Of the three respondents who claimed not using any research to help them make a decision or establish a position concerning TJTC, one, a Department of Labor representative, had acquired a TJTC responsibility only three months earlier and claimed to be unaware of any TJTC-related research. Nevertheless, she was currently serving as project monitor for an outside contractor who had been hired to conduct a study of a novel approach to issuing TJTC vouchers that was being tried in one southern state and was anxiously awaiting the results of this research so that she could recommend expansion or curtailment of the new vouchering technique to her superiors. The other two nonresearch users were interest group employees who felt that their organizations had already staked out their positions on the relevant TJTC issues.
(prior to these persons taking their jobs) and hence they felt no need to reexamine these issues critically. Both were aware, however, of at least some of TJTC-relevant research.

THE TJTC ISSUES FOR WHICH RESEARCH WAS USED

As Table 9 shows, of the 17 respondents who claimed to have applied TJTC-related research to some specific issue, four (all from the Department of Labor) could cite only one such issue to which this research had been applied. The remaining 13 respondents claimed to have applied TJTC-related research to anywhere between two and six issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Issues</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the congressional and interest group respondents tended to cite more issues to which they applied TJTC-related research than did the Department of Labor respondents. A possible explanation for this is that the congressional and interest group
officials tended to be concerned with the whole program while the
typical Department of Labor person took a narrower view reflecting
his/her own limited areas of responsibilities and/or the more
immediate problem orientation that program officials tend to have.
Support for this view is gained by the fact that the higher up in
the Department of Labor hierarchy we went, more TJTC issues were
cited to which research had been applied, and occurrence that could
be expected given the presumption of the broader view and greater
responsibility of these officials.

There was a rather wide variety of TJTC issues to which
research was applied to help the respondents establish a position
or make a decision. The types of issues and the number of respond­
ents claiming to have applied TJTC-related research to that issue
were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Design and Administrative Structure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Impact on Business Behavior</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Retroactive Certifications</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperative Education Target Group</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Program Impact on Target Group Behavior</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vouchering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Verification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Promotion of the Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Program Evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two comments should be made about this list of issues. First, with the exception of issue number four, the cooperative education target group question, there was no discernible grouping by organizational affiliation. On the cooperative education issue only members of the congressional staff and interest groups claimed to have used TJTC-related research to help them form an opinion. No Department of Labor respondent included this in their list of issues to which they applied TJTC-related research.

The second observation to be made based on this list of issues is how small it is relative to the many aspects of, and issues inherent in, the TJTC program. Of course, I have done some collapsing here. For example, issues number one, two and five are actually composites of a number of more precisely stated issues. Nevertheless, even if the categories had not been collapsed, the list still would have contained only 15 issues. There are at least two possible explanations for this.

First, TJTC has not been a heavily researched topic and not all facets of the program have been examined. Hence, the opportunities for applying research to topics of interest were limited. In fact, one comment/complaint heard from many of those interviewed was directed to this lack of sufficient TJTC research.

Second, it is possible that selective perception was operating among those interviewed so that the only areas in which they chose to apply the research they were exposed to were those areas in which they had questions/problems, or otherwise had not yet formed firm opinions. We will see later, only a minority of the respondents
who reported at least occasionally seeking research did so for "conceptual" reasons in the area of TJTC (Table 14). All others saw themselves motivated by more immediate problems and needs.

The issues cited by the respondents to which they claimed to have applied TJTC-related research were all rather straightforward and immediately understandable except for the last item on the list -- "Overall Program Evaluation." As can be seen, this was the most important topic in terms of the number of respondents who pointed to it as an issue for which TJTC-related research had helped them make a decision or establish a position. This issue is most interesting from the perspective of research utilization and as such deserves elaboration.

Actually, an argument can be made that "Overall Program Evaluation" is not at all a specific issue in the same manner as the other issues cited by the respondents and ought not to appear on the list. In fact, one might argue that using research to help form a judgment of the overall value of the TJTC program is more analogous to "conceptual" thinking than to the issue-specific applications indicated by the other items on the list. This may or may not be the case, but I am disposed to dismiss the question of whether "Overall Program Evaluation" belongs among the "specific issues" or should be classified as "conceptual" use as basically uninteresting. What I find interesting and surprising is that in response to a question which sought to determine the specific issues to which TJTC-related research had been applied more respondents singled out the "big picture" question of "Overall Program
Evaluation than any of the more specific issues inherent in the TJTC program. Equally important, for every claim that TJTC-related research had helped to make a decision or establish a position concerning the overall program evaluation, my interviewing turned up a similar number of comments in which the hope was expressed that some research would be done that would help to establish the worth of the TJTC program. I can think of no other unsolicited comment received more frequently than this one. Further, those who were unable to make the inductive leap to overall program evaluation tended to feel frustrated by the unresponsiveness or irrelevance of existing research.

Some of the comments from respondents who claimed to have been helped by TJTC-related research to form an opinion on the question of the overall evaluation of the program should help convey their own perception of the importance of this issue and the role played by research. The statement of Department of Labor official was typical:

I looked at everything I could get my hands on regarding TJTC in the early days. I was working on the joint report with Treasury to Congress on the program. The research I reviewed helped form my views on the retrocert problem, the need for a greater Employment Service role in the program, and the prospects for significant private sector uptake. But this wasn't the major question we were concerned with. The major question was whether or not the program as a whole should or should not be continued. Treasury was against it in principle and we were running hot and cold on it. I used what information I could get hold of to help me form my own judgment. A lot of the research just wasn't on target. I combined field data, and research reports, and guesses, to come up with my views on the worth of the thing.
An interest group official who was surprisingly familiar with many of the details of TJTC commented:

We did our own study of the program. We were especially interested in getting the views of the business community. The most important outcome from this was that it caused me to get off the fence and support the program -- not that it doesn't have some real problems. This came just in time. The program was up for review in Congress and we were able to let our views be known.

Another interest group official expressed a similar "big picture" use of TJTC-related research albeit with a different outcome:

The only TJTC-related research I'm familiar with is the OSU study and Bishop's work. I found these useful even though they don't really get at the real question of whether the program has any value or is just a windfall to certain businesses. So I'm still undecided. The case for TJTC is still unproven.

A congressional staff member also was able to take the leap from the specifics of research studies to a general conclusion about the overall value of TJTC:

The issues I recall using research for were: telephone vouchering, the status of vocational education students, the performance of the different vouchering agencies, and the attitude of corporate officials toward the credit. These were all based on research including checking with people. The most important thing research did was show me that the program almost died before it had a real chance to live. Corporate heads are now putting pressure on the lower levels in their organizations to use the credit. This is reflected in the evaluation reports I've seen. As I see it, TJTC has been shown to be a good middle ground between CETA and doing nothing.

The ability to move from a consideration of specifics to a judgment of the overall value of the TJTC program is what distinguished this group of respondents from those who expressed the desire to be able to make such summary judgments but felt unable to do so because, in their opinion, the research with which they were
familiar did not address the kinds of questions that would enable them to make these judgments. The former group implicitly seemed to recognize that no empirical research could take any series of observations on the specific functioning of the TJTC program and then draw the value-based conclusion that the program ought or ought not to continue. The latter group implicitly seemed to feel that such a transition could be made and it was only their misfortune not to have uncovered any such study that would safely lead them from their knowledge of the specific aspects of TJTC to the "proper" conclusion as to the merit of its continuation or termination. As one Department of Labor official put it:

I wish we had some good studies of TJTC. The studies that have been done that I've seen deal with administrative issues that really don't require any research to know what the outcome is going to be. Take the question of the shared responsibility for vouchering for example. Anybody who has run a program knows that unless you clearly fix the location of responsibility you're going to get a weak effort out of everyone. So as I see it we will probably keep on getting studies of administration when what is really needed are studies of the social benefits brought about by TJTC. I mean TJTC may be this or that administratively, and it may be good public policy politically, but to me the question is, is it really good public policy.

The perspective of a congressional staff member was also typical of those seeking "better" research to help them answer the ultimate question of program value:

In the process of getting ready for our hearings on the renewal of TJTC, I reviewed the conceptual work on tax credits done by the Brookings Institution, and the empirical pieces done by OSU, Bishop, and Perloff and Wachter. There were some other studies too that I looked at but I can't recall the authors. A lot of these studies have complicated economics in them -- our members can't handle that. So I look for any evidence that the views held by the members I serve are being refuted, or whether the research supports
what we know or want. Most of this research isn't very useful however because it doesn't have a policy orientation. I found no research that says TJTC should be renewed. This is where we have to exercise judgment and this can be tough because there are so many factors to be weighed and the research really doesn't give much help here. What really would be good is if there was some research showing net job creation due to TJTC. This would establish the program beyond refute. Of course, it is a little easier than this in practice since I defer to the members' views.

My own sense of what may distinguish those who do make summary judgments based on research from those who do not is that the former group deliberately minimizes its concern for normative issues such as "what would be just under these circumstances" and focuses on arriving at some sort of costs/benefits judgment which, when made, leads them to extend or withdraw support for a program. Their task is made only a little easier by the exclusion of the normative questions. They are still faced with the enormously complex task (complex at least when viewed analytically from the outside) of assigning different weights to such diverse aspects of TJTC as "number of persons places," "administrative disruptions," "possibility of fraud," "stigmatizing clients," and the like, and then arriving at a final judgment. The nondeciders remain hopelessly bogged down by their concern for "what ought to be."

The two groups -- those who make summary judgments based on research and those who do not -- I would suspect are distinguished by some fundamentally different world-views or predispositions that my research did not probe. Alternatively, there is the possibility that the nature of the organization and/or the place within an organization a person finds themself may be linked to this
deciding/nondeciding behavior. In fact, later in this study when I present the results of cross-tabulating all of the variables that I considered, I will suggest some factors that appear to distinguish these two groups.

There is one last comment to be made on the subject of the issues to which TJTC-related research was applied. On five of the nine issues identified earlier -- program design and administrative structure, retroactive certifications, target groups, program impact on business behavior, and overall program evaluation -- at least one instance could be found in each case where an individual reached a conclusion, allegedly based on a review of the research available, that was at odds with the other members of that group. For example, the general consensus was that the business community had responded disappointingly to TJTC and that prospects for improvement were not bright. One congressional staff member, however, reached exactly the opposite conclusion. What happened in these instances of conflicting research-based conclusions may have several potential explanations:

1. The different judgments among the research users reflects differences in the research itself. (However, my review of the empirical research indicates that contradictory findings were rare.)

2. The research may all be generally in agreement but so cautious, caveated, and admittedly nondefinitive that differing interpretations are understandable.

3. An individual's values, predispositions, ideology, etc. may
be so strong as to not permit certain conclusions to be reached no matter what the "facts" are. (And besides, has it ever been determined if the cup is half full or half empty?)

In my opinion, a full accounting of the discrepancies in the judgments reached by the respondents would draw on each of these three potential explanations.

THE TJTC-RELATED RESEARCH THAT WAS USED

My own research has lead me to uncover 15 empirical studies that deal directly with the subject of TJTC. An additional number of studies exist that deal with predecessor employment tax credits or with tax credits at a level general enough to be useful to someone thinking about the generic aspects of an employment tax program.

I had several reasons for wanting to pursue the question of which studies the respondents used. First of all, I wondered if those who claimed to have used TJTC-related research to help them make a decision or establish a position were, at the aggregate level, drawing from many or only a few studies. Second, at the individual level were the respondents basing their decisions on a smaller or larger number of studies. Third, I intended to use this question to help verify the individual's responses to the earlier question on whether or not they had used TJTC-related research to help them make a decision or establish a position.

Before looking at the results obtained from this question a reminder is in order. First, and most importantly, TJTC has not been a heavily researched program and that research that has been
done has not been published, with only few exceptions, in ways that make it readily accessible. Some of the studies exist in mimeographed form only. Others are buried in the text of congressional hearings by various House and Senate committees. It should be expected that these factors would have some impact on utilization. 3

Second, there was no way to avoid the possible confounding influence of the fact that most of the respondents in this study had been interviewed by me as part of an earlier study of the implementation of TJTC. All respondents were reminded of (or told of) that study as part of the introduction of the interview upon which this study is based. In short, it would be most surprising if all respondents, if only for the reasons mentioned, could not at least cite knowledge of the "Ohio State" study. On the other hand, it is also fair to say that the "Ohio State" study was one of the less than handful of major research pieces on TJTC, and may very well have been known by the respondents for this reason alone.

I have identified some 1 3 distinct responses to this question. These responses include, as I requested, reference to specific studies, ten of them to be exact, but they also contain three other responses that should be noted. These are:

1) failure to recall studies by author, title, or any other descriptor,
2) reference to other people as a source of research information, and
3) reference to the economic theory literature or other non-TJTC-specific research literature as the source of
research the respondent applied to some aspect of TJTC. Each of these points is interesting in its own right and I will briefly review them before turning to an examination of the literature-based responses to this question.

Six of the 21 respondents failed to recall adequate descriptive information on one or more specific studies they claimed they had used in reaching a decision or establishing a position concerning TJTC. Five of these respondents were able to adequately identify at least one other specific study they had used. One respondent, however, (a Department of Labor official) was not able to cite any specific research study.

The fact that I asked the respondents to identify specific research studies they had used may have acted to minimize references to the acquisition of research-based information via other persons. Nevertheless, seven respondents made reference to other individuals as the source of the research-based information they had applied to the TJTC program. Each of these seven respondents was also able to cite at least one other specific study by name (although two of these could only cite the OSU study) suggesting that personal contact was not used as the exclusive means for acquiring research information. I should acknowledge that I can only assume that these contacts were yielding research-based information as opposed to merely the advice and counsel, not otherwise based on research, of a trusted colleague on some aspect of the TJTC program. In the case of the three congressional staff members who cited the personal contact factor, we can be fairly certain their contacts were yielding
research-based information since each of them claimed that these contacts were with TJTC researchers.

Four respondents cited a number of non-TJTC specific studies they claimed helped them reach decisions or establish positions regarding the TJTC program. These individuals were all economists by training and made liberal reference to economic theory as the basis for some of their opinions (which at times differed given their allegiances to different "schools"). Further, these individuals appeared quite confident of their ability to take insights gathered from research in some non-TJTC areas and apply them to TJTC. These respondents cited WIN and New Jobs Tax Credit (NJTC) studies, the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, and several studies of client/business behavior under the CETA program as some of the material they applied to the questions they had concerning the TJTC program. Each of the four respondents was also able to cite, and claimed to have used, several TJTC studies as well.

Turning now to an examination of the specific TJTC-related research studies the respondents claimed to have used, we see in Table II the number of such studies that were cited by the 21 respondents who had claimed to have used TJTC related research. As this Table shows, a majority of the respondents who claimed to have used TJTC-related research to help them establish a position or make a decision were able to cite two or more specific studies as evidence of such use.

If we eliminate from consideration the OSU study and any in-house research studies conducted by the respondent's organization,
we can get some sense of how far beyond the immediately obvious and available sources the respondents went to seek out research-based information. Table 12 shows the results of eliminating the OSU and in-house studies.

TABLE 12

Number of TJTC-Related Studies Cited if the OSU and In-House Studies are Omitted from Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Studies Cited</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, eliminating the OSU and the in-house studies had a significant impact on the number of studies cited by the respondents. Using this stricter measure, only seven of the 21 respondents were able to cite two or more studies. Three respondents could cite no studies beyond their own in-house research and/or the OSU study. One respondent could cite no studies at all.

The conclusion seems inescapable that given the universe of TJTC studies available for use, only a small portion of them were actually used, on the average, at the individual level. I am not able, however, to make any value judgment on the adequacy or inadequacy of this limited use pattern. I do not know, for example, whether or not a more extensive search behavior would have caused the respondents to reach different conclusions on those issues to which they had applied the TJTC research that was available to them. I would speculate, based on the basic agreement in the findings of the research studies, that an expanded search would rarely have led to different conclusion.

THE FACTORS OTHER THAN RESEARCH THAT WERE USED TO HELP MAKE A DECISION OR ESTABLISH A POSITION CONCERNING TJTC

There were a number of factors other than research that the respondents claimed to have considered as they went about their decision making or position taking behavior concerning TJTC. Table 13 identifies these factors. (Data are provided for all respondents, even those who claimed not to have used any research in their TJTC decision making or position taking behavior.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Considered</th>
<th>Total Mentions</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Constituency Views</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Politics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administration's Views</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Views of the Business Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TJTC Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Existing Policy and Practice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One's Own Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organization's Experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal Philosophy/Values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Internal Revenue Service Opinions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Economic Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 13, eleven different (although in some cases closely related) factors were considered by the respondents as the basis for their decision making or position taking behavior. Approximately 75% of the respondents claimed to have considered at least two factors; four of these respondents each claimed four or more factors.

The decision making or position taking behavior of the interest group respondents appeared to be the least complicated when compared
to the congressional and interest group respondents. Basically, they were dominated by only one consideration and that was the views of their perceived constituencies. The statement of one of these interest group respondents was straightforward and fairly typical of the comments made by other members of this group, "The positions we have taken concerning TJTC certainly don't have much to do with research. Our positions are based on what [our constituents] said they wanted. It is as simple as that."

The congressional respondents each paid proper homage to the views of their perceived constituents, but presented a somewhat more complex view of decision making or position taking than did the interest group members. Each of the congressional staff members volunteered that they also gave active consideration to at least one other factor in addition to the views of their constituents. This multifaceted approach to handling TJTC problems and questions was clearly conveyed by one of these staff members:

Of course I have to consider what the members want. That's why I'm here. The members' views basically reflect what they hear from their districts on TJTC. Only a couple of committee members have any real interest in TJTC although the district can get to them. I remember after we tightened up on the eligibility of cooperative education students, [Representative Edwards] got jumped on by the voc. ed. people in Indiana. That was the only time he paid attention to the program.

So I pay close attention to what the members want. But they didn't hire me to parrot their views. They need information and that is my job. On TJTC I just philosophically believe that if we can have a tax credit for capital equipment, we should have one for people too. That's really why I'm behind the credit. To the members, I focus on the help to the disadvantaged aspect of TJTC. They can understand this. One of the problems with the research I've seen on TJTC is that it just doesn't look at those things that interest
Congress. Or if it does, they can't understand it.

Another congressional staff member who worked in part for the Black Caucus (which supported TJTC) indicated how his views on the tax credit were (reluctantly) changed in spite of the preferences of the Caucus members:

I've talked on several occasions to the trade association people, and to individual business people. They put the cards on the table. If TJTC wasn't made real attractive to them, they would have nothing to do with it. What they wanted most was a bigger credit and to keep the retrocert thing. It would be nice for me to think that poor folks who need a job are going to be helped by business. But they won't be unless the bribe is big enough.

The Department of Labor respondents, in aggregate, claimed to be considering the most factors when compared to the other respondent groups. Eight of the 11 Department respondents acknowledged their equivalent, in my opinion, of "constituency" by way of their references to the "administration's views," and "existing policy and practice." Beyond these factors (and research), six other factors offered by varying numbers of Department of Labor respondents were said to be part of their considerations in their decision making or position taking behavior.

Those respondents in lower level positions in the Department were particularly impressed with the importance of the Internal Revenue Service to the TJTC program. In the words of one of these individuals, "The IRS gets into the most minute details on TJTC. Everything we do here has to be blessed by them first." Actually, there were differing opinions among these respondents about the value of the IRS. Some clearly saw it as a nuisance that slowed things down and compromised
the Department's sense of control over the program. Others, apparently resigned to the necessary role played by the IRS, spoke highly of the competence and cooperation they received. (In fact, the Department's current national TJTC coordinator confided that she had received more and better help from the IRS than she did from within her own organization!)

Most prominent of the remaining factors considered by the Department of Labor respondents was "experience" -- both one's own and that of one's colleagues. Nine of the 11 Department of Labor respondents cited one or both of these factors. (The two respondents who did not acknowledge a role for experience were the furthest removed both physically and organizationally from those having the operating responsibility for TJTC. Their own interests in the program were directed toward the broadest of policy questions and not toward the day-to-day administrative routines.) Typically, the response of those citing the experience factor had the earmarks of personal and organizational coping and survival behavior -- when faced with a problem, something that can go wrong, the safest strategy to follow is to proceed as you (or your organization) have in the past under similar circumstances. After all, you survived that crisis and similar behavior now is your best bet to survive again.

"Experience" was often juxtaposed to "research," at least implicitly, in the comments of the respondents, and typically in a tone that had research coming off second best. Stated in its extreme form (and I actually heard no comments so extreme), this view might
be expressed as follows:

If I have a real problem, one that if I don't handle correctly, I'll be in trouble, I could use some help in selecting the right course of action. My experience and that of my colleagues is certainly a far better source of such guidance than what might be suggested by any researcher because they aren't aware of many important considerations. Important subtleties of program and organization that we "know," but may be hard for us to articulate, escape them. Their conclusions and recommendations are then based on faulty assumptions. Under these circumstances it is best to trust your own judgment, and not that of an outsider who has no stake in the outcome of the decision.

In effect, what seems to happen among those who strongly acknowledge the importance of "experience," is that a protective barrier is erected to preserve or reinforce certain values. One result of this barrier is that research has a much more difficult time penetrating into the heart of the decision making or position taking behavior process than it would without such a hurdle to cross.

I should comment on the references received to "politics" as a factor considered by the respondents in their decision making or position taking behavior. This factor appeared to be most prominent among the congressional respondents with three of the four mentioning it. It was apparently relatively less important to the Department of Labor and occupied a middle ground for the interest group respondents. Actually, this was a category that could have been shown as having even more importance than is suggested in Table 13. An individual was counted as having considered "politics" only if he/she used this term in response to the question which asked about the nonresearch factors that were considered in TJTC decision making or position taking. A more liberal classification procedure could
easily have seen many of the comments that were directed to constituency, the administration's views, and the organization's experience with TJTC as containing at least implicit political considerations.

THE NONINSTRUMENTAL USE OF RESEARCH

Thus far I have been examining the instrumental use of TJTC-related research i.e., the use of research to help establish a position or make a decision. We will recall that the literature is unanimous in declaring that noninstrumental use of research is the more frequent (and possibly more important) instance of research utilization. I was now interested in determining the noninstrumental use of TJTC-related research by the respondents and whether or not they were consciously aware of choosing among the several research "uses" available. Specifically, and following Weiss (1977b:11-15), I was seeking reports of the application of TJTC-related research for any of the following purposes:

1) Conceptual Use
2) Political Ammunition Use
3) Decision Avoidance Use
4) Knowledge-Driven Use

The Noninstrumental Use of TJTC-Related Research

My first question on noninstrumental research use did not elicit a great many positive responses -- certainly fewer than would have been expected given what the literature suggests. It is possible that my question was somewhat at fault. It may have been too nondirective. In fact, and as will be seen, I followed-up my first question with a
more pointed question in which specific examples of noninstrumental research use were given and, as a result, the number of affirmative responses increased. Of course, the reasons for the few positive responses to the first question may not at all reflect on the question itself but simply indicate that the extent to which the respondents reflect on their research utilization behavior, they are primarily aware of the more obvious instrumental uses as they try to answer questions or solve problems, and have no reason to further concern themselves with the more subtle meanings of "use."

The first question was stated as follows: "Aside from using research to help you establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC, were there any other purposes for which you used TJTC-related research?"

The typical response to this question, which was asked of the 21 respondents who claimed to have used TJTC research, was a quizzical to contemplative look followed by "No, I don't think so." Only nine respondents offered specific comments. Seven of these respondents offered examples of noninstrumental research use that I would classify as "conceptual." Representative statements included: "I use research to get more informed." "Research helps me to know what is going on." "Keeping up with research in my area satisfies my intellectual curiosity."

Only two of these seven respondents offered other than conceptual uses of research in response to the question. A Department of Labor representative who was in a supervisory position claimed to use research as a tool to "stimulate" his staff and to make them feel a
part of "important goings on." Another Department official claimed
that his noninstrumental use of research was limited to the acquisi­
tion of information so that he would not become "obsolete" and,
hence, remain marketable.

After offering specific examples of noninstrumental research
use, the number of affirmative responses increased. These are
shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14

Noninstrumental Use of TJTC-Related Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Use</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ammunition</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Avoidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-Driven Use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 14 indicates, the number of respondents claiming some
form of noninstrumental TJTC research use increased when specific
examples were provided to them. With the prompting, 16 of the 21
respondents claimed to have used TJTC-related research in a non­
instrumental way. Also, with prompting, the average number of
noninstrumental research uses per respondent increased as well.

Conceptual use remained the most common form of noninstrumental
utilization, but I found no evidence supporting the dominant
conclusion in the literature that conceptual use of research is more common than instrumental use. This may, of course, reflect some uniqueness of the respondents, or (more likely I believe) differences in information gathering or measuring techniques (see note 5, Chapter 1).

With prompting the political use of research now emerged as the second most frequent example of noninstrumental use. Respondents in all agencies reported such use with the interest groups and congressional staff members reporting, proportionately, the most. The comments of one of these respondents, an interest group official, gives some of the flavor of these responses:

Oh yes, we use research for our political purposes quite a bit around here. It hasn't been so pronounced concerning TJTC, but even here I can give you at least one example. We had to prepare some testimony for Congress on TJTC. This was when it was being considered for extension. Our position was clear. We felt the credit was doing some good from what we had heard from the field and therefore should be extended. We wanted to substantiate this with research results so I looked around but couldn't find anything that clearly supported extension. It was more a mixed bag of results. So we dropped the idea of referring to research studies in our testimony and instead went with our own field reports. [Our organization] will frequently go with something independent of what the research says.

A Department of Labor official related an instance where TJTC-related research was sought for both political and decision avoidance reasons. In his words:

We were getting pressure from Florida to permit the issuance of vouchers by phone rather than in person. They claimed this would significantly expedite things down there. We resisted—it just did not seem like a good idea. They didn't accept our answer and got to some Congressmen saying we had our heads in the sand, were being obstructionists, and so forth. The congressmen got to [a Department of Labor official] and I was told to "reconsider" our refusal to permit telephone
vouchering. Well hell, the only thing this place is into is fraud and abuse prevention so I said that I thought telephone vouchering was ripe for abuse but to give it a fair chance we should do some research on how the telephone vouchering had gone so far. They bought the idea and we put out a quick contract with Booz Allen. If we're lucky, the study will clearly knock off the telephone vouchering concept. I can then waive the study around and say 'Do you want to go against the facts?' But I'll tell you, we really didn't need that study. I am just buying time. I know already what the study will say. It will equivocate. Telephone vouchering is supposed to promote efficiency. The study will say the evidence isn't clear on this point. Telephone vouchering is supposed to give you no greater error factor than face to face vouchering. The study will say there were some errors but imply that it's not too bad. Regarding fraud, they will find very little or none. Of course not, you have to have a system in place for a while before people learn how to beat it! I'll tell you, I've already talked to some staff people on the Hill. Privately they agree with me. With a little luck this thing will blow over before the study is completed.

A comment should be offered concerning the five respondents, all from the Department of Labor, still failing, after prompting by way of the specific questions, to indicate anything other than instrumental use of TJTC-related research. Each of these individuals occupied lower level positions within the organization. My impression is that they were so involved with precise day-to-day matters concerning TJTC that noninstrumental use of TJTC related research was an unnecessary luxury to them.

As Table 14 implies, a number (most) of the respondents acknowledged more than one type of noninstrumental use of TJTC-related research. The exact frequencies and distributions are provided in Table 15.
TABLE 15
Number of Noninstrumental Uses of TJTC-Related Research Per Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Uses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Noninstrumental Use of Research in General

Once again I was interested in finding out if the answers the respondents were giving were peculiar to TJTC-specific behavior, or were a part of more general behavioral patterns on their part. Specifically, I now wanted to know whether or not the noninstrumental use of TJTC research was somehow unique to this particular issue, or could be seen as consistent with the respondents general pattern of noninstrumental research utilization. The self-reported general pattern of noninstrumental research utilization are displayed in Table 16. (The Table is based on the 24 respondents who had earlier indicated that they were at least occasional research users.)

We should first remind ourselves that the respondents had been "primed" by the earlier question and probes on the noninstrumental use of TJTC-related research and without the benefit of specific
TABLE 16
Noninstrumental Use of Research in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Use</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ammunition</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Avoidance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-Driven Use</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

examples to react to the respondents would have reported far less noninstrumental use than they actually did.

Several features of Table 16 deserve comment. First, the five Department of Labor respondents who reported no noninstrumental research use in response to the specific question concerning TJTC-maintained that they were also nonusers in general.

Second, the conceptual use of research increased somewhat when compared to the responses to the earlier specific question. Now, a clear majority of those respondents who claimed to be research users admitted to at least this form of noninstrumental use.

Third, the category with the greatest increase when we compare the specific to the general noninstrumental use question was "political ammunition." The number of respondents claiming such noninstrumental use increased from 11 to 18 as we moved from the TJTC-specific question to the general question, and now represents
the largest type of noninstrumental research use. All of the congressional respondents and all but one of the interest group members now claimed at least the occasional political use of research. Only six of the 11 Department of Labor respondents made similar claims in response to the general question. I would maintain that the relatively less frequent use of research for political purposes in the Department of Labor reflected a combination of the lack of opportunity and/or interest of many of these respondents, given their position in the hierarchy, to engage in such use, or it reflected the sense that I got from some of these respondents, also clustering toward the lower end of the organizational hierarchy, that such use was somehow "inappropriate" for a public employee.

Fourth, there was also an increase in the number of respondents who reported the "decision avoidance" use of research as we moved from the specific to the general question. The examples of such use given by these respondents were either of the request for more research before a decision was made when it looked as though the decision that would result would be contrary to their own preferences, or the use of existing research to support a preferred position in the face of opposition with the hope of producing a stalemate.

Fifth, the incidence of multiple noninstrumental uses of research also increased by the movement from the TJTC arena to research in general. As Table 17 shows, except for the five respondents who claimed to use research in only an instrumental manner, only three respondents now claimed less than two types of noninstrumental use.
TABLE 17
Number of Noninstrumental Uses of Research
in General Per Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Claimed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, I conclude that, in general, the noninstrumental research utilization behavior of the respondents in the area of TJTC appears to be the extension, albeit on a less complete/vigorous scale, of more general noninstrumental research utilization behavior patterns.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TJTC-RELATED RESEARCH

The Specific Importance of TJTC-Related Research

Each of the respondents who indicated that they had used TJTC-related research to help them make a decision or establish a position was asked to estimate, using a three position scale, the relative importance this research had compared to other inputs in reaching these positions/decisions. Table 18 displays the results obtained.

As can be seen, for a significant majority of the respondents, TJTC-related research was more than just a minor factor in the
TABLE 18
Importance of TJTC-Related Research to Specific Decision Making/Position Taking Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision/Position Reached Mainly on the Basis of Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision/Position Someewhat Determined by the Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision/Position Determined only to a Very Small Extent by the Research</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

decision making or position taking process they went through for the issues to which this research was applied.

To some, but not a perfect extent, if one looks at the array of responses from the perspective of the breadth rather than depth of perspective/responsibility of the respondents, there is a suggestion that those with the broader overview acknowledge a greater impact of research on their decision making or position taking behavior. If this relationship is, in fact, valid, I would speculate that the reason for the distinction between those who acknowledged a greater role for research from those who did not was that the latter group tended to be made up of individuals at the lower end of the bureaucratic ladder who had very precise operational responsibilities for many of the issues to which they sought to apply research findings. It is possible that at that level there
were many vivid counter pressures such as their direct daily experience with the program, their understanding of established policy, etc., that tended to dissipate the impact of research. Again, this is a quite speculative line of reasoning. I am only trying to suggest what one possible element might be in a comprehensive explanation of what it is that distinguishes those two groups.

I must acknowledge that to my surprise the respondents answered the question of the relative impact of TJTC-related research without undue hesitancy. I would have expected at least a few of the respondents to find it difficult, if not impossible, to answer this question. Some responses were, in fact, remarkably precise as the comment from a congressional staff member suggests:

My position was basically determined by research on the following issues: the Employment Service's role in the program, the need to eliminate retroactive certification, and the need to eliminate nondisadvantaged cooperative education students from the program.

A Department of Labor representative who also found TJTC-related research to be very important stated his views in this manner:

For those issues for which I had research, and had the time to consider it, I would say it played a major role. In many areas, however, I either didn't have time to look at the research or, if I did, the boss's views may have been different from what the research said. In those cases research wasn't very important to me.

The idea expressed by this Department of Labor respondent that suggests an important role for research as long as other factors (such as time or the boss's views in this case) are not intruding was a common refrain. The response of an interest group official
was representative, at least in tone, of many of these comments:

I guess I would have to say that research played only a minor role with me. Mostly it was the philosophy of this place which determined my position.

The fact is that the respondents cited a number of "filtering" or, in some cases, "blocking" agents whose presence could seriously affect the impact that the research might otherwise have. My point here is simply to note the acknowledgment of these factors by the respondents. I will identify and discuss them along with factors that appear to enhance the chances for research to have an impact later in this study.

The Overall Importance of TJTC-Related Research

Having asked about the role and importance of TJTC-related research as it was applied by the respondents to specific issues, I next wanted to get some idea of the relative or overall importance this research played in the decision making/position taking behavior of the respondents. Specifically, I was interested in finding out whether or not a respondent who indicated that TJTC-related research had played a role in helping him/her to reach a decision or establish a position concerning some specific issue would thereby conclude that this research was *ipso facto* equally important to all of their decision making/position taking behavior concerning TJTC. In other words, were the issues to which the respondents had applied TJTC-related research the only issues they dealt with that required them to establish a position or make a decision? Table 19 shows the overall importance of TJTC-related research to the respondents.
TABLE 19
Overall Importance of TJTC-Related Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Minor Importance</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, when viewed in the context of the whole TJTC program, research was of more than just very minor importance to the decision making or position taking of only a minority of the respondents. It is obvious then that the decision making or position taking behavior of the respondents in the area of TJTC was by and large determined by other than research-based considerations.

The only respondents to claim that research was "very important" overall were the Director and chief researcher of an interest group who maintained that as a general rule "everything we do around here is based on research." One congressional staff member who claimed an overall "important" role for TJTC-related research responded to this question in a manner similar to the Director of the interest group by saying:

"Generally speaking I would guess that of the decisions I make around here in about one half of them research plays an important role in helping me get there. I would certainly have to say this was true for TJTC when I was working on it."

The only Department of Labor officials to claim anything other than very minor importance for TJTC-related research were rather
highly placed individuals who had several interesting characteristics including an admitted personal predisposition toward including research findings in their decision making process, and a perception that their job responsibility included the expectation that they should be familiar with relevant research. These respondents were also the only two who could be said to be exceptionally well aware of the existing TJTC-related research including some pieces that had received very limited circulation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FREQUENCY OF RESEARCH USE

Each of the research utilization variables discussed in this chapter were cross-tabulated in an effort to identify the factors that might help to account for the position of the respondents.

Only one of the research utilization variables discussed in this chapter appeared to be systematically related to the others. This variable was the frequency of research use. For example, the more frequently one used research, the more important that research was seen as being to the individual's decision making/position taking behavior. Of those respondents who classified themselves as "very frequent" research users, 55% reported that in those instances where research was used, their decisions/positions concerning TJTC were established mainly on the basis of the research. Those who saw themselves as using research "often," or only "sometimes," reported that their decisions/positions were "mainly determined" by research only 20%, and 0% respectively. (The direction of causality is unclear here. Possibly the relationship is one where the more frequently research is used, the more important it is perceived to be. However,
it is possible that the relationship is one where the more important research as an input to decision making/position taking is perceived, the more frequently it is used.) In addition, the same relationship found between the frequency of research use and the importance of research was found between frequency of use and the number of TJTC issues to which research was applied and the number of research studies used. That is, the more often one reported using research, the more TJTC-related issues to which research was applied, and the more research studies used in this process.

Frequency of use also appeared related to the ability to make judgments about the overall value of the TJTC program. Seventy-two percent of the most frequent research users made overall evaluation judgments of TJTC; only 10% of those using research less frequently made such determinations.

Lastly, the frequency of research use was linked positively to the multiple uses of research. Thus, 82% of the "very frequent" research users cited three or more applications of research such as for conceptual or political purposes, while none of the less frequent research users had more than two applications.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Twenty-one of the 24 respondents who claimed to be research users in general, also claimed to have made use of TJTC-related research to help them make a decision or establish a position. Of those respondents who could recall a specific example of such use, most were able to cite two or more uses of TJTC-related research.
Nevertheless, at the aggregate level, research was applied to only a small portion of the universe of issues inherent in TJTC—a phenomenon that may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that TJTC was not a heavily researched program. Further, most respondents could cite no more than three studies they had used—a relatively small part of the available studies. In addition, on most of the issues to which the respondents applied TJTC-related research, at least one instance, could be found where an individual reached a conclusion, allegedly based on the available research, that was at odds with the rest of the members of that group.

Among the issues to which the respondents claimed to have applied TJTC-related research, the one most frequently cited was "overall program evaluation." That is, the most frequent use made of research that investigated selected aspects of TJTC was to help form basic judgments of the overall worth of the tax credit. For every claim of such a use of TJTC-related research, a similar number of comments were made expressing the hope that research would be conducted that would establish the overall worth of the tax credit. Clearly, most respondents were able to make the inductive leap to overall program evaluation, while others could not. Those who could not make the inductive leap tended to feel frustrated by the unresponsiveness or irrelevance of the existing research. Later in this study I will suggest some factors that may help account for the differences between these two groups of respondents.

In addition to using research to help make a decision or establish a position concerning TJTC, the respondents cited a variety of
other inputs they considered. Most frequently mentioned were constituency views, politics, the administration's views, and the individual's own and organizational experience.

Of the 21 respondents who claimed to have used research instrumentally to help them make a decision or establish a position concerning TJTC, 17 also claimed to have used this research in a noninstrumental way—primarily for conceptual or political purposes.

TJTC-related research played at least a somewhat important role in the decision making or position taking behavior of a majority of the respondents for the issues to which this research was applied. However, relative to all of the decision making or position taking behavior of the respondents, research was of more than just very minor importance only to a minority of the respondents.

Among the variables considered in this chapter, "frequency of research use" was the only factor that appeared related to any of the other variables. Relationships were suggested with the importance of research to TJTC decision making/position taking, the number of issues to which TJTC-related research was applied, the number of TJTC studies used, the number of multiple uses of research, and the ability to make an overall evaluation of the worth of TJTC.

The primary purpose of this chapter has been to identify the type and extent of TJTC-related research. The following chapters will search for factors that appear to affect this use. Nevertheless, what we have seen thus far has contained several suggestions (or hints) of factors affecting the type and/or extent of research
utilization. To draw these suggestions in clear relief, I will state them in the form of propositions.

1. Research utilization typically involves an active search or outreach effort which, in turn, seems based upon either a general predisposition to include research as part of the input to one's decision making/position taking behavior, or a more precise sense of information need at the moment. The absence of at least one of these factors seriously reduces the likelihood of research use.

2. Research use is affected by whether or not a person feels that their job responsibility includes awareness and use of research.

3. The position occupied within an organization affects the amount of use made of research. In general, the higher one's position in the organization, the more issues to which research will be applied. This in turn is a reflection of the breadth of one's responsibilities.

4. The more accessible research is, the greater the chance it will be used.

5. The amount and type of use made of research is affected by the time available to deal with problems.

6. Research that is difficult to understand will not be used.

7. The more frequently research is used: the more important research is seen to decision making/position taking; the greater the number of studies that are used; the more issues to which research is applied; the more uses that are made of research; and the greater the ability to make overall judgments of the value of TJTC. It is also possible that the converse of these statements is true. For example, the more important research is seen to decision making/position taking, or the greater one's ability to make judgments about the overall value of TJTC, the more frequently research is used.

8. Potential research users often appear to have pre-existing "barriers" or "filters" which affect the chances of research being used. Examples of these barriers or filters are personal values, and a commitment to serving constituency, or organizational preferences.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. The table format will vary between those that show "Totals" only, and those that provide detail according to the organizational affiliation of the respondents. This latter format will be used only when there appear to be interesting variations in responses based on organizational affiliation.


Full citations can be found in the bibliography.

3. Based on my familiarity with the organizations in which the interviewing took place, I would estimate that a reasonable effort to identify TJTC-related research (one that was confined to asking for such references only from individuals within one's immediate organizational environment) would have lead interest group and Department of Labor respondents to uncover eight of the 15 studies. The congressional staff would have found nine of the studies. These should be seen as rough estimates, particularly for the interest groups.

4. The topic of acquiring research information indirectly through other persons rather than from original sources will be examined in more detail in Chapter 5.

5. The definition of these terms can be found in Chapter 1, page 11. I have adapted the categories of research use from Weiss. In the field setting the "interactive use" was typically confused with instrumental use and hence I dropped the use of this category in the final interviews. Also, Weiss' "Miscellaneous" category was unproductive; I replaced it with one of Weiss' examples of Miscellaneous use—decision avoidance. Further, the kind of responses I received caused me to add an "other" category as can be seen in Tables 14 and 16.
6. As part of this study, I systematically cross-tabulated the responses received on one question to those obtained on another. I was looking, of course, to find that a cluster of responses at one point on the distribution of a variable was associated with a clustering of responses on another variable.

Prior to examining the cross-tabulations, I arbitrarily established a range of 30% difference between variable-pairs as meriting discussion. Because of the few differences of this magnitude between the variable-pairs examined, I reduced this to a 20% spread. Nevertheless, most of the apparent relationships discussed have at least a 30% spread in the variable-pairs. The apparent relationships emerging as a result of this analysis are discussed in the remaining chapters of this study. In chapter 7, the disparate relationships are discussed from a holistic perspective. A final reminder is offered concerning the relatively small number of respondents upon which this research is based.
BASIC ATTITUDES TOWARD AND NEED FOR RESEARCH

The literature on research utilization leans strongly in the direction of supporting the proposition that, in general, the potential users of research have a basically positive attitude toward it, seeing research as a potentially useful tool (Caplan, et al. 1975:24; Rothman, 1980:157; and Alkin et al. 1979:223-225). If this is, in fact, the case, then the reason for actual low levels of research utilization must be explained by other than the attitudes of the potential user.

The attitude of the respondents toward research emerged from their responses to the questions on the frequency of research use and the reasons for seeking research-based information. It seems reasonable to infer from the frequency of research use by the respondents (see Tables 7 and 8) that this did reflect a basically positive attitude to the potential helpfulness of research. Among the 24 respondents who reported at least occasional use of research, only one claimed never to actively seek it out but rather to be receptive to such information if others provided it. All other respondents saw themselves as at least occasionally actively seeking research studies to help them do their jobs better. Further, we will recall from Table 16 that, with prompting, 19 of the 23 respondents who actively
sought research claimed to have used it for at least one nonintrinsic purpose such as conceptualizing or the acquisition of political ammunition.

In addition to the evidence provided by the frequency of research utilization, the reasons offered by the respondents to explain their behavior also pointed to a basically positive attitude toward research. For those who focused on the instrumental use of research, the need for additional information to help make a decision or establish a position was reason enough to seek research. These explanations all shared a sense of the specific and immediate--this issue required this kind of information before a decision could be made. Selected comments from the respondents could convey this sense:

Research helps me to know what my options are. (Congressional staff member)

I look for research studies when I have problems that need to be solved. If I do not have enough information at hand, I seek help. (Interest group respondent)

Those respondents who offered "conceptual" reasons for seeking research conveyed the sense that research could help them to think more clearly about whatever subject was at hand even though it might not help them solve any immediate problem. Basically, there appeared to be a desire to see what a presumably neutral observer had to say about whatever subject that interested them.

One interesting characteristic of those who offered conceptual reasons as at least part of their motivation to seek research was what appeared to be an internalized value that research was desirable, even a preferred way to acquire knowledge to serve as the
basis for decision making. As one of the congressional staff members put it:

Yes, I actively seek research studies to help me here. I would like to think that I would use research for all of the issues I work on, but that is not feasible given the time pressures around here.

One exception to the basically positive attitude toward research came from three respondents who saw research solely in political terms. These individuals established their positions on bases other than research, and research was used only if it was needed to help bolster their position or attack the opposition. As one congressional staff member put it, "If the research is available and supports my boss's position, I'll use it. Otherwise I'll bury it."

Although there might be a temptation to see these politically oriented respondents as quite willing to run rough shod over the findings of researchers and thereby ignore established facts (truth?), this was not their self-perception. Rather, these individuals saw research as typically not directed to the really critical, often value-based issues with which they must contend. They tended to see researchers as slow to reach conclusions, and preoccupied with the inconclusiveness of their research (and hence with the need for more research). They saw the research enterprise as consisting in large part of one researcher attacking the work of another. In short, they simply did not see research as anything but a very minor element in the policy process without there being any prospect for it becoming a major positive factor.

Although the respondents typically displayed a basically positive attitude toward the use of research to help them discharge their
public policy responsibilities, my questioning in this area elicited comments on two factors, the presence of which were seen as having a potentially negative impact on the desire to make use of research or, at minimum, an impact on the way research was used. Specifically, I am referring to the impact of an individual's ideology, and what I will call the "manager's mentality" on the decision to seek and/or make use of research.

THE IMPACT OF IDEOLOGY ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Certainly respondents from organizations other than the Department of Labor recognized that an individual's ideology or values had an impact on their ability and willingness to use the results of research in their decision making. Department of Labor respondents, however, seemed uniquely preoccupied by the impact that ideology had on research utilization in the Department. In large part, their preoccupation seems to have been stimulated by the perception that radical change had occurred in the environment for research with the change in regime from the Democrats to the Republicans.

One senior level Department of Labor official expressed the dominant view in this way:

At one time the Department had a very active research program. Staff were involved with the contractors and we were kept abreast of the research findings. The Secretary of the Department under President Carter was research oriented. He felt he needed research results to provide him with adequate information. All this fell apart with the new Administration. They found research embarrassing. That is, they wanted to go with X, but the research said X didn't work. For example, they wanted to cut Public Service Employment, but our research showed that PSE accomplished a lot of good. So they decided to ignore research that didn't agree with their political views and to stop the risk of further embarrassment by cutting the support of research.
Several individuals in the Department took a slightly different view. Although they acknowledged the importance of ideology, they saw a role (albeit minor) for research within this ideological context. In its simpler version, all this meant was that research would be used if it bolstered the Administration's views and ignored if it did not.

There was, however, a more subtle perspective expressed on the actual relationship between ideology and research. Here, research was seen as playing a variable role even within an atmosphere highly charged with ideology. For example, the respondents espousing this view saw evidence that research dealing with the operational details of the programs that were otherwise selected or supported for ideological reasons had a role to play in the Department. Further, they argued that even in a highly ideological environment, not all of the issues, programs, or policies that the Department deals with are necessarily part of the Administration's ideological baggage. In these areas, research (or, as one of these respondents put it "the disinterested pursuit of truth") could and did have a role to play.

Some insisted that the type of research needed to be considered when thinking about the role research in general was playing in a highly political environment. Thus, policy researchers were to be looked at with caution--everyone knows their conclusions will reflect their own biases and ideology. But market research (and, by extension, survey studies) were more familiar to the group in power and, hence, more trustworthy.
Finally, these respondents (although probably not of the Administration's ideological persuasion) acknowledged the ultimately interwoven nature of values and facts in the public policy arena and thus were less inclined to damn the current Administration simply because its values were not shared by them. As one of these respondents put it:

A lot comes down to your personal values. So two people can look at the same research findings and reach different conclusions. Take TJTC for example. I can look at it and say "Let's scrap it. It isn't working. We are not really creating any new jobs. It's a windfall for business, etc." But you might look at it and say "It's doing a little bit of good. It's a start. It's an inexpensive way to do good for the disadvantaged without a huge government bureaucracy. It shows we are compassionate, etc." To me this is the "Is the cup half full or half empty" question. It takes a lot of hard facts to wean you away from a position you are committed to. Concerning TJTC, there just hasn't been enough research to batter people away from their preconceived positions.

THE IMPACT OF THE "MANAGER'S MENTALITY" ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Within the Department of Labor a phenomenon was observed that was not evident in other organizations. Five of the Department of Labor officials interviewed who were responsible for the operation of actual programs (as opposed to those serving staff roles such as economists) gave evidence by many of their responses that they felt an uneasiness, or a lack of clarity about what the proper attitude of a manager ought to be toward research. (We will recall that all but one lower level Department of Labor official indicated that they at least occasionally sought research information.) The difficulty appears to have been an uncertainty about the circumstances under which it was proper to seek the help that research had to offer. The concern was that program managers might somehow lose their
"managerial nature" if they allowed too many of their decisions to be influenced by research. As one of these respondents put it:

Sometimes you just know what to do based on your experience and judgment. Why then should I spend the time and the money researching something if I already know what the outcome is going to be? After all, managers are paid to make decisions, not to run research programs, or to procrastinate. You have to have confidence in your experience and judgment.

As another stated, "This is nothing but a crisis management operation. Problems need to be solved now. We can't wait for researchers to give us their reports. Someone has to make these decisions. I guess that's my job."

The strongest statement of this attitude was packed with bravado and is, perhaps, implicitly derisive of research:

There are some personality types that should never have become program managers. They can't take the heat. They are afraid to decide anything. They are afraid to make a mistake. So they look around for some research study that will give them direction and then they can always blame the researcher. I told [a fellow program official in the Department] "you're a manager and you have to make decisions. You don't need to wait for more data. Hell, all the data is never in anyway."

It should be kept in mind that the individuals quoted here had all earlier indicated that they do, at least occasionally, seek research to help them do their job.

THE IMPACT OF THE RESPONDENTS' POSITION IN THE ORGANIZATION ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The possibility that those occupying managerial positions may have a special attitude toward research use is compatible with other findings from the study of research utilization suggesting that one's position in an organization affects one's research use (Rich, 1979b:98),
and Badura and Waltz, (1980:375). To more systematically explore this possibility, the position level of the respondents was cross-tabulated to their answers to a variety of questions directed toward research use. Table 20 displays the possible relationships found. Specifically, assuming that those respondents holding supervisory positions were, in fact, "program managers," we find that 85% of the persons falling into this category considered themselves to use research "often" or "very frequently," while only 42% of those in nonsupervisory positions considered themselves using research this frequently. Clearly, while program managers may fret over the amount of research they use, these findings suggest that this does not represent a formidable barrier to such use. I would speculate that a primary reason for the differences in the frequency of research use between supervisors and nonsupervisors is that the former group have responsibility for more aspects of TJTC and, hence, have more occasions to need research than the latter group.

The position the respondent occupies in the organization may also be related to their perception of the degree of importance of research to the organization, and efforts made in the organization to encourage and facilitate the use of research. For example, 40% of those holding upper level positions saw research playing an "important" to "very important" role in the organization compared to only 10% of those at lower levels. Likewise, all upper level respondents saw their organizations making significant efforts to facilitate the use of research while only 35% of those at lower
TABLE 20
The Impact of Position in the Organization on Research Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Saying Research is &quot;Important&quot; or &quot;Very Important&quot; Effort to Facilitate to Their Organization</th>
<th>Percent Preferring In-House Research &quot;Often&quot; or &quot;Very Often&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Using Research In-House Research &quot;Often&quot; or &quot;Very Often&quot;</td>
<td>Percent Preferring In-House Research &quot;Often&quot; or &quot;Very Often&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Levels Positions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Positions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supervisors</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
levels saw such an effort being made. One reason for this may relate to the socialization to the organizational culture observed by Badura and Waltz (1980) that characterizes those who obtain higher-level positions. Quite simply, higher-level personnel may have a harder time finding serious faults with their organization. Supporting this possibility is the fact that 42% of those in supervisory positions preferred the research they used to come from in-house; none of the nonsupervisors preferred in-house research, rather, 64% of this group preferred outside contractors. (The topics of the importance of research to the organization, the efforts of organizations to encourage and facilitate research use, and the impact of the source of research on research utilization will be discussed further in Chapter 5.)

THE IMPACT OF THE RESPONDENTS' EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

One other personal characteristic of the respondents that was examined for its potential impact on research use was educational background following the suggestion in the literature (Caplan et al. 1975:36, and Badura and Waltz, 1980:378) that this might be an important explanatory variable.

The cross tabulations suggested several possible relationships. For example, 65% of those respondents with at least a bachelor's degree in a social science discipline considered themselves to be "very frequent" research users while only 18% of those without this educational background classified themselves in this way. Also, those with a social science background applied more research, in
more ways, to more issues, and found these applications to be more important than did those without a social science background. Table 21 displays these findings.

An educational background in the social sciences also seemed linked to the ability to make judgments about the overall value of the TJTC program on the basis of studies that looked at specific aspects of the tax credit. Fifty percent of those with a social science education made overall evaluation judgments compared to only 18% of those without a social science background.

It would appear then, and ought not to be particularly surprising, that those who are educated in the social sciences, are much more willing (and presumably able) to make practical use of the results of social sciences research as they attempt to carry out their job-related responsibilities.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Some evidence was uncovered to support the claim that certain characteristics of potential users of research affect the utilization decision. In general, as evidenced by the frequency of research use and the reasons offered for such use, the respondents appear to believe that research is at least potentially useful to them in the conduct of their duties. Several respondents perceived that the presence of ideology and what I have called the "manager's mentality" could negatively affect research use. I could find no evidence, however, that this latter factor, as measured by the frequency of research use by program managers, had a negative impact on research use. In fact, it appeared to be positively related to utilization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Using Two Or More Studies (Excluding In-House And OSU Study)</th>
<th>Percent Having Two Or More Noninstrumental Uses of TJTC Research</th>
<th>Percent Applying Research To Four or More TJTC Issues</th>
<th>Percent Saying Decision/Position Reached Mainly On The Basis of Research</th>
<th>Percent Making Judgments of the Overall Value of TJTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Social Science Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only do those occupying higher-level positions in their organizations claim to use research more frequently than lower-level individuals, they also see research playing a more important role in their organizations, and see their organizations making greater efforts to encourage and facilitate research use. This essentially pro-organizational view on the part of the higher-level officials is also reflected in the fact that they disproportionately preferred to use research that is generated in-house.

The educational background of the individual also appears to be strongly related to research utilization. Those with at least a bachelor's degree in the social sciences apply more research, to more issues, more often, in more ways, and with more impact on their resulting decision making/position taking behavior than was the case for those without such an educational background.
CHAPTER 5: THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The research into research utilization suggests a powerful role for the organization in influencing the research use behavior of the individual. We have already seen that the position occupied by the individual within the organization may influence research use.

Perhaps, according to the literature, the most important way in which an organization can influence research use is by its efforts (or lack thereof) to encourage and facilitate such use. In addition, the actual research use experience of the organization sets a standard that is seen as impacting individual behavior. (See, for example, Badura and Waltz, 1980:375; Rothman, 1980:46-51; and Hargrove, 1980.)

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH TO THE INDIVIDUAL'S ORGANIZATION

All respondents were asked to state their view of the importance of research to the decision making process in their organizations. In the case of congressional staff persons, "organization" was defined as the committee or office for which they worked. Department of Labor employees were asked to apply this question to the Division for which they worked. Table 22 displays the findings.

It is clear that the respondents, in aggregate, saw themselves working in organizations where research played only a somewhat important role at most in the decision making process. Only four
of the 25 respondents saw a more important role for research in their organizations. Three of these were in interest groups that were known to conduct a considerable amount of original research; one was a congressional staff person who had a very strong personal predisposition to use research whenever possible. At the other end of the spectrum, three Department of Labor respondents believed research to be of absolutely no importance to their organization.

**TABLE 22**

The Importance of Research

To the Decision Making Process of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Minor Importance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, except for several individuals in the Department of Labor who were concerned that research was of no or at best minor importance to their organization, there was no sense conveyed in the responses of those interviewed that research utilization ought to be any greater (or at least not significantly greater) in their organizations than it actually was. Most seemed comfortable with the realization that research was only one of a number of inputs to the decision making process in their organization. No respondents
came even close to intimating that agency decisions ought to be dominated by research. Typical responses to this question convey this sense. For example, an interest group staff member responded:

Research plays somewhat of an important role here but other factors are more important. For example, existing policy positions of the organization are hard to change regardless of what research might suggest ought to be the case. Even more important are the views of our constituents. We do what they want.

Another interest group respondent expressed similar views:

Research is only of secondary importance here. Policy is determined by our Board and they are motivated by self-interest. Therefore, we use research only to buttress our position or to push congressmen who are on the fence. For example, last year we hired Price Waterhouse to do a study for us. We did it only to get the U.S. Treasury back in line.

The tone of the Department of Labor respondents was different however. Said one:

Research has great potential here and can be very useful, but that research that does exist is easy for managers to dismiss. For example, if you are in phase one of a research project you say you have to wait for phase two results. When you finally get phase two results new issues have surfaced and get everyone's attention. The old issues for which the research was conducted have already been handled by management decision and the research has had no impact.

The picture that emerges is one where an organization can be seen as having dropped below a certain "proper" level of research use, but that the level itself is modestly low in terms of the importance of research to the decision making routines of the organization.

THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND FACILITATION OF RESEARCH BY THE ORGANIZATION

To a large extent, the respondents appeared to judge the efforts of their organizations to encourage and facilitate research
use according to their judgment of the importance of research to the organization. That is, the more important research was perceived to be to the decision making process of an organization, the more that organization was seen as actively encouraging and facilitating the use of research by its employees. Although the respondents were asked to comment separately on "encouragement" and "facilitation," their responses were identical. Research use was seen as being encouraged by the organization if the organization made an effort to facilitate such use. The responses to these questions are reported in Table 23.

TABLE 23
The Encouragement and Facilitation of Research Use by Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Encouragement and Facilitation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>IRS</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
<th>Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Encouraged and Facilitated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged and Facilitated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Encouraged and Facilitated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Encouraged and Facilitated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, there was a somewhat greater sense of encouragement and facilitation of research use by an agency than actual use of research in the decision making process except for the Department
of Labor where both use and encouragement/facilitation were seen as low. The interesting anomaly of the one interest group respondent who claimed that his organization did nothing to encourage and facilitate the flow of research information to him also claimed that the only use of research was as a source of political ammunition. Any decisions that needed to be made were done so solely in terms of the interests of his organization's constituency.

Those respondents working in organizations that did make efforts to facilitate the flow of research information noted several methods by which this was accomplished. Most frequently (eight respondents), an in-office library was cited as the means by which research information was acquired, stored, and disseminated. Staff meetings and other internal communication devices were cited by five respondents, as was the availability of an in-house research staff. Four respondents referred to efforts their offices made to enable them to meet with researchers who were doing relevant work. Although I did not directly probe to determine levels of satisfaction with these various efforts to facilitate the flow of research information, my impression was that all were seen to work satisfactorily.

Within the Department of Labor the standard complaint was with the lack of "coordination" of their research funding program. Typical comments were:

We used to be much better organized to handle research than we are now. There is no systematic way of knowing
what is going on. There are no mechanisms to follow up on interesting research findings.

DOL's research support program is not coordinated with the program people. It seems like we are going down two different tracks.

Things used to be better than they are now. We used to be posted on the results of research projects that Labor supported. They used to bring in the researchers so that we could talk to them. Now very little research is done—at least I assume very little is being done. That's the problem, we just don't know.

The comments from the Department of Labor respondents draw our attention to the administrative circumstances that the Department of Labor found itself in regarding TJTC. Further elaboration here of these circumstances is warranted not only to gain additional perspective on the question of what the Department of Labor did to encourage and facilitate the flow of research information to its employees but, more generally, to gain an appreciation of the status of TJTC and research within the Department at the time of my interviews and, hence, the environment in which research would (or would not) be sought and used.

We have seen that the consensus view within the Department of Labor was that research played a very minor to nonexisting role in the decision making process of that agency and that without exception Department employees did not perceive their agency as making any appreciable efforts on their behalf to facilitate the flow of research to them. Further, there was agreement within the Department that matters had degenerated with the advent of the Reagan Administration.
The source of concern within the Department was twofold. First, there was a widely-shared view that the senior Department officials either feared or simply did not perceive the need for research. Second, there was concern that sizable personnel reductions and the corresponding administrative reorganizations had left the Department in a much weakened position that basic program operating responsibilities were being neglected. Equally important was the fact that within a retrenchment posture the corresponding reassignment of responsibilities saw those few staff members who were not let go and who had had experience with TJTC assigned to completely different responsibilities.

The reorganization that occurred was abrupt and there was no opportunity for a transition period for the new TJTC staff to be tutored by the old staff. All of this was taking place within the context of a Department greatly reduced in personnel and getting ready to implement the new Jobs Training Partnership Act of 1983 (JTPA), the successor legislation to the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1975 (CETA). Many individuals, including some of those with TJTC responsibilities, found themselves given temporary part or full time assignments to help out with the transition to JTPA. Within this environment it is perhaps understandable that morale among those responsible for TJTC was admittedly low—a situation not enhanced by the presence of a good sized dose of intra-Divisional bickering, jealousy, and backbiting.

One must go to the fourth level of organization within the Division responsible for TJTC to find the person identified as
the "TJTC National Coordinator." The comments of this individual help demonstrate the condition of the TJTC program within the Department of Labor:

I have had my position for three months. Prior to that there were two people doing full time what I now do. They were given other assignments within the Division. They tell me they will be hiring another person to help me out, but I'm not optimistic.

My job is now to act as a clearinghouse for TJTC problems that can't be handled at the Regional level. Most of my time is spent working with the Regional coordinators of TJTC. TJTC is incredibly technical now. It would not surprise me if TJTC just collapses under all of its technicalities.

I have been given very little to help me do my job. Thank God for ____ at IRS, he knows TJTC and has been very helpful. Let me tell you how incredibly bad things are here. I don't have a copy of the TJTC legislation. I don't even have my own copy of the TJTC Handbook! I had to go to a national conference on TJTC not too long ago--I had to read the Handbook, which is badly out of date, on the plane! And there is no one I can easily turn to in the Department for help. My supervisors know less about TJTC than I do. You would not believe the condition of our files on TJTC. [At this point the respondent took me to a small storage room filled with large file boxes each containing many file folders. There was no immediately apparent filing scheme and clearly there were a good many non-TJTC related materials in the room as well.] Here they are. This is the Department of Labor's official files on TJTC. I haven't even looked at them yet. I wouldn't know where to begin. Would you?

Under circumstances such as those described it is not surprising that the typical Department of Labor respondent often felt that attention to research was an unaffordable luxury. We must keep in mind that the views expressed by the Labor respondents on the array of research utilization issues may well have been colored by these circumstances.
What, in fact, was the relationship between the respondents' perception of the importance of research to their organizations, the efforts made by these organizations to encourage and facilitate research use, and the respondents' research utilization behavior? Cross-tabulating the respondents' answers to these questions indicates that these organizational factors did not have an impact on the reported frequency of research use, but did influence other aspects of utilization behavior. For example, half of those respondents who saw their organizations as making significant efforts to facilitate and encourage research use, reported that in those instances where they used TJTC-related research, their decisions were made "mainly on the basis" of the research. Only 10% of those who perceived their organization making no or a weak effort to encourage and facilitate research claimed a similarly important role for research in their own decision making/position taking.

The perception of an organizational effort to facilitate and encourage research use also appeared related to the inclusion of other inputs to the respondents' decision making/position taking behavior. Fifty percent of those who believed their organization made a significant effort to encourage and facilitate research use claimed to use only one other major input (such as constituency influence) to their TJTC decision making/position taking. Eighty-five percent of those working in organizations seen as making a weak to no effort to encourage and facilitate research used at least two major inputs in addition to research
to help them reach decisions/positions.

Finally, seventy percent of those working in proresearch organizations applied TJTC research to at least five issues; only 10% of those working in organizations less supportive applied research to that many issues.

It would appear then that the efforts of an organization to facilitate and encourage research (or at least, perhaps, the perception that such efforts are being made) do have an impact on certain aspects of research utilization. Before leaving this topic, however, I should comment on the apparent lack of organizational impact on the frequency of research use. Specifically, the fact that all but one Department of Labor respondent indicated either general or specific use of TJTC related research is surprising in view of their perception of the lack of effort by the Department to encourage and facilitate research utilization. One might be tempted to conclude that in spite of the importance of encouragement and facilitation of research as implied by the respondents, the examples of the Department of Labor personnel suggest that the absence of these institutional characteristics is not a serious impediment to research utilization at the individual level. My view, however, is that this would be too strong a conclusion. I base this judgment on the fact that many (but not all) of the examples given by the Department of Labor personnel of TJTC-related research use occurred prior to the reductions in force and reorganizations that, along with attitudinal changes at the top management level, were alleged to have brought
about an environment that was not conducive to research utilization. Nevertheless, several examples of TJTC-related research use were given by Department personnel that occurred under these "poor" organizational conditions suggesting that the "proper" institutional environment may well facilitate research utilization, but that the absence of such an environment does not necessarily mean an absence of research use. I would judge that individual predispositions toward research may become much more important under such circumstances and help to account for at least some of the examples of research utilization noted in the Department of Labor. Also, the phenomenon of "networking" may contribute heavily to research utilization in spite of (and maybe because of) lack of organizational efforts to encourage and facilitate such use.

THE IMPACT OF "NETWORKS" ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The discussion with the respondents concerning the efforts of their organizations to encourage and facilitate research revealed a fascinating and unexpected phenomenon—-one that has considerable importance to an understanding of the role of research in the decision making process generally, and concerning TJTC in particular. I am referring to what I will call the "networking" phenomenon.

By "networking" I mean the deliberate effort of an individual to seek information, including research-based information, not from original sources such as research reports, journal articles, etc., but rather from trusted, knowledgeable contacts who can properly be seen as "information brokers."
We will recall that some of the literature on research utilization has acknowledged a role for networking as a source of research-based information. Dunn (1980:527), for example, has discussed the importance of "change agents" or "knowledge brokers." The work of Patton et al. (1977:158) has focused on the importance of the "personal factor" in promoting research utilization. This factor can be seen as a form of networking. More directly, Lucas (1983:380), and Rich (1979b:99) have identified important roles for networks among research users. Yin and Gwaltney (1981:567), in fact, have concluded based on their research that networks are the primary source of research-based information within organizations.

References to "networking" were frequent (14 respondents offered such comments) and they cut across all agencies and ranks within agencies. Interestingly, although my question asked about organizational efforts to facilitate the flow of research-based information, the "networking" responses typically suggested individual rather than organizational initiatives.

The comments of the respondents suggested the possibility of a far greater impact of research on the decision making process than they themselves may have assumed, albeit an impact that comes in a circuitous way. Thus, instead of a simple and direct process such as:

Research → Decision Maker → Decision
the respondents suggested that the far greater incidence of re-
search use looked like this:

Research ➞ Information Broker ➞ Decision Maker ➞ Decision

(I am deliberately oversimplifying here. As indicated earlier, and
will be seen again later, the respondents acknowledged that a de-
cision typically had more inputs to it than that from "research"
alone.)

Some of the comments of the respondents should help vivify the
concept and perceived importance of "networking":

A lot of what I know comes about from a very informal
process of sharing what you know and learn with other
colleagues in other organizations. Maybe this is be-
cause we have overlapping job responsibilities. (An
interest group official)

I get little help from my office when it comes to getting
research information, but after a while you learn who
you can call to get help. (An interest group official)

A congressional staff member saw networking as the most im-
portant source of research-based information. His comments, while
lengthy, deserve repeating because they clearly convey the sense
that was more implicit in the comments of others who addressed
the concept of networking:

I get information from three or four sources. The
first is unsolicited stuff including a lot of "aca-
demic" stuff. I get at least a foot of mail a day,
and I just don't have time to even look at the un-
solicited stuff.

The second source is the Congressional Research
Service. Their stuff can be solicited or unsolic-
ited. I pay more attention to their research be-
cause it is not academic.
The third source of research information for me is my two legislative interns. They look into what I need, and they are good at it.

The fourth source of research information is my network of contacts. This is my most important source. These are people you meet over time who you can call if you need information. Some are academic researchers, some are other congressional staff people, some are interest group people. All know how government works. The real secret to success in this town is knowing how to get digested information from people you trust, fast.

A staff member for an interest group described a rather formalized approach to his "networking." This was revealed in his response to the question of whether his organization did anything to facilitate the flow of research information to him:

I don't have a strong bent toward research, but I do keep up on developments in the area of tax-related matters. I have no problem in getting what I need. I devote a part of everyday to reading and some of this reading includes research studies. I keep files of relevant materials that I can pull out when needed. I also get information from people I can call who have expertise. It all blends in. In fact, a few months ago I helped to start what we are calling the 'Tax Accountant's Forum'. We meet once a month to trade notes on topics of mutual interest. The group is made up of District people from various organizations who have an interest in tax matters.

In the Department of Labor where there was unanimous agreement that that organization did nothing to facilitate the flow of research information, networking was the only easy means available to individuals to keep abreast of relevant developments. A composite of comments from representatives of that agency clearly conveys this situation:

I now have no way of knowing what kind of research is going on here except to read the annual report of the Employment and Training Administration.
The Department does nothing to help us. We each do our own thing, but we do share information. I have the best collection of research done on TJTC in my files and I'll share that with anyone who wants it.

When I was working with TJTC I really didn't need any research information except for a couple of times when I wanted if anyone had done anything on the problem I was trying to handle. In those cases I just called _____, he knew what was going on.

The last two comments are particularly important. The Department of Labor individual claiming to have the "best collection of research done on TJTC" had been with the Department for over ten years. He had a Ph.D. in economics, was pleasant, cooperative, well-known, and obviously well-liked. Of the 14 respondents who mentioned "networking" as a source of research-based information, eight of these (five from within the Department of Labor; three from outside that agency) mentioned this Department official by name (without prompting) as at least one of the persons they could call when they needed information.

The interview with this person confirmed his own perception of being a focal point for persons seeking information--research based or otherwise--on TJTC, and suggested several interesting characteristics of this network that could possibly apply to others.

First, it grew up informally and was based on having some minimal personal contact with, and a sense of trust and confidence in, the person who is eventually to be turned to for help.
Second, it seems as though this "contact person" soon sensed his role and by his attitude, tone, and behavior conveyed a willingness to continue this responsibility. The continuing positive feedback encouraged him to maintain his efforts to "stay on top of things."

Third, in the case of this particular network, the contact person was not a proselytizer seeking out new customers for his services. In fact, by his own admission he was shy and by no means the outgoing, self-promoting personality type. I would speculate that this personality type with its accompanying behavioral traits was probably an aid rather than a hindrance to the development of this particular network. This was so because it helped the network members quickly develop a sense of trust in a contact person who, by his behavior, demonstrated no commitments to any vested interests or schools of thought. As we shall see later, "trust" has an important role to play in research utilization.

Two other observations based on this particular network deserve noting. First, the economist who was its center was very self-conscious of his difference from most other economists given his bias toward empirical research and away from the more theoretical studies of his colleagues. As he put it:

There aren't many around here, and that includes me, who have much time or patience to tease out nuggets of helpful information that may be buried in some of the research going on. Much of it is higher mathematics with no contact with the real world. I prefer good evaluation studies. I look at a lot of
survey data. I think the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey is a gold mine of useful information.

The second observation is the fact that although five Department of Labor employees were a part of this network, others in the same Department, including apparently all of those with current operating responsibility for TJTC, were unaware of this source of potential information. Because those Department of Labor officials working on TJTC at the time of these interviews had only relatively recently acquired this responsibility, it does support the "slow-growth" conception of networking. It takes time to develop trust and confidence.

One way that the literature suggests that trust and confidence may be developed is by bringing potential research users into personal contact with researchers. If this is true, an organization interested in increasing the importance of the role played by research in its decision making routines could take steps to facilitate the contact between researchers and users so as to help accomplish this goal.

THE IMPACT OF PERSONAL CONTACT WITH RESEARCHERS ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The alleged importance of personal contact with researchers stems from the perception on the part of the potential user of a "gap" between him/herself and the researcher akin to that between the "two cultures" of the humanities and the sciences. The perception that there are different technical languages, knowledge acquisition tools, values, etc., is seen as causing the potential user to consciously or unconsciously shy away from research.
Perhaps, the thought goes, that somehow taking deliberate steps to bring these two cultures together will lead to greater mutual understanding and the realization that the perceived gap is not as wide or deep as first feared. (See, for example, Caplan, et al., 1975:33; Rothman, 1980; and Van de Vall and Bolas, 1981:476-477.)

The respondents were asked to express their opinions on this subject. Table 24 displays the answers they gave.

**TABLE 24**

The Importance of Personal Contact with Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Minor Importance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Important</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, 16 of the 24 respondents who were at least occasional research users believed that personal contact with researchers would be at least somewhat important in promoting their use of the researcher's findings. The answers given to this question typically represented, in my opinion, an amalgamation of the respondents' personal experience with researchers, and their theoretical sense of whether or not such contact facilitates research use. Although the question was not asked directly, I would
judge, based on the answers I received to this and other questions, that no more than two of the 24 respondents had not had some personal contact with researchers at some time or another although not necessarily related to TJTC.

In the Department of Labor, depending on the organizational location of the individual, this contact typically came about by way of being interviewed by researchers, or attending debriefings for staff in which researchers made oral presentations of their findings.

Congressional staff members had their contact with researchers in the context of preparing for testimony before their committees. This occasion for personal contact leads to the development of a network of contacts that can then be called by the staff member when needing information. Each congressional staff member indicated that they had a network of researchers working in areas of interest to them that they could call upon when needed for advice or information.

The interest group respondents typically did not have the institutionalized opportunity available to the congressional and Department of Labor staff members to develop personal ties to researchers. The contact with researchers that the interest groups had seemed to have come about in a variety of ways such as: meeting at conferences, or while testifying before Congress; self-promotional efforts by researchers who bring themselves and their work to the attention of the interest groups; ad hoc outreach efforts on the part of interest groups to make personal
contact with researchers who may be of help to them; and personal
toats that may result from participation in information
exchange networks.

The common thread that works its way through the comments
of those respondents who indicated that personal contact with
researchers was at least somewhat important in promoting their
use of the research was "trust." The specific articulation of
this was somewhat different among the respondents but their main
point was unmistakable—to place yourself in the position of will­
ingness to use or act upon the results of someone else's research
places you in a vulnerable position since you are now doing some­
thing which you personally cannot defend or justify. Your de­
fense rests on the credibility of the work done by someone else
and, since you as the user of research may not possess the tech­
nical competence to assess the scientific quality of the work
done, you are left with the need to make a leap of faith—a leap
made easier if you can develop personal confidence in the re­
searcher behind the research.

Implicit in the desire to develop confidence in the researcher
is a stereotype that surfaced rather frequently in the inter­
views. This is the image of the "ivory tower" researcher who
"technically" may do superb work but within a context so devoid
of "real world" elements (from the perspective of the respondents)
as to render his/her work practically useless. The things that
really count to the practioners, the potential users of research,
are not noticed by this stereotypical researcher or, if noticed, are deemed unimportant and relegated to the unexamined ceteris paribus.

I have drawn this picture sharply. None of the respondents phrased their concerns in such an unequivocal way. (In fact, later we will see that in some respects the respondents actually appear to be in a state of tension--drawn between a desire to see their concerns, their perspectives, their views adopted by researchers, and the desire for an unfettered, objective look at the world within which they work.) Let us look at some representative comments offered in response to the question on the importance of personal contact.

A congressional staff member who had suffered through a difficult experience was convinced that some preliminary personal contact with the researchers would have helped him. In his words:

Sure personal contact with researchers is helpful. It gives me a sense of whether they know Congress. If they don't, I don't want them testifying. I made that mistake once. It was on the safe harbor leasing issue. [This refers to a tax maneuver that allows one corporation to "lease," for tax purposes, the unused tax credits of another firm.] I brought these guys [researchers] down here and their work all supported safe harbor leasing. The problem the committee was faced with was that the public was dead set against it. So what we ended up with was the researchers saying their research supports safe harbor leasing and the committee looking at these guys and saying to themselves--that's not the problem. What are we supposed to do about the public--that's the problem.
An interest group respondent expressed her view of the benefit of having personal contact with researchers in this way:

I guess if I know the person doing the research I will be more inclined to read what they have done. It makes it more meaningful or personal. Knowing the researcher personally also would give me the chance to explain our views to them which helps, I think, make sure that they will be considered in any research that is done.

The Department of Labor respondents who expressed the opinion that contact with researchers would be at least somewhat important in inducing them to use the research focused their concerns on the need to convey the importance of organizational concerns. One Department of Labor official expressed the typical sentiment:

There is no doubt that personal contact is very important. Contact with researchers gives you a feel for whether they know what they are doing. The further the researcher gets away from program concerns the less likely is it that the research will be used. We can't have researchers coming in with off the wall ideas. I think if we get a chance to meet researchers we have a good chance of explaining our views and not being ignored.

Although the typical response from those individuals who believed in the benefit of personal contact with researchers had to do with the opportunity to convey views that would hopefully be considered, or the ability to "check out" researchers on a more personal level, another closely related reason for having personal contact was also frequently offered. The perspective here was not benefits that would accrue to potential research users (after all, they are free to ignore research if they so choose), but the pay-offs to the researcher that result from such contacts. The concept here as expressed by the respondents is, "If a researcher
wants his or her work to be used, they should make sure it is useful. They can do this by checking with the potential users. We will help them stay on track." The thrust of this argument places the burden of responsibility for establishing and maintaining personal contact on the researcher. After all, it is they who will benefit by way of seeing the fruits of their labor utilized.

Taken to its extreme form, as was done by some of the respondents, the burden that is placed on the researcher is not only the cultivation of the personal ties with potential users but an explicit, active effort to sell or "market" his/her findings. An interest group representative summed this view up quite succinctly:

I think the researcher who hopes to be utilized has more of a responsibility than just the conduct of the research. Someone has to get the research that has been done to the decision points. Who's responsibility is that? Mine? I think the answer is that there is a shared responsibility for taking steps to see that relevant research is made available where it can do the most good. The way decisions are made is so political that I think it is naive of a researcher to think that his work can enter this process without a push. My only point is that the researcher ought to take on much more responsibility for pushing his own research than he usually does.

This extreme view, while held by only a minority of those favoring personal contact with researchers, helps to draw the counterpoint more easily. Those relatively few respondents who felt that personal contact with researchers was not at all important to determining whether research would be used or not, and even several of those who did choose in favor of personal contact (all of whom said it was "somewhat important"), expressed the very strong concern that such contact could be potentially corrupting.
A Department of Labor respondent expressed this concern in this way:

I think personal contact with researchers if fine if the relationship is a positive one. But there are some shortcomings that I think outweigh the good. What concerns me is that personal contact leads to mutual adjusting. We bend and the researchers bend. They start to tell us, maybe not even consciously, what we want to hear or at least what they think we want to hear. That is no way to run a research program. I am anticontractor because of this. I keep seeing the same people get contracts. The argument always is that 'they know the program.' That may be true, but they then form opinions, maybe biases, and they worry about whether they'll get renewed. I guess I would just as soon never meet the researcher. Just give me their report and I'll read it.

Those respondents who were not in favor of personal contact with researchers or, if in favor, concerned about the possible harmful side effects, tended to see themselves as having a responsibility to help minimize the chances of corruption. They did this by seeing themselves acting as "brokers" between the researcher and the decision makers. They rejected the idea that the researcher should be involved in "marketing" his/her research to policy makers. That was their job, or the job of their organization. They would take the relevant research and put it in a form helpful to the policy maker and lobby for its use. One interest group respondent stated her view in this way:

My job is to take 500 pages of research, some of it tough to understand, boil it down to two or three pages that cover the relevant issues, and get it to the right people. I will push it into the right hands.
A congressional staff member saw a similar role for herself:

I see part of my job as translating what researchers say into language the committee members understand. It would be good if researchers wrote more with a view to a lay audience in mind, but I don't think they can do my job. I pick and choose according to the interests of the committee members and the issues they are dealing with. I wouldn't expect researchers to do this.

An examination of the composition of the two groups of respondents to the question on the importance of personal contact with researchers--those 16 who felt personal contact was at least somewhat important, and those eight who did not share this view--did not reveal any obviously shared characteristic within these two groups except for the fact that the latter group was very concerned about the possibly corrupting influence of personal contact.

The only other factor observed to be affecting the importance placed on personal contact was education. Only 28% of those with at least a bachelor's degree in the social sciences, but 70% of those without this background, felt that personal contact with researchers was "important" or "very important."

THE IMPACT OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN RESEARCH ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Although not as strongly established in the research utilization literature as is the importance of personal contact between researchers and the potential users of research, there is some evidence (Rothman, 1980:90; and Ballard and James, 1983:412) to indicate that the chances for research use occurring are enhanced if the potential user can somehow be meaningfully involved in the
research itself. This "Two Cultures" gap closing technique it is believed will help demystify the research process, create and sustain interest, lead to a shared sense of ownership of the research findings and, on this foundation, greatly increase the likelihood that the research will actually be put to use.

I asked the respondents whether or not they thought their involvement in the various aspects of a research project would lead them to make greater use of the results of the research than they would have without such involvement. Table 25 depicts the responses received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of User Involvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Minor Importance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Important</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents' views on this question are not too dissimilar from their judgments on the value of personal contact with researchers with user involvement scoring just slightly higher in overall importance. Clearly, a majority felt that their involvement in various aspects of a research project would be an important or very important factor in influencing their use of the
results of that research. Only one respondent (a congressional staff member) felt such involvement would have absolutely no impact on his decision to make use of research findings. His views were clear, "I'm too busy to get involved in any way with the conduct of a research project. I just want the bottom line. Give me the report. I'll read it, and if there is anything interesting in it, I'll use it."

Actually, there was more than just surface similarity between the responses to the question on the value of personal contact with researchers and the response to the question on user involvement in the research. The same concern about the potential for corruption that surfaced in the question on personal contact emerged here, only stronger. The primary manifestation of this concern was the self-imposed limits the respondents placed on their involvement in a research project. What all but one respondent wanted (with varying degrees of intensity) was participation in the selection of the precise questions to be asked by a research project. Involvement beyond this would be modest to non-existent depending on the individual respondent. None would wish to participate in the actual conduct of the research, and none would wish to select the research methods to be used in the study. The only post-question selection involvement some of the respondents (mostly located in the Department of Labor) wanted was to be briefed by interim progress reports, and given the opportunity to comment on these reports for the sole purposes of
insuring that the right questions continued to be asked, or that the information that was reported was intelligible.

The motivation behind the responses received to this question were simple and straightforward. A research project which addressed the "wrong" questions, or could not be understood, would not be used. No one is in a better position to specify the useful questions or issues to be addressed (or to comment on intelligibility) than those who are dealing with these questions or issues on a daily basis in the "real world."

Given the logic behind the respondents' views on the question of their involvement in the research enterprise, it might appear surprising that more of them did not score such involvement as "very important." I can think of two possible explanations why this was not, in fact, the case. The first was the cloud of concern that there may very well be a thin line between mutually productive interaction among the researchers and the potential users of research, and the corruption of the whole enterprise by "mutual adjusting." The second reason why the ratings may not have been even higher than they were was the fact that the decisions to seek research and to then actually use it are themselves complex, as we have seen. User involvement in research remains only one element in this complex process and in itself is hardly likely to be the determining factor. Hence the absence of many "very important" scores. This last point was summed up
nicely by a comment made by an interest group official:

It would be nice to be involved with the selection of the research study to be done. Certainly if I was involved in this way, I would be very interested in following its progress. I guess I would be given to wanting to use the research too, but as I think about it I'm not so sure how big a difference my involvement would make in my decision to make use of a research report. What I mean is either I want research or I don't, and either I get research that I can use or I don't. These are the really important things, not whether I have been involved or not.

THE IMPACT OF SOURCE OF RESEARCH INFORMATION ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Among the benefits said to accrue from personal contact with researchers and involvement in the research enterprise is the development of a sense on the part of the potential user that the research product is responsive to his/her needs and questions. The literature on research utilization suggests that the chances for research to be used will be enhanced if research comes from an in-house source. This research, it is thought is prima facie assumed to be responsive to user needs and will, therefore, be used in some way. (See Rothman, 1980:46; Van de Vail and Bolas, 1981; and Rich, 1979b:98.)

The respondents were asked for their opinions on the question of whether or not the source of a research product—in this case from an in-house research team or an outside contractor—would make a difference to them in terms of their willingness to make use of it. Table 26 shows the responses received.

Overall, no clear preference emerges from the question. Twelve of the respondents believed that the source of research
made a difference while 12 felt it did not. Among the 12 respondents who believed that source did make a difference, five cast their vote in favor of in-house research while seven preferred outside contractors.

An analyses of the responses received to this question suggests that those persons with preferences for in-house research had this view because they believed that this was the best way to insure that the right questions would be asked. As a Department of Labor respondent put it:

I prefer research that is done by our in-house unit. They do what they are told. You can control them easier than you can outside contractors. This means that they will address the practical concerns that we have around here. With an outside contractor this is less likely. That's why their reports usually just gather dust.

A congressional staff member expressed a similar view:

Personally, I prefer to see the research I use come from the Congressional Research Service. There are two reasons for this. First, they work faster than outside contractors, or at least you can keep the whip to them. It is harder to speed up a contractor. What good is a research report after the Committee has already formed its views? The second reason I prefer to use the Congressional Research Service is

### TABLE 26

Preference for Research by Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house Preferred</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Contractor Preferred</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that they are more sensitive to the politics of what they're doing even though they may not admit this, and they are more responsive to the needs of the Committee. They give you what you ask for, and this isn't always the case with contractors.

All of those respondents who expressed a preference for research done by outside contractors shared one opinion that distinguished them from those who wanted their research to come from an in-house effort. This concern was with bias. Simply stated, these respondents believed that in-house researchers could not be relied upon to give an accurate answer to an important question facing their own organization. For a variety of reasons, subtle and not so subtle pressures would force these researchers, often unconsciously, to shade their findings in a way that they believed would be pleasing to management. In the words of a Department of Labor respondent:

You really can't expect someone who knows what the boss is looking for to turn around and give him something else. Maybe they can do this every once in a while, but if they do it too often, they start to worry that they will lose their job or something.

Although all respondents preferring contract research did so, in part at least, because of their concern over bias, not all of these respondents felt that in-house research was necessarily doomed in all cases to carry this flaw. Rather, it was their concern that the perception on the part of others was that in-house research was biased research that pushed these respondents in the direction of outside contractors. This view was found in the Department of Labor, but was most pronounced in the comments
of the interest group respondents. Said one such respondent:

Let's face it, we are seen as a lobbying organization, and that's what we are. As I told you earlier, we use research if it helps us politically and ignore it if it doesn't. We are suspect to begin with, and there is no way tauting something that is based on research we would do would in anyway help us. What we need is to find research done by others that supports our view and ride that. We talk about adding more in-house research capacity here every now and then, and we always come to the same conclusion. It would do us more harm than good.

It is conceivable, of course, that one could admit the strong possibility of bias from an in-house research team, or share the view that in-house research is perceived by others to be biased (even if it is not), and still find a place for such an organizational capacity. Several respondents, in fact, did admit that even within an atmosphere highly charged with concern over bias/credibility, there is a role for in-house research. Examples would be conducting studies on topics in which the organization has no vested interest in a particular outcome, or getting quick "snapshots" of issues that may prove to merit further study by an outside contractor. Nevertheless, each of these respondents expressed an overall preference for outside contractors.

Another theme, minor when compared to the concern over bias and credibility, that emerged from the comments of some of the respondents preferring outside contractors is that in-house researchers, as a rule, are not quite as good as those one might find in a university or private contract firm. This was a view that was expressed most forcefully by several of the Department of Labor respondents. (Ironically, one of the Department of
Labor respondents who indicated a preference for in-house research did so, he said, because to admit a preference for contract research would imply that the in-house team was incompetent, and that would reflect poorly on all Department employees.)

Those 12 respondents who expressed no preference for either in-house research or outside contractors were characterized by one of two views. Either they had no concern over bias and credibility and truly saw no advantage to having their research come from one or the other source, or they were convinced that bias was inevitable regardless of source, and it made no difference whether this bias came from an in-house source or an outside contractor. The former view was the one held by most of those in the "no preference" group.

The cross-tabulation analysis revealed one factor that appeared related to the preference for research by source. Forty-two percent of those higher-level respondents preferred in-house generated research while 64% of the lower-level respondents preferred research to come from outside contractors. Once again, the socialization to organizational values that is assumed to occur in organizations, and serves as a prerequisite for advancement, may help to account for this difference.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, a number of characteristics of organizations that the literature suggests may have an important impact on research utilization were investigated.
The respondents perceived that research was typically only somewhat important, at most, to the decision making process of their organizations. Basically, this relatively unimportant role for research was not seen as inappropriate because decision making was acknowledged to be (properly) influenced by many inputs.

Respondents evaluated the extent of their organization's efforts to encourage and facilitate research use in accordance with their perception of the importance of research to the decision making process of the organization. Only five individuals felt that their organizations made a strong effort to encourage and facilitate research use. At the other extreme, 11 respondents (nine from the Department of Labor) claimed their organization did nothing to encourage or facilitate research use.

The efforts of an organization to encourage and facilitate research use appeared to influence several aspects of utilization behavior including the impact of research that is used, the number of nonresearch inputs to decision making/position taking that are considered, the number of issues to which TJTC-related research was applied and, possibly, the frequency of research use as well.

Although the subject was not pursued directly, 14 respondents indicated that they obtained at least some of their research-based information from informal "networks" of personal contacts with other research users. Important characteristics of the networks observed were the role of personal contact, and trust between the
information-giver and the information-receiver.

The importance of personal contact and trust were also seen in the views of the respondents concerning personal contact with researchers and personal involvement in research. In both instances, roughly half of the respondents felt that such contact/involvement would have at least an "important" impact on their utilization decision. Such involvements enabled users to develop confidence in the researcher and, hence, the research and, at least from the users' perspective, were a means to help insure that the research would be relevant. However, a tension was recognized within this context. Personal contact, and involvement in research it was feared, could lead to a corruption of the research enterprise by way of conscious or unconscious "adjustments" between researchers and users. The importance of education also showed itself in this area with those having a social science background, apparently more confident in their own ability to use research, feeling much less need for personal contact with researchers, and involvement in research than did those without such an education.

No clear picture emerged concerning the preference for research by source. Half of the respondents did not care if their research came from an in-house source or an outside contractor. The remaining respondents were approximately split in their preferences. Once again, concern over the possibility of bias in research was a key consideration in the respondents' choice. One factor that appeared related somewhat to source
preference was the position occupied by the respondent. Those in higher-level positions seemed more inclined to use research generated in-house than did those in lower-level positions. The socialization phenomenon observed earlier may help account for this difference.
CHAPTER 6: THE IMPACT OF RESEARCH CHARACTERISTICS ON RESEARCH UTILIZATION

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF RESEARCH AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE UTILIZATION DECISION

We saw in Chapter 1 that the literature on research utilization suggests that a cluster of variables that may play an important role in the use/nonuse decision relate directly to the nature of the research enterprise itself and the typical product of this enterprise--the research report. Specifically, the literature draws our attention to twelve research characteristics. These are:

1. Timeliness of the research
2. Relevance of the research
3. Reliability of the research
4. Validity of the research
5. Action-Orientaion of the research
6. Practicality of the research
7. Presentation of the research
8. Political Acceptability of the research
9. Consistency of the research with previous research findings
10. Consistency of the research with commonly held assumptions
11. Consistency of the research with the potential user's established position
12. Consistency of the research with the potential user's intuition or sense of the situation
The views of the respondents on the importance of these research characteristics revealed that there was often little variation in response within any particular variable, and there was only a little more variation apparent when we compare the responses among the variables. Generally speaking, each of the 12 factors was seen as "important" to "very important" in helping the respondent make a decision to use or not to use a particular research study, although the practical implications of these judgments did vary somewhat depending on the factor being considered. The full array of responses is shown in Table 27.

It must be acknowledged that the direct interview approach was, perhaps, not the ideal way to try to ascertain the importance of at least some and possibly all of these 12 variables. I think there were at least two reasons for this. The first is that it is difficult to imagine someone who is considering whether or not to use a piece of research saying that at least some of these 12 variables such as relevance, validity, or practicality are unimportant to their deliberation. It is just too easy to say that factors such as these are "important" or "very important" without giving any further thought to the matter. What I am reminded of are the sometimes startling differences that are observed in the public's responses to survey questions that seek to elicit their degree of commitment to such general concepts as "freedom," "democracy," "opportunity," or "equality," and the responses that are received to specific questions on topics such as tolerance of political dissent, or race relations. A more sensitive, unobtrusive measure than the
TABLE 27
The Importance of Research Characteristics to Research Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Characteristics</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Minor Importance</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-Orientation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Acceptability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Previous Research Findings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Commonly Held Assumptions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Potential User's Established Position</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Potential User's Intuition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 24 Respondents
one I used may have been the preferable way to gauge the impact of these 12 variables on the research utilization decision. (Without attempting to provide specific details of what such a technique might look like, I would, nevertheless offer the thought that it would probably be an elaborate, time consuming effort that might border on being impractical.)

There is a second reason why the direct interview approach may have had serious drawbacks as the means employed to try to gauge the impact of the 12 variables on the research utilization decision. It has already been established that the respondents, both generally and with regard to TJTC, used research in more than just an instrumental way to help them reach a decision or establish a position. Ideally, we would know the impact of each of the 12 variables considered here on each kind of research use we earlier identified. If we can visualize this as filling in the cells of a matrix, we would be dealing with 72 data points per respondent, which in itself would have been unwieldy if not burdensome given the overall length of the interview. Even if I did take this approach, I would still have been faced with the first difficulty pointed out with the direct interview approach. As it turned out, with few exceptions, the views of the respondents on the importance of the research report characteristics reflected an instrumental view of research use. This may reflect the relative frequency of this type of research use (in which case this finding is in disagreement with those prevailing in the literature), or the fact that "use" itself was a term not further specified for this portion of the interview and
thus the respondents assumed that the more common instrumental meaning was intended.

I will offer one last general comment. It would be a legitimate question to ask whether or not the presentation of a list of 12 variables to the respondents for them to react to does not bias the picture obtained about the importance of characteristics of the research "product" on the research utilization decision. This could very well be true. In fact, when I tested my interview guide, I tried at first to elicit comments on the impact of research report characteristics on utilization, but found I needed to "prime" the respondents with specific examples before the question became meaningful to them.

Because of these considerations, I will not elaborate further on the relative sense of importance the respondents placed on research characteristics to the utilization decision. Rather, the value served by these questions was in the elaborations on the basic responses that were offered by the respondents and that provide insight into the conditions under which research characteristics take on their importance.

**Timeliness of the Research**

The only indication of a perspective that went beyond the instrumental conception of research utilization came from those respondents who claimed that timeliness was only "somewhat important" to them. Without minimizing the importance of timeliness to instrumental use, these six respondents acknowledged other purposes to which the research could be put. An otherwise untimely piece of
research still was potentially valuable as an aid to conceptualizing or, perhaps, it would suggest issues that needed closer attention (knowledge-driven use). This finding is consistent with that of Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977:220-22). Those respondents who took the broader conception were all high-ranking individuals within their organizations and all had at least a bachelor's degree in the social sciences. Nevertheless, in this particular instance most highly placed individuals, including those with a social science educational background, took only an instrumental view of research use.

Variations in the perspectives on the importance of timeliness to the utilization decision appeared to be associated with variations in response to other questions on the importance of research characteristics. The more important that timeliness was to the research utilization decision, the more often was action orientation, practicality and presentation also seen as important to that decision—views that would seem compatible with an instrumental view of research use.

Relevance of the Research

Reflecting again perhaps an instrumentalist view of research utilization, relevance was seen as "important" or "very important" by all of the respondents.

The comments offered by the respondents concerning the importance of "relevance" were similar regardless of their organizational affiliation. A typical response, this from an interest group representative was:

"Of course the research has got to be relevant for it to be
used here. Frankly, I'm pretty cynical about pure academic research. It is so far removed from the real world, or at least from my world, that it is useless. I need research that I can understand, make other people understand, and that deals with the issues that are important to me.

Earlier we saw that at least some of the respondents cited the applicability of non-TJTC-specific research literature to TJTC-related issues they were considering. I suspect that these respondents would claim that because these non-TJTC-related studies were applied to TJTC-related issues they were, by definition, relevant. However, the comments I received in response to the direct question of the importance of relevance to research utilization suggested that only those studies that deal clearly and directly with an issue of immediate concern would be used. This view was shared, apparently, even by those respondents who showed a broader conception of research utilization in their answer to the previous question on the importance of timeliness.

Reliability and Validity of the Research

These two concepts are being considered together because there was very little difference in the responses I received to these questions, and because the concepts themselves were seen as closely related by our respondents. In fact, a number of respondents were clearly uncomfortable with these questions. Some of them confessed to not being sure what the terms meant, and asked for examples or definitions. Others, I suspect, would have liked such direction, but did not seek it out.

The questions of the reliability and validity of research appeared to be less important to the utilization decision, in general,
than were the factors of timeliness and relevance. At first thought this appears to be a rather surprising finding. Why would not each of the respondents say that reliability and validity are very important considerations in their decision of whether or not to use a particular piece of research?

One answer to this question has already been given. Some of the respondents simply did not understand the concepts clearly enough. Others admitted they did not possess the technical skills needed to make judgments about the adequacy of a study's reliability and validity. These were the respondents who indicated that these factors were either "not at all important" to their research utilization decision, or they were of "very minor" importance, or only "somewhat" important. With few exceptions, the individuals expressing an inability to judge matters of reliability and validity were distinguished from those who said (or implied) they made such judgments by their educational background. Typically, only those respondents who were holders of bachelor's degrees or better in the social sciences claimed that reliability and validity were "important" considerations for them as they assessed a study with a view to using it or not.

This association is somewhat curious. Intuitively, I would expect those without a social science background to be more concerned with matters of reliability and validity. I would speculate that what might have happened here was that this group, generally lacking a social science background, felt at a disadvantage when it came to judging the reliability and validity of a research study. Their
experience, however, taught them that to ignore such concerns was perilous and so they sought out surrogate measures of reliability and validity namely, trust and confidence in the researcher that came about by way of personal contact, and their own involvement with the research project itself. Those respondents who did have a social science background, on the other hand, were much more confident of their ability to judge a research report for its reliability and validity and, hence, these factors do not loom quite so large to them. Again, a speculation.

The most interesting finding emerging from the questions on reliability and validity had to do with those individuals who acknowledged that these concepts played at least a "somewhat" important role in their decision to use or not to use a particular research study, but who also had limited or no skills to enable them to independently pass judgment in these areas. There were two things that appeared to happen in cases, and both were based on "trust." Either the respondent chose to use studies from known individuals or organizations where they believed that any questions about reliability or validity could be adequately answered (or, more likely, not even raised), or they asked a trusted individual from their "network" to pass judgment of the quality of the study in question. In the latter case, where the "network" was used, it appeared as though a research study first had to pass certain tests such as "relevance," or whether it agreed or disagreed with the position held by the respondent or the respondent's organization, before the effort was made to check on reliability and validity.
The discovery of the use of "tests" supports a similar finding by Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980:101-106).

Of course, the impression emerging from the respondent's comments is not one of them literally seeking explicit judgments from others on matters of reliability and validity. Rather, the image is of less structured interaction characterized by questions such as, "Have you seen the study of X? What do you think of it?" Ten of the respondents falling on the middle ground between those who gave minor importance at most to reliability and validity, and those who claimed to pass judgments for themselves on these subjects, had some sort of "trust" mechanism operating to help them in this area. For example, a Department of Labor respondent sought the assurances of reliability and validity by limiting the sources of research he considered:

These things really depend on who is doing the research. I'll accept the findings of university researchers. They are value-free. Private enterprise is another story, however. I think what they do is very suspect. Personally, I ignore it.

Another Department of Labor respondent relied on her network of contacts:

I don't assume reliability [and validity] in a study, but I am not into this area. If it looks like a good study to me, I'll talk to people who know more about the technical aspects of research than I do, and get their opinion.

Still another Department of Labor representative revealed the operation of a preliminary testing device the outcome of which determined whether or not the study's reliability and validity would need further examination:

I am very concerned about this [reliability], but I am not
an expert here. A lot of research is common sense. I am not saying that it isn't scientific, it's just that common sense would tell you the same thing. If I read a study and it all makes sense to me, I accept it. If it doesn't make sense, then I either dismiss it, or I'll check around and get other opinions about it. You know, we canned a TJTC study because it was unreliable.

Comments similar to these were made by both the congressional and interest group respondents. For the congressional group, there was a sense that only the very best work could make it through to get their personal attention. By this time, the reliability and validity were no longer in question. As one congressional aid put it:

The reliability [and validity] of research isn't my problem, it's the author's problem. The people I rely on to keep me posted on what's going on just wouldn't send me a study that was a piece of junk. By the time I see a research article I can be pretty sure that it's OK."

Six of the nine interest group respondents indicated that they or their organizations took steps to be assured of the reliability and validity of a study. The underlying motivation was a keen sense that anyone involved in lobbying must be scrupulous in their efforts to maintain credibility. A typical response was:

If you are pushing something and in part doing so because you say that research supports your views, you know damn well that someone out there who disagrees with your views will go through your research with a fine tooth comb to find something they can knock. You learn to be very careful here.

Action-Orientation and Practicality of the Research

Although a distinction can be made between the "action-orientation" of research findings and their "practicality," this distinction was too fine a point to be of any interest to most of the respondents. To them, in essence, "action-orientation" implied "practicality."
Action-orientation that was not practical was a contradiction in terms, at least if we are to judge by their comments.

The comments offered by our respondents to explain or justify the level of importance they attached to these variables were not too dissimilar to the ones offered in support of timeliness and relevance. The words of a Department of Labor respondent were fairly typical of what was heard:

Again, it's a question of time. I don't have time to try to figure out what to do with a research report. That should be clearly stated in the report itself. The biggest cop-out going is for a researcher to draw up short of telling you what the practical implications of their findings are.

Those respondents who indicated that action-orientation and practicality were either of "very minor importance" or "somewhat important" to them were less inclined to place all of the burden of finding usefulness on the researcher. A Department of Labor respondent expressed this view in the following way:

It seems to me that the most important thing a researcher can do is find some connection between events. If they do this, I think it then becomes another matter entirely, one to be left to policy makers, to decide what to do about this connection.

Also, those respondents who saw action-orientation and practicality as somewhat less important than did the others were the same ones who, in response to the first question on timeliness, indicated that they took more than an instrumental view of research utilization. Further, these same respondents appeared to make use of research more frequently than did those who saw action-orientation and practicality as very important.
Presentation of the Research

The exact question asked of the respondents was:

How important is the presentation of the research to your decision to use or not to use it? By 'presentation' we mean the way in which the researcher wrote his/her reports. Were they written using technical language, or was an effort made to keep such language to a minimum? Was the format of the report attractive and conducive to reading?

The basic finding of the literature that presentation is an important element in the research utilization decision was, in general, supported by the views of the respondents although in some cases presentation competed with other factors such as relevance for dominance.

Twelve of the 24 respondents expressed the belief that "presentation" was "very important." The four individuals who indicated that presentation was either of very minor importance or not at all important to them were driven mainly by the relevance of the research. As one of them put it, "The question is does the research deal with something I'm interested in. If it does, I'd pour through even a bad one to see if it has anything interesting to say." (It should be noted that these respondents had advanced degrees in the social sciences, and had earlier indicated that they were not uncomfortable about the technical aspects of the research enterprise.) Those respondents who indicated that presentation was "somewhat important" or less, were more inclined to use research conceptually, and to use research more frequently, than those who claimed that presentation was "very important."

The remaining respondents were not so clearly driven by the
relevance of the research, important as that variable was, to ignore an otherwise bad presentation; although I could detect a certain tension between these two aspects of the research report. For three respondents, their lack of technical expertise seem to carry the day. "I read English, not statistics," said one such respondent from the Department of Labor.

One's network of trusted, competent colleagues was mentioned by six individuals as a way around the problem of poor presentation in the same manner that they reached a peace with themselves on the question of reliability and validity.

Often, the person who indicated that presentation was "important" or "very important" to their own utilization decision, explained their views with reference to their perception that presentation was really more important to others. The extreme of this view was found in Congress where three staff members indicated that presentation was at least an "important" consideration to them, but offered explanations having to do with the unwillingness of congressmen to wade through pages of technicalities. The solution to this problem was for the staff members to serve as a "research broker" to the congressmen whereby they would "translate" technical research into concepts more easily understood. The idea of "research broker" also came out in the comments of four of the six interest group respondents who indicated that presentation was a "very important" factor in their own utilization decisions.

Interestingly, none of these respondents would fault the researcher for this particular state of affairs. In fact, they
supports similar conclusions reached by Caplan et al. (1975:35), and Patton et al. (1977:149).

None of the respondents could imagine making a decision to somehow use a research report without that decision being tempered by a prior decision about the political acceptability of the research itself. The decision was not always or even typically the simple sort such as "is it or is it not politically feasible for me to make use of this research?" In fact, only one respondent, a Department of Labor official, stated flatly that if a piece of research failed to pass the political feasibility test he would ignore it from that point onward. The more typical response had to do with how political concerns would affect the use of an otherwise acceptable piece of research, and not whether politics would preclude use altogether.

Clearly, if an otherwise acceptable piece of research also passed whatever tests of political feasibility were applied to it, the utilization decision was rather unproblematic. If, however, that same research was now found to be a political liability, the potential user was faced with a dilemma.

One way in which most of the respondents appeared to cope with this dilemma started with a perception of political acceptability not as an either/or condition but rather as a spectrum ranging from more to less. These respondents claimed to be dissuaded from using a particular piece of research only under conditions characterized by an extremely high level of political unacceptability. Otherwise, and if other factors were in place such as relevance and validity, they would not be readily inclined to ignore completely a good piece
of research. The sense I got was that the more attractive the research and the lower the political sensitivity, the more likely the research would be used. Change these factors in any significant way and the probability of utilization would also change.

Five of the respondents gave specific examples (none related to TJTC) where they perceived themselves to be working for the adoption of some research findings in the face of hostility from their superiors or constituents. Two respondents, both public interest group members, were convinced that they had pioneered new paths for their organizations in the face of considerable initial hostility from their constituents. Both claimed that it was research that caused them to "see the light" in the first instance. I am convinced that these are rather rare instances of the respondents persevering in the face of strong political sentiment.

Strong political feelings may serve to prevent the respondents from attempting to implement the findings of the offending research, but they do not cause them to ignore the research altogether. For example, many of the respondents were in the position of giving information and counsel to policy makers, and they perceived their responsibility to include the provision of information that was not necessarily to the liking of their superiors. If the subject the research dealt with was one these persons felt strongly about, the respondents used the research, generally speaking, not to convert their superiors but to warn them should a political foe attempt to use the research to their advantage.
In fact, the lack of congruence between research and politics was in itself a "warning signal" that most frequently served as a call to seek additional research that would help them to resolve the conflict. The primary tendency appeared to be to find a way to dismiss the research and retain a commitment to whatever political arrangements were in place, although the strength of the research and the strength of the political commitments could influence this tendency. (A few of the respondents also noted that it was exceedingly rare for one research study to have such a dramatic impact. More important, and more frequent, though less dramatic, was the impact of accumulated evidence from many studies all pointing to the same conclusion.) The comments of one of the respondents from the Department of Labor should help to illuminate this process:

You can't ignore political considerations especially around here where the politics can get incredible at times. If I find a research study that in essence goes against Department policy, my first thought is to try to find some fault with it and, if I can, I'll then use that as a club to beat the hell out of the whole thing. It is one hell of a lot easier to pick on one research study than it is for me to try to change Department policy. [Question: What would you do if you could not find any faults with the research?] [Laughter] That's a good question. First of all you can always find something to knock, but let's just say that I'd admit that the study was pretty good. I'm not sure. I guess if I was willing to admit that it was a good study, it wouldn't be long before others read it and reached the same conclusion. So it would still end up coming back to haunt the Department. I guess what I might do would be to alert my boss to it by saying something like 'you'd better look at this thing. I think someone is likely to pick it up and start shooting at us.' One thing we might do is get our own contractor to study whatever it is that is in question. You can always find someone who will say just the opposite thing.

This last comment by the Department of Labor respondent to the effect that politically unacceptable research may serve as a stimulus
to further research is, I think, an important point. It is also
one, as we shall see, that emerges even more strongly in the comments
the respondents made about the remaining research product variables.
I will discuss this point further at that time.

**Consistency of the Research with Previous Research Findings**

According to the respondents, all other things being equal, the
reinforcement coming from the consistency of a research study with
past studies would increase the chances of that particular research
being used. This finding is not especially surprising. What I
did find that was intriguing however was the activity that would
be precipitated by the discovery of a research study that differed
in the conclusions it reached when compared to those of past studies.
Eighteen of these 24 respondents indicated in one way or another
that the discovery of research that was in one way or another
inconsistent with prior work, if it was in an area of interest/
importance to them, would prompt them to "take a closer look,"
"rethink an issue," or "get more research." A Department of Labor
respondent summed up this point of view rather succinctly:

That kind of thing [finding a research study that offers
conclusions different from those found in previous research] gets my adrenaline flowing. I would definitely take a closer
look. I would look for flaws first of all—chances are this
guy is wrong and everyone else has been right. But if I
could not find anything wrong, I would be forced to recon-
sider my position.

This respondent was one of those who felt capable of reaching his
own decisions on the soundness of a research study. Several of
those who were not so well equipped indicated that they would call
on their "network" to help them resolve the apparent contradiction
in findings.

The impression I got from the responses was of a condition psychologists refer to as "cognitive dissonance." It simply was intolerable for most of the respondents to be confronted with contradictory research findings, and such an occurrence would cause them to take steps to resolve this situation. (An additional impression that emerged was that one way a researcher could improve the chances of his/her work being noticed was to reach conclusions that were different from those of previous research studies.)

Consistency of the Research with Commonly Held Assumptions

This question was similar to the previous question concerning the impact of consistency/inconsistency in research findings on the utilization decision except that here I was seeking to learn what impact research findings had if they were inconsistent with the "prevailing wisdom" as reflected in commonly held assumptions about such things as people, policies, and organizations.

The respondents in aggregate, perceived the consistency of research findings with commonly held assumptions to be less important to their utilization decision than was the consistency of the research with previous research findings.

The primary reason for this finding was that 11 of the respondents claimed not to be particularly moved by "commonly held assumptions." These respondents tended to be frequent users of research when compared to the others. Of the remaining 13 respondents who indicated that a discrepancy between commonly held assumptions and research would be at least "important" to their utilization decision,
five rephrased the question in such a way that the assumptions the research contradicted were those of their boss, agency, constituency, committee, or their own views. Under these conditions, contrary research findings became much more important to them.

**Consistency of the Research with the Potential User's Established Position**

In its starkest form, the respondents indicated that any single research study that reached conclusions that did not conform to their established position on an issue was not likely to be used. This statement requires further elaboration.

We should recall that earlier in the interview most of the respondents indicated that one reason they had for seeking research was what I referred to as their "information" needs. Typically, they were unsure about something and felt that research might help them to reach firmer ground. In asking the question as I did—whether it was important if research was to be used that it be consistent with the respondent's established views—I de facto eliminated the most frequent occasion for them to seek research. Established views, formed perhaps in part on the basis of prior research, and having reached the status of "established" because they melded with the organizational and political realities the respondents faced, were not to be put aside lightly simply because one study reached differing conclusions. This was the common ground all of the respondents shared in response to this question.

The practical outcome of a confrontation of one's established position with contrary research findings was variable among the
respondents and depended on the specific configuration and intensity of other factors that were important not only to their research utilization decisions but, more basically, to their decision making routines in general. Thus, within this context, some of the respondents indicated that they would expect simply to ignore a research study that had reached conclusions that differed from their own established positions. More pressure, and further signals would need to be received by them before any additional action on their part was warranted. Others would scan their environment actively looking for signals from important sources that would suggest that reconsideration, or active defense of their established position was in order. Among these respondents, part of that reconsideration or defense process could include the search for additional research information.

Consistency of the Research with the Potential User's Intuition or Sense of the Situation

The consistency of a research study's conclusions with the respondents' sense of a situation was quite important to their decision to make use of the research. The first inclination of the respondents would be to ignore a study that reached conclusions that appeared to them to be counterintuitive. In what by now must be recognized as a clear pattern, one contrary study by itself was not likely to shake the commitment of our respondents to their own intuition, just as it would not shake them from the established positions they held. But, depending on the intensity and configuration of other considerations such as the importance of the issue in
question, the strength of their own feelings toward the issue, the quality of the research study, or its reception by the respondent's constituency, a contrary study could be a powerful impetus to action by the respondents—again a finding consistent with that of Weiss and Bucuvalas (1977:224). When this happened, regardless of the specific action taken, the goal was to somehow eliminate the psychic discomfort that came from the presence of contradictory elements within the field of forces that the respondents deemed to be important to them.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Most of the research characteristics examined in this study were seen as at least "important" to the respondents' research utilization decision. Some of this clustering of responses, however, may well reflect the way in which the information was gathered. Therefore, it only seems prudent to accept tentatively the characteristics of research as having a significant impact on research utilization.

The primary value served by the explanation of the importance of research characteristics was the insights gathered from the comments offered by the respondents that help shed light on the conditions under which research characteristics take on their importance, and to the relationships that appear to exist among at least some of the characteristics of research. Some of the more suggestive insights gathered from this investigation will be summarized here.
1. When thinking about the importance of research characteristics to the utilization decision, the vast majority of the respondents took an exclusively instrumental view of research use. It is not clear if this view reflects the dominance of instrumental use (a finding that would be contrary to the prevailing view found in the literature), or was somehow an artifact of the way in which information was sought concerning the importance of research characteristics. I would judge that the explanation lies in the fact that the term "use" conveys an "action" sense that is most compatible with the instrumental application of research. If this is the case, other forms of research use will be under-reported unless a deliberate effort is made to seek evidence of their use.

2. Those respondents who view utilization as involving more than just the instrumental application of research findings, assign less importance to the timeliness, action-orientation, practicality, and presentation of research than do those who take an exclusively instrumental view. This finding reflects the fact that these research features simply are not particularly germane to the noninstrumental uses of research. Some evidence was seen that suggests that one's position in an organization and/or educational background may be related to the noninstrumental use of research and, hence, to the importance of certain research characteristics.

3. The importance of the reliability and validity of research to the utilization decision appears to be related to educational background with those having training in the social sciences claiming greater importance for these variables than did those without such an education. Nevertheless, this latter group appears to use "surrogates" to achieve confidence concerning the quality of research. Examples of these surrogates are: limiting the research used to that coming from trusted sources, and use of one's "network" to help make judgments of quality.

4. There appear to exist relationships among the research characteristics themselves whereby the importance of one is contingent on the importance of another. For example, presentation, reliability and validity are important only after a research piece has passed the test of relevance. We have already seen that action-orientation, and practicality may be important only if the user is determined to use timely research to help solve an immediate problem. Further, factors external to research characteristics can affect the importance assigned to these characteristics. For example, a study, the reliability of which is unknown, may be eagerly sought and acted upon in a crisis setting.
characterized by a dearth of "hard" information. Similarly, the importance of the "presentation" of the research appears to be at least in part related to the educational background of the user.

5. Some users prefer research that explicitly provides for policy guidance. Anything short of this is seen as unusable. Others are able, or even prefer, to draw their own conclusions and, in fact, may suspect the objectivity of a researcher who hastens to provide policy guidance. These differences, in turn, may be related to several factors. For example, the more frequently one reports using research, the less inclined they are to desire explicit policy guidance. Likewise, those who see their job responsibilities including the provision of research results to their superiors, seem to prefer to draw their own policy conclusions in part, at least, to minimize the potential of bias that might occur if a researcher were pressured to offer policy guidance.

6. Although there is universal agreement on the importance of political considerations to the research utilization decision, the connection between these two factors is neither simple, nor direct. The dismissal of a research study simply because it is politically unacceptable was practically unheard of. (Likewise, it is difficult to imagine that one contrary study would, in itself, be capable of immediately pulling the user away from a strongly held political position.) Rather, the question is what among a range of possibilities should be done when confronted by a politically unpopular research piece. The answer that emerges does so from a complex of factors, undoubtedly weighted differently in importance, such as the strength of commitment to existing policies, the visibility of the study, its impact on significant persons, its quality, the reputation of its author, whether it breaks new ground or is the coup de grâce of an otherwise suspect policy, or whether the user was personally involved in the research. Frequently, the discovery of a politically unpopular research study was itself a strong impetus to seek further, confirming or disconfirming, research. The comments of the respondents concerning the political characteristics of research gave the most vivid evidence that the research utilization decision can easily become a complex, multivariate phenomenon that makes the effort to understand the factors leading to a use decision most difficult. This same perspective was reinforced by the respondents' views of the importance of the consistency of research with prior research, with commonly held assumptions, and with their own intuition.
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter I will first summarize the key findings of this study. As part of this, I will make suggestions where appropriate that might help to guide future research efforts in the area of research utilization. Next, drawing on the insights gathered, I will venture into a more speculative realm, at first rather cautiously by way of describing some modal patterns of research utilization behavior and then, venturing further, offering a general model of research utilization in the public policy process.

The speculative nature of these efforts is to be noted. I have dealt with a limited number of respondents working in a very limited, not particularly visible, public policy area. I do not know how typical the respondents or TJTC are of other research users or policy areas. The generalizability, therefore, of my findings to other areas is problematic.

Nevertheless, the study reported here is part of a relatively new field of inquiry which suffers from the sparseness of its empirical literature. Its theoretical literature is also in its formative stages. The case study of research use in the TJTC policy area can be seen, therefore, as both a hypothesis testing and generating effort and, thus, an attempt to extract some statements that may have more general applicability seems warranted.
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS

The use of research based information in the public policy arena, if this study provides a typical example, is by no means a rare occurrence. Research was used at least sometimes by all but one of the 25 respondents. This use was predicated on the belief that research can and should make a contribution to the public policy process. Only three of those who claimed to be research users in general failed to apply research to the TJTC policy area. This finding is in general agreement with the literature on the perceived importance of research by potential users.

Nevertheless, the typical respondent applied only a small portion of the existing TJTC research to only a small portion of the TJTC issues with which they dealt. However, in those instances where TJTC research was used, it tended to be at least a "somewhat determining" factor in the respondents' decision making/position taking behavior. Further, there was no sense conveyed by the respondents that research ought to be a dominant factor in their organizations' decision making/position taking processes.

We should recall that in this study, respondents were asked about their deliberate search for and application of research. My statements in this instance of the importance of research therefore stem from this very explicit sense of instrumental "use." As part of the agenda for future research more attention will need to be paid to the broader conceptualizations of instrumental use. Specifically, no work has been done which in any way tries to gauge the indirect impact of research on public policy (or policy makers)
that comes about by way of the infusion of research-based ideas/information into common parlance. It seems reasonable to think that a broader concept of instrumental use would, in fact, demonstrate research to be even more important to the public policy process than now appears to be the case.

Although the use of TJTC research for decision making/position taking was the more common occurrence (a finding at odds with the literature), over three-fourths of the respondents reported non-instrumental application of this research, primarily for political or conceptual purposes.

While research was applied to a variety of specific issues pertaining to TJTC, the issue to which it was most commonly applied was the question of the overall value of the TJTC program—an interesting finding because none of the readily available empirical literature approached this issue directly.

The nonresearch factors considered most often by the respondents in their decision making/position taking behavior were politics, constituency views, and the views of the individual or his/her organization.

Several factors appeared to be associated with variations in the research-use variables. For example, the frequency with which research was used appeared to be related to other research-use variables such as the importance of research to TJTC decision making/position taking, the number of issues to which research was applied, the number of studies used, the number of multiple uses of research, and the ability to form judgments about the overall worth of TJTC.
The position occupied within an organization also seemed to affect the type of use made of research. In general, the higher one's position in the organization, the more issues to which research was applied. This in turn may be a reflection of the breadth of one's responsibilities which sees higher-level personnel dealing with more issues and, hence, having a potential need for more research than do those in lower-level positions. The more senior-level respondents also tended to see research as more important to their organization, and to see their organization as making a greater effort to encourage and facilitate research use than did lower-level respondents. The explanation of these relationships may lie in the presumed socialization to organizational culture that some have seen as characterizing senior officials. Supporting this conclusion is the fact that senior-level personnel preferred their research to come from in-house sources. These findings are consistent with the (scant) empirical literature on the subject of the importance of the position of the individual in the organization to research use.

The efforts of an organization to encourage and facilitate research use appeared to influence several aspects of utilization behavior including the impact of the research that was used, the number of nonresearch inputs to decision making/position taking that were considered, the number of issues to which TJTC-related research was applied and, possibly, the frequency of research use as well. These findings are also in general agreement with those of other studies.
Granting an important role for organizations, future studies of research utilization would do well to probe further in this area. Much more specificity is needed than now characterizes the discussions of this important variable. It could very well be that an explication of the concept of "organizational impact" would reveal several related variables of importance to research utilization. For example, the concept of organizational culture and attitude toward research and the assumed socialization to these factors needs further exploration. How do organizations acquire such a culture? Can it be changed? How? Does the type of organization make a difference. For example, are private firms inclined toward a different research use culture than government agencies? Can organizations intent on increasing the level of research by its employees undertake any activities that would change the potential users' attitude toward research? What would these activities be?

A majority of the respondents indicated that they obtained at least some of their research-based information from informal "networks" of personal contacts with other research users. Important characteristics of the networks observed were the role of personal contact and trust between the information-giver and the informationreceiver.

The importance of personal contact and trust was also seen in the views of the respondents concerning contact with researchers and personal involvement in research which roughly half of the respondents felt would have at least an "important" impact on their utilization decision. The scope of the contact with researchers
and involvement in research was seen as limited because such involvement, it was feared, could lead to a corruption of the research enterprise by way of conscious or unconscious "adjustments" between researchers and users. Typically, personal contact/involvement in research would be limited to the extent of insuring that the research is relevant to the needs of the potential user.

The topics of research-based information networks, and involvement in the actual research effort draws our attention to the broader question of the ways in which research information is acquired by users. This is a topic that needs systematic exploration. We need information on how, specifically, research information is obtained by users. For example, are some channels such as journals or newspapers used more frequently than others? Is there a distortion that occurs when one obtains research-based information from a "network" rather than more directly? How wide-spread is the network phenomenon? Does it develop along predictable lines? What factors promote or impede its growth? What determines membership in or exclusion from a network?

Education also showed itself to be important to the research use decision with those having a social science background, apparently more confident in their own ability to use research, feeling much less need for personal contact with researchers and involvement in research than did those without such an education. More generally, those with a social science education used more research, more frequently, applied it to more issues, and found these applications more important than did those without a social science
background. Further, those with an education in the social sciences more often were able to leap from the specifics of individual research studies to overall judgments of the worth of TJTC.

A variety of research characteristics such as relevance, timeliness, and action-orientation were examined for their possible impact on research use. Perhaps as a function of the way in which this information was gathered, research characteristics were invariably seen as at least "important factors" in the research use decision. Among those relatively few research characteristics where there was some noticeable variation in responses, several possible connections to other variables were suggested. For example, those respondents who appeared to frequently use research in a non-instrumental way assigned less importance to the timeliness, action-orientation, practicality, and presentation of research than did those who viewed research predominantly in instrumental terms.

The reliability and validity of research appeared related to the respondent's educational background with those having training in the social sciences claiming greater importance for these variables than did those without such an education. (This latter group appeared to use "surrogates" such as checking with one's "network" to achieve confidence concerning the quality of research.)

There appeared to exist relationships among the research characteristics themselves whereby the importance of one was contingent on the importance of another. For example, presentation, and reliability-validity were important only after a research piece had passed the test of relevance; action-orientation, and
practicality may be important only if the user is determined to use timely research to help solve an immediate problem. (The relationships that exist among the factors influencing research use are another area to which future research should be directed.) Further, factors external to research characteristics can affect the importance assigned to these characteristics. For example, a study, the reliability of which is unknown, may be eagerly sought and acted upon in a crisis setting characterized by a dearth of "hard" information. Similarly, the importance of the "presentation" of the research appears to be at least in part related to the educational background of the user.

Although there was universal agreement on the importance of political considerations to the research utilization decision, the connection between these two factors is complex. The dismissal of a research study simply because it is politically unacceptable was practically unheard of. Rather, the question was what among a range of possibilities should be done when confronted by a politically unpopular research piece. The answer that emerges does so from a complex of factors, undoubtedly weighted differently in importance, such as the strength of commitment to existing policies, the visibility of the study, its impact on significant persons, its quality, and the reputation of its author. Frequently, the discovery of a politically unpopular research study was itself a strong impetus to seek further, confirming or disconfirming, research. These findings are not in agreement with most of the research utilization literature, but do support those of Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980) who also
found that the presence of "contrary" research was a great stimulus to further action and not to the blind dismissal of the offending study.

The findings of this study (and the last few paragraphs provide the most vivid evidence of this) point to the fact that research utilization is a complex phenomenon that, to be properly understood, involves a consideration of organizational, personal, and political factors in addition to a consideration of the characteristics of research itself. Not only do these variable-areas influence the research use decision, but they interact among themselves making univariate attempts to explain research use not only risky, but unrealistic. Further, we must recall that "research use" itself is a complex, multifaceted concept.

The study of research utilization is still in its formative stages. The content of basic operating concepts is still being decided. We are some distance away from being able to specify with confidence the necessary and/or sufficient conditions for research utilization. Nevertheless, it is clear that if this field of study is to progress, advances will need to be made along several fronts some of which have already been noted. In addition, several other areas are in need of attention:

1. The development of indicators of the concepts and generalizations to be tested in the area of research utilization needs more work. Too often, a single indicator is used which may be chosen as much for its convenience as for its relationship to the concept being tested.
2. Methods of study beyond the dominant case study and interview approaches need to be developed. In particular, experimental or quasi-experimental techniques should be used more often. Some examples would be simulations in which the precise influence of specific variables can be traced. Also, organizations that are known to be high research users can be compared and contrasted with organizations known to be low research users for evidence of systematic differences. Or, experiments can be undertaken to deliberately infuse research by way of "knowledge brokers" in one unit of an organization and compare the results to other units not receiving this service.

3. We need to refine our understanding of what is it that accounts for differences in the predispositions of individuals toward research. A single measure such as educational background seems too simplistic.

4. What are the weights assigned by users to the various factors that account for their utilization decision? What accounts for the weights assigned to these factors? Is this process ideosyncratic or subject to systematic variation?

5. How can we develop more precise measures to single out the impact of research on a decision? That is, what are the practical consequences of using (or not using) research based information? Does research, for example, have a tendency to buttress the status quo?
6. Does the type of research (e.g. discipline orientation, methods) make a difference in research utilization? If so, to whom? Why?

7. Does research use vary systematically by the stages of the policy process?

A PROFILE OF RESEARCH USER TYPES

Thus far in this study I have presented discussions of the various aspects of the research utilization behavior of the respondents and have commented on those factors that appeared to be related to this behavior. At this point, it is desirable to try to pull the separate pieces together into a coherent whole. I will do this in two stages. First, I will describe the results of having graphed the responses of those interviewed to determine whether or not certain modal types of research utilization behavior could be observed. Second, and based on the discussion of modal types of behavior, I will offer a general model of research utilization behavior in the public policy arena.

After I completed my review and analysis of the individual responses made to the various questions posed to those interviewed, I constructed and analyzed cross-tabulations of the responses in an attempt to uncover possible bivariate relationships. Following this, and in an effort to move beyond a consideration of bivariate relationships, all of the responses of each of those interviewed were plotted on a line graph. The purpose of this exercise was to focus attention on the individual (rather than any one variable)
and to look for patterns of responses that would suggest that the respondents could be classified into homogeneous groups.

Inspection of the graph revealed three distinct, homogeneous groups of research users. The first group consisted of nine respondents who were similar to each other across eleven variables. That is, out of a maximum of 99 possible points of coincidence on the graph (nine respondents x the 11 variables), the scores among this first group were in agreement with each other 88% of the time. The 12 deviant scores were randomly scattered among the respondents and the variables. Distribution of these respondents' scores on the other nine variables revealed no systematic patterns.

The second group consisted of six respondents who were similar to each other across the entire range of twenty variables. Of the maximum of 120 points of agreement on the graph, this second group found itself sharing the same points 101 times (84%). The deviant scores appeared randomly distributed among each of the respondents and 13 of the 20 variables.

The third group to evidence similar research use behavior was composed of six respondents who were in essential agreement on five variables 93% of the time; their responses were randomly distributed among the remaining 15 variables.

I will now describe each of the three groups of research users. For the sake of clarity and consistency, the research use characteristics of the respondents will be considered as "Dependent Variables;" those factors that appear to have some influence on the research use variables will be listed as "Independent Variables."
(It should be recalled, however, that certain "dependent variables," for example, frequency of research use, also can be seen to be "independent variables" given their apparent effect on other research use characteristics.)

**RESEARCH USER-TYPE I**
(9 Respondents)

**Independent Variables**

--Occupies a higher level position in his/her organization
--Has at least a bachelor's degree in the social sciences
--Is a member of a research information network

**Dependent Variables**

--Uses research often
--Research is considered to be of more than minor importance to the overall decision making process
--Applied research to several TJTC issues
--When used, research is at least "somewhat" important to the decision making process
--Research is used for conceptual purposes
--Research is used for political purposes
--Personal contact with researchers is not very important to the research use decision
--Personal involvement in the research is not important to the research use decision

Each of the four congressional staff members was found in this first group of research users along with three interest group employees, and two Department of Labor officials.
The second group of research users, all from the Department of Labor, are the mirror image (and more) of the first group. They not only score the opposite on each of the 11 variables that distinguished the first group, but they are consistently placed on all of the other variables as well. The complete profile of this group is as follows:

RESEARCH USER-TYPE II
(Six Respondents)

Independent Variables

--Occupies a lower level position in his/her organization

--Does not have an educational background in the social sciences

--Is not a member of a research information network

--Sees research as unimportant to his/her organization

--Sees his/her organization making no effort to encourage/facilitate research use.

Dependent Variables

--Uses research infrequently

--Research is of very minor importance to the overall decision making process

--Applied research to only one TJTC issue

--Used two or less research studies

--When used, research is rather unimportant to the decision making process

--Is not able to form general evaluative judgments based on research
- Research is not used for noninstrumental purposes
- Personal contact with researcher is important to the research use decision
- Personal involvement in the research is important to the research use decision
- The source of research is important to the research use decision (although this group is about evenly split between those preferring in-house research, and those preferring outside contractors)
- The timeliness and presentation of research is important to the research use decision
- The reliability and validity of research is of minor importance to the use decision

A comparison of the Type I and Type II user cannot fail to remind us of the "two cultures" analogy referred to in the first chapter. Clearly, Type I users convey an acculturation to research. They are comfortable with it. They want it and they have worked it into their decision making/position taking routines. Type II users are halting in their efforts to use research. Routines have not been developed. They are awkward, suspicious, and much more limited in their use of research.

A third group of six users was identified--three from the interest groups and three from the Department of Labor. This group was compatible on six variables.

**RESEARCH USER-TYPE III**
(Six Respondents)

**Independent Variables**
(None Shared)
Dependent Variables

--When used, research is important to the decision making process.

--Personal contact with researchers is not important to the research use decision.

--Personal involvement in the research is not important to the research use decision.

--The source of the research is not important to the use decision.

--Timeliness of the research is not important to the use decision.

--Presentation of the research is not important to the use decision.

The Type III user would appear to occupy the middle ground between the extremes of the other two types of users we have seen. Although not frequent users of research, when research is used it plays an important role. Further, and like the Type I user, this group seems to be "comfortable" with research--the "negative" aspects of the Type II user simply do not show up in this group.

One feature not captured by the variables considered here that may help to account for the position of the Type III user is that each of the persons had quite explicit mandates to be aware of relevant research. This "job responsibility" factor may help to pull these individuals away from the Type II model and put them closer to the Type I example of research use. Unfortunately there is a sufficient mixture of social science educational background and/or high ranking position in the organization that the "job responsibility" argument can only be speculative.
A final comment to be offered concerning the typology of users relates to three individuals, all from interest groups, who were not able to be placed in any of the three types just reviewed nor could they be seen as a homogeneous group to themselves. The variable configurations describing these individuals at this point appear ideosyncratic. At most, two of the three respondents occasionally shared the same score on a particular variable. If the full array (or parts thereof) of the responses are the result of systematic influences, the explanatory factors are to be found outside the range of information considered in this study.

MODELING RESEARCH UTILIZATION

The profile of the three types of research users serves as a good transition to a more formal consideration of those factors influencing research utilization. The analytic framework used in this study classified the variables presumed to be important to the research use decision into three categories:

- Personal Characteristics of the User
- Characteristics of the Organization
- Characteristics of the Research

From what has been learned by this study, it would appear that a simple model that predicts the decision to seek research can be depicted as shown in Figure 1.

This model says that the proximate cause of the decision to seek research is a prior judgment that there is a need that can be served by research. Examples of such needs would be the need for
FIGURE 1
MODEL OF THE DECISION TO SEEK RESEARCH
political ammunition, for information, or for assistance in helping to think about an issue. This need decision is influenced by three factors. First, it is impacted by the individual's attitude toward research which, in turn, is primarily a function of the individual's educational background and position held within the organization. Second, the need judgment is influenced by the individual's organization's attitude toward and efforts to encourage and facilitate research use. For example, an individual who otherwise would not be inclined to seek research might do so if his/her organization maintains an accessible in-house research team. Third, the needs decision is influenced by what I am here calling the policy environment which I will describe shortly. The model shows that the agency environment and the policy environment act on both the individual's basic attitude toward research (probably through a slow process of socialization) and more immediately as independent contributions to the needs decision.

A comment on the "policy environment" portion of model is needed. This is a factor that has not had explicit treatment thus far in the study although it has been implicit at times. As used here, "policy environment" is conceived to mean not simply the arena of agencies, interest groups, and individuals that participate in a particular policy area, but also the status of research within this setting. If, for example, the "rules of the game" within a specific policy setting discourage or preclude research based inputs, then the chances of any individual attempting to inject such con-
siderations is probably quite slim. If, on the other hand, the battles within a given policy area are fought with good-sized doses of research-based information, then clearly the chances of any one participant seeking and attempting to use research would be enhanced. Clearly, the concept of the policy environment as it relates to research utilization is yet another area in need of systematic exploration. At this point I would simply speculate that whatever the factors that go to give a policy area its character in terms of the role played by research, one of these factors would undoubtedly be the basic attitudes toward research of the policy participants. In this sense, a more elaborate rendition of the model showed in Figure 1 would show an arrow coming from the individual's attitudes toward research to the policy environment. For now, however, policy environment must remain essentially terra incognita.

Once the decision has been made to seek research, what determines whether or not it will be used? For simplicity, I will focus only on the instrumental use of research. Specifically, by "use" I am referring to the application of research to help make a decision, or establish a position concerning some policy matter. Figure 2 offers a model that predicts the research use decision.

This model is somewhat more complex than the earlier one. It predicts that the research use decision in the first instance is a function of the capacity of the individual to use research. This capacity, in turn, is a function of the individual's education and the position he/she occupies in the organization. This capability can be enhanced, or in the case of a lack of capability, somewhat
FIGURE 2
MODEL OF THE RESEARCH UTILIZATION DECISION
circumvented, either by agency efforts to encourage research use such as by facilitating personal contact with researchers, or personal involvement in research, or by the individual's involvement in a research information sharing network which probably provides a supportive environment that encourages the application of research information.

The research itself will also contribute to or impede application by way of its characteristics such as relevance and timeliness. The exact importance of these factors will be in large part (but not completely) a function of the capability of the potential user.

Even granting capability of the potential user and the absence of any negative research characteristics, research use may still be impeded by a variety of constraints acting on the individual or the agency. These constraints may emanate from the broader policy environment, or from factors within the organization. Examples of constraints that may impede the use of research would be budget or authority limitations, and various political considerations.

CONCLUSION

The models described here should be seen as only a first step in the development of a theory of research utilization in the public policy arena. Many of the variables in the models need to be made more specific and less simplistic and attempts should be made to develop multiple indicators for the primary concepts in the models. For example, much more should be known about the organizational culture concerning research use and the type and impact of the
activities an organization can undertake to enhance research use. Further, the relative potency of the variables in the models needs to be specified—they are only hinted at here. The links said to exist among the variables needs to be confirmed—the relationships may be more complex than is now suggested by the models.

Nevertheless, both models are able to accommodate the three types of research users identified earlier. For example, the Type II user characterized in terms of the model depicted in Figure 2 would be an individual with low capability to understand/use research, working in a lower level of the organization which is seen as not encouraging/facilitating research use. This individual is further troubled by the characteristics of the research such as its presentation and relevance, and is not a member of research network.

The models described here are parsimonious—they direct our attention to a relatively few key variables (or more accurately variable clusters). They are based on existing research and literature. The models are also testable in a variety of ways and settings which will serve as the basis for their refinement. Although not completely developed, the direction of causality is indicated, and the relative importance of at least some variables is suggested. For example, research characteristics is seen as a second-order variable the importance of which is determined to a large extent by the capability of the user. These models, while sifting the reality of research use still capture its complexity.

The research reported here hopefully contributes to the long range goal of the explanation and, ultimately, prediction of the
research utilization phenomenon. The insights and suggested relationships obtained from the study of those working in the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit policy area will need to be refined and tested among other populations, in other policy arenas before we know the limits of their generalizability. Within this context, it must be recalled that research is, ultimately, only a single input to the public policy making process. A complete understanding of the role and importance of research will be had only after this field of inquiry is far enough developed so that we can then begin to explore the relationships between research and the other inputs to the policy process and thereby come to know the relative impact of research on public policy.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 7

1. I am skipping over a step--that of the location of research. A discussion of this point would highlight educational background, agency efforts to facilitate research use, and "networks."
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Note: The interview began with the respondent being told that he/she was being interviewed as part of a study of the role that research played in the area of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program. The meaning of the term "research" as it was to be used throughout the interview was given. The interviewer's past research on the implementation of TJTC was quickly reviewed. Assurances of confidentiality were given. The respondent was then given the opportunity to ask questions prior to the start of the interview. During the interview, particularly when the respondent was asked to answer a question according to a "high/low" scale, follow-up probes were asked, if necessary, to elicit additional information.

1. I would like to begin our interview by asking you to describe your job responsibilities including but not limited to, your responsibilities in the area of TJTC. Please start by giving me your official position title.

2. Do you ever use the results of research as you carry out the responsibilities of your position? Please answer according to the following scale:

   Very often
   Often
   Sometimes
   Not at all

3. What is it that prompts you to seek or not to seek research?

4. In general, would you say that research based information plays an important role in helping your agency/office reach decisions? Please answer according to the following scale:

   Very important
   Important
   Somewhat important
   Very minor importance
5. Is the use of research encouraged by the management of your office/agency? Please answer according to the following scale:

- Strongly encouraged
- Encouraged
- Somewhat encouraged
- Not encouraged

How does your office/agency encourage research use?

6. Does your office/agency do anything to facilitate the flow of research information to you? Please answer according to the following scale:

- Strongly facilitate
- Facilitate
- Somewhat facilitate
- Do not facilitate

How does your office/agency facilitate the use of research?

7. Have you used the results of any research studies to help you establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC?

8. If you have not used the results of any research to help you establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC, why do you think that is?

9. What were the TJTC issues for which you used research findings to help you establish a position or make a decision?

10. In those cases where you did use TJTC-related research, would you say that your position was determined or your decision made:

   a. mostly on the basis of the results of the research?
   b. somewhat on the basis of the results of the research?
   c. to a very small extent on the basis of the results of the research?

11. We have discussed the role and importance of TJTC-related research concerning the specific issues to which you
applied this research. I would now like to get some idea of the relative or overall importance TJTC-related research had for you. Relative to all of the decisions you make or positions you took on TJTC, how important was research? Please answer according to the following scale:

Very important
Important
Somewhat important
Very minor important

12. What is it that prompted you to seek out and use TJTC-related research?

13. Do you recall what TJTC-related research studies you used to help you establish a position or make a decision?

14. What factors other than TJTC-related research did you consider in establishing your position or making a decision concerning TJTC?

15. Aside from using research to help you establish a position or make a decision concerning TJTC, were there any other purposes for which you used TJTC-related research? (Probe here for other types of use.)

16. In general, that is, without consideration of TJTC, do you ever use research in ways other than to help you establish a position or make a decision concerning the issues that you must deal with on your job? (Probe here for other types of use.)

17. Do you feel that personal contact with researchers is important to promoting your use of their research findings? Please answer according to the following scale:

Very important
Important
Somewhat important
Very minor importance
Not at all important

18. How important do you feel it is for the potential user of research to be actively involved in the various aspects of the research enterprise such as problem selection, and study methods selection? Please answer according to the following scale:
Does the source of research information make any difference to you? That is, would you prefer to use research that was conducted by part of an inhouse operation rather than research performed by outside contractors?

I next want to ask you some specific questions about those factors that you may consider when evaluating whether or not you will use a research report in some way in your job. Please indicate how important the factors that I will be mentioning are to your decision to use the research report, using the following scale:

**Very important**
**Somewhat important**
**Important**
**Very minor importance**
**Not at all important**

19. a. Timeliness of the research.
   
b. Relevance of the research.
   
c. Reliability of the research.
   
d. Validity of the research.
   
e. Action-orientation of the research.
   
f. Practicality of the research.
   
g. Presentation of the research.
   
h. Political acceptability of the research.
   
i. Consistency of the research with previous research findings.
   
j. Consistency of the research with commonly held assumptions.
   
k. Consistency of the research with the potential user's established position.
   
l. Consistency of the research with the potential user's intuition or sense of the situation.

21. (Show respondent a list of the factors mentioned in question 20.) We have been talking about the importance of certain characteristics of the research report itself on your decision to use or not to use the report. Which of these 12 characteristics would you say is the most important to your decision to use or not to use a research study?
22. We have been talking about many different kinds of factors that may facilitate or impede the use of research. As my next question I would like you to reflect on those potentially facilitating or impeding factors and tell me what you think most facilitates and impedes your use of research.

23. My last questions are easy ones:

a. How many years have you worked for this organization?
b. What is your educational background?

(The interview closed with an acknowledgement of appreciation for the time and cooperation of the respondent.)
APPENDIX B

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO THE
TARGETED JOBS TAX CREDIT

Although the Reagan administration opposed the extension of TJTC on the grounds that it had failed to accomplish its goals, TJTC was modified significantly and extended under the Economic Recovery Tax Act enacted in August 1981. TJTC was now scheduled to expire December 31, 1982 (rather than December 31, 1981), but the new law allowed employers who hired eligible individuals before that date to claim tax credits for up to two years after that date.

Modifications were made in a number of areas. First, target group eligibility criteria were altered. New target groups were added: AFDC recipients and WIN registrants and involuntarily terminated public service enrollees from Titles IID and VI of CETA. The age limitation for Vietnam-era veterans was removed. And the cooperative education student target group was limited to include only economically disadvantaged students. At the same time, the WIN Tax Credit was terminated, since WIN registrants were included as a TJTC target group. All of these target group changes took effect immediately with the exception of the change in criteria for cooperative education students, AFDC recipients, and WIN registrants, which took effect December 31, 1981.
Second, changes were made in certification requirements. In a major change, the retroactive certification option was eliminated by a requirement that certifications be either received from or requested by the employer prior to the eligible individual’s employment starting date (not the hiring date). For those individuals who began work between September 26, 1978 and 45 days before enactment of the Economic Recovery Tax Act, retroactive certifications were valid only if they were issued or requested by July 23, 1981. For those individuals who began work for an employer within 45 days before or after enactment, retroactive certifications were valid only if issued not more than 45 days after enactment.

Third, changes were made in the TJTC delivery system. Responsibility for issuing vouchers as well as certifications was centralized more clearly in the Employment Service. Thirty million dollars was authorized for administration and monitoring. The validity period of vouchers for economically disadvantaged target groups was extended from 30 to 45 days. Just over $19 million was allocated for administration, an increase from the fiscal year 1981 appropriation of $14 million.

In early 1982, and for reasons that were not quite clear, the Reagan administration reversed its earlier opposition to TJTC and announced it would seek an extension of the tax credit. The Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 extended TJTC for two more years (to December 31, 1984) and created another eligible target group—economically disadvantaged youth aged 16 and 17 employed during the summer months.
Certification requirements were again changed. Under the new law, certifications could be made up to the date of hire.

A change was made in the eligibility of the general assistance target group that allowed recipients of script and vouchers as well as cash assistance to qualify for TJTC.

Involuntarily terminated CETA public service employment enrollees lost their eligibility for TJTC effective December 31, 1982.

The authorization for administrative funding of TJTC was changed from $30 million to "such funds as necessary."
1. Based on interviews conducted with knowledgeable persons in the summer of 1983, it appears that the Reagan administration decided to seek an extension of TJTC because of the concern that to eliminate the credit without some other initiative to replace it would convey a lack of sympathy toward disadvantaged job seekers—a politically unacceptable outcome. Of secondary importance was the realization that the credit was compatible with the Reagan administration philosophy of encouraging private sector solutions to public problems, and was relatively inexpensive. Of tertiary importance was the possibility that with some improvements the credit might actually accomplish some good.
APPENDIX C
TJTC PERFORMANCE DATA

VOUCHERS AND CERTIFICATIONS ISSUED

Table 28 shows the total number of vouchers and certifications issued for TJTC from fiscal year 1979 to fiscal year 1982.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Certifications</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Certifications as a % of Vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979 (6 month)</td>
<td>83,752</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>37,020</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>616,942</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>305,743</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>733,672</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>411,581</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>685,271</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>252,461</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = not applicable

Source: U.S. Department of Labor--Office Planning and Review.

Fiscal year 1979 was the start-up year for TJTC vouchering and certification activity as can be seen by the large increases in fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981. The decrease in the vouchers and certifications during fiscal year 1982 reflected the elimination of retroactive certifications in that year and, at
least as far as certifications are concerned, the fact that the cooperative education students now needed to be economically disadvantaged in order to be eligible for TJTC. A third possibility that might account for a reduction in vouchering relates to the change from the end of the month expiration of the voucher to it being made valid for a 45 day period thereby reducing the need for the issuance of multiple vouchers to an individual. No data are available concerning the impact of the change in the expiration of the voucher.

Concerning the certifications that have been issued, it should not be inferred that these translate into new jobs created. This is true in part because the period covered by the data in Table 28 was one of very little aggregate growth in employment in the United States. Further, the primary purpose of TJTC was not the creation of new jobs (although it was hoped that the credit would induce some employers to establish new positions). Rather, the main objective of the credit was to stimulate employers to shift their hiring practices in favor of the targeted groups. Theoretically, at least, TJTC could be expected to lead to a substitution of one category of employee for another.

Another reason why TJTC certifications should not be seen as synonymous with new jobs created was the impact of retroactive certifications through fiscal year 1981. The best hard-data estimate based on reports from 44 states for the first three quarters of fiscal year 1981 indicated that 63% of all certifications issued (excluding cooperative education students) were retroactive
This fact drove many to see TJTC as a failure—all that was being accomplished was the provision of a windfall savings to employers for a hiring action that would have taken place without TJTC.

In the early months of the tax credit, some proponents of the program defended the retroactive certification provision as providing a "foot-in-the-door" to industry. Briefly, it was argued that if industry could see that independent of a government program, they had been making employment decisions that turned out to be compatible with a national goal of targeting employment to certain groups then the tax credit they were given for this original decision would impel them to aggressively seek these groups out for future hirings. As time passed, it became generally recognized that the hoped for "wedge" effect never amounted to much (The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, July 1980:32-33).

TARGET GROUPS SERVED

TJTC primarily has been a youth employment subsidy program as can be seen from Table 29. The youth category (ages 18-24), and the cooperative education students category account for 74% of all certifications issued in fiscal year 1982, and 86% in fiscal year 1981.

The impact of the change in eligibility requirements for cooperative education students is evident in the decrease in the relative contribution this group made to the total certifications issued in fiscal year 1982 when compared to fiscal year 1981. The 7% showing for the AFDC recipients in fiscal year 1982, their first
year of eligibility for TJTC, undoubtedly reflects the fact that this group had participated in a similar tax credit program (WIN) since 1967 and, in essence, needed no "start-up" period for use of the new credit.

TABLE 29
Percent of TJTC Certifications
By Target Group-FY1981-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>FY1982</th>
<th>FY1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth (18-24)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam-era veterans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-convicts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General assistance recipients</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI recipients</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service employment (PSE)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC recipients</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Less than 1%  ** = Not eligible

Source: U. S. Department of Labor--Office of Planning and Review.

"TAKE-UP" RATE

The "take-up" rate refers to the proportion of the universe of a target group that received a voucher or certification. Take-up rate measures are frequently used as one measure of program effectiveness. Estimates of the take-up rate for economically disadvantaged youth for fiscal year 1981 and 1982 were made in a
1983 study by the General Accounting Office. These estimates are shown in Table 30.

Table 30 points to the probable impact of the elimination of retroactive certification in fiscal year 1982 and, more obviously, to the relatively low take-up of TJTC by economically disadvantaged youth. Roughly 95% of the eligible universe was untouched by the tax credit.

TABLE 30
TJTC Take-up Rate
For the Economically Disadvantaged Youth-FY1981-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY1982</th>
<th>FY1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate for gross hires*</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate for full-year equivalent hires</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Includes individuals hired more than once during the year.


DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table 31 shows the percentage of vouchers and certifications issued for selective periods to blacks, Hispanics, and veterans. As can be seen, the ratio of vouchers to certifications is approximately equal for all groups with veterans having somewhat more variation than blacks or Hispanics. Also evident is the fact that TJTC has been used mainly by whites and that between 1980 and 1981 there was a drop in the proportion of vouchers and certifications issued to blacks and veterans with a slight upward trend in service to Hispanics.
TABLE 31

Percent of Total Vouchers and Certifications Issued for Blacks, Hispanics, and Veterans, Excluding Cooperative Education Students, April 1980 - June 1981.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Certifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages for April and September 1980 are based on Cumulative Vouchers and Certifications Issued by the End of the Months in Question. Percentages for June 1981 are Based on Vouchers and Certifications Issued Only Between October 1, 1980, and June 30, 1981.

Source: The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, November 1981:33.
WAGES AND OCCUPATIONS

Over 70% of all certifications issued for TJTC were for jobs paying less than $4.00 per hour. Table 32 displays the latest available data concerning the occupations into which the TJTC participants were hired. As this table shows, roughly a quarter of all certifications have been in the "clerical and sales" fields although some modest change over time is noticeable particularly in the "professional, technical and managerial" area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Cumulative Through 9/30/80 % of Total Certifications</th>
<th>10/1/80 - 6/30/81 % of Total Certifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical Managerial</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Sales</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Trades</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench-Work</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Ohio State University Mershon Center CETA Study, November 1981:36.
NOTES TO APPENDIX C

1. A caution is offered about the quality of the data upon which this section is based. From its beginning, the TJTC program was plagued by inaccurate, inconsistent and, in many cases, no reporting at all from the states. No significant effort was ever made at the national level to correct this situation—reflecting in part the low priority assigned to TJTC. Further, the reporting effort withered with the passage of time. For example, I have been unable to locate data pertaining to TJTC that goes beyond fiscal year 1982.

2. Prior to fiscal year 1982 cooperative education students were not issued vouchers. Instead, a certification of their status was the only step required for their eligibility to participate in the program. The data shown in Table 28 however, includes an equal number of vouchers and certifications for cooperative education students. This one-to-one relationship compromises the integrity of the last column of this table.
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