To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Larry D. Mayes entitled "Lobbying and Influence in the Funding of State Universities by the Tennessee General Assembly." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Robert K. Roney

Robert K. Roney, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Wm H Coppedge

S C Ullen

David M. Wilson

Accepted for the Council:

Lew Minkel

Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate School

LOBBYING AND INFLUENCE IN THE FUNDING OF STATE UNIVERSITIES BY THE TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Larry D. Mayes

December 1989

DEDICATION

This dissertation, "Lobby and Influence in the Funding of State Universities by the Tennessee General Assembly," is dedicated to my parents, Ulys and Lula Mayes. Their patience, understanding, and faith made it possible for me to complete this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to Dr. Robert K. Roney, Chairman of the doctoral committee, for his guidance and valuable time.

Dr. William H. Coffield, Dr. Gerald C. Ubben and Dr. David M. Welborn also served on the committee. The author is grateful for their cooperation and interest. A special expression of thanks is extended to Dr. Joyce S. Hopson for her advice, recommendations, and counsel.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of Tennessee legislators and educational lobbyists of Tennessee state universities regarding the degree of influence lobbyists have on decision making pertaining to the funding of state universities. Data were collected by administering questionnaires to the members of the 1987-88 Tennessee General Assembly and the educational lobbyists from Tennessee's state universities.

Frequencies and percents of each item were computed for each group. Additionally, frequencies and percents of each item were tabulated for legislators' level of education, legislative district, number of years in the legislature, and chamber membership. Frequencies and percents were also calculated for each item for the existence of a four-year public university in a legislative district, membership on an education committee, and party affiliation.

Analysis of the data indicated that the majority of respondents of both groups believed that lobbying activity by educational lobbyists from state universities in Tennessee results in more generous treatment by the General Assembly. The data further demonstrated that the provision of data was considered by a majority of both groups as

the single most important function of an educational lobbyist.

There was disagreement between the groups regarding certain lobbying techniques. Lobbyists, for example, considered district level lobbying to be more influential; however, most legislators preferred to be contacted at the Capitol in Nashville. Furthermore, the majority of lobbyists considered entertainment to have a positive impact upon legislators while most legislators adamantly opposed this idea.

There was also disagreement among the legislative profile areas regarding certain items. Educational committee members were one of the few legislative sub-groups to reject the idea that lobbying results in more generous treatment. Most Senators preferred "one-to-one" communication with the lobbyist while the majority of House members considered testimony at hearings by the lobbyist to be more influential. Finally, most Democrats felt that the Governor should be more influential that the Tennessee Higher Education Commission while the majority of Republicans were of the opposite view.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Research Questions	4
	Significance of the Study	5
	Statement of Assumptions	5
	Delimitations of the Study	6
	Definitions of Terms	6
	Methodology	7
	Organization of the Study	10
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
	Historical Overview	11
	Lobbying Strategies and Techniques	19
	State Level Lobbying	26
	Education Lobby Groups	29
	Tennessee Lobby Laws	35
	Higher Education In Tennessee	38
	Tennessee Appropriations to State Universities	41
	Higher Education Lobbying	44
III.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	49
	Research Question Number 1	53

CHAPTER PAGE

III. (Continued)

Summary of Responses to Research Question Number 1 61

Research Question Number 2 61

Summary of Responses to Research Question Number 2 82

Research Question Number 3 83

Summary of Responses to Research Question Number 3 101

Research Question Number 4 102

Summary of Responses to Research Question Number 4 117

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 119

Purpose, Procedures, and Questions 119

Summary of the Findings 121

Conclusions 132

Recommendations. 134

BIBLIOGRAPHY 136

APPENDIXES 140

APPENDIX A. LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS 141

APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE 144

VITA 152

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Response Rate of the Tennessee General Assembly and Higher Education Lobbyists	50
2.	Response Rate of Tennessee Legislators Per Profile Area	51
3.	Response to Item 1: "The Legislative Process for Funding State Universities is a Cumbersome Process."	54
4.	Response to Item 2: "The Recommendations Made by THEC are More Influential Than the Recommendations Made by the Governor."	56
5.	Response to Item 3: "The Recommendations Made by THEC Should Be More Influential Than the Recommendations Made by the Governor."	58
6.	Response to Item 4: "Lobbying Activity by Educational Lobbyists from State Universities Results in More Generous Treatment by the General Assembly."	60
7.	Response to Item 5: "All Educational Lobbyists from State Universities Have Reasonably Unlimited Access to Legislators."	63
8.	Response to Item 6: "Educational Lobbyists from State Universities Concentrate Their Efforts on Trying to Influence Only a Select and Small Number of Legislators Who Hold Important Positions in the Appropriations Process." . . .	65
9.	Response to Item 7: "Testimony at Hearings by an Educational Lobbyist is More Important Than One-To-One Communication with a Legislator."	66

TABLE PAGE

10. Response to Item 8: "Contact About a University's Budget Request by a Non-Lobbyist Who is a Close Friend of a Legislator is More Influential Than Contact by an Educational Lobbyist from a State University." 68

11. Response to Item 9: "Contact About a University's Budget Request by the President of a University is More Influential Than Contact from Other Educational Lobbyists from the Same University." 70

12. Response to Item 10: "The Point in Time which an Educational Lobbyist from a State University Contacts a Legislator About a Budget Request is as Important as the Number of Contacts Made by the Lobbyist." 72

13. Response to Item 11: "The Number of Contacts Made with a Legislator by an Educational Lobbyist from a State University is as Influential as the Content of the Contacts." 74

14. Response to Item 12: "Contacts About Budget Requests Made by Educational Lobbyists are More Influential When Made in the Legislators Home District Than When Made While the Legislator is at the Capitol in Nashville." 75

15. Response to Item 13: "The Alumni Association of a State University Should Leave the Responsibility for Disseminating Budget Information to the University's Educational Lobbyist." 77

16. Response to Item 14: "Educational Lobbyists Should Maintain Contact with Legislators During the Time the Legislature is Not in Session." 79

TABLE PAGE

17. Response to Item 15: "It is Important That Previous Support and Assistance by Legislators be Recognized by Educational Lobbyists." 81

18. Response to Item 16: "Educational Lobbyists Should Demonstrate That Requested Budget Increases are Supported by Specific Needs Rather Than by Emotional Appeals." 84

19. Response to Item 17: "Educational Lobbyists Should Provide Information About a University Budget Request to Legislators Prior to a Legislative Session.". 86

20. Response to Item 18: "Budget Increases Based on Facts Rather Than Pressure Tactics are More Persuasive." 87

21. Response to Item 19: "The Influence of Educational Lobbyists Determines the Extent to Which THEC's Recommendations are Accepted by the General Assembly." 89

22. Response to Item 20: "Educational Lobbyists from State Universities Exert Much Less Influence on Funding Allocations to Their Universities Than the Administrators of Their Universities Believe They Do." 91

23. Response to Item 21: "The Prestige of a University is More Influential When Considering Budget Requests Than are the Presentations Made by an Educational Lobbyist." 93

24. Response to Item 22: "A Legislator's Prior Affiliation with a State University, Either as a Graduate or Through Other Channels, Causes the Legislator to be More Sympathetic to Its Funding Requests." 94

TABLE PAGE

25. Response to Item 23: "Educational Lobbyists Often Take Credit for Influencing Appropriations Which in Reality They Did Not Influence." 96

26. Response to Item 24: "Legislators Who Support the Budget Requests of State Universities Located in Their Immediate Area Usually are More Effective in Influencing Other Legislators About Budget Appropriations Than are Educational Lobbyists." 98

27. Response to Item 25: "The Single Most Important Function of Educational Lobbyists is to Provide Data and Information to the Legislators." 100

28. Response to Item 26: "Educational Lobbyists are Generally Effective at Presenting and Explaining Their Universities' Budget Requests." 104

29. Response to Item 27: "Educational Lobbyists Generally Do Not Provide an Adequate Amount of Information to Support Their Universities' Budget Request." 106

30. Response to Item 28: "The More Knowledgeable Educational Lobbyists are About the Legislative Process the More Influential They Will Be." 107

31. Response to Item 29: "The More Visible Educational Lobbyists are During a Legislative Session, the More Influential They Will Be." 109

32. Response to Item 30: "The Content of a Message from an Educational Lobbyist is as Important in Influencing Legislators as are the Communication Skills of the Lobbyist." 111

TABLE PAGE

33. Response to Item 31: "Entertainment Provided by Educational Lobbyists from State Universities Has a Positive Influence on Legislators." 113

34. Response to Item 32: "Social Meetings and Entertainment are Preferred by Educational Lobbyists to Persuade Legislators Toward a Budget Request." 114

35. Response to Item 33: "The Use of Pressure Tactics by Educational Lobbyists Has an Immediate Negative Impact Upon a Legislator." 116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The future of American education is, and will continue to be,influenced by political decision making (Bailey, p. 1). Therefore, only those individuals who clearly understand appropriate political influence can be effective in influencing educational policy goals (Bailey, p. 2). Yet, the myth that schools must be kept out of politics has been a long-standing tradition in the United States. The myth was largely created by mid-nineteenth century educators who convinced the public and politicians of the sanctity of education and of their own positions as the best judges of how much of the public's resources should be employed toward the advancement of education (Milstein and Jennings, p. 4).

The nineteenth century educators were in a position to isolate themselves and their domain from society. However, societal conditions have changed radically since that time. Education is no longer a protected field and has been increasingly subjected to intensive scrutiny by non-educators (Brubacher and Rudy, p. 29).

Numerous other lobby groups exist which are primarily concerned with influencing those decisions which will

ultimately impact the higher education community. These associations usually expend a great deal of lobbying effort at the national level. However, individual institutions concentrate their efforts on influencing legislation at the state level. Lobbying is a legitimate fact of life for higher education in the State of Tennessee. In fact, each of Tennessee's state universities has an individual who, although not registered under state lobbying laws, nevertheless, conducts activities consistent with lobbying behavior.

One of the primary concerns of all institutions of higher education is the level of funding received from the legislature. A tremendous amount of effort is expended by educational lobbyists insuring that the institutions they represent receive their "fair share" of appropriations.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The state universities in Tennessee have a commitment to serve the educational needs of their clientele. Colleges and universities could not fully fulfill these obligations, however, without funds obtained from the state legislature. Student tuition provides for only a portion of the budget for higher education with the majority of funds being secured through the legislative process.

The budget process requires the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) to recommend to the Governor the level of funding each institution is to receive (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 135). The Governor, however, may choose not to follow the recommendation of THEC. In fact, recommendations of THEC have rarely been fully adopted since 1967, the year the commission was created. Additionally, the legislature may choose not to adopt the budget as proposed by the Governor.

The legislative phase of the budgeting process is where lobbying activity has the potential of being most influential on the decision-making process. Arguably, the amount of money received by an institution is related to the influence of the institution's lobbyist. Little research has been conducted in Tennessee regarding the impact of lobbying activity upon higher education resource allocation.

II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to compare the perceptions of Tennessee legislators and educational lobbyists of Tennessee state universities regarding the degree of influence educational lobbyists have on legislative decision making regarding the funding of state universities. Additionally, a review of the current literature and

research was undertaken relative to state-level lobbying activities.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was designed to answer the following specific research questions:

1. What were the attitudes of legislators and educational lobbyists toward the higher education budgetary process in the State of Tennessee?

2. What methods of contact were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as the most effective?

3. Which items were selected by legislators and educational lobbyists as being the most influential in affecting a legislator's decision regarding funding higher education?

4.What techniques were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as being most effective in affecting a legislative decision regarding appropriations to Tennessee state universities?

For each of these research questions the effect of educational level, type of legislative district, number of years in the legislature and chamber (House or Senate) membership on legislator's perceptions of lobbying efforts were assessed. Additionally, the effect of the existence

of a state university in a legislator's immediate area, education committee membership, and political affiliation on his/her attitudes regarding the impact of lobby groups were considered.

IV. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study was significant in that administrative officials and lobbyists of state universities need to be aware of the most influential lobbying techniques and procedures as perceived by state legislators. Moreover, no such comprehensive study of this type has been conducted in the State of Tennessee.

In this period of social accountability, economic constriction and retrenchment, it is vital that administrators of public, state universities be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of lobbying efforts. The conclusions of this study will be beneficial to educational leaders as they attempt to influence educational resource allocation at the state legislative level and to legislators who need effective information on this important topic.

V. STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumptions underlying this study were as follows:

1. Responses of the legislators and educational lobbyists were honest and accurate within the scope of their perception.

2. The legislators and educational lobbyists had an accurate understanding of what was meant by lobbying strategies and techniques.

VI. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was delimited in scope by the following factors:

1. Only sitting members of the 1987-88 Tennessee House of Representatives and the Senate were included in the study.

2. No attempt was made to compare the perceptions of Tennessee legislators and educational lobbyists with those of other states.

3. The study did not attempt to consider lobbying of the executive branch of the state government or at other governmental levels.

4. Only the impact of lobbying activities related to Tennessee state universities was examined.

VII. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The following definitions were used for the purpose of the study:

Tennessee Higher Education Commission. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission is a nine-member board appointed by the Governor and empowered with the three-pronged responsibility to (1) coordinate higher education in Tennessee, (2) approve new degree programs, and (3) develop a mechanism for the equitable distribution of funds for higher education (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 135).

Educational lobbyist. An educational lobbyist is any individual associated with a state university who attempts to influence decisions of the Tennessee General Assembly on higher education matters, especially those of a financial nature.

Lobbying strategies. Lobbying strategies are those activities utilized by educational lobbyists to influence the decision of a Tennessee legislator.

State universities. State universities are those public institutions in Tennessee which have been authorized to provide formal education above the secondary school level and which offer at least the bachelor's degree.

VIII. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaires were administered to Tennessee legislators and educational lobbyists of state universities to solicit their perceptions of the impact of lobbying upon

the funding level of Tennessee state universities. The study utilized a questionnaire (developed by Caston) that was formulated from a review of current literature and certified by a panel of six faculty members and a former legislator. Their suggestions eliminated ambiguities and were beneficial in determining the sequence of items within the instrument (Caston, p. 7). Furthermore, the instrument was constructed such that interval level data were generated.

The instrument consisted of two sections. Section one asked members of the general assembly and lobbyists their perceptions of the level of influence of certain identified lobbying strategies and techniques. Section two was only administered to members of the general assembly and was designed to elicit demographic data. Items 1-4 on the questionnaire related to research question 1; items 5-15 related to research question 2; items 16-25 and item 34 related to research question 3; and, items 26-33 and item 35 related to research question 4. (See Appendix A.)

The population of the study consisted of the 132 members of the 1987-88 Tennessee legislature and educational lobbyists from Tennessee's nine state universities. The legislature was comprised of 99 representatives and 33 senators. The data were collected during a one-week period of time during the 1988 legislative session. The survey

instrument and an attached return envelope were delivered to each legislator with a memo indicating that the completed instrument would be collected from the legislator's office or the legislator could mail the instrument (see Appendix B). Additionally, the Speaker of the House, the Clerk of the House, and several legislators were instrumental in encouraging their colleagues to participate in the study.

The system of public higher education in Tennessee consists of nine state universities. The chief executive officer of each state university was identified as the university's chief lobbyist and was mailed a copy of the instrument with a return envelope.

Frequencies and percents of each item were computed for each group. Additionally, frequencies and percents of each item were tabulated for for legislators' level of education, legislative district, number of years in the legislature, and chamber membership. Frequencies and percents were also calculated for each item for the existence of a four-year public university in a legislative district, membership on an education committee, and party affiliation.

IX. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I provided an introduction, a statement of the problem, a purpose of the study, a presentation of research questions, the significance of the study, a statement of assumptions and limitations of the study, the definitions of terms, the methodology, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature and research related to lobbying activities in regard to state legislatures.

Chapter III provides the findings and an analysis of the data as collected from the questionnaire administered to the Tennessee legislators and education lobbyists from Tennessee state universities.

Chapter IV presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

I. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Lobbyists and lobby groups have played an increasingly active role in the modern legislative process. The number of lobbyists has grown steadily since the New Deal but especially since the late 1970s. This growth in lobbying activity has paralleled the increase in governmental spending and in the expansion of governmental influence into new areas.

Lobby groups are not new in the United States. In fact, the right to lobby was made implicit by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances." James Madison, father of the Constitution, was concerned with the influence of what he termed "factions." Madison succinctly defined faction as:

> . . . a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and activated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interest of the community (Barnes, 1971, p. 2).

Despite his obvious disapproval, Madison recognized that the existence and activities of factions were an unavoidable part of the democratic government. Madison further concluded that "the regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government" (The Washington Lobby, p. 4).

The use of the word "lobby" in describing an agent of special interests seeking to influence an elected official was not used until approximately forty years after the Constitution was ratified. The first use of the word was in 1829 (Schriftgiesser, p. 5). The term originally appeared as "lobby-agent" and was used in reference to seekers of special privilege at the capitol in Albany, New York. Journalists soon shortened the word to "lobbyist" and by 1832 it was frequently used in Washington. From its inception and throughout the nineteenth century the term was associated with negative views. Not until 1946, with the passage of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, was the term given a legal and respectable connotation (Schriftgiesser, p. 6).

The history of lobbying in America is closely related to the history of American legislation. In fact, a

reasonably accurate date for the beginning of pressure tactics upon Congress was the passage of the first Tariff Act in 1787. Alexander Hamilton's Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry, founded in the early 1800s, can claim credit as the first business lobby formed for the purpose of influencing a legislature on behalf of a powerful faction (Schriftgiesser, p. 6).

As industry developed and the nation expanded, the practice of lobbying increased dramatically. The growth of industry and commerce in the United States in the nineteenth century concentrated huge amounts of money in a small group of individuals. These people immediately felt the need to protect their vast fortunes. The primary role of lobbying throughout the century, therefore, was the preservation and encouragement of private property (Deakin, p. 57).

By the mid-1800s, the value of manufactured goods surpassed the value of agricultural products. The nation was undergoing the transition from an agrarian to a predominately industrial society. Thus, the classic period of lobbying which utilized lavish entertaining, spending, and raids on the national treasury, ensued. The situation had deteriorated to such a point that in 1852 James Buchanan indicated that "the host of contractors, speculators, stock-jobbers, and lobby members which haunt

the halls of Congress, all desirous . . . to get their arm into the public treasury, are sufficient to alarm every friend of the country. Their progress must be arrested" (Deakin, p. 58).

Among the deluge of lobbyists that invaded Washington during this period of time, Thurlow Weed is probably the best known. In addition to being a talented political organizer, Weed was also a talented legislative manipulator. To his contemporaries, he was known as "the wizard of the lobby," "the Lucifer of the lobby," and "the father of the lobby." He was also referred to as "the dictator" by both his friends and enemies and has been referred to by historians as one of the first of the great fixers (Deakin, p. 59).

In the wake of Thurlow Weed emerged an individual who for the next twenty years would reign as the "King of the Lobby." Unlike Weed, Samuel Ward brought refinement and dignity to the lobbying profession. In fact, he once wrote, "The profession of lobbying is not commendable. But I have endeavored to make it respectable by avoiding all measures without merit." (Deakin, p. 63)

The financial panic of 1857 had only begun to subside when Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt emerged as a leading lobbyist. Vanderbilt bribed legislators on a grand scale in a successful attempt to maintain his lucrative mail

contract with the federal government. In fact, the twenty years between 1865 and 1885 were replete with Washington scandals which continued until the inauguration of Grover Cleveland in 1895 (Deakin, p. 70).

The flagrant lobbying had attracted little attention from the public even though two congressional investigations had revealed widespread corruption among the various agents. In 1874, however, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision rebuking one form of lobbying activity. For nearly thirty years N. P. Trist had been attempting to collect a claim against the United States. In an effort to enhance his position, Trist employed Linus Child who was responsible for inducing Congress to award Trist his claim. When Trist refused to pay Child the agreed fee, Child brought suite which subsequently reached the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Noah H. Swayne spoke strongly in the decision indicating that:

> The agreement . . . was for the sale of influence and execution of the lobby agent to bring about the passage of a law . . . to legalize the traffic of such service would open a door at which fraud and falsehood would not fail to enter (Schriftgiesser, p. 17).

Although Justice Swayne's denunciation of lobbying did little to end the practice, it was an impetus for Congressman George Justice Hoar to sponsor legislation

requiring all lobbyists to register with the Clerk of the House (Schriftgiesser, p. 17).

During the first years of the twentieth century, a small group of American writers who became known as "the muckrakers" spearheaded a mass social, political, and economic reform movement. Individuals such as Ray Starmard Baker, Mack Sullivan, and George Creel concentrated on exposing to the public the pressures exerted upon Congress by special interest groups (Deakin, p. 73).

These disclosures set the stage for President Woodrow Wilson to clash with lobbyists early in his first term as President. President Wilson supported a bill substantially reducing tariff rates on imported manufactured goods. The "tariff lobby" which represented numerous manufacturing concerns responded with an extensive campaign in opposition to the tariff bill. President Wilson replied with an attack on the lobby by stating:

> Washington has seldom seen so numerous or so insidious a body. The newspapers are being filled with advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment not only of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain the lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public tariff.. . . It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of the matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it (Rich, p. 9).

The New York World shortly afterward published an article detailing the questionable tactics utilized by the "tariff

lobby" which included alleged bribery of members of Congress (Congress and Pressure Groups: Lobbying in a Modern Democracy, p. 7).

In response, the Senate subsequently began the first full-scale investigation of lobbying ever undertaken by either house. The Judiciary Committee conducted extensive hearings which disclosed a pattern of chronic abuses by the various Washington lobbyists. After several months of investigation, the select committee recommended passage of a bill requiring registration of all lobbyists with the Clerk of the House. The bill passed the House of Representatives but failed the Senate (Congress and Pressure Groups: Lobbying in a Modern Democracy, p. 7).

By the mid-1930s, Senator Hugo L. Black became the champion of the cause against lobbying excesses. Black, who later became a member of the United States Supreme Court, believed that private pressure on government had grown to such a degree that the democratic form of government was being jeopardized. In a speech in 1935, Black maintained that lobbying "has reached such a position of power that it threatens the government itself. Its size, its power, its capacity for evil; its greed, trickery, deception and fraud condemn it to the death it deserves." Black unsuccessfully proposed legislation requiring lobbyists to register (Schriftgiesser, p. 69).

Not until 1946 did Congress pass a general lobbyist registration law, the Federal Regulation Act of 1946. From its enactment, however, the bill received criticism. Critics asserted that "the act was neither carefully drafted nor fully considered. Its ambiguous terms encourage evasion; and, in providing for enforcement, Congress has failed to draw upon the experience of the states . . ." (Barnes, p. 15).

In 1954 in the Hariss Case, the Supreme Court in a 5-3 split decision upheld the constitutionality of the 1946 lobbyist law. The Court's interpretation of the law, however, contained various vague areas which allowed certain organizations and individuals to avoid registering under the law (Barnes, p. 16). The influence of pressure groups and paid lobbyists on congressional legislation in the post World War II era has been substantial. Almost every bill considered by Congress has had a contingent of interested pressure groups. The methods used to pressure Congress were basically the same as those used in the past. In the period of time from the passage of the 1946 lobby act through 1964, however, there were no publicly proven instances of a lobbyist influencing a Congressman's action on legislation through outright bribery or for any form of "in kind" payments (Diamond, p. 2).

Today hundreds of interest groups attempt to make their weight felt at selected points of government. They cover a range as varied as the society of which they are a part and include such multifaceted concerns as commercial, educational, industrial, and agricultural interests, as well as unions, ethnic and racial groups, and agencies of state and local government.

Private interests have expanded their activities with particular increases since World War II. This phenomenon precipitated the Senate's Special Committee to Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions to maintain in a report that:

> The increasing complexity of modern life and the consequent increase in the role of government in the lives of all Americans have caused pressure groups to play a more important part in our government than was anticipated a hundred years ago (Barnes, 1971, p. 2).

II. LOBBYING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES

The legislature may be described as an autonomous system with its own set of inputs which it transforms into decisions or outputs. Lobbyists are only one set of factors in the legislative process and their importance may vary from issue to issue. To be successful, however, lobbyists must employ strategies and tactics that legislators find necessary, desirable, or unavoidable. The more successful lobbyists are in accommodating themselves

to legislators and the legislative process, in terms of self-interest of individual legislators and the dynamics of the process, the more rewarding will be their efforts (Holtzman, p. 72).

Although access to the legislative system is the fundamental objective of lobby groups, it is the minimum objective. Once achieved, access only provides an opportunity to utilize procedures in order to give effect to the claims (Truman, p. 354).

In order to operate effectively within the legislature, lobbyists must be aware of certain basic and essential processes. The legislature generally establishes a timetable for specific action. Certain bills, for example, must be originated in the House or Senate by a specific date. The lobbyists generally consider these processes as baseline information and will review them extensively prior to any lobbying activity (Angel, p.105).

Certain "rules of the game" prevail among lobbyists and legislators regarding appropriate lobbying procedures and techniques. Lobbyists must be trustworthy and reliable, or the legislator will usually deny access to the lobbyists. Lobbyists must work toward developing a trust relationship by demonstrating such traits as honesty, dependability, sincerity, and a willingness to provide information and regarding appropriate lobbying procedures

and techniques. Lobbyists must be trustworthy and reliable, or the legislator will usually deny access to the lobbyists. Lobbyists must work toward developing a trust relationship by demonstrating such traits as honesty, dependability, sincerity, and a willingness to provide information and services when called upon to do so. The legislative process operates such that no one individual has absolute power, control, or independence. All the actors in the legislative process must, therefore, rely to some degree upon one another (Holtzman, p. 77).

Threats are generally resisted by legislators and can often prove counterproductive to the lobbyist. Perhaps if legislators were dependent upon lobbyists' or their clientele's votes or financial support for an election bid, they could be threatened without repercussion. Few lobbyists, however, are in possession of this level of leverage over legislators (Holtzman, p. 78).

Bribery is considered by both lobbyists and legislators as the least effective method of lobbying behavior. It is also considered as a very risky technique that could ultimately become a great disadvantage to the user. However, bribery does exist and probably more at the state level than in any other level of government (Holtzman, p. 79).

Despite the low ranking given to entertainment by legislators, most lobbyists are involved in a great deal of entertainment activity. A fundamental rule of the game regarding entertainment is that entertainment should involve no discussion of business. In fact, if business is discussed the value of the entertainment is lost (Zeigler, p. 191).

The size of most legislative bodies is such that lobbyists are precluded from working with all legislators intimately. Probably the most important focal point in the legislative process for lobbyists is the committee. What the committee recommends is usually adopted by the legislature at large. Influencing legislative decisions from outside the committee rather than from within, however, is a much more difficult task for the lobbyist. The task may be reduced if the committee or subcommittee responsible for the specific legislation is isolated for intensive lobbying activity. The task may be further reduced if the lobbyist can identify the specific network of individuals who actually exercise the power within the committee. In this regard, the chairperson is generally considered an extremely influential individual. Chairpersons may decide when, what, and if particular bills will come before the committee. They, therefore, may determine whether a particular bill will ever be considered (Holtzman, p. 93).

Lobbyists generally present their views by personally visiting governmental decision makers and delivering their messages in face-to-face conversation. There are several barriers to effective communication which must be overcome, and a clear and straight forward presentation may go a long way toward achieving this goal. However, a concise presentation must be supported by correct data. In fact, competitive lobbyists may evaluate each other's communication for mistakes or misrepresentation which they use to the disadvantage of the original sender (Milbrath, p. 375).

Pleasantness is probably the most important factor in obtaining and maintaining access to decision makers. The lobbyists must also convince legislators that they have something to say and that it is important and in the legislator's best interest to listen. A demonstration of constituent interest is perhaps the best way to insure legislative attention (Milbrath, p. 383).

Legislators require lobbyists to be knowledgeable because they need the information and want something in return for the time and attention they provide. It is imperative, therefore, that lobbyists be well prepared and well informed. Capable lobbyists should be well apprized not only in their own fields but on a broad range of issues. They should be aware of the appropriate phrases and with whom to communicate. The challenge to lobbyists

is to communicate the greatest amount of relevant information in the shortest possible time. Lobbyists who violate this norm challenge legislators to devise ways to dismiss them; they may lose the legislator's attention not only for the present but for future presentations (Milbrath, p. 385).

In the mid-1900s, special congressional investigative committees called attention to significant shifts in lobbying, shifts that had occurred only in the previous two decades. In contrast to the well-established methods of "direct contact" by lobbyists, the committee reported that "this new emphasis on pressure tactics might best be called 'lobbying at the grass roots'" (Holtzman, p. 99).

Lobbying at the grass roots assumed that the legislators were responsive to public opinion. This indirect lobbying involved resorting to constituents, other interest groups, and the mass media in order to influence legislation (Holtzman, p. 100).

One grass roots tactic that interest groups may employ is the letter-writing campaign. By motivating constituents to write their legislators, lobbyists hope to demonstrate that issues are of real concern to constituents and thereby influence legislators in a particular direction. Conversely, letter campaigns may have an irritation effect in that legislators or their staffs

must respond to the letters. The mere threat of a letter campaign may, however, accomplish the lobbyist's purpose (Milbrath, p. 397).

Public relations campaigns are much more indirect and are generally more expensive than letter-writing campaigns. They are equally difficult to control, and their effects are generally uncertain. Public relations campaigns that are big enough to establish a climate of opinion, however, are very effective for influencing governmental decisions (Holtzman, p. 123).

Certain lobbying organizations widely publicize legislative roll-call votes so that a wider number of voters have access to the voting record of individual legislators. The publication of this information is generally rejected by lobbyists. The tactic is dangerous in that most legislators perceive the technique as primitive; and, they may, therefore, retaliate against those lobbyists who utilize it. Legislators perceive that pressure is being applied to force their vote in a particular direction (Milbrath, p. 402).

Frequently, lobbyists may fail to obtain a favorable reception for their position. With the introduction of constituents and friends of the legislator into the campaign, lobbyists attempt to apply a more personal touch. Most lobbyists, however, employ constituent contacts very

carefully. They generally utilize this tactic more to gain access than to attempt to persuade the legislator (Holtzman, p. 106).

A combination of the direct and indirect approach is most productive for lobbyists. There are some legislators whom lobbyists may easily approach and predict how they are going to vote. It would, therefore, be unwise to direct substantial resources toward those legislators. Conversely, if lobbyists are aware that their personal intervention will have little or no impact upon the legislator, they may turn to techniques that will yield a more favorable outcome (Holtzman, p. 107).

Obviously lobbyists must work closely with the party which is in power. This is especially true if the controlling party maintains a large majority within the legislature. Party control may change, however, with any given election; therefore, attention must be given to the minority leadership (Angel, p.105).

III. STATE LEVEL LOBBYING

The American federal system of government has encouraged an increase in interest group activity at the state level. The creation of numerous points of decision making has contributed to a diffusion of the political process, thereby providing lobbyists with greater

opportunities for access to the decision makers (Jacob and Vines, p. 107).

Successful access to the state legislature, as with the national Congress, is dependent upon lobbyists' ability to gain favorable responses from those officials in a position to make a critical decision. Access, or the lack thereof, cannot, however, be limited directly to any set of circumstances or characteristics. Access may more likely be attributed to the structure of the situation (Jacob and Vines, p. 107).

A popular perception of lobbying exists which suggests that state level lobbyists involve themselves with providing entertainment for legislators, offering bribes, and threatening retaliation by defeating the incumbent legislators in the next effort at reelection. This notion has been largely dispelled at the national legislative level. However, there does appear to be some evidence which supports the belief that at the state level certain questionable methods continue to persist (Jacob and Vines, p. 104).

After interviewing lobbyists and legislators in Washington, Milbrath found that their perception was that state lobbying was much more corrupt than national lobbying. Some of the comments of his respondents were:

> Lobbying is very different before state legislatures; it is much more individualistic. Maybe this is the reason they have more bribery in state legislatures than in Congress. . . .
>
> In state legislatures,lobbying is definitely on a lower plane. The lobbyists are loose and hand out money and favors quite freely. . . .
>
> Lobbying at the state level is cruder, more basic and more obvious. . . .
>
> Lobbying at the state level is faster and more freewheeling and less visible; that is why it is more open to corruption. . . . (Milbrath, p. 8).

Certain characteristics of state legislatures and legislators exist which tend to lend creditability to the belief of more corrupt lobbying techniques and activity at the state level. State legislatures meet for shorter sessions and less often than does the national Congress. Therefore, a set of formal and informal rules relative to lobbying activity may be much more difficult to develop. State legislators are also more likely to consider their legislative careers as a secondary aspect of their lives. Also, the turnover rate of state legislators is much higher than in the national Congress. Finally, state legislators usually do not reside permanently in the state capitol and generally incur more expenses in relation to their incomes than do national legislators. These characteristics often improve the general access of lobbyists to state-level legislators (Jacob and Vines, p. 138).

Those groups with resources at the state level have a clear stake in state-level politics and are therefore more

likely to concentrate their efforts in state legislatures. Just as the strength of political parties varies from state to state, however, the impact of the various state-level interest groups depends upon a multiplicity of factors and circumstances (Jacob and Vines, p. 141).

IV. EDUCATION LOBBY GROUPS

The Constitution of the United States makes no mention of education and the Tenth Amendment reserves to the states and the people all powers not specifically reserved to the Federal Government. Education has, therefore, become Constitutionally a state responsibility. As state government has reassumed a larger responsibility for providing support to education in recent years, educational lobbyists have increasingly become more in evidence at the state level. Not only are they more numerous and more active, but they are also better organized and tend to continue as functional groups even after the problem which initially coalesced them has been resolved (Steele, p. 258).

In a generic sense, the question of what education lobbyists want from the state legislature can be answered quite simply: (a) protection for their clientele against harm, (b) rules and resources favorable to their clientele's perceived self-interest, and (c) personal respectability and recognition. These, obviously, are the

basic wants of all those who attempt to influence the course of public policy, regardless of the field of interest or level of government (Milbrath, p. 26).

The number of state laws and administrative regulations that have an impact upon various segments of American education is staggering. Education lobbyists, therefore, spend much of their time monitoring the daily business of state government in an effort to discourage decisions that might harm their constituents. Conversely, lobbyists attempt to encourage those developments that will positively affect the educational enterprises they represent (Milbrath, p. 26).

The other side of "protection from harm" is "favorable consideration," that is, the securing of laws, regulations, interpretations, guidelines, and money that confer some kind of positive benefit upon a general or particular clientele. In the case of educational interests, sought-after benefits may be grouped into four, somewhat overlapping, categories: financial, categorical-programmatic, professional, and administrative (Milbrath, p. 57).

In terms of financial benefit, a majority of educational institutions in the United States are publicly supported. Most of the public money for education has been state and local rather than federal in origin. Over the past twenty years, however, as the demands for and cost of

education have dramatically increased, local pressures have induced larger sums of money to be appropriated at successively higher levels of government. As a result, partnerships have increasingly been formed between educational lobbyists and the bureaucratic leadership in the state executive and legislative branches in the determination of spending targets (Campbell and Mazzoni, p. 102).

Many educational lobbyists are interested in particular categories of governmental assistance such as money targeted for special education programs, the handicapped, the disadvantaged, vocational education, or drug education, to name only a few. Around each of these categories develops a cluster of associations intent on securing special governmental support for the program in question (Jones, p. 76).

Much of the energy of educational lobbyists is poured into the development and protection of professional status and privileges. This takes many forms: attempts to be "included in" or to be "included out" (that is,attempts to restrict membership and otherwise to define eligibility); attempts to gain advantage in bargaining situations; attempts to protect autonomies, freedoms, and prerequisites; and attempts to improve salaries, pensions, and fringe benefits (Milbrath, p. 116).

Educational lobbyists maintain a continuing interest in the administration of whatever programs are in current operation. The way in which programs are administered--including the locus of discretionary judgments about the allocation of program resources--is a matter of grave concern to key actors in intergovernmental relations (Milbrath, p. 125).

Educational lobbyists are key intermediaries in an information network that provides clients and members with material about governmental agency programs while concomitantly providing governmental agencies with operational feedback. The alliance between educational lobbyists and the governmental agency is frequently a love-hate relationship. The agencies and the lobbyists need one another, but the symbiosis is frequently troubled by the agency's belief that educational lobbyists want money without accountability and by the lobbyists' belief that the agencies suffer from "the triumph of technique over purpose" (Milbrath, p. 146).

The symbiosis is most effective when both the agency or bureau and lobbyists benefit from cooperative attempts to transmit "the word" to professional grass roots. The "word" may be a new regulation or a guideline, a notice of change in procedure, or a new interpretation of eligibility for an old program. Whatever the type of information, the

agency benefits from a communication network that is infinitely more precise and direct than the public media (Milbrath, p. 155).

The converse is the flow of information and opinion back from the grass roots through the lobbyists to the governmental agency. At times this relationship is formal; lobbyists may be asked to serve on ad hoc or advisory committees to bureaus or programs. At other times, a government program director will ask lobbyists to sample their clientele for opinions on the reasonableness of a prepared guideline or regulation. Or again, lobbyists may take the initiative in bringing complaints or fears to the attention of governmental officials (Milbrath, p. 185).

The tasks and roles of education lobbyists are varied. Nearly all of the relationships between lobbyists and government, however, occur through various means of communication. The various roles of an educational lobbyist may be broadly categorized into four broad areas: liaison, advocate, strategist, and collaborator (Milbrath, p. 202).

Liaison between clients and the government is an important aspect of every lobbyist's responsibility. Viewed from this perspective, lobbying can be conceptualized as communication channels obtaining information concerning government from the press,

government publications, and personal contacts, screening it for items of interest to clients, and transmitting these items to appropriate persons among their clientele. Conversely, items from the clientele are transmitted to appropriate individuals in the government. These individuals may be members of the bureaucratic, executive, judicial, or the legislative branch of government (Jones, p. 117).

Many clients may lack the skill at communication or the time required to plead their own positions to the appropriate governmental decision makers. They, therefore, expect their lobbyist representatives to assume the roles both of liaison and advocate representatives. Advocate lobbyists plead the case or make a request on behalf of their clients to the appropriate governmental officials. They may communicate not only facts and information but also their clients' reason for desiring the adoption of a various policy. The lobbyist's task is obviously facilitated if it can be pointed out that numerous members of the organization represented are closely monitoring the decision of the governmental official (Jones, p. 120).

Although nearly all lobbyists have liaison and advocacy tasks, a few lobbyists may specialize in the development of strategy. Strategies differ from situation to situation, and the strategists must be prepared to plot

a strategy consistent with the events at hand. Generally, the primary task of the strategists is to explore areas of agreement between those groups who are advocating the passage of a particular policy and those who are attempting to block the policy (Jones, p. 125).

Perhaps the most overpowering type of lobbying is the collaboration of various groups toward the accomplishment of a mutually beneficial goal. Nearly all governmental decision makers hesitate to decide against a strong coalition. Some groups, especially the smaller ones, plan nearly all strategy in joint session with collaborators; and, for some, collaboration becomes the very essence of their effectiveness and survival (Jones, p. 145).

V. TENNESSEE LOBBY LAWS

The Tennessee Code Annotated (T.C.A.) 3-6-101, et seq., referred to as the Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act of 1975, serves as the controlling statute regarding lobbying activity. According to the Act, the Secretary of State serves as the Administrative Agency of the Lobbyist Disclosure Law. The Act defines a lobbyist as "any person who communicates directly or indirectly with any official of the executive or legislative branch of government with the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative action" (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration

and Disclosure Act, 1975). The definition also includes individuals who have expenditures other than political contributions in excess of $200.00 to solicit others, "either directly or by an advertising campaign, to communicate with any official in the legislative or executive branches of government with the purpose of influencing any legislative or administrative actions."

The Secretary of State is required to describe the various forms, reports, and other information and to provide this documentation to lobbyists and maintain this information for a five-year period of time. The Secretary of State is, therefore, required to develop an appropriate filing and coding system. The Secretary of State is, furthermore, required to seek advisory opinions from the Attorney General and to "promulgate any rules and regulations as may be appropriate for the administration of the Act" (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act, 1975).

The Act requires all individuals who qualify as lobbyists to file the appropriate forms with the Secretary of State within five days after becoming a lobbyist. Lobbyists must also furnish to the Secretary of State written proof of the authority to lobby on behalf of each client represented (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act, 1975).

At the time of registration each individual must pay a $25.00 annual filing fee for each client represented. Any lobbyist, however, who serves as an official of the executive or judicial branch of government or any state educational institution must register but is exempt from the filing fee. The registration year begins on January 1 and continues through December 31 (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act, 1975).

Each person registered as a lobbyist must file with the Secretary of State a sworn report concerning the lobbying activities which must contain the extent of any direct business arrangement or partnership with any candidate for public office or an official in the legislative or executive branch of government. The lobbyist must also submit to the Secretary of State an itemized list of, "any gifts of $50.00 or more and each political contribution of more than $100.00 made by the lobbyist to benefit a candidate for public office or an official in the legislative branch or a member of a legislator's staff" (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act, 1975).

The Act specifically prohibits a lobbyist from, "offering or attempting to offer anything of value to a legislator or to the family of a legislator on the understanding that the legislator will in return vote in a

particular way." Furthermore, the lobbyist is forbidden to make a ". . . false statement concerning any matter for which he is registered to lobby or to make a loan to any candidate for the General Assembly. Any person who violates any of the provisions set forth in the Act will be guilty of a misdemeanor" (Tennessee Lobbyist Registration and Disclosure Act, 1975).

VI. HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE

Article XI of the Tennessee Constitution states that "The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance, support and eligibility standards of a system of free public schools. The General Assembly may establish and support such post-secondary educational institutions, including public institutions of higher learning, as it determines" (Tennessee Constitution, Article XI, Section 12).

The structure of Tennessee higher education consists of two major systems that are governed by separate boards: the Board of Regents of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee and the Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee. These boards are coordinated by a third body, The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). Each governing and coordinating body is composed of lay citizens appointed by the Governor in an effort to

ensure public input into the direction of policy guidance of higher education. All three bodies employ chief executive officers and are legislative entities with defined purposes and responsibilities (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 135- 136).

The State University and Community College System of Tennessee was created by the General Assembly in 1972. Originally, the system was comprised of six state universities and ten community colleges. Four state technical institutes and twenty-six area vocational-technical schools were transferred to the State University and Community College System in 1983 (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 137).

The system is governed by the State Board of Regents whose major responsibilities include curricula development, program and degree requirements, approval of operating and capital budgets, selection of campus presidents, and the establishment of policies regarding system and campus operations. The institutions and schools span the State and all are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 137).

The University of Tennessee is a multi-campus university system which is comprised of four principal campuses. Each campus is headed by a Chancellor, and the

four are geographically situated in various sections of the state. The University System is governed by a Board of Trustees with the members of the Board being appointed by the Governor, who also serves as Chairman of the Board (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 144).

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission was created by the General Assembly in 1967 to achieve coordination and unity between Tennessee's dual public post-secondary institution system. The Commission serves as a primary source of information concerning higher education in Tennessee and is charged with the responsibility of developing a structured Master Plan to ensure consistently for higher education. The Master Plan is used when making policy recommendations to the Board of Regents, The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, the General Assembly, and the Governor regarding the need for existing degree programs, the implementation of new programs, and the regulation of tuition and fees (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 136).

The Commission is further charged with the responsibility for studying the use of public funds appropriated for higher education. The Commission recommends the appropriations of state funds for the public higher education institutions and conducts studies and makes recommendations relating to all aspects of higher education

in the State of Tennessee (Tennessee Blue Book, 1987-88, p. 136).

VII. TENNESSEE APPROPRIATIONS TO STATE UNIVERSITIES

The legislation creating the Tennessee Higher Education Commission in 1967 set forth numerous responsibilities with included the commission's development of policies insuring the equitable distribution of public funds. The THEC adopted the formula method to determine the fiscal year 1987-88 operating appropriations for Tennessee's state universities. The following goals were the essential characteristics of Tennessee's appropriation formula:

1. The formula should adequately reflect the funding needs of Tennessee's state universities.

2. The formula must provide an equitable distribution of available resources.

3. State universities should retain maximum flexibility in the management of funds and should not be penalized for the efficient utilization of resources.

4. The formula should provide recognition of the differences in the roles, mission, and goals of the various state universities.

5. The formula should be compatible with state-wide goals such as access, desegregation, quality, and evaluation of performance.

6. The formula should be as simple as possible given the nature of the institutions to be funded.

7. The formula should be based upon reliable information and data systems which assure comparability among institutions (Appropriations Formula Academic Formula Units Fiscal Year 1987-88, pp. 1-2).

The formula generates expenditure requirements for each institution a nd focuses upon allocation of equal support to all institutions conducting the same type of activities. Formula analyses of expenditures measure requirements for 14 specific categories (Appropriations Formula Academic Formula Units Fiscal Year 1987-88, pp. 2-3).

The formula approach for instructional academic support, the largest expenditure, recommends funds based upon faculty salaries and student/faculty ratios at comparable institutions. Ten "peer" institutions were selected for Tennessee by institutional groups based upon institutional size, program mix, and other factors. Average faculty salaries were computed for the peer institutions using Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS) salary data. The funding calculation divided the

projected student credit hour production by student/staff ratios to determine the number of instructional personnel required, and this number was then multiplied by the average salary factor of the peer institutions. Adjustments were made for graduate assistants, equipment, clerical and supplies requirements, and enrollment fluctuations among academic terms. Supplements were provided to Memphis State University to reflect higher salaries associated with the law school and to Tennessee Technological University due to increased salary requirements for engineering faculty. Expenditures for the remaining thirteen instructional support activities were generated as a percentage of instructional expense by type of institution. Capital outlay, desegregation funds, and monies for special projects were appropriated by the legislature in addition to the funds generated by the formula. Although a multiplicity of factors have an impact upon the level of appropriations to state universities, it is the period of time between THEC's recommendation to the Governor and the actual budgetary approval by the legislature that educational lobbying has the greatest impact upon the budget process (Appropriations Formula Academic Formula Units Fiscal Year 1987-88, p. 2-3).

VIII. HIGHER EDUCATION LOBBYING

E. Terrance Jones maintained that state politics have changed dramatically during the 1970s and 1980s and that many public colleges and universities are subsequently losing ground because they are continuing to utilize outmoded forms of lobbying strategies and techniques. Moreover, Jones maintained that if higher education is to increase its financial support it must revamp its political efforts. The various changes in state politics require a change in university lobbying practices (Jones, p. 110).

Jones identified five areas which are especially relevant to public higher education: resources are more scarce than they have been, responsibilities of state government are greater, citizens are less supportive of government, referenda are more frequently used to make major public policy decisions, and interest group and campaign technology have become more complex (Jones, p. 110).

Several reasons were enumerated by Jones as causes for the decrease in state-level spending power during the late 1970s and early 1980s. First, the national economy was less productive, and real growth requires greater productivity. Second, revenue systems in most states have not kept pace with inflation. Neither the sales tax nor

the property tax effectively copes with rapid or drastic price changes. Furthermore, most state income tax plans are not progressive enough to deal effectively with rapid price swings. Third, a number of states have passed fiscal limitation measures which may seriously restrain state revenue growth. Finally, federal assistance to states has declined (Jones, p. 110).

While states have less money to spend, their responsibilities have increased. Since the early 1970s, Jones contends, successive national administrations have increased the portions of the domestic policy burden to state and local governments (Jones, p. 111).

Past and present attempts by state universities to influence state policy making have had a narrow focus. Lobbying efforts have largely been conducted in a piecemeal fashion. Lobbyists have concentrated their efforts in the state capitol and have been almost entirely directed toward regulatory and budgetary policy matters. Given the past decade's dramatic changes regarding state politics, the prevailing practices of education lobbyists should be drastically extended and revised. Higher education must, therefore, take an interest in additional policy areas, be willing to participate in coalitions, be more instrumental in influencing statewide activities, and involve more of

the campus community in the lobbying effort (Jones, p. 112).

Appropriations to higher education do not exist in a vacuum. If public colleges and universities are to receive adequate funding, Jones contended, they must be as concerned about the size of the the total state budget as they are about the proportion of their individual budget. Higher education must, therefore, direct some attention to policies aimed at increasing total state revenues. Such efforts may range from assisting in stimulating economic development to calling for changes in the tax structure (Jones, p. 112-113).

As public higher education broadens its policy interests it must also seek new political allies. Coalitions are essential elements in accomplishing substantial impacts upon policy formulation. The problem is to persuade state officials that higher education needs more money and that it makes political sense to increase political support to public colleges and universities. To be successful, higher education must speak to the entire state (Jones, p. 113).

No single approach to higher education lobbying can be guaranteed to be a successful strategy. Certain basic principles exist, however, which, if followed, may have a positive impact upon the higher education lobbying effort.

In any state only a few individuals make the basic decisions as to the amount of resources which will be appropriated for higher education. The successful lobbyist should, therefore, concentrate his/her efforts on these individuals (Hicks, p. 100).

Faculty members are usually considered to be ineffective lobbyists, and faculty committees are even less useful in the lobbying effort. Students, however, can be very effective in the lobbying effort. They are especially effective if their effort is concentrated upon their own senators and representatives and if they confine themselves to merely explaining the importance of a quality education (Hicks, p. 101).

The university president is a key figure in the lobbying effort. The most effective strategy for the president is to develop a personal style and to continue with it throughout the lobbying effort. Generally the more successful presidents avoid overexposure and present an aura of integrity and sincerity. Successful presidents never engage in name calling or are involved in half truths (Hicks, p. 101).

The most important criteria for a successful higher education lobbying program, however, is the way in which the institution serves its clientele. There is no substitute for the provision of quality education.

University quality may be the most important lobbying strategy or technique utilized by the higher education lobbyists (Hicks, p. 104).

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data collected to assess the impact of lobbying and influence in the funding of state universities by the Tennessee General Assembly are presented in this chapter. Table 1 presents information relative to the response rate of Tennessee's 132 members of the General Assembly and 9 higher education lobbyists. Sixty-six representatives (67%) and 26 senators (79%) responded to the questionnaire. A total of 92 members (70%) of the 1987-88 Tennessee legislature and 8 (89%) educational lobbyists participated in the study.

Table 2 presents demographic data obtained from members of the General Assembly. Slightly more than 28 percent of the legislators had earned a terminal degree. Approximately 16 percent of the legislators had a master's degree; 25 percent had earned a bachelor's degree, and about 17 percent of the legislators indicated they had attended college but not graduated. A few more than 13 percent were only high school graduates and none of the respondents indicated less than a high school education.

Slightly less than half of the legislators (44.57%) indicated they represented rural districts; 40.22 percent

TABLE 1

RESPONSE RATE OF THE TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND HIGHER EDUCATION LOBBYISTS

	Total Membership	Total Responding	Percent Responding
House	99	66	67
Senate	33	26	79
Total	132	92	70
Lobbyists	9	8	89

TABLE 2

RESPONSE RATE OF TENNESSEE LEGISLATORS
PER PROFILE AREA

Legislator Profiles	Percent	Number Responded
Education Level		
Less than High School	00.00	0
High School Graduate	13.04	12
Some College	17.39	16
Bachelor's Degree	25.00	23
Master's Degree	16.30	15
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	28.26	26
Legislative District Urban	40.22	37
Rural	44.57	41
Suburban	15.22	14
Years in Legislature		
0 - 4	47.83	44
5 - 8	21.74	20
9 - 12	20.65	19
13 - 16	7.61	7
17 or more	2.17	2
Chamber		
House	71.74	66
Senate	28.26	26
Live Near State University		
Yes	69.57	64
No	30.43	28
Education Committee		
Yes	17.39	16
No	82.61	76
Political Affiliation		
Democrat	72.83	67
Republican	27.17	25

indicated their districts were primarily urban. Only 15.22 percent of the legislators represented suburban areas.

Nearly 48 percent of the legislators had served 4 years or less in the legislature. They were followed in the order of years of service by those who had served 5-8 years (21.74%), 9-12 years (20.65%), 13-16 years (7.61%), and legislators with 17 or more years (2.17%) of service.

A large majority of respondents (71.74%) were members of the House of Representatives while only 28.26 percent were senators. Most of the legislators (69.57%) indicated they lived near a state university; however, 30.43 percent did not reside near a state university. Approximately 17 percent of the respondents served on an education committee with 83 percent serving on other committees. A large majority (72.83%) were affiliated with the Democratic party, while only 27.17 percent were Republicans.

Four research questions were presented in Chapter I. The research questions with the corresponding survey items are treated separately in this section. The means and frequencies of the data obtained for each item, the number of respondents in each profile area, and a discussion of each item are also reported in this chapter. Responses to the survey questions were on a 4 point scale from strongly agree (4) to strongly disagree (1). Agreement was therefore considered a rating of 3 or 4; disagreement a rating of 1 or 2.

I. RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 1

What were the attitudes of legislators and educational lobbyists toward the higher education budgetary process in the State of Tennessee?

Items 1 through 4 on the instrument directly relate to this question. Results of the data analysis for each item by legislator profile and lobbyists response follow.

Item 1. "The legislative process for funding state universities is a cumbersome process. (Process includes: (a) budget request by university, (b) budget recommendation by THEC, (c) recommendation by the governor, (d) committee hearings, and (e) appropriations by the legislature.)" Analysis of the means and frequencies of item 1, as shown in Table 3, indicates that a majority of the legislators (79.35%) agreed that the budgetary process for funding state universities is cumbersome. The total mean was 2.95 and also suggested agreement.

Only one category of legislators did not respond positively a majority of the time--senators. Exactly one-half of those with 17 or more years experience agreed with the item. Lobbyists also disagreed that the funding process was cumbersome. Several groups of legislators--

TABLE 3

RESPONSE TO ITEM 1: "THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS FOR FUNDING STATE UNIVERSITIES IS A CUMBERSOME PROCESS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	80.00	2.70
Some College	16	100.00	3.38
Bachelor's Degree	23	86.96	3.17
Master's Degree	15	73.33	2.87
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD., etc.)	26	65.38	2.69
Legislative District			
Urban	37	83.78	3.11
Rural	39	76.92	2.85
Suburban	14	78.57	2.93
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	83.33	3.07
5 - 8	20	80.00	2.85
9 - 12	19	84.21	3.05
13 - 16	7	57.14	2.71
17 or more	2	50.00	2.00
Chamber			
House	63	93.65	3.19
Senate	26	46.15	2.38
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	82.26	3.05
No	28	75.00	2.79
Education Committee			
Yes	16	87.50	3.25
No	74	78.38	2.91
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	81.54	3.00
Republican	25	76.00	2.88
All Legislators	92	79.35	2.95
Lobbyist	8	40.00	2.62

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

those who were high school graduates (80.00%), had only some college (100.00%), had a bachelor's degree (86.96%), were from an urban district (83.78%), had less than 13 years experience, were House members (93.65%), lived near a state university (82.26%), were members of an education committee (87.50%), and Democrats (81.54%)--had 80 percent or more who agreed that the funding process was cumbersome. Legislators with 17 or more years experience (2.00) and senators (2.38) had means of less than 2.5, indicating lack of strength of agreement for these groups. Lobbyists, while reflecting only 40 percent agreement with the item, had a mean score of 2.62.

Item 2. "The recommendations made by THEC are more influential than the recommendations made by the Governor." Analysis of the data reveals that the majority of legisla- legislators disagreed that recommendations made by THEC are more influential than those of the Governor. As depicted in Table 4, only 27.17 percent of the responding legislators expressed agreement with the item. Their total mean (2.01) also indicates opposition.

Legislators who were only high school graduates (60.00%) and those with 17 or more years of experience (100.00%) were the only profile categories in which a majority of respondents agreed. They were also the only groups with a mean of at least 2.5. Moreover, several

TABLE 4

RESPONSE TO ITEM 2: "THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THEC ARE MORE INFLUENTIAL THAN THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE GOVERNOR."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	60.00	2.50
Some College	16	31.05	2.19
Bachelor's Degree	23	13.04	1.78
Master's Degree	15	20.00	1.80
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	26.92	2.00
Legislative District			
Urban	37	32.43	2.03
Rural	39	20.51	1.92
Suburban	14	28.57	2.14
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	28.57	2.00
5 - 8	20	20.00	1.85
9 - 12	19	15.79	1.95
13 - 16	7	42.86	2.14
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	30.16	2.06
Senate	26	19.23	1.85
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	24.19	1.92
No	28	32.14	2.18
Education Committee			
Yes	16	18.75	1.94
No	74	28.38	2.01
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	26.15	1.98
Republican	25	28.00	2.04
All Legislators	92	27.17	2.01
Lobbyists	7	14.29	1.57

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

groups--those with a bachelor's degree (13.04%), master's degree holders (20.00%), those with 5-8 (20.00%) or 9-12 (15.79%) years experience, senators (19.23%), and education committee members (18.75%)--had 20 percent or less positive response. The responses of educational lobbyists were consistent with legislators in that a minority (14.29%) concurred with the item, and the mean (1.75) of their responses also denotes disagreement.

Item 3. "The recommendations made by THEC should be more influential than the recommendations made by the Governor." Analysis of the results of Item 3 displayed in Table 5 indicates that only 47.82 percent of the legislators agreed with the item. The mean of 2.34 also connotes mild disagreement.

At least 50 percent of the legislators in the following groups, however, responded positively: high school graduates (50.00%), those who had earned only some college credit (56.25%), terminal degree holders (50.08%), representatives of urban areas (56.75%), legislators with 0-4 (50.00%), 9-12 (52.63%), or 17 or more years (50.00%) in the legislature, senators (53.85%), those who lived near a state university (50.00%), education committee members (56.25%), and Republicans (60.00%). Less than 25 percent of the legislators from suburban districts (21.43%) felt that THEC should be more influential. However, five groups

TABLE 5

RESPONSE TO ITEM 3: "THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THEC SHOULD BE MORE INFLUENTIAL THAN THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE GOVERNOR."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.10
Some College	16	56.25	2.56
Bachelor's Degree	23	39.13	2.17
Master's Degree	15	46.67	2.33
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	50.08	2.46
Legislative District			
Urban	37	56.76	2.57
Rural	39	48.72	2.26
Suburban	14	21.43	2.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	50.00	2.29
5 - 8	20	45.00	2.45
9 - 12	19	52.63	2.47
13 - 16	7	28.57	2.00
17 or more	2	50.00	2.50
Chamber			
House	63	44.44	2.24
Senate	26	53.85	2.58
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	50.00	2.44
No	28	43.59	2.14
Education Committee			
Yes	16	56.25	2.62
No	74	45.95	2.28
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	43.08	2.28
Republican	25	60.00	2.52
All Legislators	92	47.82	2.34
Lobbyists	7	14.29	2.43

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

of legislators--those who had some college (2.56), representatives of only urban areas (2.57), legislators with 17 or more years service (2.50), senators (2.58), and Republicans (2.52)--also responded with a mean of at least 2.5. An analysis of the responses of lobbyists showed that they disagreed that the recommendations of THEC should be more influential than the Governor's. In fact, only 14.29 percent concurred with the item and their mean of 2.43 also reflects a lack of support.

Item 4. "Lobbying activity by educational lobbyists from state universities results in more generous treatment by the General Assembly." Examination of the means and percentages displayed in Table 6 indicates that a majority (63.04%) of the legislators agreed with item 4. The total group mean of 2.57 also suggests slight endorsement.

A majority of legislators in all subgroups, with the exception of representatives with only some college (43.75%), those with 13-16 years (42.86%) service, and education committee members (37.50%), expressed approval. Several groups, however, responded with a mean of less than 2.5--legislators with only some college (2.31), those with a master's degree (2.33), legislators with 9-12 (2.32), and 13-16 (2.29) years in the legislature, senators (2.36) and education committee members (2.00). This suggests only marginal support by legislators of the contention that

TABLE 6

RESPONSE TO ITEM 4: "LOBBYING ACTIVITY BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES RESULTS IN MORE GENEROUS TREATMENT BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	2.70
Some College	16	43.75	2.31
Bachelor's Degree	23	69.57	2.70
Master's Degree	15	53.33	2.33
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	69.23	2.65
Legislative District			
Urban	37	59.46	2.54
Rural	39	64.10	2.56
Suburban	14	64.29	2.57
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	66.67	2.62
5 - 8	20	65.00	2.70
9 - 12	19	52.63	2.32
13 - 16	7	42.86	2.29
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	66.67	2.65
Senate	26	53.85	2.36
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	66.13	2.65
No	28	53.57	3.04
Education Committee			
Yes	16	37.50	2.00
No	74	67.57	2.68
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	64.62	2.57
Republican	25	56.00	2.52
All Legislators	92	63.04	2.57
Lobbyists	7	100.00	3.29

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

activities by educational lobbyists result in more generous treatment. Not surprisingly, however, all of the educational lobbyists concurred with the item; and, their mean of 3.29 also signifies their solid support of this idea.

II. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 1

Analysis of items 1-4 demonstrates that the majority of legislators believed that the legislative process is cumbersome. They generally did not consider, however, that the recommendations of THEC are, or should be, more influential than those of the Governor. Legislators also only marginally supported the contention that activities by educational lobbyists result in more generous treatment by the General Assembly.

In contrast, most educational lobbyists believed that the budgetary process is not cumbersome. They strongly concurred with the legislators, however, that the Governor is, and should be, more influential than the THEC. Contrary to legislators, however, lobbyists believed their activity results in more generous treatment by the legislature.

III. RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 2

What methods of contact were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as the most effective? Items 5

through 15 directly addressed this question, and the results of the data analysis of each item follows.

Item 5. "All educational lobbyists from state universities have reasonably unlimited access to legislators." Analysis of legislative responses to item 5 presented in Table 7 indicates that the majority of legislators (72.82%) agreed that lobbyists have reasonable access to legislators. Their mean of 3.05 also signifies strong support.

At least 50 percent of the legislators for all subgroups responded positively to item 5. In fact, 80 percent or more of the legislators in three groups--legislators who had a bachelor's degree (82.61%), representatives of suburban districts (92.86%), and education committee members (81.25%)--agreed that lobbyists have access to legislators. Furthermore, the mean for all subgroups, with the exception of those with only some college (2.94), urban representatives (2.95), and legislators with 5 or more years experience was at least 3.0 which further suggests strong agreement. Lobbyists also believed they have access to legislators as demonstrated by a 75 percent positive response rate and a mean of 3.25.

Item 6. "Educational lobbyists from state universities concentrate their efforts on trying to

TABLE 7

RESPONSE TO ITEM 5: "ALL EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES HAVE REASONABLY UNLIMITED ACCESS TO LEGISLATORS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	3.10
Some College	16	62.50	2.94
Bachelor's Degree	23	82.61	3.13
Master's Degree	15	73.33	3.00
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	76.92	3.15
Legislative District			
Urban	37	64.86	2.95
Rural	39	76.92	3.15
Suburban	14	92.86	3.21
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	78.57	3.31
5 - 8	20	70.00	2.85
9 - 12	19	78.95	2.95
13 - 16	7	57.14	2.86
17 or more	2	50.00	2.50
Chamber			
House	63	73.02	3.08
Senate	26	76.92	3.08
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	72.58	3.10
No	28	78.57	3.04
Education Committee			
Yes	16	81.25	3.12
No	74	72.97	3.07
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	75.38	3.08
Republican	25	72.00	3.08
All Legislators	92	72.82	3.05
Lobbyists	8	75.00	3.25

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

influence only a select and small number of legislators who hold important positions in the appropriation process." Analysis of item 6 provided in Table 8 indicates a small majority (60.87%) of legislators agreed that educational lobbyists concentrate their efforts on a small number of legislators. The mean of 2.67 also shows only marginal support.

A majority of legislators for all subgroups, except those with only a high school education (30.01%) and legislators with 5-8 (35.00%) or 13-16 (42.86%) years in the legislature agreed. Moreover, at least 80 percent of the legislators who had served 9-12 (84.21%) or 17 or more years (100.00%) in the legislature responded positively. The means of all the groups with exception of holders of only a high school diploma (2.00) and those who served 5-8 (2.20) or 13-16 (2.43) years in the legislature were at least 2.5. The two respondents with 17 or more years experience demonstrated the strongest support as evidenced by a mean of 3.50. In contrast to legislators, lobbyists expressed strong agreement to the item as evidenced by 87.50 percent positive response and a mean of 2.75.

Item 7. "Testimony at committee hearings by an educational lobbyist is more influential than direct "one-on-one" communication between a legislator and a lobbyist." Analysis of of the data presented in Table 9

TABLE 8

RESPONSE TO ITEM 6: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES CONCENTRATE THEIR EFFORTS ON TRYING TO INFLUENCE ONLY A SELECT AND SMALL NUMBER OF LEGISLATORS WHO HOLD IMPORTANT POSITIONS IN THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	30.01	2.00
Some College	16	56.25	2.50
Bachelor's Degree	23	73.91	3.13
Master's Degree	15	66.67	2.80
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	61.54	2.58
Legislative District			
Urban	37	59.46	2.78
Rural	39	58.97	2.51
Suburban	14	71.43	2.86
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	64.29	2.79
5 - 8	20	35.00	2.20
9 - 12	19	84.21	2.95
13 - 16	7	42.86	2.43
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	57.14	2.71
Senate	26	69.23	2.54
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	62.90	2.74
No	28	57.14	2.54
Education Committee			
Yes	16	56.25	2.50
No	74	62.16	2.72
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	60.00	2.71
Republican	25	64.00	2.60
All Legislators	92	60.87	2.67
Lobbyists	8	87.50	2.75

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 9

RESPONSE TO ITEM 7: "TESTIMONY AT HEARINGS BY AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN ONE-ON-ONE COMMUNICATION WITH A LEGISLATOR."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.00
Some College	16	18.75	1.81
Bachelor's Degree	23	26.09	1.91
Master's Degree	15	40.00	2.07
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	53.85	2.27
Legislative District			
Urban	37	29.73	1.92
Rural	39	43.59	2.15
Suburban	14	42.86	2.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	45.24	2.24
5 - 8	20	35.00	1.90
9 - 12	19	26.32	1.79
13 - 16	7	14.29	1.57
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	23.81	1.79
Senate	26	73.08	2.65
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	32.26	1.94
No	28	50.00	2.25
Education Committee			
Yes	16	37.50	2.06
No	74	37.84	2.03
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	36.92	2.00
Republican	25	40.00	2.12
All Legislators	92	38.04	2.03
Lobbyists	8	00.00	1.38

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

indicates that only a small percentage (38.04%) of responding legislators agreed with this item and the mean (2.03) also indicates a lack of agreement.

One-half or more of the legislators in only 5 groups--legislators with only a high school diploma (50.00%), terminal degree holders (53.85%), those with 17 or more years experience (100.00%), senators (73.08%), and those not living near a state university (50.00%)--concurred with item 7. Moreover, senators (2.65) and legislators with 17 or more years experience (3.00) were the only groups to reply with a mean greater than 2.5 which further demonstrates a lack of support by most groups. None of the lobbyists agreed with the item, and their mean of 1.38 also signifies a low level of support.

Item 8. "Contact about a university's budget request by a non-lobbyist who is a close friend of a legislator is more influential than contact by an educational lobbyist from a state university." Data presented in Table 10 indicate that a small majority of legislators (55.43%) concurred with the item while the total mean of 2.43 indicates disagreement.

Legislators reported mixed feelings regarding this item. Only a minority of several groups were in agreement: master's degree holders (46.67%), those with a terminal degree (38.46%), suburban representatives (28.57%),

TABLE 10

RESPONSE TO ITEM 8: "CONTACT ABOUT A UNIVERSITY'S BUDGET REQUEST BY A NON-LOBBYIST WHO IS A CLOSE FRIEND OF A LEGISLATOR IS MORE INFLUENTIAL THAN CONTACT BY AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST FROM A STATE UNIVERSITY."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	80.00	2.80
Some College	16	62.50	2.50
Bachelor's Degree	23	65.22	2.70
Master's Degree	15	46.67	2.20
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	38.46	2.15
Legislative District			
Urban	37	64.86	2.65
Rural	39	56.41	2.41
Suburban	14	28.57	1.93
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	57.14	2.43
5 - 8	20	45.00	2.35
9 - 12	19	68.42	2.68
13 - 16	7	28.57	1.71
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	69.84	2.73
Senate	26	19.23	1.65
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	54.84	2.40
No	28	57.14	2.50
Education Committee			
Yes	16	43.75	2.12
No	74	58.11	2.50
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	55.38	2.48
Republican	25	56.00	2.32
All Legislators	92	55.43	2.43
Lobbyists	8	87.50	2.88

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

legislators with 5-8 (45.00%) or 13-16 (28.57%) years experience, senators (19.23%), and education committee members (43.75%). However, high school graduates (80.00%) and those with 17 or more years experience (100.00%) responded with a very high positive response rate. Furthermore, high school graduates (2.80), those with only some college (2.50), holders of a bachelor's degree (2.70), urban representatives (2.65), representatives with 9-12 (2.68) or 17 or more years (3.00) of experience, members of the House (2.73), those who do not live near a university (2.50), and legislators not on an education committee (2.50) responded with a mean greater than or equal to 2.50. Suburban legislators (1.93) were joined by legislators with 13-16 (1.71) years experience and senators (1.65) in returning a mean of less than 2.00.

A large majority of lobbyists (87.50) recognized the level of influence friendship has upon legislators. Their mean of 2.88 further demonstrates the high level of agreement lobbyists had toward this item.

Item 9. "Contact about a university's budget request by the president of a university is more influential than contact from other educational lobbyists from the same university." Analysis of item 9 presented in Table 11 indicates that a majority (68.48) of legislators agreed that the president of a university is more influential than

TABLE 11

RESPONSE TO ITEM 9: "CONTACT ABOUT A UNIVERSITY'S BUDGET REQUEST BY THE PRESIDENT OF A UNIVERSITY IS MORE INFLUENTIAL THAN CONTACT FROM OTHER EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM THE SAME UNIVERSITY."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.70
Some College	16	62.50	3.00
Bachelor's Degree	23	82.61	3.17
Master's Degree	15	46.67	2.40
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	80.77	2.96
Legislative District			
Urban	37	67.57	2.84
Rural	39	74.36	3.03
Suburban	14	57.14	2.71
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	69.05	3.05
5 - 8	20	75.00	2.95
9 - 12	19	63.19	2.63
13 - 16	7	57.14	2.57
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	60.32	2.79
Senate	26	88.46	3.15
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	64.52	2.77
No	28	78.57	3.18
Education Committee			
Yes	16	56.25	2.62
No	74	71.62	2.96
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	72.31	2.95
Republican	25	60.00	2.76
All Legislators	92	68.48	2.89
Lobbyists	8	87.50	3.12

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

other educational lobbyists, and the mean (2.89) also implies support for this item.

At least 50 percent of the legislators in all subgroups, except legislators with master's degrees (46.67%), supported the contention. In fact, a few groups--those with a terminal degree (80.77%), legislators who had served 17 or more years (100.00%), and senators (88.46%), responded with an 80 percent or greater majority. Moreover, all groups except one, master's degree holders (2.40), replied with a mean greater than 2.5. Lobbyists also concurred with this item as evidenced by an 87.50 percent positive response rate and a mean of 3.12.

Item 10. "The point in time at which an educational lobbyist from a state university contacts a legislator about a budget request is as important as the number of contacts made by the educational lobbyist." Analysis of these data depicted in Table 12 relate that 77.17 percent of the legislators agreed with the item (with a mean of 2.87).

A majority of legislators regardless of profile category concurred that timing is important. Legislators with only some college (81.25%), holders of a terminal degree (84.62%), representatives of urban districts (81.08%), those with 5-8 (85.00%) or 17 or more years experience (100.00%), and education committee members

TABLE 12

RESPONSE TO ITEM 10: "THE POINT IN TIME AT WHICH AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST FROM A STATE UNIVERSITY CONTACTS A LEGISLATOR ABOUT A BUDGET REQUEST IS AS IMPORTANT AS THE NUMBER OF CONTACTS MADE BY THE LOBBYIST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	2.60
Some College	16	81.25	2.88
Bachelor's Degree	23	78.26	2.96
Master's Degree	15	66.67	2.80
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	84.62	3.00
Legislative District			
Urban	37	81.08	2.97
Rural	39	74.36	2.77
Suburban	14	78.57	3.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	78.57	2.90
5 - 8	20	85.00	3.00
9 - 12	19	68.42	2.68
13 - 16	7	71.43	3.00
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	77.78	2.84
Senate	26	76.92	2.96
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	79.03	2.90
No	28	75.00	2.86
Education Committee			
Yes	16	81.25	3.00
No	74	77.03	2.86
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	78.46	2.94
Republican	25	76.00	2.76
All Legislators	92	77.17	2.87
Lobbyists	8	87.50	3.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

(81.25%) returned at least an 80 percent positive response. The mean of all groups was also at least 2.5 which further demonstrates support.

Educational lobbyists also indicated solid agreement as evidenced by an 87.50 percent positive response and a mean of 3.00.

Item 11. "The number of contacts made with a legislator by an educational lobbyist from a state university is as influential as the content of the contact." When the results of item 11 in Table 13 were analyzed only 21.74 percent of responding legislators (with a mean score of 2.02) expressed agreement. In fact, only high school graduates (30.00%), holders of a terminal degree (30.77%), those with 5-8 (35.00%) or 17 or more years (100.00%) in the legislature, and senators (30.77%) responded with greater than 25 percent agreement. Lobbyists likewise were opponsed to the idea as demonstrated by only a 37.50 percent rate of positive responses and a mean of 2.12.

Item 12. "Contacts about budget requests made by educational lobbyists are more influential when made in the legislator's home district than when made while the legislator is at the capitol in Nashville." Analysis of the data of item 12 presented in Table 14 show that only

TABLE 13

RESPONSE TO ITEM 11: "THE NUMBER OF CONTACTS MADE WITH A LEGISLATOR BY AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST FROM A STATE UNIVERSITY IS AS INFLUENTIAL AS THE CONTENT OF THE CONTACTS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	30.00	2.20
Some College	16	18.75	2.00
Bachelor's Degree	23	17.39	1.83
Master's Degree	15	00.00	1.53
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	30.77	2.31
Legislative District			
Urban	37	21.62	1.89
Rural	39	20.51	2.08
Suburban	14	14.29	2.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	14.29	1.93
5 - 8	20	35.00	2.20
9 - 12	19	5.26	1.74
13 - 16	7	28.57	2.14
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	15.87	1.89
Senate	26	30.77	2.27
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	22.58	2.05
No	28	14.29	1.86
Education Committee			
Yes	16	12.50	1.81
No	74	21.62	2.03
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	20.00	1.97
Republican	25	20.00	2.04
All Legislators	92	21.74	2.02
Lobbyists	8	37.50	2.12

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 14

RESPONSE TO ITEM 12: "CONTACTS ABOUT BUDGET REQUESTS MADE BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS ARE MORE INFLUENTIAL WHEN MADE IN THE LEGISLATORS HOME DISTRICT THAN WHEN MADE WHILE THE LEGISLATOR IS AT THE CAPITOL IN NASHVILLE."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.50
Some College	16	43.75	2.06
Bachelor's Degree	23	47.83	2.39
Master's Degree	15	66.67	2.53
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	30.77	2.27
Legislative District			
Urban	37	45.95	2.38
Rural	39	43.59	2.28
Suburban	14	50.00	2.36
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	33.33	2.10
5 - 8	20	60.00	2.55
9 - 12	19	57.89	2.63
13 - 16	7	28.57	1.86
17 or more	2	100.00	4.00
Chamber			
House	63	53.97	2.44
Senate	26	23.08	2.04
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	40.32	2.29
No	28	57.14	2.43
Education Committee			
Yes	16	31.25	1.94
No	74	48.65	2.42
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	44.62	2.26
Republican	25	48.00	2.52
All Legislators	92	46.74	2.36
Lobbyists	7	62.50	2.86

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

46.74 percent of the legislators with a total mean of 2.36 believed that lobbying is more effective in the district.

Most of the legislators in only a few groups--high school graduates (50.00%), holders of a master's degree (66.67%), suburban representatives (50.00%), legislators who had served 5-8 years (60.00%), 9-12 years (57.89%), 17 or more years (100.00%), House members (53.97%), and those on an education committee (57.14%)--agreed with item 12. Several groups, however, responded with a mean of at least 2.5. They were: high school graduates (2.50), holders of a master's degree (2.53), those with 5-8 (2.55), 9-12 (2.63) or 17 or more years experience (4.00), and Republicans (2.52). A slight majority of lobbyists endorsed this item as suggested by a 62.50 percent positive response rate and a mean of 2.86.

Item 13. "The alumni association of a state university should leave the responsibility for disseminating budget information to the university's educational lobbyist." Analysis of item 13 provided in Table 15 indicates that only a slight majority (55.43%) of legislators agreed that the alumni association should leave lobbying activity to the lobbyist. The mean for this item was 2.66 also indicating marginal agreement.

Legislators with a bachelor's degree (43.48%), those with 5-8 years in the legislature (40.00%), and education

TABLE 15

RESPONSE TO ITEM 13: "THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF A STATE UNIVERSITY SHOULD LEAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISSEMINATING BUDGET INFORMATION TO THE UNIVERSITY'S EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	60.00	2.70
Some College	16	50.00	2.81
Bachelor's Degree	23	43.48	2.48
Master's Degree	15	60.00	2.73
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	69.23	2.77
Legislative District			
Urban	37	54.05	2.68
Rural	39	53.85	2.64
Suburban	14	71.43	2.86
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	61.90	2.76
5 - 8	20	40.00	2.50
9 - 12	19	57.89	2.63
13 - 16	7	71.43	3.14
17 or more	2	50.00	2.00
Chamber			
House	63	55.56	2.76
Senate	26	61.54	2.54
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	56.45	2.69
No	28	57.14	2.68
Education Committee			
Yes	16	43.75	2.62
No	74	59.46	2.70
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	50.77	2.62
Republican	25	72.00	2.88
All Legislators	92	55.43	2.66
Lobbyists	8	75.00	2.88

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

committee members (43.75%) were the only groups with less than a 50 percent positive response. Exactly half of legislators with only some college (50.00%) and those with 17 or more years (50.00%) of legislative experience expressed agreement. Moreover, only 2 groups, those with a bachelor's degree (2.45) and legislators with 17 or more years in the legislature (2.00), had a mean of less than 2.5. Three-fourths (75.00%) of the lobbyists approved of the item and replied with a strong mean of 2.88.

Item 14. "Educational lobbyists should maintain contact with legislators during the time the legislature is not in session." Examination of the responses for item 14 presented in Table 16 indicates that a majority (78.26%) of responding legislators agreed with this notion. The mean of 3.08 also suggests agreement.

A majority of legislators for all subgroups within each profile area expressed agreement. In fact, 80 percent or more of the legislators in several groups expressed approval: those with only some college (87.50%), legislators with a terminal degree (84.62%), representatives of suburban districts (92.86%), those with 5-8 (80.00%), 9-12 (94.74%), or 17 or more years in the legislature (100.00%), senators (84.62%), those who live near a state university (82.26%), education committee members (87.50%), and Republicans (80.00%). The means for all subgroups were

TABLE 16

RESPONSE TO ITEM 14: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS SHOULD MAINTAIN CONTACT WITH LEGISLATORS DURING THE TIME THE LEGISLATURE IS NOT IN SESSION."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	2.80
Some College	16	87.50	3.38
Bachelor's Degree	23	69.57	2.87
Master's Degree	15	73.33	3.13
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	84.62	3.12
Legislative District			
Urban	37	78.38	3.05
Rural	39	71.79	2.87
Suburban	14	92.86	3.64
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	71.43	2.90
5 - 8	20	80.00	3.15
9 - 12	19	94.74	3.37
13 - 16	7	57.14	2.86
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	76.19	3.03
Senate	26	84.62	3.19
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	82.26	3.11
No	28	67.86	2.96
Education Committee			
Yes	16	87.50	3.44
No	74	75.68	2.99
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	76.92	3.09
Republican	25	80.00	3.00
All Legislators	92	78.26	3.08
Lobbyists	8	100.00	3.38

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

also greater than 2.5 which further suggests agreement. All of the education lobbyists felt they should maintain contact with legislators even when the legislature is not in session. The mean for this group (3.38) indicated strong belief in the importance of this factor.

Item 15. "It is important that previous support and assistance by legislators be recognized by educational lobbyists." When the responses to item 15 presented in Table 17 were observed, it was found that the vast majority of legislators (85.87%) agreed that it is important for educational lobbyists to recognize previous support and assistance by legislators. Moreover, the mean (3.17) also indicated strong belief in this issue.

All subgroups concurred with this item. In fact, the only groups with less than 80 percent agreement were those with 13-16 years in the legislature (71.43%), legislators who did not live near a state university (78.57%), and Republicans (76.00%). Legislators with 5-8 years experience, 17 or more years experience, and senators joined the lobbyists with 100 percent agreement. The means reflected similar strong agreement, with only those with a high school education (2.90) having a mean less than 3.0. Lobbyists had a mean of 4.00.

TABLE 17

RESPONSE TO ITEM 15: "IT IS IMPORTANT THAT PREVIOUS SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE BY LEGISLATORS BE RECOGNIZED BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	80.00	2.90
Some College	16	81.25	3.38
Bachelor's Degree	23	91.30	3.43
Master's Degree	15	86.67	3.00
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	88.46	3.08
Legislative District			
Urban	37	83.78	3.08
Rural	39	87.18	3.26
Suburban	14	92.86	3.29
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	83.33	3.10
5 - 8	20	100.00	3.40
9 - 12	19	84.21	3.21
13 - 16	7	71.43	3.14
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	80.95	3.10
Senate	26	100.00	3.42
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	90.32	3.23
No	28	78.57	3.11
Education Committee			
Yes	16	93.75	3.44
No	74	85.14	3.14
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	90.77	3.25
Republican	25	76.00	3.04
All Legislators	19	85.87	3.17
Lobbyists	8	100.00	4.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

IV. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 2

Analysis of items 5-15 reveal that almost three-fourths of the legislators believed that they are available to lobbyists for lobbying activity; however,they believed, although to a lesser degree, that lobbyists concentrate their efforts on a select and small number of legislators. Legislators adamantly rejected the notion that testimony at hearings is more important than "one-to-one" communication. They only marginally supported the contention that contact by a non-lobbyist friend is more important than contact by a lobbyist; however, they considered the university president as the most important educational lobbyist. Legislators were clear that timing is an important aspect of lobbying while the number of contacts has much less impact than the content of the message. Legislators also preferred to be contacted in Nashville and also believed that the alumni association should not be involved in disseminating budgetary information. Legislators wished to stay informed even when the legislature is not in session and expect recognition of past support.

Lobbyists concurred with legislators on all items with the exception of where lobbying activity should occur. As previously stated, legislators preferred to be contacted in

Nashville, but lobbyists believed their activity more influential in the legislator's home district.

V. RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 3

Which items were selected by legislators and educational lobbyists as being most influential in affecting a legislator's decision regarding funding higher education? Items 16 through 25 specifically relate to this research question. In item 35, the respondents ranked a list of sources of information in priority importance to legislators when considering budget requests from state universities. The results of data analysis for each item follow.

Item 16. "Educational lobbyists should demonstrate that requested budget increases are supported by specific needs rather than by emotional appeals." Analysis of item 16 presented in Table 18 indicates that all legislators (100.00%) agreed that budget increases should be supported by specific needs rather than by emotional appeals. Mean responses ranged from 3.50 (17 or more years experience) to 3.85 (rural representatives) with an overall mean of 3.71 also indicating strong feelings in this area. All lobbyists likewise agreed with this notion with a mean of 3.75.

TABLE 18

RESPONSE TO ITEM 16: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THAT REQUESTED BUDGET INCREASES ARE SUPPORTED BY SPECIFIC NEEDS RATHER THAN BY EMOTIONAL APPEALS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	100.00	3.80
Some College	16	100.00	3.69
Bachelor's Degree	23	100.00	3.74
Master's Degree	15	100.00	3.73
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	100.00	3.65
Legislative District			
Urban	37	100.00	3.62
Rural	39	100.00	3.85
Suburban	14	100.00	3.57
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	100.00	3.69
5 - 8	20	100.00	3.65
9 - 12	19	100.00	3.84
13 - 16	7	100.00	3.71
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	100.00	3.73
Senate	26	100.00	3.65
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	100.00	3.68
No	28	100.00	3.79
Education Committee			
Yes	16	100.00	3.75
No	74	100.00	3.70
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	100.00	3.72
Republican	25	100.00	3.68
All Legislators	92	100.00	3.71
Lobbyists	8	100.00	3.75

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

Item 17. " Educational lobbyists should provide information about a university budget request to legislators prior to a legislative session." Analysis of the responses to item 17 presented in Table 19 denotes that 92.39 percent of responding legislators with a total mean of 3.51 agreed with the idea that a university's budget request should be made available to legislators prior to a legislative session.

A majority of respondents within all profile areas also concurred with no group falling below 80 percent agreement. The means of the responses also indicated a high level of agreement by a majority of respondents regardless of group. The overall mean was 3.51, with a range from 3.29 (13-16 years in the legislature) to 3.73 (senators). All of the educational lobbyists also acknowledged that legislators should be provided information about budget requests prior to a legislature session. The mean for the group was 3.38 further signifying strong support.

Item 18. "Budget requests based on facts rather than on pressure tactics are more persuasive." Analysis of these data, in Table 20, reveals that 90.22 percent of the legislators responding to this item agreed that budget requests based on facts are more persuasive. Their mean of 3.58 also demonstrates strong agreement with this issue.

TABLE 19

RESPONSE TO ITEM 17: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS SHOULD PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT A UNIVERSITY BUDGET REQUEST TO LEGISLATORS PRIOR TO A LEGISLATIVE SESSION."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	90.00	3.40
Some College	16	87.50	3.44
Bachelor's Degree	23	100.00	3.61
Master's Degree	15	86.67	3.33
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	96.15	3.65
Legislative District			
Urban	37	91.89	3.49
Rural	39	97.37	3.54
Suburban	14	92.86	3.57
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	92.86	3.57
5 - 8	20	95.00	3.60
9 - 12	19	94.74	3.42
13 - 16	7	85.71	3.29
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	90.48	3.44
Senate	26	100.00	3.73
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	91.94	3.55
No	28	96.43	3.46
Education Committee			
Yes	16	93.75	3.50
No	74	93.24	3.53
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	92.31	3.48
Republican	25	96.00	3.64
All Legislators	92	92.39	3.51
Lobbyists	8	100.00	3.38

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 20

RESPONSE TO ITEM 18: "BUDGET INCREASES BASED ON FACTS RATHER THAN PRESSURE TACTICS ARE MORE PERSUASIVE."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	80.00	3.20
Some College	16	93.75	3.50
Bachelor's Degree	23	90.91	3.59
Master's Degree	15	93.33	3.80
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	96.15	3.69
Legislative District			
Urban	37	94.59	3.65
Rural	39	86.84	3.50
Suburban	14	100.00	3.71
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	97.56	3.73
5 - 8	20	80.00	3.45
9 - 12	19	94.74	3.47
13 - 16	7	85.71	3.57
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	87.30	3.48
Senate	26	100.00	3.85
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	93.55	3.65
No	28	8	

Eighty percent or more of the legislators in all groups approved of this item. The means also suggest a high level of agreement for all groups, with a range of 3.20 (high school graduates) to 3.88 (education committee members and Democrats) and an overall mean of 3.58. All of the educational lobbyists supported the idea that facts are more persuasive than pressure tactics. They also responded with a strong mean of 3.50.

Item 19. "The Influence of educational lobbyists determines the extent to which THEC's recommendations are accepted by the General Assembly." An analysis of item 19 presented in Table 21 demonstrates that only a minority of responding legislators (43.48%) agreed that educational lobbyists influence the General Assembly into accepting the recommendations of THEC. The mean for all legislators was 2.40.

A majority of legislators with a terminal degree (53.85%) were joined by representatives from urban districts (54.05%), legislators with 5-8 (60.00%) or 17 or more years (100.00%) experience; those who lived near a state university (53.23%), and Republicans (56.00%) in responding positively to this item. Both respondents who served 17 or more years (100.00%) and exactly one-half of the senators (50.00%) also agreed. The means further reflect mixed feelings with only the preceding groups

TABLE 21

RESPONSE TO ITEM 19: "THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS DETERMINES THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEC'S RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ACCEPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	40.00	2.30
Some College	16	31.25	2.12
Bachelor's Degree	23	45.45	2.59
Master's Degree	15	40.00	2.33
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	53.85	2.50
Legislative District			
Urban	37	54.05	2.59
Rural	39	36.11	2.24
Suburban	14	42.86	2.36
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	39.02	2.39
5 - 8	20	60.00	2.65
9 - 12	19	31.58	2.16
13 - 16	7	42.86	2.29
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	41.94	2.42
Senate	26	50.00	2.38
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	53.23	2.55
No	28	22.22	2.07
Education Committee			
Yes	16	43.75	2.44
No	74	46.38	2.40
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	39.06	2.38
Republican	25	56.00	2.48
All Legislators	92	43.48	2.40
Lobbyists	7	00.00	2.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

(with the exception of Republicans--2.48) responding with a mean of at least 2.5. None of the lobbyists felt they influenced the extent to which THEC's recommendations are accepted by the General Assembly, and their mean of 2.00 also reflects weak support for this idea.

Item 20. "Educational lobbyists from state universities exert much less influence on funding allocations to their universities than the administrators of their universities believe they do." When the results of item 20 presented in Table 22 were analyzed, only a minority of legislators (35.87%, mean 2.24), believed that lobbyists exert less influence on funding allocations than administrators believe they do.

An analysis of the percentage of positive responses and the means for all groups show that a majority of legislators opposed this item. In fact, only two groups--high school graduates (50.00%) and legislators with 17 or more years experience (50.00%)--replied with at least a 50 percent positive response rate. Furthermore, the latter was the only group to respond with a mean of at least 2.5. Educational lobbyists also disagreed as indicated by only a 42.86 percent level of agreement and a mean of 2.43.

Item 21. "The prestige of a state university is more influential when considering budget requests than are the

TABLE 22

RESPONSE TO ITEM 20: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES EXERT MUCH LESS INFLUENCE ON FUNDING ALLOCATIONS TO THEIR UNIVERSITIES THAN THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THEIR UNIVERSITIES BELIEVE THEY DO."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.44
Some College	16	25.00	2.07
Bachelor's Degree	23	33.33	2.24
Master's Degree	15	46.67	2.40
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	34.62	2.16
Legislative District			
Urban	37	29.41	2.15
Rural	39	41.03	2.28
Suburban	14	42.86	2.36
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	45.24	2.40
5 - 8	20	31.58	2.11
9 - 12	19	25.00	2.06
13 - 16	7	28.57	2.00
17 or more	2	50.00	2.50
Chamber			
House	63	36.84	2.28
Senate	26	38.46	2.12
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	35.71	2.14
No	28	42.86	2.43
Education Committee			
Yes	16	26.67	2.00
No	74	37.84	2.29
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	36.07	2.25
Republican	25	43.48	2.22
All Legislators	92	35.87	2.24
Lobbyists	7	42.86	2.43

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

presentations made by educational lobbyists." Analysis of item 21 represented in Table 23 suggests that a small majority of legislators (58.71%) agreed that university prestige is more influential than presentations made by lobbyists. The mean (2.63) of legislators also signifies marginal agreement.

Most legislators, except those representing suburban districts (35.71%), those with 9-12 years experience (47.37%), and senators (42.31%) agreed with the item. Exactly one-half of the legislators who had a terminal degree (50.00%) and those with 5-8 years (50.00%) or 17 or more years (50.00%) experience also acknowledged agreement. The means of all groups except terminal degree holders (2.42), suburban representatives (2.29), and senators (2.19) were greater than 2.5. One group, high school graduates, responded with an 80 percent positive response and a mean of 3.00. All of the lobbyists (100.00%) with a mean of 2.88 accepted the notion that university prestige is more important than are their presentations.

Item 22. "A legislator's prior affiliation with a state university either as a graduate or through other channels, causes the legislator to be more sympathetic to its funding requests." Analysis of these data presented in Table 24 connotes that the majority of responding legislators, 92.39 percent (mean of 3.35), agreed with this

TABLE 23

RESPONSE TO ITEM 21: "THE PRESTIGE OF A UNIVERSITY IS MORE INFLUENTIAL WHEN CONSIDERING BUDGET REQUESTS THAN ARE THE PRESENTATIONS MADE BY AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	80.00	3.00
Some College	16	68.75	2.75
Bachelor's Degree	23	52.17	2.57
Master's Degree	15	57.14	2.67
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	50.00	2.42
Legislative District			
Urban	37	59.46	2.76
Rural	39	64.10	2.62
Suburban	14	35.71	2.29
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	64.29	2.69
5 - 8	20	50.00	2.55
9 - 12	19	47.37	2.53
13 - 16	7	71.43	2.57
17 or more	2	50.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	65.08	2.81
Senate	26	42.31	2.19
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	56.45	2.61
No	28	60.71	2.64
Education Committee			
Yes	16	43.75	2.56
No	74	60.81	2.64
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	53.85	2.57
Republican	25	68.00	2.76
All Legislators	92	58.71	2.63
Lobbyists	8	100.00	2.88

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 24

RESPONSE TO ITEM 22: "A LEGISLATOR'S PRIOR AFFILIATION WITH A STATE UNIVERSITY, EITHER AS A GRADUATE OR THROUGH OTHER CHANNELS, CAUSES THE LEGISLATOR TO BE MORE SYMPATHETIC TO ITS FUNDING REQUESTS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	100.00	3.60
Some College	16	87.50	3.38
Bachelor's Degree	23	95.65	3.35
Master's Degree	15	73.33	2.93
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	100.00	3.42
Legislative District			
Urban	37	83.78	3.19
Rural	39	100.00	3.44
Suburban	14	92.86	3.43
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	85.71	3.24
5 - 8	20	100.00	3.40
9 - 12	19	100.00	3.37
13 - 16	7	85.71	3.57
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	92.06	3.37
Senate	26	92.31	3.23
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	90.32	3.27
No	28	96.43	3.46
Education Committee			
Yes	16	93.75	3.19
No	74	100.00	3.36
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	93.85	3.35
Republican	25	88.00	3.28
All Legislators	92	92.39	3.35
Lobbyists	8	100.00	3.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

item. In fact, holders of a master's degree (73.33%) was the only group to respond with less than an 80 percent majority. Additionally, they were the only group to respond with a mean (2.93) less than 3.00. Lobbyists joined legislators by unanimously agreeing with the item. They also reported a very strong mean of 3.00.

Item 23. "Educational lobbyists often take credit for influencing appropriations which in reality they did not influence." Examination of the responses of item 23 presented in Table 25 discloses that only 38.04 percent of responding legislators agreed that lobbyists take credit for influencing appropriations which in fact they did not influence. The mean of 2.49 suggests ambivalence to this item.

Legislators with 17 or more years experience (100.00%) and senators (61.54%) were the only groups in which a majority responded positively. The following groups had a mean of at least 2.50: high school graduates (2.50), those with some college (2.53), master's degree holders (2.57), legislators with a terminal degree (2.52), urban legislators (2.51), representatives of rural districts (2.51), those with 0-4 years (2.58), 9-12 years (2.60), and 17 or more years experience (3.50). Senators (2.77), those who do not reside near a state university (2.54), education committee members, and Republicans (2.52). This suggests

TABLE 25

RESPONSE TO ITEM 23: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS OFTEN TAKE CREDIT FOR INFLUENCING APPROPRIATIONS WHICH IN REALITY THEY DID NOT INFLUENCE."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	30.00	2.50
Some College	16	37.50	2.53
Bachelor's Degree	23	39.13	2.40
Master's Degree	15	40.00	2.57
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	44.00	2.52
Legislative District			
Urban	37	45.71	2.51
Rural	39	33.33	2.51
Suburban	14	42.86	2.43
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	43.90	2.58
5 - 8	20	25.00	2.30
9 - 12	19	46.67	2.60
13 - 16	7	42.86	2.14
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	33.33	2.40
Senate	26	61.54	2.77
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	47.17	2.48
No	28	38.46	2.54
Education Committee			
Yes	16	43.75	2.44
No	74	37.84	2.51
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	41.27	2.49
Republican	25	42.86	2.52
All Legislators	92	38.04	2.49
Lobbyists	8	62.50	2.62

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

that although the majority of legislators did not accept that lobbyists take credit for activities they did not impact, those who agreed with the item had very strong feelings. Conversely, the majority of educational lobbyists (62.50%, mean of 2.62), believed that they often take credit for activities they did not influence.

Item 24. "Legislators who support the budget requests of state universities located in their immediate area usually are more effective in influencing other legislators about budget appropriations than are educational lobbyists." Analysis of item 24 displayed in Table 26 establishes that 68.48 percent of responding legislators (a mean of 3.09) believed that legislators are more instrumental in influencing other legislators than are educational lobbyists.

Analyses of the responses indicate a majority of respondents for all groups agreed with the item. Groups with the strongest agreement were legislators from rural districts (82.05%), those with 13-16 years experience (85.71%), 17 or more years experience (100.00%), and those who did not live near a state university (82.14%). Mean responses for all subgroups were over 2.50, varying from a low of 2.79 for suburban legislators to a high of 3.50 for legislators with 17 or more years experience. All

TABLE 26

RESPONSE TO ITEM 24: "LEGISLATORS WHO SUPPORT THE BUDGET REQUESTS OF STATE UNIVERSITIES LOCATED IN THEIR IMMEDIATE AREA USUALLY ARE MORE EFFECTIVE IN INFLUENCING OTHER LEGISLATORS ABOUT BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS THAN ARE EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	3.20
Some College	16	62.50	3.06
Bachelor's Degree	23	69.57	3.09
Master's Degree	15	53.33	2.87
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	76.92	3.15
Legislative District			
Urban	37	56.76	3.00
Rural	39	82.05	3.26
Suburban	14	57.14	2.79
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	71.43	3.14
5 - 8	20	60.00	3.00
9 - 12	19	57.89	2.89
13 - 16	7	85.71	3.29
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	68.25	3.10
Senate	26	65.38	3.00
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	61.29	3.03
No	28	82.14	3.18
Education Committee			
Yes	16	56.25	3.06
No	74	70.27	3.08
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	70.77	3.15
Republican	25	60.00	2.96
All Legislators	92	68.48	3.09
Lobbyists	8	100.00	3.62

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

lobbyists concurred with the item and their mean of 3.62 further suggests strong agreement.

Item 25. "The single most important function of educational lobbyists is to provide data and information to legislators." When the results of the responses for item 25 as depicted in Table 27 were analyzed, it was found that all of the legislators, for all subgroups within all profile areas agreed that the single most important function of the educational lobbyist is to provide information to legislators. Their total mean response was 3.47 and all the means for all groups were at least 3.00 which also represents strong agreement. A majority of lobbyists (87.50%) also agreed with this assertion. The mean for this group was 3.25 which is characteristic of solid agreement.

Item 35. The respondents were asked to rank their sources of information in priority of importance (1=most importance, 9=least important) when considering budget requests from state universities. Legislators ranked university administrators (mean=2.57) as the number one source of information when considering budget requests. Educational lobbyists (3.52), legislative colleagues (3.86), constituents (4.04), friend or family members (4.93), alumni (5.99), faculty members (6.03), campaign

TABLE 27

RESPONSE TO ITEM 25: "THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS IS TO PROVIDE DATA AND INFORMATION TO THE LEGISLATORS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	100.00	3.40
Some College	16	100.00	3.50
Bachelor's Degree	23	100.00	3.35
Master's Degree	15	100.00	3.73
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	100.00	3.46
Legislative District			
Urban	37	100.00	3.35
Rural	39	100.00	3.56
Suburban	14	100.00	3.57
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	100.00	3.45
5 - 8	20	100.00	3.45
9 - 12	19	100.00	3.63
13 - 16	7	100.00	3.43
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	100.00	3.41
Senate	26	100.00	3.65
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	100.00	3.47
No	28	100.00	3.50
Education Committee			
Yes	16	100.00	3.69
No	74	100.00	3.43
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	100.00	3.51
Republican	25	100.00	3.40
All Legislators	92	100.00	3.47
Lobbyists	8	87.50	3.25

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

workers (6.12), and students (6.73), were ranked 2 through 9 respectively.

Analysis of the means of responses further shows that educational lobbyists believed legislative colleagues to be the number one source of information to legislators as they consider budget requests from state universities. The means further reflect that university administrators (2.43), constituents (4.29), educational lobbyists (4.71), alumni (4.86), friends or family members (5.00), faculty members (6.29), campaign workers (7.29) and, students (8.29) were ranked by lobbyists as 2 through 9 respectively.

VI. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 3

An analysis of items 16-26 indicates that legislators were adamant in their belief that lobbyists should demonstrate that budget increases are actually needed and that lobbyists should provide them information regarding budget requests prior to a legislature session. Legislators were clear that the provision of data and information is the single most important function of lobbyists. Most legislators did not believe, however, that lobbyists were influential in convincing the General Assembly to accept THEC's recommendations. Legislators also felt that lobbyists were more influential than

administrators give them credit for, but lobbyists did not take credit for influence they did not initiate. The prestige of a state university appears to be more important than are the presentations of lobbyists, and legislators' prior affiliation with a university causes them to be more sympathetic to its funding requests. Legislators also felt that they may have more influence upon their colleagues than do educational lobbyists but consider university administrators as their number one source of information when considering budget requests.

Lobbyists were in agreement with legislators on most of these issues. Although a majority of both groups felt that the prestige of a university is important, lobbyists favored this item much more intensely than did legislators. In contrast to legislators, lobbyists felt that they often take credit for appropriations which they did not influence. They identified legislative colleagues rather than themselves as the primary source of information as legislators consider budget requests.

VII. RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 4

What techniques were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as being the most effective in affecting a legislative decision regarding appropriations to Tennessee state universities? Items 26 through 34

relate to specific techniques utilized by educational lobbyists in influencing legislators' decisions regarding appropriations to state universities. Results of the data analysis for each item follows.

Item 26. "Educational lobbyists are generally effective at presenting and explaining their university's budget request." Analysis of the responses of item 26 represented in Table 28 reveals that a majority of legislators (79.09%) agreed that lobbyists are effective at presenting budget requests. The total mean of this item was 3.09 which also signifies a fairly strong level of agreement.

The group of legislators with the lowest positive response was those with 17 or more years experience (50.00%). Several groups--holders of a bachelor's degree (82.61%), those with a master's (80.00%), rural legislators (84.62%), suburban legislators (92.86%), those with 5-8 (85.00%) and 9-12 (89.47%) years experience, senators (80.77%), those who did not live near a university (82.14%), education committee members (87.50%), and Democrats (81.54%)--responded with at least an 80 percent majority. Furthermore, all means were at least 2.5 with urban legislators (2.89), those with 0-4 (2.98) or 17 or more years experience (2.50), and Republicans (2.96) being the only groups with a mean less than 3.00. Positive

TABLE 28

RESPONSE TO ITEM 26: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS ARE GENERALLY EFFECTIVE AT PRESENTING AND EXPLAINING THEIR UNIVERSITIES' BUDGET REQUESTS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	3.00
Some College	16	75.00	3.06
Bachelor's Degree	23	82.61	3.17
Master's Degree	15	80.00	3.13
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	76.92	3.12
Legislative District			
Urban	37	64.86	2.89
Rural	39	84.62	3.15
Suburban	14	92.86	3.57
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	71.43	2.98
5 - 8	20	85.00	3.25
9 - 12	19	89.47	3.32
13 - 16	7	71.43	3.14
17 or more	2	50.00	2.50
Chamber			
House	63	76.19	3.02
Senate	26	80.77	3.35
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	75.81	3.10
No	28	82.14	3.14
Education Committee			
Yes	16	87.50	3.44
No	74	75.68	3.04
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	81.54	3.17
Republican	25	68.00	2.96
All Legislators	92	76.09	3.09
Lobbyists	8	75.00	3.12

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

responses (75.00%) and the mean (3.12) of lobbyists also depicts a high level of agreement to the item.

Item 27. "Educational lobbyists generally do not provide an adequate amount of information to support their universities' budget requests." Examination of the legislators' responses of item 27 presented in Table 29 indicates that only 20.65 percent of legislators (mean of 2.01) agreed that lobbyists do not provide an adequate amount of information to legislators. Holders of only a high school diploma (50.00%) or a bachelor's degree holders (30.43%) legislators with 17 or more years experience (50.00%) and representatives (26.98%) were the only groups to respond with a level of positive response greater than 25 percent. Moreover, none of the means were greater than 2.50 also suggesting disagreement to the item. Not surprisingly only 25 percent of the lobbyists concurred with this item, and their mean of 1.75 also suggests disagreement.

Item 28. "The more knowledgeable educational lobbyists are about the legislative process the more influential they will be." The responses to item 28 presented in Table 30 indicate that a large majority (98.21%) of responding legislators (mean of 3.62) believed that the more knowledgeable educational lobbyists are the more influential they will be.

TABLE 29

RESPONSE TO ITEM 27: "EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS GENERALLY DO NOT PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THEIR UNIVERSITIES' BUDGET REQUEST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.20
Some College	16	6.25	1.75
Bachelor's Degree	23	30.43	2.26
Master's Degree	15	13.33	2.00
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	11.54	1.88
Legislative District			
Urban	37	18.92	2.03
Rural	39	20.51	2.00
Suburban	14	21.43	2.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	21.43	2.05
5 - 8	20	20.00	2.00
9 - 12	19	21.05	2.11
13 - 16	7	00.00	1.57
17 or more	2	50.00	2.00
Chamber			
House	63	26.98	2.08
Senate	26	00.00	1.81
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	17.74	2.00
No	28	25.00	2.04
Education Committee			
Yes	16	6.25	1.81
No	74	22.97	2.05
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	20.00	1.98
Republican	25	20.00	2.08
All Legislators	92	20.65	2.01
Lobbyists	8	25.00	1.75

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 30

RESPONSE TO ITEM 28: "THE MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS ARE ABOUT THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS THE MORE INFLUENTIAL THEY WILL BE."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	100.00	3.50
Some College	16	100.00	3.62
Bachelor's Degree	23	95.65	3.65
Master's Degree	15	100.00	3.73
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	100.00	3.54
Legislative District			
Urban	37	97.30	3.57
Rural	39	100.00	3.62
Suburban	14	100.00	3.71
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	97.62	3.64
5 - 8	20	100.00	3.70
9 - 12	19	100.00	3.47
13 - 16	7	100.00	3.43
17 or more	2	100.00	4.00
Chamber			
House	63	98.41	3.59
Senate	26	100.00	3.65
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	100.00	3.63
No	28	96.43	3.57
Education Committee			
Yes	16	100.00	3.75
No	74	98.65	3.58
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	100.00	3.68
Republican	25	96.00	3.44
All Legislators	92	98.91	3.62
Lobbyists	8	75.00	3.25

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

An analysis of the frequencies and means demonstrate that at least 95 percent of the legislators in all groups concurred with this factor. The means ranged from 3.43 (legislators with 13-16 years experience) to 4.00 (those with 17 or more years experience) which further suggests strong support. Educational lobbyists, although in agreement, were less intense on this item than legislators. Seventy-five percent of the lobbyists responded positively to this factor but they had a strong mean score of 3.25.

Item 29. "The more visible educational lobbyists are during a legislative session, the more influential they will be." Table 31 shows that 70.65 percent of responding legislators (mean of 2.98) agreed that visibility positively impacts the influence of lobbyists.

Most of the respondents for all groups, except those with 13-16 years of experience (28.57%) agreed with the item. Legislators who had a bachelor's degree (86.77%), were joined by those with 5-8 years (85.00%) and 17 or more years experience (100.00%), senators (87.77%), and education committee members (81.25%) in responding with at least an 80 percent majority. The means for all groups except those with 13-16 years experience (1.57), were also greater than 2.5 further demonstrating a high level of support for this item.

TABLE 31

RESPONSE TO ITEM 29: "THE MORE VISIBLE EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS ARE DURING A LEGISLATIVE SESSION, THE MORE INFLUENTIAL THEY WILL BE."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	60.00	3.00
Some College	16	62.50	2.88
Bachelor's Degree	23	82.61	3.17
Master's Degree	15	60.00	2.73
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	73.08	2.92
Legislative District			
Urban	37	70.27	3.11
Rural	39	66.67	2.82
Suburban	14	78.57	2.93
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	66.67	2.83
5 - 8	20	85.00	3.35
9 - 12	19	73.68	2.89
13 - 16	7	28.57	1.57
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	65.08	2.97
Senate	26	80.77	2.88
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	69.35	3.02
No	28	71.43	2.82
Education Committee			
Yes	16	81.25	3.19
No	74	67.57	2.91
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	67.69	2.92
Republican	25	76.00	3.04
All Legislators	92	70.65	2.98
Lobbyists	8	37.50	2.75

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

Conversely, only a minority of lobbyists (37.50%), agreed with the item. The mean (2.75) of their responses, however, suggests that those lobbyists who responded positively had intense feeling regarding visibility.

Item 30. "The content of a message from an educational lobbyists is as important in influencing legislators as are the communication skills of the lobbyist." The presentation of item 30 in Table 32 shows that 61.96 percent of responding legislators (mean of 2.67) felt that the message content was as important as the communication skills utilized in the delivery of the message.

A majority of legislators in all groups with the exception of legislators with only some college (50.00%), those with 9-12 years (47.37%), and legislators who did not live near a state university (50.00%), agreed with the item. Both legislators who served 17 or more years in the legislature were in agreement. Furthermore, the mean of only two groups, those with 9-12 years experience (2.47) and those who did not reside near state university (2.43) were less than 2.50. However, only one group, those with 17 or more years experience (3.50) responded with a mean greater than 3.00. This suggests weak agreement with the item. A large percentage of lobbyists (71.43%) acknowledged that they thought that the content of the message was as

TABLE 32

RESPONSE TO ITEM 30: "THE CONTENT OF A MESSAGE FROM AN EDUCATIONAL LOBBYIST IS AS IMPORTANT IN INFLUENCING LEGISLATORS AS ARE THE COMMUNICATION SKILLS OF THE LOBBYIST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	60.00	2.50
Some College	16	50.00	2.62
Bachelor's Degree	23	65.22	2.65
Master's Degree	15	60.00	2.67
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	65.38	2.73
Legislative District			
Urban	37	56.76	2.68
Rural	39	58.97	2.54
Suburban	14	78.57	2.93
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	64.29	2.69
5 - 8	20	65.00	2.65
9 - 12	19	47.37	2.47
13 - 16	7	57.14	2.71
17 or more	2	100.00	3.50
Chamber			
House	63	58.73	2.62
Senate	26	65.38	2.69
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	66.13	2.76
No	28	50.00	2.43
Education Committee			
Yes	16	62.50	2.81
No	74	60.81	2.62
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	63.08	2.69
Republican	25	56.00	2.56
All Legislators	92	61.96	2.67
Lobbyists	7	71.43	2.86

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

important in influencing legislators as were communication skills. Their mean of 2.86 also implies fairly strong support for this position.

Item 31. "Entertainment provided by educational lobbyists from state universities has a positive influence on legislators." Examination of item 31 in Table 33 indicates that only 38.04 percent of legislators (with a mean of 2.15) agreed that entertainment has a positive influence on legislators.

Analysis of the percentages and means of the legislature groups indicate that only two groups, those with 5-8 years (65.00%) and legislators with 17 or more years (100.00%) experience agreed with the item. They were also the only group to respond with a mean greater than 2.5 (2.55 and 3.00, respectively). Moreover, several groups--those with only some college (25.00%), holders of a master's degree (20.00%), legislators with 13-16 years experience (0.00%), and education committee members (18.75%)--responded with a positive response rate less than or equal to 25 percent. Conversely, all lobbyists (100.00%) responded positively with a strong mean of 3.00.

Item 32. "Social meetings and entertainment are preferred by educational lobbyists to persuade legislators toward a budget request." Response to item 32 reported in Table 34 indicate that only 23.91 percent of responding

TABLE 33

RESPONSE TO ITEM 31: "ENTERTAINMENT PROVIDED BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES HAS A POSITIVE INFLUENCE ON LEGISLATORS."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	50.00	2.20
Some College	16	25.00	1.94
Bachelor's Degree	23	47.83	2.35
Master's Degree	15	20.00	1.93
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	38.46	2.15
Legislative District			
Urban	37	32.43	2.22
Rural	39	41.03	2.10
Suburban	14	35.71	2.00
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	28.57	2.10
5 - 8	20	65.00	2.55
9 - 12	19	31.58	2.00
13 - 16	7	00.00	1.29
17 or more	2	100.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	39.68	2.19
Senate	26	26.92	1.96
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	38.71	2.18
No	28	32.41	2.04
Education Committee			
Yes	16	18.75	1.88
No	74	40.54	2.19
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	40.00	2.17
Republican	25	28.00	2.04
All Legislators	92	38.04	2.15
Lobbyists	7	100.00	3.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

TABLE 34

RESPONSE TO ITEM 32: "SOCIAL MEETINGS AND ENTERTAINMENT ARE PREFERRED BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS TO PERSUADE LEGISLATORS TOWARD A BUDGET REQUEST."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	20.00	1.90
Some College	16	31.25	2.00
Bachelor's Degree	23	21.74	1.96
Master's Degree	15	13.33	1.80
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	23.08	2.04
Legislative District			
Urban	37	27.03	2.16
Rural	39	17.82	1.67
Suburban	14	35.71	2.21
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	14.29	1.88
5 - 8	20	35.00	2.15
9 - 12	19	26.32	1.84
13 - 16	7	14.29	1.86
17 or more	2	50.00	3.00
Chamber			
House	63	25.40	1.97
Senate	26	11.54	1.88
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	19.35	2.00
No	28	28.57	1.86
Education Committee			
Yes	16	18.75	1.88
No	74	22.97	1.97
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	23.08	1.97
Republican	25	20.00	1.92
All Legislators	92	23.91	1.99
Lobbyists	7	28.58	2.00

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

legislators (with a mean of only 1.99) agreed that social meetings and entertainment are positive lobbying tactics.

Most legislators denied that entertainment is an advantageous lobbying technique. In fact, legislators with only some college (31.25%), those from suburban districts (35.71%), legislators with 5-8 (35.00%) or 17 or more (50.00%) years experience, House members (25.40%), and those not residing near a university (28.57%) were the only groups to respond with a greater than 25 percent rate. Likewise, only a small portion of the lobbyists (28.58% with a mean of 2.00) agreed with this idea.

Item 33. "The use of pressure tactics has an immediate negative impact upon a legislator." Table 35 indicates that 85.87 percent of responding legislators (with a mean response of 3.33) believed that pressure tactics is a counterproductive lobbying strategy.

At least 80 percent of all legislators, with the exception of those with only a high school diploma (70.00%) and those with 5-8 (75.00%), or 17 or more years (50.00%) experience agreed with item 33. Moreover, legislators with 17 or more years experience (2.50) was the only group to respond with a mean of less than 3.00. Lobbyists also concurred with this contention as evidenced by an 87.50 positive response rate and a mean of 3.38.

TABLE 35

RESPONSE TO ITEM 33: "THE USE OF PRESSURE TACTICS BY EDUCATIONAL LOBBYISTS HAS AN IMMEDIATE NEGATIVE IMPACT UPON A LEGISLATOR."

Legislator Profiles	N	Percent Positive Response[a]	Mean[b]
Education Level			
High School Graduate	12	70.00	3.00
Some College	16	100.00	3.75
Bachelor's Degree	23	82.61	3.22
Master's Degree	15	80.00	3.40
Terminal Degree (Ph.D., MD, etc.)	26	96.15	3.35
Legislative District			
Urban	37	83.78	3.32
Rural	39	89.74	3.41
Suburban	14	92.86	3.29
Years in Legislature			
0 - 4	42	92.86	3.45
5 - 8	20	75.00	3.05
9 - 12	19	94.74	3.47
13 - 16	7	85.71	3.57
17 or more	2	50.00	2.50
Chamber			
House	63	84.13	3.30
Senate	26	96.15	3.46
Live Near State University			
Yes	62	87.10	3.35
No	28	89.29	3.36
Education Committee			
Yes	16	93.75	3.75
No	74	86.49	3.27
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	65	84.62	3.31
Republican	25	96.00	3.48
All Legislators	92	85.87	3.33
Lobbyists	8	87.50	3.38

a = Either 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree).
b = Score range was 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree).

Item 34. The respondents were asked to rank lobbying techniques in priority of importance (1=most important, 4=least important) when considering budget requests from state universities. A review of the means of the responses show that legislators ranked direct contact (1.53) as the most important lobbying technique when considering budget requests from state universities. Special assistance (2.46), testimony at hearings (2.51) and social pressure (3.84),ranked second, third, and fourth respectively. Educational lobbyists prioritized the lobbying techniques in the same order: direct contact (1.25), special assistance (2.14), testimony at hearings (3.00), and social pressure (3.67).

VIII. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO RESEARCH QUESTION NUMBER 4

Legislators believed that lobbyists were effective at providing adequate information to support their universities' requests. They also felt that the influence of a lobbyist is a function of the knowledge the lobbyist has of the legislative process. Legislators felt that visibility and message content were important factors in the lobbying process; while entertainment, social meetings, and pressure tactics were discouraged by legislators as productive lobbying techniques. They also considered direct contact as the most important lobbying technique.

Lobbyists were in general agreement with legislators on most lobbying strategies. However, lobbyists, contrary to legislators, placed little emphasis upon visibility and lobbyists placed great value on entertainment as a positive lobbying strategy. They agreed with legislators, however, regarding the importance of direct contact as a successful lobbying strategy.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a brief restatement of the purpose, a synopsis of the design and procedures, and a reiteration of the research questions. A summary of the findings, conclusions based on those findings, and recommendations are then presented.

I. PURPOSE, PROCEDURES, AND QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of legislators and lobbyists regarding the level of influence of lobbying on the funding of state universities by the Tennessee General Assembly. Additionally, a review of related literature was conducted to determine common lobbying techniques employed by lobbyists to influence legislative decisions regarding appropriations to state universities.

A descriptive statistical design was utilized to fulfill the purpose of the study. The 1987-88 Tennessee legislature was comprised of 99 representatives and 33 senators. The chief executive officer of each of Tennessee's state universities was identified as the university's primary lobbyist. Questionnaires were

administered to legislators and educational lobbyists; and frequencies, percentages, and means were computed for each of the following research questions:

1. What were the attitudes of the legislators and educational lobbyists toward the higher education budgetary process in the State of Tennessee?

2. What methods of contact were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as the most effective?

3. Which items were selected by legislators and educational lobbyists as being the most influential in affecting a legislator's decision regarding funding higher education?

4. What techniques were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as being most effective in affecting a legislative decision regarding appropriations to Tennessee State Universities?

For each of the four research questions the effect of educational level, type of legislative district, number of years in the legislature, and chamber membership (House or Senate) on legislator's perceptions of lobbying efforts were assessed. Additionally, the effect of the existence of a state university in a legislators' immediate area, education committee membership, and political affiliation

on his/her attitudes regarding the impact of lobby groups were considered.

II. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Analysis of the data provided for the following summary of findings for each research question, discussed here in the order in which they appeared as research questions in the study.

1. What were the attitudes of legislators and educational lobbyists toward the higher education budgetary process in the State of Tennessee?

The majority of legislators viewed the budgetary process for funding state universities in the State of Tennessee as a cumbersome process. The bulk of the legislators believed, however, that the recommendations made by THEC were not and should not be more influential than those of the Governor. Additionally, legislators acknowledged that lobbying activity results in more generous treatment by the general assembly.

In contrast, most educational lobbyists did not think that the budgetary process is cumbersome. They agreed with legislators, however, that the Governor's recommendations are and should be more influential than the recommendations of THEC. Not surprisingly, educational lobbyists also

agreed unanimously that lobbying activity results in more generous treatment to state universities.

2. What methods of contact were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as the most effective?

Most legislators concurred that educational lobbyists have reasonably unlimited access to all legislators, but they concentrate their efforts on only a small and select number of legislators. The legislators felt that "one-to-one" communication with a legislator was more important than testimony at hearings by an educational lobbyist.

There was some disagreement among legislators as to whether contact by a non-lobbyist friend of the legislator is more important than contact by a lobbyist. However, a small majority of the lobbyists believed this to be true. Most legislators also judged the contact by the university president to be more influential than contact from other lobbyists from the same university.

The point in time at which lobbyists make contact with legislators was as important to both legislators and lobbyists as the number of contacts. Moreover, a large majority of both groups felt that the content of the contacts was more important than the number of contacts. The respondents disagreed as to the most effective location for lobbying contacts. A slight majority of legislators

would rather have been contacted in Nashville, but the majority of the lobbyists judged district level contacts to be more influential. Both groups concluded that the alumni association should leave lobbying activity to the lobbyists; however, lobbyists were in stronger agreement on this item than were legislators. Both groups also thought that contact should be maintained during the time the legislature is not in session and that it is important to recognize previous support and assistance of legislators.

Legislators ranked university administrators as the number one source of information when considering budget requests. Educational lobbyists, legislative colleagues, constituents, friends or family members, alumni, faculty members, campaign workers, and students were ranked 2 through 9 respectively. Educational lobbyists ranked legislative colleagues as the number one source of information to legislators, with university administrators, constituents, educational lobbyists, alumni, friends or family members, faculty members, campaign workers, and students ranked 2 through 9 respectively.

3. Which items were selected by legislators and educational lobbyists as being the most influential in affecting a legislator's decision regarding funding higher education?

Legislators and lobbyists alike thought budget requests should be supported by specific facts rather than with emotional appeals. Likewise, both groups felt that information should be provided to legislators prior to a legislative session. Legislators and lobbyists also concluded that facts are more effective than pressure tactics and that lobbying activity has little impact on the acceptance of THEC's recommendations by the General Assembly. Legislators and lobbyists also felt that lobbyists exert as much influence on funding allocations as their administrators believe they do.

Both legislators and lobbyists acknowledged that the prestige of a university is more influential than lobbyists' presentations; however, the lobbyists were stronger than the legislators in this belief. A legislator's prior affiliation with a state university appears to be important when budget requests are being considered. There was disagreement between the two groups regarding the extent to which lobbyists take credit for outcomes which they did not effect. Lobbyists felt they accepted more credit for influencing appropriations than in reality they exerted, while legislators felt legislators did not claim more credit than they deserved. Lobbyists placed more emphasis on the ability of legislators to influence their colleagues than did legislators. Both

groups considered the provision of information as the single most important function of educational lobbyists. Both legislators and lobbyists ranked direct contact as the most important lobbying technique when considering budget requests. Special assistance, testimony at hearings, and social pressure were ranked second, third, and fourth respectively by both groups.

4. What techniques were perceived by legislators and educational lobbyists as being most effective in affecting a legislative decision regarding appropriations to Tennessee state universities?

Legislators and lobbyists agreed that lobbyists are effective at presenting and explaining their university's budget request, and both groups believed lobbyists provide an adequate amount of information to legislators. Although both legislators and lobbyists agreed that an increase in the understanding of the legislative process results in an increase in the effectiveness of lobbyists, legislators were much more positive on this idea than were lobbyists.

There was disagreement between the groups regarding the impact of lobbyists' visibility during a legislative session. Legislators considered visibility very important while lobbyists opposed this notion. The content of a message from an educational lobbyist was considered to be as important as the skills involved in communicating the

particular message; however, lobbyists felt stronger on this idea than did legislators. Lobbyists placed much more emphasis upon entertainment than did legislators. However, both groups considered social meetings and the use of pressure tactics to have a negative impact upon legislators.

The following summarizes the effect of educational level, type of legislative district, number of years in the legislature, and Chamber (House or Senate) membership on legislators' perceptions of lobbying efforts. Additionally, the effect of the existence of a state university in a legislator's immediate area, education committee membership, and political affiliation on his/her attitudes regarding the impact of lobby groups will be considered.

The majority of legislators in all groups except those with 17 or m ore years experience and senators believed the budgetary process for funding state universities in the State of Tennessee to be cumbersome. Most legislators, with the exception of those with only a high school education and legislators with 17 or more years experience, felt that the recommendations made by the Governor were more influential than those made by THEC. Although legislators as a whole felt that the Governor's recommendations should be more influential than those of THEC, at

least half of those in the following groups took the opposite view: those with only a high school education, legislators with some college, terminal degree holders, urban legislators, those with 0-4, 9-12, or 17 or more years experience, senators, legislators who lived near a state university, education committee members, and Republicans. Legislators with some college, those with 13-16 years experience, and education committee members were the only groups in which a majority did not believe that lobbying results in more generous treatment by the General Assembly.

Most legislators believed that educational lobbyists have reasonably unlimited access to legislators; however, only half of those with 17 or more years experience agreed with this item. The majority, with the exception of those with only a high school education and legislators with 5-8 or 13-16 years experience, also believed that lobbyists concentrate their efforts on a small and select number of legislators. Those with only a high school education, terminal degree holders, those with 17 or more years experience, senators, and those legislators who did not reside near a state university were the only groups in which at least half thought testimony at hearings to be more influential than "one-on-one" communication. A slight majority of legislators believed that contact by a non-

lobbyist friend of a legislator is more influential than contact by an educational lobbyist. However, a majority of legislators with advanced degrees, suburbias representatives, those with 5-8 or 13-16 years experience, senators, and education committee members expressed opposition to this item. The majority of legislators, except those with only a high school diploma and legislators with a master's degree, felt that contact by a university president is more influential than contact from other lobbyists from the same university. The timing of the contact was more important to the majority of legislators for all profile categories than were the number of the contacts. Moreover, the vast majority of legislators, except those with 17 or more years experience, felt that the content of the message was more influential than the number of contacts.

While a slight majority of legislators would rather have been contacted in Nashville, at least half of the legislators with only a high school education, master's degree holders, suburban representatives, those with 5-12 or 17 or more years experience, house members, and legislators who did not reside near a university preferred to be contacted in the district. Most legislators believed that the alumni association should not be involved in lobbying;however, at least half of those with some college, bachelor's degree holders, those with 5-8 or 17 or more

years experience, and education committee members were of the opposite view. The majority of legislators for all profile groups believed that contact should be maintained even when the legislature is not in session and that it is important for lobbyists to recognize the previous support and assistance of legislators.

All legislators believed that lobbyists should support their requests by specific needs rather than emotional appeals and most agreed that lobbyists should provide information to legislators prior to a legislature session. Furthermore, the majority of legislators thought that budget requests supported by facts are more persuasive than those based on pressure tactics.

While the majority of legislators felt that lobbyists did not determine the extent to which THEC's recommendations are accepted by the General Assembly, at least half of the following groups were of the opposite opinion: terminal degree holders, urban representatives, those with 5-8 or 17 or more years experience, senators, those who lived near a state university, and Republicans. Legislators with only a high school education and those with 17 or more years experience were the only groups in which half believed that lobbyists exert less influence than their administrators believe they do. Most legislators believed that the prestige of a university was

more influential than lobbyist's presentations; however, only half or less of the legislators with a terminal degree, representatives of suburban districts, those with 5-12 or 17 or more years service, senators, and education committee members agreed with this item.

Most legislators believed a legislator's prior affiliation with a university causes the legislator to be more sympathetic to its funding requests, and legislators with 17 or more years service and senators were the only groups in which a majority believed lobbyists take undue credit for their activities. Most legislators felt that they were more effective in influencing their colleagues than were lobbyists and all legislators believed the provision of data was the single most important function of lobbyists.

A majority of legislators believed that lobbyists were effective at presenting their request; however, only half of the legislators with 17 or more years experience agreed with this item. While most legislators agreed that lobbyists provide an adequate amount of information, only half of those with 17 or more years experience concurred.

The majority of legislators for all profile areas believed that the more knowledgeable lobbyists are about the legislative process the more influential they will be. Most, with the exception of legislators with 13-16 years

experience, also considered visibility by lobbyists to have a positive impact upon their level of influence. Legislators with only some college, 9-12 years experience, and those who did not reside near a university were the only groups in which half or less felt that communication skills were as important at the content of the message.

Legislators with only a high school education and those with 17 or more years experience were the only groups in which at least half believed that entertainment had a positive influence on legislators. Furthermore, the latter was the only group in which half believed social meetings were preferred by lobbyists as a lobbying technique. The majority of legislators, except those with 17 or more years experience, also believed that the use of pressure tactics had an immediate negative impact upon legislators.

A review of related literature and research revealed that lobby groups are not new in the United States. In fact, the right to lobby was made implicit by the First Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Educational lobbyists have become more in evidence at the state level as state government has assumed a larger responsibility for providing support for education. The development of educational lobbying in Tennessee has paralleled that of other states. Many of the same strategies, techniques, and regulations employed in Tennessee are found in different

states. In fact, a comparison of the perceptions relative to lobbying of Tennessee legislators with those in Alabama (Caston, pp. 78-220) revealed only minor differences. Most Tennessee legislators, for example, preferred to be contacted in the capitol in Nashville while the majority of Alabama legislators favored district level contacts. Most Tennessee legislators felt that the alumni association should not be involved in lobbying activities, while most legislators in Alabama were of the opposite opinion. Tennessee legislators generally did not think that lobbyists take undue credit for appropriations but most legislators in Alabama believed that lobbyists commonly accept credit for appropriations they did not influence. Most Tennessee legislators did not think that lobbyists employed entertainment as a lobbying technique while legislators in Alabama believed that state lobbyists did utilize entertainment as a lobbying strategy. However, both Tennessee and Alabama legislators viewed educational lobbyists as a necessary component of the legislative process and relied on them for valuable and accurate information.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were obtained from the findings:

1. It takes time for legislators to become familiar enough with the funding process for state universities so that they understand it and no longer consider it cumbersome.

2. Higher educational lobbyists must not ignore the Governor and his staff when planning the lobbying strategy.

3. Some lobbying techniques may be overrated by higher educational lobbyists as effective methods for increasing funds to state universities.

4. Certain lobbying strategies appear to limit lobbyists' ability to influence legislators.

5. Particular lobbying techniques may enhance the educational lobbyists efforts to increase the funding level to state universities.

6. Increased knowledge of the interaction among the legislature, Governor, and THEC may be beneficial to lobbyists as they attempt to influence the appropriations to state universities.

7. The high level of agreement of perceptions among the various legislative profile groups relative to effective lobbying strategies and techniques, suggest that the legislature has apparently established both a formal and informal set of standards concerning lobbying which are understood and accepted by its members.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. A more thorough orientation into the funding process for higher education needs to be provided for new legislators.

2. Higher educational lobbyists should consider lobbying the Governor and his staff as well as the legislature in support of funding for state universities.

3. State universities need to reevaluate the time, money, and effort spent on certain lobbying techniques in an attempt to use resources more effectively. For example, contact by a non-lobbyist friend of the legislator, contact in the home district, and the involvement of the alumni association, appear to have had less influence on legislators than was thought by educational lobbyists.

4. Higher education lobbyist should reconsider their utilization of entertainment as an effective technique for influencing legislators toward a particular budget request.

5. Due to the complex nature of the legislative process educational lobbyists must be willing to use numerous techniques in order to influence legislators. And their efforts may be enhanced if they (a) concentrate on contact timing rather than the number of contacts, (b)

maintain contact with legislators during the time the legislature is not in session, (c) recognize previous support and assistance of legislators, (d) support their requests with facts rather than emotional appeals and pressure tactics, (e) provide information to legislators prior to a legislative session, (f) base their requests on facts rather than emotional appeals, and (g) provide legislators with accurate and timely information.

6. Further research needs to be conducted to determine which lobbying strategies and techniques would be effective in influencing the Governor and THEC toward a budget request.

7. Further research needs to be conducted into the coalescing of formal and informal power groups in the General Assembly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angel, Dan. (1987). How to play the state capitol game. In Leonard F. Goodall (Ed.) When colleges lobby states (pp. 104-109). Washington, DC: American Association of State College and Universities.

Appropriation's formula academic formula units fiscal year 1987-88. A brochure developed by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

Bailey, Stephen K. (1975). Education interest groups in the nation's capitol. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Barnes, Robert A. (Ed.). (1971). The Washington lobby. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Quarterly, Inc.

Burbacher, John S. & Rudy, Solomon Willis (1976). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976. New York: Harper and Row.

Campbell, Roald F. & Mazzoni, Tim L., Jr. (1976). State public policy making for the public schools: A comparative analysis of policy making for the public schools in twelve states and a treatment of state government models (1976). Burkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Caston, Donna Robertson (1982). An assessment of the influence by lobbyists on appropriations by the legislature to four-year universities in Alabama. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Committee on Governmental Affairs United States Senate. (1986). Congress and pressure groups: Lobbying in a modern democracy (Publication No. S. Prt, 99-161). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Deakin, James (1966). The lobbyists. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.

Diamond, Robert A. (Ed.). (1974). The Washington lobby. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Quarterly, Inc.

Fuhrman, Susan & Rosenthal, Alan (1981). Shaping education Policy making in the states. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hicks, John W. (1987). Lobbying for limited resources. In Leonard E. Goodall (Ed.) When colleges lobby states (pp. 100-103). Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Holtzman, Abraham (1966). Interest groups and lobbying. New York: Collier-MacMillan Limited.

Jacob, Herbert & Vines, Kenneth, N. (1965). Politics in the American states. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Jennings, Robert E. & Milstein, Mike E. (1970). Education policy making in New York state with emphasis on the role of the state legislature. New York: Praeyer Publishers.

Jones, E. Terrence (1987). Public universities on the new state politics. In Leonard E. Goodall (Ed.). When colleges lobby states (pp. 110-117). Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Milbrath, Lester W. (1970). "The impact on lobbying on governmental decisions." In Robert H. Salisbury (Ed.). Interest groups politics in America (pp. 104-126). New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row.

Milstein, Mike M. & Jennings, Robert E. (1973). Educational policy making and the state legislature. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Rich, Spencer (Ed.). (1965). Legislators and the lobbyists. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Quarterly Service.

Rosenthal, Alan & Fuhrman, Susan (1981). Legislative education leadership in the states. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Schriftgiessar, Karl S. (1951). The lobbyists. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Steele, Donald J. Jr., Russell, J. Working, & Bernacki, Gerald J. (1981). Care and feeding of interest groups. Education and Urban Society, 13 (2), 22-31.

Tennessee Blue Book. (1985-86). Nashville, TN: The Secretary of State.

Tennessee Blue Book. (1985-86). Nashville, TN: The Secretary of State.

Tennessee Blue Book. (1987-88). Nashville, TN: The Secretary of State.

Tennessee Constitution, (as ratified on March 7, 1978). Article XI., Section 12.

Tennessee Lobbyists Registration and Disclosure Act of 1975, 313, 1 T.C.A. 3-601 (1975).

Truman, David B. (1964). The governmental process. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Zeigler, Luther Harmon (1964). Interest groups in American society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Zeigler, Luther Harmon & Baer, Michael A. (1964) Lobbying: Interaction and influence in American state legislatures. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS

April 9, 1988

Dear Dr.

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Tennessee in the area of Educational Leadership. My dissertation topic is, "Lobbying and Influence in the Funding of State Universities By The Tennessee General Assembly." The purpose of the study is twofold: (1) to identify the techniques used by educational lobbyists, and (2) to determine their perceived effectiveness upon appropriations to state universities in Tennessee.

Attached is a research questionnaire requesting pertinent information necessary to successfully complete the study. In the majority of state universities in Tennessee, the Chief Executive Officer serves as the University's primary informal lobbyist. However, you may have designated an individual to serve in this capacity. If the latter is the case, please forward this instrument to the appropriate individual. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest convenience and return it in the enclosed pre- addressed envelope.

The completion of the instrument is voluntary and the anonymity of the respondent will be completely protected. The completion will also be considered the informed consent of the respondent.

Your cooperation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Larry Mayes

Enclosures

March 28, 1989

Dear Legislator:

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Tennessee in the area of Educational Leadership. My dissertation topic is, "Lobbying and Influence in the Funding of State Universities By The Tennessee General Assembly." The purpose of the study is twofold: (1) to identify the techniques used by educational lobbyists, and (2) to determine their perceived effectiveness upon appropriations to state universities in Tennessee.

Attached is a research questionnaire requesting pertinent information necessary to successfully complete the study. Please complete the questionnaire at your earliest convenience and you may return it in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope or, if you prefer, the completed instrument will be picked up at your office.

The completion of the instrument is voluntary and the anonymity of the respondent will be completely protected. The completion will also be considered the informed consent of the respondent.

Your cooperation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Larry Mayes

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Lobbying and Influence in the
Funding of State Universities by
the Tennessee General Assembly

NOTE: For the purpose of this survey an educational lobbyist is defined as any individual associated with a state university who attempts to influence decisions of the General Assembly on higher education matters especially those of a financial nature.

DIRECTIONS: Please read and respond to each item. Your response to each item should be indicated by circling only one of the four possible responses: Strongly Agree (4) and Strongly Disagree (1).

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
4	3	2	1	1.	The legislative process for funding state universities is a cumbersome process. (Process includes: (a) budget request by university, (b) budget recommendation by THEC, (c) recommendation by the governor, (d) committee hearings, and (e) appropriations by the legislature.)
4	3	2	1	2.	The recommendations made by THEC are more influential than the recommendations made by the governor.
4	3	2	1	3.	The recommendations made by THEC should be more influential than the recommendations made by the governor.
4	3	2	1	4.	Lobbying activity by educational lobbyists from state universities results in more generous treatment by the General Assembly.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
4	3	2	1	5.	All educational lobbyists from state universities have reasonably unlimited access to legislators.
4	3	2	1	6.	Educational lobbyists from state universities concentrate their efforts on trying to influence only a select and small number of legislators who hold important positions in the appropriations process.
4	3	2	1	7.	Testimony at committee hearings by an educational lobbyist is more influential than direct "one-on-one" communications between a legislator and a lobbyist.
4	3	2	1	8.	Contact about a university's budget request by a non-lobbyist who is a close friend of a legislator is more influential than contact by an educational lobbyist from a state university.
4	3	2	1	9.	Contact about a university's budget request by the president of a university is more influential than contact from other educational lobbyists from the same university.
4	3	2	1	10.	The point in time at which an educational lobbyist from a state university contacts a legislator about a budget request is as important as the number of contacts made by the educational lobbyist.
4	3	2	1	11.	The number of contacts made with a legislator by an educational lobbyist from a state university is as influential as the content of the contacts.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
4	3	2	1	12.	Contacts about budget requests made by educational lobbyists are more influential when made in the legislator's home district than when made while the legislator is at the Capitol in Nashville.
4	3	2	1	13.	The alumni association of a state university should leave the responsibility for disseminating budget information to the university's educational lobbyist.
4	3	2	1	14.	Educational lobbyists should maintain contact with legislators during the time the legislature is not in session.
4	3	2	1	15.	It is important that previous support and assistance by legislators be recognized by educational lobbyists.
4	3	2	1	16.	Educational lobbyists should demonstrate that requested budget increases are supported by specific needs, rather than by emotional appeals.
4	3	2	1	17.	Educational lobbyists should provide information about a university budget request to legislators prior to a legislative session.
4	3	2	1	18.	Budget requests based on facts rather than on pressure tactics are more persuasive.
4	3	2	1	19.	The influence of educational lobbyists determines the extent to which THEC's recommendations are accepted by the General Assembly.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
4	3	2	1	20.	Educational lobbyists from state universities exert much less influence on funding allocations to their universities than the administrators of their universities believe they do.
4	3	2	1	21.	The prestige of a state university is more influential when considering budget requests than are the presentations made by an educational lobbyist.
4	3	2	1	22.	A legislator's prior affiliation with a state university, either as a graduate or through other channels, causes the legislator to be more sympathetic to its funding requests.
4	3	2	1	23.	Educational lobbyists often take credit for influencing appropriations which in reality they did not influence.
4	3	2	1	24.	Legislators who support the budget requests of state universities located in their immediate area usually are more effective in influencing other legislators about budget appropriations than are educational lobbyists.
4	3	2	1	25.	The single most important function of educational lobbyists is to provide data and information to the legislators.
4	3	2	1	26.	Educational lobbyists are generally affective at presenting and explaining their universities' budget request.

Strongly Agree			Strongly Disagree		
4	3	2	1	27.	Educational lobbyists generally do not provide an adequate amount of information to support their universities' budget requests.
4	3	2	1	28.	The more knowledgeable educational lobbyists are about the legislative process the more influential they will be.
4	3	2	1	29.	The more visible educational lobbyists are during a legislative session, the more influential they will be.
4	3	2	1	30.	The content of a message from an educational lobbyist is as important in influencing legislators as are the communication skills of the lobbyist.
4	3	2	1	31.	Entertainment provided by educational lobbyists from state universities has a positive influence on legislators.
4	3	2	1	32.	Social meetings and entertainment are preferred by educational lobbyists to persuade legislators toward a budget request.
4	3	2	1	33.	The use of pressure tactics by educational lobbyists has an immediate negative impact upon a legislator.

34. Rank the following lobbying techniques in priority of importance to legislators when considering budget requests from state =>ties. (1 = most important, 5 = the least important)

_____Direct contact
_____Testimony at hearings
_____Special assistance
_____Social pressure
_____Other:_____

35. Rank the following sources of information in priority of importance to legislators when considering budget requests from state universities. (1 = most important, 10 = the least important)

_____Contact by university administrator
_____Contact by educational lobbyist
_____Contact by university faculty
_____Contact by university student
_____Contact by university alumnus
_____Contact by non-lobbyist friend or family member
_____Contact by election campaign worker
_____Contact by legislative colleague
_____Contact by constituent
_____Other:_____

Profile of Respondents

Please respond to the following questions about yourself.

36. What is your highest level of education: (check one)

_____Less than high school diploma
_____High school graduate
_____Some college
_____Bachelor's degree
_____Master's degree
_____Terminal degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., Law, etc.)

37. How would you best describe your legislative district?
(check all that apply)

_____Urban
_____Rural
_____Suburban

38. Please check the total number of years, including 1988, you have served in the Tennessee Legislature (include service in both houses if applicable): (check one)

_____ 0 - 4 years
_____ 5 - 8 years
_____ 9 - 12 years
_____13 - 16 years
_____17 years or more

39. In which chamber are you currently a member? (check one)

_____House of Representatives
_____Senate

40. Is a state university located in your immediate area? (check one)

_____Yes
_____No

41. Please indicate if you are either a member of the Senate Education Committee or the House Education Committee. (check one)

_____Yes
_____No

42. What is your political affiliation? (check one)

_____Democrat
_____Republican
_____Other

VITA

Larry D. Mayes was born in Monroe, Michigan on March 29, 1953. He resides at 415 East Holston Avenue, Johnson City, Tennessee. He attended elementary school in Claiborne County, Tennessee and graduated from Powell Valley High School in May, 1971. He enrolled in The University of Tennessee at Martin in 1973 and received a Bachelor of Arts degree in secondary education with majors in history and economics in June, 1977. He began work on the Master's degree at Kentucky State University in Frankfort, Kentucky and received the Master's of Public Administration in December, 1979.

In the fall of 1979 he accepted a position with the Claiborne County Board of Education which continued until May, 1985 when he enrolled in the doctoral degree program in the Department of Educational Leadership at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. His major area of study was educational administration and supervision with collaterals in political science and higher education. He is currently employed at East Tennessee State University as a Planner/Evaluator in the Office of Human Resources. He also teaches research classes for the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis.