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In early civics lessons Americans are taught that theirs is a system of participatory government, that one person's vote does have meaning, and that by making views known to representatives they will be acted upon. They are taught about the governmental process, the steps involved in legislation, the function of the judicial and executive branches, and the means of political participation. Seemingly, they are given a working knowledge of government in action. What they are not made aware of during these lessons is that there are systems within the system and certain unwritten rules which must be followed in order to experience any degree of success in the political realm.

Those citizens who go no further than the exercise of the franchise function perfectly well with the knowledge imparted by high school civics, but the few who attempt to influence the political system more directly learn that this knowledge is not enough. Success in the political world requires not only a working knowledge of government but also a working knowledge of groups and collective action. Most individuals cannot expect to influence policy unless they join or organize effective groups of like-minded associates who have familiarized themselves with the rules of the political game. Politics is really the
struggle among groups to influence policy.\textsuperscript{1}

Individuals become important in this struggle when they act as part of or on behalf of group interests. These groups are essential bridges between individuals and government.

Because groups are such a visible component of the policy process, it is important that the determinants of group political success be identified. This thesis suggests that group political success involves several factors, many of which are gleaned only after an unsuccessful effort in the political arena has been made. This seems to be most evident when the group involved is small, politically inexperienced, and unable to hire political veterans for expertise and advice. Both size and political expertise are important resources in the struggle for influence.\textsuperscript{2} It logically follows that groups which lack these resources will face the most political difficulties.

Much of the research which addresses group political action or interest groups is limited to the national level, focusing on the relationship between Congress, interest groups, and federal agencies.\textsuperscript{3} Studies of these same relationships on the state level are fewer in number and when the topic is further narrowed to the issue of political success for the small group, the available research is quite limited.\textsuperscript{4}
Wiggins and Browne in their study of interest group success in the Iowa state legislature found that most of the systematic inquiries into the power and influence of interest groups is long on theory and short on data. They further state that there is little information of a quantifiable nature which indicates the presence or absence of group success. I reached the same conclusion in my own search for literature which addressed small group success in the realm of state politics.

This study focuses on small, politically inexperienced groups which have rallied around an issue in the hope of influencing policy on a state or local level. There are basically three reasons for focusing on the small group. First, as mentioned above, there are few studies of small group success in state politics, and politics at this level is often rife with small groups trying to exert influence. In order to understand state and local policymaking the participants should be carefully studied, noting those factors within the small group which seem to be most important in advancing the group's cause. By reviewing the political attempts of similar groups, other groups may ascertain the prerequisites for success. The reasons for the relative exclusion of small groups from political research up to this point is difficult to
determine. Perhaps it is because many small groups are inactive politically, waiting until they have achieved a certain size or legitimacy before attempting to influence the policy process, or perhaps researchers have looked closely only at those groups which are politically active, but that determination is beyond the scope of this paper.

The second reason for focusing on the small, politically inexperienced group is that most people first engage in group "politics" through this type of group. This may include a band of neighbors who go before the city council to request better police protection, a group of employees seeking better benefits, or a group of consumers seeking truth in advertising. Most individuals begin their group experiences in contexts such as this and may subsequently become involved in more organized and structured groups. It is therefore reasonable to begin a study of the prerequisites for group success with a focus on the small group.

A third reason for examining the requirements for small group success comes from my own frustrations as a small group member. I was an officer in the Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association for three years, actively involved in the group's political efforts. It seemed that in those years no progress was made in
spite of constant attention to the issues. I came to the conclusion that there were elements influencing success which our group had neither identified nor taken steps to control. The next step was to identify and document those elements which influence small group political success in hopes that similar groups could use this information to advance their own political attempts.

This thesis will address the issue of small group success by attempting in an exploratory fashion to uncover those factors which contribute to success of the small group in a political context. The first step involves addressing group theory and interest group literature in order to distill from it an understanding of the factors necessary for group political success. In order to test the utility of these factors in explaining small group success in a few selected instances, the literature review was followed by a case study. This case study was conducted in 1985 and focuses on the political experiences of some small groups in Arkansas. It attempts to determine the degree of each factor which the groups possess and how this relates to the members' perceptions of success.

The major focus of the case study is the Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association (ASDHA), an organization which has worked toward reforming the
regulations governing the dental hygiene profession. Some limited comparisons will also be made from the experiences of other similar groups such as the Arkansas Dietetic Association (ADA) and the Arkansas State Nurses' Association (ASNA). This case study is intended to be exploratory in scope and the conclusions drawn may not be widely generalizable. Again, because the literature on small group political success is limited there is a need for case studies such as this to be conducted. Not only are they important for the descriptive data they provide, the case study is important in that it identifies those areas which should be the focus of broader research efforts.

The second chapter contains a formal review of the group theory literature. In it I attempt to establish the legitimacy of the group concept in politics. This review will develop an understanding of the role of groups in politics with a particular focus on the issue of group success. Drawing from the literature and my own experiences in small groups, I will distill the factors which are most important for small group political success.

The third chapter examines the rationale for using the case study design and the corresponding survey. The means of operationalizing the factors influencing group success is also explored. The fourth chapter
will report the results of the survey, examining the
groups' perceptions of their role in the policy process
and the importance of each factor for success. The
fifth chapter will analyze the results of the survey
and the data obtained in the case study. This analysis
is made so that the factors selected in the literature
review can be compared to actual group experiences and
the tenet that small group success is dependent on the
presence of those factors can then be tested.

The final chapter will examine the political
achievements of the groups in the intervening four
years since the case study was conducted. It also
makes recommendations for enhancing the small group's
chances for political success.
FOOTNOTES


5Ibid., p. 548.

6For purposes of this paper I have arbitrarily designated groups with 1000 or fewer dues-paying members as "small." One should remember, however, that many dues-paying members are not active in the group.


Chapter Two - GROUPS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Before attention can be given to the problems of specific groups, the legitimacy of the group concept in politics must be established. This chapter will provide a brief review of the literature on group theory identifying the importance of groups in the political process, the reasons for group formation, and the issue of group success. Drawing from the literature and my own experiences in small groups, I will attempt to isolate those factors which are most important for small group political success.

Legitimacy of the Group in Politics

Through the years many divergent opinions have developed regarding the role of groups in politics. It is important to review the various group theories in order to gain an understanding of group influence in politics, both past and present.

James Madison was one of the first Americans to consider the role of groups in politics. Writing in the Federalist papers, Madison discussed the importance of groups which he called "factions," or:

a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.\(^1\)
As the definition makes clear, Madison felt that factions, or interest groups, were inherently bad; they were seen as working against the rights of others, or against the community as a whole. For Madison, however, factions resulted from selfish impulses of human nature, and their development and activity could not be naturally checked. He did not propose, however, that they be eliminated by force. Rather, the "mischiefs of faction" must be contained by setting the "ambition" of one faction against the selfish tendencies of other factions.

John C. Calhoun agreed with Madison that interests were destined to be varied and diverse in society, and he shared Madison's fear of a "tyranny of the majority." Calhoun, however, did not label factions as necessarily selfish or contrary to the needs and views of society. Instead he argued that varying group views and positions were vital to the nation. He further argued that each of the various interest groups of the society should be allowed a veto power over any major policy proposal that affected them. Conversely, a "concurrent majority" of all interest groups would have to support a policy proposal for it to be adopted.

Early in the twentieth century the debate over the role of groups in American politics took on a new tone as the relatively new science of politics entered the
debate. In *The Process of Government*, published in 1908, Arthur Bentley not only discussed the impact of groups on politics, but he also developed a portrait of the entire American political scene in group terms. Bentley was scornful of the concept of an overall public interest. To him, government policies were merely the result of the interactions and pressures of groups both within and outside the formal structure of government. His views contrasted sharply with the standard perspective of political science of the time which was largely concerned with the study and description of government structures, institutions, and laws. Nongovernmental organizations were not considered a legitimate subject of research. For Bentley, however, society is "nothing other than the complex of groups that compose it." 4

Bentley's interpretation of American politics, a radical interpretation for its time, endured and served as the catalyst for David Truman's 1951 book, *The Governmental Process*, in which Truman exhaustively describes the institutions of government as aggregations of groups, interacting with one another and with the variety of outside groups. Truman also saw individual citizens in terms of their group identification and membership. He pointed out that an individual is normally a member of several groups, each
making claims upon him; these overlapping group memberships help to control the "mischiefs of faction."

In his group analysis Truman focused on the importance of group access to decision makers. According to Truman, "Power of any kind cannot be reached by a political interest group, or its leaders, without access to one or more key points of decision in the government." He further notes that the common feature of all interest groups, regardless of the governmental institution observed, is the attempt to achieve effective access to decision makers. The groups in this case study found that access to decision makers is indeed of paramount importance.

**Reasons for Group Formation**

Citing the above authors and the group research that they have performed is of immense value in establishing that groups are indeed legitimate components of politics and worthy of additional study. One must go a step further, however, and examine the reasons for group development and continued group existence as these elements are also determinants of group political success.

**Equilibrium Theory.** Truman observes that interest groups arise from two inter-related societal processes.
To begin with, interest groups arise as society becomes more complex. In Truman's words,

It is obvious that the trend toward an increasing diversity of groups functionally attached to the institutions of government is a reflection of the characteristics and needs, to use a somewhat ambiguous term, of a complex society.\(^5\)

Truman admits, however, that the increasing complexity of society does not, by itself, adequately explain the proliferation of groups in our society. Rather, one should look beyond this broad generalization to the specific catalytic factors which cause previously non-political groups to enter the policy process. Truman postulated that people are stimulated to organize because they undergo a disturbance that alters their relationship with other groups or institutions. A disturbance is some force that changes the "equilibrium" of a particular segment of the population with other elements in society. This disturbance often places one group in an inferior position relative to other groups. The purpose of forming an interest group or association is to overcome these potentially disadvantageous forces and to stabilize relations so that a new equilibrium can be reached.\(^7\) The Arkansas Dietetic Association, to be examined later in this paper, will provide an example of the disturbance theory of group action.
Thomas Dye subscribes to an equilibrium theory similar to that of Truman. Dye states that public policy at any given time is the equilibrium reached in the group struggle.\textsuperscript{8} This equilibrium is determined by the relative influence of interest groups. Changes in the relative influence of any interest group can be expected to result in changes in public policy; policy will move in the direction desired by the group gaining in influence, and away from the desires of the group losing influence. Political scientist Earl Latham, another advocate of equilibrium theory, finds group politics to be a struggle replete with referees:

What may be called public policy is actually the equilibrium reached in the group struggle at any given moment, and it represents a balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to tip in their favor. . . . The legislature referees the group struggle, ratifies the victories of the successful coalition, and records the terms of the surrenders, compromises, and conquests in the form of statutes.\textsuperscript{9}

Exchange Theory. In 1969, Robert H. Salisbury offered another framework for group formation and activity based on exchange theory.\textsuperscript{10} Salisbury argues that the exchange theory is a more useful tool for studying interest group origins. Exchange theory postulates that individuals enter into interpersonal
relationships on the basis of an incentive or a benefit they will receive from the relationship or "exchange."

Salisbury identified three basic types of benefits or incentives: material (tangible rewards such as money, jobs, taxes); solidary (the socialization and friendship of group involvement); and purposive (ideological satisfaction). For Salisbury, politically oriented groups trade mainly in purposive and and material incentives. While purposive incentives are cheap—rhetoric does not cost much—groups that are solely oriented toward purposive ends are by nature unstable. Salisbury's framework underscores the inherent advantages of materially oriented groups, including business and labor, and the inherent drawbacks of "public-interest" or ideologically motivated groups.

Salisbury's basic thesis is that the success of organizing potential groups is dependent on the quality of the political organizer or "entrepreneur". It is the entrepreneur who must make members aware of any benefits they may receive by joining the organization. If the entrepreneur can gain a "profit" (e.g. a high salary, prestige, personal satisfaction) and can provide sufficient incentives, the organization should succeed.
Economist Mancur Olsen also subscribes to an exchange theory much like that of Salisbury although his focus is not on the germination of groups but on their ability to attract and maintain members once they have been organized. The question of why people initially join public interest groups and then continue their membership has yet to be fully answered. It has been suggested that people become members because of purposive incentives—individuals derive ideological satisfaction from the organization’s pursuit of certain collective goods. Another reason may be that although their organization lobbies only for collective goods, members may still receive selective benefits that have nothing to do with public policy objectives. A third explanation may be that a great number of people receive solidary benefits from their memberships. Through local chapters of organizations, members can derive benefits from the act of socializing with their coworkers.

Olsen argues that it is irrational for an individual to maintain membership in a large interest group if persons are able to share in the goods being sought without being dues-paying members. For example, why should a farmer join an agrarian organization that is lobbying for higher price supports? Certainly he wants higher price supports, but if the organization is
already lobbying for these goods, why should the farmer waste his money by joining? He will share in the higher prices whether or not he is a member of that group. Olsen has found that it is the small rather than the large group which is most effective at organizing around a common cause. Small groups are able to provide themselves with a collective good simply because of the attraction of the collective good to the individual members. In large groups the amount of a collective good which will be received by each member is minimal, therefore there is less interest in seeing the good obtained.

Following this logic, it is only rational for individuals to join an interest group if they receive a "separate and selective incentive." In other words, there must be some benefit that accrues only if the individual is a member of the group. Olsen makes several qualifications. If a group is so small that a person's nonpresence will be noticed by other members, then it is not irrational to maintain group membership in the absence of separate and selective incentives. Also, in some instances, individuals will have no choice but to join an interest group (e.g. closed shop labor union).

Olsen realized that the reasons for joining and maintaining group membership may change over time as he
states, "The common characteristic which distinguishes all of the large economic groups with significant lobbying organizations is that these groups are also organized for some other purpose." Lobbies are really by-products of selective incentives that induce members to join. Jeff Berry cites the Farm Bureau Federation as an example. It originally attracted members not for its lobbying, but because of the technical expertise it offered members.

Group functions. It is often the services or functions that a group may provide for its members which causes individuals to join and retain group membership. These functions may range from the psychological to the concrete and each may involve a political element or require group involvement in the political arena.

Symbolic functions provide one reason for joining a group. Salisbury has referred to these functions as "expressive." He notes, "Expressive actions are those where the action involved gives expression to the interests and values of a person or group rather than instrumentally (or concretely) pursuing interests or values." Membership or activity in a religious-based group, for example, may be undertaken to reinforce one's identification in that group rather than to promote a particular goal or policy.
Ornstein and Elder note five functions which a group may provide as a means to attract and retain members.17 The first of these is economic, as the primary distinction made between public interest groups and private interest groups is usually along economic self-interest lines. While groups exist for a variety of reasons and engage in a variety of activities, a great deal of interest group involvement has an economic basis. People will commit their resources to a group in the hopes that they will receive an economic return on their investment.

Groups may also perform broad or narrow ideological functions for their members. Groups may adopt far-reaching political ideologies covering all policy areas—liberal, conservative, socialist, communist, or other—that reflect the overall beliefs of their members. Other ideological functions are narrower, reflecting deep feeling single issues. For example, the National Rifle Association has a strong ideological belief in the American citizen’s unrestricted right to bear arms.

Another function that groups may provide is the dissemination of information. Many organizations publish a periodical such as a newsletter or a journal to keep their members up to date on topics which affect them.
The final group function mentioned by Ornstein and Elder is instrumental. Groups have an instrumental function when they strive for a concrete goal which is not economic. For example, right-to-life groups seek to outlaw abortion; the March of Dimes aimed to find a cure for polio. A direct, narrowly focused instrumental goal can be important in sustaining a group, and such goals, as they often involve legislative or government decisions, lead frequently to lobbying activity. When their goals are achieved or permanently blocked, groups which have formed around instrumental goals must either disband or focus on a new goal. After an effective polio vaccine was developed, the March of Dimes remained in existence (it continues to thrive) as an organization striving to conquer birth defects.

While Ornstein and Elder have identified some of the primary functions that a group may provide in hopes of enhancing membership, the "political" function of a group may be quite different from the primary function. For example, the AFL-CIO's primary function is clearly the economic well-being, through collective bargaining, of its labor union members; its political function extends well beyond directly labor-related issues to include civil rights, national health insurance, foreign trade, foreign policy, and the full gamut of
Some of these issues may also affect the economic well-being of the members but it is more indirectly than through collective bargaining, the primary motivation of the organization. Thus, a simple categorizing of groups according to primary motivations is not enough. Some understanding of the nature, size, and characteristics of the memberships of groups, their subject areas, and their resources is also necessary to understand group impact on the policy process. Those groups which are full-time participants in the policy process discovered the most successful lobbying techniques long ago and it is incumbent upon the lesser experienced groups to learn through observation of these political veterans. Through study of the various groups one can determine the factors which are most likely to bring about political success for the interest group. Adjustments should be made depending upon the resources available to the group, but the basic determinants of group power and success tend to be the same.

Factors Which Determine Group Influence and Success

In order to ascertain the basic determinants of group success, the work of early theorists and researchers should be considered once more. Unfortunately, early theorists such as Madison and
Bentley studied only the impact of groups on governmental process and spent little, if any, time studying the requirements for success. David Truman corrected this oversight in his 1951 book, *The Governmental Process*. In addition to describing the institutions of government as aggregations of groups and developing a theory of group proliferation, Truman suggested the factors most necessary for group success. Subsequent interest group research has shown that there are many factors which contribute to the development of a successful interest group such as access, contacts, expertise, information and resources, coalitional relationships, and so on. My own experiences in a small group vying for political recognition further emphasized the prerequisites for interest group success. Five of these, in my opinion, are especially vital to political success for the small group and should receive special attention.

Cohesiveness and Communication. The first trait which a group should demonstrate before attempting to influence policy is internal cohesiveness. According to Webster, cohesiveness may be defined as "the act of connecting naturally or logically, as by a common principle; to become or stay united in action, to be in accord." Cohesiveness is a broad term used to describe the internal group environment. It is an
indicator of group harmony and the unity with which an organization can make its claims. Kurt Lewin further defines cohesiveness as "Members positive valuation of the group and their motivation to continue belonging to it." He further states that when group cohesiveness is high, all members express solidarity, mutual liking, and positive feelings about attending meetings and carrying out the routine tasks of the group. Truman states that other factors bear upon a group's capacity to assert its claims successfully upon society, but the degree of unity in the group is probably most fundamental in determining the measure of success it will enjoy.

Other authors who have addressed the issue of group influence also stress the importance of cohesiveness. Terry Moe states that cohesion is the factor of primary importance, since it is agreement among individuals that makes concerted action possible in the first place. Harmon Zeigler states that any organization will suffer a reduction in political effectiveness by reason of internal conflict. Dorwin Cartwright notes that cohesiveness contributes to a group's potency and vitality; it increases the significance of membership for those who belong to the group. Dye and Longley also state that the influence of groups is determined in part by their internal
Ornstein and Elder regard membership unity as an organizational resource and a motivator. They note that small, cohesive groups which are committed to a cause often display an intensity of feeling that can multiply the group's influence far beyond its numbers.

Chester Barnard identifies cohesiveness as a type of general incentive for joining a group. A cohesive group may provide that associational attractiveness and opportunity for enlarged participation which will induce members to join and become active in the group.

The importance of group cohesiveness becomes apparent when groups must respond to criticism. Cohesion is a variable characteristic, both in respect to the number of matters on which members agree and in respect to the solidarity of their agreement, where the latter is a measure of the extent to which members are willing to maintain their arrangement despite threats, costs, and other inducements to break away. In many instances not only will a specific issue be under attack but the ideology of the group as well. A group must be unified to withstand this type of attack. William Graham Sumner postulated that in-group solidarity increases when clashes arise with out-groups. There should be agreement among a majority of members that the policy the group is
advocating is the right one before a public stand is taken. Once a decision has been made within the group, all members should support it. This attitude is often exhibited by the two major American political parties in that once a candidate is nominated, it is expected that all members will work together "for the good of the party" to see him or her elected.

Accepting that cohesiveness is a crucial element in insuring success, it is important that groups be attentive to maintaining it. In order to maintain cohesiveness in a group, the membership must be kept informed. Members of more cohesive groups seem to have a higher success rate in communication. Communication in groups is basic to coordination. It provides for orientation, goal setting, dispersal of information, distribution of rewards, and maintenance of member relations. Communication in a group may follow many different channels—memos, publications, or vocal messages to individuals or groups. For most public interest groups, a significant channel of communication is the organization's publication(s). Publications not only reveal what information organizations feel is useful and interesting to their audience, they also give members an indication of what their role should be. Moe believes that the associational newspaper plays a crucial role in
maintaining the association. The entrepreneur can use it to advertise the selective incentives that he has to offer and try to increase the perceived value of membership, or he may structure the content of communication in such a way as to turn the message itself into a selective incentive. He can do this by providing members with specialized information related in various ways to their economic well-being -- information about their industry, government regulations, recent economic developments, new production techniques, labor or management relations, etc.34

Communication and intelligence in an organization must flow not only from the top to the bottom but in the other direction as well. It is important for rank-and-file members to be able to convey their views on issues to the leaders of the organization. Berry found that in terms of "statutory influence", that is, actual impact on organization policy, 57 percent of public interest membership groups have no structure that elicits and considers members opinions.35 Most groups admit that their members are supportive rather than participatory. For the remainder of the groups (43 percent), the most common communication mechanism through which members can influence organizational decisions is annual or biannual conventions.36 Some
groups have federated structures where the rank-and-file's views can be represented via delegates to the meetings. Other organizations have open conventions that all members are free to attend. In a smaller number of groups, members are able to express preference directly by ballot or polls.

Jewell and Reitz emphasize the importance of communication in a group by looking at the functions that it serves. At the simplest level, communication provides information which is the basis for organizational action. Communications also command and instruct. They guide who does what, where, and how often. A third function of communications is to influence and persuade. This type of communication is the principal means by which groups enforce their norms, and according to Leon Festinger, "Discussions over the content and importance of group norms are one of the major reasons for communications within groups." Finally, communications serve integrative functions. That is, they serve to reinforce the various authority, status, and social relationships within the group.

Other authors also note the importance of communication in small groups. Sidney Verba states that the influence of one person over the behavior and opinions of another can be exerted only through
communication. He further notes that any technical information that is needed to aid the group in the achievement of its instrumental goal must be communicated to be effective. Zaleznik and Moment report that the prevalence of communication in group activities can be considered the most significant structural property of a group as well as the most readily observable phenomenon of group life. Perhaps Cathcart and Samovar sum up the importance of communication best when they state:

"If a man is to be successful in the many groups to which he belongs, including those which are highly structured as well as those that are inconspicuous and subtle, he must understand himself—how he communicates with himself, how he communicates with others, how he acts and reacts in groups—and something of the dynamics of each of these groups. In short, man must understand about communication if he is to operate to his full potential."

Leadership. Quality leadership is essential for the long term success of any interest group. Leadership is a combination of functions, usually performed by two or more people, which influences a group of people to work together to accomplish a collective goal. Truman defines a leader as one who initiates most of those actions—verbal or otherwise—to which the others in the group respond. To be effective this relationship must be persistent,
the leaders and followers must behave in this fashion consistently through time in the particular group. It should be noted also that the leader need not always initiate all actions involving members of the group. In fact, the most successful leader responds in private to the actions of individuals who are among his followers in the group -- that is, he "takes advice" from individuals but "gives orders" to the group.45

Much of the group literature indicates that the power of a group leader is not a quality "possessed" by that individual, but results from a functional relationship between the leader and the led. As Robert MacIver points out, "He cannot command unless another obeys. He cannot control unless the social organization invests him with the apparatus of control."46 These propositions were further summarized by Cecil A. Gibb:

Leadership is not a quality which a man possesses; it is an interactional function of the personality and of the social situation. A leader is a member of a group on whom the group confers a certain status, and leadership describes the role by which the duties of status are fulfilled. The effectiveness of the role depends upon the functional relation between the individual attributes of the man and the specific goal of the group at any moment. It is natural that some individual attributes of skill and personality will be generally effective though they will not confer upon their possessor universal leadership status.47
It seems then that no single leadership trait or group of characteristics has been isolated which determines the suitability of an individual for leadership. Leadership can, however, be learned. Military officers are trained to lead in the schools they attend. Business and industry spend millions of dollars each year in training their managers to lead. Officers of voluntary organizations can learn to lead, too.

The importance of good leadership to the successful interest group is frequently mentioned in the literature. Robert Dahl notes that all the important choices bearing on the life of an association are made by a relatively small proportion of people--the leadership. A group cannot operate until the key leadership role is filled and group direction is determined. D. A. Butterfield credits Bales and Slater with a two-function approach to leadership, that which facilitates the tasks involved in accomplishing group goals and that which shows consideration for the social-emotional problems of the group and its individual members. A task leader carries out the facilitating functions and a social leader, the consideration functions. A task leader is usually considered to be the leader and the social leader is considered to be the most popular person in the group.
It is only a very small percentage of the population which can fill both roles.\textsuperscript{52}

Bentley devotes a chapter to the importance of the various types of group leadership in the governmental process.\textsuperscript{53} Dye also mentions the importance of leadership to the successful group.\textsuperscript{54} D. A. Butterfield states that among the many variables used to predict and understand organizational effectiveness, leadership is central. Indeed, the supervisor's behavior is often considered the key element in how effectively a group will perform.\textsuperscript{55} Ornstein and Elder further state that the skill of a group's leadership in managing the other resources of the group, allocating them appropriately, determining priorities, and choosing allies is crucial to the group's success in the political process.\textsuperscript{56}

According to Truman, an office in an organized group is a status symbol—a position of importance about which membership expectations cluster. As such it is symbolic of the unity of the group, of the functions that the group performs in the lives of the members.\textsuperscript{57} In other words, the reason that the leadership of the group is important is that it serves to maintain the cohesion of the group.

The leadership role in most groups is carried out by what Truman calls "the active minority."\textsuperscript{58} This
minority may be labeled by derogatory terms such as "oligarchy" and "old guard" or approving ones such as "public spirited citizens" and "civic leaders." Truman contends that the role of an active minority in a group is not necessarily a detrimental state of affairs, rather it is a common situation in groups.

Status. Regardless of the techniques used by the leadership, a group tends to be most successful when it is accorded a position of status in the social structure. Status is a position of prestige awarded to a group as a result of public opinion and may be based on a number of factors.

A certain amount of prestige is bestowed on a group simply because it is formally organized. Formal organization carries with it a sense of stability and legitimacy that seems to command respect. The groups and individuals enjoying the most prestige in a society are those that are given major credit for the most valued achievements of the society. For example, the contributions of lawyers and doctors command a great deal of popular respect and thus their professional organizations have status in society. Status may also be conferred upon a group when its leader is recognized as a legitimate spokesman in a particular area. This favored status may give a critical political advantage
over entrepreneurs who are competing with him to represent a particular sector as well as lure politically motivated members and potential members to him because his favored status makes membership in his group more valuable.61

The government is in a position to grant the group another kind of favored status by legally requiring that potential members join the group if they are to qualify for certain benefits or opportunities. A worker may find that his legal options are to join a trade union or to look elsewhere for employment. When his alternatives are so dramatically restricted, the worker may feel that he has no choice but to join the group.62

A group’s position in society may also be closely correlated with income, both group income and the individual income of the members. That is, in most societies both prestige and money are among the rewards for persons and groups occupying high positions.63 Such persons and groups can raise money relatively easily both because their supporters have it and because giving money may be a source of vicarious prestige to the giver. Money is not the only variable determining the influence of a group, but, like formal organization, it is highly significant. It can buy those resources that a group might not otherwise be
able to get. Other things being equal, position is a determinant of financial strength.

Prestige attaches not only to persons, objects, and institutions, but also to majorities. Position and prestige are important because they facilitate the formation of alliances among groups. In most political situations, what "everybody" is doing or thinking not only cannot be wrong but also has a presumptive claim to being right. In a society that frequently uses majority rule as a technique in making decisions, groups often find it essential to make alliances in order to assert their claims effectively.

Another reason that group status is important is that it directly affects group cohesiveness. According to Jewell and Reitz, cohesiveness is a measure of the group's attractiveness and high status is usually attractive, thus status can lead to cohesiveness. They further state that status can come from many sources, the first being success. Successful groups usually have little trouble attracting and keeping members. Another is high entrance requirements. Some groups require prospective members to go through taxing, arduous, or even painful processes before admission. The severity of these procedures, labeled "initiation rites" by social scientists, serve to create a bond of difficult accomplishment among members.
and a sense of uniqueness or elitism that fosters group status, self-esteem, and cohesiveness.66

Longley reiterates the importance of a group’s place in society in determining its potential for success. He states that groups drawing their membership from higher social strata are presumed to be more "legitimate" and thus more effective. He also suggests that the age of an organization is important to group status because an older group has presumably built up popular support and achieved an established place in the community.67 Holloman and Hendrick state that there can be a world of difference between the efficiency and effectiveness of new and traditional groups.68 Groups usually need time and experience to learn the strengths and weaknesses of their members and to learn how to deal effectively with both.69 Trecker and Trecker also note that the standing a group has in the community can affect group effectiveness.70 The overall prestige of a group can aid it in its goals because status makes it easier to attain other resources necessary for a political attempt.

Maximization of Resources. As a factor in determining group success the importance of maximizing group resources should be obvious. Terry Moe states that manipulating information, expertise, official
favoritism, public policy, coalitional support, and other resources, can have a variety of effects on organizational structures and on the very survival of the group. It involves the ability to recognize one's assets and to make the most of them. In exceptionally large groups resources are often unlimited and what the group does not have within its ranks, it can purchase elsewhere. This is not usually the case with small groups. Their budgets are as small as their numbers, therefore groups in this situation must analyze the resources that they do have and use them in the most effective manner possible. The first step is to identify the available resources.

According to Ornstein and Elder, group resources may fall into the categories of physical resources, organizational resources, political resources, and motivational resources. Physical resources refer particularly to money and membership size. Money can be the most important resource available to a group in influencing public policy because it can be used to attract many other resources, including substantive, political, and leadership expertise, as well as public relations talent. If a group is denied access to decision makers through the regular channels, it can buy space in newspapers or time on radio and television to make its case. Groups can also give money in the
form of campaign contributions in hopes of gaining access and influence in the policy process. Hrebenar and Scott also cite money as the single most useful resource a group can possess. They state that quality leadership, access to political decision makers, a favorable public image, a hard-working and knowledgeable staff are just some of the resources that can be purchased with the careful expenditure of adequate amounts of money.

According to Ornstein and Elder, group size is also a noteworthy physical resource although it may not have a consistent effect on group success. Beyond the direct translation of size into votes, a large group representing many citizens has a built-in legitimacy; it speaks for a sizable part of the population, not just a handful of individuals. They admit, however, that a small group can sometimes overcome its size disadvantage. They state that a small group which is politically active and cohesive can have more political impact than a large, politically apathetic, and unorganized group. In addition, a group's formal membership may not be a valid indicator of its political support. This is particularly true of mass-based groups that successfully organize large numbers of average individuals. In such groups -- like the Farm Bureau,
the Chamber of Commerce, or Common Cause -- Olson's theory points to selective incentives, not political goals, as the explanation of large size.\textsuperscript{77}

Organizational resources include membership skills, unity, and substantive expertise. The ability of a group to mobilize its membership strength for political action is a highly valuable resource. The skill of a group's leadership in managing the other resources of the group, allocating them appropriately, determining priorities, and choosing allies is crucial to a group's success in the political process. The ability of a group to command facts, figures, and technical information in support of its positions is another key organizational resource.

Political resources such as campaign expertise, political process knowledge, political strategy expertise, and political reputation are also important to the political interest group. Groups that are experienced and knowledgable about political campaigning can offer important services to political candidates, and can also intelligently and efficiently disperse a group's financial resources for campaign contributions. Political process expertise-- knowledge of the "ins and outs" of the legislative process including the important stages of the process, the relevant committees and subcommittees, the key actors,
the best moments to act or withdraw, the personal characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of members and staff—is vital to a group's legislative success. This is why many groups hire former members of the legislature as lobbyists. Political reputation as an honest political broker and honest information source, as well as the general reputation for political influence is a crucial element in political success.78

Another key political resource is coalition building, the extent to which a group forms ties and alliances with other groups and key individuals of compatible interests. For any set of issues, the leadership may seek out groups with similar goals in order to coordinate resources and activities. By this means groups can pool their political contacts, channels of access, sources of information, as well as the talents and expertise of their personnel, to yield a greater fund of resources to draw upon.79 Nearly all governmental decision makers will be hesitant to disregard the demands of a strong coalition of groups. Cooperation among groups can increase the power, access, and tactical advantages of the groups while decreasing the financial and political risks for any of the individual groups.

While both Ornstein and Elder, and Hrebenar and Scott consider money (physical resources) to be most
important, Presthus found level of interest group activity (political resources) to be most effective.\textsuperscript{80} Presthus found that groups with highly active lobbyists were most effective. In fact he concluded that this was probably the the most important characteristic of the influential interest group.\textsuperscript{81} Presthus did, however, consider a group’s ability to obtain adequate amounts of money to support its activities essential for group success. A third group resource that Presthus emphasizes is leverage to provide or withhold resources that policymakers need. This may be expert knowledge or even the ability to block policy implementation by refusal to cooperate. The more potentially disruptive the group, the greater is its bargaining power.\textsuperscript{82}

Few small groups have the genuine power to prevent policy implementation, however, and disruptive tactics alone are often viewed as illegitimate by decision makers. Groups using such dramatic tactics not only breach the political "rules of the game" but also risk alienating decision makers who themselves are accustomed to very different interpersonal styles. Instead, the most successful means of maximizing group political resources appear to be those involving services to legislators, particularly the presentation of information and research.\textsuperscript{83}
Access to Policymakers. Interest groups strive to monitor governmental activity that might affect them, initiate governmental action to promote their interests, and block actions that would work to their detriment. According to Ornstein and Elder each of these areas requires, above all else, access--access to what the government is doing or is about to do, and access to key decision makers. The nature of access--the number of points of access, the ability to reach the "right" people, the type of reception from the decision makers--is directly related to the other resources of the group and its ability to utilize them.84 Terry Moe states that access to critical governmental arenas directly affects the organization's ability to achieve collective goods.85 Obtaining access is no mean feat. E.E. Schattschneider has estimated that 90 percent of the population cannot get into the interest group system.86

Many successful interest groups begin the quest for access by making their presence known to the legislature. The "good will" tactic is an attempt over the long term to mold a favorable image for the interest group which may form the foundation for an offensive or defensive campaign in the future.87 Many organizations hold legislative receptions or send "care packages" to the legislators. Several women's groups
opposing the Equal Rights Amendment sent gifts of homemade bread and other baked goods hoping that these benign gifts would cause the legislators to identify with the homemakers' position when the bill came up for a vote.88

It is often easier to have influence in policy-making when a warm working relationship with legislators exists. Berry warns, however, that interest groups operating on this premise should beware that overly friendly relations do not lead to a "cooptation" of the group that would reduce its ability to act without compromise.89

Group strategies for access may be "inside," focusing on members or staff of the political body, "outside," focusing on grassroots opinion and pressure, or a combination of the two, depending on circumstances and timing.90 An "inside" strategy focuses on the interaction between groups and their representatives and political actors in the legislature and the executive branch. Inside strategies rely less on the constituency relationship of groups and legislators, and more on the internal legislative and political needs of legislators as well as the web of social friendships, to cultivate access and exert influence. To maximize access and to enhance their "inside" contacts, interest groups frequently will employ former
legislators, former staff aides, or people who already have close ties to the legislature.

Although groups can chose to work through connections which are exclusively in the Capitol, groups which maintain constituency ties have better access to legislators. Kingdon's numerous interviews with legislators in 1968-69 led to the conclusion that, "Unless an interest group had some connection with their constituencies, the group would have little or no influence on their decisions." 91

A technique which is frequently used by interest groups to get constituents' positions known to the legislators is the letter writing campaign. Americans have long considered personal communication of their views to elected officials as a right and occasionally a duty. 92 Political mail has traditionally been a means through which largely unorganized and transitory interests could articulate their demands. Only a minimum level of literacy and verbal ability is required to write a brief letter, relative to the more specialized skills (as well as poise and self-confidence) needed for personal contacts with legislators. Letter-writing can be done in the home, at one's discretion--ideal conditions for the group member who wants to "do something." Although it is generally felt that legislators give more weight to
unorganized than to organized mail when it arrives in comparable quantity, they do not totally discount form-letters, hand-copied or reproduced, since they do indicate interest on the part of the constituents.93

It is especially important to target mail and personal contacts upon key persons in the legislative process: the leadership, committee members, and the undecided. If, however, the issue is very important to the group and the legislative vote is expected to be very close, each legislator should be contacted, preferably by his/her own constituents. Concentration on the committee considering a measure is generally a good strategy for reasons beyond mere conservation of time and energy. Committees shape legislation, and members of committees are likely to be sympathetic to associated group interests.

One of the most effective tools for keeping the public and the legislature informed is the use of the media. When a group has limited visibility and limited resources it must often turn to the press in its attempts to gain access and influence government. There is a threefold purpose for this, the first being to draw attention to the existing problem. The second purpose is to encourage the readers to write to the relevant policymakers expressing their viewpoint. Third, the group may hope to put government officials
"on the spot" to a point of embarrassment by revealing their seemingly anti-public position. What power or pressure a group is able to bring to bear is thus due largely to their ability to portray policymakers in a negative light in the media. Often the use of the media puts the legislature on the defensive but it may be the only way to get enough attention to merit serious legislative consideration. It is one of many group tactics designed to gain entrance into the policy system.

An important group of participants in the attempt to gain access and influence policymaking is community and governmental leadership. Elite support is important because prominent names make news. Furthermore, these leaders help form public opinion. Members of both the public at large and the legislature can be influenced by their value judgements. Support from other elected and appointed government officials is especially important in influencing legislators. For example, a strong relationship has been observed between gubernatorial support and interest group success. Small groups seeking access to policymakers can thus take advantage of contacts with politicians on state and local levels to further their objectives.
There are several other factors which a group may find helpful when dealing with politics but I believe these five (cohesiveness, leadership, status, maximization of resources, and access to policymakers) are most important for small group political success. Unfortunately most groups identify these factors only after an unproductive attempt to enter the policy process. Such is the case with some of the groups in this study. The points of their failure may provide insight for similar groups taking political action in the future.
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Chapter Three - METHODOLOGY

Developing the Research Design

A study of relevant interest group literature led to the isolation of several factors which influence interest group success. My own participation in small group settings resulted in further narrowing of the list to five basic determinants of success for the small group -- cohesiveness, leadership, group status, maximization of resources, and access to policymakers. It then became necessary to determine if these factors are indeed a prerequisite for small group political success. A case study was deemed to be the most appropriate research design for accomplishing this task.

A case study has the goal of trying to describe whatever is important in a situation without limiting the focus in advance to a small number of well-defined variables (which is what differentiates case study research from other types). The case study design involves the observation of one or a few populations or samples at one point in time. In this instance certain factors had been garnered from both personal experience and the relevant literature as the determinants of interest group success. In order to establish that these factors were applicable to the small group, a
study technique which would measure the rather abstract variables of this case was required. After reviewing various research techniques, the case study design was selected as most appropriate for this problem. Exploratory in nature, a case study may be used to gather knowledge and test tentative hypotheses, hopefully leading to formulation of more definitive hypotheses which can then be tested under more controlled conditions.

I am aware that there are limitations to the case study technique but for the type of information sought in this thesis it was the most suitable research design. This thesis is an attempt to determine the necessary factors for small group political success. Although much information about group success was gleaned from the literature, it was necessary to determine if these factors did indeed apply to the small group. Thus, both in scope and feasibility the case study was the most appropriate choice.

It should be emphasized that case studies are forms of descriptive research and as such do not allow rigorous conclusions that apply beyond the subject matter described. Compared with experiments a case study is low on control, and compared with surveys it is low on representativeness. Although case studies can provide a wealth of detail about a subject, making
inferences from case studies may involve an unknown amount of risk. The result of case studies often suggests perceptive hypotheses that subsequently should be tested under experimental and survey situations. 

Developing the Study

After reviewing the literature which addresses group political success and scrutinizing my own participation in group activities, I isolated five factors which appear to enhance the likelihood of group political success. Because most individuals become active at the small group level, I intend to discover if these factors for success apply to the small group which is attempting to become politically active as well as to the larger, more politically experienced group. The case study allows me to determine the degree to which each of the three groups studied possess the necessary factors for success. A survey was used in conjunction with the case study to measure the groups' perceptions of each factor and of their political success.

Three professional organizations were selected for study on the basis of several similarities— the Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association (ASDHA), the Arkansas State Nurses Association (ASNA), and the Arkansas Dietetic Association (ADA). These
organizations are all health-related, are composed primarily of women, are under 1000 members strong, and are all trying to influence policies governing their professions in Arkansas. Most important, they were all relatively inexperienced politically at the time the data was collected. Political inexperience was important in this study for with political attempts often comes knowledge about the prerequisites for political success.

A representative of each organization was interviewed in depth to discover each organization's past political experience and latest political attempts. Surveys were then mailed to the officers of each of the three organizations in order to get their perceptions of the political process and the degree to which their respective organizations possessed the factors necessary for success. There was a promise of confidentiality to encourage total honesty in the responses.

In addition to surveying organizational officers for perceptions of their groups and the policy process, a brief survey was also sent to the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners. This was done so the perceptions of policymakers could be compared to the perceptions of those seeking to influence policy (in this case, ASDHA).
Operationalizing the Factors

As discussed earlier, there are five factors thought to be required for political success—cohesiveness, leadership, group status, maximization of resources, and access to policy makers. The questionnaire (Appendix A) sought to establish the degree to which each organization possessed these factors. The first factor which appears to be necessary for political success is group cohesiveness. Four measures attempt to determine the concept of cohesiveness. The first is the percentage of professionals who are members of the organization. The amount of interaction between group members and the attendance at organization meetings also signifies the cohesiveness and solidarity of the group. The presence of majority support for the organization's political goals is a third measure of group cohesiveness.

Communication in an organization (both among the rank-and-file and among the officers) is crucial to maintaining cohesiveness in the organization and is thus required for political success. Questions were asked to establish whether communication was perceived to be good within the organization and to determine the method of communication which was used most often. Good communication also requires keeping the membership
informed so questions concerning the number and frequency of organizational publications were included.

Good leadership is another element which is necessary for political success. Good leaders are chosen on the basis of administrative ability rather than popularity, have the respect of the membership, and are efficient and organized. The perceptions of the officers were sought in each of these areas (because the surveys were anonymous it was expected that the officers would be honest in their evaluations). Another component of leadership which is beneficial in terms of effectiveness is continuity among officers. The questionnaire asked if there had been continuity in the leadership of each organization over the past five years and also asked each officer how long she had served in a leadership capacity.

Another factor deemed necessary for an organization to be politically successful is positive status. This can mean a good reputation with policymakers, recognition and support of the profession by the public, and the ability to work from a base of equality with other professional organizations. Questions addressing these points were included in the survey. The status of an organization may sometimes be linked to gender issues and because the organizations
in this study are largely female there were also
questions addressing discrimination:

Success in the political arena seems to require
the availability or presence of adequate resources
which an organization can draw from when trying to
influence policy. Resources include membership size,
money, political expertise, and ideological commitment
to mention a few. The questionnaire asked the officers
whether their organization possessed these resources
and to what degree, and then asked that they be ranked
in order of importance. It will be interesting to see
if the groups will reach consensus on the importance of
each resource.

Having a strategy for obtaining and maintaining
access to policymakers is another necessary factor in
group political success. The organizations in this
study were asked if they have outlined a strategy for
attaining their political goals. Familiarity with the
legislative process, access to policymakers, and
perceived influence in policymaking are other areas in
which answers were sought.

As mentioned above, exploratory research provides
little justification for generalization to larger
groups. The perceptions measured in this study are
intended only to provide insight into the reasons some
groups are politically successful and others are not.
The task of narrowing down the data for more scientific treatment is left for subsequent research.
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Chapter Four - SURVEY RESULTS

Introduction

The review of relevant literature and my own participation in small group settings distilled five basic determinants of success in the small group -- cohesiveness, leadership, group status, maximization of resources, and access to policymakers. The survey at Appendix A was used as a tool to measure the groups' perceptions of each factor and of their political success. Figure 4-1 depicts survey results. Surveys were sent to 13 officers of the Arkansas Dietetic Association (ADA) and 9 responded (a response rate of 69.2 percent). The officers of the Arkansas State Nurses' Association (ASNA) provided a 100 percent response to the survey as 7 questionnaires were mailed and returned. The officers of the Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association (ASDHA) returned 11 of the 11 surveys sent (100 percent). The overall response rate was 27 of 31, or 88 percent.

Not all surveys were returned and not all questions were answered by every respondent. The majority of questions provided two answer choices in an attempt to discourage "middle of the road" responses. Several responses, however, were written in and account for responses in the text which were not an actual part of the survey.
Several of the questions asked for a numerical response in the answer. This was done to confirm the numbers which had been given in the interview portion of the case study, and to determine whether the officers were actually knowledgeable of membership size, amount of dues, frequency of publications, etc. For these questions, unless otherwise indicated, the median answer is reported in the survey results. The mean was not used due to its tendency to be influenced.
by extremes. The mode did not seem appropriate due to the small sample size. The median, in every instance, closely coincided with the numbers obtained in the interviews and thus was judged to be an acceptable reflection of the group.

With this information it is now possible to obtain insight into the presence or absence of the five factors for success within each group. This chapter will merely report the survey results. An analysis and interpretation of the results will follow in Chapter Five.

Cohesiveness

The first factor necessary for political success is group cohesiveness. Four questions aimed at measuring the cohesiveness of the group. The first is the percentage of professionals who are members of the organization. One would expect a voluntary organization which is cohesive and representative of their constituents to have a large percentage of their profession as associational members. Membership reflects concern about the future of the profession and commitment to an organization and its goals.

The ADA officers indicated that approximately 99 percent of the dietitians in Arkansas are members of their organization (Figure 4-2). Willingness to devote
time to an organization by attending business meetings may also be a measure of commitment and cohesiveness. Forty percent of the ADA members attend the ADA annual business meeting with a small number also attending ADA regional (local) meetings (Figure 4-3). Only 10 percent of the officers believe that their organization has low membership, and all ADA officers regularly associate with dietitians other than co-workers and fellow officers (Figures 4-4, 4-5). If the ADA dissolved tomorrow, all officers agree that it would have a real impact on the average dietitian (Figure 4-6).

The ASNA officers indicate that, of the near 14,000 registered nurses working in the state, only about 796 are members of the association or 6 percent (Figure 4-2). As shown by Figure 4-3, the annual ASNA meeting is attended by approximately 300 members which is 38 percent of the membership, 2 percent of the registered nurse population. All of the ASNA officers agree that the organizational membership is low, blaming the low membership chiefly on apathy while admitting that high dues ($112 annually) and other nonprofessional priorities such as home and family are also key detractors (Figure 4-4). Seventy-one percent of the ASNA officers associate with nurses who are not co-workers or fellow ASNA officers, and the same
percentage (71 percent) believe that if ASNA were to
dissolve tomorrow, it would make a real difference to
the average registered nurse (Figure 4-5, 4-6).

Figure 4-2. Percentage of professionals who are
organization members (Question 1.2 based on median
numbers).
Figure 4-3. Percentage of members who attend the organization's annual meeting. (Question 1,3 based on median numbers).
Figure 4-4. Percentage of officers who perceive that organization membership is low (Question 5).
Officers of the ASDHA indicate that of the near 450 dental hygienists who are currently practicing in the state, only about 120, or 27 percent, are members of the association (Figure 4-2). Of these, an average of 50 attend the ASDHA annual meeting which equals 42 percent of the membership and 11 percent of the registered dental hygienist population (Figure 4-3). All the officers stated that the ASDHA has low
membership, blaming high dues ($111 annually), other nonprofessional priorities, and apathy, respectively (Figure 4-4). Ninety-one percent of the officers regularly associate with members of the profession outside the workplace or association meeting (Figure 4-5).

The ASDHA was the one organization which indicated that if their organization were to dissolve tomorrow, it would make no real difference to the average dental hygienist. Only 27 percent of the officers of the ASDHA indicate that dissolution of the organization would have a real impact on the practicing dental hygienists in the state (Figure 4-6). This suggests that the level of cohesiveness between the ASDHA and its constituents is quite low.
Figure 4-6. Percentage of officers who believe that if the organization dissolved tomorrow, it would make a real difference. (Question 8)

Communication is a critical element in achieving maximum cohesiveness and thus political success. Effective communication requires that the membership be kept informed of issues that are affecting the organization or the profession as a whole. All three organizations in this study publish a newsletter on at least a quarterly basis. The ADA officers were undecided as to whether their organization regularly
published political action articles or newsletters (45 percent yes, 55 percent no). The ASNA reports that they publish these articles quarterly, while the ASDHA reports that they do not publish political action articles or newsletters at all.

When the officers were asked to rate communication between officers and the membership in their organization, 10 percent of the ADA gave a poor rating, 40 percent average, and 50 percent excellent (Figure 4-7). They indicated that their constituents use organizational publications, surveys, independent letters, conventions or business meetings, and elected representatives to communicate with the organization. Conventions were cited as being the most important communication avenue while independent letters were cited as the least important (Figure 4-8, 4-9). When ranking communication among themselves (the association officers), 10 percent wrote in that communication was average and 80 percent indicated the communication level was excellent while another 10 percent did not answer (Figure 4-10).
Figure 4-7. Officers' perception of communication between officers and membership (Question 14).

*Response written in
Figure 4-8. Officers' perception of the most important method of communication within the organization (Question 16).

* one ADA officer failed to respond (10%).
Figure 4-9. Officers' perception of the least important method of communication within the organization (Question 16).

* 10% (1) of the ADA officers, 29% (2) of the ASNA officers, and 10% (1) of the ASDHA officers left this question blank.

Fourteen percent of the ASNA officers believe that communication between the officers and the rank-and-file to be poor, 72 percent average, and 14 percent excellent (Figure 4-7). The officers consider elected representatives to be the most important means by which members can communicate and they consider
independent letters to be least important to the organization (Figure 4-8, 4-9). Communication among the officers of the ASNA was viewed by 14 percent as average and by 86 percent as excellent (Figure 4-10).

Figure 4-10. Officer's perception of communication between officers (Question 15).

* response written in

** 1 ADA officer did not answer

Again, the dental hygienists were divided in their perception of the ASDHA. Thirty-six percent indicate
that communication between the officers and general membership of the organization is poor, while another 36 percent indicate that it is excellent (Figure 4-7). The remainder (28 percent) indicate that communication between these two entities is average. The ASDHA officers indicate that publications/surveys or conventions/business meetings are most important for communication within the organization. Independent letters were considered to be the least important source of communication (Figure 4-8, 4-9). Communication among the ASDHA officers was considered to be excellent by 82 percent, average by 9 percent, and poor by 9 percent (Figure 4-10).

Leadership

Effective leadership is another element which is necessary for political success. This thesis assumes that good leaders are chosen on the basis of administrative ability rather than popularity, have the respect of the membership, and are efficient and organized. A key to effective leadership is continuity among the leaders, thereby providing a consistent direction for the organization.

Only 30 percent of ADA officers indicate that an elected position in the organization is actively sought by members (Figure 4-11). Sixty percent of the ADA
officers believe that holding an office is viewed as a meaningful opportunity (Figure 4-12). If it is indeed meaningful, why aren't elected positions more actively sought? Twenty percent of the officers view their positions as burdensome responsibilities, while 10 percent wrote that they consider it to be a combination of the above descriptions.

Figure 4-11. Percentage of officers who believe that a leadership position in the organization is actively sought (Question 18).
Elections in small organizations often become popularity contests, especially when constituents are not familiar with either the candidates or the issues. Seventy percent of the ADA officers believe that administrative ability is the key to selection for an office, 10 percent feel that popularity is the key, and another 10 percent believe that it is a combination of both (Figure 4-13). The committee system of the ADA is considered to be effective by 80 percent of the officers while 80 percent of the officers believe that they are efficient and organized (Figures 4-14, 4-15). The ADA officers have been in a leadership role in the organization a median of 7 years and 90 percent believe that there has been continuity in the leadership of this organization (Figure 4-16, 4-17).
Figure 4-12. Officers' description of leadership position within the organization (Question 19).

* Response was written in.

** One ADA officer (10%) failed to respond to this question.
Figure 4-13. Officers' perception of the basis for selection to a leaders position (Question 20).

* Response written in.

** One ADA officers and one ASDHA officer did not respond to this question.

** One ASDHA officer wrote in "willingness."

** One ASNA officer wrote in "neither."
The officers of the Arkansas State Nurses Association were split in their assessment of the significance of holding office in the organization. Forty-three percent thought that members actively seek to become officers while an equal 43 percent stated that they do not (Figure 4-11). One officer (14 percent) wrote that offices are actively sought "occasionally". The majority of the officers (57 percent) feel that holding office is viewed as both a meaningful opportunity and a burdensome responsibility (Figure 4-12). Feelings were again split regarding the basis for selection to office within the ASNA. Administrative ability was cited as the basis for selection by 43 percent of the officers, 29 percent stated popularity, 14 percent said both, and 14 percent stated neither (Figure 4-13).
Figure 4-14. Percentage of officers who believe that the organization committee system is effective (Question 22).

* One ASNA member states that it depends on the committee leadership.
The ASNA is pleased with its committee system (86 percent state that it is effective), however, one individual noted that the effectiveness of the committee is contingent upon the effectiveness of the leader (Figure 4-14). Likewise, the officers were in total agreement that they are efficient and organized in their leadership roles (Figure 4-15). The ASNA unanimously agreed that there has been continuity in
the leadership of their organization over the past five years, with the median being 4 years in a leadership role (Figure 4-16, 4-17).

![Figure 4-16](image_url)

**Figure 4-16.** Median number of years officers have served organization in a leadership capacity (Question 17).

Only 18 percent of the ASDHA officers state that members actively seek to become officers of the association, with an even split of 36 percent on whether holding an office is a burdensome responsibility or a meaningful opportunity (Figure 4-11, 4-12). Administrative ability is the basis for
selection to an office according to 64 percent of the officers, 18 percent say that popularity is the basis, while 9 percent state that the person who is willing to do the job is the one who will be elected (Figure 4-13).

Figure 4-17. Percentage of officers who believe that there has been continuity in the leadership of the organization (Question 21).

The committee system of the ASDHA is deemed effective by 82 percent of the officers while 91 percent believe that the officers themselves are efficient and organized (Figure 4-14, 4-15).
Ninety-one percent of the ASDHA officers agreed that there has been continuity in the leadership of the association with a median of 4 years spent holding office (Figure 4-16, 4-17).

Status

Another factor deemed necessary for an organization to be politically successful is positive status. This can mean a good reputation with policymakers, recognition and support of the profession by the public, and the ability to work from a base of equality with other professional organizations. One way which an organization may improve its status is to experience political successes. The ADA officers indicate that they have had successful legislative efforts in the past five years, as well as positive attempts to influence regulatory boards, elect officials, and acquaint itself with policymakers (Figure 4-18). According to 80 percent of the officers, the association has taken steps to introduce itself to legislators, state regulatory boards, and other professional organizations and believes that it has some influence with these groups (Figure 4-19, 4-20). The ADA officers unanimously agreed that the public is not knowledgeable about their profession (Figure 4-21).
The status of an organization may sometimes be linked to gender issues, especially when the organizations are largely female, as in this study. The results of the survey will be provided in this chapter, however, discussion of the role of gender in the political efforts will be held until Chapter Five. The ADA officers indicate that the fact that their organization is largely female has impeded their success with state legislators. This problem has not been as noticeable in the state regulatory boards or other professional organizations (Figure 4-22). Thirty percent of the ADA officers state that their organization is dominated by related organizations which are largely male (the medical profession) and 20 percent state that sexual discrimination or sexual harassment has been a problem in that organization's political attempts (Figure 4-23, 4-24). Overall the ADA appears to have positive status, the only noted exception being the public's lack of familiarity with the profession.
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Figure 4-18. Percentage of officers who indicate that the organization has been successful in the above categories over the past five years (Question 24).
The officers of the ASNA were very divided in their responses to the questions addressing status. The ASNA has had some success in the past five years in electing officials and acquainting itself with policymakers but little success in legislative efforts or in influencing regulatory boards (Figure 4-18). Eighty-six percent of the ASNA officers indicate that the organization is taking steps to introduce itself to policymakers (Figure 4-19). Only 43 percent of the
ASNA officers perceived the association as having influence with legislators, state regulatory boards, and other professional organizations (Figure 4-20). They further indicate that the public is not knowledgeable about their profession (Figure 4-21).

Figure 4-20. Percentage of officers who indicate that the organization has influence with the above entities (Question 29).
Figure 4-21. Percentage of officers who believe the public is knowledgeable about their profession (Question 40).

The fact that the ASNA is largely female has impeded their success with state legislators, other professional organizations, and state regulatory boards, according to the ASNA officers (Figure 4-22). Seventy-one percent indicate that they are dominated by professions which are largely male, in this case the physicians (Figure 4-23). Surprisingly, only 14 percent of the nursing officers state that sexual discrimination or sexual harassment has been a problem.
in their political attempts. One officer did note, however, that sexual discrimination has many covert forms and can occur without being noticed.

Figure 4-22. Percentage of officers who state that the fact that their organization is largely female has impeded success with the above entities (Question 42).

The ASDHA officers indicate that they have had success in legislative attempts and influencing regulatory boards in the past five years but otherwise few political successes (Figure 4-18). They are undecided as to whether or not they have outlined a
specific strategy for achieving their political goals (45 percent yes and 45 percent no to Question 26) and none of the ASDHA officers indicated that their organization has taken steps to introduce themselves to policymakers (Figure 4-19). They further indicate that they have little influence with legislators, state regulatory boards, or other professional organizations (Figure 4-20). The ASDHA officers all agree that the public is not knowledgeable about the dental hygiene profession (Figure 4-21).

The fact that the ASDHA is largely female is cited as impeding success with state legislators by only 18 percent of the officers, however, 73 percent cite it as a problem with state regulatory boards (Figure 4-22). The officers were split on the impact of the gender issue in dealing with other professional organizations. The ASDHA is dominated by a related profession which is largely male, according to 91 percent of the officers. Ironically, only 9 percent feel that sexual discrimination or sexual harassment has been a problem in the ASDHA's political attempts (Figure 4-23, 4-24).
Figure 4-23. Percentage of officers who believe that their organization is dominated by professions which are largely male (Question 43).

* One ASNA officer noted that it depends on the issue.
Maximization of Resources

Success in the political arena seems to require the availability or presence of adequate resources from which an organization can draw when trying to influence policy. Resources include membership size, money, political expertise, and ideological commitment to mention a few.
Figure 4-25. Percentage of officers who indicate that their organization has outlined a specific strategy for achieving its goals (Question 26).

The Arkansas Dietetic Association currently has the goal of making licensure a requirement for all dietitians in the state. Eighty percent of the officers indicate that they have outlined a specific strategy for achieving these political goals and 70 percent of the officers feel that they have a good working knowledge of the legislative process (Figure 4-25, 4-26). There are only about 300 dietitians in
the state so size is not a legitimate resource for the ADA.

Figure 4-26. Percentage of officers who believe that they (the officers) have a good working knowledge of the steps involved in the legislative process (Question 27).

Sixty percent of the ADA officers report that their organization or a related political action committee has donated time or money to political candidates in the state (Figure 4-27). The legislative chairman reports that they have contributed approximately 5 percent of their annual budget to
political efforts, however, the small size of the association may make this contribution seem negligible to the state politician. At this time the ADA does not employ a lobbyist which it can rely on for information, access to policymaking, or political expertise, nor do they have an administrative staff which could do some of the administrative work required for any political attempt. Only 30 percent of the officers report that the membership is easily motivated, and according to the officers write-in responses, their constituents would most likely write letters if asked to become politically active (Figure 4-28). This is the form of communication which the officers earlier named as least effective. Seventy percent of the ADA officers feel personally knowledgeable about their organizations latest political attempt (Figure 4-30).
Figure 4-27. Percentage of officers who state that their organization or a related political action committee has donated time or money to political candidates in the state (Question 31).
Figure 4-28. Percentage of officers who state that their membership is easily motivated to take action on political issues (Question 32).

The officers were asked to rank in order of importance the resources that the organization has at its disposal. The rankings for each variable were totaled and then divided by the number of responses to arrive at a mean score for each resource. The resources were then ranked in order from most important (1) to least important (8). The ranking was as follows:
A comparison of the three organizations reveals a basic consensus regarding the importance of the above resources. Certain ironies, however, become evident in the comparison. The largest and most affluent organization, ASNA, places the least emphasis on size and money. As expected, ASNA places a higher premium than the other groups on political reputation and political expertise, perhaps justifying their lobbyist, administrative assistant, and political action committee. Rankings of the other resources were in basic agreement.

The ranking of the ADA officers with the numerical score for each resource is shown below:

1 - commitment to goals (1.25)
2 - consumer interest (3.14)
3 - ability to form coalitions (3.6)
4 - media coverage (3.8)
5 - organization size (4.8)
6 - money (5.28)
7 - political reputation (6.0)
8 - political expertise (6.3)
Analysis of the resources of the Arkansas State Nurses' Association revealed that they were in a better position than the dietitians in terms of both size and money. There are 14,000 registered nurses in the state which is a noteworthy constituency in a state or district election. Even though the ASNA claims only 796 members, it has the potential to influence the election decisions of a much larger number if it can effectively communicate its position. The ASNA retains a lobbyist and all officers indicate that the organization contributes both time and money to political action within the state (Figure 4-27). The ASNA legislative chairman declined to release the actual budget amount designated for political purposes, but she insinuated that it was a large sum. In addition, they employ a full-time administrative assistant(secretary) to respond to inquiries about the ASNA.

Seventy-one percent of the ASNA officers indicate that the organization has outlined a specific strategy for achieving its political goals and 57 percent of the officers report that they have a good working knowledge of the legislative process (Figure 4-25, 4-26). Fifty-seven percent of the ASNA officers believe that their membership is easily motivated and would most likely attend meetings and write or call legislators,
if asked to become politically active (Figure 4-28). Seventy-one percent of the ASNA officers feel personally knowledgeable about their organization's political plans and can rely on previous experiences as well as the political expertise of their lobbyist as they attempt their political goal of changing the composition of the State Board of Nursing (Figure 4-30).

![Bar chart showing percentage of officers knowledgeable about their state organization's latest political attempt]

**Figure 4-30.** Percentage of officers who feel personally knowledgeable about their state organization's latest political attempt (Question 36).
The officers of the ASNA were asked to rank the resources which they had at their disposal in order of importance. The results were:

1 - commitment to goals (1.6)
2 - consumer interest (1.75)
3 - media coverage (2.5)
4 - ability to form coalitions (2.6)
5 - political expertise (6.0)
6 - political reputation (6.0)
7 - organization size (6.5)
8 - money (7.5)

The Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association, like the dietitians, is very limited in terms of organization size and money. There are only about 450 practicing dental hygienists in the state and the ASDHA members represent only about 27 percent (Figure 4-2). The ASDHA has no paid staff, no lobbyist, and does not contribute to any politicians or political causes within the state (Figure 4-27). The officers unanimously agreed that the membership is difficult to motivate, despite the fact that ASDHA is trying to implement policy changes which will directly affect the practice of dental hygiene in the state (Figure 4-28). Ninety-one percent of the officers feel personally knowledgeable about the organization's latest political attempt but when asked whether the officers as a group have a good working knowledge of the steps involved in the legislative process, only 27 percent said yes (Figure 4-26, 4-30).
Other than one successful legislative attempt in 1981, the ASDHA legislative chairman reports that the organization has no experience in the political arena. The ASDHA officers ranked their available resources in order of importance:

1 - commitment to goals (2)
2 - consumer interest (3.4)
3 - media coverage (3.8)
4 - organization size (4.1)
5 - ability to form coalitions (4.4)
6 - political reputation (4.5)
7 - political expertise (5.2)
8 - money (6.4)

Access to Policymakers

Having a strategy for obtaining and maintaining access to policymakers is another necessary factor in group political success. According to 80 percent of the officers, the ADA has taken steps to introduce itself to policymakers and 90 percent of the officers feel that they have identified the individual policymakers who have influence in matters related to the dietetic profession (Figure 4-19, 4-31). The ADA officers feel that they have open access to legislators, regulatory boards, and other state agencies (Figure 4-32). These are the primary governing bodies in the dietetic field, therefore the ADA, in the opinion of its officers, has open access to key policymakers.
The ASNA officers feel that their organization has open access to key policymakers in the nursing field. Thirty-six percent of the officers indicate that they have identified the most influential legislators in matters regarding the health care field and are taking steps to make these individuals more cognizant of the ASNA (Figure 4-19, 4-31). Seventy-one percent of the officers believe that ASNA has influence with legislators, state regulatory boards, or other professional associations (Figure 4-20).

Figure 4-31. Percentage of officers who state that their organization has identified the individual policymakers who have influence in their profession (Question 34).
Figure 4-32. Percentage of officers who state that their organization has open access to the above entities (Question 37).

The Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association has a less optimistic view of their access to policymakers (Figure 4-32). As reported earlier, less than 20 percent of the ASDHA officers state that they have influence with key policymaking bodies and 72 percent of the officers state that as a group they do not have a good working knowledge of the legislative process (Figure 4-20, 4-26). Sixty-four percent report
that the individual policymakers who have influence in matters related to the dental hygiene profession have not been identified (Figure 4-31). Until the key policymakers are familiar with the group, its goals, and objectives, it is extremely difficult to experience political success.

Figure 4-33. Percentage of officers who believe that their organization will be successful (Question 45).

The final question in the survey asked each officer whether their organization has been/will be
successful in its political attempts. After answering the survey questions it was hoped that the officers would think about their response rather than state the ideal (Figure 4-33).

In the case of the ASDHA, this response can be compared to the survey responses elicited from the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners. A brief questionnaire was sent to the five dentists who are on the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners (Appendix B). Four of the dentists responded (80 percent). The first question asked if ASDHA had any influence regarding dental hygiene policies in Arkansas. All four answers were yes (only 18 percent of the ASDHA officers feel that they have influence with their state regulatory board).

The next question asked if the board members considered the policies and goals of the ASDHA to reflect the desires of the majority of hygienists in Arkansas. Three dentists said no, one stated that he did not know. The third question asked if ASDHA had open access to the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners. Again, all four answers were yes (compared to 55 percent of the ASDHA officers who feel that they have open access).

The fourth question asked if ASDHA officers were chosen on the basis of administrative ability or
popularity. Two dentists chose popularity while the other two answered with question marks. The final question asked if ASDHA has been/will be successful in its political attempts. Two said yes, one said no (because ASDHA did not represent the desires of the majority of hygienists), and one said that he did not know but that every issue would be seriously examined.

Again, the information presented in this chapter is the raw survey results just as they were received. An interpretation of the officers' responses will follow in the next chapter. What this chapter does reveal, however, is an inconsistency in responses, contradictions within each organization, and a lack of agreement on many of the survey questions. The presence or absence of the five factors necessary for political success is difficult to ascertain from these responses, however, when coupled with the political history of the organization, the existence of each factor and the bearing it has had on the political success of the organization can be determined.
Chapter Five - ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

This chapter will focus on each organization, with emphasis on the group's political experience, the factors necessary for success, and the degree to which the group possesses these factors. The perceptions of the officers as reflected in the survey and the actual situation as reported by a group member (either the organization president or the legislative chairman) will be reviewed. Because I was an officer in the ASDHA and actively involved in that group's political effort, that organization is examined in greater detail.

This chapter reflects the perceptions of each group as observed in 1985. Measurement of perceptions, although difficult, is based on the premise that perceptions of complex social phenomenon are no less valid than other measures of reality.\(^1\) Comparisons will indicate each group's possession of the factors necessary for political success and will thus be helpful in prescribing corrective measures which may improve organizational performance in the political arena. Chapter Six will then provide an update of group political achievements over the last four years (through 1989).
Arkansas Dietetic Association (ADA)

Political Attempts. As part of a move toward licensure, sponsored by the American Dietetic Association, the Arkansas Dietetic Association (ADA) initiated legislation which would require all dietitians in the state to be licensed. At the time this study was conducted there was no law governing the issuance of dietetic advice in the state. The result was a mushrooming of nutrition and weight loss centers which employed "nutritionists" or "diet counselors" to advise patients on food intake, when in reality these advisors may have had no more training than what they received on the job.

In contrast, a "registered dietitian" is an individual who has a bachelor's degree in food nutrition or dietetics, has completed an internship program or a master's degree program which includes job experience, and who has successfully completed the ADA registration exam. They work with a medical doctor and develop a nutritional profile for a patient from the doctor's diagnosis.

The mandatory licensure sought by ADA would specify the scope of practice for a dietitian and regulate the practice standards. In this way, the organization could keep the unqualified from dispensing
nutrition information. The issue was viewed by the dietitians as one of consumer protection and it was from this view that they planned to launch their campaign. The rationale for the dietitians' political attempt nicely fits Truman's hypothesis that people are stimulated to organize and act as a result of a disturbance which alters their relationship with other groups or institutions.²

The ADA began working on this issue in early 1984. Their first step was to appoint a committee which developed a questionnaire about the issue. The questionnaire was mailed to the approximately 250 members of the ADA and a telephone network was then activated to reach those members who failed to respond by mail. The result was response from over 66 percent of the membership. In addition, this issue was frequently reported in the organization's newsletter so members would be aware of the licensure campaign. There was no organized opposition to the effort at the time this study was conducted.

The ADA targeted the 1987 legislature for presentation of their proposal so they had plenty of time to lay the groundwork. They garnered the support of a representative on the Public Health, Labor, and Welfare Committee to introduce the bill and they
planned to organize a letter writing campaign for 1986. No further plans had been made.

Factors for Success.

Even though the Arkansas Dietetic Association was in the early stages of their attempt to influence policymaking when this data was gathered, their possession of the factors necessary for political success can still be judged. The ADA has a distinct advantage over the other organizations in this study because in order to be a registered dietitian, one must join the organization. The nurses and dental hygienists cannot practice unless they are registered (licensed) by their state regulatory board. They are voluntary members of their professional organization. This means that ADA has none of the worry about maintaining membership that the other two groups have. The group is more cohesive automatically, even though all the dietitians may not be active.

Another reason that ADA appears more cohesive than the other two organizations is the effort that they make to communicate with all of their members. When the mail response to their survey was not satisfactory, a telephone tree was organized to reach the remaining dietitians. The result was a 66 percent response.
Concern about communicating with all members is characteristic of a cohesive organization.

In addition, the officers of the ADA believe that the organization is cohesive. The officers gave a positive response to all survey questions aimed at measuring cohesiveness (the only organization surveyed to do this).

ADA officers were unified in the majority of their responses to survey questions. The president-elect of the organization said that not only the officers, but most of the dietitians in the state, want to take an active role in getting Arkansas dietitians licensed. The real motivator for ADA appears not to be the organization's leadership, but professional pride. The dietitians were upset because "amateurs" were imitating dietitians and the public was unaware of it. This issue was important to registered dietitians who feel that they were being misrepresented. Because the issue had significant meaning to the members of ADA, the leadership role was made easier.

The weakest of the five factors necessary for group success in the case of the ADA is group status. Survey responses indicate that group status could be defined as "neutral." Eighty percent of the officers feel that they have introduced themselves to policymakers and have some influence with them.
however, it is doubtful that the ADA wields much influence at this point. The ADA should increase the visibility of their profession through the use of the media and high visibility events. Public health advertisements are run at no cost on most radio and television stations. Participation in health fairs could also provide the opportunity to educate the public. ADA officers unanimously agreed that the public is not knowledgeable about their organization or the present political issue. Since the issue is to be presented from a consumer protection standpoint, ADA must reverse this situation. The officers indicate that they have had positive political experiences in the past and that steps have been taken to introduce the group to legislators, regulatory boards, and other professional organizations. ADA officers feel that their organization does have some influence with the above entities and are preparing to become even more visible as a result of their upcoming political effort.

An effort was made in the survey to measure the effect of gender issues on group political status and eventual chances for success. Political scientists have only rarely considered women's groups in the context of political participation. Women, in general, have been portrayed in the literature as a categorical group with few common political interests. It is felt
that women's groups lack unity on concrete policies and therefore are of little political consequence.³
Because the ADA, as well as the ASNA and the ASDHA, are comprised primarily of women, they may tend to be viewed as "political amateurs" and the group legitimacy may be questioned.

According to the survey, 60 percent of the ADA officers believe that the fact that their organization is largely female has impeded success with legislators. Thirty percent say that the same is true regarding state regulatory boards and other state agencies. Although the ADA officers believe that sexual discrimination may have impeded their political success, only 20 percent state that sexual harassment has been a problem. This small positive response is understandable when one considers the 1980 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission definition of sexual harassment:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

a) made as a condition of employment.

b) used as the basis for employment decisions.

c) it interferes with work performance or creates an intimidating hostile atmosphere.⁴

Policymakers could attempt to coerce sexual favors from group members by issuing or withholding licensure from
individuals or by promising to use their influence to achieve group goals. However, the frequency of direct contact between individual policymakers and group members, as observed in the study groups, is rare.

Another problem facing women's groups in their attempt to influence policy may stem from their exclusion from the common socio-occupational pool from which state legislators and lobbyists are drawn. Though female lobbyists may closely resemble legislators in level of education, women in the United States continue to experience educational and occupational phenomena very different from those of men. The educational and occupational experiences of women in the health-related professions is probably an even greater deviation from that of the average legislator.

Women must also be more conscious of their dress and mannerisms than men when attempting to influence policy. Predominantly male legislatures have a preconceived notion of how a woman should look and act and they are put off by anyone or anything which is contrary to this image. Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) proponents found this to be true as their amendment was associated in the minds of many legislators with the more militant elements of the new feminist movement. As a result, ERA supporters often found themselves
trying to "out-lady" opponents. Proponents also found themselves in a Catch-22 in presenting their arguments.

If you argue in an emotional way, they say you're "only a woman." If you debate logically and effectively, they say you're too mannish.8

A statement of Graham Wootten may sum up the attitude of many legislators toward women's groups.

"But in [the legislator's] eyes most women's organizations probably appear as women themselves appear - of aesthetic appeal rather than political import."9

The ADA officers believe that political reputation or group status is not necessarily an important resource in a political attempt. When asked to rate eight political resources in order of importance, the ADA officers found:

1 - commitment to goals
2 - consumer interest
3 - ability to form coalitions
4 - media coverage
5 - organization size
6 - money
7 - political reputation
8 - political expertise

It is interesting to note that the importance of the resource seems to directly relate to ADA's possession of it. The resources which ADA has or which ADA intends to use in this political effort are ranked near the top while those which exist only minimally in the ADA are, according to ADA officers, not as important.
ADA's strongest resource certainly is commitment to goals. According to Ornstein and Elder, a small group which is politically active and committed to goals can have more political impact than a large, apathetic organization. Although the ADA ranks consumer interest as an important resource, this is not a resource which the ADA possesses at this time. Consumer interest will develop as group visibility increases. The same techniques which will improve group status, namely media coverage, will also cultivate consumer interest. The small membership of the ADA eliminates size as a legitimate resource and likewise, small size translates into small budget. Even though the ADA and related political action committees donate time or money to political candidates in the state, the small size of this association may make the contribution seem negligible. The American Dietetic Association provides support by sending consultants to assist in planning legislative attempts and by helping to subsidize some state political activity. ADA did not receive national assistance in this political effort. ADA does not have a political reputation, either positive or negative, to carry into this legislative attempt, nor do they have a lobbyist or other individuals within the organization which they may rely on for political expertise. The ADA is
therefore forced to maximize those resources which they do have—commitment to goals, consumer interest (if cultivated) and media coverage -- and hope that this will carry the political effort until other resources can be developed.

A final factor necessary for political success is access to policymakers. Before an individual or group can obtain access to policymakers, however, there must be a basic understanding of the policy process. Seventy percent of the ADA officers indicate that they have a good working knowledge of the legislative process while an equal 70 percent feel personally knowledgeable about their organization's legislative attempt. The officers further indicated that they have open access to the primary governing bodies in the dietetic field. Although ADA had not actually entered the policymaking process, they had charted a course which they felt would lead to success. They planned to organize a letter writing campaign in 1986 so that each legislator would be familiar with the bill when it was introduced. They located a legislator who would introduce the bill for them and planned to launch a series of "good will" tactics in the state legislature.11

A review of the presence of the five factors for success in the ADA reveals a cohesive organization with
99 percent of the professionals in the state as organization members. They are rallied around an issue which has significant meaning for the membership, furthering cohesiveness and making the leadership role easier. The organization leadership appears to be effective, based on administrative ability, and consistent in terms of organization direction. At the time of this study, neither group status nor the maximization of resources had been developed to the degree necessary to launch a political attempt, however, the ADA is working on these areas. The final determinant of success in the small group is access to policymakers. The ADA officers indicated that they have access to policymakers, however, it is doubtful that they are taking full advantage of this access.

Arkansas State Nurses Association (ASNA)

Political Attempts. An issue which has been of concern to the Arkansas State Nursing Association (ASNA) in recent years has been the composition of the State Board of Nursing. In 1979, a bill was introduced by Senator Mike Wilson which reorganized the State Nursing Bill (Senate Bill No. 65, filed January 10, 1979). This bill specified the practice standards and the composition of the State Board of Nursing. This
bill originated inside the Public Health, Welfare, and Labor Committee and its contents were a surprise to the ASNA. ASNA advocated a State Board of Nursing in which a majority of the members would be RN’s. This bill proposed that six of the fourteen members be RN’s. ASNA was inactive politically at the time and although the organization assumed a defensive posture and made their opposition to this bill known, they decided to accept it in fear that fighting it without doing the necessary background work would make matters worse.

Since 1979 ASNA has been unhappy with the regulations governing the practice of nursing in the state of Arkansas but due to political inexperience and administrative difficulties they have been unable to do anything about them. In reaction to the nursing regulations ASNA decided, in January 1984, to study the practice act for points of possible improvement and to go to the legislature in order to again change the structure of the State Board of Nursing. These issues lay dormant until the 1984 fall convention of ASNA where it was decided to introduce a bill in the 1985 legislature. This example also confirms Truman’s theory that people are stimulated to organize or take action as a result of a disturbance which alters their relationship with other groups or institutions.12
The ASNA's goal was to add two Registered Nurses (RN's) with doctoral preparation to the State Board of Nursing. The board currently consists of 3 LPTN's (licensed psychological technical nurses), 3 LPN's (licensed practical nurses), 2 RN's with associate degrees, 2 RN's with diplomas or certificates, 2 RN's with Bachelor's degree or higher, and 2 consumer representatives. The ASNA believes that RN's should have a greater voice on the board. The existing arrangement is unsatisfactory because 8 of the 14 members are not RN's and, according to ASNA, not familiar enough with many nursing issues to offer an informed opinion. The ASNA believes that the less educated members of the board don't have the experience necessary to make some of these decisions nor do these members want the responsibility. The ASNA feels that Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degree nurses are under represented with only two of their number on the board.

With this rationale, the ASNA contacted the Arkansas State Hospital Association, the Arkansas Medical Society, and the Arkansas Nursing Home Association to seek their input before pursuing the issue. All of these organizations stated that because the issue was confined to nursing administration, they would have no opposition to it.
ASNA then hired a lobbyist, wrote a position paper and a bill, both of which were introduced in the legislature by a member of the Public Health, Welfare and Labor Committee on February 11, 1985 (Senate Bill No. 402). The bill encountered immediate opposition from Senator Bill Moore who objected to the bill at its introduction, while Representative Lloyd George expressed his opposition through informal channels. Both of these gentlemen had been involved in nursing issues for over fifteen years and were apparently infuriated that this bill had made it to the legislature without their prior knowledge of it. They were quite vocal in their opposition to the bill and because they were deemed by their peers as "nursing experts", the bill had no chance of success. The ASNA realized this and withdrew the bill on February 27, 1985, before it was ever formally presented.

ASNA realizes that they must do a great deal of preparation before approaching this issue a second time. They plan to establish a sound political profile in the future in hopes of becoming a reference source that the legislature can turn to regarding nursing issues. Many members of ASNA also subscribe to AN-PAC (Arkansas Nurses Political Action Committee) which provides volunteer work and contributions to candidates whom they think are likely to be allies of nursing
(ironically, neither of the two legislators considered "nursing experts" had received contributions from AN-PAC at the time of the legislative attempt).

ASNA also intends to keep in contact with several of the specialty organizations as a means of getting more RN's involved in political issues. According to the ASNA legislative chairman, there has been very little continuity of leadership on the issues and with each new slate of officers there has been so much turmoil that the organization becomes temporarily impotent in legislative as well as other areas. This conflicts with the result of the survey as all of the officers indicated that there has been continuity in the organization leadership (Figure 4-17, Question 21). The ASNA is trying to spread out responsibilities so that there will always be someone familiar with each issue on the board.

They have also put a lobbyist on full-time retainer for the next year so they will be constantly aware of legislative issues affecting nursing. They believe that in order to be successful politically, they must be aware of the peculiarities and idiosyncracies of the Arkansas General Assembly and to do this, they must have full-time contact.

The ASNA has no definite plans to reintroduce the bill which would change the composition of the State
Board of Nursing. Instead they are lobbying the governor, urging him to appoint nurses to the various health commissions and regulatory boards which were set up during the last legislative session. This is a wise move as a strong relationship has been observed between gubernatorial support and interest group success.\textsuperscript{13} ASNA has made the establishment of a working relationship with the legislature a priority issue, devoting the majority of their physical and monetary resources for the next year to it. When they feel that an acceptable rapport has been established, they will introduce more legislation. According to the ASNA legislative chairman, this experience taught ASNA a valuable lesson. They intend to do their homework in the future or the next lesson may be much more costly.

Factors for Success. The ASNA has several problems which must be overcome before another political attempt is made, the majority of which are linked to the five factors prescribed for success. In terms of cohesiveness, it is not necessarily the cohesiveness of the ASNA which is the problem but that of the nursing community as a whole. With only 6 percent of the RN’s (796 members of 14,000 RN’s) in the state as members of ASNA, their newsletter is not widely read. Frequent public meetings have been held to encourage input from the nursing community but
feedback has been rare. The direction of the ASNA is thus left to the discretion of the officers with very little communication from the rank-and-file. This small membership also leads policymakers to question whether ASNA is actually representative of RN's throughout the state. Luttberg and Zeigler write, "Like all political organizations, they are accorded more legitimacy when they can show they are representative of the attitudes and values of a particular segment of society." Constituency support is therefore important in both cohesiveness and the status afforded the group by the policymakers.

A contributor to the cohesiveness problem is the lack of communication between specialty groups within the nursing community. It was Truman who pointed out that an individual is usually a member of several groups, each making claims upon him and the ASNA is finding this to be true. The ASNA is the professional organization for RN's and there are similar organizations for LPN's and the other educational levels of nurses. Within these classifications, however, are smaller specialty organizations such as the Emergency Room Nurses' Association, the Operating Room Nurses' Association, etc. Because people have only a limited amount of time, money, and energy to devote to professional
organizations, they are often choosing the specialty organization which has more direct effect on their daily work lives. This is much to the dismay of the more general ASNA.

ASNA recognizes this problem and is seeking to resolve it by forming coalitions with some of the specialty organizations which represent RN's, such as the Licensed Technical Nurses Association and the Arkansas League of Nursing. They are also seeking input from other types of nurses such as the LPN's and the LPTN's to get their support. They send their newsletter to several of the larger specialty groups and the legislative chairman has established personal contacts with the officers of these organizations in order to unify the nursing community.

It will take time for ASNA to reach a majority of RN's in the state, but the organization appears determined. One tactic might be to have a representative at the specialty groups' meetings. In this way the ASNA could explain their position and appeal for support on a more personal level rather than from one organization to another.

The legislative chairman has assumed the leadership role in the ASNA's legislative attempt. In this instance, the legislative chairman is an individual who has only recently become active in the
organization and is not an individual recognized by the rank-and-file, therefore, her attempts to rally the organization around this issue may be less effective than those of someone more recognized.

The ASNA leadership is apparently devoted to this issue because they have allocated the majority of the yearly budget to it. ASNA has a full-time administrative assistant/secretary and rents office space so it must be assumed that it has considerably more money at its disposal than the other two organizations. Although the ASNA declined to release the specific figures, the legislative chairman left no doubt that it was a large amount of money.

The status of the ASNA is another factor which must be emphasized before another legislative attempt is made. According to the ASNA legislative chairman, Arkansas legislators seem to think that nurses don't need very much education, and that the traditional "ladies in white" and being misrepresented by the ivory tower academic nurses who are usually most visible on political issues. The politicians seem to feel a responsibility to protect traditional nursing while ASNA asserts that traditional nursing has evolved into what they (the ASNA) represent. Only 43 percent of the officers indicate that ASNA has influence with policymakers. Possibly this lack of influence is the
result of the legislator's perception that ASNA is not representative of their constituents.

This issue is closely linked to the gender questions asked on the survey. Seventy-one percent of the ASNA officers indicate that the fact that their organization is largely female has impeded success with legislators and other state agencies. Only 14 percent state that sexual harassment or sexual discrimination has been a problem in their legislative attempts.

ASNA does not appear to be a cohesive organization and does not have dynamic leadership or positive status. But it is in their access to policymakers where their latest political attempt failed most visibly.

The issue of putting two more RN's on the State Board of Nursing is a relatively benign issue, or it would have been if ASNA had done their homework on the legislature. Before considering introduction of a bill, ASNA should have inquired as to the identity of the key individuals on nursing issues. Obviously it was no secret that the two individuals who so adamantly opposed their bill were "nursing experts."

Representatives of ASNA should have met with the members of the Public Health, Welfare, and Labor Committee individually to sound them out regarding this issue. They could then have explained the rationale for the bill and lobbied for their support. As it was,
the bill slipped in without the necessary preparation of the legislators and was on the verge of being defeated before ASNA wisely withdrew it. In this instance the problem was not lack of access to policymakers, it was failure to attempt access. The ASNA may find that it must overcome a negative image with the Public Health, Welfare, and Labor Committee before another political attempt is made.

ASNA realizes that its hasty approach to policymaking could have done serious political damage to the organization's political future if the issue had not been withdrawn. They now intend to start again, this time making themselves "the" reference source for nursing issues in the General Assembly. It will take a long time for this sort of reputation or group status to be established. ASNA would be wise to cultivate other introductions to the legislature as well, perhaps using "good will tactics" to make benign introductions of the organization to the legislature. In addition, ASNA should encourage RN's to contact their legislators on behalf of ASNA, asking for support when nursing issues arise. With over 14,000 RN's in the state, if only half would do this, it would be quite impressive.

The key, then, is for ASNA to make the most of its available resources. At present the organization size is small, but with 14,000 nurses in the state there is
potential for much growth. An aggressive membership campaign could improve both the size and cohesiveness of the group. Even if the campaign did not significantly increase the size of ASNA, it would enlighten the non-members about nursing issues in the state and perhaps motivate them to participate when nursing issues arise.

ASNA appears to have adequate monetary resources to support their political attempts, however, they must see that the money is spent advantageously. If AN-PAC is going to contribute to the campaign of individual legislators, certainly the two "nursing experts" should be targeted.

ASNA is hiring a lobbyist to provide the political expertise required for a political effort and is trying to educate organization members about the political process. At the present time both political expertise and political reputation are not solid resources on which the organization can depend.

When the ASNA officers were asked to rank the resources which they had at their disposal the results were:

1 - commitment to goals
2 - consumer interest
3 - media coverage
4 - ability to form coalitions
5 - political expertise
6 - political reputation
7 - organization size
8 - money
Because the present issue is one of nursing administration rather than nursing principle and will have no impact on the consumer, it is doubtful that consumer interest or media coverage will be a resource in the organization's political efforts. The most obvious resource for the ASNA thus seems to be commitment to goals.

ASNA's possession of the five prerequisites for political success is limited. ASNA is not cohesive, and the leadership of the political effort is relatively new to the group and not recognized by the rank-and-file. The status of the group is suffering under the legislator's "traditional" view of nursing and the legislative attempt which was attempted previously. The ASNA is attempting to maximize its resources by hiring a lobbyist for political expertise, applying money to political efforts, forming coalitions with related organizations, and trying to improve its political reputation. It will take a great deal of hard work for ASNA to experience political success in the Arkansas General Assembly.

Arkansas State Dental Hygienists Association (ASDHA)

Political Attempts. Aware that dental hygiene components in other states were seeking to give dental
hygiene a voice in the regulation of dentistry by placing a dental hygienist on the State Board of Dental Examiners, the ASDHA decided to follow suit in 1974. For quite some time there was more rhetoric than action as Arkansas hygienists felt that they should first speak to individual dentists throughout the state to get their opinion. This was done informally by each hygienist speaking to her employer. No further action was taken on this issue until 1979.

In 1979 the issue became an active item on the ASDHA agenda. The president-elect of ASDHA met with Governor Bill Clinton in October 1979 to discuss placing a hygienist voting member on the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners. Other than talk between ASDHA officers and some members of the dental community, this was the end of any organized work toward the goal until September 1980. At this time the ASDHA president and the director of the University of Arkansas School of Dental Hygiene went before the executive council of the Arkansas State Dental Association (ASDA) to answer questions about why ASDHA sought to place a hygienist on the State Board of Dental Examiners. After hearing the rationale behind the effort, the ASDA voiced no opposition to the plan.

The ASDHA next searched for a member of the legislature to write and sponsor the bill for them.
Conveniently, the ASDHA president was a personal friend of Senator Mike Wilson who shepherded the bill (House Bill No. 124, Act 197) through the legislature. It was signed into law by Governor Frank White on February 26, 1981.

ASDHA did not attempt to influence the legislators except for a form letter sent by the president to all Senators and Representatives explaining ASDHA's position and asking for support. There was no organized opposition to the issue but it still required seven years from inception for ASDHA to get the goal accomplished.

ASDHA stayed away from the political scene until the board decided in the fall of 1983 to investigate the possibility of revising the Arkansas Dental Practice Act. Their goals were:

(1) making continuing education mandatory for relicensure
(2) allowing hygienists to administer local anesthesia (infiltration only).
(3) allowing hygienists to "administer" nitrous oxide rather than only "monitor" its use
(4) redefinition of "general supervision" to allow practice in public or private health facilities.

Because ASDHA's political experience was limited, a legislative consultant was called in from the national ADHA office to advise the board on how to
accomplish its goals. A two-day workshop was held with the advisor in December 1983 to clarify the path which ASDHA would follow in attempting to get these changes approved. The consultant outlined a plan for achieving ASDHA's goals, encouraging them to concentrate first on the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners.

The strategy of the ASDHA was to go before the regulatory board to request changes and, if they were denied there, they could pursue the issues later in the legislature. The consultant recommended that ASDHA seek all of the changes at once, not separate them. She further urged that the ASDHA board keep these issues confidential until they had gathered sufficient information to answer any questions which might arise.

No further action was taken by the board until June of 1984 when it was decided to actively pursue the issue. At this time a legislative committee was appointed by the ASDHA president to gather information from states who were already licensed in the areas of concern. A comprehensive package was to be presented to the State Board of Dental Examiners for approval in early December. In this way the issue could be carried on to the legislature in January 1985 should the State Board of Dental Examiners fail to approve it.

A survey was being prepared to seek input from hygienists throughout the state to make sure that their
interests were being represented. Attitudes of the non-dental members of the State Board of Dental Examiners (the consumer representative and the senior citizen representative) were sounded out by the hygienist on the Board. Most of the background work was done by the legislative chairman of ASDHA and was to be presented at the ASDHA board meeting in September.

At the business meeting in September 1984, the ASDHA president ignored the advice of the ADHA legislative consultant and revealed what she knew about the legislative attempt. She then realized the folly of her premature announcement as an avalanche of questions bombarded her. She had no answers and repeatedly had to refer the questions to the chairman of the legislative committee who answered the majority of them, although certainly not with the authority necessary for a convincing presentation. Two members of the audience, one a past ASDHA president, continued to ask questions and announced that they felt that ASDHA was in no way prepared to tackle these issues and made a motion for all of the goals to be dropped with the exception of mandatory continuing education for relicensure. They felt that the State Board of Dental Examiners would gladly pass this regulation (ironically the dentists rejected mandatory continuing education
for relicensure in their own business meeting the preceding day). The ASDHA president immediately agreed with these hygienists (coincidentally they were from her hometown) and a motion was made that ASDHA would try to make continuing education mandatory for relicensure by first appealing to the State Board of Dental Examiners and then to the legislature. The business meeting was adjourned and the board meeting was cancelled with another scheduled for December 1.

At the meeting in December it was decided that the chairman of the legislative committee should attend the next State Board of Dental Examiners meeting to try and determine the Board's attitude toward mandatory continuing education. This meeting was held a week later and when the members of the State Board of Dental Examiners were questioned on this issue, they said that they felt that the issue had been reviewed extensively in the past and that a satisfactory solution could not be found. The main problems were said to be lack of manpower, high administrative costs, and inability to approve courses prior to the actual course date. When pressed, the State Board of Dental Examiners said that they would be happy to review any proposal that ASDHA would care to submit for they "always had an open mind."
The ASDHA legislative committee developed a proposal making continuing education mandatory for relicensure and submitted it for the approval of the ASDHA members at the April 1985 business meeting. No major revisions were made so the plan was presented at the June State Board of Dental Examiners meeting. The Board agreed to consider the issue and discuss it in detail at a meeting in the fall of 1985. The proposal has not been addressed since the June 1985 meeting.

Factors for Success. By comparing the factors identified as necessary for group success with the characteristics exhibited by ASDHA, it is easy to see why this group has had so much difficulty achieving success in politics. The problems encountered by the ASDHA, for example, did not come so much from external opposition to the goals but from conflict within the organization. In other words, cohesiveness and communication within the organization is poor. The ASDHA officers seem to agree with this assessment. All officers agree that membership is low and only 27 percent feel that dissolution of the organization would make a real difference to the average dental hygienist.

It will be extremely difficult for the ASDHA to exert a unified political effort until they can improve cohesiveness within the dental hygiene community.
ASDHA should strive to make the organization a more visible component of the practice of dental hygiene within the state. A public relations effort should be made to contact every practicing hygienist. This could be achieved through local meetings, personal contacts, or even by phone. The officers should let the constituents know that they are important and that their feelings about the practice of dental hygiene in the state of Arkansas do count. The conversation should seek opinions on the issues, reasons for joining or not joining the ASDHA, and should seek any suggestions regarding ASDHA and future projects. These hygienists could be asked to write a letter to the State Board of Dental Examiners asking them to approve the policy changes. In this way ASDHA could show that they desperately seek the opinion of their constituents and perhaps some of the apathy of the dental hygiene community could be overcome. At the same time, they may gain some valuable information about how to increase membership.

As mentioned previously, communication within the organization is an integral component of cohesiveness and group political success. ASDHA has always encouraged input from members and non-members alike but the majority of hygienists have voiced no opinion. The ASDHA has a quarterly publication, the Hy-Lite
Bulletin, which contains news about ASDHA and addresses to which correspondence may be sent. A page in the ASDA Journal is also reserved for comment from the ASDHA president and this comes out quarterly to all ASDA members and all ASDHA members who request it. Frequent mailings regarding continuing education courses and membership recruiting are sent to every hygienist in the state but seldom is any mail to the ASDHA board received. In fact, a questionnaire was sent out by the ASDHA Board of Trustees seeking member input regarding the legislative issues that the ASDHA board was considering. Of approximately 500 questionnaires mailed, 37 responses (7 percent) were received. This corroborates Question 32 (Figure 4-28) of the survey where all officers indicate that the ASDHA membership is difficult to motivate on political issues.

As mentioned by Berry, the most common mechanism by which members can try to influence organizational decisions is through annual or bi-annual conventions.\(^1\)\(^5\) Turnout at the bi-annual ASDHA meetings is as poor as the mail responses with approximately 42 percent of the membership (11 percent of the dental hygiene population) attending. Attendance at ASDHA business meetings averages about 30 hygienists, 11 of these being board members.
The communication problem in the ASDHA is present not only between the board and the rank-and-file, but also between board members. According to 82 percent of the ADA officers, communication between officers is excellent. The case study information, however, indicates otherwise. The fact that the board members are scattered throughout the state and meet only every six weeks is admittedly a problem, but this does not excuse the lack of communication between the ASDHA legislative chairman and the president. ASDHA board members are reimbursed for long distance telephone expenses so the president and legislative chairman should have kept one another informed of the progress of this project. Perhaps if this had been done all along, the embarrassment of being unprepared at the general business meeting could have been avoided. The results of this meeting are a good example of the harm that poor communication or discord among group leaders can cause within an organization.

Effective communication is just one component of good leadership within an organization. Other components are administrative ability, respect, and continuity or consistency of direction. The leadership of the ASDHA has traditionally been weak, not because of lack of administrative ability but because there has been no reason to be otherwise. It is only since
approximately 1980 that ASDHA has begun to chose issues that will have any effect on the future of dental hygiene in the state. Before that time they received memos from the national office stating what other states were doing and what ASDHA "ought" to do but because the initiative came from outside the state, no action was ever taken.

Now the issues are there and ASDHA is having difficulty finding individuals who will assume the leadership role in achieving them. Eighty-two percent of the officers agree that members do not actively seek to become officers, with 36 percent describing the elected experience as a meaningful opportunity and 36 percent claiming it is a burdensome responsibility. The ASDHA presidency is viewed by the membership as a burden requiring a great deal of individual sacrifice. The presidency of ASDHA is handed down like a jail sentence, a three year sentence at that, for a person is first president-elect, then president, and finally past-president, a three year obligation to the ASDHA.

ASDHA must find within its ranks a dynamic individual who can bring some life back into the organization. The presidency of one's profession should be an honor which is bestowed after candidates have campaigned and the membership has chosen the individual that they feel is most qualified to lead the
organization. A charismatic president with enthusiasm for the position might be just what the ASDHA needs to get the organization moving.

Another factor deemed necessary for an organization to be politically successful is positive status. This can mean a good reputation with policymakers, recognition and support of the profession by the public, and the ability to work from a base of equality with other professional organizations. Based on the previous legislative attempt and the successful appointment of a dental hygienist to the State Board of Dental Examiners, the ASDHA officers should feel relatively comfortable with the status of their organization. The survey reveals that in spite of this early success, most officers believe they have little influence with policymakers. The officers also indicate that the public is not knowledgeable about the profession, eliminating consumer interest as a resource for political efforts.

It is imperative for the ASDHA, as for any organization, to maximize their available resources. Membership size is sometimes a factor in political attempts when size can be turned into votes, but the 120 members of ASDHA or even the over 450 practicing hygienists in Arkansas pose no electoral threat. The ASDHA should nevertheless launch an aggressive
membership campaign. This could lead to improved cohesiveness and communication within the organization. An annual budget of approximately $2000 allows no room for recognizable campaign contributions, negating money as a legitimate campaign resource.

The issue elicits no media interest so press coverage will not be an available resource and the group has little political knowledge or expertise, therefore, the services it can offer policymakers is limited. There is little need for dental knowledge by the legislature and if there were, the Arkansas State Dental Association would be the recognized authority. For this reason, the ASDHA should establish a positive working relationship with the ASDA. ASDHA should ask to attend a meeting of the ASDA's executive council to explain the proposed policy change, answer any questions, and ask for their support. This was done with a great deal of success when ASDHA was seeking to place a dental hygienist on the State Board of Dental Examiners, and it is even more important now because the ASDA has recently retained a lobbyist.

When asked to rate eight resources in order of importance the ASDHA officers ranking was:

1 - commitment to goals
2 - consumer interest
3 - media coverage
4 - organization size
5 - ability to form coalitions
6 - political reputation
7 - political expertise
8 - money

Because ASDHA has been relatively inactive politically in the past few years, very few policymakers are aware of the group's existence, much less their stand on the issues. For this reason, ASDHA should unobtrusively make its presence known to those individuals who influence health policy.

The final factor required for political success is access to policymakers. Since ASDHA first plans to target the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners to achieve its goals, it is with this group that they should first attempt to become acquainted. A dental hygienist is a member of this regulatory body which should make access to this policymaking group much easier. All meetings of the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners are open to the public and anyone who requests may be put on their mailing list and receive information on upcoming meetings. ASDHA should have representatives at every meeting of the Board. Although the Board will probably view this as an intrusion at first because there is rarely an audience at these meetings, they will soon realize that ASDHA is seriously concerned with dental policymaking. The ASDHA legislative chairman had asked all ASDHA officers
and committee chairmen to attend the Board meeting at which she presented the proposal for mandatory continuing education, however, only two officers were present. It will take more than this to convince the Board of Dental Examiners that ASDHA is serious.

If the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners rejects the mandatory continuing education proposal, ASDHA plans to present the issue at the 1987 session of the Arkansas General Assembly so this body should also merit the ASDHA's attention. ASDHA should inform every hygienist of the identity of their elected representatives and encourage them to contact these individuals on behalf of ASDHA. ASDHA should pay special attention to legislators on the Public Health, Welfare, and Labor Committee, making sure that they are personally contacted by a hygienist from their district regarding the issue(s). ASDHA is also considering the preparation of dental health kits for the legislators containing toothbrushes, toothpaste, dental floss, and a witty note. These plans should be carried out regardless of whether ASDHA has issues before the 1987 General Assembly. It is never too early to start the "good will tactics." 17

To review ASDHA's possession of the factors necessary for political success reveals an organization which is not cohesive, leadership which is reluctant to
pursue the issues, and which has done little to improve its status with policymakers or the public. The group has few resources and limited access to policymakers. The group has not been very aggressive so far in attempting to change these circumstances. One gets the impression that ASDHA knows what it "ought" to do but lacks the conviction (i.e. cohesiveness, leadership) to accomplish these goals.

There is no way to predict success or failure in the political arena with 100 percent accuracy. A brief review of the organizations in relation to the factors required for political success reveals that the ADA is an organization which is cohesive and has effective leadership, but which has few resources, no group recognition or status, and which has not attempted access to policymakers. The ASNA is not cohesive, does not have a recognized leader for this political effort, has not had positive legislative experiences and may have a poor reputation in the legislature. ASNA does appear to have monetary resources at their disposal and has hired a lobbyist for political expertise and to assist in maintaining access to decision makers. The third group, ASDHA, is not cohesive, does not have effective leadership, has negligible group status and very few resources. They do, however, have access to
policymakers. It will be interesting to see which of these groups, if any, will achieve success.
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Chapter Six - CONCLUSION

The surest means of judging the political success of an organization or interest group is to look back over time and determine if the goals were achieved. The surveys and case studies of the ADA, ASNA, and ASDHA were conducted in 1985. Now, after four years have elapsed, it is appropriate to examine each organization’s achievement of the goals which were outlined in 1985. The current president of each organization was interviewed in regard to achievement of stated goals, the presence of the five factors for success, and the impact, if any, these factors had on the organization’s political efforts.

Arkansas Dietetic Association

The Arkansas Dietetic Association finally achieved their mandatory licensure goal. The dietitians found a legislator who supported their cause and agreed to sponsor their bill. The measure basically defined the profession of dietitian and established practice standards. The bill was introduced as House Bill No. 1388 in the 1987 General Assembly by Representative Jim Stockley on January 28, 1987. It was greeted by severe opposition from the health food industry. This group feared that such legislation might restrict their ability to dispense health foods, vitamins, and nutritional advice. When faced with the opposition of the health food industry, the sponsor withdrew the bill.
Instead of resubmitting the bill with amendments, a new bill was filed on 18 February 1987 (House Bill No. 1696, sponsored by Representative Stockley). It went to interim committee on March 12th, was recalled on March 23rd, and passed the Senate on March 25th. The bill died without being sent to the House of Representatives.

In order to enhance their legislative position, the ADA retained a lobbyist on an hourly basis. They began to make public service appearances and offering nutritional advice as a community service in order to increase public awareness of the profession. The organization made no political contributions nor did they have a political action committee which had contact with the legislature. The ADA president noted that, ironically, the sponsor of the measure did not even have a dietitian in his district. She was unsure of how this particular legislator came to be the champion of their cause. Apparently he merely believed in the issue and considered it to be in the best interest of the public.

At the 1989 session of the General Assembly it was decided that no bills which made licensure a requirement could be introduced without first going to interim committee. The postponement that the ADA experienced which placed their bill in interim committee now turned to their advantage. Representative Pat Flanagan re-introduced the measure in the Arkansas General Assembly on February 1, 1989 as House Bill No. 1473, Act 392. It passed overwhelmingly.
and was signed by Governor Bill Clinton on March 7, 1989. The health food industry was not as vocal as they had been in the previous session and the "diet counselors" did not organize in opposition at all.

The ADA president credits their success to the grassroots support of the ADA membership. All members pulled together to support the issue and were eager to contact their legislative representatives to discuss the bill. Education of the membership was also cited as a key to group success. She states that cohesiveness and communication within the group were consistently high throughout the political attempt.

Leadership within the organization remained constant throughout the legislative effort. A new slate of officers is elected every year, however, the ADA president reports that out-going officers continued to stay actively involved.

The ADA president reports that legislators had no preconceived impression of the organization prior to the introduction of the legislation. The status of the organization continuously improved throughout the political attempt. Members of the ADA testified before the interim committee and feedback to the group revealed that the policymakers were impressed with the logical and factual manner in which the case was presented. There were no hysterics and no emotional appeals. The ADA proved
themselves to be a professional organization whose legislative position was worthy of consideration.

The ADA was working on a very limited budget yet they were able to maximize their resources. They were able to locate a lobbyist who agreed to work for an hourly salary instead of the usual set fee. As mentioned above, they contributed time to public service work to enhance their public image. The majority of group members wrote letters or in some way contacted their legislative representatives to ask for support. Access to policymakers was possible through the sponsor of the bill and through the lobbyist. The ADA president stated that they experienced no difficulty in meeting with the policymakers.

Needless to say, the ADA is quite pleased with their legislative success. They feel that they have established a strong political base and that any future political attempts will be much easier. The ADA will be actively involved in the establishment of the regulatory board for the dietitians. They have no other political plans for the near future.

Arkansas State Nurses Association

In 1985 the ASNA unsuccessfully introduced legislation which would have added two RN’s with doctoral preparation to the State Board of Nursing. The bill met severe opposition...
from members of the Public Health, Labor, and Welfare Committee and was withdrawn before it came up for a vote.

At that time the ASNA planned to improve their status with the legislature and re-introduce the bill at a later time. To date, this has not occurred. In fact, the ASNA has no plans for any political attempts at all.

The ASNA president reports that after the bill was withdrawn, the issue was no longer an active issue on the ASNA agenda. Ideally, the State Board of Nursing should be composed of the more educated nurses, however, it is not a realistic issue at this time. She reports that a few years ago there was a nation-wide initiative to make a baccalaureate degree the minimum credential for a registered nurse. The current shortage of nurses, however, precludes placement of any barriers before those who desire to enter the profession or those who wish to serve on its regulatory board.

Although the ASNA has no political initiatives of its own, the organization continues to take an interest in health-related legislation. The organization still retains its lobbyist and takes a position on various health issues. The ASNA president reports that the organization has been much more visible in the 1987 and 1989 General Assemblies because in addition to the lobbyist, their executive director is very interested in legislative activity. AN-PAC
(Arkansas Nurses Political Action Committee) is an arm of the association which interviews and endorses political candidates on the state level. The ASNA president is unaware of any contributions which have been made to political candidates.

With regard to the cohesiveness of the organization, the ASNA president states that she cannot categorically say that the organization is cohesive. Participation of members is very issue-dependent and identity with the organization does not seem important to most RN's. The size of the organization has remained constant over the years.

The official leadership of the organization changes with yearly elections, however, the direction of the organization has been consistent. The president reports that most former officers remain active in the organization.

The status of the organization has changed only slightly, according to the ASNA president. She believes that the legislature respects their position on health-related issues, however, this opinion is not solicited. They have improved relations with the Arkansas Medical Association although there is no sense of active cooperation between the two organizations.

There is open access to policymakers, according to the ASNA president, but it is no more than that experienced by any other individual or group. The ASNA lobbyist does have
more direct contact with policymakers and serves as a liaison between the organization and the legislators.

The ASNA president reports that they attempt to take advantage of as many resources as possible in their efforts to be visible in the political arena but that most of the organization's resources are quite limited. She states that money is quite limited at the present time and that there have been no political issues which would generate media interest. They are maintaining a lobbyist in order to maximize political exposure.

The ASNA has no political goals for the future other than to stay visible in the General Assembly. In this way the organization will have a foot in the door should the need to present legislative issues arise.

Arkansas State Dental Hygienists Association

The ASDHA has not yet accomplished the political goal of mandatory continuing education which it established in the early 1980's. The ASDHA president reports that after the mandatory continuing education issue was presented to the State Board of Dental Examiners in June 1985, it was never addressed again. In late 1985, the legislative chairman moved out of state and the organization president followed the next year. These individuals were the motivational force behind the issue of mandatory continuing education and without their impetus, the issue was dropped.
Mandatory continuing education is now becoming an issue again. The Arkansas component of the American Academy of General Dentistry (AAGD) is proposing mandatory continuing education for dentists in the state and have asked ASDHA to sponsor a similar bill for dental hygienists in the 1991 Arkansas General Assembly. The ASDHA president states that the AAGD is a very small organization and does not reflect the opinions of the much larger and more recognized Arkansas State Dental Association (ASDA). Chances for success of this legislative attempt are remote. ASDHA has taken no action on this issue as yet.

The ASDHA has achieved one of the original political goals that it had outlined in 1984, but it was not by any direct action on the part of the organization. The State Board of Dental Examiners was in the process of revising its rules and regulations this spring and when approached by the ASDA, agreed to study recommendations provided by an advisory committee. The committee consisted of 15 dentists, 2 dental hygienists, and 1 assistant. As a result of a committee suggestion, dental hygienists can now "administer" nitrous oxide rather than merely "monitor" its use.

No other political action has been taken by the ASDHA although the ASDHA agenda is full of political goals. The officers are attempting to educate themselves and attended a Strategic Planning Retreat with the national American Dental Hygienists Association president in October 1988. This is
now being planned as an annual event. The ASDHA president also recently attended the national ASDHA legislative workshop. There she was told that if the State Board of Dental Examiners had been unsuccessfully approached about an issue previously, to go directly to the legislature for the second attempt. The ASDHA would therefore be wise to combine forces with the AAGD and target the 1991 General Assembly for introduction of mandatory continuing education legislation.

When questioned about the five factors necessary for political success, the ASDHA president put it simply, "You can't accomplish your goals without grass roots support." She indicated that the organization is not cohesive, instead, a few committed individuals attempt to shoulder the burden for the entire organization.

The leadership of the organization has stayed the same over the past four years. Most of the officers are the same, resulting in burn-out and lethargy in some instances. Selection for office is essentially based on volunteerism; the one who appears most eager is elected. The ASDHA president reports that at the last election there was more interest from the new college graduates. She has established a President's Council which is comprised of interested individuals who are not holding an office. This was done in an effort to sustain interest in the ASDHA.
The ASDHA president reports that the status of the ASDHA is amiable as long as ASDHA "stays in its place." ASDHA is recognized by the State Board of Dental Examiners and they do have a good working relationship. This, according to the ASDHA president, is because the ASDHA has caused no trouble. She revealed that when she mentioned "general supervision" at a recent meeting of the State Board of Dental Examiners, the District Trustee admonished her by shaking his finger and saying that the dentists and hygienists in Arkansas had enjoyed a good working relationship for 35 years, but that references to general supervision would certainly sever that relationship. (General supervision does not require the presence of the dentist in the office, only his knowledge that the procedure is taking place. It is viewed by many as the first step toward private practice). The ASDHA is not recognized at all by the Arkansas General Assembly and no contacts are planned at present.

The ASDHA president feels that the organization is beginning to make more effective use of its resources. It has a larger budget now and plans to devote a portion of it to political efforts. They realize that they can never match dollar for dollar what the dentists contribute so they are prepared to donate time to legislative campaigns as well. There is no lobbyist currently employed by the ASDHA. Although the president feels that procurement of these
services is inevitable. The ASDHA has held numerous public service events, all of which were well publicized by the media. These events and the fact that many people now have dental insurance which will pay for semi-annual cleaning and check-ups have made the dental hygiene profession much more recognizable by the public.

The ASDHA has open access to the State Board of Dental Examiners, but their attendance is welcome only if the organization is not there to cause a disturbance in the status quo. The ASDHA must decide if attendance under the muzzle of the policymakers is actually going to allow them to accomplish their goals. Access to the legislature has not been attempted since 1981.

ASDHA has not yet decided what action it will take in the move for mandatory continuing education. They believe that if this passes the legislature, they could then successfully introduce legislation which would allow hygienists to administer local anesthetics. The issue of mandatory continuing education, according to the ASDHA president, is the key for all future legislative efforts.

Conclusion

The groups which most citizens become involved are more similar to the groups mentioned here than they are to the large, professional organizations which come to mind when the term "interest group" is used. Every group, no matter
matter the size or composition, has the potential for becoming an interest group. A band of neighbors who go before the city council to request better police protection, a group of employees seeking better benefits, or a group of consumers seeking truth in advertising, all of these are interest groups.

If one lesson were to be learned from the experiences of these groups, it should be that a group must be cohesive. All members must strive for the same goals and share a common conviction that they can be accomplished. A political effort which is not based on a shared belief in these goals is unlikely to succeed. A crucial element in the cohesiveness of a group is the degree of communication which is present. The group environment must be conducive to exchange of ideas between all levels of the organization in order for political success to be achieved.

In addition to being cohesive and rallied around a common cause, a successful group must have some reference material or political expertise to guide their attempt. This may come from publications, the advice of a legislative expert, or a lobbyist, but whatever the source a political guide is a must. It is the responsibility of the group leadership to direct the group on a path which is consonant with the selected political guide.

Once a guide has been identified and the appropriate political tactics selected, the plans should be followed
through... It does no good to make plans and postpone implementing them. When this is done tactics often lose their timeliness and different plans must be made. What results is often a constant cycle of planning, postponing, and revising until enthusiasm for an issue wanes and no action is ever taken. The ASNA and ASDHA are examples of this syndrome.

Crucial to being able to follow through with political plans is having access to policymakers. This includes a familiarity with the policy process, the key actors, and the "rules of the game". It requires the group to make its presence known in political circles and to develop an amiable political reputation whenever possible.

The five factors necessary for political success as outlined in this paper are cohesiveness, leadership, group status, maximization of group resources, and access to policymakers. It is the thesis of this paper that any group may experience political success because the necessary prerequisites for success are not difficult to obtain. The problem is that most groups are not aware that these requirements exist before they enter the policy process. It is only after a political attempt fails that a group reflects on what was needed for success, and at this point, the group's political reputation may already be damaged or the group may be too discouraged to continue the effort. For this reason, groups should examine the political
experiences of other organizations and learn from any mistakes that they may have made.

The basic outline for interest group action and success is the same regardless of the group involved. It is hoped that the factors essential for group success pointed out in this thesis will be beneficial to groups making political attempts in the future. A firm grasp on the basics of interest group success is a prerequisite for any political attempt.
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APPENDIX A

Small Group Influence Questionnaire

(CONFIDENTIAL)

Please complete the questionnaire by circling or filling in the appropriate response. If after completing it you would like to make additional comments about the factors which have influenced your organization's political experiences, please do so on the last page. I would appreciate any additional insights you might offer.

1. Approximately how many registered dental hygienists are currently practicing in the state?

2. How many of these individuals are members of ASDHA?

3. Approximately how many hygienists attend the ASDHA annual meeting?

4. How many individuals attend ASDHA regional meetings?

5. Do you feel that your organization has low membership?

   Yes  No

   If yes, to what would you attribute this?
   a. high dues  Yes  No
   b. apathy  Yes  No
   c. other nonprofessional priorities  Yes  No (such as home and family)

6. How much are your annual dues for ASDHA (both state and national)?

   state_________________________national_________________________
7. Do you regularly associate with members of your profession who do not work with you (other than your fellow ASDHA officers)?

Yes    No

8. If the ASDHA dissolved tomorrow, would it make any real difference to the average dental hygienist?

Yes    No

9. Does your state organization have a permanent staff at the state level?

Yes    No

10. Is your staff paid or volunteer?

Paid    Volunteer

If paid, how many are full-time employees?____How many are part-time?____How many are professional?____How many are nonprofessionals (e.g. clerical)?____

11. Do most members support the political goals of your state organization?

Yes    No

12. Does your organization regularly publish a journal or newsletter at the state level?

Yes    No

How many times per year? __________

13. Does your organization frequently publish political action articles or newsletters?

Yes    No

How many times per year? __________

14. How would you rate communication between officers and members in your organization?

Poor    Excellent

15. How would you rate communication among officers in your organization?

Poor    Excellent
16. Which of the following methods do the members use to communicate in your organization? (circle all appropriate answers).

- a. organization publications/surveys Yes No
- b. independent letters Yes No
- c. conventions or business meetings Yes No
- d. via elected representatives Yes No

Of the above, which is most important? ____________

Which is least important? ____________

17. How long have you been involved in the leadership of your organization? ____________

18. Do members actively seek to become officers in your organization?

Yes No

19. In your estimation, is holding an office in your organization regarded as a meaningful opportunity or as a burdensome responsibility?

Meaningful opportunity Burdensome responsibility

20. In general do you feel that the leaders of your organization are chosen on the basis of administrative ability or popularity?

Administrative ability Popularity

21. Has there been continuity in the leadership of your organization over the past five years?

Yes No

22. Does your organization have an effective committee system?

Yes No

23. Do you consider the officers of your organization to be efficient and organized?

Yes No
24. Has your organization been successful in the past five years in:
   a. legislative efforts  Yes  No
   b. influencing regulatory boards  Yes  No
   c. electing officials  Yes  No
   d. acquainting itself with policymakers  Yes  No

25. Does your organization currently have political goals which will influence policies in your profession?
   Yes  No

   List two or three of the most important.

26. Has your organization outlined a specific strategy for achieving its political goals?
   Yes  No

27. Do you feel the officers of your state organization have a good working knowledge of the steps involved in the legislative process?
   Yes  No

28. Has your organization taken steps to introduce itself to policymakers (elected public officials, administrators)?
   Yes  No
29. Do you feel that your organization has any influence with:
   a. legislators          Yes         No
   b. state regulatory boards  Yes        No
   c. other professional organizations (AMA, ADA)  Yes         No

30. Approximately what percent of your organization's annual budget is designated for political or legislative activity?

____________________

31. Has your organization or a related political action committee donated time or money to political candidates in the state?
   Yes         No

32. Is your membership easily motivated to take action on political issues (write letters, attend meetings, answer surveys, take other action)?
   Yes         No

33. Does your state organization retain a lobbyist?
   Yes         No

34. Has your organization identified the individual policymakers who have influence in matters related to your profession?
   Yes         No

35. Do you feel that your organization had adequate time to prepare for its latest political attempt?
   Yes         No

How much time was allowed?__________________________

36. Do you feel personally knowledgeable about your state organization's latest political attempt?
   Yes         No
37. Do you feel that your organization has open access to:
   a. legislators  Yes  No
   b. regulatory boards  Yes  No
   c. other state agencies  Yes  No

38. Have any members of your profession organized in opposition to your organization's political plans?
   Yes  No

39. Has your organization encountered any organized opposition to its political plans from outside the profession?
   Yes  No

   If yes, what is/are the most important sources of this opposition?

40. Do you believe that the public is knowledgeable about your profession?
   Yes  No

41. Please rank in order of importance the political resources that your organization has at its disposal.

   ______ political expertise
   ______ money
   ______ organization size
   ______ ability to form coalitions
   ______ consumer interest
   ______ media coverage
   ______ political reputation
   ______ commitment to goals
42. Does the fact that your organization is largely female impede your success with:

a. state legislators Yes No
b. state regulatory boards Yes No
c. other professional organizations Yes No

43. Do you feel that your organization is dominated by related professions which are largely male?

Yes No

If yes, which professions?

What effect has this had on your organization's political efforts?

44. Do you think sexual harassment or sexual discrimination has been a problem in your organization's political attempts?

Yes No

45. Do you feel that your organization has been/will be successful in its political attempts?

Yes No

46. Now I would appreciate any additional comments or information about your organization's political experiences. I am particularly interested in what you believe is necessary for small organizations to be politically successful. Feel free to elaborate in the following space or on the reverse side of this page.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY.

IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO RETURN THE COVER LETTERS WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
APPENDIX B

Small Group Influence Questionnaire
(CONFIDENTIAL)

1. Do you believe the Arkansas State Dental Hygienists' Association has any influence regarding dental hygiene policies in Arkansas?
   Yes       No

2. Do you consider the policies and goals of the ASDHA to reflect the desires of the majority of hygienists in Arkansas?
   Yes       No

3. Do you feel that ASDHA has open access to the Arkansas State Board of Dental Examiners?
   Yes       No

4. Do you feel that the ASDHA officers are selected on the basis of administrative ability or popularity?
   Ability   Popularity

5. Do you feel that ASDHA has been/will be successful in its political attempts?
   Yes       No

Why or why not:______________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________