

## **Congressional and Presidential Effects on the Demand for Lobbying**

Frank R. Baumgartner, Penn State University, [frankb@psu.edu](mailto:frankb@psu.edu)  
Heather A. Larsen-Price, University of Memphis, [hlsnprc@memphis.edu](mailto:hlsnprc@memphis.edu)  
Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University, [leech@polisci.rutgers.edu](mailto:leech@polisci.rutgers.edu)  
Paul Rutledge, Penn State University, [per126@psu.edu](mailto:per126@psu.edu)

### **Abstract**

We update and confirm results from an earlier paper by Leech et al. showing substantial “demand effects” on the mobilization of lobbyists in Washington. The number of lobbyists active in a given issue area is driven not just by social mobilizations and economic trends, but also by government activities themselves. There is evidence for rent-seeking behaviors as well: the more spending, the more lobbyists. However, the effect of spending is much smaller than that of congressional interest as reflected in the number of hearings. Much lobbying is in response to regulations, not spending. We augment our analysis by considering indicators of presidential activities. Controlling for hearings activity, we find that neither State of the Union Address statements nor executive orders increase lobbying activity. Government activity of all kinds stimulates interest-group mobilization, but presidential actions affect lobbying activities only when they are followed by congressional action.

## **Introduction**

Social movements, the mobilization of professional communities associated with economic growth and diversity, and simple rent seeking have long been seen as important explanations for the growth of government.<sup>1</sup> Economic and social groups have mobilized in various areas of political life, often demanding new government programs, services, and protections. In a recent article, Leech and several colleagues showed that the reverse is also true (Leech et al. 2005; for extensions to the state level see Gray et al. 2005, Lowery et al. 2004). As government has become involved in a wider range of activities in diverse areas of the economy, interest-group mobilization has also been stimulated. Groups respond to the mobilization of government, just as government responds to the mobilization of groups. Walker argued that group mobilization was largely due to three sources—patrons, professions, and social movements—and he developed the idea of patronage to include direct government inducements to form or maintain voluntary associations (1983, 1991). The demand effects of government on interest groups push Walker’s patronage idea a little further.

Government stimulates the growth and mobilization of interest groups not only by direct subsidy and contracts, as Walker demonstrated, but also and on a much larger scale simply by expanding its range of activities. This includes government spending, as groups mobilize in response to increased opportunities to gain grants or contracts. Campbell (2005), for example, showed that the Social Security program dramatically transformed the patterns of political mobilization of the entire elderly generation, significantly increasing their interest and engagement in politics, especially among those most dependent on their Social Security income.

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation through grants SBR–0111611 and 0111224. All data and related files used in this paper are available at <http://lobby.la.psu.edu/related.html>.

So it is clear that spending can affect social mobilization. But the larger effects go far beyond direct federal spending. Much more important are regulatory activities of all kinds. These encourage some groups to mobilize to protect the government rules that help them and stimulate mobilization of other groups seeking to reduce the level of government control in a given area. The more activity, the more groups of all kinds have reason to get involved in the policy process. Increased government activity in a broader range of economic and social sectors therefore has a stimulating effect on the interest-group community as a whole. In this paper we update and expand on the analysis conducted by Leech and colleagues, confirming their results with a longer time-series relating to the effects of congressional activities on group mobilization and adding new indicators not previously discussed in the literature concerning presidential activities. The results strongly support a demand-side theory of group mobilization, emphasizing the effect of government activity on interest-group activities.

Further, we show important inter-branch dynamics in this process as presidential activities, measured alone, have a strong mobilizing effect on groups. However, controlling for congressional behavior and spending, presidential activities have either a negative effect (in the case of statements in the State of the Union address) or no effect (for executive orders). This suggests that presidential activities must be followed by significant congressional follow-through in order to have the hypothesized effect on groups. Typically, this is indeed the case, as congressional activities are often correlated with presidential priorities.

As in the Leech et al. paper, we link data collected from federal Lobbying Disclosure Reports to indicators of congressional and presidential activities drawn from the Policy Agendas Project ([www.policyagendas.org](http://www.policyagendas.org)). The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 requires lobbyists to report their activities in each of 74 specific issue areas. Leech et al. demonstrated that 56 of

these issue areas could be linked to the topic coding system used in the Policy Agendas Project, covering about 85 percent of the lobbying reports. We follow this same procedure here, updating the earlier analysis from just four time points to 14 six-month periods from 1996 to 2003. Since the publication of the earlier article, new data resources relating to presidential activities have also become available through the Policy Agendas Project, and we make use of these as well. These include a summary of the topic discussed in each sentence of the president's annual State of the Union Address and a dataset consisting of every executive order of the President. These data resources are coded by topic category using the identical system as the congressional hearings, so we link them to the Lobby Disclosure Reports in a straightforward manner. We provide further detail on the datasets and measures as needed below.

### **Congressional Hearings and the Demand for Lobbying**

Congressional hearings can be used as a general indicator of the intensity of interest or activity in an issue area. Hearings may relate to legislation, to bureaucratic oversight, or simply to information-gathering. In any case, the number of hearings on a given topic in a given year is an indicator of the degree of congressional interest. Interest is rarely neutral; it means that Congress is actively considering some new legislation, overseeing the activities of a bureaucratic agency, or simply directing attention to a problematic policy area. Congress may be debating a proposed bill, pushing an agency to revise its policies, or hearing from citizens, corporations, and interest groups about the need for action in response to some problem. Since hearings are an indicator of congressional involvement in a policy area, we expect that hearings should have a driving effect on lobbying activity—the more hearings, the greater the number of lobbyists who will register. Note that speaking or testifying at the hearings themselves will not have any direct impact on our dependent variable. Lobbyists are not required to register if their activities are limited to

testifying. Rather, the increases in lobbying occur because hearings indicate the level of government activity in the issue area more generally.

(Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here)

First, we replicate the results shown by Leech and her colleagues. Table 1a shows these results. Models 1 through 4 in Table 1a replicate the original findings virtually exactly.<sup>2</sup> Model 5 then drops the variable for firms from the original model. The number of firms active in the same area of the economy was included in the original analysis as a measure of social or economic supply, since sectors with greater economic activity might generate more lobbying activity. The original analysis showed that this variable was insignificant in its impact when previous lobbying activity was included, as Model 4 indicates. As inclusion of the firms variable caused a significant loss of data because the data were not available for all 56 issue areas and cannot be collected for each of the 14 six-month time periods we include in our extended analysis, we omit this variable in our extension of the original work. As Model 5 shows, there is no substantively important difference in the results between Model 4 and Model 5, so we proceed without the firms variable.

Part B of Table 1 presents the full analysis of the extended time-series now available. The first model shows that 20 additional hearings in any issue area (that is, about one standard deviation) can be expected to result in about 36 more groups registering to lobby in that area. Controlling for the level of federal spending in the issue area causes the number of observations to drop substantially (because we do not have spending data for each of the 56 issue areas where

---

<sup>2</sup> The Policy Agendas Project released updated budgetary figures since the original Leech et al. article was published. Using the new Agendas Project budget data, figures are reported in 2003 dollars rather than 2000 dollars as in the original. In addition, a small number of budgetary categories were adjusted in the new dataset. None of this affects the replication of the original results in any significant manner. Just one coefficient shifts by even one tenth of one decimal place: In model 3 of Table 1a, the coefficient for hearings is 2.64; it was 2.63 in the original.

we have hearings and lobby registration information), but the substantive impact remains virtually the same: 40 more groups for every 20 hearings, and a small effect for spending. For each *trillion* dollars in spending, we would expect to see an increase of about 40 registered interest groups. This effect is statistically significant now that it is based on many more observations than in the earlier published analysis. However, overall federal spending across the entire budget was less than \$2.5 trillion in 2003, so this effect within any given issue area would substantively be related to at most only a few more group registrations. Finally, Model 3 is the most appropriate and accurate model, controlling as it does for the number of groups registered to lobby in the previous time period. Here we see significant coefficients both for hearings and for spending. Comparing the results from Parts A and B of Table 1 shows that our extended time coverage confirms the earlier analysis. Some of the coefficients change in size but all the effects are now significant and the analysis is based on a much larger empirical base.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The level of inertia in lobby registrations is extraordinary. Leech et al. showed this in their Tables 1 and 2 and in the related Appendix tables which showed that there was great variation in the numbers of registrations from area to area, but little change over time. For organizations lobbying on their own behalf, a simple regression of the number of registrations predicted by the number in the previous time period (with a constant term) shows an  $R^2$  of 0.98. For organizations lobbying on the behalf of clients, there is greater variation; the simple regression produces an  $R^2$  of 0.84. Simple plots of the number of registrations at  $\text{Time}_t$  with that at  $\text{Time}_{t-1}$  confirm that the data fall almost perfectly on a straight line, with just a small amount of variation around the line. For registrations by lobbying firms, as the numbers suggest, we see some more significant variation around that line. These characteristics suggest several things. First, organizations lobbying on their own behalf register in a given issue area because they have interests there and they are highly likely to remain interested, and registered, in subsequent periods. Second, organizations with fleeting or temporary interests in a field where they are not routinely involved will hire a firm to represent them in that area rather than establish their own presence there. Third, the small amount of remaining variance over time makes it very difficult statistically to find significant coefficients, once lagged registrations are included. Finally, there is greater statistical opportunity to explain the behavior of paid lobbyists rather than organizations lobbying on their own behalf, since there is greater period-to-period variation there. In our results, we find significant results in each case despite the highly inertial characteristics of our data.

Table 2 shows an identical series of results for hired contract lobbyists rather than for organizations lobbying on their own behalf, as in Table 1. These results are stronger than those for the groups analyzed in Table 1 because there are greater numbers of contract lobbyists, with more variation from area to area and from time period to time period. In any case, the results largely reconfirm the original analysis but put these findings on a much more substantial empirical footing.<sup>4</sup>

### **Presidential Impact on Lobbying**

Presidential statements from State of the Union addresses and executive orders both can be used as indicators of presidential interest or activity in an issue area. The number of statements on a topic in a given State of the Union address is used as one indicator of presidential activity. In State of the Union addresses, presidents list a number of agenda items for congressional consideration. While the argument has been made that the State of the Union address does not provide an exhaustive expression of the president's agenda (Rudalevige 2002), the address is generally viewed as a good indicator of presidential priorities. Linkages between the articulation of presidential priorities in this yearly, televised speech and changes in the public agenda have been thoroughly investigated. Presidents are able to set the public agenda, in the short run, in a limited number of policy areas, as well as in the long run for foreign policy issues (Cohen 1995;

---

<sup>4</sup> We do not replicate the analyses presented in Table 4 in the original publication. These used the number of hearings in the previous ten years rather than only in the contemporaneous six-month period. Replication of these results showed that the models were largely confirmed. However, with 14 time points rather than only 4 as in the earlier paper, the results were not significant in the model with a lagged dependent variable. This is because the number of hearings in the previous ten years is almost the same for each successive six-month period. (If one thinks of a ten-year period consisting of 20 six-month windows, moving forward in time, the data are identical for 18 of the 20 windows, changing only by replacing one old window with one new one in each period. These differences are never very substantial.) The redundancy of including both this variable as well as the lagged dependent variable makes little sense. Findings were highly significant, as in the original, without the lagged dependent variable.

Hill 1998). Existing research suggests that these annual calls to Congress to act on various proposals or policy areas should exert an impact on lobbying activity. Presidents often call on representatives of interest groups to serve on advisory commissions that provide legitimacy for presidential policy positions (Chin and Lindquist 2004), and organized interests with close ties to the administration are called on to help provide support for those positions by lobbying Congress and otherwise mobilizing around the issue (Peterson 1992). Especially this latter sort of interest-group activity should be reflected by increases in the number of lobbying disclosure reports.

The number of executive orders issued on a given topic in a given year is a second indicator of presidential activity. Research indicates that executive orders have gradually evolved from a primarily administrative tool to a policymaking tool; they have become a means for presidents to take control of certain policy areas by acting first and relying on the inability of Congress to respond quickly and avoid its collective action problems (Mayer 2001). As Congress becomes more fragmented, presidents have more freedom to act unilaterally and issue more significant executive orders (Howell 2003). In recent times, presidents issue executive orders across a wide array of policy areas; many of these orders have real policy implications. We expect that this expansion of power, with this unilateral policy-making tool, will lead to an increase in lobbying activity as agency officials begin to act to implement these orders. We therefore should see an increase in lobbying disclosure reports in an issue area following an executive order in that area. One caveat to our analysis of presidential activities is that the greatest emphasis in the Lobby Disclosure Act is on congressional activities. Virtually all congressional lobbying activity must be reported, whereas the definition of “covered officials” within the executive branch includes only more senior members, down to the level of undersecretaries, assistant directors, and members of commissions like the Federal Mine Safety



and Health Review Commission. As a result, much routine contact between lobbyists and staff members in executive agencies need not be reported in the Lobby Disclosure Reports we use here. Nonetheless, executive orders requiring agency action would virtually always include actions by agency officials in top policymaking positions. Interest-group activities and their lobbying reports should reflect that tendency.

Presidential statements in the State of the Union typically are related to subsequent legislative activity (that is, in the same years as the speech, which is always given in January). Correlations between State of the Union attention, Executive Orders and congressional hearings and statutes across each of the 18 major topic areas of the Policy Agendas Project are presented in Table 3. The data cover the entire post-war period and are not limited to only the 56 issue-areas in the lobbying data that we have. Rather, these show the general correspondence between presidential and congressional activities, across all topic areas. There are 18 correlations listed in Table 3 because each shows the correspondence from 1953 to 2003 between the number of presidential activities and the number of congressional activities per year across the major topic categories of the Policy Agendas Project. We combine the “Defense” and “International Affairs” categories from the Agendas Project.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

Three things are apparent in Table 3. First, statements in the State of the Union and executive orders are both correlated with subsequent congressional action, in some issue areas. There are eight significant correlations between statements and hearings and seven between orders and hearings. In most areas the correlations are more moderate and are not statistically significant. Second, there is great variation from issue to issue. Only three issue areas produce significant correlations for both statements and orders with hearings. Third, presidential

activities are virtually uncorrelated with statutes. In fact, there are only two significant correlations between presidential activities and actual lawmaking in Congress, a number that could easily occur by chance across the 38 correlations reported. (And, as one of those two significant correlations is negative and the other positive, the chance hypothesis must be taken very seriously.) In other words, presidential activities are sometimes related to hearings activity in Congress, but they have virtually no direct correspondence with lawmaking activities. By comparison, the correspondence between congressional activities, as measured by hearings, and lawmaking is positive and significant for half of the major topic areas.

All this points to the idea that presidential activities may or may not be related to congressional activities—it apparently depends on the issue area, the types of activities, and on other factors. Further, presidential actions, if they are to result in lawmaking activity, must be followed up by substantial congressional activity; lawmaking is a congressional function, after all. We present the information from Table 3 not to propose a general model of inter-branch relations. Our simple correlations are obviously not close to such a thing, and a full model of these dynamics is well beyond the scope of this paper. The important point here is simply that the president and Congress may work on similar or on divergent agendas. This has a dramatic effect on lobbyists, as one might expect. The next section demonstrates this.

We turn now to an analysis of the ways in which presidential and congressional activities affect the mobilization of lobbyists. Tables 4 and 5 present the results.

(Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here)

Table 4 presents the full analysis of the extended time-series for organizations with the addition of the two indicators of presidential activity. The bivariate relationship between presidential statements and group activity is shown in the first model. With no control variables,

statements appear to exert a strong, significant impact on lobbying activity. In model 2 executive orders produce an even stronger impact, with a higher number of groups registering to lobby following executive orders in a given area. When hearings are not included in the models, presidential activities matter. In models 3 and 4 we include congressional hearings, and this typically has the effect of reducing the presidential variables to insignificance. Adding budgetary spending to the models, in models 5 and 6 (greatly reducing the number of observations), we find again that presidential statements and orders are insignificant. Finally, in model 7, our full model including both presidential indicators, hearings, spending, and a lagged dependent variable shows that hearings, spending, and the number of groups registered in the previous time period maintain their significant coefficients while presidential activities have no impact. The findings for budgets, hearings, and lagged group registrations are robust to the addition of the presidential variables, quite similar in magnitude to those reported in the final model in Table 1b. Presidential variables, on the other hand, appear to have no impact once these congressional variables are also included.

Table 5 shows the identical series of results for the presidential indicators and hired contract lobbyists rather than for organizations lobbying on their own behalf. This series of models produce findings that are quite similar to those produced in Table 4. Again, in both models 1 and 2, the two presidential indicators are highly correlated with lobbying activity. In fact, the impacts of both statements and orders are stronger with contract lobbyists. This is because the number of contract lobbyists active in an issue area is much more variable than is the number of organizational lobbyists. It takes months or years to set up an organizational office and hire new staff lobbyists; a contract lobbyist can be put on retainer in a matter of hours or days. Models 3 through 6 show similar instability in the impact of presidential variables as

controls for congressional hearings and spending are included. State of the Union attention is again signed negatively, as in Table 4. In this model, with greater remaining variance once the lagged number of registrations is included, this variable is statistically significant. Model 7 presents the full model with both presidential indicators and the lagged dependent variable added to the controls. Statements retain a negative, significant impact while executive orders remain insignificant.<sup>5</sup>

These results indicate that there is something quite different about the statements from the State of the Union in comparison to the two other measures of government activity. This notion is apparent in light of the negative, significant coefficient for statements in the series of models for lobbying firms. Why would we expect presidential statements in the annual address to have no, or a negative, effect on lobbying activity? One explanation is the nature of the rhetoric employed in the yearly address. If these presidential statements are largely symbolic, with little legislative proposal or executive order follow-up on these issues, then they may not instigate lobbying activity in light of the low level of opportunity or threat. As shown in Table 3, congressional hearings and presidential statements are significantly correlated only for less than half of all major issue areas. Therefore, if presidents spend a good deal of time speaking about a topic, but Congress does not follow up, and there is no spending in that area, then all concerned may recognize that this is only a symbolic speech action, and lobbying in that issue area is apparently depressed compared to what it would be considering the number of hearings and the amount of spending in the area. The significant negative coefficient for State of the Union statements in the final model in Table 5 leads to this interpretation.

---

<sup>5</sup> We also modeled these relationships using an index of governmental activity that combined actions by Congress and the President. The index provides similar results but no improvement in the fit of the model above using hearings alone, so we do not include it here.

Executive orders, in contrast to State of the Union speeches, are actions of policymaking rather than persuasion. They force immediate actions by agencies and sometimes by Congress. Since executive orders—like congressional lawmaking—often must be interpreted by an agency before they can be fully implemented, they elicit additional lobbying by interest groups. In our analysis here, lobbying of agency officials is somewhat undercounted because of the nature of the lobbying disclosure reports. It may be that with a more exhaustive measure of agency lobbying, executive orders would be seen to have more of an impact. However, it seems more likely that the negative finding we see for executive orders is because congressional activity is already controlled for. Presidential activities matter, certainly. But they are often filtered through congressional action.

The different findings for State of the Union addresses and executive orders may be because the State of the Union speech is aimed at the public and at Congress, rather than at agency personnel. It is meant to set the public and congressional agendas by bringing high levels of attention to some issues rather than others. In this speech the president often demands action on given topics, declares his own priorities. However, we found no independent effect from the State of the Union in Table 4, and a negative effect in Table 5. Interest groups are mobilized not by the symbolic actions of the president through the State of the Union, but the concrete activities of Congress as indicated by congressional hearings. If presidential activities lead to increased congressional activities, then we see substantial interest-group mobilization. If the president's actions are not followed up by congressional hearings, then there follows no significant interest-group mobilization. Presidential activity which is seen as purely symbolic may even depress lobbying mobilization.

## **Conclusion**

Leech et al. (2005) argued that group mobilization is often in response to, rather than the cause of, government activities. While social and economic mobilization affect the development of the interest-group universe, so too does government activity itself. Recent work has confirmed and extended these findings. Baumgartner, Gray, and Lowery (2006) found that congressional hearings stimulated subsequent interest group mobilization in the state capitals. That is, even controlling for state legislative activities, actions in Congress caused groups to mobilize in those same issue areas in the 50 states. Clearly, federal government activities send strong cues to interested constituencies. In response to increased levels of federal activities, affected interests mobilize to fight off the new federal incursions, move to encourage the activity, or attempt to modify the proposals before they are completed. In any case, we see that state action affects group mobilization, not only the reverse.

In this paper we confirm and extend the original findings by Leech et al. in three ways. One is simply by adding additional time points and more observations, showing more robust and stronger findings than in the original. With a substantial number of additional observations now available, we show that the first findings are clearly robust. Second, we clarified the earlier model by dropping the long-term hearings variable where a lagged dependent variable was also used. Third, we have explored the impact of presidential involvement. Our treatment here is certainly not the last word on this topic. Our measure of lobbying activity is more accurate for congressional lobbying activities than it is for presidential or executive branch lobbying. We have not presented a full model of presidential–legislative relations. But we have found some intriguing results suggesting that presidential activities affect interest-group mobilization only to the extent to which they are filtered through the impact of the president on Congress. When congressional actions are controlled for, presidential activities have no additional effect.

Almost 70 years ago Ernest Griffith (1939) noted the importance of communities of professionals in and around government dealing with the many details of public policy. His idea of “policy whirlpools” became part of the standard understanding of the policymaking process, and remains relevant today. Over 50 years ago, David Truman’s (1951) view of the mobilization of interests through social disruptions generated a new view of the dynamics of social mobilization and interest-group activity in America. Since this time scholars from Olson (1965) to Salisbury (1984 and Heinz et al. 1993), to Walker (1983, 1991) have made this story more complete. More recently a number of scholars have addressed the impact of large new government programs on the development of citizen mobilization surrounding those issues. These studies have focused on war-related pensions (Skocpol, 1992), the social security program (Campbell, 2005), and the GI Bill (Mettler, 2005). In this paper, like those that have preceded it (Leech et al. 2005 and Baumgartner, Gray, and Lowery 2006), we add to this growing perspective. Group mobilization affects government growth, to be sure. Government activities affect groups as well.

## **References**

- Baumgartner, Frank R., Virginia Gray, and David Lowery. 2006. Congressional Influence on State Lobbying Activity. Paper under review.
- Campbell, Andrea L. 2005. *How Policies Make Citizens: Senior Political Activism and the American Welfare State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chin, Michelle, and Eric Lindquist. 2004. Presidential Management of Interest Group Participation in Federal Advisory Committees. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia.

- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 1995. Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda. *American Journal of Political Science* 39:87-107.
- Griffith, Ernest S. 1939. *The Impasse of Democracy*. New York: Harrison-Hilton.
- Heinz, John P., Edward O. Laumann, Robert L. Nelson, and Robert H. Salisbury. 1993. *The Hollow Core: Private Interests in National Policymaking*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hill, Kim Quaile. 1998. The Policy Agendas of the President and the Mass Public: A Research Validation and Extension. *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (4):1328-1334.
- Howell, William. 2003. *Power Without Persuasion: The Politics of Direct Presidential Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gray, Virginia, David Lowery, Matthew Fellowes, and Jennifer Anderson. 2005. "Legislative Agendas and Interest Advocacy." *American Politics Research* 33 (3):404-34.
- Lowery, David, Virginia Gray, Matthew Fellowes, and Jennifer Anderson. 2004. "Living in the Moment: Lags, Leads, and the Links Between Legislative Agendas and Interest Advocacy." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(2): 463-77.
- Leech, Beth L., Frank R. Baumgartner, Timothy La Pira, and Nicholas A. Semanko. 2005. Drawing Lobbyists to Washington: Government Activity and Interest-Group Mobilization. *Political Research Quarterly* 58, 1 (March): 19–30.
- Mayer, Kenneth R. 2001. *With the Stroke of a Pen*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 2005. *Soldiers into Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olson, Mancur, Jr. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.



Salisbury, Robert H. 1984. Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions. *American Political Science Review* 78: 64–76.

Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Walker, Jack L., Jr. 1983. The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America. *American Political Science Review* 77: 390–406.

Walker, Jack L., Jr. 1991. *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Table 1. The Effect of Congressional Hearings on Lobbying Activity by Organizations

Part A. Replicating the Original Model, 1996 to 2000					
Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Hearings	1.67# (0.43)	1.652# (0.48)	2.64** (1.07)	0.25* (0.15)	0.29* (0.17)
Federal Spending (in billions)		0.004 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.02)	0.02# (0.01)	0.02# (0.01)
Firms			3.32e <sup>-04</sup> # (5.03e <sup>-05</sup> )	3.33e <sup>-05</sup> (2.84e <sup>-05</sup> )	
Organizations, t-1				0.98# (0.05)	1.00# (0.04)
Intercept	83.41# (5.10)	98.951# (8.58)	49.19# (13.55)	-1.7 (1.16)	-1.28 (1.26)
R-square	0.07	0.07	0.42	0.98	0.98
N, T	N=56, T=4	N=26, T=4	N=21, T=2	N=21, T=2	N=21, T=2
Observations	224	104	42	42	42

Part B. Extending the Original Model, 1996 to 2003.

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Hearings	1.83# (0.21)	2.07# (0.27)	0.150# (0.06)
Federal Spending (in billions)		0.04# (.01)	0.011# (.004)
Organizations, t-1			0.995# (.02)
Intercept	86.56# (3.12)	94.67# (5.51)	-0.061 (1.17)
R-square	0.10	0.14	0.98
N, T	N=56, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=12
Observations	784	364	312

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; # p < .001

Table 2. The Effect of Congressional Hearings on Lobbying Activity by Lobbying Firms

<i>Part A. Replicating the Original Model, 1996 to 2000</i>					
Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Hearings	2.90# (0.59)	3.25# (0.66)	6.80# (2.07)	1.96** (0.80)	3.59# (1.04)
Federal Spending (in billions)		0.21# (0.02)	0.11** (0.05)	0.03** (0.01)	0.16# (0.02)
Firms			4.15e <sup>-04</sup> # (8.66e <sup>-05</sup> )	-2.54e <sup>-05</sup> (2.4e <sup>-05</sup> )	
Organizations, t-1				0.92# (0.06)	1.33# (0.09)
Intercept	132.34** (6.38)	147.67# (11.00)	57.34** (25.55)	-15.15# (5.72)	-11.32 (7.80)
R-square	0.07	0.10	0.43	0.98	0.69
N, T	N=56, T=4	N=26, T=4	N=21, T=2	N=21, T=2	N=21, T=2
Observations	224	104	42	42	42

*Part B. Extending the Original Model, 1996 to 2003.*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
Hearings	5.02# (0.63)	5.92# (0.80)	2.33# (0.78)
Federal Spending (in billions)		0.26# (0.03)	0.05# (0.02)
Organizations, t-1			0.89# (0.08)
Intercept	157.07# (13.93)	162.95# (21.47)	-4.53 (14.03)
R-square	0.14	0.19	0.83
N, T	N=56, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=12
Observations	784	364	312

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; # p < .001

Table 3. Correlations among Legislative and Presidential Activities, 1953–2003

Major Topic	Hearings- Statements	Hearings- Orders	Statutes- Statements	Statutes- Orders	Hearings- Statutes
Economics	<b>0.30*</b>	-0.04	0.19	0.07	<b>0.49#</b>
Civil Rights	0.11	-0.04	-0.14	0.01	-0.23
Health	<b>0.35*</b>	0.28	0.07	0.16	<b>0.53#</b>
Agriculture	<b>0.35*</b>	0.07	0.22	-0.04	<b>0.29*</b>
Labor	-0.1	0.01	-0.06	0.06	-0.10
Education	<b>0.35*</b>	0.06	0.12	0.16	0.10
Environment	0.15	<b>0.37**</b>	-0.03	-0.01	<b>0.46#</b>
Energy	<b>0.61#</b>	<b>0.70#</b>	0.06	0.09	0.15
Transportation	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.07	<b>0.41</b>
Law and Crime	<b>0.53#</b>	<b>0.41**</b>	<b>0.32*</b>	0.14	0.18
Welfare	<b>0.42**</b>	0.15	-0.03	-0.13	-0.01
Housing	0.00	0.15	-0.16	0.10	<b>0.45**</b>
Commerce	0.01	-0.20	-0.22	<b>-0.37**</b>	<b>0.50#</b>
Defense & International	0.17	<b>0.33*</b>	0.18	0.11	0.12
Science & Tech.	<b>0.29*</b>	<b>0.53#</b>	0.07	-0.05	<b>0.30*</b>
Foreign Trade	0.17	<b>0.37**</b>	-0.17	0.07	-0.14
Government Operations	0.04	0.28	-0.07	-0.03	-0.06
Public Lands	0.17	<b>0.49#</b>	0.01	0.12	<b>0.38**</b>

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; # p < .001

Table 4. The Effect of Executive Activity on Lobbying Activity by Organizations, 1996-2003

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
State of the Union	2.27# (0.43)		1.16** (0.47)		-0.25 (0.54)		-0.10 (0.07)
Executive Orders		19.10# (4.16)		1.45 (3.74)		9.79 (6.56)	-1.02 (1.10)
Hearings			1.43# (0.23)	1.78# (0.26)	2.20# (0.44)	1.79# (0.32)	0.23** (0.08)
Federal Spending (in billions)					0.04 (0.01)	0.04# (0.01)	0.01** (0.00)
Organizations , t-1							0.99# (0.02)
Intercept	99.65# (3.53)	103.78# (2.81)	85.80# (3.27)	86.59# (3.11)	94.52# (5.68)	94.68# (5.23)	-0.20 (1.19)
R-square	0.07	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.14	0.15	0.98
N, T	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=12
Observations	784	784	784	784	364	364	312

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; # p < .001

Table 5. The Effect of Executive Activity on Lobbying Activity by Lobbying Firms, 1996-2003

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
State of the Union	3.37# (0.96)		-0.70 (1.03)		-4.73** (1.43)		-2.43** (0.88)
Executive Orders		52.81# (12.63)		4.67 (11.81)		32.84 (16.98)	4.29 (8.95)
Hearings			5.25# (0.77)	4.87# (0.80)	8.27# (1.38)	4.98# (0.97)	3.55# (1.07)
Federal Spending (in billions)					.28# (0.03)	0.25# (0.04)	0.06** (0.02)
Organizations, t-1							0.86# (0.08)
Intercept	208.49# (17.78)	204.07# (16.60)	157.53# (13.7)	157.16# (13.95)	159.97# (20.76)	162.99# (21.17)	-2.91 (13.76)
R-square	0.03	0.05	0.14	0.14	0.24	0.20	0.84
N, T	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=56, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=14	N=26, T=12
Observations	784	784	784	784	364	364	312

\* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; # p < .001