

Web Appendix for
“Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged?
Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender”

Journal of Politics

Dara Z. Strolovitch
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

dzs@umn.edu

1. Appendix A describes the 2000 Survey of National Economic and Social Justice Organizations and the in-depth interviews.

2. Appendix B contains the following supplementary tables:

a. Table A1 presents the Distribution of Organizations in Telephone Survey and Face-to-Face Interviews.

b. Tables A2a, A2b, and A2c present the bivariate correlations among the variables in the model.

c. Table A3 presents the collinearity diagnostics for the variables in the model.

d. Table A4 presents the results of alternative ordered logit and two-stage least squares models.

e. Table A5 presents the results of an alternative ordered logit model that excludes cases using welfare reform, and compares this model with the one that is presented in the article.

f. Table A6 presents the predicted probabilities of activity levels by issue type.

Appendix A: The 2000 Survey of National Economic and Social Justice Organizations (SNESJO)

This study uses data that I collected in two principle ways: (1) through a telephone survey conducted with officers at 286 advocacy organizations; and (2) via face-to-face interviews with officers at 40 organizations.

I collected the survey data in 2000 using the Survey of National Economic and Social Justice Organizations (SNESJO), a survey of 286 national women's, civil rights, racial minority, and economic justice organizations that are active in domestic policy issues. "Racial minority" organizations encompass Asian Pacific American, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Native American/American Indian organizations. In addition, I have included broadly-based civil rights and civil liberties organizations, immigrants' rights groups, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights organizations, Arab/Muslim organizations, minority civil rights organizations, anti-racist organizations, some religious minority groups, and multiculturalism organizations under the category "Civil Rights--general." Economic justice organizations include labor, anti-poverty, welfare rights, homeless, anti-hunger, and public interest groups. I include reproductive rights, women's health, and women of color organizations in the category "women's rights/feminist" organizations.

I define of national organizations to include ones outside of Washington, D.C. because some of the populations that are represented by the organizations in which I am interested are geographically concentrated outside of the east coast. For example, while 74% of African American, and 70% of economic justice groups are based in the Washington D.C. area, only 44% of Asian American, 55% of Latino, 65 percent of women's, and 25.5% of Native American organizations are based in the D.C. area. While many maintain D.C. offices, a disproportionate

number of these organizations are based instead in California, the Southwest, New York City, and the Midwest. Organizations included in the survey therefore either maintain a Washington, D.C. or play a leadership role in the national policy activities of the movements of which they are a part (Minkoff 1997; Minkoff and Agnone 2003).

I compiled the database of organizations using information from published directories of organizations, media sources, and movement publications. These sources were also used to assemble preliminary data about the organizations in order to test for non-response and other types of bias in the survey data. The published directories include: the *Encyclopedia of Associations* (Gale Research 2000); *Public Interest Profiles* (Foundation for Public Affairs 1999); *Washington Information Directory* (CQ Press 1998); *Washington Representatives* (Columbia Books 1999); and *Who's Who in Washington Nonprofit Groups* (Congressional Quarterly 1995). In addition, I consulted specialized directories, including the *National Directory of Asian Pacific American Organizations* (Organization of Chinese Americans 1999); the *National Directory of Hispanic Organizations* (Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Inc. 1999); and the *Women of Color Organizations and Projects National Directory* (Women of Color Resource Center 1998). I also consulted lists of organizations on approximately thirty web-sites, including the *Leadership Conference on Civil Rights*, and the *Electra Pages*.

Survey Questions

The survey questions focus on organizations' activities on policy issues of the 1990's that have significant implications for rights and resources for women, racial minorities, and low-income people. To contextualize these activities and facilitate comparisons with existing work, the survey replicates key questions from earlier surveys (Berry 1977; Heinz et al. 1993; Knoke and Adams 1984; Kollman 1998; Laumann and Knoke 1987; Schlozman and Tierney 1986; and

Walker 1991), and contains questions about organizations' age, sources of funding, ideology, size, as well as measures of political context factors such as partisan control of Congress.

Policy Issue Selection

The policy issues about which respondents were asked are all domestic policy issues that can be pursued at the national level and through all three branches of the federal government (Congress, the administration, and the judiciary). Using a two-step method, I also stipulated that the policy issues must have been on the national political "agenda" during the period covered by the study (i.e., issues had to involve pending court cases being heard by the Supreme Court; pending legislation being debated in Congress; or pending policy being set in an executive branch department or agency). To select appropriate issues, I compiled a list of issues from the *Congressional Quarterly* for 1990, 1993, 1996, and 1999, and another from the "Supreme Court Roundup" (a regular feature in the *New York Times*) for 1990-2000. After selecting all issues that were potentially relevant to the groups in the survey, I then searched the 1990-2000 volumes of the *Congressional Record* and of the *Federal Register* to confirm that the issues were on the agendas in the legislative and executive branches as well, noting how many times each issue had been mentioned in each of these sources. I repeated this "reverse" search for the Supreme Court Roundups. Although appearing in any one of these sources would constitute sufficient evidence that issues were on the "radar screen" and could reasonably be expected to be on the agenda of advocacy groups, all 22 issues that I selected were found in at least two of the sources, and 20 of the 22 issues were found in all three sources. While there are certainly biases inherent in basing the selection of policies on these sources, this method avoids issues for which a lack of activity could be explained simply as a function of issues not being "on the agenda."

The policy issues are: Protecting or expanding hate crime laws; Protecting or expanding laws against violence against women; Protecting or expanding affirmative action for minority-owned businesses in government contracting; Social Security Reform; Banning racial profiling in law enforcement; welfare reform; Protecting or expanding affirmative action in higher education; Alleviating the “green card” backlog for resident alien citizens; Rectifying the underrepresentation of poor people and racial minorities in the U.S. Census; Protecting access to late-term abortion; Protecting or expanding tribal sovereignty or self-government; Protecting gay, lesbian, bisexual, and trans-gender people from workplace discrimination; The denial of federal safety-net benefits to immigrants; Raising the H-1B Visa ceiling for temporary high-skilled immigrant workers; Protecting or raising the minimum wage; Identifying, preventing, and rectifying gender-based wage disparities; Efforts to unionize white-collar workers; Restrictions or cuts to public funding for abortion; Reforming the system of campaign finance; Preventing racial discrimination in environmental policy-making, and in the enforcement of environmental laws; Protecting privacy on the Internet; and Regulating abortion coverage by insurance companies and HMOs.

In order to determine which of the above issues should be asked of each type of organization, I constructed a grid arraying each organization type along one axis and each issue type along the other axis. After listing all of the various subgroups of a constituency that could be affected by each policy issue, I then assigned each policy issue under consideration (based on the selection process detailed above) to the appropriate issue type cells for each organization type -- one majority issue, one advantaged-subgroup issue, and one disadvantaged-subgroup issue. A “universal” issue -- Social Security-- was used for all groups, serving as a control issue (see Table 1, in main text of article).

So, for example, respondents from Asian American organizations were asked about hate crime as a majority issue, as all Asian Americans are, theoretically, equally likely to be victims of hate crime. Respondents were asked about affirmative action in government contracting as an advantaged subgroup issue, as this issue affects primarily Asian American business owners, a relatively privileged subgroup of all Asian Americans. Finally, they were asked about violence against women as a disadvantaged-subgroup issue, as it intersects gender and race and affects Asian American women, an intersectionally disadvantaged subgroup of Asian Americans.

Variables and Measurements

The dependent variable in this study is the level of organizations' activity on each type of policy issue (Level of policy activity). To measure this, I use a survey question that asks:

“Please tell me, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not active, and 5 is very active, how active has your organization been on each of the following policy issues in the past ten years?”

Several explanatory variables are operationalized using survey questions as well. Member support for a group's position on each issue (*Members agree*) is measured using the question:

“In general, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is none and 5 is everyone, what proportion of your members would you say agrees with your organization's position on each of the following issues?”

Public support for an organizations' position on each issue (*Public agrees*) is measured using the question:

“In general, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is none and 5 is everyone, what proportion of the public would you say agrees with your organization's position on each issue?”

The level of controversy (*Controversial*) surrounding each issue is measured by asking:

“In general, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all controversial and 5 is extremely controversial, how controversial is each of these issues?”

Member concern about an issue (*Members concerned*) is measured by asking:

“On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is none and 5 is almost all, what proportion of your members would you say is concerned about the following issues?”

Finally, the proportion of the membership affected by an issue is tested using a question that measures the proportion of the larger group that is likely to be affected by an issue:

“On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is none and 5 is almost all, what proportion of your members would you say is directly affected by the following issues?”

This question is also used to validate the classification of policy issues as either universal, majority, disadvantaged subgroup, or advantaged subgroup.

Survey Execution and Sampling Methods

The initial search for organizations yielded 987 organizations, and solicitation letters were sent to all of these groups. Of these, 273 were defunct, resulting in a universe of 714 organizations. Six weeks into the survey, a second solicitation letter was sent to organizations that had not yet been interviewed but had not yet refused to participate. To ensure that all of the organizations contacted are indeed advocacy groups, the survey began with the screening question, “On a scale of 1 to 5, if 1 is “not important” and 5 is “very important,” how important is influencing national public policy as a part of your organization’s mandate and activities?” Interviews were not completed with respondents who answered “1” to this question.

The telephone interviews were conducted by Zogby International between 26 June-11 November, 2000, and took an average of 33 minutes to complete. Interviews were completed with 286 organizations, for a 40% completion rate. According to Jeffrey Berry and his co-authors

(Berry et al. n.d.), this is about average for surveys of organizations, which generally have response rates between 25%-50%. Respondents were promised anonymity for themselves and for their organizations.

The results of the survey compare closely to previous studies, and data on criterion variables such as location, number of employees, and year founded do not differ significantly from the data on these measures that I collected from publicly available sources for the universe of organizations as a whole in the course of compiling the master-list of organizations. For example, 61.4% of the groups in the sample are located in or around the Washington, DC area, as are 61.1% of the groups on the master list. Similarly, the average age (in 2002) of the groups in the master list is 37.5 years old, while the average for the respondent groups is 38.4 years old. The average number of staff among the organizations in the survey is 39, compared with an average of 37 staff among the organizations on the master list (see Strolovitch 2006; forthcoming).

While the results of the SNESJO compare closely to previous studies, they also diverge in some important ways that provide useful information about the ways in which social and economic justice organizations differ from other types of interest groups. In particular, this study focuses on organizations that are out-moneyed by organizations of other, more traditional interests. In addition, they have fewer resources and fewer of the organizational and political tools than do other interests such as business and professional organizations. Less than a third (31.8 percent) of the organizations surveyed in the SNESJO employ a legal staff, compared with three quarters of the organizations in Schlozman and Tierney's broader 1986 study of interest groups.¹ Only a quarter of the organizations in the SNESJO employ lobbyists, and only a fifth has Political Action Committees (PACs). Schlozman and Tierney (1986), in contrast, found that

54 percent of the organizations in their 1986 study had PACs, while Kollman (1998) found that 64 percent of organizations in his 1998 research sponsored them.

Because interest group officers have strategic interests, there is reason to be concerned about the validity of the survey responses. Large-scale surveys of advocacy organizations have, however, been used to collect data in many of the most important studies of interest groups (Berry 1977; Heinz et al. 1993; Kollman 1998; Laumann and Knoke 1987; Schlozman and Tierney 1986; Walker 1991), and are credited with having contributed to “some of the greatest advances in the past decades of research on groups” (Baumgartner and Leech 1998: 12). Most centrally, the survey results show that officers’ responses are not biased in “desirable” directions. Instead, the data show a great deal of variation in levels of activity by policy issue, suggesting that officers were quite forthcoming.

Database

Using the information collected through the telephone survey, I created two data sets following the method used by Kollman (1998). In the first data set, the unit of analysis is the organization, with one record (row) for each of the 286 organizations surveyed. Arranging the data in this way allows me to analyze and compare the characteristics and activities of the organizations. In the second data set, there are four records for each organization -- one row for each of the four policy issues about which they have been asked, resulting in a total of 1144 cases (of which only the 712 cases are membership organizations are included in the analysis in this paper). Using the data arranged in this fashion, I am able to pool all the information about the policy issues to predict a range of dependent variables, distinguishing organizations’ levels of activity on each of the four policy issues.

Face-to-Face Interviews

In addition to collecting survey data, I conducted semi-structured, anonymous, face-to-face interviews with officials at 40 organizations between 22 March and 3 August, 2001. The interview responses supplement the survey data by providing a window into the nuances of how, why, and in what context organization officers make the decisions that they do about how to allocate resources. Because of their small number, the interviews and the quotes are not intended to be generalizable as such, but rather are used to illustrate and help to elaborate and explain the quantitative findings. Nonetheless, the statements that are quoted in the article manuscript can be taken as typical of trends in the general substance, tone, and tenor of interviews as a whole.

The breakdown of interviews by organization type is presented in Table A1 below. Interviewees were not randomly sampled. Instead, groups were selected to vary based on criteria such as size and policy areas. Nonetheless, the data in Table A1 demonstrate that the resulting number of organizations in each category does not diverge drastically from their relative numbers in the broader universe. I recruited approximately half of the subjects by sending thank you letters to the 286 survey respondents in which I requested follow-up interviews. The other half were recruited using a “snowball” sample generated through (1) recommendations from interviewees; (2) references from colleagues; (3) requests for interviews with officers whom I met at political events.

The questions on the semi-structured interview protocol were intended to gather more detailed information about issues that had been covered by survey questions, including questions about constituencies, coalition work, general policy activity, representation, and about choices of policy issues and advocacy tactics. The interviews also allowed me to ask respondents more detailed questions about the four policy issues from the survey, asking respondents, for example,

to compare their involvement in different issues and about their policy goals.

Among the questions that were asked systematically and that elicited several of the quotes used in this manuscript include the following ones:

1. In the past few years, has this organization been active around [Policy]?
 - a. [If not at all involved] Did the organization consider getting involved in [Policy].
 - b. [If yes] What made you decide not to?
 - c. [If no] Why do you think this was so?
2. [If active] How Active?
 - a. What made you decide to get involved, and how did you decide how involved to be?
 - b. What are your general policy goals when it comes to [Policy]?
 - c. How do you frame what is at stake when it comes to [Policy]?
 - d. How does this compare to the ways other organizations frame the issues associated with this policy?
 - e. What specific tactics have you employed in pursuing these goals?
3. Who or what groups would you say are most affected by [Policy]?
4. In thinking about which issues to pursue, to what extent and in what ways do you consider the following factors:
 - a. Which portions and the proportion of your constituency will be affected by an issue?
 - b. The proportion of your constituency that is interested in the issue?
 - c. How controversial you perceive the issue to be among the general public?

One benefit of open-ended interviews, of course, is that they sometimes stray from the script. While I asked these questions consistently, some of the most interesting insights came out of digressions. In addition, although in general I replicated the policy issues that had been used in the telephone survey, I also added or substituted issues that were tailored to the mission of the organization in question. In particular, I asked about additional disadvantaged-subgroup issues to test whether groups that might not be active on one disadvantaged-subgroup issue are active on another. For example, if an economic justice organization was not active on the designated disadvantaged-subgroup issue -- public funding for abortion -- I might ask about another disadvantaged-subgroup issue, such as restoring the public benefits that had been eliminated by the 1996 Immigration Reform and Control Act.

¹ Schlozman and Tierney's question was slightly broader, asking whether the group has "lawyers on staff." In addition, their study encompassed a sampling of all organized interests, including corporations, trade associations, unions, professional associations, civil rights groups, and citizens' groups.

Appendix B: Supplementary Tables

Table A1 Distribution of national advocacy organizations (nationally and in samples), by organization type

Organization Type	<u>Organizations in the United States</u>		<u>Sample</u>		<u>Membership Organizations</u>		<u>Face-to-Face Interviews</u>	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Asian Pacific American	32	4.5	13	4.5	7	3.9	3	7.5
Black/African American	40	5.5	20	7	15	8.4	4	10
Latino/Hispanic	43	6.3	16	5.6	12	6.7	2	5
Native American/American Indian	35	5.3	13	4.5	6	3.4	1	2.5
Civil rights -- General	70	10.1	33	11.4	18	10.1	5	12.5
Immigrants' Rights	8	1.1	6	2.1	4	2.2	1	2.5
Labor	175	24.6	42	14.7	32	17.8	4	10
Economic justice	153	21	66	23.1	31	17.4	8	20
Public interest	21	3	11	3.8	8	4.5	4	10
Women's rights/feminism ^a	137	18.6	66	23.1	45	25.3	8	20
Total	714	100	286	100	178	100	40	100

Sources: The database of organizations was compiled by author based on information in the following print and online directories: the *Electra Pages* (electrapages.com); the *Encyclopedia of Associations* (Gale Research 2000); the *Leadership Conference on Civil Rights* (lccr.org); the *National Directory of Asian Pacific American Organizations* (Organization of Chinese Americans 1999); the *National Directory of Hispanic Organizations* (Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Inc. 1999); *Public Interest Profiles* (Foundation for Public Affairs 1999); *Washington Information Directory* (CQ Press 1998); *Washington Representatives* (Columbia Books 1999); and *Who's Who in Washington Nonprofit Groups* (Congressional Quarterly 1995); the *Women of Color Organizations and Projects National Directory* (Women of Color Resource Center 1998).

^a Includes women of color, reproductive rights, and women's health organizations.

Table A2a Correlations among variables

	Level of Activity	Majority Issue	Disadvantaged Subgroup Issue	Advantaged Subgroup Issue	Members Affected X Majority	Members Affected X Disadvantaged Subgroup	Members Affected X Advantaged subgroup
Majority Issue	0.308*						
Disadvantaged-subgroup Issue	-0.129*	-0.333*					
Advantaged-subgroup Issue	0.227*	-0.333*	-0.333*				
Members Affected X Majority	0.336*	0.908*	-0.299*	-0.299*			
Members Affected X Disadvantaged-subgroup	-0.046	-0.287*	0.880*	-0.287*	-0.257*		
Members Affected X Advantaged-subgroup	0.255*	-0.302*	-0.302*	0.924*	-0.271*	-0.260*	
Members Affected	0.159*	0.055	-0.223*	0.033	0.272*	0.040	0.208*
Members Concerned	0.297*	0.165*	-0.132*	0.053	0.243*	0.012	0.149*
Members Agree	0.233*	0.147*	-0.051	0.033	0.186*	0.045	0.094*
Public Agrees	0.051	0.071	-0.096*	-0.045	0.098*	-0.044	-0.012
Controversial	-0.035	-0.080*	-0.015	0.005	-0.039	-0.013	0.031
Primary Niche	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.059	-0.018	-0.007
Secondary Niche	-0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017	0.011	0.017
Majority Niche	0.239*	0.871*	-0.290*	-0.290*	0.728*	-0.249*	-0.263*
Advantaged-subgroup Niche	0.207*	-0.290*	-0.290*	0.871*	-0.261*	-0.249*	0.796*
Disadvantaged-subgroup Niche	-0.151*	-0.306*	0.919*	-0.306*	-0.275*	0.820*	-0.278*
Agenda Salience	0.156*	0.450*	0.109*	-0.291*	0.362*	0.125*	-0.274
Number of Members (in thousands)	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.015	0.047	0.027*
Percent of budget to advocacy	0.012	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.033	0.003	0.002
Number of paid staff	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.052	0.025

* Relationship is significant at $p < .10$.

Table A2b Correlations among Variables

	Members Affected	Members Concerned	Members Agree	Public Agrees	Controversial
Members Concerned	0.499*				
Members Agree	0.344*	0.416*			
Public Agrees	0.246*	0.271*	0.329*		
Controversial	0.133*	0.091*	0.004	0.029	
Primary Niche	-0.096*	-0.033	0.126*	0.066	-0.103*
Secondary Niche	0.053	0.125*	0.033	-0.020	0.014
Majority Niche	-0.037	0.104*	0.140*	0.068	-0.108*
Advantaged-subgroup Niche	0.013	0.028	0.056	-0.051	-0.040
Disadvantaged-subgroup Niche	-0.194*	-0.099*	-0.061	-0.094*	-0.003
Agenda Salience	-0.100*	0.100*	0.017	0.004	-0.095*
Number of Members (in thousands)	0.122*	0.002	0.030	0.140*	-0.053
Percent of budget to advocacy	-0.100*	-0.035	0.046	0.052	0.010
Number of paid staff	0.115*	-0.024	0.073	0.133*	-0.008

* Relationship is significant at $p < .10$.

Table A2c: Correlations among variables

	Primary Niche	Secondary Niche	Majority Niche	Advantaged Subgroup Niche	Disadvantaged Subgroup Niche	Agenda Salience	Number of Members (in thousands)	Percent of budget to advocacy
Secondary Niche	0.418*							
Majority Niche	0.246*	0.103*						
Advantaged-subgroup Niche	0.246*	0.103*	-0.253*					
Disadvantaged-subgroup Niche	0.082*	0.197*	-0.267*	-0.267*				
Agenda Salience	0.058	0.165*	0.539*	-0.213*	0.192*			
Number of Members (in thousands)	0.124*	0.080*	0.031	0.031	0.016	-0.009		
Percent of budget to advocacy	0.054	-0.199*	0.013	0.013	-0.040	-0.031	-0.021	
Number of paid staff	0.220*	0.086*	0.054	0.054	0.017	-0.049	0.471*	-0.080*

* Relationship is significant at $p < .10$.

Table A3: Collinearity Diagnostics

Variable	VIF	Tolerance
Majority Issue	24.64	0.04
Advantaged Subgroup Issue	22.05	0.05
Disadvantaged Subgroup Issue	20.51	0.05
Members Affected X Majority	16.29	0.06
Members Affected X Advantaged Subgroup	15.95	0.06
Members Affected X Disadvantaged Subgroup	11.57	0.09
Disadvantaged Subgroup Niche	10.24	0.10
Majority Niche	9.77	0.10
Advantaged Subgroup Niche	7.66	0.13
Members Affected	6.6	0.15
Primary Niche	2.91	0.34
Agenda Saliency	2.19	0.46
Members Concerned	1.76	0.57
Secondary Niche	1.7	0.59
Number of paid staff	1.57	0.64
Number of Members (in thousands)	1.53	0.65
Members Agree	1.41	0.71
Public Agrees	1.25	0.80
Percent of budget to advocacy	1.11	0.90
Controversial	1.09	0.92
Mean VIF	7.45	

Table A4: Predicting levels of activity on policy issues using ordered logit and the unmodified dependent variable both with and without control for overall activity, compared with model using two-stage least squares

	Ordered Logit Models				2SLS Model**	
	Includes control for overall activity		No control for overall activity		Coeff.	RSE
	Coeff.	RSE	Coeff.	RSE		
Constant					-0.520	0.635
Intersectionality Variables						
Majority issue	0.135	0.921	-0.228	0.820	0.313	0.651
Advantaged-subgroup issue	1.139	0.907	0.815	0.845	0.656	0.595
Disadvantaged-subgroup issue	0.072	0.814	-0.350	0.788	-0.330	0.540
Members affected X majority	0.518*	0.212	0.473*	0.196	0.296*	0.133
Members affected X advantaged-subgroup	0.177	0.208	0.134	0.191	0.139	0.126
Members affected X disadvantaged-subgroup	0.602*	0.228	0.550*	0.216	0.443*	0.140
Strategic Variables						
Members affected	-0.292*	0.173	-0.292*	0.170	-0.194*	0.107
Members concerned	0.673*	0.116	0.736*	0.116	0.423*	0.073
Members agree	0.290*	0.118	0.317*	0.119	0.127*	0.072
Public agrees	0.209*	0.114	0.250*	0.118	0.079	0.083
Controversial	0.052	0.089	0.031	0.091	-0.018	0.056
Political Opportunity Variables						
Primary Niche	0.001	0.003	-0.002	0.003	0.001	0.002
Secondary Niche	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.002
Majority Niche	-0.001	0.005	0.001	0.004	-0.002	0.003
Advantaged-subgroup Niche	0.002	0.005	0.003	0.004	0.000	0.003
Disadvantaged-subgroup Niche	-0.009*	0.004	-0.005	0.004	-0.005*	0.003
Agenda salience ^a						
Political Opportunity Variables						
Number of members (in thousands)	0.002*	0.001	0.003*	0.001	0.001*	0.001
Percent of budget to advocacy	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.004	0.001	0.002
Number of paid staff	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.001
Activity on other three issues	0.656*	0.125			0.476	0.249
LL at convergence		-633.27		-652.36		
Chi-square (DF)		199.63*		196.54*	F (DF)	134* (21)
Pseudo R ²		0.18		0.15	R ²	0.42
N		512		512		463

Sources: SNESJO; ^a *Congressional Quarterly*; the *New York Times* “Supreme Court Roundup;” the *Congressional Record*; and the *Federal Register*. Note: Cases represent the level of one organization’s activity on one of the four issues about which they were asked in the SNESJO. The dependent variable uses responses to the survey question: “Please tell me, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not active, and 5 is very active, how active has your organization been on each of the following policy issues in the past ten years?” Respondents were asked about four policy issues corresponding to the four issue types in the policy typology. Universal issues are the excluded category. As the dependent variable is coded 1-5, a positive sign on a coefficient indicates an increase in activity, while a negative sign indicates a decrease. *Relationship is

significant at $p < .01$. ** Activity on other three issues was instrumented using measures of (1) the level of importance ascribed to “influencing national public policy” as part of an organization’s mandate and activities; (2) their self-placement on a 1-10 scale of ideology (where 1 is very conservative and 10 is very liberal); (3) the number of other organizations that are members of the organization; (4) whether the organization has lawyers on staff; (5) whether the organization is registered to lobby members of Congress; (6) whether the organization regularly employs registered lobbyists in Washington, D.C.; and (7) whether the organizations has any political action committees. All of these measures were selected because they should affect organizations overall levels of policy activity, but should have no direct effect on their decisions about whether to take action on a particular policy issue. They are all uncorrelated with the residuals from the OLS regression model. The adjusted R^2 for the first stage equation is 0.23.

Table A5: Ordered logit results excluding welfare reform (compared with the model that includes all issues)

	<u>Excludes Welfare</u>		<u>Includes All Issues</u>	
	Coeff.	RSE	Coeff.	RSE
<i>Intersectionality Variables</i>				
Majority issue	1.183	1.101	1.094	0.979
Advantaged-subgroup issue	1.849*	0.991	1.797*	0.927
Disadvantaged-subgroup issue	0.465	0.892	0.456	0.802
Members affected X majority	0.582*	0.227	0.568*	0.206
Members affected X advantaged-subgroup	0.259	0.210	0.247	0.208
Members affected X disadvantaged-subgroup	0.632*	0.222	0.629*	0.201
<i>Strategic Variables</i>				
Members affected	-0.351*	0.164	-0.335*	0.154
Members concerned	0.419*	0.092	0.373*	0.087
Members agree	0.107	0.115	0.178*	0.101
Public agrees	0.000	0.103	0.001	0.091
Controversial	0.044	0.080	-0.001	0.071
<i>Political Opportunity Variables</i>				
Primary Niche	0.007*	0.003	0.006*	0.003
Secondary Niche	-0.000	0.002	0.001	0.002
Majority Niche	-0.014*	0.005	-0.012*	0.005
Advantaged-subgroup Niche	-0.004	0.005	-0.004	0.005
Disadvantaged-subgroup Niche	-0.013*	0.004	-0.014*	0.004
Agenda salience ^a	0.001*	0.000	0.001*	0.000
<i>Political Opportunity Variables</i>				
Number of members (in thousands)	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Percent of budget to advocacy	0.002	0.003	-0.001	0.003
Number of paid staff	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001
LL at convergence		-0.524.86		-618.854
Chi-square (DF)		131.21*(2)		147.40*** (20)
Pseudo R ²		0.13		0.13
N		432		507

Sources: SNESJO; ^a *Congressional Quarterly*; the *New York Times* “Supreme Court Roundup;” the *Congressional Record*; and the *Federal Register*. Note: Cases represent the level of one organization’s activity on one of the four issues about which they were asked in the SNESJO. The dependent variable uses responses to the survey question: “Please tell me, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not active, and 5 is very active, how active has your organization been on each of the following policy issues in the past ten years?” Respondents were asked about four policy issues corresponding to the four issue types in the policy typology. Universal issues are the excluded category. As the dependent variable is coded 1-5, a positive sign on a coefficient indicates an increase in activity, while a negative sign indicates a decrease. *Relationship is significant at $p < .01$.

Table A6: Predicted probabilities of activity by issue type

	Mean (SE)	Universal Issue	Majority Issue	Advantaged- subgroup Issue	Disadvantaged- subgroup Issue
Probability of being inactive	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.01
	0.32	0.11	0.16	0.06	0.09
	0.43	0.07	0.46	0.06	0.37
	0.15	0.08	0.30	0.08	0.41
Probability of being very active	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.12

References

- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Beth L. Leech. 1998. *Basic Interests: the Importance of Groups in Politics and Political Science*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. 1977. *Lobbying for the People*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berry, Jeffrey M., David F. Arons, Gary D. Bass, Matthew F. Carter, and Kent E. Portney. n.d. *Surveying Nonprofits: A Methods Handbook*. Washington, DC: Nonprofit Sector Research Fund, The Aspen Institute.
- Columbia Books. 1999. *Washington Representatives*. Washington, DC: Columbia Books.
- Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Inc. 1999. *National Directory of Hispanic Organizations*. Washington, DC: Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Inc.
- Congressional Quarterly. 1995. *Who's Who in Washington Nonprofit Groups*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
- CQ Press. 1998. *Washington Information Directory*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Foundation for Public Affairs. 1999. *Public Interest Profiles*. Washington, DC: Foundation for Public Affairs.
- Gale Research. 2000. *Encyclopedia of Associations*. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Heinz, John P., Edward O. Lauman, Robert L. Nelson, and Robert H. Salisbury. 1993. *The Hollow Core: Private Interests in National policy making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Knoke, David and Richard Adams. 1984. *National Association Study*.
- Kollman, Ken. 1998. *Outside Lobbying: Public Opinion and Interest Group Strategies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Laumann, Edward O. and David Knoke. 1987. *The Organizational State: Social Choice in*

- National Policy Domains*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Minkoff, Debra, and Jon Agnone. 2003. "Protest Potential in the U.S. Social Movement Sector"
Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Minkoff, Debra. 1997. "Producing Social Capital: National Social Movements and Civil Society." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40(5): 606-19.
- Organization of Chinese Americans. 1999. *Asian Pacific American Organizations*. Washington, DC: Organization of Chinese Americans.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman and John T. Tierney. 1986. *Organized Interests and American Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Strolovitch, Dara Z. Forthcoming. *Affirmative Advocacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walker, Jack L. 1991. *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Women of Color Resource Center. 1998. *Women of Color Organizations and Projects*. Berkeley, CA: Women of Color Resource Center.