



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

4-1996

Lobbying in the Nonprofit Sector: A Study of Practice and Values

Larry A. Buzas
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons

Recommended Citation

Buzas, Larry A., "Lobbying in the Nonprofit Sector: A Study of Practice and Values" (1996). *Dissertations*. 1694.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1694>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



LOBBYING IN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR:
A STUDY OF PRACTICE AND VALUES

by

Larry A. Buzas

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the
Degree of Doctor of Public Administration
School of Public Affairs and Administration

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1996

LOBBYING IN THE NONPROFIT SECTOR: A STUDY OF PRACTICE AND VALUES

Larry A. Buzas, D.P.A.

Western Michigan University, 1996

Executive directors of nonprofit organizations were interviewed to determine their lobbying practices. Direct lobbying and grassroots lobbying, as defined by P.A. 94-455 were studied. Independent variables include: (a) formal organizational support, (b) organizational affiliation, (c) organizational characteristics, and (d) the executive directors' perceptions and demographic characteristics.

Data were collected during semi-standardized interviews. A random sample of 50 executive directors of nonprofit organizations in Michigan was selected. The research shows that executive directors of nonprofit organizations do lobby policy makers at the local, state, and federal levels using the following techniques: (a) face-to-face visits, individually or with coalitions, including providing oral and written testimony at hearings; (b) telephone calls; (c) letters and facsimile transmissions; (d) special events at the capital; and (e) coalition meetings in the community. Respondents reported value conflicts in lobbying related to personal versus organizational positions and the selective use of information. Executives advised that it is critical to establish relationships with policy makers long before they are asked for anything. It is also important to create and maintain credibility by being knowledgeable in the field, providing education, information, and

services in a professional and timely manner, being visible, and keeping commitments.

Ten independent variables did not have a statistically significant association with any lobbying techniques. Among these ten independent variables are: (a) age, gender, educational level, and time in position of the executive director; (b) the organization as a sole provider of service; (c) age of the organization; (d) the field of the service of the organization; (e) board member participation in lobbying; (f) the size of the organization's budget; and (g) the legislative or political action committees of the board.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

UMI Number: 9623742

Copyright 1996 by
Buzas, Larry Allen

All rights reserved.

UMI Microform 9623742
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indeed fortunate to have the support and guidance of many outstanding individuals. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Ralph Clark Chandler who served as committee chair, mentor, role model, advocate and valued friend. Dr. Chandler defines what it means to truly be a gentleman scholar. It is a privilege to know and work with him. I also wish to thank my other committee members, Dr. Kathleen Reding and Dr. Edward J. Pawlak. As committee members they set the bar high and also showed me how to jump over it. I am grateful for the many hours these individuals spent on my behalf, their professional contributions, and their personal support.

I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Alex Nesterenko who spent many hours crunching numbers and was a constant source of encouragement, support, and friendship. Dr. Mark Wilson also provided a great deal of data and encouragement along the way. The board and staff of the Area Agency on Aging of Western Michigan, Inc., provided support for my formal education and taught me a great deal about lobbying. Special thanks to everyone at A.A.A.W.M.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. To my father and mother, Louis and Dolores Buzas, I am grateful for the many sacrifices that they made along the way and their unending love and support. To my children, Patrick and Alaina, with apologies for the time I could not be with them because of this work, and with hope for the time ahead. To my sister, Shelly Raymond, who is a model of faith and grace. And to my brother, Stanley Buzas, who demonstrated how to set goals and never give up.

Larry A. Buzas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Factors Influencing Awareness	4
The Regulatory Environment	7
The 1976 Lobby Law: P.A. 94-455	7
Direct Lobbying	8
Grassroots Lobbying	8
OMB Circular A-122: Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations: Restrictions on Nonprofits That Lobby and Receive Federal Funds	9
The Hatch Acts	10
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	15
Interest Groups and Pluralism	15
James Madison and the Federalist Papers	16
Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America	19
Contemporary Pluralist Writings	21
Government and the Nonprofit Sector Interdependency	24
Purchase of Service Contracting	26

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Nonprofit Lobbying Theory	28
III. STATE OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR	31
A National Perspective	31
Nonprofit Organizations in Michigan	33
IV. RESEARCH DESIGN	37
Dependent Variables	37
Independent Variables	37
Formal Organizational Support Variables	39
Organizational Affiliation Variables	41
Participation in Local Coalitions That Lobby	41
Organizational Affiliation With a State or National Association	41
Other Organizational Variables	42
The Amount and Percent of Income Received From Governmental Sources	42
The Nonprofit Organization's Status as the Sole Provider of a Specific Service	43
The Field of Service of the Nonprofit Organization	44
Age of the Organization	44
The Percent of the Total Agency Budget Spent on Lobbying	45
Executive Director's Perceptions and Demographic Characteristics	45

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

The Executive Director's Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Lobbying in Comparison to Other Responsibilities as the Leader of a Nonprofit Organization	45
Age of the Executive Director	46
Gender of the Executive Director	46
Years of Experience of the Executive Director	47
Educational Level of the Executive Director	47
Executive Director's Awareness of the Lobbying Law	48
Value Conflicts Experienced by Executive Directors While Lobbying	49
Major Research Questions	50
Specific Research Questions	50
Funding Questions	51
Demographic Questions	51
Professional Status Questions	52
Organizational Questions	52
V. METHOD	54
Data Collection	54
Sample	55
Research Interviews	56
Setting	57

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Data Analysis	57
VI. RESEARCH FINDINGS	59
Profile of Respondents	59
Executives' Characteristics	59
Profile of Respondents' Organizations	61
Organizational Characteristics	61
Funding Levels and Sources	62
Lobbying Practices	81
Introduction	81
Executives' Visits to Policy Makers Alone	82
Executives' Visits to Policy Makers With Others	86
Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers Without the Executive	91
Participation in Community Group Meetings With Policy Makers	94
Executives Writing Letters to Policy Makers	98
Executives Asking Others to Write Letters to Policy Makers	103
Executives Telephoning Policy Makers	107
Executives Asking Others to Telephone Policy Makers	112
Executives' Use of Newspapers to Lobby and Asking Others to Use Newspapers to Lobby	115

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

Executives' Use of Radio and Television to Lobby and Asking Others to Use Radio and Television to Lobby	115
Executives Sponsoring Special Events at the Capitol and Asking Others to Sponsor Special Events at the Capitol	115
Executives Reporting No Lobbying	116
Value Conflicts in Lobbying	118
Background	118
Supporting the Official Position of the Organization That Is Different From the Executive's Personal Beliefs	120
The Risk of Alienating Supporters of the Organization by Taking a Position for, or Against, a Policy of the Government	123
Not Revealing All You Know About a Particular Issue in the Course of Advocating for a Decision Favorable to Your Organization	128
Overestimating the Need for Your Services and/or Programs in the Course of Advocating for Decision Favorable to Your Organization	132
Jeopardizing the Nonprofit Status of the Organization	137
Bivariate Analysis	140
Major Research Questions	140
Specific Research Questions	141
Executive Directors Recommendations About Lobbying	153

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	161
Lobby Techniques in Use	161
Summary of Action Principles	168
The Necessity of Lobbying	171
Areas for Further Research	173

APPENDICES

A. Letter to Respondents	176
B. Respondent Interview Handout	178
C. Interview Guide	184
D. Permission to Quote From Mark Wilscam	209
E. Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval	211
BIBLIOGRAPHY	213

LIST OF TABLES

1. Nonprofit Employment Activity, U.S. and Michigan, 1987	34
2. Characteristics of Executives	60
3. Distribution of Executives Among Fields of Service in the Nonprofit Sector	63
4. Total Amount of Funds for Executives' Agencies	64
5. Amount of Local Funding for Executives' Agencies	66
6. Amount of State Funding for Executives' Agencies	68
7. Amount of Federal Funding for Executives' Agencies	70
8. Amount of Other Funding for Executives' Agencies	72
9. Age of the Organizations Participating in the Study	75
10. Characteristics of the Organizations	77
11. Comparison of Board and Executives Ratings of Lobbying, $N = 50$	81
12. Executives' Use of Selected Lobbying Techniques, $N=50$	83
13. Visits by Executives Alone to Policy Makers in the Past 12 Months, $N=32$. . .	84
14. Visits by Executives With Others to Policy Makers in the Past 12 Months, $N=27$	87
15. Executives Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers Without the Executive, $N = 24$	92
16. Executives' Participation in Community Group Meetings With Policy Makers, $N=29$	95
17. Executives Writing Letters to Policy Makers, $N = 30$	99

List of Tables—Continued

18. Executives Asking Others to Write Letters to Policy Makers, $N = 23$	103
19. Executives Telephoning Policy Makers, $N = 30$	108
20. Executives Asking Others to Telephone Policy Makers, $N = 22$	112
21. Awareness of the Lobby Law, $N = 50$	117
22. Value Conflicts in Lobbying	120
23. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Sending Letters to Policy Makers	143
24. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Asking Others to Send Letters	144
25. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Visits to Policy Makers With Others	144
26. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and the Value Conflicts With State Policies	145
27. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Value Conflicts With Local Policies	146
28. Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Value Conflicts With Local Policies	147
29. Executives Participation in Local Coalitions and Writing Letters to Policy Makers	148
30. Membership in State Associations and Executives' Asking Others to Write Letters to Policy Makers	149
31. Membership in National Associations and Executives' Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers	150
32. Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives' Visits to Policy Makers Alone	151

List of Tables—Continued

33. Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives' Visits to Policy Makers With Others	151
34. Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives' Telephoning Policy Makers	152
35. Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives' Writing Letters to Policy Makers	152
36. Summary of Lobbying Practices	162
37. Summary of Lobbying Targeted to Various Levels of Policy Makers	164

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is some agreement regarding the extent to which executive directors of nonprofit organizations should engage in political activities, lobbying among them. Pawlak and Flynn (1990) surveyed fifty-seven directors of nonprofit organizations and found diversity of opinion about the type and scope of appropriate political activity. They discovered that executive directors of nonprofit organizations participate in a variety of political activities and have a variety of reasons for doing so. However, they emphasize the importance of being aware of the legal constraints as well as the politics pertinent to their positions and their respective organizations. Their research also emphasizes the difficulty of interpreting federal and state regulations governing political activity, including lobbying, by employees of nonprofit organizations and organizations receiving state and federal tax dollars.

The topic of this research is the lobbying activity of executive directors of charitable nonprofit organizations. The Internal Revenue Code defines charitable nonprofit organizations in section 501(c)(3):

Corporations, and any community chest, fund or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary or educational purpose, or to foster national or international competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or the prevention of cruelty to animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual. No

substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in the opposition to) any candidate for public office.

There are other designations of nonprofit status in the Internal Revenue Service Code that have not specifically prohibited lobbying to the extent that section 501(c)(3) does; however, organizations without 501(c)(3) status are not considered charitable organizations. Many of these other nonprofit organizations are advocacy groups that engage in lobbying, but they are typically not service providers. The definition does not specifically mention health care which accounts for half of the expenditures and the employees of the entire nonprofit sector (O'Neill 1989).

Lobbying activities tend to expand when resources are limited as service providers are compelled to petition governmental agencies to maintain funding levels for services. (Wolman & Teitlebaum, 1985). The status of service provider demands an advocacy position, particularly in times of scarce resources (Hansman, 1980, Roberts-Degennaro, 1986). Efforts to obtain support for the specific population served by each nonprofit organization intensify as nonprofits build community awareness of their mission.

Many nonprofit organizations are recipients of federal and/or state tax dollars. Salamon and Abramson (1982) found that in 1980 private philanthropic giving in the nonprofit sector totaled more than \$47.7 billion. Of this, \$22 billion went to churches, synagogues, and mosques, and other religious congregations, mostly for sacramental religious purposes, which left \$25.5 billion for other types of nonprofit organizations. During the same year these other types of nonprofit organizations had expenditures of

approximately \$116 billion. Of this sum the federal government contributed \$40 billion, or thirty-four percent of the expenditures of these types of organizations.

The federal government's share of domestic spending in the last decade has been greatly reduced for health and human services programs, the arts, research, and other activities of the nonprofit community (Dolbare 1986, O'Neill 1989). In addition, there is a clear trend in shifting responsibility for funding of health and human service programs from the federal level to state and local government (Jacobettii 1988, O'Neill 1989).

During this same period there has been an increase in social problems addressed by the nonprofit community including: homelessness, chemical dependency, children born into poverty, and illiteracy, and the demand for services has continued to rise (United Way of America, 1992). Correspondingly, the need for advocates of nonprofit health and human services programs has increased substantially, especially in the public policy development process (Jones, 1984), an activity that until recently was, in part, restricted by the definition of a charitable nonprofit organization in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Thus, the role of nonprofit service provider organizations, funded by a mix of government resources and philanthropy, has become more vital to the public policy debate, particularly in regard to policies affecting the delivery of health and human services. Given the contractual relationship in purchase of service contracting between government and nonprofits, the threats to funding for nonprofit organizations, and the increase in the demand for services, several questions about 501 (c) (3) organizations emerge.

The overall research questions can be stated as follows: Do executive directors

of local charitable nonprofit organizations lobby? If they do engage in lobbying, what types of approaches are used? What value issues might they encounter? If they do not engage in lobbying, what are the factors that influence their decision? The research is not extended to questions of the effects of lobbying or outcomes related to the behavior in question. Examining the impact of lobbying efforts of executive directors of nonprofit organizations is beyond the scope of this study.

In this chapter, discussion of nonprofit lobbying begins by examining factors that may influence awareness by executive directors of recent changes in the lobbying law. The federal regulations concerning lobbying by local charitable nonprofit organizations are also presented. To enhance the readers understanding of the role of nonprofits in America, a brief discussion of the roots of nonprofit organizations as interest groups is provided. The need for nonprofits to lobby policy makers demonstrated by examining the current relationship between government and the nonprofit sector, particularly purchase of service contracts. The overall nature and scope of the nonprofit sector are described as well to indicate the importance of nonprofits both as interest groups and service providers.

Factors Influencing Awareness

In August of 1990, fourteen years after the enactment of P.A. 94-455, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) issued final regulations under the 1976 lobby law. Section 1307 identified lobbying as an appropriate and acceptable activity of nonprofit organizations. The intervening fourteen years, particularly the latter four, were peppered with debate

regarding the provisions of the final regulations. When the final regulations were announced in *The Nonprofit Times* (October 1990) they were reported not as the cover story, as one might expect, but rather in a short article approximately one page in length beginning on page three with its remaining parts distributed in the 47 page publication.

The extent to which the formative debate about and the substance of the 1990 regulations have been a part of the operating consciousness of nonprofits at the local community level is not known, however there are several reasons for suspecting that nonprofit executive directors are unaware of recent changes in the regulation of lobbying activity by the IRS and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) policies.

The identity of nonprofits is typically linked with the particular professional service that they provide. For example, they view themselves as substance abuse treatment agencies, adoption agencies, and foster care agencies. Moreover, nonprofit organizations attend to the specialized literature of the field in which they provide services, they are members of field specific organizations, and they are likely to attend conferences and seminars that specifically relate to their area of service delivery. For example, the philosophy and contributions of Murray Bowen, a noted family therapist, are much more likely to be known and appreciated in a nonprofit organization that provides family counseling services than are the philosophies and contributions of Brian O'Connell, President of The Independent Sector. Thus, executives may not be involved in the network of regulatory administration and may be unaware of changes in the regulatory environment.

Some executive directors of nonprofit organizations are more attentive to internal organizational operations and the immediate and daily pressures of delivering direct

services than they are to lobbying and the political process. Nonprofit organizations at the local service delivery level, particularly those involved with meeting basic human needs such as food, shelter, and medical care, are under heavy pressure to meet the current needs of clients and have little time or energy for system-level problem solving.

Identity as a nonprofit is important in these matters: fundraising, capital expenditures, and property taxes. When nonprofit organizations solicit funds the issue of tax deductible contributions is important. However, even in these situations the primary emphasis is on the emotional appeal of supporting a worthy cause such as the prevention of child abuse or the support of cancer patients and their families. Nonprofit organizations are exemption from payment of sales taxes on purchases and from the payment of property taxes.

Given these conditions, several questions arise. Is it possible that executive directors of nonprofit organizations are not aware of the regulations regarding their lobbying? If so, what factors influence their level of awareness, and what is the relationship between knowledge of the legal issues and the actual lobbying practices of these individuals? Has been a paradigm shift among the members of the nonprofit community away from the perception of lobbying as substantially prohibited activity toward lobbying as an activity that is encouraged under the current regulations. Finally, does lobbying by executive directors of nonprofit organizations lead to conflicts between an individual's personal values and actions that are perceived to be in the best interest of the organization? These are some of the questions that this research seeks to address.

The Regulatory Environment

The 1976 Lobby Law: P.A. 94-455

The regulations governing lobbying by nonprofit organizations, are documented in Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code, OMB Circular A-122, and the Hatch Acts. The most relevant to the purposes of this research is Section 501 (c)(3) which has been in existence since 1934, and its important revisions in the Tax Reform Act of 1976, often referred to as "the lobby law". This Act clarified and expanded the allowable lobbying activity for nonprofit organizations.

Lobbying is clearly defined as a legal activity under P.A. 94-455, however specific spending limits on lobbying are provided for in the Act. The lobby law allows nonprofits to spend up to twenty percent of the organization's first \$500,000 of annual exempt purposes expenditures on lobbying, fifteen percent of the next \$500,000, ten percent of the next \$500,000 and five percent of the remaining exempt purchases up to a total of one million dollars. In no case may the total lobbying expenditures exceed \$1,000,000. For example, a nonprofit organization with exempt purchases of \$250,000 is allowed \$50,000 in lobbying expenses, however an organization with exempt purchases of \$5,000,000 is allowed \$1,000,000 in lobbying expenses. Exempt purchases are generally all those expenditures the nonprofit organization pays in the course of carrying out its mission with the exception of certain fundraising costs paid to a separate fundraising unit, capital expenses, and any unrelated business income. Where there is no expenditure of money by a nonprofit organization for lobbying purposes, there is in effect, no lobbying under

the 1976 law. Thus, the effort of volunteers to influence legislation where they are not reimbursed for their efforts is not considered lobbying.

Direct Lobbying

The 1976 law defines lobbying activity and divides it into two general categories. The first category is direct lobbying. Direct lobbying is described as any attempt to exert influence on legislation through communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or with any government official who may participate in the formulation of the legislation. Types of direct lobbying include contacting a policy maker on behalf of specific legislation and in so doing taking a position on the merits of the proposed legislation. Direct lobbying also applies to communications an organization may have with its own members in an attempt to influence legislation. A nonprofit organization may spend 100 percent of the allowable amount on direct lobbying.

Grassroots Lobbying

The second category of lobbying is called grassroots lobbying. Grassroots lobbying is defined as any attempt to influence legislation through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof. Grassroots lobbying primarily occurs when organizations reach out beyond their members to the general public and encourage them to take action on specific issues, particularly by contacting their legislators. There are three essential elements to grassroots lobbying under the law: (1) communication to the general public, (2) reference to specific legislation and a view of its merits, and (3)

encouragement of the general public to contact legislators. A nonprofit organization may spend only 25 percent of the allowable amount on grassroots lobbying.

OMB Circular A-122: Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations: Restrictions on Nonprofits That Lobby and Receive Federal Funds

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-122, Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations, requires nonprofits to make sure that their funds from federal sources are not used for lobbying, as defined by OMB. Nonprofits covered by these regulations include those that receive direct grants or sub-grants and operate primarily for charitable, service, education, scientific or similar purposes that are in the public interest, and are not organized primarily for profit; the net proceeds of which are used to maintain and provide or expand their operations. Colleges and universities are not covered by these regulations, neither are hospitals that are covered under a separate U.S. Department of Health and Human Services document.

Only lobbying at the state and federal levels are covered under Circular A-122; local lobbying is not effected by these regulations. Direct and grassroots lobbying are defined by OMB in much the same manner as they are in P.A. 94-455 (the "Lobby Law"). OMB defines direct lobbying as any attempt to influence the introduction of federal or state legislation or the enactment or modification of any pending federal or state legislation through communication with any member or employee of Congress or state legislature (including efforts to influence state or local officials to engage in similar lobbying activity), or with any government official in connection with a decision to sign or veto

enrolled legislation. Grassroots lobbying is defined as any attempt to influence the introduction of federal or state legislation, or the enactment or modification of any pending federal or state legislation by preparing, distributing, or using publicity or propaganda or by urging members of the general public or any segment thereof to contribute or participate in any mass demonstration, march, rally, fundraising, lobbying campaign, or letter or telephone campaign.

OMB regulations do not include in the definition of lobbying such activities as providing technical and factual presentations directly related to the performance of a grant through hearing testimony, letters to Congress or a state legislature or cognizant staff members. Also excluded from the definition of lobbying provided by OMB are attempts to influence state legislation in order to reduce costs or avoid material impairment of the grantee's ability to perform contracted services. As long as none of the lobbying is funded by federal money OMB places no restrictions on the amount of lobbying that occurs. Nonprofits are, of course, required to maintain adequate records of the expenditures related to all activities including lobbying.

The Hatch Acts

On October 6, 1993, President Clinton signed into law PL. 103-94, The Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993. The law does a number of things that, for the most part, loosen the restrictions on the political activities of federal employees (Ponessa, 1993). Congress had been trying for nearly two decades to amend and simplify the Hatch Act that governs the political activity of approximately two million federal employees.

The Hatch Acts (1939, 1940, 1993) were enacted by Congress to protect government employees from partisan political pressures relating to their jobs. Further the Acts sought to limit political contributions and subsequent spending. The 1940 Act revisions applied similar limitations to employees of state and local governments who were participating on projects supported by federal funds. The 1993 amendments tighten on-the-job restrictions on political activity for federal employees, however, the constraints on off-duty behavior have been relaxed.

In the most recent revisions, federal employees are encouraged to participate fully and freely in the political process without fear of reprisal. Federal employees should also not have to fear reprisal for not participating in political activities. The law defines federal employees generally, as any individual other than the president or vice president, or General Accounting Office workers, employed or holding office in an executive agency, or in a competitive civil service position that is not in an executive agency. Postal workers are included as federal employees under the law. The constraints of the Hatch Act may apply to some employees of nonprofit organizations where there are positions that are solely funded by federal dollars.

One of the possible ways which the changes in the Hatch Act may positively support the lobbying of nonprofit organizations has to do with the off-duty political activity of federal employees, an area that is less restricted by the 1993 amendments. There are approximately 3 million federal employees. It is possible that some of these individuals are board members of nonprofit organizations. Federal employees may be desirable board members for nonprofit organizations because they have the ability to influence the

bureaucracy, personal relationships with policy makers important to the nonprofit organization, and access to information. The revisions enable federal employees as board members to engage in lobbying on behalf of the nonprofit.

Off-duty federal employees are now allowed to manage a political campaign or take an active role in political parties. Other allowable off-duty activities mentioned in the legislation include: (a) seeking and holding positions in local and national political parties; (b) stuffing envelopes, organizing and participating in phone banks and voter registration drives; (c) carrying posters at a political rally, distributing campaign materials, and soliciting votes off the job; (d) organizing and participating in political meetings; (e) endorsing candidates publicly; and (f) soliciting contributions for a political action committee of a federal employees' organization from other members of that organization who do not work under the person soliciting the funds.

The 1993 revisions retain some limits for both off-duty and on-duty political behaviors of federal employees. These include: (a) running for partisan political office, (b) interfering with or affecting the result of an election by the use of their official authority, and (c) interacting with persons who have business pending before the employees office in an encouraging or discouraging manner. Examples of this type of business include: grant applications, requests for rulings, licenses, certificates and permits. This last provision could be interpreted to assist in removing one type of potential barrier to successful nonprofit lobbying, that being inappropriate encouragement or discouragement of the lobbying activity on the part of a key federal employee. The IRS Section 501(c)(3) regulates organizational lobbying of nonprofits by the amount of dollars spent and the

message communicated. Whereas the Hatch Act regulates the behavior of individuals who are directly employed by the federal government.

In order to take advantage of the provisions of the lobby law, the governing body of a nonprofit organization must vote, "elect" in IRS terms, to be subject to the law and file IRS form 5768. If nonprofits choose not to be subject to the provisions of the lobby law they are subject to the vagaries of what is known as the "insubstantial rule". The insubstantial rule refers to the original language of section 501(c)(3) which states:

No substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, intervene in (including the publishing or distribution of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in the opposition to) any candidate for public office.

Smucker (1990) reports the following history of legal challenges and court decisions that have addressed the definition of insubstantial with mixed results. In 1955 the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals effectively ruled that attempts by nonprofits to influence legislation that constitute five percent or less of the total activities of the organization are not substantial. The five percent benchmark was challenged by a Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in 1972. In that case the court used a "facts and circumstances" test. Further, the court stated that a percentage guideline was inappropriate for determining when lobbying activities were substantial for an individual nonprofit organization. The court generally called for case by case decisions based on the stature and prestige of the organization as a measure of the potential to influence legislation.

A local, single unit nonprofit organization with few resources could attempt to influence legislation and be "out lobbied" by a well funded and politically connected

national office of a major nonprofit network such as the American Red Cross, even if both organizations were operating under the "five percent rule". The benefits and logic of electing to be subject to the 1976 lobby law seem indisputable, given the risk of the loss of nonprofit status as a penalty for violating an insubstantial rule that remains very much open to interpretation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Interest Groups and Pluralism

The concept of pluralism is pervasive in scholarly and casual discussions of politics and democracy in the United States. For the purposes of this research, however, the concept of pluralism is not only a general underlying foundation of the area of this study, it is a key concept in the developing theory of nonprofit lobbying. The basic constructs of the theory are: (a) that nonprofit organizations are legitimate interest groups, (b) interest group lobbying provides an important balance to majority rule in pluralist democracies, and (c) lobbying is an appropriate activity for nonprofit organizations. In this section the roots of nonprofit organizations as interest groups in a pluralist society are discussed.

Pluralism's roots can be traced to Aristotle, in The Politics, where various forms of government and constitutions are discussed in light of the principles of justice and "the good". At the heart of Aristotle's theory is the concept that to obtain justice and political stability a society must allow for representation of all the major groups within it. Further, the strength of this representation must be such that each group believes that its interests are protected against the possibility of abuse by others. It is in Madisonian pluralist theory that the nonprofit sector in the United States discovers its roots, as well as its

constitutional claim on the legitimacy of engagement in the practice of lobbying, and it is Tocqueville who describes the uniqueness and pervasive nature of voluntary associations in the American landscape.

James Madison and the Federalist Papers

Nonprofit organizations are just one of the thousands of interest groups in the United States. Discussion of the existence of interest groups and their relationship to the legislative process in the United States dates back to the writings of the founding fathers. James Madison articulated concern about the influence of interest groups in the Federalist 10. The Federalist papers were, in essence, a massive propaganda effort launched by Alexander Hamilton with the assistance of James Madison and John Jay. Hamilton and Madison carried the burden of writing The Federalist.

Publishing under the pen name of "Publius", the three authors produced a series of eighty five papers discussing various critical issues of the function and form of government. There are five principal themes in the Federalist Papers: (1) federalism, (2) checks and balances, (3) separated powers, (4) pluralism, and (5) representation. It is the discussion of pluralism that is most relevant to the focus of this research.

In Federalist 10, Madison developed the relationship between factions, or interest groups, and the republican form of government. The ability of a well constructed republican union to moderate the influence of factions is argued by Madison to be one of the strongest advantages of this form of government. Madison defined faction as "....a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united

and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community." (Madison, in Wills ed. pg. 43)

While this definition appears to view factions as a negative force in society, indeed Madison refers to the "mischief" that they create, factions are considered to be fundamental to a free society. Madison talks of two societal responses to reduce the influence of factions, removing the cause of the faction, and controlling its effects. In addressing the causes of factions, a government has the choice of destroying liberty, an essential element to the existence of factions, or eliminating factions by making their views the view of every citizen. However, abolishing liberty as a means of eliminating factions would be a grave mistake, as liberty is essential to democratic political life.

Further, Madison asserts that factions have and will persist forever, for as long as there is more than one circumstance of person there will be more than one opinion. As long as individuals are influenced in their reasoning by their personal needs and benefits, there will be factions. The relationship between property and faction is not insignificant in Madison's view. Economic interests or differences in property or wealth and the potential to accumulate the same as a function of various laws and regulations of government are inevitable effects of democracy. Furthermore, it is one of the primary functions of government to insure the protection of individual rights of property. Therefore, it may be that factions are inevitable in a democratic society as a direct result of the underlying purpose of that form of government.

Also discussed in Federalist 10 is the futility of expecting that elected officials and

other statesmen will be able to control the competing interest of factions to the extent necessary to minimize the damage done to the public good. This is a fundamentally false expectation because these individuals are not without economic interests of their own. In an almost prophetic way Madison cites the influence of indirect and remote considerations which may exert more influence on factions than domestic forces. A contemporary illustration of this point may well be the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries' (OPEC) influence on the domestic economy since the oil crises of the late seventies.

Madison concludes that the causes of factions cannot ever be removed and government must therefore turn its attention to the means of controlling the effects of factions. The most difficult situation in which to protect the public good is when the opinions of a faction that are contrary to the public good are held by the majority. The potential to do damage to society is great in this instance. Madison argues that the role of government is to override the view of the majority in the event of the alignment of the majority with a self-injurious viewpoint. Furthermore it is a republican form of government that alone has the unique capacity to carry out such a role. Republican governments have the capacity to express the best interests of the people in those cases where the passionate viewpoints so often attributed to factions, or interest groups, may become the opinion of the majority and thus become more popular than a more objective and reasoned viewpoint that holds as its priority the protection of the public good. In other words, republican governments are of value because of the capacity to counter act the propensity of human beings to place immediate personal gratification ahead of long term benefit and the public good.

Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America

Baron Alexis de Tocqueville was a French nobleman who, along with his companion Gustave de Beaumont, came to America in May of 1831. They departed for France just nine months later having toured the new land extensively. Tocqueville's impressions and analysis of the politics and passions of the Americans were set down in his Democracy In America (1835). No small part of Tocqueville's work was concerned with what can easily be identified as interest groups, which are arguably the forerunners of contemporary nonprofit organizations. Tocqueville discussed in some detail the ease with which Americans formed associations, and the multiple purposes for which they were formed. He claimed that "...in no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used, or applied to a greater multitude of objects than in America." (pg. 95).

Tocqueville defined associations as the public acknowledgment of certain doctrines or principles given by a group of individuals who also engage to promote the widespread proclamation of these same philosophies. In writing specifically about political associations he described three means of operationalizing such associations. They are, in increasing order of influence: (1) through publication in readily accessible print, (2) through the power of meetings, and (3) through associations in electoral bodies with political ends. In the first case, the association is between individuals who are of the same opinion. Thus, the tie among them is primarily intellectual or philosophical in nature. In the second case, centers of activity are established and the opinions are strengthened and

maintained through the development of personal relationships with a vigor that cannot be approached in printed material. In the third case, a political party or coalition is in essence formed.

In writing on the use of public associations in civil life, Tocqueville observed that Americans of all ages, conditions, and dispositions are constantly forming associations. He noted the American proclivity to make associations not only for commercial and manufacturing concerns, but also to give entertainment, found seminaries, churches, libraries, hospitals, prisons, and schools. These associations may be of a religious or moral nature, serious or futile, general or restrictive, enormous or diminutive. In short there was no end to the variety of purposes and forms of associations that Tocqueville identified in early America. The single common characteristic of all of them, however, was their voluntary nature. Tocqueville admired the skill with which the early Americans could rally a great many people to achieve a common purpose. This was their identifying characteristic and the heritage of the infant country. Tocqueville remarked:

I have often seen Americans make great and real sacrifices to the public welfare; and I have remarked a hundred instances in which they hardly ever failed to lend faithful support to each other. The free institutions which the inhabitants of the United States possess, and the political rights of which they make so much use, remind every citizen and in a thousand ways, that he lives in a society. ... Men attend to the interests of the public, first by necessity, afterwards by choice: what was intentional becomes an instinct; and by dint of working for the good of one's fellow citizens, that habit and taste for serving them is at length acquired (p. 197).

Tocqueville also remarked on the mutually supportive role of democratic governments and free associations. Here, in Tocqueville's writing, is the beginning of an understanding not only of the associations that were the forerunners of contemporary nonprofit

organizations, but also of the role of lobbying, or influencing the legislative process for nonprofits.

Contemporary Pluralist Writings

Chandler and Plano (1986, pg. 85) define pluralism as "a model of political decision making in which multiple and competing elites determine public policy through a process of bargaining and compromise". Their definition further describes three elements of government in the United States that encourage a pluralist reality: (1) separation of power among the legislative branch, the executive office and the judiciary; (2) federalism, the separation of national, state, and local government bodies; and (3) strong and active participation of individual citizens in voluntary associations. Bealy (1983) describes two types of pluralism. One type is the pluralism of the political scientist that is concerned with the situation in which associated groups and political parties have sufficient freedom to lobby, or "bargain and appeal for support". Social pluralism, on the other hand, has a broader connotation, referring to the diverse interests in a society. Social pluralism becomes political pluralism when groups have the capacity to engage in political action.

Baskin (1971) also lists three concepts central to pluralistic political structures: (1) social diversity and balance, (2) separation of powers, and (3) subsystem autonomy. One of the underlying concepts of pluralism is the belief that the most appropriate policy decisions are a product of free and open debates among competing interest groups, providing that a balance of power can be maintained. There are several other assumptions of classical pluralist theory, one of which is that of equal capacity and interest in engaging

in politics by every member of the society.

This idealized state assumes that all members of a society would have the necessary prerequisite skill, interest, and time to participate in the policy making process. This could never be the case. However, it may be argued that voluntary associations, or non-profit organizations, play a mediating role for those individuals who lack either the time, talent, or other resources to participate in policy making. Examples of this are found in the many nonprofit organizations that take an advocacy role for special populations, such as the Association for Retarded Citizens, which advocates for persons with developmental disabilities; the American Cancer Society, which works to, among other things, bring resources to bear to assist persons suffering from cancer; and Camp Fire for Boys and Girls, one of many organizations whose members represent the concerns of children.

Olsen (1982) raises interesting questions in his writings on participatory pluralism in which he describes two types of power equalization. The first has to do with equal opportunities and the second has to do with equal outcomes. Olsen seeks a reconciliation between the two with the concept of acceptable ranges of outcomes. Olsen further integrates a theory of participatory democracy with a theory of social political pluralism. He defines participatory democracy as that system in which the fullest participation by all individuals in public decision making is supported, and this leads to full citizen control of the entire political process. Sociopolitical pluralism, on the other hand, is based on the belief that only through collective action through voluntary interest associations can individual citizens have significant influence on the political process and policy decisions.

Another assumption of pluralist theory is the existence of overlapping interests

among various groups in society so that there exists forces encouraging the establishment of coalitions with mutual benefits resulting from policy outcomes. While this may hold true in some cases, the coalitions that form may do so with respect to economic stratification and thus support the legitimacy of the theory of a handful of power elites controlling the policy process (Mills, 1956; Neustadt, Scott, & Clausen, 1991).

Bealy (1988) recognizes three levels of organization of interest groups: local, regional, and national. He further identifies "promotional groups" that exist to publicize a cause for the purpose of either initiating executive action or stopping it. Etzioni (1985) makes a similar distinction between special interest groups and constituency representation groups claiming that the benefits attributed to the former can be shown to come primarily from the latter, in terms of a pluralist policy structure. He also argues that special interest groups cannot be eliminated and are not likely to contain each other, in the absence of sufficiently strong pro-community forces.

Thus, the need for a variety of influential interest groups that represent the needs of disenfranchised segments of the population, including those who lack economic power, becomes more evident. Here is where the nonprofit sector plays an important role by giving access to the policy making process to those who would otherwise not be able to participate. This role is not equally shared among all nonprofit organizations but is particularly evident in the case of those nonprofits that provide health and human services. Commercial nonprofit organizations, on the other hand, such as the Home Builders Association, play a significantly different role.

Health and human service nonprofit organizations provide an important advocacy

service for populations not able to perform as successful self-advocates, such as persons with developmental disabilities (Association for Retarded Citizens), older adults (American Association for Retired Persons), children (The Children's Defense Fund) and those with debilitating diseases (the Alzheimer's Association, American Cancer Society, The National Kidney Foundation). The nonprofit sector functions to promote the values and serve the needs of individuals and groups that are not adequately served by either the government or the private sector. Thus, the nonprofit sector may be legitimately seen "as a powerful force for pluralism, providing the kind of safety net that compassionately responds to societies otherwise neglected needs (Van Til, 1990, p. 8).

Some effective tools of interest groups in influencing policy have been shown to be lobbying and the effective use of the media (Horowitz, 1979, Smucker, 1991). As nonprofit organizations engage in lobbying for public policy changes they act as interest groups in the American pluralist democracy. It is therefore appropriate that the IRS has enacted changes in lobbying regulations for nonprofit organizations so as to enhance the ability of these groups to participate in the policy formulation process, particularly in their surrogate citizen role.

Government and the Nonprofit Sector Interdependency

Across America, the image of nonprofit organizations typically involves the characteristics of localness, voluntary action, neighbor to neighbor support and community responsiveness (Bellah, 1985). There is evidence to suggest that the actual state of the nonprofit sector is changing in ways that run contrary to these images, largely due to the

growing interdependence of government and the nonprofit sector.

Salamon (1987) suggests a partnership orientation in discussing the relationship between nonprofit organizations and government, claiming that the mutual reliance is beneficial to both parties. He identifies a set of mutual dependencies that exist between government and nonprofit organizations. Gronbjerg (1987) places the relationships between government and the nonprofit sector in four analytical types: cooperation, as in child welfare services; accommodation, as is the prevailing pattern in health care; competition, as is the case in education; and a symbiotic relationship as illustrated in the field of housing and community development.

Lipsky and Smith (1990) suggest that the increased influence of government over the nonprofit sector tends to threaten the civic virtues of the sector, such as citizen participation, localness, and voluntarism. They further describe several responses to the increased influence of government. Prominent among these responses is the tendency of nonprofits to force social problems into the policy agenda at both the state and federal level. The authors further assert that, in many cases, governments have acknowledged the need for public action only after nonprofit advocates effectively lobbied their specific cause. Van Til (1988) best describes the relationship between nonprofit organizations and government as acted out in matters of policy when he says, "Organized lobbying and advocacy is a central focus of third sector organizations, a mediating force of considerable importance in the sustenance of American democracy in an era of dwindling voting rates and a pervasive arrogance of governmental power." (p. 119).

Purchase of Service Contracting

Viewed through the lens of the purchase of service contracts, an image of non-profit organizations as a type of third party government becomes apparent. This third party government role of the nonprofit sector enables additional public action to address public needs without an accompanying growth in public bureaucracy.

Purchase of service contracting (POSC) has been defined as a legally binding agreement between a government contracting agency (with responsibility for serving a specific population and the resources to serve them) and a contractor (with the appropriate capability to provide the service) in which the contractor provides care or services to the clients of the government contracting agency in exchange for funds or other resources (Kettner & Martin, 1987). Evidence of POSC has been traced to colonial times. The practice of POSC is founded in the belief that there are some things that private sector, charitable and nonprofit organizations can do better than government. Cost and quality of service have both been key factors in the POSC equation.

The use of POSC grew with the advent of the Great Society programs of the 1960s. The war on poverty and other programs of the Kennedy/Johnson administrations were fertile ground for POSC, in part because of the emphasis on public/private partnerships, and in part because the innovative character of the program initiatives demanded more responsive administrative structures than government was capable of providing at the time (Kettner & Martin, 1987). Further, the political climate of the time lacked both philosophical and financial support for increasing the government bureaucracy.

Purchase of service contracting has been a major force in the developing relationships between nonprofit organizations and government (Van Til and Gurin, 1990). The nonprofit sector has maintained momentum as an important part of the American welfare state in large part due to the extensive reliance of government on nonprofit organizations to deliver services that are publicly financed. For example; in the case of social services and health care, nonprofit organizations deliver a larger proportion of services financed by government than do government agencies themselves. (Salamon, 1987).

One might ask, given the depth and scope of the mutually dependent relationship between government and nonprofit organizations, what is the nature of the influence of the nonprofit sector on the policy making processes of government? Van Til and Gurin (1990) provide a succinct analysis of the ties between the nonprofit sector and government:

1. Existence - through granting, withholding, or withdrawing tax exempt status.
2. Funding - through tax policies that effect incentives for voluntary giving and through contracts, grants, and purchase of service.
3. Programs - through making available government money that may or may not coincide with the organization's mission.
4. Operational costs - through mandates to comply with an increasing range of laws and regulations, such as equal opportunity, age discrimination, affirmative action, and occupational safety and health.
5. Constituency - through grants in aid programs for college students and health insurance programs.

Kettner and Martin (1989) also identified political influence as an important factor in determining POSC decisions. Weisbrod (1977, pg. 65) described nonprofit organizations as "mini governments" possessed of coercive and compulsive powers. They are capable of providing social pressure and opinion that has a policy formulation role to play in government. Clearly, the role of the legislature is central in the development and maintenance of the government/nonprofit partnership, spanning issues of mission, funding, program, regulations and legitimacy. Thus, nonprofit executives must address this partnership, which among other things includes lobbying.

Nonprofit Lobbying Theory

The statements below reflect the author's assumptions about the status of executive directors of nonprofit organizations with respect to the issue of lobbying and public policy. They summarize the theoretical foundations on which the research is based.

1. Interest group lobbying provides an important balance to majority rule in the policy making process.
2. Nonprofit organizations are legitimate interest groups.
3. Lobbying is appropriate for nonprofit organizations.
4. Lobbying is an appropriate professional activity for executive directors of nonprofit organizations.
5. There are a number of factors that influence the extent to which executive directors of nonprofit organizations engage in lobbying.

Smucker's (1991) authoritative work on the topic of nonprofit lobbying covers the

1976 lobby law as well as the 1990 changes in the IRS regulations. Smucker (1991 pg. 105-106) describes six general categories of highly effective lobbying techniques for non-profits: (1) site visits by legislators; (2) personal visits by constituents; (3) spontaneous, individually composed letters from constituents; (4) telephone calls from constituents; (5) articles in major daily newspapers; and (6) editorials in major daily newspapers.

Smucker emphasizes that a professional or full time paid lobbyist is not an essential ingredient for success for nonprofit organizations. Several aspects of interpersonal style and problem solving skills are described as basic to successful lobbying. Smucker (1991, p.9) states that competent nonprofit lobbyist must understand the following:

The basics of the legislative process and the key committee members or other legislators who have either jurisdiction or influence over the legislation or can effect its movement.

The details of the bill the nonprofit is supporting and why its provisions are important to the legislator's constituents and to the nonprofit organization.

The organizational structure of the nonprofit group and how it communicates with its grass roots.

Motivation, focus, and organization are described as essential elements of attempts to influence public policy (Eisnagle, 1990). Litch (1990) describes the increasing tendency toward public and private partnerships in addressing difficult and complex policy issues. The most successful lobbyists appear to be characterized by a strong task orientation. Lamont (1988) also recommends coalition building as an effective technique. The importance of actively tracking legislation from introduction through the committee process and amendments to floor votes was identified by Wise (1989) as a technique essential to effective lobbying.

Some of the differences between public and private sector lobbyists are that public lobbyists do not contribute to political campaigns, host social events, or take legislators to dinner (Abney, 1988). In addition to understanding the legislative process, Davis (1998) adds (a) bipartisanship, (b) the ability to communicate, (c) the ability to compromise, (d) a good sense of humor, and (e) timely use of information to the list of essential skills for lobbyists.

Smucker also emphasizes that interpersonal relationship skills are the most essential element for a successful lobbyist. While the specific techniques can be easily taught to most individuals, the ability to use them effectively throughout the lobbying process is highly dependent on the lobbyist's ability to relate to and work effectively with the variety of personality types that one is likely to encounter. Since a basic goal of the lobbying efforts of nonprofit organizations is to effect social change, these efforts have a tendency to strain the relationship between the established and prevailing conservative element of the power elites, in both government and society at large.

These relationships are particularly sensitive in that both groups of elites are potential sources of funding for nonprofit organizations. Funding for nonprofits proceeds, on the one hand, from governmental elites through the budgetary process. On the other hand, funding for nonprofits proceeds from non-governmental elites through individual and collective philanthropic efforts. This risk of alienation is a double edged sword that appears as nonprofit advocates attempt to be effective proponents of the specific consumers of their services, while at the same time maintain a relationship with the power elites in government and non-governmental sectors that are current or potential sources of funding for the nonprofit sector.

CHAPTER III

STATE OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR

A National Perspective

The size and scope of the nonprofit sector have become a subject of academic research only as recently as the past twenty years (O'Neill 1989), while the history of nonprofit organizations predates colonial times (Wilson, 1991). Still, the diversity of the sector and the voluntary nature of the organizations in it have made it difficult to describe in a complete and comprehensive manner (Hodgkinson, 1989).

Nonprofit organizations weave in and out of the fabric of traditional data bases used by government, public and private sector researchers as they attempt to describe American life in terms of economic and demographic variables. Defining the inputs, processes and products of the nonprofit sector has posed major challenges even for Independent Sector, the premier national association of the nonprofit community, and an organization that is considered by many to be a leading facilitator of research of nonprofit organizations in the United States.

Hodgkinson and Weitzman (1989) provide the following capsule summary descriptions of the nonprofit, or "independent" sector. The terms "independent sector" and "nonprofit sector" are for all practical purposes, synonymous. However "independent sector" meaning the entire population of nonprofit organizations should not be confused

with "Independent Sector" a national membership organization of nonprofit organizations. This statistical profile is the third in a series of reports produced by Independent Sector and is considered the authoritative single source for compiled national statistics for the nonprofit sector. The capsule descriptions are provided below.

In 1987, the independent sector was estimated to comprise 907,000 organizations. Included in these are tax exempt voluntary and philanthropic organizations, including schools, hospitals, social service organizations, advocacy organizations; civic, social, and fraternal organizations; arts and cultural organizations; foundations; and religious institutions, such as churches, synagogues, and mosques. The independent sector represented 4.2 percent of all institutional entities in 1987, a decline from 4.6 percent in 1977 (p. 4).

The independent sector had 7.4 million paid employees in 1987 (p. 10)

Total wages and salaries in the independent sector were \$116 billion in 1987, 5.3 percent of the total wages and salaries for all employees on nonagricultural payrolls (p. 10).

The per capita expenditures of nonprofit organizations in constant (1982) dollars, which adjusts for both population and price changes, increased 71 percent between 1960 (\$524) and 1987 (\$896). Adding the value of volunteer time to this figure increased the per capita expenditures of nonprofit organizations by 35 percent in 1987 to \$1,298 (p. 5).

In 1987, the independent sector had annual funds totaling about \$327 billion from the following sources: private contributions, 27.3 percent; dues, fees, and charges, 38.6 percent; other receipts, including endowment and investment income, 7.9 percent; and government, 26.1 percent (p. 6).

Government provided about 26 percent of total funds for the independent sector in 1987, down from a high of 27 percent in 1982 (p. 6).

Between 1977 and 1987 total annual funds increased 186 percent from \$114 billion to \$327 billion (p. 6).

In 1987, the total support for the independent sector was almost \$414 billion, \$86.5 billion representing the assigned value of volunteer time contributed to the work of nonprofit organizations (p. 6).

It is interesting that the nonprofit sector grew faster than the private sector or government between 1977 and 1982. During this time the total national income that originated from the nonprofit sector increased 85 percent in current dollars, from \$84.4 billion to \$155.8 billion. During the same time period total national income from the private sector increased 62 percent and from the government, 65 percent (Hodgkinson 1989).

Nonprofit Organizations in Michigan

A comprehensive description of the size and scope of the nonprofit organization industry in Michigan was recently developed by Wilson in the State of Nonprofit Michigan Report (1991). Wilson described the nonprofit sector in terms of six organizational service categories: (1) recreational and amusement services, (2) health services, (3) education services, (4) social services, (5) membership organizations, and (6) an "other" category. Table 1 (Wilson, 1991 p. 4) depicts Wilson's comparison of United States and Michigan nonprofit employment data.

Recreational services include camps, recreation clubs, fairs, theaters, museums and art galleries. Health services include medical and dental clinics, nursing and personal care provider organizations, hospitals, and other health services. Educational services are defined as libraries, vocational schools, and other educational services. Social services include child day care, individual and family services, job training services, residential care, and other social services. Membership organizations business associations, civic and fraternal associations, professional organizations, and other organizations. Wilson has grouped legal aid, research and development and management services into the sixth category, which he labeled simply "other nonprofit services".

Table 1

Nonprofit Employment by Activity, U.S. and Michigan, 1987

	<u>United States</u>		<u>Michigan</u>	
	Number Employed	%	Number Employed	%
Recreation and Amusement Services	253080	3.75	8676	3.33
Camps	16957	0.25	694	0.27
Recreation Clubs	121423	1.80	4633	1.78
Fairs	6084	0.09	130	0.05
Theatres	56494	0.84	1643	0.63
Museums/Art Galleries	52104	0.77	1576	0.60
Health Services	4648435	69.00	189472	72.70
Medical/Dental Clinics	85671	1.27	4917	1.89
Nursing and Personal Care	371497	5.51	11750	4.51
Hospitals	3964109	58.85	165941	63.67
Other Health Services	227158	3.37	6864	2.63
Education Services	49278	0.73	964	0.36
Libraries	13217	0.20	59	0.02
Vocational Schools	10202	0.15	273	0.10
Other Education Services	25859	0.38	632	0.24
Social Services	1109536	16.48	43182	16.57
Child Care	155402	2.31	3522	1.35
Individual/Family Services	312711	4.64	11743	4.51
Job Training Services	238195	3.54	10525	4.04
Residential Care	240530	3.57	12380	4.75
Other Social Services	162698	2.42	5012	1.92
Membership Organizations	538868	8.00	15424	5.92
Business Associations	87454	1.30	2327	0.89
Civic/Social/Fraternal Associations	322933	4.79	10475	4.02
Professional Organizations	49279	0.73	1226	0.47
Other Organizations	79202	1.18	1396	0.54
Other Nonprofit Services	137491	2.04	2897	1.11
Legal Aid	16191	0.24	479	0.18
Research and Development	107800	1.60	2114	0.81
Management Services	13500	0.20	304	0.12
TOTAL	6736670	100.00	260615	100.00

Source: United State Bureau of the Census, *Census of Services 1987* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990).

Wilson's data base is the 1987 United States Bureau of the Census. Thus, his description of the size of the nonprofit sector is based on the number of employees working in the various categorical service sectors. Health services are by far the largest service category comprising 69% of the national total. Social Services is the next largest category with slightly less than 16.5%, followed by membership organizations, recreation and amusement services, the "other" nonprofit service category and educational services, in descending order of employees.

Wilson reports that Michigan has over 40,000 nonprofit organizations, but fewer than 3,000 employ one or more persons. There are literally thousands of nonprofit organizations with highly specialized purposes and equally limited memberships. Being primarily voluntary associations, many of the small nonprofit organizations have extremely minor or nonexistent financial resources. These two characteristics, lack of money and lack of staff make these organizations statistically invisible. They have little, if any, need to register at the local, state, or national level, and therefore elude traditional survey research. Thus, those organizations that appear in Wilson's analysis are mainly those that employ workers.

The report cites 1987 United States Bureau of the Census data stating, in that year, there were 6,205 nonprofit organizations that employed 260,615 workers. The payroll for this population reached nearly \$11 billion. Employment in the nonprofit sector in Michigan represents 5.8% of the state's work force. Michigan is believed to account for 3.87% of the national nonprofit work force and has the eighth largest nonprofit work force in the country.

For the same year, 1987, Michigan Employment Security Commission data showed a nonprofit labor force of 185,420 workers, or 4.3% of the state work force. As recently as 1990 these numbers had increased to 241,373 and 5.1%, respectively. In the three years between 1987 and 1990 the nonprofit sector in Michigan had grown by almost 33 %. This compared to the rate of growth in government of 21.7 % and 6.1 % in the private for-profit sector. Wilson computed the average size of a nonprofit organization in Michigan to be 136.1 employees in 1987 and 103.1 employees in 1990. This average figure is high and reflects the weight of large health care organizations in arriving at the average.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN

Dependent Variables

The purpose of the research is to identify the lobbying practices executive directors of nonprofit organizations and the potential values conflicts that may be experienced by the executives while lobbying. Lobbying is the dependent variable. Two general categories of lobbying have been identified in the IRS code. They are:

1. Direct Lobbying, defined as any attempt to exert influence on legislation through communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or with any government official who may participate in the formulation of the legislation.
2. Grassroots Lobbying, defined as any attempt to influence legislation through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof.

Independent Variables

Nonprofit lobbying is an emerging issue in the scholarly journals in social science and political science. A computer aided literature search using the key words nonprofit, lobbying, resulted only in citations of articles discussing P.A. 94-455, during its formulation and after its passage. Using the key words, interest groups and lobbying resulted in a great deal more citations. However the foci of these studies were primarily private

sector associations acting on the national level, whereas the focus of this research is community based nonprofit organizations. With the exception of Smucker's (1991) technique manual on nonprofit lobbying, and Pawlak and Flynn (1990), nothing substantive was found in the literature about structural, funding, or other characteristics of community based nonprofit organizations or their executive directors with respect to lobbying.

Given the absence of an established body of knowledge on nonprofit lobbying, independent variables presumed to have an effect on the lobbying behavior of nonprofit executive directors have been selected for this exploratory research.

Listed below are the independent variables selected for this research on the lobbying activity of executive directors of community based charitable nonprofit organizations. Examples of these types of organizations include food banks, shelters for the homeless, and residential treatment programs for adolescents, family counseling agencies, and sheltered workshops. Following this list is a brief discussion of the specific interview guide questions corresponding to the dependent and independent variables.

1. The existence of legislative or political action committees of the nonprofit organization.
2. The lobbying conducted by members of the board of directors.
3. The support for executive director lobbying provided by the board of directors.
4. Lobbying for the organization as a formally stated element of the executive director's job description.
5. Participation in local coalitions that lobby.

6. Organizational affiliation with a state or national association.
7. The amount and percent of income received from governmental sources.
8. The nonprofit organization's status as the sole provider of a specific service.
9. The field of service of the nonprofit organization.
10. Age of the organization.
11. The percent of the total agency budget spent on lobbying.
12. The executive director's perceptions of the relative importance of lobbying in comparison to other responsibilities as the leader of a nonprofit organization.
13. Age of the executive director.
14. Gender of the executive director.
15. Years of experience of the executive director.
16. Educational level of the executive director.
17. Executive director's awareness of the lobbying law.
18. Value conflicts experienced by executive directors while lobbying.

Formal Organizational Support Variables

The first four variables focus on the perceived value of lobbying to executive directors and boards. Smucker (1991) asserts that a strong government relations committee can add greatly to the impact of a nonprofit organization's lobbying efforts. However, boards and executive directors are not always in agreement on lobbying. There may be situations where the executive director does not value lobbying but is compelled to lobby by the board, whether or not it is formally stated in the executive's job description.

Conversely, the board may not value lobbying but the executive director may feel strongly about the importance of lobbying and find ways to pursue it through direct or grassroots action. A conflict may occur between the official position of the agency and the personal beliefs of the executive director.

Do executives have political action or legislative committees on their boards? If they do, how does the existence of these committees relate to the lobbying activity of the executive director? Board members may serve as intermediaries for the executive director. Pawlak and Flynn (1990) reported the use of intermediaries in political activities by executive directors of nonprofit organizations. Is it the case that politically active executive directors also have active board members working in committees or would active committees function to reduce the individual efforts of the executive director? It may be that organizations with political action committees have executive directors who lobby differently than executives whose organizations do not have political action committees.

It may be that executive directors focus on other issues and leave the lobbying to the committee members. One could also argue that an executive director might actually lobby more when the organization has a political action committee by virtue of providing a model of behavior for the committee or as a member of the committee. Another possibility is that organizations with political action committees devote more of their overall resources to attempting to influence legislation. Examining the relationship between board legislative or political action committees and the lobbying activity of the executive director will assist in understanding how nonprofit organizations lobby.

Organizational Affiliation Variables

Participation in Local Coalitions That Lobby

There is some evidence to suggest that lobbying in coalitions is an effective approach (Lamont, 1988; Smucker, 1991). Coalitions sometimes form around general services that meet a need for a broad range of citizens such as transportation or libraries. They may also form around meeting the needs of a specific population such as teenage single mothers, the homebound elderly or other interest groups. However, it may also be the case that executive directors prefer to engage in these activities by themselves for reasons of personal preference, ease of scheduling, or lack of available and concerned individuals to assist with lobbying.

Organizational Affiliation With a State or National Association

It is not unusual for local nonprofit organizations to hold memberships in state or national associations of service providers with similar missions. For example, the 14 Area Agencies on Aging in Michigan formed a statewide association that supports several staff members who are registered lobbyists with the state of Michigan. These individuals work to further the goals of the Association, primarily through lobbying. This association provides advocacy and education services on behalf of its members and is an important force in lobbying the Michigan legislature. Another similar type of state association is Big Brothers/Big Sisters in Michigan. This organization is composed of the 15 local Big Brother/Big Sisters Chapters and has recently developed strategic goals that include

advocacy or lobbying. Several similar organizations exist on the national level, such as the Gerontological Society of America and Goodwill Industries of America.

One of the services that is often provided by these associations for their members is directly lobbying policy makers at the Federal level along with a range of activities that support lobbying by member agencies. Some of these types of services include issuing legislative calls to action that urge members to lobby at the federal and state level, providing information and training about the legislative process to member agencies, and working in coalitions with other associations. What are the implications for lobbying by local nonprofit organizations who belong to these associations? Affiliation with a state or national organization may have an impact on the lobbying activity of local nonprofit organizations.

Other Organizational Variables

The Amount and Percent of Income Received From Governmental Sources

It may be that there is a relationship between the size of the organization's total budget and the amount of lobbying that occurs. Do smaller organizations lobby less if they are less dependent on state or federal funding to support their services? Or do smaller organizations lobby more in an attempt to obtain any state or federal funding?

Is there a relationship between the mix of funding from county, state, and federal levels and the amount of lobbying that occurs? Is there any pattern in the lobbying efforts of executive directors of nonprofit organizations based on the mix of funding the

organization receives? For example, if an agency receives a large portion of its budget from the state, will its lobbying efforts be directed at state government?

If the state dollars are actually distributed by a county level agency, as is often the case with Community Mental Health programs in Michigan for example, will there be more lobbying directed at those policy makers at the local level who make distribution decisions, or will there be a significant amount of lobbying directed at policy makers in state government who make allocation and other policy decisions department wide? These are the questions that this research seeks to answer.

The Nonprofit Organization's Status as the Sole Provider of a Specific Service

It could be argued that a community based nonprofit organization that was the sole provider of a specific service in a given area would not be required to lobby as much as those organizations who were not. The absence of competition for funds might be a factor affecting how much a nonprofit lobbies. They might also take on the status of "expert in the field" more easily in cases where their opinion might not be challenged because they are the sole provider and this might also reduce the apparent need to lobby. On the other hand, sole providers may be required to lobby more because they are the only ones advocating for that specific service or the population being served. For these reasons the relationship between being a sole provider of a service and lobbying activity is important to consider.

The Field of Service of the Nonprofit Organization

The phrase field of service refers to the six organizational service categories for the nonprofit sector described by Wilson (1991). These categories are: (1) recreational and amusement services, (2) health services, (3) education services, (4) social services, (5) membership organizations, and (6) an "other" category. Are there differences in the lobbying activity of the various types of organizations? For example one might expect that due to the complexity and scope of health services executives representing these organizations might lobby more actively than executives who lead recreation and amusement services. Perhaps field of service is not relevant at all. One could argue that it is not field of service alone that influences nonprofit lobbying but the existence of legislative issues for a particular field of service at any given moment in time.

Age of the Organization

Is the age of the organization a factor that influences executive director lobbying? It may be that older organizations have established relationships with key policy makers who chair important committees that relate to the mission of the organization. They may have well-developed grassroots lobbying networks and have some political currency to spend. Whereas younger agencies may not have these types of resources. On the other hand one could make the case that younger agencies would have more of an active lobbying component as they work to develop the relationships, skills, and knowledge necessary to become effective lobbyists.

The Percent of the Total Agency Budget Spent on Lobbying

Is there a relationship between the percentage of the agency's budget spent on lobbying and lobbying activity? Can anything be predicted by examining this figure? Moreover do agencies even identify and record lobbying expenditures as part of their budget. P.A. 94-455 sets specific guidelines for lobbying expenditures. Examining this issue will shed light on how nonprofits treat lobbying expenditures.

Executive Director's Perceptions and Demographic Characteristics

The Executive Director's Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Lobbying in Comparison to Other Responsibilities as the Leader of a Nonprofit Organization

Executive directors of nonprofit organizations wear many hats. They are program managers, provide leadership to staff, manage relationships with policy boards and advisory committees, market, do fund raising, and help coordinate agency services in the community, manage agency budgets and contracts, and plan for the long term survival of the agency, to name just a few of the roles. With so many activities competing for the executive's time and attention, what relative importance does lobbying hold for them? Do executives make planned and conscious choices about lobbying, or does it more or less occur on a crisis or reactive basis? What priority does lobbying hold among all the responsibilities of the executive? It may be the case that while executives perceive lobbying to be important their actual lobbying may not match with the level of importance they attach to it.

Age of the Executive Director

Similar to the age of the organization, is the age of the executive a factor in the lobbying activity of nonprofit organizations? One could argue that the older executive would have well-established ties and relationships with policy makers and would engage in more lobbying or lobby differently from younger executives. For example the older executives may have access to higher levels of influence in the policy making structure of local, state or federal government.

Younger executives may not have these advantages or liabilities. Is it possible that younger executives are more likely to work in smaller agencies and as a result have to work more diligently than older executives to influence policy makers? Given that policy makers whom are elected officials change as the voters express their preferences, are the younger executives on relatively equal footing with older executives in terms of establishing and maintaining relationships with policy makers? By examining the relationship between the age of the executives and lobbying activity, some light may be shed on these questions.

Gender of the Executive Director

Are there any gender related differences in the manner in which executives lobby? Are men or women more likely to engage in lobbying, or lobby differently from one another? A comparison of lobbying techniques for men and women will help to answer these questions.

Years of Experience of the Executive Director

Similar to the age of the executive, is the number of years of experience of the executive a factor in the lobbying activity of nonprofit organizations? One could argue that the more professionally experienced executives lobby differently as a result of this experience. For example, the more experienced executives may have developed particularly effective lobbying techniques, these executives may have access to higher levels of influence in the policy making structure of local, state or federal government. They may prefer to use grassroots or direct lobbying techniques based on previous experience. The career record of older executives may, depending on specific circumstances, support or detract from their lobbying activity, depending on how successful they have been in establishing credibility with policy makers.

Executives with less experience may be less committed to certain lobbying techniques and more open to trying new lobbying techniques or using a variety of techniques. For example they may be more likely to use computer assisted lobbying techniques for grass roots lobbying or video and satellite technology to lobby with groups or individuals in remote locations. By examining the relationship between the years of experience of the executives and lobbying activity some light may be shed on these questions.

Educational Level of the Executive Director

Do executives with different levels of formal education lobby differently? One could assume that there are differences between the way a non-degree director of a

nonprofit organization would lobby and the type of lobbying conducted by director with a Ph.D. For example, one might expect that those with a higher level of education may use more research reports and technical writing to support their lobbying efforts. Another supposition could be that those with less education engage in more grassroots lobbying whereas those with higher levels of education would engage in more direct lobbying of policy makers. Perhaps education does not influence lobbying at all, however, one might expect that the advanced education would correlate with more sophisticated verbal skills and reasoning abilities that are helpful in preparing and acting out lobbying strategy.

Executive Director's Awareness of the Lobbying Law

For many years lobbying has been a substantially prohibited activity for nonprofit organizations operating with 501(c)(3) status. The extent to which Public Law 94-455 influences executives is not known. Do executives have knowledge of the new regulations? To what extent is there a relationship between having or not having knowledge of the lobbying regulations and lobbying activity. It may be that some executive directors know very little about the law and consequently do not lobby at all because they assume that there are strong prohibitions against lobbying by nonprofits still in effect. It may be that others have limited knowledge of the law but lobby aggressively with a passionate approach to advocacy. Is there indeed any relationship between knowledge of the lobbying law and lobbying activity on the part of executive directors of nonprofit organizations?

Value Conflicts Experienced by Executive Directors While Lobbying

Lobbying by executive directors of nonprofit organizations may lead to conflicts between an individual's personal values and actions that are perceived to be in the best interest of the organization. O'Neil (1988) points out that nonprofit organization managers, like their counterparts in public and private organizations, have a responsibility to act morally in helping the organization meet its goals. Chandler (1988) describes several ethical pitfalls for public servants that may well apply to nonprofit executive directors and a code of ethical behavior or guidelines for addressing these pitfalls. It is also possible that the values of the nonprofit organization may be in conflict with the prevailing values of the community in which it operates. Denhardt (1981 p. 83) describes how conflicts arise when individual values clash with organizational requirements. Opportunities arise for these conflicts to occur related to the nature of the service provided by certain nonprofit organizations, for example, Planned Parenthood or gay and lesbian rights organizations.

Similarly, opportunities for conflict may arise from differences in beliefs about the role government should play in regulating and funding nonprofit organizations. Another potential area for value conflicts to arise in lobbying is the selective use of information about program operations, client needs, policy impacts and other issues. Thus, value conflicts related to lobbying behavior are important to consider.

Major Research Questions

The overall research questions can be stated as follows:

1. Do executive directors of local charitable nonprofit organizations lobby?
2. If they do engage in lobbying, what types of approaches are used? What value issues might they encounter?
3. If they do not engage in lobbying, what are the factors that influence their decision?

Examining the impact of lobbying efforts of executive directors of nonprofit organizations is beyond the scope of this study.

Specific Research Questions

Lobbying, as defined in the Internal Revenue Service Code, is an important and appropriate activity for executive directors of nonprofit organizations. However, questions exist regarding a number of personal, organizational, and environmental factors that influence the extent to which nonprofit executive directors engage in lobbying. The intent of the questions contained in the interview guide is to develop information about (a) the lobbying behavior of executive directors of nonprofit organizations, and (b) characteristics of the organization and the individual that may influence this behavior. The questions have been crafted to elicit responses about the type of lobbying activity, the level of policy maker to which lobbying is directed, and the frequency of lobbying. These questions are listed categorically below.

Funding Questions

1. Is there a relationship between the size of the organization's budget and lobbying activity?
2. Is there a relationship between the percentage of state and federal tax dollars in the organizations budget and lobbying activity?
3. Is there a difference in lobbying activity of nonprofits that are the sole provider of a service and those that are not?
4. Do nonprofit organizations identify the amount of resources spent on lobbying?
5. Is there a relationship between the amount of money spent on lobbying and lobbying activity?

Demographic Questions

6. Is there a relationship between age of the executive director and lobbying activity?
7. Is there a relationship between gender of the executive director and lobbying activity?
8. Is there a relationship between the executive director's perception of the relative importance of lobbying and lobbying activity?

Professional Status Questions

9. Is there a relationship between the years in position of the executive director and the amount of lobbying activity?

10. Is there a relationship between the level of education of the executive director and lobbying activity?

11. Are executive directors of nonprofit organizations aware of the more liberal definitions of lobbying activity allowable under the 1990 IRS regulations?

12. Do executive directors of nonprofit organizations who engage in lobbying experience value conflicts relating to this activity?

13. Is there a relationship between having lobbying as a specific job requirement of the executive director and lobbying activity?

Organizational Questions

14. Is there a relationship between having legislative or political action committees and lobbying activity?

15. Is there a relationship between participating in local coalitions and lobbying activity?

16. Is there a relationship between the age of the organization and lobbying activity?

17. Is there a relationship between affiliation with state and national organizations and lobbying activity?

18. Is there a relationship between the level of board support for executive director lobbying and lobbying activity?

19. Is there a relationship between the level of board participation in lobbying and lobbying activity?

20. Is there a relationship between the field of service of the nonprofit organization and lobbying activity?

CHAPTER V

METHOD

The Grounded Theory of Glasser and Strauss (1967) is an investigative approach applicable to the model proposed and the research questions described herein. In grounded theory, the researcher generates conceptual categories and/or their properties from the evidence collected. Developing grounded theory is a means of moving from the general to the specific through the identification of common elements. Generating grounded theory requires joint collection, coding, and the analysis of data. Berg (1989) suggests seven major elements possible in content analysis: words, themes, characters, paragraphs, items, concepts and semantics. From these findings a theory of variables influencing the lobbying activity of nonprofit organizations will hopefully emerge.

Data Collection

Data collection took the form of semi-standardized interviews (Berg, 1989) conducted face-to-face with the directors. The semi-standardized interview approach is characterized by the use of a number of predetermined questions or special topics. An interview guide with 145 items was constructed for this research for the purpose of eliciting information regarding both the respondent's experience and beliefs about lobbying. The interview guide was developed over several months and revised after field testing with

five nonprofit organizations that conduct business outside of the area from which the research respondents were drawn. The research protocol was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University.

Sample

Executive Directors of nonprofit organizations operating in Kent and Ingham Counties in Michigan were selected as respondents. Kent and Ingham counties are similar in many ways but have clear differences. Both counties have a mix of urban and rural areas. Both counties are influenced by the presence of colleges and universities. Both counties have a well-developed nonprofit sector, although Kent County has a somewhat larger nonprofit employment base when major health care institutions are included in the figures (Wilson, 1991).

The counties are closely ranked (Slater & Hall, 1992) in terms of per capita expenditures of local government dollars with Kent spending \$1,036 and Ingham spending \$1,462, and they are almost identical in per capita income with Ingham at \$11,747 and Kent at \$11,883. Similarly, federal per capita expenditures were \$1,022,400 in Ingham and \$1,151,240 in Kent county (Slater & Hall, 1992). The unemployment rate is one indicator of the potential need for services provided by charitable nonprofit organizations. The unemployment rate for the same period (1988) as the financial data listed above was 6% for Ingham county and 6.1% for Kent.

There are some notable differences between the two counties. The 1990 U.S. census data indicate that the population of Ingham county is about half (56%) that of

Kent County. Lansing, the state capital, is located in Ingham County. The proximity of state policy makers might suggest somewhat different lobbying opportunities for executive directors of nonprofit organizations in Ingham County.

A random sample of 50 executive directors of nonprofit organizations was drawn from a data base of 96 agencies, 48 United Way member agencies in each county. Twenty-five organizations per county were selected for a total of 50. These areas were selected for their well-established nonprofit sectors (Wilson, 1991) and accessibility for research. Although there is variability in the size of United Way funded agencies, they all have met certain standards in order to receive United Way funding.

Research Interviews

The process to complete the research interviews included the following steps. First, a letter was mailed that described the research and solicited participation in the interview (Appendix A). The prospective respondents were contacted by telephone to confirm their interest in participating and to schedule the time and place of the interview. The third step was actually conducting the interviews. Twenty-five executive directors were interviewed from each county. Executive Directors who worked less than full-time and/or in a volunteer capacity did not participate in the research. Replacements were drawn on a random basis for those in the first sample set who were unable to participate in the interviews.

Setting

Data collection occurred during June, July, and August of 1993. Interviews occurred primarily at the executive's place of business. Three of the interviews occurred in other less formal settings at the request of the interviewee, such as a park or restaurant. Interviews were audio taped with the approval of executives. None of the directors refused to have the interview taped. All of the directors were allowed to have the tapes turned off at any time during the interview, and several took advantage of this opportunity during some of the more sensitive questions regarding value conflicts. Precautions were taken to ensure an uninterrupted and concentrated interview session. Executives were guaranteed the confidentiality of their remarks.

Interview tapes were transcribed shortly after each of the interviews. As the tapes were transcribed the data collection sheets were also checked for accuracy. Tapes were erased after they were transcribed. A pamphlet distributed by Independent Sector containing a summary of the new lobbying regulations was made available to the executives following the interview as a means of thanking them for their participation.

Data Analysis

The interview guide was designed to elicit qualitative and quantitative information from the executives. The quantitative information was coded as nominal level data for most of the one hundred and forty-five items. A few of the interview items allowed for responses to be placed on an ordinal scale. Quantitative data collected during the inter-

views was analyzed using SPSS.

The interview guide allowed the interviewer to probe for detailed information on a number of items and thereby generate qualitative data about the respondents' experiences, motivation, and decision making processes about lobbying practices and beliefs. Using grounded theory, conceptual categories were developed by moving between general and specific frames of reference through the identification of common elements. In conducting a content analysis of the transcribed audio tapes, words, themes, characters, concepts and semantics used by the executives were studied.

CHAPTER V

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Profile of Respondents

Executives' Characteristics

Fifty executive directors of nonprofit organizations were interviewed; they will be referred to as executives, directors, or participants to avoid the monotony of repeated use one referent. Table 2 describes the characteristics of these executives.

Age of the Executives

Forty-four percent of the executives were 40 years of age or younger. Fifty-two percent were between the ages of 41 and 60. Two percent were older than age 61. Only one subject refused to provide this information describing it as discriminatory.

Gender

Twenty-seven (54%) executives were female and twenty-three (46%) were male. Although nonprofit organizations tend to employ more females than males, the leadership in such organizations generally is more balanced between males and females. Some organizations, by virtue of the nature of their mission and services are more inclined to be led by males or females such as boy scouts, girl scouts and domestic violence shelters.

Table 2
Characteristics of Executives

Characteristic		% of Executives
Gender		
	Female	54
	Male	46
Level of Education		
	Associate Degree or Less	12
	College Graduate	32
	Graduate Degree	54
	No response	2
Time in Position		
	0 - 5 years	68
	6 - 15 years	24
	16 or more years	8
Race		
	Caucasian	90
	Native American	4
	African American	4
	Hispanic	2
Age		
	0 - 40 years	44
	41 - 60 years	52
	61 or more years	2
	No response	2

Race

Caucasians comprised 90% (45) of the executives, 4% (2) were Native Americans, 4% (2) were African Americans, and there was one (2%) Hispanic.

Time in Position

Sixty-eight percent (34) of the executives had been in their positions for less than five years at the time of the interview. Twenty-four percent (12) had been in their positions between five and fifteen years. Eight percent (4) had been in their positions sixteen years or more.

Level of Education

Fifty-four percent (27) of the executives had obtained a master's degree or higher. Thirty-two percent (16) had obtained a bachelor's degree. Twelve percent (6) held Associate degrees or high school diplomas. One executive refused to answer the question describing it as elitist.

Profile of Respondents' Organizations

Organizational Characteristics

Field of Service

Executives were asked to identify their organizations categorically by the type of service the organization provides. Social service agencies comprised 54% (27) of the organizations led by those executive directors participating in the research. Executive directors of health organizations represented 14% (7) of the executives as did executive directors for organizations providing educational services. Membership organizations

comprised 8% (4) of those participating in research. Membership organizations represent business, professional, labor, civic and religious groups. Some examples include chamber of commerce, fraternal order of police, and home builder's association. Six percent (3) described their organization as providing something other than one of the five categories described by Wilson (1991). Four percent (2) of the executives led organizations that provide recreational and amusement services.

There are some differences between the characteristic of this sample of nonprofit organizations and that reported by Wilson (1991) for Michigan and the United States. Table 3 shows that the social service and health care categories are the two largest in the nonprofit sector. In the sample of respondents for this research social services is the largest and health services is the second largest category. Wilson's data for the Michigan and the United States shows health care as the largest category and social services as the second largest category. The differences exist primarily because Wilson's study included major hospitals, medical and dental clinics in the health care category, whereas this study did not.

Funding Levels and Sources

A description of the sources of funds and approximate funding levels of the organizations participating in the research is found in Tables 4 through 8. The data in these tables indicate approximate funding levels for fiscal year 1993.

The total budgets of each organization as indicated in Table 4 are estimates of agency resources and are the figure most often cited by executives in discussing their

Table 3

Distribution of Executives Among Fields of Service in the Nonprofit Sector

Field of Service	Sample Number	Sample Percent	Percent in Michigan	Percent in U.S.
Social Services	27	54	17	16
Health Services	7	14	72	69
Education Services	7	14	<1	<1
Membership Organizations	4	8	6	8
Other	3	6	1	2
Recreational & Amusement	2	4	3	4
Total	50	100	100	100

agencies. During the interviews the executives could easily report their total budget, but most required some time to estimate the breakdown between local, state, federal and "other" sources. Many of the executives could only provide an estimate during the time allowed for the interview. Some of the directors were somewhat frustrated by the question, indicating that their bookkeeping did not follow this breakdown in funding but that they were more familiar with the program by program funding breakdowns.

The agencies participating in this study reported total budgets ranging from \$27,700 to \$8,000,000. For the sample as a whole, 5% was local funding, 25% was State funding, 36% was federal funding, and 34% of the funding was from other sources.

Table 4

Total Amount of Funds for Executives' Agencies

Agency	Amount	Rank
2	\$27,700	50
13	\$47,000	49
25	\$66,000	48
16	\$70,000	47
49	\$78,500	46
1	\$89,900	45
30	\$104,000	44
18	\$141,000	43
21	\$190,000	42
31	\$195,000	41
11	\$196,000	40
47	\$200,000	39
50	\$230,000	38
20	\$240,000	36
48	\$240,000	36
22	\$278,000	35
37	\$280,000	34
46	\$300,000	33
24	\$302,402	32
32	\$326,000	31
9	\$365,855	30
8	\$385,000	29
26	\$416,000	28
19	\$450,000	26
28	\$450,000	26
4	\$499,900	25
34	\$500,000	24
15	\$540,000	23
29	\$550,000	22
3	\$639,000	21
7	\$850,000	20

Table 4--Continued

Agency	Amount	Rank
44	\$900,000	19
17	\$1,000,000	17
14	\$1,000,000	17
42	\$1,275,000	16
40	\$1,320,000	15
5	\$1,800,000	14
6	\$1,900,000	13
45	\$2,000,000	12
12	\$2,082,000	11
35	\$2,100,000	10
41	\$2,517,037	9
33	\$2,600,000	8
27	\$3,909,500	7
43	\$4,800,000	6
36	\$5,000,000	4
23	\$5,000,000	4
10	\$5,600,000	3
38	\$7,000,000	2
39	\$8,000,000	1
Mean	\$1,381,016	
Median	\$474,950	
Mode	\$240,000	
Range	7,972,300	
Minimum	27,700	
Maximum	8,000,000	
Sample Size	50	

Table 5

Amount of Local Funding for Executives' Agencies

Agency	Amount	Rank
13	\$0	23
25	\$0	23
22	\$0	23
24	\$0	23
8	\$0	23
19	\$0	23
28	\$0	23
3	\$0	23
44	\$0	23
42	\$0	23
1	\$0	23
29	\$0	23
48	\$0	23
34	\$0	23
16	\$0	23
31	\$0	23
11	\$0	23
37	\$0	23
40	\$0	23
18	\$0	23
46	\$0	23
14	\$0	23
32	\$0	23
35	\$0	23
17	\$0	23
23	\$0	23
39	\$0	23
38	\$0	23
2	\$1,200	22
49	\$3,500	21
30	\$10,000	19

Table 5-Continued

Agency	Amount	Rank
5	\$10,000	19
4	\$12,900	18
26	\$13,000	17
50	\$15,000	16
47	\$16,000	15
7	\$20,000	14
15	\$25,500	13
21	\$40,000	12
9	\$49,000	11
20	\$75,800	10
6	\$100,000	9
10	\$112,000	8
27	\$127,000	7
36	\$150,000	6
33	\$260,000	5
41	\$300,000	4
45	\$500,000	3
12	\$550,000	2
43	\$1,400,000	1
Mean	\$75,818	
Median	\$0	
Mode	\$0	
Range	\$1,400,000	
Minimum	\$0	
Maximum	\$1,400,000	
Sum	\$3,790,900	
Sample Size	50	

Table 6

Amount of State Funding for Executives' Agencies

Agency	Amount	Rank
13	\$0	34
25	\$0	34
30	\$0	34
22	\$0	34
24	\$0	34
8	\$0	34
19	\$0	34
28	\$0	34
4	\$0	34
3	\$0	34
44	\$0	34
42	\$0	34
1	\$0	34
29	\$0	34
48	\$0	34
50	\$0	34
34	\$0	34
16	\$5,600	33
31	\$7,000	32
11	\$9,800	31
21	\$10,000	29
7	\$10,000	29
15	\$10,100	28
2	\$16,500	27
47	\$20,000	26
37	\$28,000	25
20	\$41,750	24
5	\$50,000	23
49	\$60,000	22
40	\$80,000	20
18	\$80,000	20

Table 6--Continued

Agency	Amount	Rank
46	\$88,000	19
14	\$120,000	18
9	\$127,000	17
26	\$180,800	16
32	\$213,000	15
33	\$260,000	14
27	\$382,500	13
6	\$600,000	11
35	\$600,000	11
45	\$750,000	8
17	\$750,000	8
41	\$750,000	8
12	\$800,000	5
23	\$800,000	5
39	\$800,000	5
43	\$1,500,000	4
10	\$1,965,600	3
36	\$2,900,000	2
38	\$3,500,000	1
Mean	\$350,313	
Median	\$24,000	
Mode	\$0	
Range	\$3,500,000	
Minimum	\$0	
Maximum	\$3,500,000	
Sum	\$17,515,650	
Sample Size	50	

Table 7

Amount of Federal Funding for Executives' Agencies

Agency	Amount	Rank
2	\$0	35
13	\$0	35
25	\$0	35
16	\$0	35
49	\$0	35
30	\$0	35
22	\$0	35
24	\$0	35
8	\$0	35
19	\$0	35
28	\$0	35
4	\$0	35
3	\$0	35
44	\$0	35
42	\$0	35
40	\$0	35
1	\$3,900	34
47	\$4,000	33
14	\$5,000	32
46	\$6,000	30
15	\$6,000	30
11	\$9,800	29
29	\$11,000	28
48	\$20,000	27
5	\$24,000	26
45	\$25,000	25
37	\$28,000	24
18	\$31,000	23
32	\$32,000	22
21	\$40,000	19
31	\$40,000	19
9	\$0,000	19

Table 7- -Continued

Agency	Amount	Rank
26	\$46,000	18
50	\$76,000	17
20	\$87,297	16
17	\$100,000	15
33	\$260,000	14
7	\$430,000	13
34	\$450,000	12
12	\$582,000	11
41	\$750,000	10
6	\$800,000	9
35	\$1,000,000	8
27	\$1,360,000	7
43	\$1,600,000	6
36	\$1,900,000	5
10	\$2,402,400	4
38	\$2,800,000	3
23	\$3,500,000	2
39	\$6,400,000	1
Mean	\$497,388	
Median	\$24,500	
Mode	\$0	
Range	\$6,400,000	
Minimum	\$0	
Maximum	\$6,400,000	
Sample Size	50	

Table 8

Amount of Other Funding for Executives' Agencies

Agency	Amount	Rank
2	\$10,000	50
49	\$15,000	49
18	\$30,000	48
20	\$35,153	47
13	\$47,000	46
34	\$50,000	44
36	\$50,000	44
16	\$64,400	43
25	\$66,000	42
32	\$81,000	41
1	\$86,000	40
30	\$94,000	39
21	\$100,000	38
50	\$139,000	37
31	\$148,000	36
9	\$149,855	35
17	\$150,000	33
12	\$150,000	33
47	\$160,000	32
26	\$176,200	31
11	\$176,400	30
46	\$206,000	29
48	\$220,000	28
37	\$224,000	27
22	\$278,000	26
43	\$300,000	25
24	\$302,402	24
8	\$385,000	23
7	\$390,000	22
6	\$400,000	21
19	\$450,000	19

Table 8--Continued

Agency	Amount	Rank
28	\$450,000	19
4	\$487,000	18
15	\$498,400	17
35	\$500,000	16
29	\$539,000	15
3	\$639,000	14
23	\$700,000	12
38	\$700,000	12
41	\$717,037	11
45	\$725,000	10
39	\$800,000	9
14	\$875,000	8
44	\$900,000	7
10	\$1,120,000	6
40	\$1,240,000	5
42	\$1,275,000	4
5	\$1,716,000	3
33	\$1,820,000	2
27	\$2,040,000	1
Mean	\$457,497	
Median	\$289,000	
Mode	\$50,000	
Range	\$2,030,000	
Minimum	\$10,000	
Maximum	\$2,040,000	
Sample Size	50	

The median budget was \$474,950. Other sources identified by the executives included United Way, fees for service, private donations, and revenue generated through other fundraising activities such as candy sales and raffles. The executives are well connected with governmental sources of funding and had a sufficient rationale and the opportunity to be in contact with policy makers at all levels.

Twenty-eight of the executives report no local funding. The amount of local funding in the agency budgets of the 22 executives reporting local funding ranged from \$1,200 to \$1,400,000, with a mean of \$172,314, a median of \$44,500, and a mode of \$1,000. Seventeen of the executives report no state funding. The amount of state funding in the agency budgets of the 33 executives reporting state funding ranged from \$5,600 to \$3,500,000 with a mean of \$530,777, a median of \$127,000, and a mode of \$750,000. Sixteen of the executives report no federal funding. The amount of federal funding in the agency budgets of the 34 executives reporting federal funding ranged from \$3,900 to \$640,000, with a mean of \$731,453, a median of \$61,000, and a mode of \$40,000. All of the executives reported some funding from other sources. The amount of funding from other sources reported ranged from \$1,000 to \$2,040,000 with a mean of \$457,497, a median of \$289,000.

Unfortunately, the amount of funding from each source is not usable in examining lobbying. In response to the question on the source of funding it appears that some executives identified the original source and some reported the allocation point, or the pass through agency where the lobbying efforts should have been directed. The problem first came to light during one of the last interviews when an executive raised the question of

how to consider federal funds passed through state agencies. It was only then that it became apparent that executives may have been responding differently to the question about the amount of funding from different sources. This investigator did not anticipate the variation in the executives' response sets. Consequently, an analysis of the relationship between the sources of funding and the target of lobbying is not possible with the available data.

Age of the Organization

The age of the organizations included in the research sample ranged from less than 10 years to more than 61 years. Forty-four percent (22) of the organizations were between 1 and 20 years old (Table 9). Twenty percent (10) of the organizations were between 21 and 40 years old. Thirty-four percent (17) were more than 41 years old. There was one missing case in these data.

Table 9

Age of the Organizations Participating in the Study

Years in Existence	Frequency	Percent
1 to 20	22	45
21 to 40	10	20
41 and older	17	35
Total	49	100

Single Provider

Sixty percent (30) of the executives indicated that they believe that their organization is the single provider of their particular service in their counties. Forty percent (20) of the executives indicated that they were aware of other organizations that provided the same service(s).

Lobbying as Percent of Budget

Executives were provided with a definition of lobbying at the beginning of the interview. They were asked to estimate the percentage of the overall agency budget that was spent on lobbying during the past twelve months. Sixty-six percent (33) of the executives stated that they spent less than 1% of their agency budget on lobbying. Ten percent (5) of the executives stated that they could not name a figure for the amount of resources spent lobbying. Six percent (3) of the executives stated that they did not spend any agency resources lobbying. One subject each reported amounts of 1%, 2%, 28%, and 30%. Two executives reported figures of 5% and 10%.

Legislative Committees

Table 10 summarizes several of the organizational characteristics perceived to influence the lobbying activity of the executives. Eighty-eight percent of the directors indicated that their organization did not have a legislative or political action committee. The twelve percent of executives reporting legislative committees had several names for

Table 10
Characteristics of the Organizations

Characteristics	% of Respondents
Single Provider of Service	60
Membership in National Associations	60
Membership in State Associations	48
Participation in Local coalitions	44
Lobbying Included in Executive's Job Description	40
Board Very Supportive of Lobbying	40
Legislative or Political Action Committee of the Board	8
Frequent Board Participation in Lobbying	2

them including public presence, advocacy, and government liaison. The committees were described as being event driven in their lobbying activity (e.g., responding to a pending vote on a specific piece of legislation or an announcement of a pending cutback in funding for a specific type of service) so that the organizations lobbied in a reactive rather than a proactive mode. Further, the organizations that did have legislative or political action committees lacked specific plans to insure their effective use. Rather, the committee members were used to write letters or make phone calls in response to events as

they surfaced. In some cases, the committee members were friends with policy makers, employees of policy makers, or policy makers themselves. These conditions were more often described by the Ingham County executives. In some cases the executives indicated that their by-laws required them to be apolitical.

Local Coalitions

Fifty-four percent of the executives indicated that they belonged to a local coalition that lobbied. The executives reported being involved in both formal and informal coalitions. In some cases, these coalitions were groups of representatives of nonprofit organizations that had a common client population, such as the homeless or pregnant teenagers, and the coalition focused on lobbying for the particular population. In other cases, the coalitions were described as being multiservice and/or multiclient oriented but, organized around a specific policy or pending legislation.

Five of the executives stated specifically that they believe the time spent in coalitions was counterproductive to meeting their mission. These directors also described their overall level of lobbying as very low or non-existent. Several of the directors reported membership in the local chamber of commerce and labeled this as a local coalition that lobbied. Executives in each county reported being a member of an informal coalition of organizations that shared a common funding source, such as Community Mental Health or the Department of Social Services. The purpose of these coalitions was to work more effectively as purchase of service contractors. Meetings were often held to review and interpret regulations and contractual relationships with these funders. Some of the

coalitions were formed to address needs in a specific geographical area such as a neighborhood or a development district.

Lobbying and Job Descriptions

Forty percent of the directors indicated that the concept of lobbying appeared in some form in their job description although rarely was the word itself used. Executives offered words and phrases from job descriptions that conveyed the expectation that they would have strong and effective relationships with policy makers. The words advocacy and public education often appeared, as did government liaison. One subject commented that *"it's not in the written job description, but it certainly is in the practical job description."* Another subject had this to offer; *"Lobbying itself? No, it's called advocacy, it really means the same thing"*. Another respondents offered this, *"It's called advocacy, I think many people have shied away from the use of the term lobbying, It's gotten such stigma attached to it."* Other terms were mentioned as alternatives to lobbying such as collaboration, community education, coordination, and identifying issues of concern. Several executives made the connection between their obligation to secure a sound financial future for the organization and their relationship with the legislature. Several directors indicated that job descriptions did not exist for their positions or they had not been reviewed in several years.

State Associations

Forty-eight percent of the executives indicated that they deferred at least some of

their lobbying to a state association. Fifty-four percent indicated that a state association had asked their agency to lobby. Fifty-two percent indicated that they would still belong to the state association even if it did not lobby.

National Associations

Sixty percent of the executives indicated that they deferred at least some of their lobbying to a national association. Fifty-eight percent of the directors also stated that the national association had requested their agencies to engage in lobbying. Sixty-two percent indicated that they would still belong to the national association even if it did not engage in lobbying.

Importance of Lobbying to Executives and Boards

Directors were asked how important lobbying was to them in comparison to other activities, how supportive their board was of lobbying, and how much lobbying the board members participated in. The executives were asked to use a five point scale. The actual ratings indicate that lobbying is ranked low by the executives in comparison to other responsibilities they hold as executive directors of nonprofit organizations (Table 11).

The directors shared the opinion that the importance of lobbying is a very time sensitive consideration. Most executives believe that when there is an issue that is immediately pending in the realm of policy making at the local, state or federal level, and that issue directly affects their agencies, then they place a high value on lobbying. Executives report the perception that their boards view lobbying as somewhat more important than

Table 11

Comparison of Board and Executives Ratings of Lobbying, N = 50

Executives Ratings		
Not important		40%
Somewhat important		44%
Very Important		16%
Board Support		
Not supportive		18%
Somewhat supportive		42%
Very supportive		40%
Board Participation		
Never Lobby		68%
Occasionally lobby		30%
Frequently lobby		2%

most of the executives do. While boards are generally supportive of executive director lobbying, the board members themselves were described as having minimal participation in lobbying overall.

Lobbying Practices

Introduction

During the interviews, 50 executive directors were asked to report on both grass-roots and direct lobbying practices. They were asked about their lobbying efforts as well as those that involved others, either as companions or intermediaries. Several types of face-to-face visits with policy makers at the federal, state, and local level were assessed.

The interviews also focused on telephone calls and writing letters to policy makers, and group or committee meetings with policy makers. In addition, the executives were asked about their use of letters to the editor and public opinion columns. The use of television and radio was also examined. Table 12 shows the executives' use of all of these lobbying techniques. This section discusses the executives' reported practices in detail. In each case, executives are quoted to add meaning to the quantitative data. Some information has been deleted from the quotations to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.

Executives' Visits to Policy Makers Alone

Thirty-two of the directors indicated they visit policy makers alone to lobby. Table 13 shows the executives' estimate of the number of times they visited policy makers during the twelve months prior to the interview. State elected policy makers were the most often visited (16) followed by local elected (11), local non elected (10), and state nonelected (9), with federal policy makers receiving the fewest numbers of visits (4, 1). No executives reported visiting all levels of policy makers.

Funding issues were the most frequently mentioned topic of discussion during these visits. Funding was identified as a topic of discussion fourteen times. When discussing funding, lobbying for an increase was mentioned ten times, lobbying against a decrease was mentioned once, and lobbying for the purpose of maintaining the current level was mentioned three times. Maintaining funding was discussed in terms of avoiding cuts or restoring funding to levels that had previously existed before cuts had been made by the State administration. Some comments offered by the executives about lobbying

Table 12

Executives' Use of Selected Lobbying Techniques, N=50

Techniques	% of Respondents Reporting Use	
	Direct Lobbying	Grassroots Lobbying
Visiting policy makers alone	64	na
Asking Others to visit policy makers	na	48
Telephone calls to policy makers	60	na
Asking Others to telephone policy makers	na	44
Community group or committee	58	na
Writing letters	60	na
Asking Others to write letters	na	46
Visiting policy makers with others	54	na
Special events	36	5
Newspaper	20	16
Television	14	2
Radio	8	6

Table 13

Visits by Executives Alone to Policy Makers in the Past 12 Months, N=32

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	1	12	3	16
Local elected	3	6	2	11
Local nonelected	2	4	4	10
State nonelected	1	7	1	9
Federal elected	2	2	0	4
Federal nonelected	1	0	0	1
All levels	0	0	0	0

regarding funding follow.

It's almost always funding issues, maintaining what we've got. Recently, it has been around the budget bill- trying to get some language into the budget bill, mandating DSS to negotiate a per diem rather than just setting a rate. So, it was in the budget bill but not specifically regarding the amount of money, it was a matter of process, I guess you would say. We have lobbied to insure that funding for our (name of program) program was in fact in the (state department) budget. So, we focus on the dollars and the processes and that happened to be in the budget bill.

Medicaid waiver..... major funding issue for us, being designated as the recipient of the waiver. The waiver had already been approved, it was available in the state, the issue was who was going to get it in the state. It was critical.

Yes, two issues, senate bill (bill number), legislation that would have added (amount) dollars to the (type of fee) fee and that money would have gone to (name of state board) and then back to us. It didn't make it through. There was bipartisan support, but people were very hesitant to support what appeared to be a tax.

We typically talk about funding, fighting against the decreases at the local level. There was a threat about having all of our funding eliminated and I talked with them several times about that.

Field of service regulations were the topic of discussion eight times and regulations applying to all nonprofit organizations were only mentioned four times. Examples of regulatory issues are the interpretation of Department of Social Services (DSS) or Department of Mental Health (DMH) regulations. Some executives' comments about regulations follow.

Child support issues. We serve on the (name of board) council with a local policy maker. We frequently talk about ways in which we can work together on some of the issues affecting the courts and our clients

Yes - (administrative office), it's either an issue of funding or program definition - regulatory issues. We have regular meetings at least every two weeks. The (administrative office) engages in close observation of our operation. They are in our face a lot. There is always a list of four or five issues, often minor, that come up at our regular meetings, I'd say every couple of months or so there is a more significant issue that has to do with the level of funding or the definition of the program.

Visits by executives alone to policy makers were described as being for educational purposes nine times. Advocacy was mentioned as the purpose of the visit eleven times. The executives' comments that illustrate their advocacy and/or educational focus follow.

Yes, state level - we talk about how good we are and how cost effective we are. Most people just assume that we provide basic care to (type of client) and we let them know that we do a lot of high tech stuff for people of all ages so we offset some lobbying that has been done by the folks in the (type of client) network to provide a balanced story. It's a lot of educational stuff.

The last big thing that we were involved with was the elimination of the general assistance program. I even talked with the governor and said, Hey! this is crazy, these people are unemployable! Mostly advocacy issues like that.

It was an attempt to advocate not only for our funding but to educate the legislators (state elected) about (type of client), the needs and problems. The other issue that I spent some time with this past year was trying to raise the level of awareness about sexual harassment - we worked with the legal council for the state house in the development of a (type of civil offense) policy that would pertain to the legislators themselves. We made some headway - but lets just say it's gotten nowhere fast. There were individual and group meetings with legislators and the legal counsel for the House.

Relationship building was reported as another reason for visiting policy makers.

Executives commented on the need to get to know policy makers personally to be effective lobbyists.

Yes, state elected, about twice in the last twelve months, it was not on a specific issue. It was more the general direction in which we are going (as an agency). It also was to insure that when something like what came down later - then they know who we are. It was relationship building.

Yes, state level, six to seven times, typically when I visit a policy maker alone it is education and get aquatinted time, this is who we are, this is what we can do for you, hand out brochures, that type of thing. We also encourage them to call us if they have questions regarding our field of service. I use these as opportunities to build relationships, provide information.

Reasons provided for not using this lobbying technique varied. For example, one executive offered that they always take a board member with them. Another stated that he/she simply did not have an opportunity to visit a policy maker in the past twelve months.

Executives' Visits to Policy Makers With Others

Slightly more than half of the directors (27) indicated they were accompanied by others during visits to policy makers to lobby. Table 14 shows the number of these visits for each level of policy maker.

Table 14

Visits by Executives With Others to Policy Makers in the Past 12 Months, $N=27$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	3	9	1	13
Local nonelected	1	3	7	11
Local elected	3	5	2	10
State nonelected	0	5	1	6
Federal elected	2	1	0	3
All levels	1	0	1	2
Federal nonelected	0	0	0	0

State elected policy makers were the most frequently visited (13) by executives accompanied by others. Local nonelected (11) and elected (10) policy makers were the second and third most frequently visited policy makers by executives accompanied by others.

In response to a follow-up question about who these "others" were, coalitions of professionals from other organizations were mentioned twelve times, board members were mentioned five times, and board members along with professional employees of the organization were mentioned three times. Board members and coalitions of professionals from other organizations were mentioned three times. One executive stated that employees from his/her own organization accompanied him when lobbying. Another executive

stated that he/she was accompanied by professionals from the organization and coalitions.

Some relevant comments offered by the executives include:

Primarily other directors of agencies that receive (name of funding source) funding - primarily at the local level, about every two months. But also sometimes at the state level with elected officials. Periodically, we... a group of agency directors including non-(name of funding source) funded agency directors will meet with a group of legislators to discuss policy issues, once or twice per year.

About 40 visits - with program directors of this agency and other agencies, clients - being youth and parents - Issues vary depending on who I am talking to. One had to do with boilerplate language in the state contracts and maintaining that. Another issue was cuts on the federal level.

Yes, with other agencies doing similar things on the other side of town. We formed a coalition to address (type of client) needs.

Yes - with board members or other (type of nonprofit) managers - coalitions, federal visits once per year (regarding funding source). About once per month, I guess for the last year we have really focused on maintaining funding.

When agency staff accompanied the executive to lobby they were typically program directors who could speak to the magnitude of a particular human service need and the importance of government assistance to fund programs to meet the needs. For example: "Yes, other employees - we have been expanding the (name of program) program - they are new programs so I would take staff members from those programs to talk about which ever program it was and the issue."

There was disagreement among the executives about taking clients, and or client family members with them when visiting policy makers to lobby. Two of the executives spoke in favor of taking clients when lobbying, as these comments illustrate:

We have asked others to testify for us as well as before the city and before the state. We do that. From time to time I have testified before the city commission and a couple times at the state level. They have hearings here locally, and I will

make presentations, and ask others to do that as well. And generally we will ask clients, staff, and board members. *But that is very effective if you can get a client to go.*

Usually it's parents, same issues as above. About ten percent of the time I would take a parent with me - about once very two months.

One executive took a different point of view regarding clients assisting with lobbying, stating: "Yes, board and staff - *never consumers or clients* - mostly local-level bureaucrats - that's almost a monthly activity. Funding issues are what we deal with mostly." The different points of view are based on the executive's perception of the usefulness of the client's presence. Clients can offer success stories highlighting the effectiveness of the nonprofit organization's programs and services. Parents and family members can also play a role in lobbying by providing a compelling and personalized case for support, putting a face on the numbers documenting the unmet need for services or underserved populations. In some cases, clients lack the expressive language and conceptual skill to be effective lobbyists or their presence was not feasible due to age, physical or mental status, or other conditions, therefore executives would not take clients with them when visiting policy makers.

Visits by executives with others cover much of the same issues as visits by executives alone, but are also unique opportunities to present a common position as a class or group of service providers. One executive said:

We are in constant contact with bureaucrats at the county level and there it gets well beyond funding issues and has much more to do with regulations about services and general provision of service issues. And we tend to do this as a group. It is part of the culture of the county that we would first get together as service providers and then approach the county together.

Funding was mentioned fifteen times when discussing visits to policy makers with others.

If we are talking about us losing ten thousand bucks a year then I will do that. If we are talking about general impact in the community, then it is of less importance for me to do that.

With state legislators - education issues and to bring funding (for services) into the state prisons and to earmark monies for our services.

The second most frequently mentioned topic following funding is field of service regulations, mentioned ten times. Directors also referred to these as contract issues, boilerplate language, and other guidelines. Some of the executives' comments on these issues are provided below:

At state level conferences we sometimes meet with state legislators to discuss issues. We also have a legislative luncheon that is a coalition of other professionals. The most recent issue was access to records in the state central registry.

Yes, other members of the federation, mostly state, about three times. Mostly in regard to administrative rules, contract language, rates of reimbursement, that sort of thing.

Lobbying efforts of executives are often described as advocacy. For this lobbying technique of visiting policy makers with others, advocacy was mentioned ten times. For example:

It's more of an advocacy approach and very often it comes down to service issues or the way the funds are allocated. A lot of times we are representing the people that we serve and making sure that (name of funder) is getting that perspective in their thinking and planning.

We may not meet on a specific piece of legislation every time, it more often than not is on a general policy direction, there could be some legislative action coming out of it, more often it is on critical directions. For example, when we meet with state legislators about general assistance for example we are not working with them on a specific piece of legislation we are simply suggesting the introduction

of some kind of legislation or some direction.Although we have also looked at how administrative rules are applied, we are more often advocating for a specific policy direction.

Visits regarding general nonprofit regulations were mentioned once and visits regarding educational purposes were mentioned twice. Two executives stated that they did not visit policy makers because they were relatively new to the position. However, both planned to lobby and take a board member with them. Another stated that he/she had not personally used this technique but understood that it was widely used by peers.

Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers Without the Executive

Twenty-four of the executives stated that they had asked others to visit policy makers without the executive being present. Examples of the types of individuals who executives might ask include staff, board members, and occasionally family and clients. Table 15 shows the number of executives reporting these visits for each level of policy maker.

Ten executives reported their representatives discussing funding issues and ten executives reported their representatives discussed regulatory issues during these visits. Nine discussed field of service regulations and one discussed general nonprofit organization regulations. Ten described these efforts as advocacy and six executives described these efforts as education. Some relevant executives' comments are:

Yes, staff from the agencies we serve - about once in the past year regarding the congressional (type of social problem) legislation - state issues were things like general assistance. Most of the time it's providing background and a position on pending legislation on (type of social problem) issues, letting them know what our position is.

Table 15

Executives Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers Without the Executive, $N = 24$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
Local elected	4	4	3	11
State elected	4	4	3	11
Federal elected	1	2	0	3
Local nonelected	0	1	2	3
State nonelected	0	3	0	3
Federal nonelected	0	0	0	0
All levels	1	0	1	2

Yes, state elected and nonelected - with (visits by) our board members, all having to do with rate increases and generally trying to educate them about what we do.

Executives felt comfortable using this technique when they could send individuals to lobby who are well versed in the field of service issues. For example, in a large agency, a program director may be asked to testify regarding a particular program element. Similarly, a senior clinician may be sent to advocate on behalf of the agency's clients. Executives most often asked professionals to lobby in their absence. Eleven executives reported that they asked professionals from their own organization, one accompanied by a board member. Four executives asked board members. Three asked professionals from other organizations that were associated with the interviewed executive's organization

in some form of coalition. Some comments on these decisions follow.

Yes, based on information we have received from our national association, if I think it is an issue that is pertinent. I might direct it to one of our specialists that is on staff. We have a (name of service) program where I was just thinking of some legislation that was recently passed where (type of professional) can provide (type of service) in the home. So that would have been an issue that would have been passed on to the appropriate manager in that area. This would have been state level elected officials.

Actually - authorizing the (name of federal agency) - one of our board members went to testify in support. We asked board members at almost every meeting to contact a legislator. We do a lot of work on maintaining funding and support for the (name of field of service).

Only two executives mentioned asking clients or family members of clients to lobby without them being present. Their opinions are provided below.

We have certainly urged family members to go, in fact, some of them did show up at public hearings and I have personallyespecially dealing with waiting lists. We, as professionals are expected to ask (the legislature for more money) I mean because after all it's my job and all of that.... when families give that personal perspective..... and that doesn't happen with any degree of regularity ... but when ever I get a chance to talk with families I do encourage that.

We try to get a lot of client involvement - mostly at the state level - issues are possibility of cuts - reinforcing the fact that services are valuable and effective - some parents and youth will go talk to legislators and explain how the program worked for them, more of an educational approach.

One executive shared an interesting perspective with his opinion about the culture of the community and lobbying by nonprofit organizations.

There is another piece to this. In West Michigan we have this ethic that we can probably do the job ourselves. And we will do the job and we are a little shy to ask for more resources to do the job with. We just kind of sit back and figure that the state will give us what we need and we really haven't been very vocal in our lobbying and our advocacy for ourselves.

We kind of think, well, we will just do a good job and the state will split the pie evenly and we are not going to worry about it. It's more of a mind set, we don't want to go, and we are not going to go to Lansing and Washington to fight

for what is ours. It is just a sense, a mind set, a group think, that we can handle our problems ourselves. And then when the problems begin to get out of control... I guess it takes something serious, maybe hitting us over the head before we think, "Hey, maybe there is more equity that we should look for." Other parts of the state are by far more active and effective lobbyists on behalf of their communities. I would say we have not been good lobbyist on behalf of our communities. We are very modest.

Participation in Community Group Meetings With Policy Makers

Twenty-nine of the executive directors interviewed indicated that they lobby as participants in group or committee meetings with policy makers in their community. Table 16 shows the number of executives reporting various frequencies of meetings with each level of policy maker. Lobbying in community groups was most frequently mentioned as occurring with state elected policy makers (16) and local elected policy makers (14). Federal elected policy makers and local nonelected policy makers were tied for the third most frequently mentioned policy makers with which meetings were held by community groups.

While similar to the interview item on belonging to local coalitions that lobby, this question asked specifically about participation in such group activities. These groups or committees were described sixteen times as being composed of coalitions of professionals from other organizations in the community and three times as professionals from the executives' organization. Board members along with coalitions were identified four times. Employee professionals together with coalitions were mentioned twice as were board members together with employee professionals. Some specific comments follow to illustrate the variety of group compositions mentioned.

Table 16

**Executives' Participation in Community Group Meetings
With Policy Makers , N=29**

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	2	12	2	16
Local elected	4	6	4	14
Federal elected	1	6	0	7
Local nonelected	3	2	2	7
State nonelected	0	2	1	3
Federal nonelected	0	0	0	0
All levels	0	0	0	0

Yes, it was like a town hall meeting with a federal elected official. There were all types of people there - our board members and other coalitions.

A typical thing might be the United Way sponsoring a legislative breakfast and there you might have agency directors and board presidents. These are mostly with state officials.

With directors of other agencies providing the same type of service. Every year we have a legislative luncheon, usually at a local church basement and ask state legislators to come and talk with us. Some meetings we have monthly, it depends. In one program we have legislators come in a couple times a year to talk about issues (field of service).

Yes, we do it twice a year and our board and staff meet with state elected officials for breakfast. We talk about issues that are of concern to programs in the agency. That tends not to be so much dollar issues as programmatic issues - regulations, etc.

Funding emerged as a dominant topic of conversation at these meetings as did

regulations relating to the specific services and general nonprofit regulations. Funding was mentioned twelve times, field of service regulations were mentioned six times, general nonprofit organization regulations were mentioned six times also. Some illustrative comments follow.

We have met with people at DSS. They invited all of us who provide this service to get together to decide what would be the best way to spend the money. So I guess we influenced their decision on how to spend the money. They also met with a coalition of board members separate from the directors for the same purpose.

A lot of the time the meetings with the state legislators are about the state budget and how that impacts on health and human service agencies. For example, the administration's decision to eliminate the general assistance program.

Lobbying efforts were also described as education five times and as advocacy nine times.

We meet about six times per year with the nonelected types who control the distribution of funds, I don't call that lobbying, I call it educating or something like that. Some of this occurs rather informally. For example, DSS was looking at cut-backs about a year ago, and four or five agencies providing direct care got together and met with DSS. That occurs not as often as it needs to in terms of together. They (DSS) would prefer to have people to talk to individually rather than to have a group to meet with them,..... strength in numbers.

Most of the coalitions are meeting monthly and are organized around a specific issue. I do most of my lobbying through boards and commissions. I am on the (name of commission) for the city of (name of city), so that reports to the city council. That's the way I do most of my lobbying rather than direct interventions. It is a thread that weaves through everything that I do. We call it advocacy basically. I don't see any difference between lobbying and advocacy.

State elected and nonelected officials were mentioned in connection with lobbying that addressed field of service regulations for the executives' agency.

I have been to meetings sponsored by groups like (name of advocacy coalition) where Debbie Stabenow might be there or Lyn Johndal (state elected officials)

talking about issues that are pertinent to the population. They are typically service, or lack of service issues.

Yes, we have met with some groups to lobby about what I would call the social contract - mostly in addressing the issues of child care and welfare reform. Recently we met with members of the state DSS and other departments - the bureaucrats.

Yes, coalitions of professionals from other organizations. about quarterly - mostly nonelected officials. The issue was about a particular piece of family support legislation. We were trying to broaden the scope of people who could be served under the legislation.

Several executives identified task forces and advisory boards as a type of community group that also engaged in lobbying activity. Some executives reported being on more than one advisory board or task force and that they would use these as opportunities to interact with policy makers and to lobby.

Yes - other agencies, like community mental health, have a legislative breakfast every year and I go to that. The (name of regional government office) - I sit on the advisory board there and they often have legislators come in to talk about issues. I sit on the (name of service) board and we have a number of legislators on that board and we talk about (type of service) issues. Mostly we tend to meet with state elected officials on these issues.

Only one executive identified the timing of community group meetings as being related to elections. One executive described participation in these groups as more for networking with other service providers than for lobbying.

Twenty-one of the executives indicated that they did not participate in community group meetings with policy makers. For some executives their reasons for not doing so were consistent with their rationale for not engaging in other lobbying practices. They either did not see lobbying as a legitimate activity for their organization because of their organization's mission and values, or their budget did not include any public tax dollars

and they saw no connection with policy makers for their organization. One executive expressed a different perspective in terms of the perceived futility of lobbying efforts because of the state budget deficit. This executive's comments are provided below to illustrate the point of view of powerlessness he felt in lobbying endeavors.

The environment at the state level has not been good for the last several years. One could ask the question, "what is to be gained by even trying? The answer is always that we don't have any money." So, in that sense we wouldn't call a group meeting say with agency directors, if we feel like we are wasting our time. And in a lot of ways recently we are. So our meetings are less frequent because of the financial condition of the state. Right now we are planning a legislative breakfast and we have not had one in a couple of years because money has been so poor. We want to talk about distribution and policy issues so we don't get bogged down in "Well, we just don't have any more money" because after that, what's the point, and that has been the theme for the past several years.

Executives Writing Letters to Policy Makers

Thirty directors stated they write individually composed letters to policy makers. Table 17 shows the number of times executives reported writing letters to each level of policy maker.

Executives wrote letters to elected officials more often than they wrote to non-elected officials. State elected officials were the most frequently written to, followed by federal elected officials and local elected officials. When asked what they had written letters about, these thirty executives reported writing letters about funding fourteen times. Similarly, they reported writing letters about field of service regulations nine times and regulations affecting nonprofit organizations in general five times. Letters were described as educational three times and for advocacy six times.

Table 17

Executives Writing Letters to Policy Makers, $N = 30$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	6	6	9	21
Federal elected	3	9	3	15
Local elected	2	3	3	8
Local nonelected	1	1	2	4
State nonelected	0	0	2	2
Federal nonelected	1	0	0	1
All levels	1	0	0	1

Letters concerning funding addressed both new legislation and renewal of existing legislation. Letters were written with regard to funding specific programs and services at both the state and federal level. Letters addressed proposed cuts in funding as well as advocated for increased funding. The comments of the executives provided below serve to further describe the issues addressed and the use of letter writing as a lobbying technique.

On the state level it's almost always having to do with money. On the federal level, letters typically address more broader policy issues.

Yes, local state and federal levels - several times - on the national level (name of service) was the issue. On the state level it has been in the area mostly revolving around cuts, or in trying to encourage state funding. On the local level it has been primarily encouraging the implementation of (name of federal legislation).

On the federal level we talked about a specific piece of legislation that would have required an additional appropriation - the (name of federal legislation). Mostly funding increases for a specific program. There were a couple of letters that I wrote at the state level advocating for increased funding through the (name of state department). Also for increased funding for a (type of service recipient) program.

Yes, I would say at least every two weeks and sometimes more frequently a letter goes out - state and federal level but probably more geared toward state though. Funding is an issue, protection at the federal level.

Yes, primarily federal elected officials probably once or twice per year, usually about cuts in services, budget cuts and when the law (name of federal legislation) comes up for renewal every three years to let people know that we are still out here and the services are valuable and needed.

Letters about field of service regulations are also written by executives. The type of regulations varied, although some of the regulations also were ultimately concerned with funding issues because they had to do with regulations affecting reimbursement for a specific type of service. An example of this is the executive who wrote about Medicare payments for psychologists. Another executive addressed the issue of access to records of a state agency by a local nonprofit. These records were viewed by the executive as essential to providing the agency services.

Executives also reported invitations to respond in writing to pending legislation by a state or federal government office. These opportunities are consistent with the definition of lobbying found in P. A. 94-455, however executives would typically describe these as advocacy or education opportunities. One executive commented that they were increasingly using a fax machine to send letters to policy makers. Some relevant comments follow.

That is primarily over regulations - the "review and comment" thing is very

common over Medicaid and the Department of Social Services. And that happens with some frequency. I am responding to something at least once per month. There are probably between three hundred and fifteen hundred individuals state-wide who receive this "opportunity to respond" depending on the administrative rule in question. It's a fairly common activity.

Yes, federal mostly, about four times. One had to do with President Clinton's health care plan including (type of service) services. One had to do with the (federal legislation). One had to do with postage for nonprofit mailings, I wrote about that. One of my board members asked me if I would write a letter about the (type of service) issues.

Executives revealed that these are also situations where they are likely to be asked by a state or national association to write a letter on a specific issue. Some comments follow to illustrate these situations:

Yes, all three - local, state and federal. For example on tax credits we will get sample letters from our national association and I won't have time to make phone calls and all these sorts of things. So I'll take the letter and touch it up, make it a little more local and send it out. At the local level it is a little more personalized. Typically, written letters often go to elected officials rather than nonelected, probably on an average of once per month.

Yes state and federal elected. If somebody asks me to I will, or I have talked to a state legislator who then asks for something in writing on our letterhead. On the federal level it's primarily the national organization asking us to write something in response to a legislative alert they send out.

In some cases the letters written by executives dealt with issues that apply widely to nonprofit organizations. Two specific issues were identified, nonprofit postal rates and tax credits. These are also issues concerned with operating capital for nonprofit organizations. Having access to reduced mailing rates for nonprofits reduces operating costs and the cost of fundraising campaigns. Similarly, the availability of tax deductions for donating to a nonprofit is an important issue for private philanthropists. Some comments follow.

Yes - when the issue of bulk mail rates comes up we always write letters. Also about re-authorizing the (name of federal legislation).

Yes, federal elected - NPO regulations. I have lobbied by signing my name to letters that are frequently composed by somebody else and then put on my letterhead. In the last year I have probably sent out one per quarter. It was an issue around the tax legislation and how that applies to charities - whether or not we were going to eliminate the three percent that applies to charitable deductions.

Executives offered several reasons for not writing letters to policy makers as a lobbying technique, all of which were concerns about the effectiveness of the letters versus other types of lobbying. A preference for personal modes of lobbying such as face-to-face meetings or telephone calls was identified. Some relevant comments follow:

Having been a fund-raiser, I would personally always prefer to go see them, the face-to-face is the most effective. Next would come phone calls and then letters. I only use letters when distance is a problem. Letters get thrown in the basket. On the phone, they can put me on hold or have someone tell me they are not in, but face-to-face they have to take a stand one way or the other. Based on my fundraising background this appears to be the way things work.

I have not done any letters in the last twelve months, I have threatened to but I haven't had to carry it out. I rarely send letters. Maybe on things where I have not been able to be persuasive in conversations and now it's time to send out a little more formal putting people on notice that we have an interest and concern about this. We are willing to put it down on paper and expect some action on it. And that's the reason that I rarely have to use it.... I mean if you have ongoing relationships with people...I think that's the technique (face-to-face) I prefer because I find it much more successful.

I most generally do not write letters. I am not one who would advocate strongly for writing letters. It is not personal enough. I enjoy the approach where a group gets together in a positive environment and presents not only what they think the issue is or the problem but also some resolution. In fact in our area our legislators are so knowledgeable that they don't need to be approached about how an issue is going to effect us, they know that. They have heard things enough. What they are looking for is "OK hey, help me, tell me what is feasible" and that is kind of more where we get involved.

Other comments from executives about the weaknesses of letters as a lobbying

techniques include being limited in space and therefore not being able to make a case in its entirety, not being able to provide context, seeing letters as too formal, and often misinterpreted as too adversarial.

Executives Asking Others to Write Letters to Policy Makers

Twenty-three directors stated they write individually composed letters to policy makers. Table 18 shows the number of times executives reported asking others to write letters to each level of policy maker.

Executives asked others to write letters to state elected officials 15 times. Federal elected officials were the second most frequently mentioned (9 times) and local elected

Table 18

Executives Asking Others to Write Letters to Policy Makers, $N = 23$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	3	8	4	15
Federal elected	5	3	1	9
Local elected	2	2	3	7
State nonelected	0	0	3	3
Federal nonelected	0	0	3	3
Local nonelected	0	0	0	0
All levels	0	0	0	0

officials were the third most frequently mentioned officials (7 times) that executives would ask others to write to. In response to a follow - up question about who these "others" were, coalitions of professionals from other organizations were mentioned six times, board members along with coalitions was mentioned four times, and clients and their family members were mentioned four times. Professionals employed by the executive's organization were mentioned three times as were board members and employee professional together.

The status, or "clout" of the individuals asked to write letters was mentioned several times. Some specific examples follow:

I ask citizens who have clout, business owners, and/or people who pay a lot of taxes or have some other kind of influence that I can perceive.

My board members were very active in giving legitimacy to the effort, the whole range. My board members' names get attention, especially when you are talking major employers in the area." (e.g., board members are well known, highly ranked employees of major companies in the community) and this service (health care).

Now, the community feels strongly about this - we have a petition going now, we have written various state legislators. The community has really rallied behind this. I have talked to three people just this week who have written letters. That may not sound like much but in our community - and this is not a slight on our community by any means - we don't have a lot of powerful people in government circles or whatever - but those who do have some position in town will write letters or whatever and be very supportive.

For some executives the power and influence of the letter writer was perceived to be important to the impact the letters might have, and that influenced who the executives sought to write letters. Others favored an approach that would yield many letters.

Some comments follow:

Last fall I wrote a sample letter and enclosed it in our newsletter, and asked

people to send them (sic) to state legislators. The newsletter goes to all the people who donate money or time to us. They become members, plus some organizations that we have a relationship with and we think that they should know what we are doing. There were ten or eleven bills pending relating to our field of service and the letter was in support of these bills.

Yes, we use our newsletter - it goes out to five thousand people - we put information in there - in the last one we asked people to write to federal legislators.

The agencies we serve - we are sort of the hub of a wheel that includes seven hundred and sixty agencies, churches and rescue missions, etc. all of whom do not have any sort of information link with Lansing or Washington. So, one of the roles we can play is just the dissemination of information. There is legislation up before congress to eliminate the government commodities that are now coming through. We tell them - you care - you should write to... etc.

The use of an indirect approaches to generating letters to policy makers was also mentioned by executives. For example:

We informed some of the people we subcontract with about potential changes in the rules and although we did not tell them specifically to lobby we did highlight the implications of the pending changes for them, and they were significant, so it amounted to the same thing.

I don't tend to ask anybody directly! At that time I informed my board that this was an issue and if they felt like it, (writing a letter) they might want to. I mean, I don't directly ask people, I just make suggestions. That's my style. It was more informing them about the situation and that they might choose to do something about it.

Yes, I have done that and it was a very tenuous sort of thing to do. I had to approach it in a very general type of way and I had to make sure that certain people that I know would not be offended by my asking. I am supposed to be apolitical. I cannot express my views one way or the other when our support is supposed to be coming from all sides.

In comments describing widespread and indirect appeals to write policy makers, the act of asking is implied by providing information about a troublesome situation that merits attention. There are subtle messages along the lines of "writing a letter is the

correct and responsible thing to do, if you truly care about the population being served."

It is a less directive approach that may have evolved out of the executives' perception of the permissibility of nonprofit lobbying. Discussed in more detail in later sections is the related finding that twenty- two of the executives were not aware of the P.A. 94-455, also known as the lobby law. Similarly fourteen of the executives expressed concern that lobbying would put their status as a nonprofit organization in jeopardy.

Executives who spoke more of directly asking others identified these others as groups and individuals professionally tied to the organization, either as coalitions of services providers, staff, or board members. Some additional comments concerning who executives ask to write letters follow:

Yes, about quarterly, members of our coalition groups and things like that. Most of the groups that we have asked to send letters have been related to local questions. We have asked board members to send letters but not very often, though.

Yes, I will ask staff to write to state and federal level (policy makers) about any issue that I would also write.

Parents and clients were also mentioned as people who were asked to write letters to policy makers to lobby. Executives made these comments about asking parents and clients to write:

Directors and former clients and parents of people involved in programs. Letters go mostly to federal elected officials although we have done it on occasion to state people, but not in the last twelve months. Issues are usually cuts in services

We lobby a lot on training issues. There are not a lot of people to provide services to our clients. Parents really have to become involved. Change just doesn't happen by itself. I try to give them the analogy that we didn't get (type of service) until people became vocal, until there was a critical mass of people.

Usually people who have been served by our organization. Mostly it has been the

state level, on an average of three or four times per year. The issues are housing, transportation, health care, etc.

Funding was mentioned ten times. Funding as reported so far is consistently described as the dominate topic in lobbying efforts. Field of service regulations were mentioned ten times, and advocacy was mentioned six times in discussing asking others to write letters. Education was not mentioned in regard to letter writing. As mentioned in earlier discussions, executives believe that the sustained contact of face-to-face meetings, individually, or with others is necessary to educate policy makers about services. Issues that nonprofit organizations address, particularly social policy issues are complex and the limited space afforded by a letter does not serve educational purposes well.

Executives Telephoning Policy Makers

Thirty of the directors interviewed indicated that they telephone policy makers to lobby. Table 19 shows the number of executives reporting various frequencies of telephoning each level of policy maker.

State elected officials were the most frequently mentioned (19 times). Local elected officials were the second most frequently mentioned (11 times). State nonelected officials were the third most frequently mentioned policy makers (eight times) that executives would telephone to lobby. In response to a follow-up question about the topic of the telephone conversations, executives identified funding thirteen times, field of service regulations eleven times, and general nonprofit organization regulations three times. Executives mentioned education five times and advocacy eleven times as a topic of phone

Table 19

Executives Telephoning Policy Makers, $N = 30$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	4	4	10	19
Local elected	1	3	7	11
State nonelected	0	0	8	8
Local nonelected	1	0	6	7
Federal elected	3	2	1	6
Federal nonelected	1	0	0	1
All levels	0	0	0	0

calls to policy makers. Some illustrative comments on these topics follow:

Usually funding, but sometimes regulations. We recently called a state legislator to see if we could get a quicker response getting one of our programs qualified for some state funding. It helped to speed up the process.

I have talked to the person who wrote the bill that created the funding for our program. When I think of lobbying I think of trying to get someone to vote on a bill, to take a position that you want them to take. So, it's not like I'm after new support, but I guess it is lobbying. When this legislation was created it had a three year sunset provision - so, recently I was talking with him about getting it re-authorized. When I talked with him it was more along the lines of asking what we need to do to have the legislators satisfied with us. We were really interested in maintaining the funding and some changes in the wording of the legislation.

The executives interviewed offered explanations of what factors influence them to call, write, or visit policy makers and also when they would combine various techniques. Some of the factors identified include timeliness of the policy decision or issue,

the complexity of the issue, and the level of personal relationship between the executive and the policy maker. Several quotations provided below illustrate these points. The first quotation is lengthy, but is included in its entirety because it is representative of opinions widely shared among directors.

The decision whether to make a personal contact, write, or call is based on how much bang I am getting for my buck. If I thought that my discussion with a federal elected official was going to make a significant difference on how they voted on something, I probably would make a personal visit. Like, for example, the (type of tax credit), that is critical to our organization for some of the development that we do. But at the federal level, there is not any federal official elected from this area that makes a critical difference, no key tax committees. So, when we get requests to write letters and make phone calls and all this, typically the best I can do is write a letter. Because I know that in this situation, my phone call or letter is not going to make that much of a difference.

On the other hand, on state issues, I have personal relationships with some of the state legislators, and I know that by calling them and talking with them, because I have worked on their campaigns or because I have been involved with them, I know that I will have an influence.. So when I have a personal relationship with a legislator in any way, if I know I've got influence, then that would help me to make a decision as to my approach. If I know I am going to have a significant influence, then I will make that personal contact. The same thing is true at the local level. I am far more likely to make the effort or phone call at the local level. At the state level, it is legislators that I have a personal relationship, or administrators or whatever. At the federal level it is not very often because I don't have that.

Yes, state legislators and a lot of times with their aides. On the federal level it always seems to be their aides. Mostly following up on letters that I wrote. The other issue I think is the comfort level - the personal relationship issues - how familiar am I with that bureaucrat or legislator. If it is someone that I know or that I have had prior interactions with I am more inclined to pick up the phone or try to meet with them face-to-face. If it's some faceless person in Washington, I am probably much more inclined to send a letter.

Yes, sometimes - to state and local. I call people I know personally. I write a lot, more than I do call, in particularly to this advocacy business. It's important for people to see on paper what I am trying to convey. I mean, I don't necessarily know all these people personally so writing seems a bit more appropriate than calling.

Clearly, one factor that influences executives to call, write, or visit is the level of personal relationship that exists between the executive and the policy maker. It seems that the closer the personal relationship with the policy maker the more likely the executives are to call. If there is no close personal relationship they are more likely to use other methods. Executives identified additional considerations as they responded to this particularly interview item on telephoning policy makers to lobby. One of the considerations for executives in choosing to telephone policy makers to lobby is the timing of the issue.

Lead time is real important. If something is happening tomorrow, or in the next couple of days, I would be more inclined to pick up the phone and make a call so that I could insure that my voice would be timely, as opposed to writing a letter or even trying to arrange a face-to-face visit.

The timeliness and the criticalness of the issue influences whether I will call or write. Do I need to get to them right away? What can I fit in my schedule? I think the other dictating factor is whether I think the legislator that I am going to contact is supportive of my position or not supportive of my position. If they are supportive it might be simply a telephone call - saying, "don't forget us," that kind of thing. On the other hand if I am not sure where they are at, or if I think they are not supportive, I'd be more likely to call and ask if I can come up and talk to somebody.

There are times when executives will use telephone calls as a follow-up to letter writing. There are several reasons offered by executives for using this combined approach. One reason is the complexity of the matter being lobbied. Complexity is important to consider in terms of providing sufficient detail to provide a compelling case. Another reason is the desire to provide an official position on record with agency stationary. Letters are more formal than telephone calls and at times are used to convey a message of support by large numbers of people.

I like to write a letter because I feel when I do it on letterhead I am the

spokesperson for the entire organization, I am speaking for our full membership and it is more official looking. So, because of my position, I like to write a letter to get that across.

Mostly the federal level - for educational purposes and advocacy. It depends how much one is at risk. The more the risk the more I am likely to make the contact myself or ask somebody else. If a lot of money is at risk I will make the contact myself. Another factor is the amount of peer pressure I get. I like to use a variety of approaches, but I like writing the best - I think it's the most effective. Even when I make a presentation I like to leave something in writing for them to consider later. I use the phone where I am sure that they understand the issues because of the amount of traffic that there is, especially if it is a national issue. Or, if it's a last minute thing, I will call. But otherwise I think it gets confusing for them to get a lot of calls.

Nineteen executives stated that they did not call policy makers on the telephone to lobby. Among the reasons provided are; the uncertainty about how the message is being received on the other end by the policy maker, a preference for face-to-face contact, the difficulty of reaching policy makers via telephone, a desire to be respectful of policy maker's time, and that a telephone call is not sufficient to be able to articulate a position. For example:

I have an aversion to that ...I much prefer to write or have personal contact. It's because of how I react. You never know if you are really being listened to or if the person on the other end is looking for a way to get out of it as politely as possible. But if I write I have an opportunity to really articulate my position, I know that at least there is a chance that I have got an audience if the person is at least interested in it. Phone, to me, it's just a matter (of legislators saying) ..."well that's one for or one against". It is different if the legislators call me because at least I know there is interest there and you are dealing with a specific issue, be that a bill or a family issue. You never know what is going on at the other end of the phone.

That's not successful, I don't do much of that, for a couple reasons. I think that any time a policy maker picks up the telephone they think that it is a waste of time. If you are not here in person - it is difficult - difficult to get your message through if you are not there in person. Do you know what I am saying? Because the phone, I think, is just not as effective anymore as it used to be. I don't want

to waste their time. I would rather get fifteen minutes of their time, schedule it, and be respectful of it. In some ways I think the telephone is kind of an intrusion when you think about it. It's there, it rings, but you don't have any control unless you just don't answer it or shut it off. So that any kind of contact needs to be very specific.

Executives Asking Others to Telephone Policy Makers

Table 20 shows the number of executives reporting various frequencies of asking others to telephone policy makers at each level.

State elected officials were mentioned thirteen times. Local elected officials were mentioned seven times. State nonelected officials were the third most frequently mentioned policy makers (5 times) that executives would ask other to telephone to lobby.

Table 20

Executives Asking Others to Telephone Policy Makers, $N = 22$

Level of policy maker	once	2-5 times	6 or more	Row total
State elected	3	6	4	13
Local elected	2	3	2	7
State nonelected	1	1	3	5
Federal elected	1	1	0	2
Local nonelected	1	0	1	2
Federal nonelected	0	0	0	0
All levels	0	1	1	2

In response to a follow - up question about who these "others" were, coalitions of professionals from other organizations were mentioned five times, board members and employee professional together were mentioned three times. Board members and coalitions of other organizations were also mentioned three times. Board members alone were mentioned twice and professionals employed by the organization alone were mentioned twice as people who have been asked by executives to telephone policy makers to lobby. Individuals other than board members, professionals, or coalitions were mentioned five times. Some specific examples of who these other were include clients, nonprofit housing developers, and other legislators. Relevant comments follow:

Sometimes I ask people on my staff to call, It depends on whether they know the individuals involved and have a working relationship. If nobody knows them, then I will make the call. Or, I would go along to make a visit, or we would see who among us would be the best person to make the call.

I have asked board members to make calls and I have also asked other agencies who make referrals to us to lobby on our behalf - at the local level - perhaps five or six times.

Yes, in the sense of providing our agencies with information about what is happening in the legislature - we suggest that they contact the policy makers but give them a choice of calling or writing - I don't care which they do.

In response to a follow-up question about the topic of these telephone conversations, funding was identified eight times, field of service regulations was identified seven times, and general nonprofit organization regulations was identified three times. Executives mentioned education once and advocacy six times as a topic of phone calls to policy makers. As with other lobbying techniques, timing was identified as a factor in executives decisions to ask others to make telephone calls. Comments on these topics

follow:

Yes, usually at a strategic point in the budget process, the closer to a vote the more likely we are to call, and what you try to do is get many calls, personal calls. We have made phone calls during hearings on budget cuts, mostly to the state level.

Early on we were making face-to-face visits to provide education and background on the issue. When it looked like it was going to be stalled we started making phone calls. We made a couple of phone calls to our reps to say, Hey! could you go see about this, we heard something was wrong (in the process). We wanted to make sure it kept going.

In determining whether to write or call time is the major factor, the immediacy of the issue. I am part of a rapid response network where I will get issue statements and then be asked to call or write. This comes out of Lansing, our association at the state level, and is specific to our field of service. A very large part of what they do is lobbying.

Twenty-seven executives stated that they had not asked others to telephone to lobby. Again, as with previously discussed lobbying techniques, executives expressed a preference for face-to-face ways of lobbying rather than through the use of the telephone. One executive framed the choice not to ask others as a trust and effectiveness issue. The following quote illustrates this point.

No, I don't trust other people to say what I can say as well as I can say it. I don't delegate much lobbying at all. It is a combination of knowledge and technique. I am a believer that advocacy is more effective if it is non-adversarial. And many people in our movement tend toward adversarial relationships. And I think you have to speak softly and carry a big stick and I like having them out there (the militants) and I can always say sort of, I'm the good cop - bad cop sort of thing... lets come up with a solution to this because otherwise you are going to have people chained to your door. And that tends to be quite persuasive, but I would never have the people who want to chain themselves to the door do my lobbying for me.

Executives' Use of Newspapers to Lobby and Asking Others to Use Newspapers to Lobby

Only ten executives reported using newspapers to lobby, forty did not. Among those who use this technique it is seven reported using it less than four times per year. Funding, regulations, education, and advocacy were mentioned nearly equally with the use of this lobbying technique. Only eight of the executives indicated that they had asked others to personally use the newspapers to lobby. These others were board members and professionals of the executives organization.

Executives' Use of Radio and Television to Lobby and Asking Others to Use Radio and Television to Lobby

Four directors reported using radio to lobby and seven reported using television to lobby. Among those executives who do use these two media to lobby, most indicate that they use the techniques less than twice per year. With this technique executives most often talked about their efforts as being general education of the public about their services or the population served, or advocacy. Very few of the directors have asked others to use either radio (8) or television (1) to lobby. Among those who do, the use of these two media to lobby is infrequent, less than twice per year.

Executives Sponsoring Special Events at the Capitol and Asking Others to Sponsor Special Events at the Capitol

Eighteen of the executives reported sponsoring something special at the capitol. Only one of the executives indicated that they had asked others to sponsor special events

reported that they sponsored events at state capitol whereas four directors reported they sponsored events at the federal level. These events were described as focusing on a range of issues affecting large groups such as homelessness, hunger, and health care, and were specifically described as education and advocacy efforts.

Executives Reporting No Lobbying

Several of the executives were skeptical about their ability to contribute to the research at the onset of the interviews because they believed that either they did not lobby at all or did very little lobbying. Following some discussion of the actual lobby laws and a closer examination of their organizations and behavior, most were able to understand lobbying in the broader context of P.A. 94-455. Indeed, 90% of the directors reported that they engaged in one or more lobbying practices covered in the interview.

There were five executive directors who stated at the outset of the interview that they believed that they did not engage in lobbying at all and indeed actually did not. Two of them were employed by different local chapters of the same nation-wide organization, one in Kent and one in Ingham county. Both of these executives stated that their organizational charter required them to remain apolitical. During the interview each of these executives did indeed verify that they had not engaged in lobbying during the past twelve months.

Two other executive directors who reported that they did not engage in lobbying had a different reason for abstaining. These organizations were strongly connected by their mission and financial support to a religious institution. They both identified lobbying

as outside the mission of their organization and not a requirement of their specific role as executive director. The fifth subject of this group did not identify barriers to lobbying in terms of organizational mission, values, or personal beliefs. Rather, this person described other impediments to lobbying. The factors that this executive director identified as barriers to lobbying were simply the small size of the agency requiring the director to work long and hard hours. The director's lack of information about how to lobby combined with a lack of confidence were also factors.

Are executive directors of nonprofit organizations aware of the more liberal definitions of lobbying activity allowable under the 1990 IRS regulations? Table 21 indicates the level of awareness indicated by the executives.

Among the executives, there is a low level of awareness of a very important law affecting nonprofits. Eighty-eight percent (44) of the executives reported having limited or no awareness of the law, and 12 percent (6) reported having a working knowledge of the law.

Table 21

Awareness of the Lobby Law, $N = 50$

Awareness Level	% executives
No Awareness	44
Limited Awareness	44
Working Knowledge	12

Value Conflicts in Lobbying

Background

Lobbying by executive directors of nonprofit organizations may lead to conflicts between an individual executive's personal values and actions that are perceived to be in the best interest of the organization. It is also possible that some values of the nonprofit organization may be in conflict with some of the prevailing values of the community in which it operates, for example, the pro-choice position of Planned Parenthood verses the pro-life position of some community groups.

Opportunities for conflict may also arise from differences in beliefs about the role government should play in regulating and funding nonprofit organizations. Another potential area for value conflicts in lobbying is the selective use of information about program operations, client needs, and policy impacts. Thus, value conflicts related to lobbying behavior are important to consider.

In Kent county the prevailing political party is republican. Consequently, those individuals who choose to volunteer their time or donate their money to nonprofit organizations are more likely to be republican than democratic. At the time of this research a newly elected republican governor of the state was attempting to make major cuts in funding to social service agencies. The General Assistance program providing aide to unemployed individuals had been recently eliminated. The effect of these cuts was to increase the demand for service provided by nonprofit organizations represented by many of the executives in this research. These factors placed executive directors of nonprofit

organizations in sensitive positions if they chose to advocate against the cuts in social programs and in favor of their clients, because this advocacy had the potential to alienate community philanthropists, board members, and other organizational stakeholders important to the continued success of the agency. Thus, the executive's experience with potential value conflicts of this type was identified as important to understanding their opinions and lobbying practices on behalf of their organization.

The executives were asked to respond to several questions concerning their exposure to the potential for these value conflicts to occur. Clearly, these are sensitive issues, and in some cases could have been interpreted by the directors as asking them if they had behaved improperly. For that reason, these items were asked at the end of the interviews after a rapport had been established with the executives. The executives were reassured of confidentiality at this point. Table 22 summarizes the directors experience with these value conflicts. The questions that appear in the interview guide used in this part of the research and a discussion of the director's responses to each is provided below.

For the purposes of this report the term "action principles" is used to describe the general guidelines and implications for nonprofit lobbying practice derived from the responses and the underlying principles provided by those who were interviewed. The action principles are identified and reported along with the findings in this section to help the reader make the connection between the findings of the interviews and their implication for nonprofit lobbying practice.

Table 22
Value Conflicts in Lobbying

Value Conflicts	% of Executives
Supporting the official position of the organization when it was significantly different from your personal beliefs.	16
Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of local government.	22
Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of the federal government.	24
Concern that lobbying will put the organizations' nonprofit status in jeopardy.	28
Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of state government.	30
Over-estimating the need for your services and/or programs in the course of advocating for decisions favorable to your organization.	30
Not revealing all you know about a particular issue in the course of advocating for decisions favorable to your organization.	40

Supporting the Official Position of the Organization That Is Different From the Executive's Personal Beliefs

Eight executives indicated that they had experienced a conflict of values with supporting the official position of the organization when it was different from their personal beliefs. Several topics were identified by the executives in discussing these

situations.

Four of the eight executives who reported that they had experienced some conflict mentioned abortion as an area of conflict. Abortion was described as an issue that polarizes communities and individuals, and as a result, could quite possibly jeopardize philanthropic support for a nonprofit organization. Another issue that was identified as a value conflict was privacy rights or access to state records about employees or prospective employees of the organization. It was a very important issue for those providing direct services to vulnerable populations. Directors who did experience this value conflict as well as those who did not report that the boards of these nonprofit agencies typically take conservative positions. Three executives stated that when faced with the conflict they would abdicate their position as spokesperson for the agency. One stated that, "I cannot envision myself going out and advocating for something I don't believe in." Three executives stated that they coped with the conflict by keeping quiet and acquiescing to the official position of the organization. So, that while the conflict between personal and official organizational positions was felt or experienced it was not acted on, or articulated publicly.

One of the reasons provided for not acting was to avoid jeopardizing the agency or the clients. One can also assume that they did not wish to jeopardize their jobs, however this was not stated by any of the executives as an explicit rationale for keeping quiet about a disagreement on agency policy. The following experience reported by one director reveals the essence of the dilemma.

Phew, yes! In this particular instance I got in trouble because I was quoted in the

newspaper. You see they all (the media) started calling about the government. It was a great quote. I can't even remember it now, but one of our republican board members called another republican board member and said "What the hell is (the executive) doing? (the executive) can't be quoted like this in the newspaper?!" So then the second guy calls me - he is a friend of mine - president of the board actually - He said "even if what you said is true - you can't say it". So I have learned to just keep my mouth shut, because when people look at me, when I speak, they can't separate me personally from the position of the organization.

Forty-two of the directors indicated that they had not experienced this type of value conflict. The most frequent explanation provided for this experience was the close fit between the values of the organization and the values of the executive director. One person somewhat jokingly stated that it was she who ran the organization, therefore there was no difference between the position of the organization and her personal beliefs. Two executives indicated that they had not experienced this conflict in their current position, but had in other jobs. Two indicated that they could see the potential for this particular value conflict to arise.

Five directors indicated that the issue did not arise because the organization was essentially apolitical, either by choice on an issue by issue basis, or by a condition of their charter, by-laws, or other formal policy decision of the board. Another director stated that they believed that diplomacy was essential in avoiding conflict over value differences, thereby acknowledging the existence of differences but striving to avoid conflicts by dealing with them. One subject was fairly representative of the group in stating the following:

I think directors have to be very careful in their own mind about what they do. In the eyes of the people you do continue to have a job that is twenty-four hours per day so you really can't be an activist in ways that you want to be if it is going to fall back on the organization in ways that might do it harm. And that is something that I have thought a lot about in term of political positions or supporting different candidates of political parties in the community. You can choose to do that

but you put your organization at a risk.

The action principle that appears to be operating here is that directors should be careful to protect the agency from real or potential harm when they make their positions known to the public. The other point that executives did not describe, but their comments refer to is that executives will experience less stress in the job if their values are closely aligned with the values of the organization.

The most frequently mentioned area for differences in personal beliefs and the official position of the organization was in regard to how agency boards positioned themselves with respect to the policies of current executive branch of state government. The executives reported specific differences with their boards, or influential board members, and the positions the board took regarding the Governor's elimination of the General Assistance Program. This action was often mentioned even though it occurred outside the time frame required by the question (within the past twelve months). As a group, the directors were strongly opposed to this specific action by the Governor, as they were routinely opposed to cuts in any health or human service program. Those directors representing arts organizations also identified this as a value conflict they experienced.

The Risk of Alienating Supporters of the Organization by Taking a Position for, or Against, a Policy of the Government

Eleven executives indicated that they had experienced this value conflict with a policy of local government. Fifteen executives indicated that they had experienced this value conflict with a policy of state government, and twelve stated that they had experi-

enced this value conflict with a policy of federal government. The comment below provides an example of the risk at the local level.

Also we get funding from the very groups that we lobby and that is where the biggest difficulty comes from. I do think that on the local level there is some impact. I was cut about five thousand dollars last year from the city of (name of city deleted to protect confidentiality). And I do think that is in part because of some advocacy that I did on behalf of (deleted to protect confidentiality).

The topics that emerged regarding government policies were: abortion, gay rights, family leave, and cutting the general assistance program. Two somewhat different comments on the general assistance issue are provided below to illustrate the range of opinions offered by those interviewed.

I think that on the general assistance question we were openly hostile to the Governor and the budget director for the way they handled the elimination of the general assistance program. I know it presented some real conflicts for some of my board members, probably two thirds of whom are republican. But, they were very supportive because they understood.... I mean republicans don't agree on everything, as democrats don't either.

There are certainly some of our donors and board members who would like to see general assistance go. But, the official position of the agency, on behalf of our clients, was that we did not support those cuts. I assume that some of the people who were supportive of the cuts were miffed or unhappy, but I don't know that it really created a big problem for us.

Executives described the need to be tactful, maintain a sense of balance on the issues and use discretion in addressing these types of value conflicts. Another strategy used to deal with this sensitive aspect of lobbying is to focus on the service recipients rather than partisan politics. One subject described this as "keeping focused on the social agenda." Several executives described taking this type of risk as part of his responsibility as the leader of an advocacy organization.

Yes, we take the risk, but to me though the risk of being "do nothing" is much worse. I'd rather be known for something even if you do not agree with it than to not be known for anything. I'd rather people know that we were doing something than to be just this mousy little organization sitting over here. And there are people who love the fact that we do a (type of service) program, but God forbid we should try to change the systems that create that whole environment to begin with. And I don't have a lot of patience for those people.

Others described a slightly different approach, seeing their role as more pragmatic.

These individuals talked about the careful selection and use of specific words and phrases that would be less likely to create controversy and still communicate a particular message or position. Similarly, some of those interviewed stressed the importance of behaving diplomatically. The following are some of the thoughts expressed by the executives on these issues:

You have to pick your battles and that was not one to go to war over.

I don't have a problem with ethics questions, it's not that I don't have any ethics it's just that I think that I am a very pragmatic person and look at solving problems.

I don't think that it's going to be helpful to bash any elected official. You have to be real careful about whether we agree or not personally or professionally, but I talk about these cuts that are being made and this is how it affects the people. So you depersonalize it with policy makers and personalize it with recipients of service. So, I take the risk but soften it by focusing on the service aspect rather than on the politics.

The action principle suggested here is that an executive should avoid doing open battle with elected officials. One way to avoid these battles is to focus on the social agenda or the needs of specific populations served by the agency. There were a variety of specific comments offered by those directors who indicated that they did not risk alienating supporters of the organization by taking a position regarding government policies.

Again, one of the explanations offered for not experiencing these types of situations was that the organization is apolitical or chooses not to take a position on sensitive executives.

This council has not taken a position on any issue, and there are plenty out there - corporal punishment, abortion, etc. We are pretty noncommittal.

We only get vocal on issues directly related to our agency and presumably our supporters would also support that action.

It has not happened I am glad to say, primarily because the organization does not take many official positions on issues that do not effect its funding directly. Fortunately, from time to time being obscure is a benefit.

No, we sidestep all the land mines. There are some organizations who go out of their way to take a stand on issues like that. It doesn't do them any good. They think that it does, but in the long run it probably does not serve any useful purpose for their agency.

The action principle suggested by these comments is that nonprofit boards and executives should only take positions on issues directly related to the mission and then only in cases where there are clear benefits that outweigh any potential harm to the organization. Three executives said that although they had not experienced this type of conflict in their present position within the time periods covered by the research, they saw a clear potential for these conflicts to occur. Some insights were offered by the executives regarding the characteristics of the community they operated in that they felt were unique and had an effect on their lobbying. The remarks below were offered by two different executives from Ingham County:

We can take a position and not worry too much because the loss of one particular supporter or faction is not going to hurt us that much. We have a broad base of support in the community. Maybe the reason is that the case here in Lansing is we don't have the few strong families with a lot of money to worry about like you do

over in Grand Rapids (Kent County). We don't have those same identified power brokers here that I need to worry about. We don't have a lot of high rollers that I worry about.

Yes there is a risk there but I think that what you have to look at doing is not focusing on the budget cuts but on the service.....But when go out and talk to agencies, I have to be real careful, I mean this is Lansing!!! If I were in Detroit it would be different, Detroit hates the Governor.

Conversely, a Kent County subject commented that,

If I go for a policy issue to lobby for or against something and it made the papers and the donors were upset or something about it, that's not something that I would know about, I would not get the feedback. I get concerned about angering state elected officials but, I think in all, it tends to be state bureaucrats that I could be more worried about, and who have been angry with me and I believe it has had some impact. They have control over proposal review and things that are my livelihood and our survival, so I have some concerns.

Executives acknowledge a concern about jeopardizing their funding support through alienating policy makers by the positions they took. Some of their comments are illuminating.

When it comes to individuals making donations we certainly are cognizant of how things might be perceived, and we walk on a thin line in some areas, but it has not arisen as much with these groups and individuals as it has with the government types.

Our national organization took a very strong pro-choice position and our board for a long time sat on the fence and did not take a position. And four years ago I went to our board and said we cannot do this, we cannot be an organization that exist for the empowerment of our clients and not take a position and they (the board) agreed. Now, we have not been as strong as we could and I have had a funder pull out of our organization.

Another issue that entered the conversation was that the risks far exceed the benefit in terms of the personal career of the executive. One of them described the issue in these terms.

No, I don't take the risk. and some of that is self-interest rather than risking the organization. And I am not apologizing for it is the reality - you have to make choices - and I have seen people really not make that much of a difference in a cause that they believe in (abortion, women's rights) but have very much done some harm to themselves and their career in the process, because they did not see the importance of drawing that line - especially women, I don't know why but I just feel that way. Even in the choice of political parties - I am a moderate republican - however I don't go around telling people that because of the majority of the people I work with are democrats. And the majority of the policy makers are democrats - so I take a much lower profile on political issues in general.

I think it's helped me to stay apolitical as far as party affiliation. I personally do not belong or have I ever belonged to any political party. People assume that I am a democrat however. But I have never belonged to any party. In fact, I have supported financially more republicans than I have democrats. It is not necessarily because any republicans are "righter" than the democrats, it's just that I am in a republican district. I tend to be a real pragmatist about all that stuff. You know, where am I going to get the biggest bang for my buck. I live in a republican district and therefore I will be actively involved with republican legislators. In spite of the fact that I don't agree with everyone.

These comments by executives seem to suggest an action principle of taking care not to align oneself too closely on a personal level, if at all, with any particular issue or group. The choice of how and when to lobby appears to have deep career effectiveness implications and is not without values conflicts that require careful and deliberate analysis prior to taking action one way or another.

Not Revealing All You Know About a Particular Issue in the Course of Advocating for a Decision Favorable to Your Organization

Twenty executives, nearly half of those interviewed, indicated that they had experienced this in the last twelve months before the interview. The directors who did not report this experience stated that they did not engage in anything but full disclosure of information. Comparatively, the opposite view expressed by those interviewed is that this

is a widespread practice.

Several recurring themes emerged in the discussion of this issue. First among the themes is the belief that the selective use of information is a standard lobbying technique. One example of the selective or strategic use of information is the practice of putting the best foot forward or portraying the agency and its clients and services in the best possible light. Five executives referred to the practice of putting the best foot forward and not discussing the less appealing aspects of their circumstances. For example:

We try to promote the needs of all our clients and use the most appealing one as representatives rather than focusing on the needs of some of the least socially desirable clients. Some times we dress up the results that we achieve. Again when you are lobbying you always want to talk best case scenario and how you are making significant impacts on all the clients you are serving.

Yes take general assistance for example. Some of the guys who are on general assistance should be cut off immediately. I mean they are on general assistance because they are lazy assholes basically. Some of them are! (instead) You talk about the guy who lost his assistance and lost his eligibility for blood pressure medicine and had a stroke and that sort of thing. You use information that is effectively going to create a public opinion, a public awareness.

Four executives talked about not revealing alternative approaches to meeting a particular need, either when asking for additional funds are talking about the impact of other policy decisions. For example:

The alternative of cutting us a lot as opposed to cutting someone else a lot is very unattractive to us. My job is to make this alternative as unattractive as possible to the funding source. That's lobbying, that's what I do. I need to let them know what the consequences of the cuts will be and put some affect into it and show some outrage, use all the persuasive tools that I have. So yeah, obviously I am not revealing all I know and I am not telling them even about all the internal alternatives. I can do somethings that are not as painful as an alternative. I do not wish to do that and so I make it sound as impossible as possible. I want to make that alternative sound as devastating and disruptive as I can. And that is probably exaggerating, and those pose internal ethical dilemmas too.

I have lobbied for funding knowing that there were probably alternative sources available if the particular source I was talking to did not come through, but I didn't let on. Similarly, if it appears that I am going to get cut. I have to have alternative plans but I am not going to tell them that, and I don't tell them that, even if it is a shuffle or juggling money from another source. But usually I have an idea what to do if I don't get the funding I ask for. But no, I am not totally honest! These are not intimate loving relationships! And it works both ways, and I won't slam people if I don't have to.

The position that it is acceptable to selectively use information, or not disclose some information is accompanied by the belief that but it is never acceptable to commit an outright lie. Four executives stated specifically that they never lie. The executives were very adamant about that point. A sample of the executives' comments on this point follows:

If some one asked me directly a question on a particular issue, I'm not going to lie to them though. I mean, I will not lie, but, you know I'm not going to necessarily share everything I know about a particular circumstance.

There have been times when I have not told the whole story but there have not been times where anyone can say that I have misrepresented or that I have lied.

I have long ago decided that If I had to make it in this businessto manipulate people and numbers..... I can't last.... I can't live that way...and I never want to be in a position where my conscience would not bother me if I did do it.

The image of lobbying as a game was invoked by two of the executives in response to this item. Similarly, several executives conveyed the belief that the practice was widespread and frequently engaged in by their peers. Some supportive comments include:

That's just the way you play the game, and you don't learn that in school, that's what you learn on the job.

All the time, there is a lot of conflict. I believe that everyone goes through this. On the one hand you are really working for the good of the community, but on

the other hand we have gotten into the selfish mode of taking care of our own.

I think that it is done everywhere. I mean I won't hold back information that I think is real critical, but I'm not going to help the other side win either.

The action principle suggested by these comments is that an executive should strive to be truthful but there are also advantages to the selective use of information. Another way of looking at it is that there is no moral imperative to reveal information that will hurt your organization if no one is asking specifically for that information. Another principle suggested here is that the executive is first and foremost an advocate for the organization that he/she works for.

Two directors who acknowledge experiencing this value conflict referred to the difficulty of finding useful, reliable and valid information as a reason for not revealing all that they know in the course of lobbying. Two other executives who did not experience this value conflict reported that good data were available for their particular service. Data can be used or omitted depending on the situation. One of the concerns expressed is that, in some cases, individuals not familiar with the intricacies of the service issue may not understand information that is presented to them. For example:

There are times when this happens, because most of the issues we deal with are human development, people kinds of issues. First of all even when we have sound research on these issues the general public doesn't believe in or abide by the research anyway, and in a lot of cases even policy makers don't abide by it. People mostly take their own attitudes, I mean this one of my biggest frustrations in life. I mean knowledge is nothing! People don't care what's known, it's like...don't confuse me with the facts! And so sometimes we don't confuse them with the facts because it's not going to make any difference as a strategy.

Some directors reported that they did not engage in this practice because the high demand for their services made it helpful to provide all the data necessary. Others believe

that their particular services had such wide public support that they would not have to face this type of dilemma. Only a few executives revealed that not revealing all they know when lobbying had resulted in problems for them in the past and as a result they avoided it.

Executives were reluctant to describe past problems in detail but did generally indicate that a single act is likely to lead to others and overall, it is better to keep everything above board. Directors talked about the complexity of funding issues influencing their decisions to keep certain information in the forefront and not refer to other information. Again the action principle of focusing on the needs of clients through telling compelling stories of individuals rather than taking other approaches is recommended. We have seen this approach recommended as an alternative to bashing public officials and again, here it is mentioned as an alternative to the use of data that may be unavailable or inadequate. Taken together these viewpoints of the directors suggests the action principle that the innocuous omission of information is an acceptable perhaps even necessary part of lobbying.

Overestimating the Need for Your Services and/or Programs in the Course of Advocating for Decision Favorable to Your Organization

Fifteen of the executives, approximately one third of those interviewed, indicated that they had experienced this type of value conflict. There was a great deal of similarity in the directors responses to this item and their comments about the practice of not revealing all they know about a particular situation in the course of lobbying. Similar

themes emerged in the discussion of this issue: (a) difficulty in obtaining good data; (b) the belief that the practice is widespread and shared; (c) the game metaphor; and (d) the notion that it is acceptable, perhaps necessary to exaggerate or overestimate needs, but it is never acceptable to commit an outright lie. Each of these points are discussed in more detail on the following pages and comments from the executives are provided to illustrate them.

Poor data, or the problem of obtaining accurate data was again a trend identified by executives in conversations about estimates. Eight of the directors who said that they had overestimated needs and two who said that they had not overestimated needs talked about the problem of obtaining good solid data to use in their lobbying efforts. Some comments to illustrate the point follow.

I worry about that. I am using data from a state wide needs assessment done by a really reliable source in 1991 - so it's recent and all that. But, I don't feel comfortable with the numbers because they are not actual numbers. They are projections based on a mathematical formula. So, when I use those I feel nervous about that. It's tough to get solid data - nobody has it.

It is very hard to get statistics on the population we serve so this is a difficult question to answer. Historically, we have made projections without a real good foundation.

Getting accurate data is always a problem - the census bureau data is hopelessly inadequate. What you wind up doing is presenting the data that you are comfortable with and then discussing general trends, local trends, this is what we have seen - and based on that we know what the population is out there that is not being served.

Four of the directors who said that they had overestimated needs and one who said that they had not overestimated stated that they believed that the practice is widespread and shared among their peers. For example:

Yes, everybody knows that. Everybody knows that everybody is exaggerating.

It could be over or underestimating, but that is very typical of human services.

We always tie the budget to what we think we can provide, but in terms of other organizations that I belong to, it is done all the time.

Similar to the previously discussed interview item on the value conflict of not revealing all that is known, executives drew the distinction between estimates and outright lies. Again executives affirmed the belief that while estimates and exaggerations are acceptable, outright lies are not. For example:

It happens all the time, and it has to, but you never lie. Lies get out, exaggerations are understood. You never even have to back off of an exaggeration, someone just has to prove you're wrong and make an arbitrary decision anyway.

To specifically say that we distort data no, that we lie - no, people are going to find you out. But, there is a fine line between that and giving a charismatic story, a message that people will like. Lets put it this way - you put the data in the most favorable light. You never really lie.

Exaggerations, yes - I have certainly expanded on the truth. I do my best to have hard numbers, but when you don't have hard numbers..... there have been times when I make it appear to be worse than it is, because I know that there is not enough of a safety net. I justify it as a safety net because it always ends up being worse.

As with previous discussions of lobbying practices, particularly the interview item regarding not revealing all that is known, The game metaphor for lobbying was mentioned. Two comments by those executives who report that they have overestimated needs allude to this approach as being outside of their control. One comment provided by an executive who has not overestimated needs also illustrates the use of a game metaphor.

Always, but only because that is the way the game is played.

We do this all the time with (deleted). It is part of the game. You know that they are only going to give you so much so you go a certain percentage above what you think you will get, knowing that you will never get all you ask for. It is unfortunate that the system is set up that way. We all know it, and everybody does it. We also bump up the figures because the (deleted) deducts certain administrative costs so you tack on that percentage. It's all a numbers game.

I would not participate in that. Once again, If I am going to value a relationship with somebody I don't expect them to play games with me and I don't play games with them.

A few of the executives described feelings of actual conflicts and the experience of an ethical dilemma during the discussion of this issue. This in some way contrasts with the perception that these practices are part of the "game" and other executives' beliefs that overestimating the need for services during the course of lobbying is widespread.

Some comments are provided below:

I don't do that kind of gray stuff because it makes me uncomfortable.

I am real careful. I am real nervous about having solid numbers. ..and I am real careful because I think those things can come back to haunt you. But there have been times when I have a little stomach ache about reporting something and wondering if that was the most accurate data.

It is also helpful to examine some of the comments offered by individuals who responded negatively to this question in comparison to those who believed that overestimating the need was a wide spread practice. Five of the executives interviewed said that they did not need to overestimate because the needs for their particular services are well documented. Two others described the practice as unwise and a short term approach. Executives also discussed the element of risk involved in overestimating needs. A sample of comments from those directors who report that they do not engage in this practice are provided below:

We don't do that - that is very short term thinking - that is a stupid approach. We use census data whenever we need data for prevalence. We use anecdotal things, success stories, that kind of thing and our own data which deals with levels of success with various clients that receive our services.

I stick to the facts because then I don't have to remember who I said what to. I mean that's my story and I'm sticking to it.

I know the importance of being able to justify and being able to verify the factual information. It's not worth it, the risk, at least I don't believe so, other people may.

We don't have to overestimate because we have a documented waiting list with lots of families on it. We don't have to do that.

Another type of overestimating was discussed by the executives that was not specifically asked about in the interview protocol guide, that of overestimating service outcomes. The practice of overestimating the ability of the organization to have an impact on the need was another way that directors described trying to put their best foot forward, as illustrated in the following comments.

I think we all kind of stretch our case - like when we apply to the state (deleted) department for re-upping our grant we try to paint our picture in the best light that we can.

It is very difficult to get data - to say you are overestimating when the data is so soft - I can't imagine that. But, I could see us overestimating the possibility of us making an impact given the fact that there are very complex problems and all of that - to impact on the need - which is also part of the game.

In this arena it is not overestimating the need as much as over estimating the success rate. So, in our reports it sounds like every program is going great guns. But I know that it is not the way it really is. We probably overestimate our successes somewhat, not so much in number but in quality.

These comments suggest that reasonable estimates are acceptable in lobbying practices. However, what is a reasonable estimate is open to interpretation. While

discussing these concerns, executives also recognized their responsibility to improve the ways and means of identifying, collecting and reporting the kinds of data desired by for lobbying purposes, and they discussed ongoing efforts to do so. The comments of the executive suggest the action principle of using the available data that one is comfortable with, even if it is not exactly what is desired for the purposes at hand. This, along with anecdotal local information, is helpful to make the best possible case for support of the organization.

Jeopardizing the Nonprofit Status of the Organization

Fourteen executives indicated that they felt some concern or risk of jeopardizing the status of their nonprofit organization because of their lobbying efforts. In comparison, over half of the fifty directors interviewed engaged in the lobbying practices of visiting policy makers, writing letters, telephoning policy makers, and lobbying in committees. Some themes emerged in the discussion of the risks to nonprofit status associated with lobbying. Five of the executives indicated a sense of the right or obligation of nonprofit executives to lobby. Of these five, three reported that they were concerned about the nonprofit status of their organization and two reported that they were not. One of executives described lobbying or advocacy in terms of a moral duty as part of serving their clients.

It is a moral duty. The people we serve do not have the luxury of being able to be involved in the political process, they are too busy trying to keep a roof over their heads and food on the table. It is our duty to do it for them as long as we are doing it correctly and truly voicing their concerns.

It seems like if people support a nonprofit and support its mission it should be

able to do whatever it wants to do to impact that laws that govern the people.

I don't see it as jeopardizing. I think we are within the law. Sure, if they followed me around there are a lot of things that they could identify as lobbying that I consider to be part of my job in keeping this agency afloat, staying on top of issues and funding, that's it.

Seven of the executives reported that they did not believe they were at risk of losing the nonprofit status of the organization because the amount of lobbying that was done was not sufficient to cause a risk. Their remarks follow.

Am I personally? No, because I don't think that we are going to get to the posture where we are involved in that amount of lobbying as a percentage of our total activity that a case could justifiably be made that lobbying is all we are doing.

I can't imagine not doing what I do, and when the measure is a percentage of my time it's a very small amount of the overall agency resources. I don't see where the risk is.

There were a variety of opinions expressed by the executives who believed that they were not risking their nonprofit status by lobbying. Three executives reported that they believed that any scrutiny of their activity is more likely to originate at the state than the federal level. Three executives mentioned that they used words like education and advocacy to describe their lobbying and this was a reason their nonprofit status was not in jeopardy because of their lobbying efforts. A few comments are provided to illustrate these points.

I think if we got audited we would be pretty safe. Under a literal interpretation I think most things could be taken as lobbying so I try to be pretty careful and keep it to education.

Yes, on occasion, when I read articles about organizations that have lost their status for one reason or another. I think most agencies walk very carefully around the issue. We are more likely to call it advocacy or education.

Yes, and because of that we tend to call it other things like advocacy or education, even though we are doing more of it in the past several years.

Thus, we see that there are a variety of ethical dilemmas faced by executive directors of nonprofit organizations as they pursue influencing policy makers on behalf of their organizations. One clear theme that emerged was agreement that these value conflicts are inevitable, and that there are number of ways to deal with them. Even those directors who had not experienced these value conflicts in the past twelve months indicated that they expected to experience them soon, or had experienced them in previous jobs. Thirty-four of the executives had five years or less in their current positions. As a result, several remarked that they had not experienced the value conflicts but fully expected to, believing that it was only a matter of time before similar situations would arise in their current positions.

Executive directors of nonprofit organizations are influenced in their lobbying decisions by the impact their actions may have on the support provided by a mix of stakeholders and funders. Stakeholder groups referenced by the directors during the interviews include private philanthropists and governmental sources of funding. Executives also expressed concern about how their lobbying practices would be perceived by client advocates or family members and the general population.

There is a variety of opinion about these experiences and the meaning that individuals attach to them. Some seem to enjoy the existential tension created by the experience, evoking a game metaphor of the political processes involved with leading their agency. Others take a more pragmatic approach and speak in terms of what is realistic

to expect of themselves and others as they seek to solve problems through lobbying. Still others picture themselves as untouched by the ethical choices encountered when working actively in the political process. These individuals described themselves as clear of purpose and of sufficient resolve to navigate safely around what other executives describe as the gray political areas of executive leadership in a community based nonprofit agency.

Bivariate Analysis

Major Research Questions

The overall research questions were stated as follows:

1. Do executive directors of local charitable nonprofit organizations lobby?
2. If they do engage in lobbying, what types of techniques are used? What value issues might they encounter?
3. If they do not engage in lobbying, what are the factors that influence their decision?

Questions one and two have been addressed in the discussion of the findings in the preceding section. Following an analysis of the frequency distributions of the quantitative data and the comments provided by the directors during the taped interviews, a bivariate analysis was conducted using Chi Square. Chi Square is useful in testing the level of significance attained in a cross tabulation of bivariate measures. The test begins with the assumption of no relationship between the variables in the population and deter-

mines if any of the relationship examined could have occurred by chance (Meier & Brundy, 1987). Blalock (1979) describes chi square as a general test useful for evaluating if empirically obtained frequencies differ significantly from those which we would expect under a given set of theoretical assumptions.

Chi square is often used in contingency problems through cross referencing nominal or ordinal level variables. Computing chi square involves three steps. To begin, the expected frequencies in each in the contingency table are calculated based on the assumption that the two variables being measured are unrelated in the population. Next, the chi square is computed based on the differences between the expected frequencies in each cell and the actual observed frequency in each cell. The greater the difference between the expected frequencies and the observed frequency the greater confidence one can have in inferring that there is a relationship between the two variables. The third step is to compare the computed value of chi square with a statistical table of theoretical chi square values. In so doing one can determine the degree of confidence for inferring from the sample cross tabulation that there is indeed a relationship in the general population.

Specific Research Questions

Executives responded to questions regarding personal, organizational, and environmental variables that the author assumed to be associated with lobbying by nonprofit executive directors. These questions are presented in this section along with the results of the analysis of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Where relationships are found at the .05 level they are interpreted within the context of

the comments obtained from the executives during the interviews. Quantitative support for the relationships between independent and dependent variables is provided by these statistics. Because so little is published about the association between characteristics of nonprofit organizations, and their executive directors, and lobbying activity as defined under PL 94-455, there was an interest in testing for an association between these characteristics and lobbying activity.

In this section all independent and dependent variables identified in the research questions are listed first. Those with statistically significant associations are then reported and discussed, followed by those that were not found to be significant.

1. Is there a relationship between the executive director's perception of the relative importance of lobbying and lobbying activity?
2. Is there a relationship between the inclusion of lobbying as a specific job requirement of the executive director and lobbying activity?
3. Is there a relationship between the organizational characteristic of participating in local coalitions and lobbying activity?
4. Is there a relationship between affiliation with state organizations and lobbying activity?
5. Is there a relationship between affiliation with national organizations and lobbying activity?
6. Is there a relationship between the level of board support for executive director lobbying and lobbying activity?

Is There a Relationship Between the Executive Director's Perception of the Relative Importance of Lobbying and Lobbying Activity?

A relationship was found between the executives' ratings of the relative importance of lobbying and several lobbying practices. Directors who ranked lobbying high among the many tasks they had as executive directors of nonprofit organizations were more likely to write letters [$\chi^2(4, N=50)=13.88122, p<.05$]. The same is true for asking others to write letters [$\chi^2(4, N=50)=13.17993, p<.05$] and visiting policy makers with others [$\chi^2(4, N=50)=21.2285, p<.05$] (Tables 23, 24, 25). Nineteen executives rated lobbying as very important. and 95% (18) of them visit policy makers accompanied by others, 84% (16) send letters to policy makers, and 47% (9) ask others to send letters.

Table 23

Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and
Sending Letters to Policy Makers

		Level of Importance		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Send Letters	Yes	33% (8)	85% (6)	84% (16)
	No	66% (16)	15% (1)	16% (3)
	Total	100% (24)	100% (7)	100% (19)

N=50, Chi Square = 13.88122, df= 2, p=.05

Table 24

**Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and
Asking Others to Send Letters**

		Level of Importance		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Ask Others to Send Letters	Yes	4% (1)	14% (1)	47% (9)
	No	96% (23)	86% (6)	53% (10)
	Total	100% (24)	100% (7)	100% (19)

N=50, Chi Square = 18.10305, df= 2, p=.05

Table 25

**Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and Visits
to Policy Makers With Others**

		Level of Importance		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Visits with Others	Yes	25% (6)	57% (4)	95% (18)
	No	75% (18)	43% (3)	5% (1)
	Total	100% (24)	100% (7)	100 % (19)

N=50, Chi Square = 21.22854, df= 2, p=.05

The executives' ratings of the importance of lobbying were also found to be related to two value conflicts: the risk of alienating supporters of the organization by taking a position for or against policy of state government [2 (4, N=50)=12.99083, $p<.05$], and the risk of taking a potentially controversial position on local policy issues [2 (4, N=50)= 18.01305, $p<.05$] (Tables 26 and 27). There is less of a tendency to experience these value conflicts as the ranking of the importance of lobbying decreases. Forty-eight percent (24) rated lobbying as not important. Of these, over ninety percent indicated that they did not experience these value conflicts.

Table 26

Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and
the Value Conflicts With State Policies

		Level of Importance		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Value Conflict	Yes	8% (2)	29% (2)	58% (11)
	No	92% (22)	71% (5)	42% (8)
	Total	100% (24)	100 % (7)	100% (19)

N=50, Chi Square = 12.98083, df= 2, $p=.05$

Table 27

**Executives' Perception of the Importance of Lobbying and
Value Conflicts With Local Policies**

		Level of Importance		
		Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Value Conflicts	Yes	4% (1)	15% (1)	47% (9)
	No	96% (23)	85% (6)	53% (10)
	Total	100% (24)	100% (7)	100% (19)

N=50, Chi Square = 18.10305, df= 2, p=.05

**Is There a Relationship Between the Inclusion of Lobbying
as a Specific Job Requirement of the Executive
Director and Lobbying Activity?**

Forty percent (20) of the executives indicated that lobbying was mentioned in their job description in some manner. A relationship was found between the job description variable and the lobbying practice of writing letters to policy makers [$\chi^2 (1, n=50) = 7.03125, p < .05$.] (Table 28). Of the 20 executives, eighty-five percent (17) reported writing letters to policy makers. Forty-three percent (13) of the executives who did not have lobbying in their job description also reported writing letters to policy makers.

Table 28

**Inclusion of Lobbying in the Executives' Job Description and
Writing Letters To Policy Makers**

		Lobbying In Job Description	
		Yes	No
Writing Letters	Yes	85% (17)	43% (13)
	No	15% (3)	57% (17)
	Total	100% (20)	100% (30)

N=50, Chi Square = 7.03125 with Yates correction, df=1, p=.05

**Is There a Relationship Between the Organizational Characteristic of
Participating in Local Coalitions and Lobbying Activity?**

Forty-four percent (22) of the executives indicated that their agencies participated in local coalitions to lobby. This characteristic of the organizations is related to the lobbying technique of sending letters to policy makers [$\chi^2 (1, N=50) = 9.50014, p < .05$.] (Table 29). Eighty-six percent (19) of those who participated in local coalitions sent letters to policy makers to lobby.

**Is There a Relationship Between Affiliation With State
Organizations and Lobbying Activity?**

Organizational affiliation with a state association is related to the lobbying practice

Table 29

Executives Participation in Local Coalitions and
Writing Letters to Policy Makers

		Local Coalitions	
		Yes	No
Write Letters	Yes	86%(19)	39% (11)
	No	14% (3)	61% (17)
	Total	100% (22)	100% (28)

N=50, Chi Square = 9.50014 with Yates Correction, df= 1, p=.05

of asking others to write letters to policy makers, [2 (1, N=50) = 3.86177, $p < .05$.] (Table 30). Executives who were members of state associations were more likely to ask others to write letters to policy makers than those who were not members of state associations. Sixty-three percent (15) of those who are members of state associations reported asking others to write letters to policy makers. Seventy percent (18) of those who are not members of state associations reported that they did not ask others to write letters to policy makers.

Is There a Relationship Between Affiliation With National
Organizations and Lobbying Activity?

The lobbying activity of asking others to visit policy makers was related to

Table 30

Membership in State Associations and Executives' Asking Others
to Write Letters to Policy Makers

State Association Membership			
		Yes	No
Asking others to Write Letters	Yes	63% (15)	30% (8)
	No	37% (9)	70% (18)
	Total	100% (24)	100% (26)

N=50, Chi Square = 3.86177 with Yates Correction, df= 1, p=.05

affiliation with national associations [$\chi^2 (1, N=50) = 4.52009, p < .05$.] (Table 31). Those executives whose organizations hold memberships in national associations were more likely to ask others to visit policy makers than those who did not belong to national associations. Sixty percent (30) of the executives reported membership in national associations. Of these, sixty-three percent (19) engaged in the lobbying practice of asking others to visit policy makers. Seventy-five percent (15) of those who do not belong to national associations do not ask others to visit policy makers.

Is There a Relationship Between the Level of Board Support for
Executive Director Lobbying and Lobbying Activity?

Four lobbying activities were associated with the level of board support for

Table 31

**Membership in National Associations and Executives'
Asking Others to Visit Policy Makers**

		National Association Membership	
		Yes	No
Asking Others	Yes	63% (19)	25% (5)
	No	37% (11)	75% (15)
	Total	100% (30)	100% (20)

N=50, Chi Square = 5.61231 with Yates Correction, df= 1, p=.05

lobbying. First among these is visiting policy makers alone [$\chi^2 (4, N=50) = 10.67226, p < .05$.] (Table 32). The level of board support for lobbying is reported in three categories; high, medium and low. Of these twenty nine executives who reported a high level of board support for lobbying, 79% (23) reported visiting policy makers alone. Sixty-two percent (18) reported that they visited policy makers with others [$\chi^2 (4, N=50) = 11.18551, p < .05$.] (Table 33). Seventy-six percent (22) reported telephoning policy makers to lobby [$\chi^2 (4, N=50) = 13.54461, p < .05$.] (Table 34). Finally, there was a relationship between directors sending letters to policy makers to lobby and the level of board support [$\chi^2 (4, N=50) = 10.62500, p < .05$.] (Table 35) Seventy-six percent (22) of the executives who reported a high level of board support also reported writing letters. With all of these, the stronger the board support the more likely it seems that the executives would engage in these lobbying practices.

Table 32

**Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives'
Visits to Policy Makers Alone**

		Level of Board Support		
		Low	Medium	High
Visits	Yes	35% (6)	75% (3)	79% (23)
	No	65% (11)	25% (1)	21% (6)
	Total	100% (17)	100 (4)	100% (29)

N=50, Chi Square = 10.67226, df= 2, p=.05

Table 33

**Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives' Visits
to Policy Makers With Others**

		Level of Board Support		
		Low	Medium	High
Visits	Yes	47% (8)	50% (2)	62% (18)
	No	53% (9)	50% (2)	38% (11)
	Total	100% (17)	100% (4)	100% (29)

N=50, Chi Square = 11.8551, df= 2, p=.05

Table 34

**Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives'
Telephoning Policy Makers**

		Level of Board Support		
		Low	Medium	High
Telephoning	Yes	41% (7)	50% (2)	76% (22)
	No	59% (10)	50% (2)	24% (7)
	Total	100% (17)	100% (4)	100% (29)

N=50, Chi Square = 13.54461, df= 2, p=.05

Table 35

**Board Support for Executive Lobbying and Executives'
Writing Letters to Policy Makers**

		Level of Board Support		
		Low	Medium	High
Letter Writing	Yes	29% (5)	75% (3)	76% (22)
	No	71% (12)	25% (1)	24% (7)
	Total	100% (17)	100% (4)	100% (29)

N=50, Chi Square = 10.62500, df= 2, p=.05

Ten independent variables do not have a statistically significant association with any lobbying techniques. Among these ten independent variables are: (1) age, gender, educational level, and time in position of the executive director; (2) the organization as a sole provider of service; (3) age of the organization; (4) the field of the service of the organization; (5) board member participation in lobbying; (6) the size of the organizations budget; and (7) the legislative or political action committees of the board.

Executive Directors Recommendations About Lobbying

At the close of the interview executives were asked: "Do you have any advice to offer to new executive directors of nonprofit organizations about lobbying?" Thirty-eight percent (19) of the executives did indeed have some advice to offer about lobbying. Their advice indicated a close fit between the interpersonal skills and tactics described in the literature for successful nonprofit lobbyists (Smucker, 1991). Smucker emphasizes that interpersonal relationship skills are the most essential element for successful lobbying. This opinion was widely shared by the executives participating in this research. Their comments reveal a high value placed on personal relationships with policy makers, both elected and nonelected. Common themes that emerged during the directors recommendations about lobbying translate into action principles for nonprofit lobbying. These action principles are described in the following paragraphs along with relevant quotes from the executives.

1. Develop close personal relationships with policy makers. The comments about personal relationships underscore the difference between knowing about lobbying and

doing it. Specific lobbying techniques are not complex or highly technical however. The ability to use them effectively throughout the lobbying process is highly dependent on the executive director's ability to relate to and work effectively with the variety of personality types that one is likely to encounter in the course of lobbying.

I think that one of the things that I believe strongly in is interpersonal skills. I prefer personal communication verses written.

What works is knowing people. I work an awful lot with bureaucrats. Knowing the staff and knowing the people who are actually working with the material is important. So, knowing the politicians to the extent that you can is important.

The executives suggested five methods of developing close personal relationships with policy makers. Each of them are described in the following paragraphs along with relevant comments.

1(a). Develop the relationships early on, before a major issue develops.

I think you need to know who the local representatives are before you run into problems. I made it my business when I took this job to get involved and to get to know who the policy makers are.

1(b). Mutual trust and respect is a key element of these relationships.

I think that the best advice I can offer is that you need to have long term relationships with legislators that are based on trust, not a relationship that is based on an issue.

1(c). Avoid the appearance of always asking for something from the policy maker.

Develop the relationships early on so that way you are not always asking for something every time you see them.

If you think you are going to need someone's assistance on something get to know them. Don't ask for anything at first. Just get to know them and then gradually you can share things so that it becomes a matter of sharing opinions. If you do this, you won't be viewed as someone always coming to them asking for a favor.

1(d). Be helpful, inform policy makers what you can do for them and their constituents. This is similar to the principle that executives should avoid having every interaction with a policy maker be one in which the executive asks for something from the policy maker. Executives should spend time and effort informing policy makers of the services and benefits that the agency brings to the community. For elected officials, this information can be used to assist constituents in solving problems, and thereby provides opportunities for the elected officials to prove they can be of service and helpful to their constituents.

This is particularly important during election years. Part of developing good relationships and establishing credibility is informing policy makers what you can do for them and their constituents. This provides an opportunity to be of service and create some 'political currency' that can be cashed in at another time. Providing assistance to policy makers also creates an opportunity to demonstrate competence in the field or service area and thereby adds to the credibility of the organization and the executive director.

Let them know that you have some information that they need to do their jobs. Try to be a resource to them. If you do this, they usually will check with you and recognize you as a resource. Remember that it works both ways. If they have a problem with one of their constituents that you can be helpful with, be responsive to helping them solve the issue. Try to be there for them and deliver your services to their constituents.

It's good just to call them up and let them know who you are and what you can do for them and their constituents. You never know what kind of opportunity that may bring in the future. They are often very curious about these things. They really do want to know. I have never, ever had a legislator refuse to meet with me.

1(e). Give sincere praise, recognition, and thanks to policy makers for their efforts. Executives should carefully develop and maintain their relationships with policy

makers. It is important to give thanks and appreciation for a policy maker's efforts on behalf of the nonprofit organization. Even if the desired effect was not achieved most efforts are still worthy of being recognized in the context of developing and maintaining relationships. This strategy recommended by the directors is really no more than common courtesy. This seems simple enough but could be easily overlooked in part because of the tendency to view politics as adversarial.

It's most important to say thank you when they do a job for you. It is important to simply thank them for their time. Do not to be afraid of them, they are just people. And make sure you get to the ones that serve the area that you represent. It's more effective when you can do that.

We will be there a lot of times giving praise or supporting them on an issue. We write letters that are also in praise and thanks for work done on other issues that they are involved in.

2. Establish credibility. The issue of credibility is an important one for nonprofit lobbying. Executives identified the issue and how to gain or create credibility by having reputable board members, matching volunteers to the task and using rational approaches. There were several different strategies suggested to establish credibility; being visible in the community, being well informed on issues, choosing issues carefully, and taking a rational logical approach. For example:

Grassroots efforts require very credible and visible people who have a passion for the issues. It also helps if the issues are politically correct, like domestic violence. Well connected and balanced board members add a lot of legitimacy to lobbying efforts. Training volunteers in grassroots techniques is very important, as is matching their skills to the tasks and activities.

2(a). Be visible in the community. Executives can be visible in the community by attending events relating to nonprofit organizations, and events where major community

leaders and organizational stakeholders are present, and where policy makers are present. The directors cautioned against lobbying extensively during these times but focused on making their presence and support known. Being visible in the community was identified as an action principle that promotes the credibility and effectiveness of a nonprofit executive director. The executives had several interesting comments regarding visibility.

My advice is that it is important to be visible in the community with as many factions as possible. Be involved in government support and all the various community activities that really work toward making the community a better on a total level. Do not limit yourself to being involved specifically with just political people. To me that is not genuine. That new person (executive director) really has to prove to all of those people out there in the community that they are genuinely committed to their mission. Get some credibility in the community with the chamber of commerce and the various factions that really do influence policy makers.

To be effective as a nonprofit executive, I think you have to be very known, very visible in the community. One of the reasons that I think this board hired me is not just because of the skills I have, but also because of the contacts that I bring to the organization.

2(b). Be well informed about the issues. Executives believe that it is important to be well informed on issues. Being knowledgeable and conversant in a variety of issues affecting the nonprofit world and the local community, particularly those that are in the policy making spotlight at the moment is helpful. Executives should be able to demonstrate that they are well rounded persons and critical thinkers who are able to see the interconnections between the mission of their agencies and the larger community. The executives recommended that the effective lobbyist would have a good understanding of the legislative process. Several executives agreed on the importance of knowing both sides of every issue that is the focus of the lobbying efforts. A related issue to this general

theme was the importance of using solid facts whenever possible and having a clear agenda when meeting with policy makers.

I think it is important to surround yourself with a broad spectrum of viewpoints. It is important for me, as someone who advocates for families, to also be in touch with the other sides argument.

Don't go in there and get all self-righteous about the downtrodden of society and all that kind of stuff. If you don't know both sides of the issues I don't think you can truly have a solid or legitimate argument or discussion. You are not going to go anywhere then, you will just end up screaming against a wall. It is important to hear their points, correct them or learn how you can work together.

I think you will be seen as more credible. Some people may say that you will be perceived as being wishy-washy. Or, they might say that you can't do anything if you are so busy trying to hear everybody's opinions and trying to please everybody else. I think you have to have a degree of information from both sides before you can take a credible stand. You can still go back to your position. At least you will know how to better defend yourself. You can at least say that you have seen their side and their viewpoint. You may not agree but at least you will understand.

You need to let the legislators know that you are concerned about the full range of constructive community issues and not just those relating to your specific field of service.

2(c). Carefully select issues that merit lobbying. Many executives strongly expressed the opinion that all lobbying efforts should have a clear tie to the mission of the agency. Another slant on this same concept was the expressed belief that executive directors of nonprofit organizations need to choose their battles carefully. Related to this was the importance placed on lobbying in coalitions as means of increasing effectiveness and reducing risk.

Use caution and go very slowly. Don't jump out there on the first issue that comes along and take a very polarized stand. Listen to others, discuss and listen to the opposing view. Be thoughtful as you look for the win, win situations. You know what you need. Find out what they need and see if you can find a way to

get them to lighten up. We have compromised in some situations where the law did not require a compromise. This is progress.

You need to choose your topics very carefully and not be all over the board. You really need to know what it is that can be most helpful. Lobby around that one issue that can garner public support and member support.

I guess my recommendation is to be careful about not getting too close in any one camp. Do not tie yourself too closely to one person, especially at the state level. It really takes all of them. You have to choose your battles carefully. Make sure it really is a key issue before you say it is a key issue. Avoid the practice of running to them all the time and becoming known as the boy who cried wolf.

2(d). Be rational and logical. It was recommended by the directors that individuals in this leadership position be the rational, logical one and let others make the emotional appeal.

I am a promoter of the idea that your stance on something is very important. Your position should be logical and based on as many facts as you can identify and not be emotional. It is very important as an executive director to be seen as logical and rational. It's also important to present the emotional side, but let other people and other groups do it. Let the clients and the client advocates get everyone all teary-eyed. You need to present the facts and the plan. You can't let emotion influence your logic. It's the data that get legislators to perk up.

3. Use coalitions and networks.

We have found it very important to be part of larger networks and coalitions. It has been beneficial for us to be part of larger issues such as homelessness rather than just the housing issues of our clients, for example. The other thing that we have done, which is very important, is to be part of various committees in the community. This provides a frame of reference for us to be recognized and become known as having expertise in a certain area. It is a process rather than a one-time thing.

Get involved with groups. You are more effective with large numbers of supporters. Build relationships by taking an educational verses an aggressive approach.

4. Lobbying is essential. Good programs and demonstrated needs for services are

not sufficient to maintain program support. Finally, many of the executives offered the opinion that lobbying is an essential part of the work of the executive director of a nonprofit organization. Several related comments follow.

You have to do it, it's survival. You know, I hate that because it's not based on the quality of your program or how good it is. It's based on who you know, and what you do, and the information you pass out and the strength of your advocacy group or your board. It's POLITICS!!!

It is a very disillusioning kind of process because that is not what you learn as a therapist in social work. You learn to help people and you find that does not have any correlation to how your program survives financially.

You do a good job. I still believe that you have to do the best job. You have to be accountable, but that's not what it is all about. It's about who you know, and how powerful your board is. It's about how many connections you have, and how well you keep that up. It's amazing!

Start it immediately. What worked for me is that I got wonderful advice from our board chair. I was acting director for a year before he convinced me to take the job. He told me to network and to meet people. That is what I did and that is how I became committed to the organization. My stories that I tell during my lobbying efforts are my personal interactions with people.

I believe that lobbying ought to be one of the responsibilities of an executive director. I believe that lobbying should be directed primarily on the issues that impact on the agency. Examples of these are funding issues, policy issues, and program issues that have a direct impact on the services provided by the agency. In other words, advocacy ought to flow from the needs and experiences of the agency and not just from the issue that might not be a particular issue for the services of the agency.

Any organization, from my perspective, that operates in the greater environment, has an absolute need to be on some kind of relationship basis with the political powers that be. Those powers may be the Governor, the state senators, state representatives, mayor, city council members or what have you. I think it behooves the executive director of a nonprofit organization to at least have some kind of passing acquaintance with the key political figures in the environment, including the business leaders, the chamber of commerce etc.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research has examined lobbying practices of executive directors of nonprofit organizations. The type and scope of their lobbying practices has been described. The value conflicts or ethical dilemmas encountered by the executives in the course of lobbying on behalf of their organizations have been documented. A bivariate analysis was conducted to help examine the relationships between personal and organizational factors and lobbying activity. The respondents recommendations about lobbying by executive directors of local nonprofit organizations have been reported.

Lobbying Techniques in Use

Executive directors of community-based nonprofit organizations do indeed engage in lobbying. Table 36 summarizes the lobbying activity reported by the executives interviewed. The strategies used by the executive respondents in the sample population are consistent with those described by experts on the practice of lobbying in the private and nonprofit sector. Executives make personal visits alone (64%) and with others (54%). They also write letters (60%) and telephone policy makers (60%), and asks others to do the same (46% and 44% respectively). They meet with policy makers in coalitions in their local communities (58%), and they sponsor special events at the capitol (36%).

One of the most frequent observations provided by the executives was that

Table 36
Summary of Lobbying Practices

Techniques	%	Level	Freq.	Topic	Others
Visiting policy makers alone	64	SE	2-5	F	na
Telephone calls to policy makers	60	SE	6+	F	na
Writing letters	60	SE	6+	F	na
Community group or committee participation	58	SE	2-5	F	C
Visiting policy makers with others	54	SE	2-5	F	C
Asking others to visit policy makers	48	LE	2-5	F	S
Asking others to telephone policy makers	44	SE	2-5	F	C
Asking others to write letters	46	SE	2-5	F, FOS	C
Special events	36	SE	1	Ed, Ad	C

Key:

% = percent of executives reporting using this lobbying practice

Level = level most frequently lobbied:

LE= local elected, SE= state elected, FE = federal elected,

LN= local nonelected, SN= State nonelected, F= Federal nonelected

Freq. = the number of instances in the 12 months preceding the data collection

Topics: F= funding, FOS = field of service regulations, Ed=education, AD= advocacy

Others = those most often identified as participating in lobbying:

B= board members, S= staff, C=coalitions

Note: more than one entry appears in the topic column only when the topics were reported equally, otherwise only the most frequently reported topic is indicated.

successful nonprofit lobbying is dependent on personal relationships with policy makers, their aides, and with peers with whom they lobby in coalitions. By far, the directors expressed a preference for personal contact and relationships with policy makers. Of the top five lobbying techniques reported by the executives, four are techniques that require personal contact, writing letters is the exception. Executives described the importance of developing personal relationships with policy makers early and nurturing these relationships for the long term investment. Sound personal relationships serve as a foundation for other aspects of effective lobbying, such as demonstrating credibility, providing good service, looking for win-win relationships, compromise, and providing appreciation and recognition to policy makers for their efforts.

Executives direct most of their lobbying to elected state officials and funding is the primary focus of these lobbying efforts. The lobbying reported by executives related to regulations also has a relationship to funding because a nonprofit organization's ability or willingness to comply with certain regulations may be a deciding factor in what programs and funding are included in the organization's operations. Some federal funding for nonprofit organizations is passed through the state bureaucracies responsible for contracting for services (Kettner & Martin, 1987). With the current trend toward returning power from the federal government to the states, lobbying of state officials is likely to prevail.

Table 37 provides a more detailed analysis of where executive directors target their lobbying efforts. Clearly, state elected officials are the most frequently lobbied policy makers, followed by local elected and federal elected officials, in that order. Federal

Table 37

Summary of Lobbying Targeted to Various Levels of Policy Makers

Techniques	Frequency of Contact					
	Most			Least		
Visiting policy makers alone	SE	LE	LN	SN	FE	FN
Telephone calls to policy makers	SE	LE	SN	LN	FE	FN
Asking others to telephone policy makers	SE	LE	SN	FE	LN	FN
Community group or committee participation	SE	LE	FE	LN	SN	FN
Visiting policy makers with others	SE	LN	LE	SN	FE	FN
Writing letters	SE	FE	LE	LN	SN	FN
Asking others to write letters	SE	FE	LE	SN	FN	LN
Asking others to visit policy makers	LE	SE	FE	LN	SN	FN
Column totals:						
SE= state elected	7	1	0	0	0	0
LE= local elected	1	4	3	0	0	0
LN= local nonelected	0	1	1	4	1	1
SN= State nonelected	0	0	2	3	3	0
FE = federal elected	0	2	2	1	3	0
FN= Federal nonelected	0	0	0	0	1	7
Key:						
LE= local elected, SE= state elected, FE = federal elected,						
LN= local nonelected, SN= State nonelected, FN= Federal nonelected						

nonelected officials are the least likely to be lobbied. There are nonprofit programs which are funded by a combination of state and federal sources where the federal money is passed through state departments prior to being delivered to community based nonprofits through purchase of service contracting. In some social, health, and educational fields, local boards at the county level also make allocations decisions and award contracts to direct service providers such as those who participated in this study. Providers of community based mental health and public health services are examples of local nonprofits that are involved in this funding arrangement. Fifty-four percent (27) of the executives participating in this survey were employed by social service organizations. Health services and education services each comprised an additional fourteen percent (7). Social services, health and educational services combined comprised eighty-two percent (41) of the organizations participating in the study. Thus, the structure of funding and regulatory administration compel many executives to lobby at the state level of government.

Five of the top nine lobbying techniques involve work with some form of coalition. Executives belong to coalitions that consist of various combinations of executives, board members, and staff of other nonprofit organizations. There is a relationship between membership in national associations and lobbying. National associations issue legislative alerts and call on their members to contact policy makers regarding specific legislation. National Associations also provide detailed information about legislation and how to approach policy makers. It may be that executives who belong to national associations ask others to visit policy makers more often than those who do not belong because of these prompts and material assistance. It may also be that belonging to a

national association of a nonprofit is a conscious choice of an executive director that is driven by a strong appreciation for lobbying in general.

Contrary to the recommendations of Smucker (1991) few respondents used the media for lobbying purposes. Use of the radio and television to lobby was reported by less than 10% of the executive directors. Newspapers were used for direct lobbying purposes by 20% of the directors and grassroots lobbying by 16% of the executives. Smucker reports that the media can be effective vehicles for lobbying efforts. Legislators are sensitive to how they are quoted in the media, and legislative staffers rate daily newspaper editorials and articles as important factors that influence elected officials.

No differences were found in how male and female executives lobbied. It is an interesting finding because of the popular notion that political activity is conducted via a "good old boys" network. One possible explanation is that the paradigm of a male dominated policy making process developed with respect to private sector lobbyists, where males outnumber females. Females slightly outnumber males among the executives who participated in this research (fifty-four percent and forty-six percent respectively). Eighty-two percent of the executives participating in this study were employed by social, health, or educational service organizations. These professions typically attract more females than males, however females are not yet proportionately represented in leadership positions, except in organizations that have a strictly female constituency such as Girl Scouts of America and Y.W.C.A.

Executives participating in this research emphasized the importance of developing relationships with policy makers and avoiding an adversarial posture. Similarly,

executives emphasized the processes over the task nature of lobbying. Both of these approaches fit more closely with stereotypical female behavior than they do with stereotypical male behavior. The absence of a statistically significant difference in lobbying by male and female executives may be, in part, explained by both male and female executives using a style of lobbying that is characteristically female.

No differences in lobbying were found based on the age, time in position, and educational level of the executive director. The data does not support the concept that older executives have well-established relationships with policy makers and access to higher levels of influence or that younger executives may not have these advantages. It may be that because elected officials change as the voters express their preferences, that younger and older executives are on equal footing in establishing and maintaining relationships with policy makers. Similar to the variable of age of the executive, neither the number of years of experience nor the educational level of the executive were found to influence lobbying activity. The data do not support the conclusion that more professionally experienced or highly educated executives lobby differently as a result of this experience and education. Education was not found to influence lobbying, as one might expect, given the sophisticated verbal skills and reasoning abilities that are helpful in preparing and acting out lobbying strategy.

These are interesting findings for several reasons relating to performance issues. First, as our society ages and individuals are living longer at improved levels of health, we should be less concerned with the age of individuals and look more closely at the actual job performance of people in leadership positions. Second, the number of years

of experience is not as important as the quality of the experience itself. There is an important difference between an individual who performs in the same manner in a particular job for ten years and the individual who learns and grows each of the ten years and thus performs at a higher level with each passing year.

These findings also have implications for the selection process for executive directors of nonprofit organizations. It is not unusual in human service agencies for staff who demonstrate good clinical skills over an extended period of time to be promoted to leadership positions. In much the same way that no relationship was found between age, level of education, and time in position and lobbying, having good clinical skills does not necessarily guarantee good leadership skills. Therefore, it becomes necessary for nonprofit boards to look to other indicators of leadership abilities such as an understanding of the action principles suggested by the respondents in this study, and the ability to use these principles.

Summary of Action Principles

There are a number of action principles that can be distilled from the executives comments on lobbying practices, the value conflicts experienced while lobbying, and the executives response to a specific request for recommendations about lobbying. Each of these have been discussed in detail in earlier sections of this report. To aid the reader in comprehending this research, a summary listing of these principles follows.

1. Develop personal relationships with policy makers and their staff that are established long before they are needed and that are based in credibility and mutual

support. Develop the ability to successfully work with a variety of personality types.

2. Face-to-face contacts are the most effective way to communicate with policy makers. Rely on these types of contacts whenever possible.

3. When face-to-face contacts are not possible, use of the telephone is the next most desirable option.

4. Use the telephone or fax machine when timing is crucial and it is not possible to have a face-to-face contact.

5. As the time approaches for critical funding or policy decisions make frequent contact with policy makers, particularly if you are not sure that your position will prevail.

6. Write letters when it is important to present the formal position of the agency and/or when documentation is important. Avoid letters when there is a risk of being misunderstood as adversarial, unless that is what you desire (however adversarial relationship are rarely effective).

7. When time allows, and you desire the show of support for a position from a large number of people, use agency news letters to solicit grassroots support.

8. When you find it necessary or helpful to have others assist you with lobbying, have a specific purpose in mind for the involvement of others and make sure they have credibility and are well informed.

9. Secure board support for your lobbying efforts. Multiply your efforts by training your board members to be effective lobbyists and make this known as an expectation when new board members are recruited.

10. Let others, such as service recipients, take the emotional position when that

approach has some utility. An executive should maintain a calm, rational, logical approach, and let others, "chain themselves to the door".

11. Establish credibility by being visible, having a good track record of performance, providing services to policy makers and their constituents whenever possible, displaying a solid knowledge of all sides of the issues, and remaining calm and rational.

12. Choose your issues carefully. They must be consistent with the mission and values of the organization. Be sure there are clear benefits for your organization for taking a stand on an issue. This does not, however preclude lobbying through coalitions and supporting others who have some meaningful relationship to your cause.

13. Lobbying in coalitions can be very effective. It demonstrates an awareness of the impact of your issues on the broader community. It also shows that you are willing to compromise and are not an empire builder.

14. Focus on the service needs of the population that you represent and strive to avoid getting involved in personality issues, bashing of policy makers, or partisan debates.

15. Be truthful, but recognize when there are also advantages to the selective use of information. There is no moral imperative to reveal information that will hurt your organization if no one is asking specifically for that information.

16. Use the data you can comfortably defend. Use compelling stories of successful programs and successful clients along with the available statistics to help make your case.

17. Give sincere praise, recognition, and thanks to policy makers for their efforts. Even if the desired effect was not achieved, efforts of policy makers are still worthy of

recognition in the context of developing and maintaining relationships.

18. Obtain a working knowledge of the legislative process and the regulations regarding lobbying and how they apply to your specific situation.

19. Limit your actual use of the term lobbying when possible. Words such as advocacy, education, relationship building, government liaison, are some examples of acceptable alternatives.

20. If you are new to the practice of lobbying, seek out an experienced person to provide coaching and serve as a mentor.

21. Generally, the community associates an individual executive director with the agency any time he/she communicates to the public. Consequently, an executive director must be very careful about what they say when they speak in public in order to protect the organization from real or potential harm when they make their positions known.

22. When faced with a conflict between personal beliefs and the official position of the agency, an executive may choose to abdicate their position as the official spokesperson of the agency or simply not make public their personal beliefs and support the official position of the agency. One way to avoid these types of conflicts is by making sure that personal values are aligned with the official agency positions on sensitive issues when making the initial decision to accept employment with an organization.

The Necessity of Lobbying

Executive directors describe lobbying as vital to the continuance of their agencies. It is described as an essential activity by those who engage in it and crucial to maintain

their ability to provide services. Given the structural imperative to lobby based in funding and regulatory relationships between nonprofit organizations and governmental units, achieving competence in effective lobbying techniques should be a priority of executive directors of nonprofit organizations that receive government funds. Similarly, boards of nonprofit organizations would do well to assess the potential of individuals seeking executive director positions to be effective lobbyists.

Lobbying interactions primarily focused on funding issues, followed closely by regulatory issues. One possible interpretation of this aspect of the research is executive directors of nonprofit organizations are equally concerned with the amount of service they provide as determined by funding levels and the manner in which it is provided as determined by regulations and administrative rules. Executives provided a sound rationale for lobbying that is directly related to their professional roles. Executives also described the benefits of lobbying for their organization: (a) influencing the policy process, (b) increasing revenue for their programs, and (c) increasing the visibility of the agency. The frequent use of the game metaphor suggests that some directors experienced satisfaction experienced playing the lobbying game.

Those executives who reported that they do not lobby often explained their position by focusing on the lack of a clear fit with the mission and purpose of the organization. In some cases, the organization's by-laws held the organization to an apolitical status. In other cases, the executives had very small amounts of government funds in their budgets or were completely independent of government contracts for services. For these reasons they did not perceive the need to influence policy makers.

Among the executives, there is a low level of awareness of lobbying activity allowed under the IRS regulations. An increase in knowledge about the law and effective techniques might result in an increase in lobbying activity. The perception of risk may be influenced by the low level of awareness of the actual law. The executives may feel that some lobbying activities are prohibited and therefore risky, when in fact they are allowed under the law within some very specific guidelines.

Areas for Further Research

Board support for lobbying was described as moderate. Forty percent (20) of the directors indicated that their boards are very supportive of their lobbying. Similarly, forty percent indicated that lobbying appeared in their job description. Over 60% of the executives indicated that they engaged in the three top rated lobbying practices of visiting policy makers alone, telephoning policy makers, and writing letters to policy makers. Executive directors are more likely to lobby when there is board support. It may be the case that the board members who support lobbying by executive directors are the more powerful or influential members. The executives were asked to estimate the overall level of board support. The overall level of support may not be as important as having key individual board members who support the lobbying activity of the executive director.

Another area for further study is the development of board members as effective lobbyists for nonprofit organizations. Only two percent of the executives reported that their boards frequently participate in lobbying. Getting board members more involved in lobbying was on the "wish list" of many of the executives interviewed and was mentioned

when executives were asked to provide advice about nonprofit lobbying. Many of the directors reported not being able to do as much lobbying as they would like to because of time constraints. If board members can be taught and encouraged to lobby on behalf of the organization, then the overall benefits to the organization can be increased. This is particularly important in terms of what executives described as the demand - response characteristic of lobbying. In discussing the relative importance of lobbying in comparison to other responsibilities, the directors described what might be called the situational importance of lobbying. In the words of one subject, "*When it is important it is real important!*" Having a cadre of willing and knowledgeable board members and other volunteers would be very valuable to the success of nonprofit lobbying efforts given these conditions. Board support for lobbying and board participation in lobbying are topics for further study.

While this study identified some clear trends in lobbying preferences it did not address the issue of effectiveness. For example, are there differences in effective techniques at the local, state, and federal levels? If lobbying in coalitions is effective for nonprofits, what can be done to maximize the effectiveness of coalitions? Given that the primary focus of lobbying reported by executives was funding, one clear measure of effectiveness is the amount of money obtained.

The data collection interviews ranged between one and two hours, depending on how much the respondent was interested in talking about lobbying. There are limits to the amount of information that can be obtained in one interview session. There are also limits to the amount of trust that can be developed between parties in an interview, and

therefore limits to the amount and accuracy of disclosure that is possible to obtain. In some cases, the comments offered by the executives may have been those that were perceived by them to be socially desirable rather than a report of their actual experiences and beliefs. This is particularly a concern for the executives comments regarding value conflicts in lobbying. It is recommended that further research in this area involve more sustained contact with the interviewees or direct observation of the respondents engaged in lobbying. The use of the Delphi technique might also be effective in further research.

Bernstein (1991) interviewed nineteen managers of nonprofit program in New York City that were providers of services through government contracts. There is a great deal of similarity in the experience described by her directors and the practices described by the executives in this research. The interplay of administrative issues, politics, and value conflicts remains a source of both challenge and accomplishment for executive directors of local nonprofit organizations. In an age of increasing demand and decreasing resources for the services performed by nonprofit organizations, support should continue to be given to efforts to further understand the complexity of the relationship between government and nonprofit organizations, so that their good works can continue to serve the needs of society.

Appendix A
Letter to Respondents

July 16, 1993

Dear :

With this letter we are announcing some information important to all nonprofit organizations and asking for your participation in an important research study.

In 1990, the Internal Revenue Service issued regulations that have significantly changed the extent to which nonprofit organizations may engage in lobbying. Unfortunately, information about these changes has not been circulated widely.

The School of Public Affairs and Administration at Western Michigan University is conducting opinion surveys about nonprofit executive director's lobbying beliefs and practices. As a participant in this research, your responses will be kept completely confidential. Each respondent will be given a code number so that neither the individual nor the agency can be identified.

I will be contacting you soon to arrange for a brief interview at your convenience. Following the interview, you will be presented with information that details the changes in the lobbying regulations as our way of thanking you for your time and participation.

Please feel free to call me at (616) 669-4426 if you have questions or suggestions. I look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Larry Buzas, M.S.W., A.B.D.
Principal Investigator

Appendix B
Respondent Interview Handout

DEFINITION OF LOBBYING

Lobbying occurs when a nonprofit organization:

- * Communicates with a policymaker and the communication refers to specific legislation, administrative rules or policies, and reflects a view of its merits,

or

- * Communicates with the general public, urging them to contact policy makers, in support of legislation, administrative rules or policies and the communication refers to specific legislation, administrative rules or policies and reflects a view of its merits.

Lobbying can occur before, during, and after legislation is introduced, or becomes law.

Lobbying can apply to policy makers at the county, state, or federal level of government.

DEFINITION OF POLICYMAKERS

Policy makers are defined as:

- * members of legislative bodies,
- * employees of legislative bodies,
- * government officials or employees,

who may participate in the formulation of legislation, administrative rules or policies and/or funding decisions at the county, state, or federal level of government.

PART 2. ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

- 1-19 Does your organization have a legislative or political action committee? (19)
- 2-20 Does your organization belong to any local coalitions that lobby?
- 3-21 Is lobbying for your organization part of your job description?
- 4-22 Is lobbying for your organization deferred to a state association of which you are a member?
- 5-25 Is lobbying for your organization deferred to a national association of which you are a member?
- 6-28 How important is lobbying in comparison to the other responsibilities that you have as a leader of a nonprofit organization?
- 7-29 How supportive of executive director lobbying activity is your board of directors?
- 8-30 To what extent do your board members participate in lobbying on behalf of your organization?

PART 3. PRACTICES

- 9-31 Have you visited a policymaker **ALONE** to lobby.
- 10-40 Have you visited a policymaker **WITH OTHERS** to lobby?
- 11-50 Have you **ASKED OTHERS** to visit a policymaker to lobby **WITHOUT YOU BEING PRESENT**.
- 12-60 Have you participated in a group or committee meeting in your community with a policymaker to lobby?
- 13-70 Have you lobbied by sending individually composed letters to a policymaker?
- 14-79 Have you **ASKED OTHERS** to lobby by sending individually composed letters to a policymaker?
- 15-89 Have you personally telephoned a policymaker to lobby?
- 16-98 Have you **ASKED OTHERS** to personally telephone a policymaker to lobby?
- 17-108 Have you lobbied through the use of the newspapers?
- 18-111 Have you **ASKED OTHERS** to lobby through the use of the newspapers?
- 19-115 Have you lobbied through the use of the radio?
- 20-118 Have you **ASKED OTHERS** to lobby through the use of the radio?
- 21-123 Have you lobbied through the use of television?

22-126 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby through the use of television?

23-130 Have you lobbied by sponsoring something special at the capital?

24-133 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby by sponsoring something special at the capital?

PART 4: POTENTIAL VALUE CONFLICTS

Have you experienced the following:

- 25-136 Supporting the official position of the organization when it was significantly different from your personal beliefs?
- 26-137 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of local government?
- 27-138 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of state government?
- 28-139 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for or against a policy of the federal government?
- 29-140 Not revealing all you know about a particular issue in the course of advocating for decision favorable to your organization?
- 30-141 Over estimating the need for your services and/or programs in the course of advocating for decision favorable to your organization?
- 31-142 Are you concerned that lobbying will put your status as a nonprofit organization in jeopardy?
- 32-143 Prior to being involved in this research to what extent were you aware of the 1976 Lobby Law also known as P.A. 94-455?
- 33-145 Do you have any advice to offer about lobbying to new executive directors of nonprofit organizations?

Appendix C
Interview Guide

Western Michigan University
School of Public Affairs and Administration

The Activities and Opinions of Executive Directors of Nonprofit Organizations on
Lobbying

Larry Buzas, MSW, Principal Investigator
1993

NONPROFIT LOBBYING INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

In 1990, the Internal Revenue Service issued new regulations governing lobbying by nonprofit organizations. Information about these changes has not been circulated widely.

There is a variety of beliefs among people in your position about lobbying.

I would like to ask you some questions about your practices, opinions and beliefs, about lobbying and what influences them.

There are two types of questions.

The first type has to do with actual lobbying activities

The second type has to do with factors that are related to lobbying practices.

INTERVIEW PROCESS

Before we begin the interview there are several points that I would like to cover:

1. At no point will you be identified as a respondent, nor will you be identified with your answers.
2. I would like to tape record our conversation for the purpose of insuring an accurate representation of your opinions. The tape will be erased after being transcribed shortly following the interview.
3. You have the right to refuse to answer any question or to have the recorder turned off at any time.

Is it all right with you if I tape our conversation?

____ YES

____ NO

CLARIFYING TERMS

Before we begin with the actual questions there are two terms that require clarification for the purpose of this research. Here is a brief definition of our use of the terms "lobbying" and "policy maker". (hand this single page of definitions to the respondents and give them a few minutes to look over the definitions)

DEFINITION OF LOBBYING

Lobbying occurs when a nonprofit organization:

- * Communicates with a policy maker and the communication refers to specific legislation, administrative rules or policies, and reflects a view of its merits,

or

- * Communicates with the general public, urging them to contact policy makers, in support of legislation, administrative rules or policies and the communication refers to specific legislation, administrative rules or policies and reflects a view of its merits.

Lobbying can occur before, during, and after legislation is introduced, or becomes law.

Lobbying can apply to policy makers at the county, state, or federal level of government.

DEFINITION OF POLICY MAKERS

Policy makers are defined as:

- * members of legislative bodies,
- * employees of legislative bodies,
- * government officials or employees,

who may participate in the formulation of legislation, administrative rules or policies and/or funding decisions at the county, state, or federal level of government.

PART 1. Descriptive Information

1 ORG. ____ 2 COUNTY: 1 ____ KENT 2 ____ INGHAM

3 FOS: 1. ____ recreational and amusement services
 2. ____ health services
 3. ____ education services
 4. ____ social services
 5. ____ membership organizations
 6. ____ other _____.

Approximately what amount and percent of income do you receive from each of the following sources?

AMOUNT OF FUNDING:	APPROXIMATE %
4 ____ COUNTY	5 ____ %
6 ____ STATE	7 ____ %
8 ____ FEDERAL	9 ____ %
10 ____ ALL OTHER	11 ____ %
____ TOTAL	

12) To the best of your knowledge are you the single provider of this service in the county?

1 ____ YES
 2 ____ NO
 8 ____ NOT SURE
 9 ____ NO RESPONSE

13) How old will your organization be in 1993?

1 UP TO 10 years
 2 11 - 20 years
 3 21 - 30 years
 4 31 - 40 years
 5 41 - 50 years
 6 51 - 60 years
 7 MORE THAN 61 years
 8 NOT SURE
 9 NO RESPONSE

14) Which age category are you in?

1. ____ up to 20 years
 2. ____ 21 - 30 years
 3. ____ 31 - 40 years
 4. ____ 41 - 50 years
 5. ____ 51 - 60 years
 6. ____ 61 - 70
 7. ____ 71 - 80
 8. ____ NOT SURE
 9. ____ NO RESPONSE

15) Gender:

1. ____ MALE
 2. ____ FEMALE
 9. ____ NO RESPONSE

16) How many years have you been in your present position?

- 1. ☐ 0 - 5
- 2. ☐ 6 - 10
- 3. ☐ 11 - 15
- 4. ☐ 16 - 20
- 5. ☐ 21 - 25
- 6. ☐ 26 - 30
- 7. ☐ MORE THAN 30
- 8. ☐ NOT SURE
- 9. ☐ NO RESPONSE

17) What is the highest level of education you have?

- 1 ☐ HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
- 2 ☐ ASSOCIATE DEGREE
- 3 ☐ BS/BA
- 4 ☐ MA/MSW
- 5 ☐ PHD/DPA
- 9. ☐ NO RESPONSE

18) Approximately what percent of your total agency budget was spent on lobbying over the past twelve months?

- APPROXIMATE %
- 8. ☐ NOT SURE
- 9. ☐ NO RESPONSE

PART 2. ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

Next I'd like to discuss some aspects of organizations that relate to lobbying. Here is a list of what I would like to cover.

- 19 Does your organization have a legislative or political action committee?
- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE
- 20 Does your organization belong to any local coalitions that lobby?
- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE
- 21 Is lobbying for your organization part of job description?
- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE
- 22 Is lobbying for your organization deferred to a state association of which you are a member?
- 1 YES If yes go to 23.
 - 2 NO If no go to 25.
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE
- 23 If the association did not lobbying would you still belong?
- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE
- 24 Has the association ever requested that you engage in lobbying?
- 1 YES
 - 2 NO
 - 8 NOT SURE
- 25 Is lobbying for your organization deferred to a national association of which you are a member?
- 1 YES If yes go to 27.
 - 2 NO If no go to 29.
 - 8 NOT SURE
 - 9 NO RESPONSE

26 If the association did not lobby, would you still belong?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 NO RESPONSE

27 Has the association ever requested that you engage in lobbying?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 NO RESPONSE

28 On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important and 5 being very important, how important is lobbying in comparison to the other responsibilities that you have as a leader of a nonprofit organization?

NI				VI			NS		NR
1	2	3	4	5			8		9

Why does lobbying receive this amount of your attention?

29 On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not supportive and 5 being very supportive, how supportive of executive director lobbying activity is your board of directors?

NS				VS			NS		NR
1	2	3	4	5			8		9

What do you think influences this level of support?

30 Again on a scale on 1 to 5 with 1 being never and 5 being regularly, to what extent do your board members participate in lobbying on behalf of your organization?

Never				Regularly		NS		NR
1	2	3	4	5		8		9

what do you think influences this level of participation?

PART 3. PRACTICES

There are several types of lobbying practices. Here is a list of them. please take just a minute to review the list. There are three things I'd like to discuss with you based on this list.

First, I would like to go through the list with you and have you indicate if you have used the techniques.

Second, for those that you have used I would also like an estimate of how many times you may have used them on behalf of your organization in the last twelve months.

Third, I'd like to explore with you briefly a few of the more important episodes.

31 Have you visited a policy maker ALONE to lobby.

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No Response

NS NR

32 LOCAL ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

33 STATE ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

34 FEDERAL ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

35 LOCAL NON-ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

36 STATE NON-ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

37 FEDERAL NON-ELECTED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

38 ALL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 or more 8 9

39 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

40 Have you visited a policy maker WITH OTHERS to lobby?

1 Yes, go to 41

2 No, go to 50

8 Not sure

9 No Response

41 Who were the others?

1 board members

2 professionals employed by your organization

3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations

4 Other

5 board & employee professionals

6 board & coalitions

7 employee professionals & coalitions

8 Not Sure

9 No response

NS

NR

42	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

43	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

44	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

45	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

46	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

47	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

48	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	---	---

49 About

1 Funding increase

2 Funding decrease

3 Funding maintenance

4 Field of Service regulations

5 General NPO regulations

6 Education

7 Advocacy

8 Not sure

9 No response

50 Have you ASKED OTHERS to visit a policy maker to lobby WITHOUT YOU BEING PRESENT.

- 1 Yes, go to 51
- 2 No, go to 60
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

51 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

NS

NR

52	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
53	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
54	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
55	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
56	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
57	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
58	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9

59 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

60 Have you participated in a group or committee meeting in your community with a policy maker to lobby?

- 1 Yes, go to 61
- 2 No, go to 70
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

61 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

NR

NS

62	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
63	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
64	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
65	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
66	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
67	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
68	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9

69 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

70 Have you lobbied by sending individually composed letters to a policy maker?

- 1 Yes, go to 71
- 2 No, go to 79
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 NO Response

NS NR

71	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
72	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
73	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
74	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
75	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
76	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
77	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9

78 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

79 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby by sending individually composed letters to a policy maker?

- 1 Yes, go to 80
- 2 No, go to 89
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

80 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

NS

NR

81	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
82	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
83	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
84	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
85	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
86	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
87	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
88	About									
	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									
	6									
	7									
	8									
	9									

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

- 89 Have you personally telephoned a policy maker to lobby?
 1 Yes, go to 90
 2 No, no go to 98
 8 Not Sure
 9 No Response

NS

NR

90	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
91	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
92	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
93	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
94	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
95	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
96	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9

- 97 About

- 1 Funding increase
 2 Funding decrease
 3 Funding maintenance
 4 Field of Service regulations
 5 General NPO regulations
 6 Education
 7 Advocacy
 8 Not sure
 9 No response

98 Have you ASKED OTHERS to personally telephone a policy maker to lobby?

- 1 Yes, go to 99
- 2 No, no go to 108
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No Response

99 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

NS

NR

100	LOCAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
101	STATE ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
102	FEDERAL ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
103	LOCAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
104	STATE NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
105	FEDERAL NON-ELECTED	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9
106	ALL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 or more	8	9

107 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

108. Have you lobbied through the use of the newspapers?

- 1 Yes, go to 109
- 2 No, go to 111,
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

109 How often have YOU TRIED to do this?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

110 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

Comments

111 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby through the use of the newspapers?

- 1 Yes, go to 112
- 2 No, go to 115,
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

112 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

113 How often have you asked that these contributions be attempted?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

114 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

115 Have you lobbied through the use of the radio?

- 1 Yes, go to 116
- 2 No, go to 118
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

116 How often have YOU TRIED to do this?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

117 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

118 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby through the use of the radio?

- 1 Yes, go to 119
- 2 No, go to 123
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

120 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

121 How often have you asked that these contributions be attempted?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

122 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

123 Have you lobbied through the use of television?

- 1 Yes, go to 124
- 2 No, go to 126
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

124 How often have YOU TRIED to do this?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

125 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

126 Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby through the use of television?

- 1 Yes, go to 127
- 2 No, go to 130
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

127 Who were the others?

- 1 board members
- 2 professionals employed by your organization
- 3 coalitions of professionals from other organizations
- 4 Other
- 5 board & employee professionals
- 6 board & coalitions
- 7 employee professionals & coalitions
- 8 Not Sure
- 9 No response

128 How often have you asked that these contributions be attempted?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

129 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

130 Have you lobbied by sponsoring something special at the capital?

- 1 Yes, go to 131
- 2 No, go to 133
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

131 How often have YOU TRIED to do this?

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

132 About

- 1 Funding increase
- 2 Funding decrease
- 3 Funding maintenance
- 4 Field of Service regulations
- 5 General NPO regulations
- 6 Education
- 7 Advocacy
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No response

133. Have you ASKED OTHERS to lobby by sponsoring something special at the capital?

- 1 Yes, go to 134
- 2 No, go to 136
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

134 Lansing

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

135 Washington

- 1 once
- 2 twice
- 3 three times
- 4 four times
- 5 five times
- 6 six times
- 7 more than six
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

PART FOUR: POTENTIAL VALUE CONFLICTS

Next I'd like to ask you seven questions about the value conflicts that may appear in the course of lobbying. Here is a list of several examples and after each would you please indicate if you have had that particular experience. We can discuss any one of these in more detail if you would like. Within the last 12 months have you experienced any value conflict situations such as:

- 136 Supporting the official position of the organization when it was significantly different from your personal beliefs?

1 YES
2 NO
8 NOT SURE
9 No Response

Can you tell me about situations where this is likely to occur?

- 137 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of local government?

1 YES
2 NO
8 NOT SURE
9 No Response

What would be an example of this type of policy or position?

- 138 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for, or against, a policy of state government?

1 YES
2 NO
8 NOT SURE
9 No Response

What would be an example of this type of policy or position?

139 Risked alienating supporters of your organization by taking a position for or against a policy of the federal government?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 No Response

Can you tell me about situations where this is likely to occur?

140 Not revealing all you know about a particular issue in the course of advocating for decision favorable to your organization?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 No Response

Can you tell me about situations where this is likely to occur?

141 Over estimating the need for your services and/or programs in the course of advocating for decision favorable to your organization? Can you tell me more about situations where this is likely to occur?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 No Response

Can you tell me about situations where this is likely to occur?

142 Are you concerned that lobbying will put your status as a nonprofit organization in jeopardy?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 No Response

Why or why not?

143 Prior to being involved in this research to what extent were you aware of the 1976 Lobby Law also known as P.A. 94-455? On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being no awareness and 5 being very aware.

Not Aware		Very Aware		NS		NR
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

145 Do you have any advice to offer about lobbying to new executive directors of nonprofit organizations?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Not sure
- 9 No Response

Comments

Appendix D

Permission to Quote From Mark Wilson

MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

210



IPPSR
INSTITUTE
FOR
PUBLIC POLICY
AND
SOCIAL RESEARCH

301 Olds Hall
East Lansing, Michigan
48824-1047

517/355-6672
FAX: 517/336-1544

Collaborating Units:
Social Science, Lead College
• Agriculture and
Natural Resources
• Arts and Letters
• Business
• Education
• Engineering
• Human Ecology
• Human Medicine
• Institute for Children,
Youth and Families
• Libraries
• Michigan State
University Extension
• Nursing
• Osteopathic Medicine
• University Outreach
• Urban Affairs Programs

MSU is an
affirmative-action,
equal-opportunity
institution.

October 14, 1994

Larry Buzas
2215 29th Street SE
Suite B8
Grand Rapids MI 49508

Dear Larry

I was pleased to hear about your positive progress on the dissertation, and feel that you are making a strong contribution to our understanding of the nonprofit sector.

One aim of the Nonprofit Michigan Project is to disseminate information about the sector in Michigan. I am pleased that you can make use of the data contained in The State of Nonprofit Michigan, so feel free to reproduce any tables or information that you need. All I ask is that material be attributed to the Nonprofit Michigan Project/Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at MSU.

My best wishes for your dissertation defence.

Mark Wilson
Research Associate

Appendix E

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: March 25, 1993

To: Larry Buzas

From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair *M. Michele Burnette JH*

Re: HSIRB Project Number 93-03-27

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Lobbying in the nonprofit sector" has been **approved** under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: March 25, 1994

xc: Chandler, PA/A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abney, G. (1988). Lobbying by the insiders: Parallels of state agencies and interest groups. Public Administration Review, 48 (5), 911-917.
- Barker E. (1958). The politics of Aristotle. London: Oxford University Press.
- Baskin, D. (1971). American pluralist democracy: A critique. New York: Van Nostran Reinhold Company.
- Bealey, F. (1988). Democracy in contemporary society (pp. 164). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Beliah, R.N. (1985). Habits of the heart. New York. Harper Row.
- Berg, B.L. (1989). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, Simon and Schuster: Massachusetts.
- Bernstein, S.R. (1991). Managing contracted services in the nonprofit agency: Adminstrative ethical, and political issues. Philadelphia. Temple University Press.
- Berry, J. M. (1989). The interest group society. Tufts University: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Blalock, H. M. (1979). Social statistics (pp. 279). New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Broadbuss, W. (1987). Oversight looks in. Foundation News, 28 (2), 44-45.
- Chandler, R.C., & Plano, J.C. (1986). The public administration dictionary (pp. 85-88). Macmillan: New York.
- Chiti, J. (1990). The impact of funding practices: Nonprofits and funders have their say. Nonprofit World, 8(1), 17-22.
- Connolly, W.E. (1969). The challenge to pluralist theory. In W.E.Connolly (Ed.) The bias of pluralism (pp. 3-34). New York: Atherton Press.
- Davis, N.M. (1988). The lobbyists. Association Management. 40 (7), 34-38.

- Denhart, R.B. (1981). In the shadow of organization (pp. 87-96). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Dolbare, K.J. (1986). Democracy at risk (pp. 83-102). Chatham House: New Jersey.
- Eisenaugle, L. (1990). Lobbying, influencing public policy. Secured Lender, 46(3), 34-36.
- Glasser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gronbjerg, K. (1987). Patterns of institutional relations in the welfare state: Public mandates and the nonprofit sector. In S.A. Ostrander & S. Langton (Eds.), Shifting the debate: Public/private relations in the modern welfare state. New Brunswick, US: Transaction Books.
- Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. (1988). The Federalist Papers (1787-1788) in G. Wills (Ed.), The Federalist Papers by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. New York: Bantam.
- Hansman, H. (1980). The role of the nonprofit enterprise. The Yale Law Journal, 89, 835-901
- Hatch Acts 1939 & 1940.
- Hodgkinson, V.A., & Weitzman, M.S. (1989). Dimensions of the independent sector: A statistical profile (3rd ed.). Washington: Independent Sector.
- Horowitz, I.L. (1979). Beyond democracy: Interest groups and the patriotic core. Humanist, 29(5) 4-10.
- Jacobetti, D.J. (1988). The federal budget deficit: Impacts of the Reagan Era budgets on the state of Michigan. Lansing, MI: Michigan House of Representatives Appropriations Report. .
- Johnson, H.D. (1987). Bears and beggars: Should Foundations rescue government agencies? Foundation News, 28(2), 36-39.
- Jones, C.O. (1984). An introduction to the study of public policy. Wadsworth: Belmont, CA.
- Kettner, P.M., & Martin, L.L. (1987). Purchase of service contracting. Newbury Park: Sage.

- Kettner, P.M., & Martin, L.L. (1989). Contracting for services: Is politics a factor? New England Journal of Human Services, 2(1), 15-20.
- Lamont, T.R. (1988). Getting involved in the legislative process. Small Business Reports, 134(9), 19-21.
- Lipsky, M., & Smith, S.R. (1990). Nonprofit organizations, government, and the welfare state. Political Science Quarterly, 4(104), 625-648.
- Litch, R. (1990). In Pursuit of public-private partnerships. Association Management, 42(4), 70-81.
- Meier, K.J., & Brundy, J.L. (1987). Applied statistics for public administrators (p.222) California: Brooks/Cole.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). The power elite. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neustadt, A., Scott, D., & Clausen, D. (1991). Class struggle for campaign finance? Political action committee contributions in the 1984 elections. Sociological Forum, 6(2) 219-238.
- Office of Management and Budget, United States Federal Government (1984) Circular A-122. Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations, attachment B, paragraph B-21. Washington.
- Olsen, M.E. (1982). Participatory pluralism: Political participation and influence in the United States and Sweden. Chicago: Nelson - Hall.
- O'Neill, M. (1988). Management and responsibility in the nonprofit sector. Working papers from the 1988 Spring Research Forum, pp. 116-129. Washington: Independent Sector.
- O'Neill, M. (1989). The third America: The emergence of the nonprofit sector in the United States. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pawlak, E.J. & Flynn J.P. (1990). Executive director's political activities. Social Work, 35(4), 307-312.
- Ponessa, J. (1993). The Hatch Act Rewrite. The Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. November 3, 1993, pp. 3146-3147.
- Public Law 94-455. Section 1307. United States Congress. 1976. Washington D.C.

- Roberts-Degenarro, M. (1986). Building coalitions for political advocacy. Social Work, 31(41), 308-310.
- Salamon, L.M. (1987). Of market failure, voluntary failure, and third party government: toward a theory of government - nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state. In S.A. Ostrander & S. Langton (Eds.), Shifting the debate: Public/private relations in the modern welfare state. New Brunswick, USA: Transaction Books.
- Slater, C.M., & Hall, G.E. (1992). 1992 county and city extra: Annual metro, city and county data book. Lanham, MD: Bernan Press.
- Smucker, R. (1991). The nonprofit lobbying guide: Advocating your causes and getting results. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Staff authors, unidentified (1990). IRS issues final rules on lobbying. The Nonprofit Times, 4(7), 3.
- Tocqueville, A. (1984). In R. D. Heffner (Ed.), Democracy in America. New York: Mentor.
- United Way of America (1992). What lies ahead: A decade of decision. Alexandria, VA: United Way Strategic Institute.
- Van Til, J. (1988). Mapping the third sector: Voluntarism in a changing economy. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Van Til, J. & Gurin, M.G. (1990). Philanthropy in its historical context. In Jon Van Til (Ed.), Critical issues in American philanthropy (pp.3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weisbrod, Burton (1977). The voluntary nonprofit sector: An economic analysis. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Wilson, Mark I. (1991). The state of nonprofit Michigan. Institute for Public Policy and Social Research. Nonprofit Michigan Project. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Wise, J. (1989). Tracking legislation. Public Relations Journal, 45(9), 43-44.
- Wolman, H., & Teitlebaum, F. (1985). Interest groups and the Reagan presidency. In L.M. Salamon & M.S. Lund (Eds.), The Reagan presidency and the governing of America (pp. 313-314). Washington: Urban Institute Press.