



ATTRIBUTES OF COLORADO LEGISLATORS WHO  
SUPPORT PUBLIC POLICIES ORIENTED  
TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING

Thesis Approved:

*Elaine Jorgensen*  
Thesis Adviser

*John W. ...*

*Beverly Crafter*

*Beverly Hirschlein*

*Peggy S. Meszner*

*Norman A. ...*  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the many who offered guidance, assistance and support in the completion of this thesis. Foremost among these is my major adviser, Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, who not only provided scholarly counsel but who also offered gentle encouragement throughout all phases of my graduate program. Her positive outlook and calm approach were very much appreciated. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Beverly Crabtree, Dr. Beulah Hirschlein and Dr. Peggy Meszaros, committee members, whose expertise as outstanding home economics leaders served as an inspiration to me. Special thanks is also expressed to Dr. Joseph Westphal who served on my advisory committee for the professional expertise he eagerly shared. A big thank you is also in order to Dr. Richard Dodder for the assistance he so willingly offered on the statistical analysis.

Appreciation is extended to the National Association of Vocational Home Economics Teacher Educators for the AVA-HEE fellowship and to the contributors of the Karl and Louise Wolf Endowed Scholarship. Appreciation is also expressed for having been awarded graduate assistantships that helped alleviate the financial burden.

The Colorado legislators who participated in this study are recognized and sincerely thanked. Without their cooperation, this study would not have been possible. A very special thank you is extended to the Honorable Senator Claire Traylor who sponsored me as her legislative

intern. Her interest in this study, the concern for its completion and her keen sense of humor gave me the encouragement to persevere.

Those who served on the jury to evaluate the legislative measures are recognized and thanked. In addition, appreciation is extended to the legislators who reviewed and evaluated the interview schedule.

A special note of thanks to my typist, Mrs. Mary Lou Wheeler. Her expertise, efficiency and conscientious manner were greatly appreciated.

Finally, I am indebted to my family and friends for their support and encouragement. Deep gratitude is extended to my mother for instilling in me at an early age the value of a good education and for her support throughout all phases of my education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of Problem . . . . .	2
Need for the Study . . . . .	3
Purpose and Objectives . . . . .	4
Hypotheses . . . . .	6
Assumption. . . . .	6
Limitations . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	8
Organization of the Study . . . . .	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Public Policy and the Family . . . . .	13
Defining Family Policy-Identifying Family Policies in the U. S. . . . .	18
Family Policy Analysis . . . . .	21
Policy Analysis According to the Functions Families Serve . . . . .	22
Family Well-Being as a Criteria of Policy Analysis . . . . .	24
Public Policy Formation at the State Level . . . . .	27
The Study of Public Policy Formation: The Behavioral Approach . . . . .	28
The Role Theory . . . . .	30
Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs . . . . .	33
Political and Constituency Variables Affecting Legislators' Decisions . . . . .	36
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . .	39
Population and Sample . . . . .	40
Instrumentation . . . . .	43
Roll Call Analysis . . . . .	48
Examination of Public Documents . . . . .	51
Personal Interviews . . . . .	53
Data Analysis . . . . .	55
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	56
Description of Sample . . . . .	56
Analysis of Voting Records . . . . .	62
Factor Analysis of Voting Records . . . . .	65

Chapter	Page
Analysis of Selected Attributes with Voting Records . . . . .	71
Correlation of Voting Records with Selected Attributes of Legislators. . . . .	72
Discussion . . . . .	76
Analysis of Variance . . . . .	78
Discussion . . . . .	86
Relationship Between Government and Families Responses on Teaching Personal and Family Living . . . . .	86
Factors that Influence Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	92
Factors that Influence Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	98
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	109
Procedure . . . . .	110
Results and Discussion . . . . .	111
Policy Analysis Framework/Selection of Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	111
Variables Associated with Support of Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	112
Relationship Between Government and Families Teaching Personal and Family Living . . . . .	113
Factors Influencing Voting Decisions . . . . .	118
Conclusions and Implications . . . . .	119
Recommendations . . . . .	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	126
APPENDICES . . . . .	133
APPENDIX A - POLICY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK . . . . .	134
APPENDIX B - JURY POLICY ANALYSIS MATERIALS . . . . .	136
APPENDIX C - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE . . . . .	145
APPENDIX D - CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	154
APPENDIX E - RESOURCES USED IN DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION OF THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . .	158

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Policies Included in This Study . . . . .	49
II. Distribution of Sample According to Personal and Family Characteristics . . . . .	57
III. Distribution of Sample According to Educational and Occupational Characteristics . . . . .	58
IV. Distribution of Sample According to Political and Legislative Characteristics . . . . .	60
V. Distribution of Sample According to Constituency Characteristics . . . . .	61
VI. Means, Standard Deviations and Number of "Yes" Votes for 30 Bills Identified by the Jury as Being Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	63
VII. Kuder Richardson Coefficient Values of Total 30 Bills and the Subcategories of Membership, Economics and Socializing Functions and Fiscal and No Fiscal Impact . . . . .	65
VIII. Bills and Factor Loadings on the Unrotated Factor . . . . .	66
IX. Bills Eliminated as a Result of Factor Analysis . . . . .	67
X. Bills and Factor Loadings for Factors One, Two and Three . . . . .	69
XI. Variation Explained by Each Factor . . . . .	70
XII. Voting Correlations on Policies Promoting Family Well-Being . . . . .	73
XIII. Means of Personal and Social Attributes, Occupational Attributes, Political and Legislative Attributes and Characteristics of Population Constituency Represented on Voting Records of Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	79
XIV. Legislators' Opinions on the Proper Relationship Between Government and Families . . . . .	87

Table	Page
XV. Legislators' Opinions on Areas in which Government Should Offer Help to Families in Meeting Their Needs and Performing Their Functions . . . . .	89
XVI. Legislators' Opinions on Appropriateness of Services the Government Could Offer Families . . . . .	90
XVII. Legislators' Responses on Appropriateness of Concepts to be Included in a Public School Course Related to Issues Dealing with Personal and Family Living . . . . .	93
XVIII. Legislators' Opinions on Most Appropriate Age to Offer Concepts in the Areas of Personal and Family Living . . . . .	94
XIX. Legislators' Opinions on the State Requiring Every Public School System to Offer a Course in Personal and Family Living . . . . .	95
XX. Legislators' Opinions on Requiring Every Public School Student to Take a Personal and Family Living Course . . . . .	96
XXI. Legislators' Support of a Hypothetical Measure Proclaiming the Family as a Basic Unit of Society to be Preserved and Protected as a Primary Resource to Enhance the Quality of Life . . . . .	97
XXII. Considerations Influencing Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	99
XXIII. Influence of Legislative Colleagues on Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	103
XXIV. Influence of Party Constituents on Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	104
XXV. Influence of Organizations on Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	106
XXVI. Type of Reading Materials that Influenced Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	107
XXVII. Extent of Influence Family and Friends Had on Legislators' Voting Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	108
XXVIII. Summary of Variables Showing Statistical Differences on Support of Policies Oriented Toward Family Well-Being . . . . .	114

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The home economics profession, since its beginning nearly 100 years ago, has had as its central focus the family. Similar to many other institutions and professions, this profession recognizes that the family is a continuing, yet ever-changing unit. While there are many social, technological and economic changes impacting on the family, members of the home economics profession concentrate on promoting ways to assist families in coping with these changes and helping them develop abilities to function within their own strengths. Family well-being has traditionally been its major goal. According to Brown and Paolucci (1978, p. 23) the mission of home economics is

. . . to enable families . . . to build and maintain systems of action which lead to (1) maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, cooperative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals . . . .

Since the relationship between the family and other social economic, and environmental systems has historically been of interest to the home economics profession (Scott, 1979), home economists have a unique interest in governmental policies that directly impact upon families. As family advocates, they recognize that policies need to be developed that enable families to function in their own strengths. Also recognizing that there is wide diversity in family structures, home economists attempt to support policies that help all families perform



their functions; their ultimate goal is family well-being for a wide variety of family structures.

In recent years, greater emphasis has been placed on the role the government is assuming in helping families meet the needs of its members through the formulation of policies. In placing an emphasis on the family as an economic resource, the United Nations announced:

Since families and the individuals who compose them are one of the most important resources of every nation, it is understandable and appropriate that the well-being of its families is today a major concern of every national government (United Nations Economic Social Council, 1965, p. 7).

Government policies need to address concerns of families both through treatment and prevention. While it is not questioned that family support systems are essential in the area of remediation, repair and therapy, policies that emphasize prevention, development and education are also necessary. Policies are needed that provide families broader options and choices in carrying out their functions related to membership, material support, and the nurturance of members. Continued support for policies that promote family well-being is essential.

#### Statement of Problem

In recent years home economists have been encouraged and challenged to become involved in the formation of public policy both as supporters and initiators of legislation which focuses on family well-being. However, in order to be effective, they need to be able to elicit the support of policy makers who are sensitive to the needs of the family and astute to the effects that legislation can have on the family. The problem addressed in this study is to identify attributes of Colorado state legislators who have supported state legislation

(as evidenced by their voting records) that is oriented toward family well-being.

#### Need for the Study

Research has been done in the area of the acceptance of broad governmental family policy. However, with current political attitudes and trends as they are, the likelihood of the enactment of such a policy is close to nonexistent. Instead, there is government family policy by default (Mondale, 1976) consisting of a patchwork of policies having a direct effect on the family (Green, 1979). These policies affecting families have emerged through social, education, labor, housing, health, and taxation programs.

In the literature there is no evidence of a study that has been done to investigate the attributes of policy makers such as state legislators, who have been consistently supportive of education, health, social and housing policies and programs that are targeted at family well-being. By knowing attributes of policy makers who are supportive of legislation that promotes family well-being, home economists and other advocates of public policy oriented toward the well-being of families may be able to elicit the support of such legislators in initiating and promoting related legislation. This information may also assist voters in making intelligent decisions in the selection of public officials who are supportive of such legislation. This investigation may be significant not only for those concerned with family well-being but could also be useful to those concerned with public policy formation in general.

## Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to identify Colorado legislative measures that are oriented toward family well-being and identify attributes of legislators who support these measures. Variables that are considered include: the legislator's personal and social attributes (education, age, marital status, length of marriage, importance of religion in personal life, sex, number of children and stage of family development); occupational attributes (occupation and income); political and legislative attributes (length of legislative service, percentage of votes received in the last election, future political aspirations, and party affiliation); and characteristics related to the population constituency represented (urban or rural, distance from the state capitol, the percentage of nonwhites in the district, percentage of Hispanics in the district, average adjusted gross income in the district, percentage of voters registered as Republicans, Democrats and unaffiliated, and the percentage of constituents unemployed). Variables influencing legislators' decisions on how to vote on these family related issues are also examined. These include the influence of fellow legislators, party leadership, informal groups in the party, staff people, constituents, the governor's office and organizations. Also included are the influence of reading materials and the impact family and friends have upon legislators' voting decisions.

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To develop a framework for policy analysis that can be used in selecting state legislative measures that are oriented toward family well-being.

2. To identify attributes of Colorado legislators who have been supportive of legislation that is oriented toward family well-being.

3. To obtain legislators' responses on their perceptions of what the proper relationship should be between government and families as well as the services they perceive as appropriate for the government to offer families.

4. To make recommendations for further research related to legislators' support or nonsupport of family public policy.

To reach these objectives, the following procedures are proposed:

1. Analyze all bills that reach the roll call voting stage during the first and second regular sessions of the Fifty-Third Colorado General Assembly for their impact on family well-being.

2. Analyze selected personal and social attributes of Colorado legislators associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.

3. Analyze selected occupational attributes of Colorado legislators associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.

4. Analyze selected political and legislative attributes of Colorado legislators with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.

5. Analyze selected characteristics related to the population constituency represented associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.

6. Analyze factors that influence voting decisions on policies oriented toward family well-being.

## Hypotheses

The hypotheses formulated are as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>. There will be no association between personal and social attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

H<sub>2</sub>. There will be no association between occupational attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

H<sub>3</sub>. There will be no association between political and legislative attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

H<sub>4</sub>. There will be no association between characteristics of population constituency represented and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

## Assumption

The following assumption is basic to the study:

1. It is assumed that legislators have a primary interest in being re-elected and this interest serves as a major factor in their policy making decisions.

## Limitations

The study is limited in the following ways:

1. The sample is limited to legislators serving in the Colorado Fifty-Third General Assembly.
2. Government policies include actions at the local, state and federal levels and can take the form of statutes, budget, program design

features, and court action. For this research project, only statutes at the state level considered during the 1981 and 1982 legislative sessions are examined. The legislation chosen is based upon its orientation toward family well-being.

3. The type of information is limited to what can be obtained through examination of public records and through personal interviews with legislators.

4. This study concentrates on legislator's behavior related to policies oriented toward family well-being. No attempt is made to conclude about the behavior of legislators in other legislative areas or phases of the legislative process.

5. The data are partially collected by the examination of roll call voting records. In the Colorado legislature, the roll call vote is recorded at different stages of a bill's progress (most often on the third reading of the bill) and is recorded in the journals of both chambers of the legislature. In the case where roll call votes are taken on a bill, individual legislator's voting record can be ascertained. However, since some bills are defeated in the first or second readings, not all bills reach the roll call voting stage. Consequently, it is feasible that many family policy bills never reach the floor for a formal vote. Therefore, the analysis of roll call votes does not provide a complete picture of all legislative activity related to family policy bills.

6. Participation in the study is limited by the number of legislators who are willing to participate in the interview.

## Definition of Terms

Attitude - "A relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (Rokeach, 1976, p. 134).

Attribute - A trait either present or absent in the situation being observed (Gould and Kolb, 1964; Zadrozny, 1959).

Belief - "Any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious inferred from what a person says or does" (Rokeach, 1976, p. 134).

Comprehensive Family Policy - Cohesive macropolicy directed to respond in some way to families and their needs (Rice, 1977).

### Constituency -

The set of individuals who have the legal right to vote (as determined by the individual's place of legal residence) for a legislative representative upon reaching the age of competence, recently set at 18 (Clausen, 1973, p. 126).

### Consumer and Homemaking Education -

Vocational home economics education that prepares males and females for the occupation of homemaking and requires knowledge and skills that are interrelated and necessary for optimum quality of life for individuals and families (Hill, Shear, Bell, Cross, Carter, and Horning, 1979, p. 13).

### Explicit Family Policy -

a. Specific programs and policies designed to achieve specified, explicit goals regarding the family; b. programs and policies which deliberately do things to and for the family but for which there are no agreed upon overall goals regarding the family (Kammerman and Kahn, 1978, p. 3).

Family - A group of two or more persons residing together who are related by blood, marriage or adoption (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1977).

Family Breakdown - The point at which the family system becomes

dysfunctional in that it no longer is able to meet and support the needs of its members.

Family Economic and Consumer Functions - Functions related to the family's ability to provide for the material needs of its members (Family Impact Seminar, 1978).

Family Life Cycle - "Sequence of characteristic stages beginning with family formation and continuing through the life of the family to its dissolution" (Duvall, 1971, p. 551).

Family Membership Functions - Functions related to whether individuals formed, broke up, expanded or contracted families (Family Impact Seminar, 1978).

Family Policy -

Everything the government does to and for the family which includes deliberate actions toward the family as well as indirect consequences of policies on the family designed to accomplish different objectives but have an effect on the family; it is both a field of study and a perspective because it is concerned with both the effects of all activities on the family and with efforts to use family well-being as an objective (Kammerman and Kahn, 1976, p. 183).

Family Policy Research - "Any research endeavor involving the relationship of public policy to the structure or process of the family" (McDonald, 1979, p. 554).

Family Socializing, Health and Nurturing Functions - Those functions related to the rearing and nurturing of dependent family members, encouraging and supporting their intellectual, physical and emotional development and providing for their psychological sustenance (Family Impact Seminar, 1978).

Family Strengths -

Those forces and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourages the development of the personal resources



and potential of members of the family and which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to family members (Otto, 1975, p. 16).

Family Well-Being - Maintenance of equilibrium so that the family, through broadened options and choices, may perform with as few restrictions as possible, its functions related to membership, material support and nurturance of members.

Fiscal Impact - The presence of an effect upon the revenue or expenditures of the state government, local government and the state economy (Colorado Legislator's Handbook, 1981).

Home Economics -

The study of the reciprocal relations of family to its natural and man-made environments, the effect of these singly or in unison as they shape the internal functioning of families and the interplays between the family and other social institutions and physical environment (Bivens, Fitch, Newkirk, Paolucci, Riggs, St. Marie, and Vaughn, 1975, pp. 26-27).

Implicit Family Policy - "Governmental actions and policies not specifically or primarily addressed to the family but which have indirect consequences" (Kammerman and Kahn, 1978, p. 3).

Legislation - A matter of business for or under consideration by a legislative body.

Legislative Attribute - A trait, either present or absent, related to an individual's activity and participation in a law making body.

Legislators - Representatives and Senators elected at the general election who make up the lawmaking body under the Constitution and make laws within the constitutional limitations (Walton, 1974).

No Fiscal Impact - The absence of an effect upon the revenue or expenditures of the state government, local government or the state economy (Colorado Legislator's Handbook, 1981).

Occupational Attribute - A trait, either present or absent, associated with an individual's vocation.

Personal Attribute - A trait, either present or absent, inherent to an individual.

Political Attribute - A trait, either present or absent, related to an individual's governmental activity.

Policy - "A plan that is used to guide decision making" (Scott, 1979, p. 22) "which spans the entire range of public activity" (Zimmerman, 1979, p. 487).

Preventative - Precautionary education or services used to nourish and sustain the family unit and to strengthen the foundations and enhance the quality of family life.

Program - "Efforts that are related to a single part of a public activity and are indicators of assured policies" (Hawkins, 1979, p. 265).

Public Policy - "As a process, whatever governments choose to do or not to do and as a product those services that provide external costs and benefits" (Darling and Bubolz, 1980, p. 20).

Roll Call Voting -

All open voting where individual positions of legislators are recorded. Methods include: voting by division (yeas and nays), announcing the vote as the legislator's name is called, voting by paper ballot, or voting by electronic machine (Anderson, Watts, and Wilcox, 1966, pp. 3-4).

Social Attributes - A trait, either present or absent associated with an individual's interdependent relationship with others.

Stage of Couple Family Development - Sequence of characteristic stages for a family structure that has been established and maintained through the marriage of a man and woman and represents the subsequent stages of that couple through the life of the family to its dissolution.

Stage of Single Family Development - Sequence of characteristic stages representing a single parent family structure.

Value -

A single belief . . . (that) concerns a desirable mode of behavior or end state that has a transcendental quality to it, guiding actions, attitudes, judgments, and comparisons across specific objects and situations and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate goals (Rokeach, 1973, p. 18).

Vote - Formal expression of will by an individual legislator or by the legislative body at large.

Voting Record - An official register of the decision of an individual legislator as well as the decision of the legislative body at large.

#### Organization of the Study

The report of this study is divided into five chapters. Chapter I presents preliminary information related to the study which includes (1) an introduction and background information related to the identification of the problem, (2) a problem statement and need for the study, (4) the hypotheses to be tested, (5) the limitations and assumption of the study and (6) definitions of terminology important to understand the report.

Chapter II is a review of literature concentrating on family policy and theories associated with legislative behavior. Chapter III describes the methodology used in the study. The instrumentation, population and sample, data collection and analysis of the data are discussed. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study and a discussion and analyses of the data. A summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations for further study constitute Chapter V.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Public Policy and the Family

As the primary socializing unit in the environment, the family is recognized as the most basic and influential institution in this country. Although diverse in nature, all families serve similar functions that closely interface with society. To a certain extent, the healthiness of the family is a measuring rod of the well-being of a country. As Margaret Mead (1965, p. 84) said, "The integrity of a society rests with the integrity of family life."

How the state perceives the family is a debatable topic. While there is no federal law related explicitly to the family, the governmental power to legislate and enforce family law is sanctioned by the constitution (Development-The Family, 1980). The state's relationship with the family is derived from two sources, police power and "parens patriae" power. The police power centers around the concept of the state's responsibility in preventing citizens from harming one another and to promote an all encompassing public welfare philosophy. In contrast, the parens patriae power is the state's authority to promote the welfare of certain individuals, such as young children and mental incompetents who lack the capacity to act in their own interest (Development-The Family, 1980).

The state's interest in the family has traditionally concentrated on individual rights rather than on the entire family unit. In the *Caban v. Mohammed* court case, the family was defined as

a collection of intimately related human beings each possessing a number of distinct individual rights, some of which continue to survive when the family is no longer intact (Development-The Family, 1980, p. 1160).

Consequently, state preference is sometimes given to individuals rather than to the family unit as a whole. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the state does have an interest in promoting and protecting the family and achieving a balance between this and protecting individual rights.

The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, accepted by the United States, describes the posture this country takes in balancing a dual responsibility to both individuals and families. It states:

Everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other levels of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control (United Nations The International Bill of Human Rights, 1978, Article 25, par. 1, p. 8).

In recent years a variety of social, economic, political and technological forces has had profound effects on the family and has caused the family to undergo some major changes. Some of these changes include: the decrease of the marriage rate and an increase in the divorce and separation rates; an increase in the number of unmarried couples living together; an increase in the number of children involved in serial parenting; an increase in the number of one-parent female headed families; and a decrease in the birth rate and size of families (Kamerman and Kahn, 1976).

Paralleling these changes has been an increased interest in a national government policy for families. Some have perceived the aforementioned changes as an indication of family deterioration and have declared that a policy or policies need to be formulated with the goal of alleviating some of these social problems (Hawkins, 1979).

Although a great deal of dialogue has been taking place in recent years related to family public policy, this concept is not new. Family policy has a rich history in European countries and has been discussed intermittently since 1948 in America.

A historical view of family policy shows that it was of paramount interest and concern in the mid and late sixties. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1965), U. S. Senator from New York is quoted as saying:

The United States is very possibly on the verge of adopting a national policy directed to the quality and stability of the American family . . . . This could be the central event of our new social legislation (p. 280).

There is evidence to show that momentum for family policy consideration increased following the 1973 hearings on the United States Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth where Margaret Mead, Urie Brofenbrenner and Edward Ziegler testified for the need of students and researchers in the family area to make contributions in the policy making process (McDonald, 1979). Literature shows that testimony has also been presented on the need to establish a U. S. Department on Marriage and Family, which at the Cabinet level, is to focus on the family and serve such functions as educational development, regulation and administration of service delivery systems (Hawkins, 1979).

A 1979 study done at the University of Minnesota to ascertain information on how state legislators perceived the concept of family

policy shows that, at that time, Minnesota legislators generally favored this concept. The findings of the study show how legislators perceive and define the concept of family policy as well as their identification of appropriate family policy goals. The results include the following legislator's statement:

The formulation of an explicit and comprehensive family policy is long term and requires reevaluation of existing legislation that negatively affects families. The organization of family policy should center around government policies that impact negatively on families (Zimmerman, Mattessich, and Liek, 1979, p. 513).

The study shows that a contradiction exists in the goals that legislators perceived as most appropriate for family policy and the areas of government that have the most impact and are of the most service to families. Because of this incongruency, the study reports that the researchers made recommendations that increased public discussion related to the content and goals of family policy be initiated.

With the Carter-Mondale ticket successful in its bid for the U. S. leadership in 1976, the literature shows that greater emphasis was placed on the family public policy theme. As former chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, Mondale (1976, p. 11) is quoted as expressing his concern over the fact that "the values of family life have been largely forgotten and overlooked in public life."

In the Carter administration, there is evidence that some progress was made in bringing government and family to a closer consensus of what the relationship between these two institutions should be. History shows the results of this effort included the 1980 White House Conference on Families and the establishment of the Family Impact Seminar which has as its primary purpose to assess the impact legislation and other governmental policies and programs have on the family.

The progress made during the Carter administration includes an increased awareness of the impact of the government on the family, but no actual enactment of an all encompassing family policy. In fact, according to Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1980), the Carter administration is one of the few in the last half century that cannot boast about having initiated a single social program.

The literature indicates that many political leaders concerned with the relationship between government and family were optimistic during the sixties and seventies about the adoption of a comprehensive family policy. However, most agree today that the campaign for such a policy during the 1980's is an effort in futility. Moynihan (1980, p. 26) is quoted as saying, "We now commence the 1980's and in truth, the subject has all but disappeared from the national political agenda."

Reasons cited for the failure of the American government's willingness to tackle the issue of comprehensive family policy are lengthy. Those who oppose such a policy say that the United States cannot deal with such a sensitive, emotionally charged issue, and that the entire concept is unmanageable and potentially dangerous. Another major roadblock has been coming to a consensus on definitions. No accepted, universal definition of family has been identified in this country; compound that with a difference of opinion on the meaning of family policy and a dilemma results. Arguments have been presented that family policy is impossible because of America's pluralistic society. Such a policy, it is said, cannot be enacted without violating individual liberties or discriminating against nonconventional families.

Some perceive the enactment of a family policy as the opportunity for the government to "meddle" in the affairs of the family. In the



1980 Virginia state legislature, the bill introduced to proclaim the family to be "protected and preserved as a primary resource to enhance the quality of life for all Virginians" (Bill to Preserve, 1980, p. B5) met substantial opposition. Opponents of such a bill perceive it as a threat to the autonomy of the family, as exemplified in the following reaction of a legislator:

This legislation is designed solely for one purpose - to make it easier for the Virginia assembly and state government to zero in on the family and meddle (Bill to Preserve, 1980, p. B5).

While many definitions and perspectives have been presented on family policy in the United States it is evident this country does not and probably will not in the near future have a comprehensive governmental family policy. However, an absence of an official policy does not mean that there is no policy. Mondale (1976) summarizes the family policy dilemma by saying:

. . . an absence of formal policy does not mean that we have no policy at all; there is no such thing as a nonpolicy. What we have might be called a family policy by default - a series of largely unexamined unarticulated and largely inconsistent burdensome policies with respect to families (p. 13).

### Defining Family Policy-Identifying

#### Family Policies in the U. S.

While the term "family policy" has received a great deal of attention in this country within the last ten years, there is no general consensus on how to define it or on what it should be. Among the definitions presented by recognized leaders in the family policy research field are as follows:

Zimmerman (1982, p. 447) "a conceptual term for loosely related activities sponsored by the government that affect families."

Lynn (1980, p. 205) "public programs enabling parents to sustain children."

DeBie (1980, p. 8) "the result of an awareness of objectives affecting families which leads to some organized actions."

Bane (1980, p. 156) ". . . all those aspects of governmental policy which affect family life."

Kamerman and Kahn (1978, p. 3) "everything that government does to and for the family."

As family policy researchers at Columbia University, Kamerman and Kahn (1976) have subdivided family policy into the two categories of explicit and implicit. In these categories they include both the effects of all types of public activities on the family and they attempt to use "family well-being" as an objective, goal or standard in developing public policy. As such they view family policy as both a field and a perspective. As a field of study, explicit family policy has boundaries that include such areas as population policy, family planning, cash in kind transfer payments, employment, housing, nutrition and health policies. Kamerman and Kahn (1976, p. 184) also identify that "personal social services, child development and the field of social policy for women have been defined by some as family policy."

When family policy is implicit it is viewed as a perspective, and is much more extensive including policies regarding taxes, military, transportation, land use, and environment that have major consequences on the family (Kamerman and Kahn, 1976). When this broad perspective is used, the criterion of family well-being can be used for every policy.

When the model focuses on explicit family policy as a field of study, it delineates the term to include governmental actions such as day care, child welfare, family counseling, income maintenance, family planning, some tax benefits, and some housing policies (Kamerman and Kahn, 1979) that are deliberately structured into the policies. Some governmental programs and services, as explicit policies, have a direct affect on the family and are documented as being beneficial to the family. It is impossible to identify all these programs because there is little documented evidence to indicate whether a particular program is helpful to families. However, some programs that have been cited as supportive of families include: Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); unemployment compensation; child care programs such as Head Start, Homestart, day care under Title XX of Social Security Act and income tax deductions for child care; disability, survivor and retirement insurance under Social Security; housing support through a variety of subsidy programs ranging from public housing to mortgage and interest income tax deductions; public education (including parenting training and nutrition education programs) maternal and child health care projects; food and nutrition programs, child abuse prevention and treatment programs; public support for provision of homemakers and home economics services provided by the Agricultural Extension Service (Johnson, 1976).

Zimmerman (1982) also recognizes explicit family policy as policies and programs designed to achieve explicit agreed-upon goals concerning families. Specific areas she identifies to be explicit family policies include no-fault divorce, child custody determinations, domestic abuse programs and tax credits for homemakers.

## Family Policy Analysis

According to Dempsey (1981), policy analysis is a term applied to the understanding of the role government plays in protecting the health and well-being of the population and how well it assumes that role. Aldous (1980) writes that policy implies purposeful action; consequently, in policy analysis a policy needs to be examined for its intent as well as for its consequences.

Several approaches have been advocated by researchers in the area of family policy analysis. Bane (1980) has identified four approaches generally taken in evaluating United States policies that affect families. Nonintervention or neutrality focuses on the philosophy that the family is a private institution and the government has no business interfering in internal family life. The government should neither encourage or discourage family functions and actions. The main problem with this approach, Bane (1980) states, is that standards of neutrality and noninterference are impossible to apply; government does affect family life.

Constitutionalism is another approach that can be taken in judging policies affecting families. This approach examines governmental policies from the notions of fundamental rights, equal protection and entitlement. This approach tends to focus more on individuals than on the family unit and applies the tests of coherence and consistency to all family policies. According to Bane (1980), current family policy fails this test.

Encouraging preferred family forms and behavior is another approach. This approach is value laden and prefers specific family values. Bane

(1980) maintains that the problem with this approach is that there is difficulty in universal acceptance of a preferred family form.

Helping families be healthy and functional is a fourth approach identified. This approach recognizes the diversity of family forms and values and attempts to identify what all families need by way of supports in order to perform their functions. Policies are judged according to the extent they support families in carrying out their functions. Bane (1980) identified that the major problem in using healthy/functional families as a framework is that the list of supports which families are assumed to need is necessarily arbitrary. As such, this approach lacks a clearly articulated and universally accepted set of value criteria by which to judge the policy.

It appears that in this country there is a preference to deal with family issues one at a time forming a policy that can be evaluated for each issue and each piece of legislation. Because of this approach, nearly all thinking about family policy has been limited to the parts resulting in random, uncoordinated efforts (Dempsey, 1981).

#### Policy Analysis According to the Functions Families Serve

In order to promote the development of family policy analysis, some authorities advocate viewing the family in terms of the functions it serves rather than by definition or structure. According to Zimmerman (1976, p. 548) the family is a "social system that progresses through defined, sequential stages in a rapidly changing environment." As such, she outlines the functions the family serves in society as:

1. Physical maintenance and care of members

2. Admissions of new members through procreation and their relinquishment when they mature
3. Socialization of children for adult roles of spouses, parents, workers, citizens, and members of other social groups
4. The maintenance of order within the family and between family and outside groups, that is the maintenance of social control
5. The maintenance of family morale and motivation to facilitate the performance of tasks in family and other social groups
6. Production and distribution of goods and services necessary for maintaining the family.

Lory (1980) also states that the government must consider the functions a family serves in developing policies. The three main family functions he has identified include:

1. Reproductive, stated as reproduction of the species
2. Socialization "the gradual development of those attitudes in children which will enable them to assume their roles in society" (Lory, 1980, p. 72). He subdivided socialization into three basic aspects: the family's contribution to a child's emotional development, the family's contribution to the child's intellectual development and the transmitting of norms and values.
3. Economic - the family's role as a producing and consuming unit.

The Family Impact Seminar, in reviewing federal domestic programs, also used dimensions related to functions a family serves. In attempting to identify all programs that have a direct (explicit) impact on families, they looked for programs that affect three dimensions of family life. These include:

1. Membership (programs that might influence whether individuals

formed, broke up, expanded or contracted families). In this category, programs are identified as to their effect on membership trends of birth, marriage, separation and death. Program examples include family planning, abortion, health services, foster care, child abuse and neglect, community based services for mental health or penal systems.

2. Material Support, Economic and Consumer which are programs that affect families' abilities to provide support for their members through employment, securing of housing, and job training. Listed as examples of programs directly addressed to aiding families carry out their economic and consumer functions include unemployment benefits, welfare assistance, social security benefits, job training and counseling programs, housing subsidies, loans and tax deductions for mortgage interest payments, and tax credits for child care.

3. Socializing and Nurturant functions which are programs that help families to rear and nurture their dependents, encourage and support their physical, intellectual, and emotional development, and to provide psychological sustenance to their members. Examples of these programs are nutrition, preventative health programs, and compensatory education programs providing services to vulnerable family members such as handicapped, mentally ill, elderly and young children.

#### Family Well-Being as a Criteria of Policy Analysis

While reference is made to family well-being in much of the literature on family policy, a concise definition for this term has not been found. Many researchers, policy makers and authorities use the term but few, if any, have attempted to define it. Rather than

addressing family well-being, several authorities, in referring to family policy themes, emphasize the importance of the family's capacity to be self-sufficient and independent. One of the final recommendations from the 1980 White House Conference on Families was

. . . that the government assume responsibilities for enhancing the ability of families to function by guaranteeing basic human needs necessary for their physical, intellectual and emotional development with the objective of providing for the independence and self sufficiency of families . . . (White House Conference on Families Listening to America's Families Action for the 80's, 1980, p. 89).

Aldous (1980) also emphasizes that family policy should aid families' capacity for self-support and independence. Kamerman and Kahn (1976) state that one of the principal tasks in family policy is to link the policies more deliberately and constructively to family well-being and self sufficiency. Dempsey (1981, p. 130) writes, "Self sufficiency may be the most highly valued trait for individuals, families and communities and the nation as a whole."

Policies that emphasize self sufficiency and independence seek to support and supplement families in the exercise of their basic functions. As such, policies that support or supplement families focus on providing broader options and choices to families in carrying out their functions rather than concentrating, supplanting, or replacing the family. As Kinsey B. Green (1979, p. 2), Executive Director of the American Home Economics Association said in her statement before the National Advisory Committee, White House Conference on Families, "We believe that the role of the federal government is to subsidize, augment or supplement rather than supplant or substitute for family categories."

Zimmerman (1976) is advocating that the family be conceptualized in terms of a social unit with family social policy being concerned with



the structure of society, relationships between individuals, groups and the larger society. The goal, then of the social family policy is "to ensure the viability of the family as a social system with specified tasks to perform for its members and society as a whole throughout the entire life span" (Zimmerman, 1976, p. 548). She maintains that the ultimate goal of social family policy is to support the family in the performance of its varied functions. In perceiving the family as a social system, Zimmerman (1976, p. 548) writes that the family is a "goal oriented-task performing system" carrying out certain functions within a structure of interrelatedness and independence of members. Another characteristic of the family as a social system is that it is equilibrium seeking and adaptive. According to Zimmerman (1976, p. 549) the notion of equilibrium "assumes a range of possible states within which the family can function and to which it can adapt."

Value judgments are made in analyzing family policies and in determining family well-being. However, as DeBie (1980, p. 16) states, ". . . values cannot be avoided in discussing the family; values are part and parcel of every policy to the extent that every policy involves a choice, a definition of the desirable."

The Family Impact Seminar also stresses that public policy analysis involves value judgments based on the belief of what is "good" for the individuals, the economy, the environment (Interim Report of the Family Impact Seminar, 1978). Value judgments are particularly involved in determining guidelines for what strengthens or weakens families and what is necessary for the well-being of families.

## Public Policy Formation at the State Level

Emphasis is also being placed on studying state government policy formation. According to Keefe (1956), state legislatures formulate a considerable amount of public policy in cooperation with the federal government that maintains control over local governments. He maintains that more responsibilities are being placed on states in the areas of schools, economic welfare, housing, highways, and public health. This provides a sound basis for an increased interest and investigation in state public policy formation.

Patterson (1962) also advocates the study of the state legislative institution for three reasons. First, he postulates, less is known about the behavior of state legislatures; second, legislative bodies at the state level are more accessible research laboratories; and third, there is a unique opportunity for comparative research between state legislatures.

Concentrating on policy formation at the state level appears to be particularly important during the current Reagan administration. This administration, through conservative federal leadership, calls for a shift to state power and more activism at the local levels. According to Congressional aides speaking to home economics state leaders at the Presidents' Unit Workshop of the American Home Economics Association, this focus is a fundamental change in both direction and procedure (New Political Reality, 1981).

Gilbert (1979) particularly advocates the decentralization of family policy formation to the state levels because this level is more responsive to a variety of family life styles. He maintains that with the 50 different states studying, organizing and experimenting,

knowledge can be gained gradually and gains and losses in the area of family policy can be observed over time.

In emphasizing policymaking oriented toward families at the state rather than at the national level, Gilbert states (1979, p. 449), "such an approach needs to be more than reactive; it needs to be proactive in that programs need to be planned to strengthen the foundation and improve the quality of family life."

### The Study of Public Policy Formation:

#### The Behavioral Approach

The task of formulating policies that affect families is not simple. Research continues to be done to develop insight into how various public policy decisions are made. In recent years, researchers have placed greater emphasis on the analysis of the behavior of individuals acting in political roles than in analyzing institutions separated from the behavior of the politicians. While a consensus has not been reached on a precise definition of the behavioralistic approach in political science, many scholars encourage this method as well as the policy oriented research approach. Merkl (1969) in advocating the behavioral approach, writes:

Instead of looking at the institutions themselves such as the courts or, in other words, the fabric of legal decisions, the behavior-oriented political scientists explore judicial behavior, electoral behavior, legislative behavior and administrative behavior as the objective regularities of political behavior within a given institutional frame. The stress on the individual behavior also points to the psychological roots of the behavioral school . . . . (p. 145).

Wallas (1956) also stresses the behavioral approach to political study and states that separating politics from human nature proves to

be harmful and ineffective. He claims that the study of human nature in politics deepens and widens the knowledge base of the political institutions.

One of the foci of current political research concentrates on studying the actions and behaviors of individual legislators. Clausen (1973) states that political study from this angle provides an outside vantage point of the political scene at large. Therefore, it is becoming increasingly common to see research concentrating on legislators' opinions and how different profile characteristics appear to affect those opinions.

A significant study on individual legislators has been done at the University of Minnesota where researchers surveyed state legislators to learn of the attitudes and perceptions of these policymakers toward the concept of family policy. The study also identifies variables that affect a legislator's attitudes toward family policy. On the assumption that a policymaker's attitudes are based on family and nonfamily variables, this study identifies 13 variables that have a potential influence on attitudes. These variables include family situation, family stage of development, education, group affiliation, socioeconomic status, age, sex, marital status, and environmental demands. Findings of the study show that family life cycle has the greatest effect on a legislator's support or nonsupport of family policy. Other significant variables include use of services, party affiliation, income, marital status, and age. The findings show that a legislator does not form his/her attitudes on a particular policy solely on the policy merits; instead, proposed legislation is viewed within the individual's personal, familial, social, and political contexts (Zimmerman, Mattessich, and Leik, 1979).

The findings from this Minnesota study related to the importance of the family life cycle is congruent with the research results reported by Gore, Grimm, Motz, and Thompson (1972, p. 192) in their study that ". . . if our focus is on the behavior of individuals, our understanding will be enhanced by the explicit recognition that the individual's behavior is often mediated by his family."

In applying this behavioral approach model to the analysis of legislative behavioral differences between sexes, Diamond (1977) reports some distinct variations between men and women. In examining the behavior of male and female legislators in four New England states, she identifies these differences in policy expertise. She reports that women most frequently cite education as their area of expertise while men most often mention fiscal affairs. The study shows that women identify health and welfare as their second area while no other areas are frequently mentioned by men.

It is also reported by Diamond (1977) that women are less receptive to legislative bargaining than are men. Women are more negative toward lobbyists than men and women are reported to be less self-reliant in their manner of making decisions. Diamond (1977) also reports that women are less politically ambitious than men and their policy views are generally more liberal than their male counterparts.

### The Role Theory

How an elected public servant, such as a state legislator, serves in a representative role is dependent upon many interrelated factors. In analyzing a legislator's behavior according to Wahlke (1968), it is important not to simply refer to the overt physical actions but to

examine the attitudes, judgments, and perceptions of the legislator and the forces affecting the legislator in the political world. Similarly, Patterson (1962) maintains that the policymaker, as a human being, is very complex and is studied only within the context of the entire system.

Legislators, then like any actors in a system, act both in the context of the system and as individuals within the system. This theory, called a system of roles or role theory model in the framework of action, focuses on the idea that legislative behavior is dependent upon the interaction of all group members as well as on the behavior of the individual actors (legislators) with the goal of the system to resolve conflict. In the system, each legislator assumes a role which refers to a set of norms of behavior which are perceived by and applied to all within the system (Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan, and Ferguson, 1962). This model concentrates on individual as well as group psychology and tends to draw conclusions about the large body by examining both individual and group behaviors.

Fundamental to this theoretical approach is the belief that the actor, to a certain extent, behaves in response to reference groups with which the individual identifies (Patterson, 1962). For the legislator, the legislative group itself serves as a reference group as does the political party and extra legislative groups.

How a legislator behaves in the system is dependent upon three main factors, the first of which is institutional behavior. This is the examination of behavior of the system at large as mandated by conformity through peer pressure and confrontation with others within the legislature. Called the core roles within sector, this concept focuses on norms guiding legislator's behavior with reference to other legislators, other public officials and peers.

The second major factor having an effect on the actor within the legislative system is the clientele role sector which focuses on the fact that no legislative body is isolated or autonomous but instead is influenced by outside reference groups. Some of these groups include political parties, constituents, pressure and interest groups, and executive and administrative offices.

Another factor having an effect on the legislator, in the legislative system, is not generally a part of the role of the legislator as such. Instead, it focuses on the belief that every individual occupies many positions in his/her society. Called the incident role sector, this personal factor concentrates on the relationship between legislators and the outsiders that impact legislators' decisions and influence legislative action. It includes the extra legislative reference groups which are friendships, fraternal or recreational associations and other primary social circumstances that are non-political and nonlegislative.

Although the research is limited on the impact extra-legislative reference groups have on the policymaker, there is reason to believe that these groups have a major impact on legislators in making decisions. Patterson (1962) says:

It is clear that extra legislative membership and psychological groups with which the legislator identified function as reference groups for him and provide selective and integrative mechanisms for role conflict resolution (p. 32).

The role theory postulates that a legislator formulates concepts of his/her legislative role long before becoming a legislator. Like all people, the legislator holds other attitudes and plays other roles which affect perceptions of the position based on personal

characteristics which are shaped by demographic variables. Some of these variables include age, sex, ethnicity, religion, education, and socioeconomic status. In addition to demographic variables, ecological variables such as state, legislative district, size and density of population and political party all have an influence on the individual personality and character of the legislator. They also contribute to his/her development of attitudes, skills, roles, and behavior (Wahlke et al., 1962).

Wahlke (1962, p. 17), however, warns that in studying legislative behavior it is important not to think of the actor's role "as a fixed attitudinal attribute of each person which invariably leads him to act and react in the same way in every situation." Instead, he maintains that each legislator exhibits versatile role behavior. However, he encourages researchers to use the variables identified in this theoretical model as the basis for political science research.

#### Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs

Another theory that serves as a basis for explaining legislative behavior is the ideologist theory. It is described by Mathews and Stinson (Cited in Ulmer, 1970), that

when a specific policy proposal comes to the floor all the member need do is compare its probable consequences with a structure of beliefs he carried around in his head. If the policy and ideology agree, he supports the measure; if not, he votes against its acceptance (p. 20).

Critics of this theory say that evidence is lacking to support it; proponents maintain that this is due to the methods used to test the theory rather than because of the actual validity of the theory.



Whether ascribing to the systems role theory or the ideological theory, the researcher is challenged to examine the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the individual legislator. According to Rokeach (1976), all are interrelated and organized into a complex system and are manifested in behavior consequences. He defines a belief as "any simple proposition conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does" (Rokeach, 1976, p. 134). An attitude is "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (Rokeach, 1976, p. 134). Beliefs, then, are a predisposition to action and an attitude is an organization of beliefs. Attitudes are either positive or negative, but beliefs are value-free and neutral. A value is similar to an attitude because it is a predisposition behavior but it is more basic than an attitude and is often underlying an attitude.

In his discussion of beliefs, Rokeach (1976) identifies authority beliefs as beliefs formulated by authorities or reference groups. These authorities differ from person to person according to an individual's social structure. Some of the variables, however, include family, class, peer group, ethnic group, religious and political groups. He further postulates that derived beliefs, which are ideological beliefs such as religious and political beliefs, are derived from authority beliefs.

The principle of belief congruence focuses on the fact that an individual tends to value a given belief, subsystem or system of beliefs in proportion to the congruence with his/her own belief system. It is further postulated that any stimulus can activate within a person a position of the personal belief system and the degree of activation depends upon the stimulus.

Benson (1980), in his study of religion on Capitol Hill identifies that there are some very strong connections between the religious view of political figures and their political stances. In correlating the relationship between religion and voting records, in eight policy areas, he finds that in four of the eight areas voting can be very accurately predicted by knowing the legislator's religious orientation. He reports:

. . . we can predict voting better by knowing members' religious orientation than we can by knowing whether they are Republicans or Democrats. By knowing both party affiliation and religious orientation, we can predict as much as 75 percent of the variation in voting on some scales (Benson, 1980, p. 54).

Benson (1980) concludes that religion and politics are strongly connected, and that the findings from his study challenge political scientists to question previously held theories about factors influencing the formation of policy. A legislator interviewed in his study summarizes it well by saying:

My beliefs affect how I vote. But should they? I can't live with myself when I vote against my conscience. But I also worry about whether I have the right to let my beliefs influence my political decisions (Benson, 1980, p. 53).

Rokeach (1976) also explains that how an individual behaves with respect to an object or event depends upon the situation and on the particular beliefs activated by the situation. The behavior is determined by the attitudes of the individual and the conditions surrounding the situation. Behavior, then is a function of the interaction between the individual's attitudes toward the issue (object) being considered and the attitudes surrounding the conditions of the situation.

In applying this to a legislator's behavior, it is said that a legislator makes decisions based upon his/her attitudes toward the

content of the bill (the object) and on the situation within the context of the political system. Some of the possible situations include which party is sponsoring the bill, the governor's support or nonsupport of the bill and political pressures within the legislative body.

### Political and Constituency Variables Affecting Legislators' Decisions

In addition to the individual factors, the influence of the political party plays a major role in an individual legislator's decision-making process. Falling in the systems category of clientele role sector, the political party is found to be a significant influence in most roll call voting decisions.

According to Patterson (1962), studies analyzing legislator's attitudes toward certain policies have included the following independent variables: political party; constituency factors; regionalism; legislators' personal predispositions and background characteristics. Factors within the legislature include committees, legislative norms, and cliques. He concludes that

even in the fluid partisan structure of United States legislatures, political party differentiation provides the independent variable of greatest importance in accounting for variations of the policy attitudes of representatives (Patterson, 1962, p. 301).

In addition to party loyalty, ambitions to hold higher positions than those currently held and political aspirations have been shown to have an influence on legislators' voting behavior. Called the ambition theory of political behavior, this theory, as postulated by Schlessinger (1966), claims that the aspiration of politicians cause them to make political choices based on the office or status they aspire

to hold in the future. Schlessinger (1966) proposes that there are three office ambitions: the discrete, where the politicians want only a particular office for its specified time and then elect to withdraw from public office; the static where they desire to make a career out of a particular office; and the progressive group who aspire to reach an office higher than the one presently held.

According to a study done by Van Der Silk and Pernacciaro (1979), those senators at the national level who fall in the category of progressive (generally aspiring to presidency) try to establish records that are above concerns that are limited only to a particular state or region. Some of the issues include management of the economy, social welfare, civil rights, and international involvement. Contrastly, those with static ambitions (both discrete and static) concentrate on parochial interests such as federal assistance programs, school desegregation plans and tax credit supports.

Constituency variables also influence legislators' decisions. There is an assumption that geographic districts have unique interests and that legislators reflect those interests in policy making decisions. Studies such as those by MacRae (1959) and Derge (1959) show a relationship between legislative roll call votes and socioeconomic and urban versus rural characteristics of the electoral districts. Researchers are recognizing that any interpretations made based upon these variables are tentative because most electoral districts are becoming increasingly heterogenous.

According to Miller and Stokes (1972), constituents can control the policy actions of legislators in two ways. The first is through the selection of a representative that shares the beliefs of the

constituents. The second is through constituency control for the elected official to follow the wishes of the district in order to win re-election. They conclude from their study that local constituency has a measure of control over the actions of its legislators. They state that the lawmaker's roll call decisions are influenced greatly by his/her own policy preferences as well as by preferences held by the constituency.

The study of the formulation of public policy is indeed complex and affected by a variety of factors. Dexter (1969) summarizes its complexity by saying:

Basically Congressmen and Senators must generally choose between a multiplicity of interests and demands from many sides. They cannot react effectively to all or even most of them. Furthermore, a great many real demands are inarticulate subconscious, waiting to be mobilized. Some of the demands to which a Congressman is exposed are self-created from his own conscience or his doctrine of politics. A good many come from his colleagues . . . . In any case, Congressmen, like other people, interpret and choose to attend to matters in accordance with their own predispositions, situation, and experience (p. 6).

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The research design of this study was descriptive, analyzing conditions associated with or relationships that influence legislators' support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being. Best (1970, p. 116) explained that descriptive research can focus on "how what is or what exists is related to some preceding event that has influenced or affected a present condition." In this study the research focused on the voting records of individual legislators during the first and second regular sessions of the Fifty-Third Colorado General Assembly (1981 and 1982 legislative sessions) to determine if there was a relationship between voting records and selected attributes of legislators.

The dependent variable was the legislator's support of public policy oriented toward family well-being. The independent variables were divided into four categories related to the legislator's personal and social attributes, occupational attributes, political and legislative attributes, and characteristics related to the constituency represented. The category of personal and social attributes included the legislator's marital status, length of marriage, age, number of children, stage of family development, education, sex, and importance of religion in personal life. Occupation and income of the legislator comprised the category of occupational attributes. The legislator's political party, political aspirations, length of legislative service,

and percentage of votes received in the last election were the independent variables considered in the category of political and legislative attributes. Independent variables that were in the category of constituency included whether the district was urban or rural, the percentage of nonwhites in the district, the percentage of Hispanics in the district, the distance the major town in the district was from the state capitol and the percentage of unemployed people in the district. Also included in this category were the percentage of people in the district registered as Republicans, Democrats, and unaffiliated.

The impact of fellow legislators, party leadership, informal groups in the party, staff people, constituents and the governor's office were examined to determine if they had an influence on voting decisions. Also examined in this category were the influence of organizations, the impact of materials read by the legislators and the impact that family and friends had upon voting decisions on family policy issues.

#### Population and Sample

The total population in this study included 100 Colorado legislators serving in the Colorado state legislature during the 53rd Colorado General Assembly. This included 35 senators serving four-year terms and 65 representatives serving two-year terms. The Colorado legislature was designed so that newly elected legislators took office during the first session of the general assembly providing for continuity of individual members during both sessions of each assembly. However, during the interim between the first and second sessions of the 53rd General Assembly, two legislators resigned, resulting in an identical population between the two legislative sessions with the

exception of two members. One resignation occurred in the Senate and the other in the House.

The state of Colorado was divided into 35 senatorial districts with the average size of each district approximately 63,000 people (State of Colorado (1981) 53rd General Assembly, 1981). During both sessions of the 53rd General Assembly, the Senate consisted of 31 men and four women. Twenty-two of these senators were Republican and 13 were Democrat (Directory 1981 Fifty-Third General Assembly-First Regular Session of Colorado, 1981). There were 65 Colorado representative districts with the average size of each district between 33,000 and 34,000 residents. During the 1981 legislative sessions, these districts were represented by 18 women and 47 men, and during the 1982 session by 19 women and 46 men. This change came as a result of the resignation of one male legislator with his appointed replacement a female. In both sessions 40 representatives were Republican and 25 were Democrat (Director 1981 Fifty-Third General Assembly-First Regular Session State of Colorado, 1981).

The Colorado state legislature was selected because Colorado is the home of the researcher which facilitated access to the legislators. Furthermore, Colorado, as a relatively diversified state, could provide findings through this study that might be suggestive of legislators in states other than Colorado.

The sample of legislators in this study was based upon a random sample selection with each legislator having an equal statistical chance of being chosen. Fifty-one randomly selected legislators served as the sample for the study, 17 senators and 34 representatives. Although only 33 names of house members were needed to reach the sample size an



additional 14 were selected as alternates in the event that some would decline to participate in the study. Similarly, in the Senate, 27 names were randomly selected with the last ten designated as alternates.

The original intent of the researcher was to interview 50 legislators; however, 51 were actually interviewed. An additional interview was conducted because one legislator was unable to complete the entire interview. To compensate for this deficiency, an alternate legislator was interviewed. In addition, the partially completed interview was included in the study since a majority of the information needed was collected.

Ten women were in the study nine of whom had served in the House of Representatives and one who had served in the Senate. Of the 41 men in the sample, 16 served in the Senate and 25 in the House. Twenty percent of the sample were women and 80 percent were men; in the total population, 23 percent were women and 77 percent were men. Sixty-one percent of the sample were Republicans and 39 percent were Democrats; in the total population 62 percent were Republican and 38 percent were Democrats. Thirty-five of the 51 legislators had returned to serve in the 1983 legislative session.

Two persons, both women who were not members of the 1983 legislature, declined to participate in the study. Both had served in the House of Representatives. In addition to those two who declined, three members of the House who were on the original list of 24 were replaced by alternates. In the Senate, three people of the original 14 chosen for the sample were replaced by alternates. The researcher was asked by the legislator guiding the data gathering procedure not to approach these six legislators for an interview because of the extremely heavy

work load of these individuals. (The researcher served as a legislative intern during the time of this study; the senator sponsoring her internship made this request.) This request was honored. Consequently, of the 53 legislators who were asked to participate in the study, 51 agreed.

### Instrumentation

Two instruments were developed for this study. One was a policy analysis framework and the other was an interview schedule. (See Appendices A and C.) The policy analysis framework served as the basis for the selection of bills used in this study. According to MacRae (1979) two important elements involved in policy analysis are the definition of the problem and the criteria for choice. The definition of the problem area in this study was the orientation of the policy toward family well-being.

Two criteria that may be used in developing a framework to assess the impact of policies on families were identified by Green (1982), Executive Director of the American Home Economics Association, in a presentation given at Oklahoma State University on home economists' involvement in public policy. The first was that the policy be examined for its positive impact on the family, that the primary criteria center on its effect on the family, not for its effect on the economy or on individuals. The second criterion she identified was that the policy be designed to enable families to function in their own strengths, through broadened options or choices and through a prevention, educational or developmental mode.

Using these criteria, only explicit family policies were examined in this study; that is, specific programs and policies designed to achieve specified, explicit goals regarding the family as well as programs and policies that deliberately did things to or for the family. For the policy analysis framework designed for this study, two criteria were used to determine if a policy was an explicit family policy. These were:

1. The family or family members were clearly the object of the policy.
2. The policy supported or supplemented families to carry out their functions through broadened options and choices.

In addition, in order for a policy to be considered a family policy in this study it needed to help families perform one of three functions. These functions were:

1. Membership Functions-policies that influenced whether individuals formed, broke up, expanded or contracted families.
2. Economic and Consumer Functions-policies that affected families' abilities to provide support for their members through employment, securing of housing, job training.
3. Socializing and Nurturant Functions-policies that helped families rear and nurture their dependents, encouraged and supported their physical, intellectual, and emotional development, and provided psychological sustenance to their members.

Using these criteria related to explicit family policy and the performance of family functions, the researcher designed a framework to analyze policies. A copy of that framework is found in Appendix A.

All bills that reached the third vote in both houses during the

1981 and 1982 legislative sessions of the Colorado legislature were examined for consideration in this study. These included 533 bills that passed in the 1981 session and 175 that passed in the 1982 session as well as the 12 bills that reached the third vote in both Houses and were defeated on that vote in one of the chambers.

The researcher read summaries of the 533 bills that were passed. These summaries were found in Digest of Bills Enacted by the Fifty-Third General Assembly, 1981 First Regular Session (1981), and Digest of Bills Enacted by the Fifty-Third General Assembly, 1982 Second Regular Session (1982). In cases where the summaries were incomplete, unclear or too brief to be understood, the researcher read those bills in their entirety as presented in the Session Laws of Colorado for 1981 (1981) and Session Laws of Colorado 1982 (1982).

Using the framework designed to analyze policies oriented toward family well-being, the researcher evaluated each bill summary for consideration of the policy in this study. If there was doubt as to whether the bill met all the criteria, the bill was included in the initial selection for further consideration by the jury selection committee and/or legal consultant.

Five bills, because of technicality in language or content, were difficult to understand. The legal counsel for the Oklahoma State University student association provided interpretations of these bills. Using his explanation of the bills, the researcher eliminated one policy because it did not meet the criteria outlined on the framework.

Twelve bills reached the third vote in both Houses and were defeated on that vote in one of the chambers. Copies of these bills were obtained from the Colorado Legislative Drafting Office. All were

examined and subsequently eliminated for use in this study because they did not meet the criteria outlined on the policy analysis framework.

Through this initial process, 31 bills were selected as possibly being oriented toward family well-being. These 31 bills were classified into three categories according to their difficulty to read and understand. The three categories were easy, fairly easy, and difficult. Twelve were classified as easy, 14 as fairly easy and five as difficult. These classifications were made to facilitate the next phase of the selection process, the jury analysis of the bills.

In order to assure that the final selection of the bills used in this study was as valid and objective as possible, a jury was used to analyze the bills. Two graduate home economics classes, one in family relationships and one in family economics, served on the jury. In addition, three individuals who were current or former graduate home economics students served on the jury, making a total of 27 jurors.

The jury analyzed the 31 bills previously selected by the researcher. Each juror analyzed three or four bills as assigned to him/her through a stratified random process. Each person received a randomly selected easy, fairly easy and difficult bill to analyze. For those receiving a fourth bill, the policy was randomly selected from the easy or fairly easy categories.

Before analyzing the bills, the jurors were trained on the procedures to follow in making their evaluations. Each juror received a packet of materials which included the policy analysis framework listing the title of policy to be analyzed by that juror. Also as a part of the packet were a definition sheet that included the definitions of family and family well-being, a description of the functions a family

serves, and a summary of each policy as well as each policy in its entirety to be analyzed by that juror. A copy of SB 62 entitled "A Bill for an Act Concerning Domestic Violence and Providing State Assistance for Such Community Programs and Making an Appropriation Thereof" was also in the packet. A copy of this jury packet may be found in Appendix B.

The jury members received verbal instructions on how to analyze the bills. Included were an overview of the research study, an explanation of "family," "family policy," and "family well-being" as used in the context of this study, as well as an explanation of the functions a family serves. Directions were presented on how to analyze the policies with all jurors analyzing SB 62 to clarify questions or misunderstandings related to the use of the framework. (SB 62 was used in the training session because it was defeated before the third vote.)

All bills were analyzed three times by three separate jurors. In order for a bill to be included in the study, it needed to be considered a policy oriented toward family well-being by at least two of the three jurors.

In order for a juror to classify a policy as being oriented toward family well-being, he/she needed to determine that the family or family members were clearly the object of the policy and that policy supported the family in carrying out its functions through broadened options or choices. The juror indicated in the appropriate boxes on the framework either "yes" or "no" his/her judgment of whether the policy met these criteria.

Under the category of "Enables Families to Perform One of Three Functions," the jurors wrote "yes" in the box or boxes of the functions

addressed in the policy. While some policies helped families perform more than one function, only one function needed to be met for the policy to be identified as being oriented toward family well-being. If the juror determined that the policy did not help the family perform one of three functions, he/she wrote "no" in all three categories of functions.

The analyses of the jurors were then tabulated. Thirty of the 31 bills were selected by the jurors as being oriented toward family well-being. These bills are presented in Table I. The function(s) the bill helped families meet as well as the identification of whether the bill had a fiscal impact is also shown on the table. The bill that was rejected by the jurors was SB 101, Limitation of Children Out of Home Placement.

#### Roll Call Analysis

The analysis of roll call votes served as a basis for determining the legislator's support or nonsupport of the bills studied. According to Eldersveld (Cited in Eulau, Eldersveld, and Janowitz, 1956), the analysis of roll call votes was a fairly reliable index because voting behavior was one body of political data that could systematically and quantitatively be measured and tested.

In the Colorado legislature, the third reading (roll call) votes were the only permanent record of individual decisions made by lawmakers in relation to legislation. Consequently, roll call votes provided an objective source of information on how legislators voted on specific legislative measures. An analysis of roll call votes provided tentative generalizations about the behavior of legislators.

TABLE I  
POLICIES INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY

Policy Number and Title	Functions Served				
	Membership	Economic & Consumer	Socializing Health & Nurturing	FI <sup>a</sup>	NFI <sup>b</sup>
SB 6 Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act	X				X
SB 28 Concerning Loans for Low or Moderate Income Housing		X		X	
SB 113 Concerning the Expansion of the Powers of the Colorado Housing Finance Authority		X			X
SB 138 Concerning the Expansion of Alternatives to Long-Term Nursing Home Care	X	X	X	X	
SB 162 Concerning the Public Employees' Retirement Association		X			X
SB 181 Concerning the Public Employees' Retirement Association and Providing for Contributions Thereto and Benefits Therefrom	X	X	X		X
SB 276 Concerning Factors Admissible in Determining the Best Interests of a Child on a Child Custody Proceeding	X		X		X
SB 315 Concerning the Sexual Exploitation of Children	X		X		X
SB 337 Concerning Placement of Children	X		X	X	
SB 364 Concerning Parent Liability for Patient Care by the Department of Institutions		X			X
SB 370 Concerning Protection of the Interests of the Child in Cases under the "Colorado Children's Code"	X	X	X	X	
SB 395 Concerning the Readoption in Colorado of Children Adopted in a Foreign Country	X		X		X
SB 470 Concerning the Administration and Distribution of Estates under the Colorado Probate Code			X		X
HB 1093 Concerning Eligibility Requirements for Aid to Families with Dependent Children	X	X	X	X	
HB 1109 Establishing Permanent Disability for Law Enforcement Officers and Firemen for the Purpose of Determining Eligibility of Dependents to Quality for Educational Benefits		X	X		X
HB 1144 Concerning Access to Child Abuse Reports by Child Care Licensing Agencies			X		X
HB 1173 Concerning the Displaced Homemaker Fund and Raising the Limitations Thereof	X	X	X	X	



TABLE I (Continued)

Policy Number and Title	Functions Served				
	Membership	Economic & Consumer	Socializing Health & Nurturing	FI <sup>a</sup>	NFI <sup>b</sup>
HB 1175 Concerning Domestic Violence	X		X	X	
HB 1177 Concerning Obligations for Support to Children and Spouse	X	X	X	X	
HB 1195 Concerning Conformity of the Colorado Unemployment Insurance Statute to Federal Law		X		X	
HB 1239 Concerning the Alternative to Long-Term Nursing Home Care for the Developmentally Disabled and the Mentally Ill	X	X	X		X
HB 1278 Concerning a Property Tax Exemption for Single Parent Family Residential Facilities	X	X	X	X	
HB 1295 Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act	X		X		X
HB 1310 Sexually explicit Materials Harmful to Children			X		X
HB 1392 Concerning the Loan of Moneys by the University of Colorado Board of Regents		X	X		X
HB 1403 Concerning the Provision of Medical Service for Dependent Students	X	X	X		X
HB 1489 Concerning Hereditary Disorders, and Providing for Newborn Screening, Genetic Counseling and Education Act	X		X	X	
HB 1490 Concerning Support Obligations	X				X
HB 1557 Concerning the Enforcement of Child Support Obligations and Providing Procedures Therefor	X	X	X	X	
HB 1571 Concerning the Parent Child Legal Relationship and Relation to the Relinquishment Proceedings	X		X		X

<sup>a</sup>Fiscal Impact; this abbreviation will also apply for subsequent tables.

<sup>b</sup>No Fiscal Impact; this abbreviation will also apply for subsequent tables.

## Examination of Public Documents

The roll call analysis told how the individual legislators voted on policies oriented toward family well-being. Ascertaining information on variables that could explain why legislators voted as they did was accomplished by examining public documents and by personally interviewing the legislators. Examination of the Colorado Legislative Directory (1981), Directory 1981 Fifty-Third General Assembly First Regular Session State of Colorado (1981), Directory 1982 Fifty-Third General Assembly Second Regular Session (1982), and Colorado Legislative Almanac (1981) provided information related to several of the independent variables. These included political party, occupation, marital status, length of service in the legislature, sex, and age. The number of children, legislative body membership, and the percentage of votes the legislator received in the last election were obtained from these sources as well. In addition, information related to the constituency the legislator represented was obtained from Colorado Legislative Almanac (1981). These included the average adjusted gross income for the district, and the percentage of voters registered as Republicans, Democrats and unaffiliated.

The 1980 Census of Population (1982) provided information on the percentage of nonwhites as well as the percentage of Hispanics in each county. Since it was impossible to obtain accurate district information for all districts on these variables, the information presented on counties was calculated for the districts. For rural areas that included multiple counties, this information was very accurate. However, in urban areas such as Denver and Colorado Springs, using the county information as district information was not accurate. Some districts

in Denver had a very high percentage of nonwhites and others had a very low percentage. By using the average for the entire county for each district, the differentiation between these districts was lost. However, because this information was not available on a district basis, it was necessary to use county information.

The Colorado Legislative Almanac (1981) identified the largest town in each district. A Colorado road map was used to determine the distance from the largest town in each district to the state capitol in Denver.

Kalenova and Reynolds (1981) provided the criteria to determine if the district consisted primarily of an urban or rural population.

According to the report

. . . the urban population is composed of persons living in densely populated areas (Urbanized Area) in areas (incorporated and unincorporated) of 2,500 or more outside urbanized areas. Each urbanized area includes a central city and the surrounding closely settled urban fringe which together have a population of 50,000 or more. All persons living outside urbanized areas in places less than 2,500 or in the open countryside are classified as rural population. According to the 1980 provisional figures . . . 80.6 percent constituted the urban population of Colorado (p. 6).

After identifying the major towns in each district, the researcher examined the 1980 Census of Population (1982) to determine if the district was rural or urban. In most cases, the district was clearly identified in one of the two categories. In those rare instances where there was doubt, the researcher placed those districts that had 50 percent or more of the district population living in areas of 2,500 or more in the "urban category." Likewise, those districts where 50 percent or more of the population in the district living in areas under 2,500 were classified as rural. Seven districts (14%) were identified as rural and 44 (86%) were classified as urban.

## Personal Interviews

Additional information associated with independent variables was obtained through personal interviews. The interviews were conducted to validate some information obtained from public records and to gather additional information related to the legislators' personal, political and professional lives. Responses were also obtained on legislators' concepts of the proper relationship between government and families as well as factors that impact voting decision. A copy of the interview schedule used in this study is found in Appendix C.

The interview schedule incorporated four questions that were designed for a survey administered at the University of Minnesota. A copy of the letter sent to the University of Minnesota requesting use of these questions is found in Appendix D with their letter granting permission found there as well.

The interview schedule was pretested on two former Oklahoma legislators, one former South Dakota legislator and one current South Dakota legislator. Feedback from these individuals was used to make revisions on the content and length of the instrument.

Interviews were conducted between January 1, 1983 and March 4, 1983. In order to have access to a majority of the legislators during this time period, the researcher served as a legislative intern for a Colorado state senator.

Thirty-six of the 51 legislators were approached in person at the capitol to be asked to participate in the study. The remaining 17 (two of whom declined) were contacted by telephone. When the initial contact was made, the researcher introduced herself, explained her status as a graduate student and as a legislative intern and briefly

discussed the research she was doing in the area of family policy. After this introduction had been given, the researcher solicited an interview with the legislator. Generally an appointment was scheduled for the interview at a later, more convenient time for the legislator. However, some legislators suggested that the interview be conducted immediately.

Interviews were conducted in the locations most convenient for the legislator. Thirty-nine of the interviews were conducted at the Colorado State Capitol, in legislators' offices, in the capitol coffee shop or on the floor of one of the chambers. Three were conducted in the business offices of the legislators, two were conducted in restaurants, four were conducted in legislators' homes, and three were conducted over the phone. Those two legislators who lived a great distance from Denver were first called by the researcher to ask if they would be willing to participate in the study. When they consented, a time that was convenient for the legislator was established for the telephone interview. The researcher followed up this conversation by sending the legislator a letter confirming the appointment as well as a copy of the interview schedule. When the interview was conducted, the legislator followed along with his copy of the interview. A copy of the confirmation letter is found in Appendix D.

The length of the interview ranged from 20 minutes to 2½ hours. Most interviews were 35-40 minutes in length.

Every effort was made to conduct the interview in a relaxed, conversational manner. Legislators were assured of their anonymity. The questions and probes were worded conversationally and careful notes were taken during the interview. The introduction presented at the

beginning of each interview is included in the appendix with the interview schedule.

Since some questions were rather long and complex and since some were of a more confidential nature, copies of these questions were handed to the legislator at appropriate times during the interview. These included items 25-55 on page 1 and 2 of the instrument, items 57-69 on page 3 and items 25, 26, and 27 on page 6.

### Data Analysis

Data obtained from the public records and personal interviews were coded and keypunched for analysis. The Computer Center at Oklahoma State University and Statistical Analysis System Computer Programming were used for all analyses.

Results were summarized and reported as frequencies for some data collected; factor analysis and the Kuder Richardson formula were employed to analyze measurements of voting records. Simple correlations were used to analyze the relationship between voting records and the legislators' personal, social, occupational, legislative and political attributes as well as the characteristics of the constituents represented. Analysis of variance was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences on voting records between the various categories of each independent variable. A probability level equal to or less than  $<.05$  served as the basis for establishing significance.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study was concerned with Colorado legislators' support or nonsupport of policies oriented toward family well-being. This chapter presents a description of the respondents and the results from the analysis of data.

#### Description of Sample

The 51 legislators who participated in this study are described according to personal and family characteristics, educational and occupational attributes, political and legislative characteristics and according to the characteristics of the constituency represented. Personal and family characteristics are summarized in Table II. Eighty percent of the respondents were male, 63 percent of the participants were between 41 and 60 years of age with a mode of 51-60 years. Seventy-seven percent were married and 88 percent had children. The mode number of children was two with the maximum number eight. In the stage of family development, the largest percentage (40%) were in the married, empty nest to retirement stage. Seventy-three percent of the legislators identified religion as very important or fairly important in their personal lives.

Data related to educational and occupational characteristics are summarized in Table III. Eighty-six percent of the legislators had

TABLE II  
 DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO PERSONAL  
 AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS  
 (N=51)

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	41	80.4
Female	10	19.6
<u>Age<sup>a</sup></u>		
33-40	13	25.4
41-50	15	29.4
51-60	17	33.3
60-67	6	11.7
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	12	23.5
Married	39	76.5
<u>Stage of Family Development</u>		
<u>Couple Family Development</u>		
Couple without children	3	5.8
Couple with oldest child less than 30 months	1	1.9
Couple with oldest child 7-13 years	1	2.0
Couple with oldest child 14-20 years	4	7.8
Couple when first child leaves home until last is gone	5	9.8
Couple, empty nest to retirement	20	39.2
Couple, retirement to death of both spouses	5	9.8
<u>Single Family Development</u>		
Single, no children	3	5.8
Single, oldest child 6-13	1	2.0
Single, oldest child 13-20	3	5.8
Single when first child leaves home until last is gone	2	3.9
Single, empty nest to retirement	2	3.9
Single, retirement to death	1	2.0
<u>Importance of Religion in Personal Life</u>		
Very important	17	33.3
Fairly important	20	39.2
Not too important	12	23.5
Not at all important	2	3.9

<sup>a</sup>As of January 1, 1982



TABLE III  
 DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL  
 AND OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS  
 (N=51)

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Highest Level of Formal Education Achieved</u>		
Less than high school	1	2.0
High school	2	3.9
Vocational/technical training beyond high school	4	7.8
College but did not receive a bachelor degree	6	11.7
College with completion of a bachelor degree	3	5.8
Graduate work without completion of a degree	12	23.5
Completion of a master's degree	11	21.6
JD (law degree)	10	19.6
Doctorate	1	2.0
Unknown	1	2.0
<u>Occupational Status</u>		
<u>Professional</u>	22	43.1
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Attorney	9	17.6
Educator	7	13.7
Public Relations	3	5.9
Clergyman	1	2.0
Social Worker	1	2.0
Insurance Underwriter	1	2.0
<u>Nonprofessional</u>	29	56.9
Manager/Proprietor	13	25.5
Farmer/Rancher	3	5.9
Legislator	8	15.7
Retired	5	9.8
<u>Family Income</u>		
Under \$15,000	2	3.9
\$15,000-\$19,000	4	7.3
\$20,000-\$29,000	6	11.7
\$30,000-\$39,000	6	11.7
\$40,000-\$49,000	10	19.6
\$50,000-\$75,000	5	9.8
\$76,000-\$100,000	6	11.7
Over \$100,000	3	5.9
Unknown	9	17.6

attended college. The greatest percentage (24) held a bachelor's degree and had done some graduate work; 20 percent of the legislators had law degrees. Only one had less than a high school education.

Forty-three percent of the legislators were employed as professionals; attorneys comprised the largest group within this category, followed by educators. Of the 57 percent who were in the category of non-professionals, more than half were employed as managers or proprietors.

The modal income range was \$40,000 to \$49,000. Two reported a family income under \$15,000 and three reported incomes over \$100,000. Nine were unwilling to disclose their incomes.

Information on the political and legislative characteristics of the participants are presented in Table IV. Sixty-one percent of the participants were Republicans; there were twice as many representatives as senators participating in the study.

Length of legislative service varied from two to twenty years. One-quarter of the participants were freshmen legislators at the time they voted on the issues investigated in this study. Five to eight years was the modal category for legislative service; three legislators had served between 16 and 20 years.

Forty-five percent of the legislators said they had no plans to seek a higher political office; however, nearly 30 percent definitely had higher political aspirations and another 24 percent were willing to say they could possibly seek a higher office. Twenty percent of the participants indicated that it is highly probable they will seek the office they currently hold at least one more time; 65 percent were unsure or unwilling to share those plans. Twenty percent of the sample were unopposed in the 1980 election; eight percent won by a very narrow margin of one percent or less.

TABLE IV  
 DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO POLITICAL  
 AND LEGISLATIVE CHARACTERISTICS  
 (N=51)

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Party Affiliation</u>		
Republicans	31	60.8
Democrats	20	39.2
<u>Membership in General Assembly</u>		
Senators	17	33.3
Representatives	34	66.6
<u>Length of Legislative Service<sup>a</sup></u>		
2 years or less	13	25.5
3-4 years	11	21.6
5-8 years	16	31.4
10-14 years	8	15.7
16-20 years	3	5.9
<u>Future Political Plans: Aspirations to Higher Office</u>		
Definitely plan to seek higher political office	15	29.4
Possibly plan to seek higher political office	12	23.5
No plans to seek a higher political office	23	45.1
Unknown	1	2.0
<u>Future Political Plans: Plan to Seek Current Office at Least One More Time</u>		
Highly probable	10	19.6
Fairly probable	5	9.8
Not too probable	3	5.9
Not at all probable	0	0
Unknown	33	64.7
<u>Percentage of Votes Received in 1980 Election</u>		
50-51%	4	7.8
52-55%	8	15.7
56-60%	9	17.6
61-69%	16	31.4
70-78%	4	7.8
100% (unopposed)	10	19.6

<sup>a</sup>As of January 1, 1982

Eighty-six percent of the legislators in this sample represented districts located in urbanized areas. The percentage of Hispanics in the districts ranged from 3 to 36 and the percentage of nonwhites ranged from 2 to 25 percent. The average adjusted gross income in the district ranged from \$5,261 to \$18,287. The modal range (28%) was \$13,501 to \$14,500. These findings are presented in Table V.

TABLE V  
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO  
CONSTITUENCY CHARACTERISTICS  
(N=51)

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Percentage of Legislative Districts Located in Urbanized and Rural Areas</u>		
Urban	44	86.3
Rural	7	13.7
<u>Percentage of Hispanics in Legislative District</u>		
3-5%	13	24.5
6-9%	12	23.5
13-17%	11	21.6
18-25%	13	24.5
33-36%	2	3.9
<u>Percentage of Nonwhites in Legislative District</u>		
2-5%	15	29.4
6-12%	15	29.4
13-20%	9	17.6
23-25%	12	23.5
<u>Average Adjusted Gross Income in Districts</u>		
Under \$10,000	1	2.0
\$10,000-\$12,000	8	15.7
\$12,000-\$13,500	11	21.6
\$13,501-\$14,500	14	27.5
\$14,501-\$16,000	11	21.2
\$16,001-\$18,287	6	11.8

### Analysis of Voting Records

A major procedure in the study was to identify all bills that reached the roll call voting stage during the first and second sessions of the Colorado legislature that were oriented toward family well-being. Bills were analyzed by jury members according to the procedures outlined in Chapter III. Thirty bills were identified by the jury as being oriented toward family well-being. The names and numbers of these bills, the percentage of votes each received, the standard deviation for each, and the number of "yes" votes each received are presented in Table VI.

To determine the reliability of "yes" votes on these bills as a measure of orientation toward family well-being, a Kuder Richardson (KR-20) value was computed. The Kuder Richardson formula tests the reliability of sample items based upon the average correlation among all items. In order for the sample items to be determined as statistically reliable, they needed to have a .50 or greater coefficient (Nunally, 1967). The 30 bills tested produced a .60 coefficient.

The 30 measures were also subdivided by the jury into three categories according to the ways in which they helped families function; these categories were membership, economic and socializing functions. The 30 bills were also categorized according to whether or not the measure had a fiscal impact as determined by the legislative drafting office. The categories into which each bill was placed are identified in Table I in Chapter III. These five subcategories were also tested with the Kuder Richardson formula with all producing coefficient values greater than .50. Coefficient values for all bill categories are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VI

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND NUMBER OF "YES" VOTES  
FOR 30 BILLS IDENTIFIED BY THE JURY AS BEING  
ORIENTED TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Bill No.	Bill Title	Raw Number of "Yes" Votes	Mean (% of "Yes" Votes)	Standard Deviation
SB 6	Concerning the Requirements for Dissolution of Marriage Upon Affidavit	44	86	.35
SB 28	Concerning Loans for Low or Moderate Income Housing	39	76	.43
SB 113	Concerning Expansion of Powers of Colorado Housing Finance Authority	42	82	.39
SB 138	Concerning the Expansion of Alternatives to Long-Term Nursing Home Care	49	96	.20
SB 162	Concerning the Public Employees Retirement Association	37	73	.45
SB 181	Concerning the Public Employees' Retirement Association and Providing for Contributions Thereto and Benefits Therefrom	41	80	.40
SB 276	Concerning Factors Admissible in Determining the Best Interest of Child in a Child Custody Proceeding	50	98	.14
SB 315	Concerning Sexual Exploitation of Children	48	94	.24
SB 337	Concerning Placement of Children	47	92	.27
SB 364	Concerning Parent Liability for Patient Care by the Department of Institutions	45	88	.33
SB 378	Concerning Protection of the Interest of the Child in Cases Under the Colorado Children's Code	44	86	.35
SB 395	Concerning the Readoption in Colorado of Children Adopted in a Foreign Country	46	90	.30
SB 470	Concerning the Administration and Distribution of Estates Under the Colorado Probate Code	42	82	.39
HB 1093	Concerning the Eligibility of Requirements for Aid to Families with Dependent Children	46	90	.30
HB 1109	Concerning Establishing Permanent Disability for Law Enforcement Officers and Fireman for the Purpose of Determining Eligibility of Dependents to Qualify for Educational Benefits	49	96	.20

TABLE VI (Continued)

Bill No.	Bill Title	Raw Number of "Yes" Votes	Mean (% of "Yes" Votes)	Standard Deviation
HB 1144	Concerning Access to Child Abuse records by Child Care Licensing Agencies	48	94	.24
HB 1173	Concerning the Displaced Homemaker Fund and Raising the Limitation Thereon	38	75	.44
HB 1175	Concerning Domestic Violence	38	75	.44
HB 1177	Concerning Obligations for Support to Children and Spouses	42	82	.39
HB 1195	Concerning Conformity of the Colorado Unemployment Insurance Statutes to Federal Law	39	76	.43
HB 1239	Concerning Alternatives to Long-Term Nursing Home Care for Developmentally Disabled and Mentally Ill	46	90	.30
HB 1278	Concerning a Property Tax Exemption for Single Parent Family Residential Facilities	39	76	.43
HB 1295	Concerning Temporary Restraining Orders under the Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act	39	76	.43
HB 1310	Concerning Sexually Explicit Materials Harmful to Children	48	94	.24
HB 1392	Concerning the Loan of Moneys by the University of Colorado Board of Regents	40	78	.42
HB 1403	Concerning the Provision of Medical Services for Dependents of Students	30	59	.50
HB 1489	Concerning Hereditary Disorders and Providing for Newborn Screening Genetic Counseling and Education	38	75	.44
HB 1490	Concerning Support Obligations	36	71	.46
HB 1571	Concerning the Parent Child Legs Relationships and Related to Relinquishment Proceedings	47	92	.27
HB 1557	Concerning the Enforcement of Child Support Obligations and Providing Procedures Therefor	45	88	.33

TABLE VII

KUDER RICHARDSON COEFFICIENT VALUES OF TOTAL 30  
BILLS AND THE SUBCATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP,  
ECONOMICS AND SOCIALIZING FUNCTIONS AND  
FISCAL AND NO FISCAL IMPACT

Bill Category	Coefficient Alpha Value
All 30 Bills (total)	.69
Economic Function	.56
Membership Function	.67
Socializing Function	.66
Fiscal Impact	.58
No Fiscal Impact	.66

#### Factor Analysis of Voting Records

Factor analysis was also used on the 30 bills to identify measures of orientation to family well-being. In the initial process of factor analysis, 15 of the 30 variables loaded heavily ( $>.30$ ) on the first unrotated factor. According to Kass and Tinsley (1979),  $.30$  suggests a reasonable measure of common variance among items. Based upon the correlations of yes votes on each bill, these 15 were clustered together to represent policies oriented toward family well-being. The 15 bills with their factor loadings on the first unrotated factor are presented in Table VIII.

The remaining 15 bills did not prove empirically to be related to the other bills which were identified as being oriented toward family well-being. This determination was based on the factor loadings on the first unrotated factor where all measures were analyzed.



TABLE VIII  
BILLS AND FACTOR LOADINGS ON THE UNROTATED FACTOR

Bill Title	Bill Number	Factor Loading
Concerning Loans for Low or Moderate Income Housing	SB28	.565
Concerning the Expansion of the Process of the Colorado Housing Finance Authority	SB113	.620
Concerning the Public Employees' Retirement Association and Providing for Contributions thereto and Benefit Therefrom	SB181	.349
Concerning Factors Admissible in Determining the Best Interests of a Child in a Child Custody Proceeding	SB276	.418
Concerning the Sexual Exploitation of Children	SB315	.411
Concerning Placement of Children	SB337	.627
Concerning Protection of the Interests of the Child in Cases under the "Colorado Children's Code"	SB378	.486
Concerning the Displaced Homemaker Fund, and Raising the Limitation Thereon	HB1173	.699
Concerning Domestic Violence	HB1175	.672
Concerning Alternatives to Long-Term Nursing Home Care for the Developmentally Disabled and the Mentally Ill	HB1239	.690
Concerning a Property Tax Exemption for Single Parent Family Residential Facilities	HB1278	.611
Concerning the Temporary Restraining Order under the "Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act"	HB1295	.326
Concerning the Loan of Moneys by the University of Colorado Board of Regents	HB1392	.469
Concerning the Provision of Medical Services for Dependents of Students	HB1403	.456
Concerning Hereditary Disorders and Providing for Newborn Screening, Genetic Counseling and Education Programs	HB1489	.507

When the factors extracted were rotated, the 15 measures having significant loadings were grouped into four types. Of these, one factor, composed of two bills (SB 181 and SB 378), was eliminated. A common dimension showing a relationship between these two bills could not be identified. This factor also explained the least amount of variation of the four factors that emerged. Fifteen bills emerged as being representative of policies oriented toward family well-being and 15 were eliminated. The 15 bills eliminated are listed by title, number, functions served, and their fiscal or nonfiscal impact on Table IX.

TABLE IX  
BILLS ELIMINATED AS A RESULT OF FACTOR ANALYSIS

Bill No.	Bill Title	Membership Functions	Economic Functions	Socializing Functions	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact
HB 1144	Concerning Access to Child Abuse Reports by Child Abuse Reports by Child Care Licensing Agents			X		X
HB 1177	Concerning Obligation for Support to Children and Spouse	X	X	X	X	
HB 1195	Concerning Conformity of the Colorado Unemployment Insurance Statutes to Federal Law		X		X	
HB 1310	Sexually Explicit Materials Harmful to Children			X		X
HB 1571	Concerning the Parent-Child Legal Relationship	X			X	X
HB 1557	Concerning the Enforcement of Child Support Obligation Providing Procedures Thereof	X	X	X	X	
HB 1490	Concerning Support Obligations	X				X
SB 6	Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act	X				X
SB 138	Concerning Expansion to Long Term Nursing Home Care	X	X	X	X	
SB 162	Concerning the Public Employees' Retirement Association		X			X
SB 364	Concerning Parent Liability for Parent Care by the Department of Institutions		X			X
HB 1093	Concerning Eligibility Requirements for Aid to Families with Dependent Children	X	X	X	X	
SB 395	Concerning the Readoption in Colorado of Children Adopted in a Foreign County	X			X	X
SB 470	Concerning the Administration and Distribution of Estates under the Colorado Probate Code			X		X
HB 1109	Establishing Permanent Disability for Law Enforcement Officers and Firemen for the Purpose of Determining Eligibility of Dependents to Qualify for Educational Benefits		X	X		X

The three remaining factors were labeled according to a common dimension identified within each and were descriptive of the intent of the legislative measures. Identification of the factors and the bills that composed each and the factor loadings of each are presented in Table X. The total explained variation for each factor is presented in Table XI.

As indicated on Table X, the bills in factor one are policies that provide for family health care and housing needs. Those in factor two are policies with no fiscal impact that assist families with membership, economic or socializing functions. Factor three consists of bills with a fiscal impact that assist families with membership and socializing functions. Of the total 30 bills, 12 had a fiscal impact and four of these were included in factor three.

In order to most effectively employ factor analysis, a broad scale measuring the dependent variable is desirable. This provides a range on which to measure each component. In this study of voting records where there was a scale of zero to one (zero indicating a "no" vote and one indicating a "yes" vote), there was not a broad range to measure the dependent variable. Consequently, factor analysis has not been a widely used measure of dichotomous variables. Several authorities have addressed the issues related to advantages and disadvantages of the use of factor analysis in this way (Bock and Liberman, 1970; Christofferson, 1975; Horst, 1965; Muthen, 1978, 1981). A report of a study employing the use of factor analysis with dichotomous variables is presented by Shea and Jones (1982). Based upon the review of these studies, the employment of factor analysis in this study appeared to be justified.

TABLE X  
BILLS AND FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FACTORS  
ONE, TWO AND THREE

Bill No.	Bill Title	Factor Loading
Factor One: Policies Providing for Family Housing and Health Care Needs		
SB 28	Concerning Loans for Low or Moderate Income Housing	.748
SB 113	Concerning the Expansion of the Powers of the Colorado Finance Authority	.579
HB 1392	Concerning the Loan of Moneys by the University of Colorado Board of Regents	.794
HB 1403	Concerning the Provision of Medical Services for Dependents of Students	.600
HB 1489	Concerning Hereditary Disorders and Providing for Newborn Screening, Genetic Counseling and Education Programs	.638
Factor Two: Policies with No Fiscal Impact that Assist Families with Membership, Economic and Socializing Functions		
SB 276	Concerning factors admissible in determining the Best Interests of a Child in a Child Custody Proceeding	.757
SB 1310	Concerning Sexually Explicit Materials Harmful to Children and Relating to the Sale, Loan or Exhibition Thereof to Children	.823
SB 1239	Concerning Alternatives to Long-Term Nursing Home Care for the Developmentally Disabled and the Mentally Ill	.552
HB 1295	Concerning Temporary Restraining Orders under the Uniform Dissolution of Marriage Act	.863
Factor Three: Policies with a Fiscal Impact that Assist Families with Membership and Socializing Functions		
SB 337	Concerning Placement of Children	.663
HB 1173	Concerning the Displaced Homemaker Fund and Raising the Limitation Thereon	.684
HB 1175	Concerning Domestic Violence	.663
HB 1278	Concerning a Property Tax Exemption for Single Parent Family Residential Facilities	.697

The result of these analyses provided 10 different measures of voting records. These included examination of voting records on all 30 bills, on those bills assisting families with membership functions on those bills helping families with economic functions and on those bills helping families with socializing functions. Measures of the dependent variable also included examination of voting records on those bills having a fiscal impact and no fiscal impact and those bills which emerged as having significant loadings on the unrotated factor. Also serving as measurements of the voting records were the three factors that emerged as a result of the factor rotation.

TABLE XI  
VARIATION EXPLAINED BY EACH FACTOR

Factor	Explained Variation
Factor I: Policies Providing for Family Housing and Health Care Needs	.32
Factor II: Policies with No Fiscal Impact that Assist Families with Membership, Economic or Socializing Functions	.30
Factor III: Policies with a Fiscal Impact that Assist Families with Membership and Socializing Functions	.37

Analysis of Selected Attributes  
with Voting Records

An objective of the study was to identify attributes of Colorado legislators who have been supportive of legislation that is oriented toward family well-being. Four procedures used to reach this objective included:

1. Analyze selected personal and social attributes of Colorado legislators associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.
2. Analyze selected occupational attributes of Colorado legislators associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.
3. Analyze selected political and legislative attributes of Colorado legislators with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.
4. Analyze selected characteristics related to the population constituency represented associated with support or nonsupport of legislation oriented toward family well-being.

Twenty-five variables were correlated with the voting records of legislators. These variables included education, age, marital status, number of years married, sex, importance of religion in personal life, number of children and stage of family life (including categories for stage of single family development and stage of couple family development). Also included were occupation, income, length of service in the legislature, future political plans (including likelihood of seeking a higher political office and likelihood of running for the same office again), party affiliation and margin of victory in the last election.

Variables studied relating to the constituency represented included whether the district was urban or rural, the distance the district was from the state capitol, the percentage of minorities in the district, the percentage of Hispanics in the district, the percentage of constituents registered as Republican, Democrat and unaffiliated, the district's average adjusted gross income and the percentage of constituents unemployed.

#### Correlation of Voting Records with Selected Attributes of Legislators

Each of the 25 independent variables was correlated with the previously described 10 measures of voting records. Six variables correlated significantly at the .05 probability level with voting records on policies oriented toward family well-being. These variables included stage of single family development, occupation, education, party, importance of religion in personal life, and whether the legislator represented an urban or rural district. The correlation of voting records with the 25 independent variables are presented in Table XII.

The four null hypotheses tested in this study included:

H<sub>1</sub>. There will be no association between personal and social attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

H<sub>2</sub>. There will be no association between occupational attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

H<sub>3</sub>. There will be no association between political and legislative attributes of Colorado legislators and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

TABLE XII  
VOTING CORRELATIONS ON POLICIES PROMOTING FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Variable	Total (30)	Membership Functions	Economic Functions	Socializing Functions	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact	Unrotated Factor	Rotated Factor 1 <sup>a</sup>	Rotated Factor 2 <sup>b</sup>	Rotated Factor 3 <sup>c</sup>
<u>Personal/Social Attributes</u>										
Marital Status	.024	-.019	.025	.006	.038	.004	-.087	.016	-.115	-.198
Length of Marriage	.016	-.046	.009	.002	.024	.003	-.130	-.018	-.064	-.269
Age	.188	.098	.171	.165	.107	.217	.034	.081	.108	-.187
Number of Children	.013	.073	-.066	.049	-.060	.079	-.022	-.113	.048	.024
Stage of Couple Family Development	-.147	-.148	-.170	-.138	-.163	-.097	-.213	-.174	-.027	-.244
Stage of Single Family Development	.548	.453	.211	.257	.214	.620*	.394	.402	-.155	.181
Education	.217	.143	.229	.225	.208	.170	.303*	.346*	.209	.205
Sex	-.193	-.125	-.224	-.225	-.176	-.160	-.123	-.071	.044	-.109
Importance of Religion in Personal Life	-.142	-.095	-.195	-.108	-.223	-.029	-.170	-.317*	.228	-.145
<u>Occupational Attributes</u>										
Occupation	.351*	.280*	.398*	.373*	.274	.335*	.444*	.484*	.281*	.288*
Income	-.020	-.179	-.032	-.114	.054	-.068	-.110	.068	.078	-.186
<u>Political/Legislative Attributes</u>										
Political Party	-.059	-.027	-.007	-.067	-.070	-.033	.149	.216	-.181	.275*
Likelihood of Running for Same Political Office	-.334	-.198	-.333	-.233	-.307	-.233	-.193	-.193	-.286	-.106
Likelihood of Running for Higher Political Office	-.214	-.208	-.208	-.232	-.161	-.211	-.182	-.053	-.064	-.195
Length of Legislative Service	.152	.098	.174	.128	.102	.161	.125	.193	.020	.068
Votes Received in Last Election (%)	-.113	-.162	-.077	-.107	-.143	-.056	-.130	-.024	.171	-.112
<u>Constituency Characteristics</u>										
Urban/Rural District	-.150	.015	-.181	.068	.008	-.263	-.149	-.378*	-.028	.060
Nonwhites in District (%)	-.136	-.102	-.117	-.140	-.045	-.188	.041	.053	-.083	.155
Hispanics in District (%)	-.109	-.069	-.049	-.082	.004	-.190	.045	.054	-.151	.159
Distance District is from Capitol	.044	.074	.022	.049	.126	-.043	-.038	-.154	.025	.055
Unemployed in District (%)	.084	.089	.103	.129	.082	.064	.012	-.097	.073	.016
Reg. Republican in District (%)	.034	.000	-.007	-.020	.083	-.021	-.137	-.129	.005	-.166
Reg. Democrat in District (%)	-.060	.002	-.039	-.035	-.041	-.063	.119	.080	-.036	.218
Reg. Unaffiliated in District (%)	-.012	-.021	-.026	.010	-.101	.075	-.167	-.154	.025	-.248
Average Adjusted Gross Income in District	-.054	-.056	-.068	-.043	-.122	.025	-.060	-.044	.057	-.121

<sup>a</sup>Policies providing for family housing and health care needs

<sup>b</sup>NFI policies assisting families with membership, economic or socializing functions

<sup>c</sup>FI policies assisting families with membership and socializing functions

\*Since N varies, underlined values represent significance at the .05 level.



H<sub>4</sub>. There will be no association between characteristics of population constituency represented and support or nonsupport of public policy oriented toward family well-being.

Acceptance or nonacceptance of each hypothesis was based upon one or more significant associations within each category. For example, if a significant association was found between sex and voting on policies oriented toward family well-being, the hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was not accepted.

Personal and Social Attributes. Since significant correlations were found between the way legislators voted on bills oriented toward family well-being and the independent variables of stage of single family development, education, and importance of religion in personal life, the first null hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was not accepted. As noted on Table XII, the other five variables were not found to be significantly correlated with the way legislators voted on policies oriented toward family well-being.

Occupational Attributes. Of the two variables examined in this category (occupation and income), occupation had statistically significant correlations with voting records on policies oriented toward family well-being on nine of the ten measures. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H<sub>2</sub>) was not accepted.

Political and Legislative Attributes. Of the five variables examined in this category, one, political party, produced a statistically significant correlation with one measure of bills oriented toward family well-being. This finding also indicated a nonacceptance of the null hypothesis (H<sub>3</sub>).

Characteristics of Population Constituency Represented. Whether the legislator represented an urban or rural district was the only variable in this category that correlated in a statistically significant way with voting records on policies oriented toward family well-being. The other eight variables in this category were not significantly correlated with voting on bills oriented toward family well-being. The null hypothesis ( $H_4$ ) was not accepted.

The only voting record measurement not showing a statistically significant correlation was the category of bills having a fiscal impact. As an independent variable, occupation has the largest number of significant correlations (nine) which occurred on every voting record measurement except fiscal impact. These correlations indicated that those legislators who were employed as professionals were more likely to support policies oriented toward family well-being than those who were employed as nonprofessionals. This finding indicates that those who are employed as attorneys, educators, public relations specialists and in other professional categories are more supportive of these policies than are managers, proprietors, farmers, and those who are retired or who identify legislator as their full-time occupation.

Education correlated significantly with two of the voting record measurements: the unrotated factor and rotated factor one. This finding indicated that the more education a legislator had, the more likely he/she was to support policies in these categories.

State of single family development correlated significantly with policies with no fiscal impact. The more advanced a legislator was in the stage of single family development, the more likely he/she was to support family well-being policies that have no fiscal impact. Stage

of single family development had high correlations on several other measures but not high enough to be statistically significant.

Political party correlated significantly with rotated factor three, policies with a fiscal impact that assist families with membership and socializing functions. These findings indicate that Democrats were more likely to support those bills identified in factor three than were Republicans.

A significant correlation was also found between support of policies in factor one and whether the legislator represented an urban or rural district. If a legislator represented a rural district, the less likely he/she was to support those policies that provided for family housing and health care needs.

The importance of religion in the legislator's personal life had a significant negative correlation with support of policies in the rotated factor one. This indicated that the more important a legislator said religion was in his/her life, the less likely that person would be to support policies that provide for family housing and health care needs.

### Discussion

In interpreting these results the researcher needs to stress that there was a wide variation in legislators' perceptions of how the government could promote family well-being. Some legislators indicated that the government had no role in the private area of family life, that families should take care of their own members without outside help, and that government involvement diminishes the incentives for families to take care of themselves. Legislators from rural areas and those who

indicated that religion was very important in their lives especially tended to hold these views. A possible explanation for the predominance of this attitude for rural legislators is that in rural areas there could be a tendency for more extended family situations. In such cases, families are in a position to provide support to members without the need of assistance from outside groups, such as the government. Similarly, some religious groups provide strong support to their members with the support of these groups diminishing the need for assistance from any other agencies, including the government.

Since 25 variables were tested for correlations on 10 separate measures (250 tests) values could be attributed to chance. However, there is reason to believe that the variables that correlated significantly with voting records were in fact significant rather than a result of chance. The fact that occupation and education had significant correlations on more than one measure presents evidence that it is unlikely that these variables correlated because of chance.

Although stage of single family development and importance of religion had significant correlations in only one category each, their correlations on several of the measures were rather high also indicating that the significant correlations were probably not a result of chance. Political party and whether the legislator represented an urban or rural district correlated with voting records on only one measure; however, both of these correlated on measurements (factor one and factor three) that had more than one significant correlation.

Previous research also tends to validate the significance of some correlations. Comparison of findings from the 1979 Minnesota study by Zimmerman, Mattessich and Leik (1979) on legislators' attitudes in the

area of family policy and the findings in this study showed that four variables were significant in both studies. These were party affiliation, urban/rural district representation, family life cycle, and education.

While it is recognized that obtaining interviews with 51 legislators is a major challenge, doing a statistical analysis of only 51 subjects has limitations. Because of the small number, the correlations are necessarily high in order to be significant. Consequently, if the study had included more subjects, it is probable that more variables would have proven to be significant.

#### Analysis of Variance

Analysis of variance (AOV) determined if the sample means of the categories within each variable differed in a statistically significant way. This analysis was done to provide further information about the relationship between selected attributes of legislators and their voting records on policies oriented toward family well-being. The AOV findings are presented in Table XIII. As shown there, seven variables showed statistically significant differences between the sample means. Those variables were stage of couple family development, stage of single family development, importance of religion, occupation, percentage of district registered as Republican, district income and location of the district.

In the stage of couple family development, there was a significant difference of voting records on factor two. The category of couple with oldest child 7-13 years of age was significantly different from all other categories. The mean for this category was much lower than all

TABLE XIII

MEANS OF PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ATTRIBUTES, OCCUPATIONAL ATTRIBUTES, POLITICAL AND LEGISLATIVE  
 ATTRIBUTES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATION CONSTITUENCY REPRESENTED ON  
 VOTING RECORDS OF POLICIES ORIENTED TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
 (N=51)

Variable	Total	Membership	Economic	Socializing	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact	Unrotated Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Marital Status										
Single	.842	.871	.819	.856	.833	.856	.854	.728	.979	.917
Married	.848	.865	.827	.858	.819	.858	.817	.717	.929	.782
Length of Marriage										
Not or Not Known	.900	.925	.902	.909	.917	.889	.917	.933	1.000	.958
10 Years or Less	.870	.900	.853	.881	.861	.889	.854	.820	.979	.917
11-20 Years	.855	.900	.824	.879	.841	.889	.850	.727	.975	.850
21-25 Years	.844	.885	.819	.879	.833	.859	.833	.717	.955	.833
26-30 Years	.841	.870	.807	.856	.819	.856	.773	.600	.917	.833
31-40 Years	.830	.832	.804	.839	.806	.833	.771	.560	.875	.750
Over 40 Years	.813	.820	.788	.809	.788	.800	.750	.467	.800	.636
Age										
31-40 Years	.879	.900	.861	.897	.864	.894	.856	.817	.977	.962
41-50 Years	.861	.867	.828	.864	.828	.889	.847	.745	.958	.771
51-55 Years	.831	.861	.820	.846	.821	.833	.839	.723	.942	.767
56-67 Years	.823	.847	.796	.833	.813	.825	.775	.640	.900	.750
Number of Children										
0	.856	.875	.863	.871	.875	.876	.865	.750	1.000	.917
1-2	.852	.872	.824	.864	.833	.843	.825	.712	.970	.813
3-8	.837	.858	.815	.845	.817	.849	.816	.700	.888	.790
Stage of Couple Family Development*										
Couple without Children	.900	.882	1.000	.920	.917	.903	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Couple with Oldest Child Less than 30 Months	.900	.913	.882	.909	.896	.889	.917	1.000	1.000	.950
Couple with Oldest Child 7-13	.889	.900	.882	.834	.889	.889	.859	.867	.250	.917
Couple with Oldest Child 14-20	.867	.900	.847	.882	.850	.878	.850	.720	1.000	.875
Couple when First Child Leaves Home until Last is Gone	.860	.870	.835	.855	.833	.878	.800	.700	.950	.750
Couple-Empty Nest to Retirement	.823	.840	.823	.836	.833	.836	.784	.680	.913	.725
Couple-Retirement to Death of Both Spouses	.800	.750	.797	.773	.804	.778	.750	.640	.250	.650

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Total	Membership	Economic	Socializing	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact	Unrotated Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Stage of Single Family Development*										
Single, No Children	.882	.850	.843	.848	.861	.796	.813	.533	1.000	.917
Single, Oldest Child 6-13 Years	.700	.700	.847	.772	.583	.778	.688	.400	1.000	.750
Single, Oldest Child 13-20 Years	.856	.900	.824	.894	.833	.870	.938	1.000	.875	1.000
Single, Oldest Child Leaves Home until Last is Gone	.833	.850	.794	.795	.750	.889	.781	.600	1.000	.750
Single, Empty Nest to Retirement	.883	.925	.824	.864	.833	.917	.875	.700	1.000	1.000
Single, Retirement to Death	.933	.950	.941	.955	1.000	.889	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Education										
Less than High School	.800	.900	.765	.909	.750	.833	.750	.400	1.000	.750
High School	.850	.900	.824	.901	.833	.861	.750	.500	.875	.750
Vocational/Technical Training Beyond High School	.808	.838	.765	.895	.771	.833	.703	.450	.938	.688
College, without Completion of Bachelor's	.822	.800	.814	.886	.778	.852	.750	.733	.833	.667
College, with Completion of Bachelor's	.878	.933	.863	.879	.889	.870	.917	.867	.917	.917
Graduate Work, without Completion of a Degree	.814	.842	.779	.864	.799	.824	.792	.633	.896	.792
Completion of a Master's Degree	.878	.891	.866	.833	.871	.879	.886	.855	1.000	.909
JD (Law Degree)	.890	.905	.871	.811	.859	.911	.881	.820	1.000	.825
Doctorate Degree	.900	.900	.941	.795	1.000	.833	.938	1.000	1.000	1.000
Sex										
Male	.857	.874	.839	.870	.843	.866	.837	.737	.945	.829
Female	.803	.835	.765	.805	.775	.822	.781	.680	.925	.750
Importance of Religion*										
Very Important	.850	.844	.789	.832	.789	.843	.776	.612	.956	.735
Fairly Important	.867	.878	.832	.873	.825	.875	.841	.710	.975	.850
Not Too Important	.855	.883	.858	.871	.896	.847	.880	.900	.917	.875
Not at All Important	.850	.850	.853	.841	.833	.861	.781	.800	.625	.750
Occupation*										
Professional	.851	.907	.885	.907	.879	.899	.918	.900	1.000	.909
Non-Professional	.813	.836	.779	.820	.793	.826	.756	.593	.897	.741
Income										
Under \$15,000	.906	.938	.912	.932	.917	.935	.953	.867	1.000	1.000
\$15,000-\$19,000	.892	.925	.882	.902	.917	.926	.927	.850	1.000	1.000
\$20,000-\$29,000	.889	.925	.863	.894	.900	.889	.875	.833	1.000	.958
\$30,000-\$39,000	.867	.900	.863	.886	.861	.875	.865	.800	1.000	.875

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Total	Membership	Economic	Socializing	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact	Unrotated Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Income (Continued)										
\$40,000-\$49,000	.867	.900	.859	.886	.850	.856	.863	.780	1.000	.875
\$50,000-\$75,000	.853	.883	.835	.884	.833	.852	.802	.733	.967	.750
\$76,000-\$100,000	.850	.858	.824	.848	.792	.844	.781	.633	.900	.750
Over \$100,000	.822	.820	.775	.818	.777	.833	.775	.500	.800	.708
Political Party										
Republican	.852	.869	.825	.864	.839	.860	.859	.810	.968	.913
Democrat	.838	.862	.824	.848	.817	.853	.804	.671	.900	.750
Political Aspirations										
Plans to Seek Higher Office	.889	.910	.875	.903	.889	.888	.883	.773	.950	.933
Does Not Plan to Seek Higher Office	.836	.859	.813	.850	.826	.862	.804	.733	.946	.792
Could Possibly Seek a Higher Office	.828	.842	.804	.823	.797	.829	.797	.696	.917	.739
Likelihood of Running for Some Office										
Highly Probable	.911	.917	.902	.909	.917	.907	.938	.933	1.000	.917
Fairly Probable	.873	.880	.859	.873	.833	.900	.838	.740	1.000	.800
Not Too Probable	.830	.855	.794	.845	.792	.856	.831	.720	.950	.750
Length of Legislative Service										
1-3 Years	.867	.889	.859	.874	.866	.867	.851	.811	.964	.847
4-6 Years	.839	.857	.820	.856	.821	.863	.816	.695	.947	.839
8-20 Years	.831	.853	.756	.838	.803	.837	.808	.657	.917	.763
Percentage of Votes Received in Last Election										
50-51%	.875	.938	.853	.898	.875	.875	.938	.850	1.000	1.000
52-55%	.838	.863	.801	.835	.844	.833	.789	.625	.938	.833
56-60%	.833	.850	.791	.833	.815	.846	.813	.689	.972	.804
61-69%	.863	.878	.853	.884	.833	.882	.840	.750	.938	.797
71-100%	.833	.846	.819	.844	.815	.845	.808	.743	.911	.750
Location of District*										
Urban	.853	.866	.834	.861	.830	.869	.837	.773	.943	.857
Rural	.805	.871	.765	.868	.833	.786	.759	.429	.929	.807
Nonwhites in District										
2-5%	.871	.903	.876	.809	.880	.874	.875	.822	1.000	.883
6-9%	.870	.883	.843	.879	.880	.867	.854	.760	.907	.861
13-20%	.840	.850	.816	.852	.789	.864	.813	.700	.917	.854
21-25%	.806	.829	.775	.814	.785	.819	.779	.653	.900	.683



TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Total	Membership	Economic	Socializing	Fiscal Impact	No Fiscal Impact	Unrotated Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Hispanics in District										
3-5%	.862	.882	.842	.874	.856	.889	.841	.782	.981	.867
6-9%	.858	.877	.838	.871	.840	.870	.832	.723	.980	.841
10-17%	.858	.875	.829	.864	.821	.859	.821	.707	.917	.771
18-36%	.816	.840	.796	.827	.811	.819	.813	.700	.887	.769
Distance District is from State Capitol										
0-4 Miles	.844	.888	.824	.879	.778	.889	.875	.800	1.000	.917
5-10 Miles	.835	.883	.803	.842	.824	.843	.827	.733	.941	.853
11-70 Miles	.853	.861	.839	.859	.825	.871	.819	.718	.921	.724
71-332 Miles	.853	.856	.833	.871	.861					
Percentage District Registered Republican*										
15-26%	.820	.843	.796	.833	.783	.844	.842	.773	.917	.867
27-29%	.897	.915	.882	.900	.883	.906	.900	.860	1.000	.875
30-33%	.792	.823	.760	.815	.782	.799	.712	.523	.865	.692
34-40%	.892	.900	.878	.895	.891	.893	.865	.769	1.000	.827
Percentage District Registered Democrat										
21-23%	.892	.910	.871	.891	.880	.922	.881	.840	1.000	.944
24-27%	.867	.900	.859	.877	.853	.872	.861	.750	1.000	.854
28-35%	.856	.865	.824	.874	.850	.840	.833	.733	.944	.825
36-43%	.817	.838	.799	.830	.792	.838	.825	.720	.917	.725
44-58%	.807	.830	.776	.823	.785	.817	.731	.580	.850	.725
Percentage District Registered Independent										
20-30%	.870	.900	.840	.872	.864	.874	.858	.743	.977	.909
31-35%	.853	.865	.833	.865	.830	.868	.830	.727	.942	.857
36-59%	.817	.843	.798	.831	.804	.825	.810	.715	.911	.750
Percentage in District Unemployed										
02%	.933	.950	.882	.909	1.000	.944	.875	.800	1.000	1.000
03%	.900	.950	.882	.886	.917	.865	.875	.852	1.000	.875
04%	.861	.888	.852	.883	.857	.855	.828	.657	1.000	.821
05%	.850	.879	.849	.864	.854	.847	.824	.600	.938	.802
06%	.839	.858	.814	.848	.816	.833	.821	.600	.928	.750
District Income*										
\$5,261-\$12,814	.884	.903	.871	.897	.911	.867	.867	.747	.983	.883
\$12,908-\$13,759	.798	.824	.765	.809	.759	.825	.776	.663	.868	.803
\$14,573-\$18,287	.867	.882	.851	.877	.838	.886	.846	.776	.985	.765

\*Significant differences between sample means in this category.

the others indicating that this group was less supportive of policies oriented toward family well-being that are included in factor two.

Stage of single family development showed significant differences on five categories of voting records. These included the total 30 bills, bills having a fiscal impact, bills in the unrotated factor, and those measures in factor one and factor three. On the voting records of the total 30 bills, two groups emerged as being significantly different. The categories of single without children and single with oldest child 6-13 years were significantly different from the other five categories in the stage of single family development. This indicated that the two aforementioned categories were less supportive of policies oriented toward family well-being than the other five categories in the stage of single family development.

On voting records of policies having a fiscal impact, three groups emerged as being significantly different. Those legislators in the category of single, retirement to death were significantly different from all other categories and were less supportive of policies oriented toward family well-being. Those legislators with the oldest child 6 to 13 years were also different from all other categories, showing the most support of these policies. The remaining four categories in the stage of single family development comprised a group that was statistically different from either of the other previously described groups. On the unrotated factor, on factor one, and on factor three those legislators whose oldest child 6 to 13 years, those legislators in the single empty nest to retirement and those in the retirement to death supported family well-being policies significantly more than the three remaining categories in the stage of single family development.

Importance of religion in personal life showed significant differences on voting records on factor one and factor two. On factor one, there was a significant difference in voting records between legislators who said religion was very important or fairly important in their lives and those who said religion was not very important or not at all important in their lives. On factor two, those who said religion was not at all important differed significantly from the other three groups of religious importance. As indicated in Table XIII, those legislators who rated religion as fairly or very important in their lives tended to support those bills in factor two less than those who rated religion as not very important or not at all important in their lives. On factor two the reverse was true. Legislators who said religion was not at all important in their lives cast more descending votes on the policies included in factor two than those who indicated that religion played a more important role in their lives.

Occupation also showed statistically significant differences on means of voting records on measures oriented toward family well-being. Professionals differed from nonprofessionals on nine of the ten voting record categories; the only category not showing a statistically significant difference between professionals and nonprofessionals was the group of bills having a fiscal impact. In all cases, those legislators who were employed in professional occupations tended to support policies oriented toward family well-being more than those legislators employed as nonprofessionals.

In the category dealing with the location of district, only one significant difference on voting records occurred. This occurred on factor one indicating those legislators representing urban areas tended

to support policies oriented toward family well-being more than rural legislators.

There were significant differences on means of voting records according to the percentage of the district registered as Republicans. Voting records differed for all 30 bills, on those bills helping families with economic functions, on those bills having no fiscal impact, on those bills in the unrotated factor, and on those bills on factor one. In each case, those legislators representing districts that had 30 to 33 percent of the constituents registered as Republicans tended to support policies oriented toward family well-being less than legislators in the three remaining categories.

District income showed significant differences on three measures of the dependent variable: bills helping families with economic functions, bills helping families with socializing functions, and bills having a fiscal impact. On each of these variables, except those bills helping families with economic functions, those legislators who represented districts where the average adjusted gross income was between \$5,261 and \$12,814 tended to support policies oriented toward family well-being more than legislators representing the other income categories. This showed that legislators representing districts with lower incomes supported the policies in this study more than legislators representing constituents in higher income levels. On the bills helping families with economic needs, there was a significant difference between the income categories of \$5,261-\$12,814 and \$14,573-\$18,287 and the middle income category of \$12,903-\$13,759. Legislators representing the lower and the higher income brackets tended to support policies

oriented toward family well-being more than those representing constituents in the middle income bracket.

### Discussion

Analysis of variance was another means of testing the 25 independent variables with the voting records on the bills identified as being oriented toward family well-being. Three new variables not producing significant correlations emerged as showing significant differences between sample means. Since analysis of variance has a less stringent standard to produce significance, it is reasonable to have more variables producing statistical significance with AOV. The three additional variables were stage of couple family development, district income, and the district political party affiliation. In addition, the following variables which produced statistically significant correlations also showed significance on analysis of variance: stage of single family development, importance of religion, occupation, and location of district. Since the hypotheses were tested for association between selected attributes of legislators and their voting records, the findings produced through the analysis of variance had no impact on the acceptance or nonacceptance of the hypotheses.

### Relationship Between Government and Families

An objective of the study was to obtain legislators' responses on their perceptions of what the proper relationship should be between government and families as well as the services they perceived as appropriate for the government to offer families. Table XIV presents

the opinions of legislators on what they perceived as the proper relationship between government and families. Nearly two-thirds of the legislators felt the government should help families only when necessary; twice as many felt the government should not interfere in family life as those who felt the government shares with families a responsibility for insuring the performance of family functions.

TABLE XIV  
LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON THE PROPER RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND FAMILIES  
(N=51)

Response	Number	Percent
Families should be able to take care of their members without help from government; government should not interfere with family life.	12	23.5
Government should help families in carrying out their functions only when necessary.	33	64.7
Government shares with families a responsibility for insuring the performance of family functions.	6	11.8

This question was also asked in the 1979 Minnesota study on legislators' attitudes in the area of family policy (Zimmerman, Mattessich, and Leik, 1979). The greatest percentage of respondents in that study (59) also indicated that the government should offer help to families only when necessary. However, another 28 percent indicated that a more

active relationship should exist between these two institutions stating that the government shares with families a responsibility for ensuring the performance of family functions. In this study of Colorado legislators, 12 percent of the legislators took that stand. Six percent of the Minnesota legislators indicated that families should be able to take care of their members without governmental help; 24 percent of the Colorado legislators identified that this should be the proper relationship between government and families. These findings indicated that the 1983 Colorado legislators perceived a more minimal governmental role in relation to families than did the 1979 Minnesota legislators.

Many legislators stated that negotiating an appropriate relationship between government and families is difficult. One legislator summarized this challenge by saying:

. . . I recognize the government has a role in controlling marriage, in licensing and a role to play in dissolution. But I reject the idea that the state should take an active role in family relationships . . . I look to see if the state is taking a more active role in the family area and if that is justified.

Table XV represents legislators' responses on the extent to which the government should offer help to families in performing functions or meeting needs of family members in selected areas. As Table XV indicates, education received the highest mean score (3.7) and recreation has the lowest (2.1). However, as indicated on the five point scale, legislators in general felt the government should not assist families to a great extent with any of these functions.

Legislators' opinions on the appropriateness of certain services the government could offer families is presented in Table XVI. The two items with the highest average scores dealt with elderly issues; the third highest issue was providing assistance to foster care families

TABLE XV

LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON AREAS IN WHICH GOVERNMENT SHOULD OFFER HELP TO FAMILIES  
IN MEETING THEIR NEEDS AND PERFORMING THEIR FUNCTIONS  
(N=51)

Area	Not at all		2		3		4		To a great extent		Mean N
	1								5		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Education	2	2.9	7	13.7	13	25.5	10	19.6	19	37.3	3.7
Physical Health Care	6	11.8	17	33.3	12	23.5	6	11.8	10	19.6	2.9
Mental Health Care	4	7.8	10	19.6	14	27.5	16	31.4	7	13.7	3.2
Employment	12	23.5	17	33.3	15	29.4	5	9.8	2	3.9	2.4
Housing	11	21.6	17	33.3	13	25.5	8	15.7	2	3.9	2.5
Recreation	23	45.1	9	17.6	12	23.5	6	11.8	1	2.0	2.1
Social Welfare Service	5	9.8	13	25.5	13	25.5	13	25.5	7	13.7	3.1
Financial Support	15	29.4	15	29.4	16	31.4	3	5.9	2	3.9	2.3
Childcare	13	25.5	15	29.4	13	25.5	6	11.8	4	7.8	2.5



TABLE XVI

LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON APPROPRIATENESS OF SERVICES  
THE GOVERNMENT COULD OFFER FAMILIES  
(N=51)

Area	Not at all 1		2		3		4		To a great extent 5		Mean
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Programs that provide aid to dependent children	5	9.8	4	7.8	12	23.5	15	29.4	15	29.4	3.6
Preventive medical care for the elderly through out-patient diagnostic services	3	5.9	6	11.8	11	21.6	17	33.3	14	27.5	3.6
Family planning services	14	27.5	12	23.5	12	23.5	4	7.8	9	17.6	2.6
Unemployment benefits	8	15.7	3	5.9	15	29.4	11	21.6	14	27.5	3.4
Public financing to install intensive-care units for premature newborns	11	21.6	8	15.7	19	37.3	7	13.7	6	11.8	2.4
Family therapy services	10	19.6	19	37.3	17	33.3	3	5.9	2	3.9	2.4
Parenting education	14	27.5	21	41.2	11	21.6	1	2.0	4	7.8	2.2
Medical insurance programs for the elderly	5	9.8	4	7.8	13	25.9	15	29.4	14	27.5	3.6
Providing assistance to families who are willing to serve as foster care families	4	7.8	1	2.0	14	27.5	20	39.2	12	23.5	3.7
Rehabilitative/restorative services for the elderly in appropriate facilities including skilled nursing homes and home health services	3	5.9	4	7.8	10	19.6	17	33.3	17	33.3	3.8
Job opportunity/training programs	6	11.8	10	19.6	14	27.5	13	25.5	8	15.7	3.1
Public funding for routine prenatal care and nutrition programs for pregnant women	10	19.6	13	25.5	14	27.5	6	11.8	8	15.7	2.8
Public funding for contraceptive services	17	33.3	11	21.6	9	17.6	7	13.7	7	13.7	2.5
Policies to assure minimum family income	23	45.1	13	25.5	8	15.7	1	2.0	6	11.8	2.1
Programs providing support to families so that foster care may be diverted through such provisions as emergency basis use of in-home caretakers, use of emergency housing, etc.	6	11.8	9	17.6	19	37.3	12	23.5	5	9.8	3.0
Public funds for abortion	23	45.1	5	9.8	10	19.6	7	13.7	6	11.8	2.4
Programs that provide services that enable the elderly to stay in their homes such as visiting nurses, home health aides, homemaker aides, etc. <sup>a</sup>	4	8.0	1	2.0	6	12.0	15	30.0	24	48.0	4.1

<sup>a</sup>One participant did not respond to this statement

followed by a three-way tie between two elderly issues and aid to dependent children. Receiving the lowest average rating was the item on policies to assure minimum family income. Parenting education received the next lowest rating followed by a three-way tie between public funds for abortion, family therapy services and financing for intensive care units for premature newborns.

Abortion was a very salient issue, especially with those who opposed it. Several legislators said the "one" on the one to five scale was not low enough; consequently, some emphatically rated it as a -25 or a -10 or a -5. Their point was that they perceived public funds for abortion as extremely inappropriate.

Many legislators qualified their support of these governmentally offered family services by saying they felt it was important to offer help only to families who were genuinely in need. Many also specified that they favored offering support for a kindergarten through twelfth grade education but that the government generally should not assist with postsecondary education of family members.

Many of these questions were addressed by legislators in response to the appropriateness of governmental involvement. For instance, in the area of parenting education, some lawmakers indicated support of the concept but stated that agencies other than the government should address the issue.

In addition, some respondents identified support of a concept but indicated that governmental involvement in such areas had not been extremely successful. Areas particularly cited were job opportunity/training programs and programs providing family support to divert foster care.

Responses on Teaching Personal  
and Family Living

Since the state government is a major funding source for public schools, the researcher was interested in ascertaining legislators' opinions on concepts related to a personal and family living curriculum. Participants were asked to rate the appropriateness of selected concepts for curriculum in personal and family living. It was explained that the purpose of teaching these concepts was to help students develop a rational foundation for making responsible choices and to increase their decision-making and communication skills.

Legislators' ratings of these concepts are shown on Table XVII. As indicated there, all concepts received an average rating of above "3". Therefore, it could be interpreted that all concepts were rated as somewhat to very appropriate. Feeding the family nutritiously and managing money, time, and human resources received the highest average ratings. Receiving the lowest average rating was sexual development and adjustment as a family member.

Some legislators rated all concepts as inappropriate (categories 1 and 2). These legislators generally expressed a belief that schools should be teaching the basics of English, math and reading and should not be addressing the areas outlined on Table XVII. In expressing this sentiment, one legislator said, "My basic philosophy of education includes the teaching of reading, writing and arithmetic. The social ills of society are taken care of in the home and church."

TABLE XVII  
 LEGISLATORS' RESPONSES ON APPROPRIATENESS OF CONCEPTS  
 TO BE INCLUDED IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL COURSE  
 RELATED TO ISSUES DEALING WITH  
 PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING  
 (N=51)

Concepts	Very Inappropriate 1		2		3		4		Very Appropriate 5		Mean
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Feeding the family nutritiously	1	2.0	0	0	9	17.6	12	23.5	29	56.9	4.3
Getting along with other people <sup>a</sup>	3	6.0	4	8.0	13	26.0	10	20.0	20	40.0	3.3
Preparation for marriage	6	11.8	11	21.6	10	19.6	9	17.6	15	29.4	3.3
Child rearing and parenting	5	9.8	6	11.8	12	23.5	12	23.5	16	31.4	3.5
Skills for making decisions	3	5.9	3	5.9	12	23.5	11	21.6	22	43.1	3.9
Sexual development and adjustment as a family member	10	19.6	11	21.6	8	15.7	9	17.6	13	25.5	3.1
Managing money, time and human resources	0	0	3	5.9	8	15.7	12	23.5	28	54.9	4.3
Personal, family and community health	1	2.0	5	9.8	13	25.5	12	23.5	20	39.2	3.9
Dealing with family crisis such as divorce, family violence and alcoholism	5	9.8	3	5.8	10	19.6	15	29.4	18	35.3	3.7
The needs of elderly family members	3	5.9	3	5.9	12	23.5	14	27.5	19	37.3	3.8
The family in relation to the world of work	3	5.9	9	17.6	10	19.6	9	17.6	20	39.2	3.7
Dealing with public policy issues that affect the family	4	7.8	6	11.8	16	31.4	10	19.6	15	29.4	3.5
Preparing both men and women for family and work roles	3	5.9	9	17.6	7	13.7	8	15.7	24	47.1	3.8

<sup>a</sup>One participant did not respond to this item.

In contrast, some legislators rated all concepts as "extremely appropriate (category 5). One legislator, in expressing support for their inclusion in a school curriculum stated, "These help students organize, plan and function for the experiences of the world."

Legislators were also asked to indicate at what age these concepts should be offered. Given four choices, they most strongly favored

offering them in bits and pieces throughout childhood and adolescence. Over 60 percent favored this category with another 22 percent indicating a preference to offer them during high school. These findings are shown on Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII  
 LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON MOST APPROPRIATE AGE TO  
 OFFER CONCEPTS IN THE AREAS OF PERSONAL  
 AND FAMILY LIVING  
 (N=49)<sup>a</sup>

Age Range	Number	Percent
Elementary Years (6-12 years old)	2	4.1
Junior High Years (12-14 years old)	6	12.2
High School Years (14-18 years old)	11	22.4
In Bits and Pieces Throughout Childhood and Adolescence	30	61.3

<sup>a</sup>Two legislators did not respond to this question.

Some lawmakers indicated that areas such as getting along with others and nutrition education should be a part of a child's education from kindergarten through high school graduation. Other concepts such as parenting education were identified as being more appropriate for high school students.

The policy makers were also asked how they felt about the state requiring every school system to offer a personal and family living course. Nearly 50 percent of the legislators indicated they strongly

opposed this concept with nearly one-quarter of them somewhat opposing the concept. Only 12 percent strongly supported the idea. These findings are shown on Table XIX.

TABLE XIX  
LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON THE STATE REQUIRING  
EVERY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM TO OFFER A  
COURSE IN PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING  
(N=51)

Response	Number	Percent
STRONGLY SUPPORT the idea of state requiring public school systems to offer a personal and family living course.	6	11.8
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT the idea of state requiring public school systems to offer a personal and family living course.	9	17.6
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE the idea of state requiring public school systems to offer a personal and family living course.	12	23.5
STRONGLY OPPOSE the idea of the state requiring public school systems to offer a personal and family living course.	24	47.1

Many legislators indicated their opposition stemmed from the Colorado constitutional article prohibiting the state from mandating curriculum to local school districts. That constitutional article says:

Neither the general assembly nor the state board of education shall have power to prescribe text books to be used in the public schools (Constitution of the United States and Colorado, 1974, p. 42).

While the constitution states text books, the interpretation has been that any curricular requirements imposed by the state are unconstitutional.

Asked to indicate their opinions on requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course, the legislators responded in a similar pattern as to the concept of requiring school systems to offer such a course. Over 65 percent of the respondents somewhat or strongly opposed this idea; approximately 10 percent strongly supported requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course. These findings are presented in Table XX.

TABLE XX  
LEGISLATORS' OPINIONS ON REQUIRING EVERY PUBLIC  
SCHOOL STUDENT TO TAKE A PERSONAL  
AND FAMILY LIVING COURSE  
(N=51)

Response	Number	Percent
STRONGLY SUPPORT the idea of requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course.	5	9.8
SOMEWHAT SUPPORT the idea of requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course.	12	23.5
SOMEWHAT OPPOSE the idea of requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course.	12	23.5
STRONGLY OPPOSE the idea of requiring every public school student to take a personal and family living course.	22	43.2

Lawmakers were also asked to respond to the concept of a measure that had been introduced in the 1980 Virginia legislature that would protect and preserve the family as a primary resource to enhance the quality of life for all Virginians. The bill proposed that the state recognize the family as the basic unit of society and that all state employees work to perpetuate the family. In addition, the bill required that all state laws be interpreted to aid families and that annual reports be prepared on the efforts to preserve the family. The legislators in this study were asked if they would support such a bill if introduced in the Colorado legislature. Given four choices, nearly 50 percent of the participants indicated they would oppose this measure with reservation. Another 30 percent would support this measure with reservation. These findings are shown in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

LEGISLATORS' SUPPORT OF A HYPOTHETICAL MEASURE PROCLAIMING  
THE FAMILY AS A BASIC UNIT OF SOCIETY TO BE  
PRESERVED AND PROTECTED AS A PRIMARY  
RESOURCE TO ENHANCE THE  
QUALITY OF LIFE  
(N=48)<sup>a</sup>

Response	Number	Percent
Would Strongly Support This Measure	1	2.1
Would Support This Measure with Reservation	14	29.2
Would Oppose This Measure with Reservation	23	47.9
Would Strongly Oppose This Measure	10	20.8

<sup>a</sup>Three legislators did not respond to this question.



In general, reactions to this measure were mixed. One legislator indicated he would like to sponsor such a bill. Others vehemently opposed it indicating it was an attempt to legislate morality. Some stated they would support this concept as a resolution but not as a state statute. If passed as a statute there would be no power to enforce it; as a resolution, it would express the sentiment of the legislature but would not have the effect of law.

#### Factors that Influence Legislators' Voting

#### Decisions on Policies Oriented Toward

#### Family Well-Being

A procedure of the study was to obtain legislators' responses on factors that influenced voting decisions on policies oriented toward family well-being. In the interview, legislators were asked to generally explain the process they followed in making decisions on how to vote on the 30 bills considered in this study. Legislators' responses to this open-ended question centered on considerations in seven areas. These seven considerations as well as the number of responses for each are presented in Table XXII.

As indicated there, more than one-third of legislators philosophically questioned how appropriate it was for the government to be involved with the issue considered in each bill. Questions they raised regarding the appropriateness of governmental involvement included: Does the government have a role in this area? Can the government manage this program? Is the government the only source to provide help or is it feasible for the private sector to address this issue? Is this policy creating a dependency on the government? The following

legislator's response was fairly typical of those presented in this category:

I looked at the role of the state. If individuals can't handle problems with their own resources, then the government must step in to help maintain stability and order. I would rather see private industry take the first stab at it. Then, if that doesn't work, the government steps in.

TABLE XXII  
CONSIDERATIONS INFLUENCING LEGISLATORS' VOTING  
DECISIONS ON POLICIES ORIENTED TOWARD  
FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Factor	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Consideration of Appropriateness of Government Involvement with the Issue	19	37.2
Consideration of Impact of the Policy on Various Groups	16	31.4
Assessment of the Problem Addressed in the Policy	14	27.5
Appropriations Attached to the Policy	13	25.5
Influence of Others	11	21.6
Influence of Personal Background	10	19.6
Merits of Each Issue	5	9.8

<sup>a</sup>The total equals more than 100 percent because respondents identified all that applied.

Another legislator, in discussing the appropriateness of governmental involvement in family related issues stated:

The government can't be all things to all people . . . I believe the family should be preserved and there is some bona fide role the government has . . . . The government has a limited role and has no business trying to be the 'supra family.' The government ought to be very restrictive in entering into private areas . . .

Still another legislator stated,

I believe the governmental role should be fairly restricted; it should serve as a solution of last resort rather than first. Whenever we have a social problem, the family church, charitable organizations, private sector and LAST the government (in that order) should deal with the problem. I am a total supporter of the family. However, I also believe in total freedom. It is not my position to force my morals on fellow citizens. When confronted with legislation that intrudes on the family, I will fight not to have government influence. I believe the family should take care of its own, not the government.

Assessing the impact of the policy on various groups was identified second most often. Legislators indicated that they tried to determine how each bill would affect groups such as the family, the state, those who are in need, and society and in general. In this respect, one legislator said, "I feel there are certain classes of people who can't provide for themselves so the only source of help is the government." Other legislators specifically identified categories of people that they considered in making voting decisions. Specifically mentioned were the elderly, the indigent, and abused children.

In the category identified as assessment of the problem, legislators evaluated family policy bills in light of these questions: Is there a problem that needs to be addressed? Is the problem already being addressed by another segment of society? Is there an existing policy that prevents it from being adopted? Regarding the assessment of the problem addressed in the policy, one legislator said:

I must decide if there is a problem and if the problem has been addressed successfully in other states and if the proposed policy would have a relationship in solving the problem.

As the name of the category on funding implies, the legislators who considered this concept based their voting decisions on the appropriations involved with the policy. In considering this factor, some legislators not only looked at the face value of the policy appropriations, but also evaluated its future projected costs or savings. One lawmaker said:

I looked at the preventative component. I asked if it was a good investment of public dollars in terms of long term savings . . . by early intervention we are saving dollars or emotional trauma from the standpoint of peoples' lives.

Those who identified that their decisions were based upon the influence of others named five groups as having an impact on their voting behavior. These were party, constituents, special interest groups, family and friends and colleagues.

Legislators who identified that their backgrounds had the most influence in family policy voting decisions stated that their conscience, judgments and convictions served as a guide in voting on family issues. Those legislators who were in the separate issues category stated that they did not follow any general patterns in making up their minds on how to vote on these issues. Instead, they said they looked at each issue separately and voted on each according to its individual merits.

Participants were asked if their legislative colleagues had an influence on their voting decisions on family policy areas. Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated that fellow legislators influenced their decisions in some way. The ways in which they provided influence fell into seven categories. These categories as well as the

number of legislators in each category is shown on Table XXIII. As indicated there, those colleagues who were perceived as specialists in a particular field were identified most often as having an influence on voting. The lawmakers identified peers having expertise in areas related to the elderly, to women's issues, health care and child abuse influenced their voting decisions. They indicated that since it is impossible for every legislator to be informed on every issue, they relied upon the experts in such areas to provide input. For ten legislators, the influence of colleagues who shared a similar political philosophy had an influence on their voting decisions. Points and arguments presented on bills during legislative debates also served as a vehicle for influencing fellow legislators. Legislators also identified that they consulted committee members who had heard testimony on the bill as well as the bill's prime sponsor for information that could influence their voting decisions. Seven legislators identified that their peers had an influence in voting on these issues but were unable to identify specific ways they impacted decisions on family policy issues.

Legislators were asked to identify the extent of influence party leadership had on their voting decisions on family policy issues. As shown on Table XXIV, 88 percent of the legislators indicated that party leadership had minimal or no influence on their voting decisions. Informal groups within the party, however, were identified as having more influence. Thirty-five percent of the respondents stated that informal groups within the party had a great deal of influence with another 24 percent indicating a minimal influence of informal party groups. Examples cited as being informal party groups included legislators who

shared an office, lawmakers who were from the same county, those who shared a similar philosophy and those lawmakers who fraternized together. These findings are shown on Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIII  
 INFLUENCE OF LEGISLATIVE COLLEAGUES ON VOTING  
 DECISIONS ON POLICIES ORIENTED TOWARD  
 FAMILY WELL-BEING  
 (N=51)

Type of Influence	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Influenced by Colleagues who are Perceived as Specialists in a Field	18	35.3
Influenced by Colleagues who Share a Similar Political Philosophy	10	19.6
Influenced by Colleagues in Legislative Debates on the Issue	7	13.7
Influenced in General by Colleagues	7	13.7
Influenced by the Prime Sponsor of the Policy	6	11.8
Influenced by Committee Members who Heard Testimonies on the Policy	6	11.8
Influenced by Colleagues who Lobbied for Support	3	5.9

<sup>a</sup>The total equals more than 100 percent because respondents identified as many influences as applied.

TABLE XXIV

INFLUENCE OF PARTY CONSTITUENTS ON LEGISLATORS'  
VOTING DECISIONS ON POLICIES ORIENTED  
TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Influence of Party Leadership		
A great deal of influence	6	11.8
Minimal influence	14	27.4
No influence	31	60.8
Influence of Informal Groups Within the Party		
A great deal of influence	18	35.3
Minimal influence	12	23.5
No influence	21	41.2
Influence of Constituents		
A great deal of influence	36	70.6
Somewhat of an influence	13	25.5
Minimal, if any influence	2	3.9

The lawmakers were asked if they talked to staff members about family policy issues. Fifty-six percent stated they consulted staff members. However, virtually all respondents emphasized that they asked for information on policies but not for input on how to vote. Since Colorado legislators did not have individual staff members assigned to them, they relied upon assistance from the legislative council staff. The purpose of this group was to provide technical researched information. Staff members were prohibited from attempting to influence political decisions. Forty percent indicated they did not consult staff on these issues and four percent did not respond to the question.

Legislators were asked to identify the extent to which constituents influenced their voting decisions. As shown on Table XXIV, 71 percent

of the legislators stated that constituents influenced them greatly with another 25 percent indicating that constituents influenced them somewhat. Only four percent stated that constituents had little, if any influence on their voting decisions on family policy issues.

The governor of Colorado had little influence on legislators' votes on family policy issues according to participants in this study.

Seventy-one percent of the legislators identified that they were not contacted by the governor on these issues; the other 29 percent indicated they had been contacted by the governor or the governor's legislative liaison on at least one of the 30 bills considered in this study.

Ninety-eight percent of the lawmakers stated they heard from organizations who tried to influence their voting decisions on family policy issues. Contact was most frequently made personally by representatives of the organizations. Mail was used less frequently to contact legislators as were telephone contacts. Legislators identified that personal contact was made most frequently by lobbyists. These findings are shown in Table XXV.

Asked to indicate if there were reading materials that had an influence on voting decisions in family policy areas, 96 percent of the legislators stated that the materials they read influenced how they voted. As shown on Table XXVI, 42 percent indicated that newspapers had an influence, 36 percent stated that reading magazines and journals influenced their voting and 28 percent identified that reading technical and research reports served as an influence. Publications distributed by organizations as well as general materials received in the mail (letters and newsletters) influenced voting decisions to a lesser degree. Many legislators indicated that reading materials read during



their formative years may have had a greater influence than materials read at the time of making the voting decisions.

TABLE XXV  
INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON LEGISLATORS' VOTING  
DECISIONS ON POLICIES ORIENTED TOWARD  
FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Variable	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Legislators who identified being contacted by organizations who tried to influence voting decisions on family policies.	49	98
Legislators who identified they had not been contacted by organizations who tried to influence voting decisions on family policies	2	2
Methods legislators identified organizations used to influence voting decisions		
Personal Contact	35	70
Mail	19	38
Telephone	8	16

<sup>a</sup>The total equals more than 100 percent because respondents identified as many variables as applied.

The lawmakers were asked to assess the extent of influence families and friends had on their voting decisions related to family policy issues. As shown on Table XXVII, the greatest number of legislators (29%) indicated that family and friends had little, if any influence, on their voting decisions. However, another 27 percent indicated that

this group had a very significant influence. Those who indicated that their family and friends had somewhat of an influence generally stated that they listened to their input and considered it along with many other sources. Those who stated that family and friends had an indirect influence said their influence was a result of upbringing, background and a shared philosophical base.

TABLE XXVI

TYPE OF READING MATERIALS THAT INFLUENCED LEGISLATORS'  
VOTING DECISIONS ON POLICIES ORIENTED  
TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Reading Material	Frequency	Percent <sup>a</sup>
Newspapers	21	42.0
Magazines and Journals	18	36.0
Technical Reports	14	28.0
Mail	7	14.0
Publications from Organizations	7	14.3

<sup>a</sup>The total equals more than 100 percent because respondents identified as many variables as applied.

As discussed in this section, seven factors or considerations influenced legislators' voting decisions on policies oriented toward family well-being. Of these, the philosophical consideration of the appropriateness of governmental involvement with the issue ranked

highest; considering the merits of each issue was stated least often. In many cases, legislators identified several factors that impacted their voting decisions. Based upon these findings, it can be interpreted that legislators' deliberations on how to vote on family policy issues are often complex.

TABLE XXVII

EXTENT OF INFLUENCE FAMILY AND FRIENDS HAD ON  
LEGISLATORS' VOTING DECISIONS ON POLICIES  
ORIENTED TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Extent of Influence	Frequency	Percent
Family and friends had a very significant influence	14	27.5
Family and friends had somewhat of an influence	13	25.5
Family and friends had an indirect influence	9	17.6
Family and friends had little, if any influence at all	15	29.4

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify Colorado legislative measures that are oriented toward family well-being and to identify attributes of legislators who support these measures. The investigation was designed to:

1. Develop a framework to select policies that are oriented toward family well-being.
2. Identify attributes of legislators who were supportive of policies oriented toward family well-being.
3. Obtain responses of legislators on their perceptions of the proper relationship between government and families as well as the services they perceived appropriate for the government to offer families.

The hypotheses tested in the second objective for the study are summarized in the following statement. There is no association between support and nonsupport of policies oriented toward family well-being and each of the following attributes of Colorado legislators:

1. Personal and social attributes: marital status, length of marriage, age, number of children, stage of couple family development, stage of single family development, education, sex, and importance of religion in personal life.
2. Occupational attributes: occupation and income.

3. Political and legislative attributes: political party, likelihood of running for same political office, likelihood of running for higher political office, length of legislative service, and percentage of votes received in last election.

4. Characteristics of constituency represented: urban/rural district, percentage of nonwhites in district, percentage of Hispanics in district, distance district is from capitol, percentage of unemployed in district, percentage of district registered Republican, percentage in district registered Democrat, percentage in district registered unaffiliated, and average adjusted gross income in district.

#### Procedure

A policy analysis framework was developed to analyze policies considered during the 1981 and 1982 Colorado legislative sessions. A jury selected 30 bills as being oriented toward family well-being. Voting records of legislators on these bills were compiled. Examination of public records and personal interviews provided information related to the personal and social, occupational, and political and legislative attributes of legislators as well as the characteristics of the constituency represented.

The population consisted of 100 Colorado legislators who served during the 1981 and 1982 legislative sessions. Fifty-one were randomly selected and interviewed. All interviews were conducted personally by the researcher. Data were analyzed by means of factor analysis, frequency distributions, simple correlations, Kuder-Richardson test, and analysis of variance.

## Results and Discussion

Of the participants in the study, 80 percent were male, 60 percent were between 41 and 60 years of age and 75 percent were married. Eighty-eight percent had children and of those in the family stage of development, the largest percentage (40%) were in the married, empty nest to retirement stage. Seventy-three percent of the legislators identified religion as very important or fairly important in their personal lives.

Eighty percent of the legislators had attended college; 24 percent held a bachelor's degree and had done some graduate work and another 20 percent possessed law degrees. Forty-three percent were employed as professionals with the modal income range \$40,000 to \$49,000.

Sixty-one percent of the participants were Republicans. Twice as many were representatives as senators. The length of legislative service varied from two to twenty years; one quarter of the participants were freshmen legislators at the time they voted on the issues included in this study.

Eighty-six percent of the legislators represented urban districts. The district percentage of Hispanics ranged from three to thirty-six and the percentage of nonwhites ranged from two to twenty-five.

### Policy Analysis Framework/Selection of

#### Policies Oriented Toward Family

#### Well-Being

Because consistent criteria needed to be established for the identification of policies that are oriented toward family well-being, a policy analysis framework was developed. Criteria outlined on the framework included:

1. The family or family members are ultimately the object of the policy.
2. The policy provides the family broader options or choices.
3. The policy assists families in meeting one or more of the following functions: membership, economic and consumer, or socializing health and nurturing.

Using this framework, the jury identified 30 bills that had reached the roll call voting stage during the 1981 or 1982 Colorado legislative sessions as being oriented toward family well-being. These 30 bills were factor analyzed with 17 bills emerging with substantial factor loadings. Three groups emerged when the factor was rotated. The original 30 bills were also subdivided according to the functions they helped families serve (membership, economic and consumer, and socializing, health and nurturing); bills were also categorized according to whether or not they had a fiscal impact. This resulted in ten different measurements of bills oriented toward family well-being.

Variables Associated with Support of Policies  
Oriented Toward Family Well-Being

Of the 25 variables associated with voting records on bills oriented toward family well-being, six correlated significantly at the .05 probability level. These included stage of single family development, occupation, education, party, importance of religion in personal life, whether the legislator represented an urban or rural district. The more advanced a legislator was in the stage of single family development, the more likely he/she was to support policies oriented toward family well-being that have no fiscal impact. Democrats were more likely than

Republicans to support policies with a fiscal impact that assist families with membership and socializing functions. Legislators from rural districts were less likely to support policies that provide for family housing and health care needs. The more important religion was in a legislator's life, the less likely that person was to support policies providing for family housing and health care needs.

Occupation correlated significantly with nine of the ten measures of the dependent variable. Those employed as professionals were more likely to support policies oriented toward family well-being than those employed as nonprofessionals. The more education a legislator had the more likely he/she was to support the 17 policies in the unrotated factor as well as the policies providing for family housing and health care needs. As a result of these findings, the four hypotheses tested were not accepted.

Analysis of variance determined seven categories where there were statistical differences between sample means on support of policies oriented toward family well-being. These categories were couple family stage of development, single family stage of development, religion, occupation, location of district, percentage of district registered Republican, and district income. The summary of these differences are presented on Table XXVIII. The means are measurements of "yes" votes on policies oriented toward family well-being; consequently, higher means indicate greater support of these policies.

#### Relationship Between Government and Families

From three statements identifying possible relationships between the government and families, nearly two-thirds of the legislators



TABLE XXVIII

SUMMARY OF VARIABLES SHOWING STATISTICAL DIFFERENCES ON SUPPORT OF  
POLICIES ORIENTED TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING  
(N=51)

Voting Record Measurement	Variable	Categories Showing Statistical Differences Between Means	Means for Categories*
Factor 2 <sup>a</sup>	Stage of Couple Family Development	Couple, oldest child 7-13 years of age	.250
		All other categories of couple family stage of development	.977
Total 30 Bills	Stage of Single Family Development	Single without children and single oldest child 6-13 years	.761
		All other categories of single family stage of development	.876
Policies Having a Fiscal Impact	Stage of Single Family Development	Single, oldest child 6-13 years	.583
		Single, retirement to death	1.000
		All other categories of single family stage of development	.819
Unrotated Factor	Stage of Single Family Development	Single, oldest child 6-13 years; single, empty nest to retirement;	.938
		single, retirement to death	
		All other categories of single family stage of development	
Factor 1 <sup>b</sup>	Stage of Single Family Development	Single, oldest child 6-13 years; single, empty nest to retirement;	.900
		single, retirement to death	
		All other categories of single family stage of development	
Factor 3 <sup>c</sup>	Stage of Single Family Development	Single, oldest child 6-13 years; single, empty nest to retirement;	1.000
		single, retirement to death	
		All other categories of single family stage of development	
Factor 1 <sup>b</sup>	Importance of Religion	Religion-very important in personal life; religion-fairly important in personal life	.661
		Religion-not very important in personal life; religion-not at all important in personal life	.850
Factor 2 <sup>a</sup>	Importance of Religion	Religion-not at all important in personal life	.625
		All other categories of importance of religion in personal life	.949
Total 30 Bills	Occupation	Professionals	.891
		Nonprofessionals	.813

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Voting Record Measurement	Variable	Categories Showing Statistical Differences Between Means	Means for Categories*
Membership Function Bills	Occupation	Professionals	.907
		Nonprofessionals	.836
Economic Function Bills	Occupation	Professionals	.885
		Nonprofessionals	.779
Socializing Function Bills	Occupation	Professionals	.907
		Nonprofessionals	.820
Bills with no Fiscal Impact	Occupation	Professionals	.899
		Nonprofessionals	.826
Unrotated Factor	Occupation	Professionals	.918
		Nonprofessionals	.756
Factor 1 <sup>b</sup>	Occupation	Professionals	.900
		Nonprofessionals	.593
Factor 2 <sup>a</sup>	Occupation	Professionals	1.000
		Nonprofessionals	.900
Factor 3 <sup>c</sup>	Occupation	Professionals	.909
		Nonprofessionals	.741
Factor 1 <sup>b</sup>	Location of District	Urban	.773
		Rural	.429
Total 30 Bills	Percent of District Registered Republican	Districts with 30 to 33 percent of residents registered Republican	.792
		All other categories of percent of district registered Republican	.870
Economic Function	Percent of Registered Republican	Districts with 30 to 33 percent of residents registered Republican	.760
		All other categories of percent of district registered Republican	.852
Bills with no Fiscal Impact	Percent of District Registered Republican	Districts with 30 to 33 percent of residents registered Republican	.799
		All other categories of percent of district registered Republican	.881
Unrotated Factor	Percent of District Registered Republican	Districts with 30 to 33 percent of residents registered Republican	.712
		All other categories of percent of district registered Republican	.869

TABLE XXVIII (Continued)

Voting Record Measurement	Variable	Categories Showing Statistical Differences Between Means	Means for Categories*
Factor 1 <sup>b</sup>	Percent of District Registered Republican	Districts with 30 to 33 percent of residents registered Republican	.523
		All other categories of percent of district registered Republican	.801
Economic Function Bills	District Income	\$5,261 - \$12,814 district income; \$14,573 - \$18,287 district income	.861
		\$12,903 - \$13,769 district income	.765
Socializing Function Bills	District Income	\$5,261 - \$12,814 district income	.900
		District income over \$12,814	.843
Bills with a Fiscal Impact	District Income	\$5,261 - \$12,814 district income	.911
		District income over \$12,814	.799
Total 30 Bills	District Income	\$5,261 - \$12,814 district income	.884
		Over \$12,814 district income	.833

\*Denotes average means of all groups within each category; range was 0-1.

<sup>a</sup>Factor 2: Policies assisting families with membership, economic or socializing functions with no fiscal impact.

<sup>b</sup>Factor 1: Policies providing for family housing and health care needs.

<sup>c</sup>Factor 3: Policies assisting families with membership and socializing functions with a fiscal impact.

selected the following as being the most appropriate: Government should help families in carrying out their functions only when necessary.

When given a list of nine general functions in which the government could assist families, participants rated education highest and recreation lowest. However, it should be noted that on the five point scale education, as the highest, received a mean of 3.7 and recreation, as the lowest, received a mean of 2.1. Consequently, the interpretation is that the legislators in general felt that the government should not assist families to a great extent with any of the functions. The other seven included physical health care, mental health care, employment, housing, social welfare services, financial support and child care. Many legislators responding to this question indicated that the government should offer help in these areas only to families who are genuinely in need.

Legislators were also asked to respond to specific services the government has or could possibly provide for families in the future. Participants rated how appropriate each service was to offer families. Issues dealing with the elderly received the highest scores; these were followed by assistance to foster care families and aid to dependent children. Policies to assure minimum family incomes received the lowest ratings, followed by parenting education, public funds for abortion, family therapy services, and financing for intensive care units for premature newborns. Again, many respondents qualified their support by indicating the government should offer assistance in these areas only to those in need.

Reactions to a hypothetical measure proposing that the state recognize the family as a basic unit of society were mixed. Some

indicated support of the philosophy but opposition to a legislative measure since they perceived this as an issue inappropriate for government involvement. Still others indicated that this measure was an attempt to legislate morality. Several said they would support the concept as a resolution but not as a statute. In responding to this question, many legislators stated that negotiating an appropriate relationship between government and families is difficult.

#### Teaching Personal and Family Living

In rating concepts that could be taught in the personal and family living area, feeding the family nutritiously and managing money, time and human resources received the highest scores. Rated lowest as an appropriate concept to be taught was sexual development and adjustment as a family member. Reactions to teaching these concepts were mixed; some legislators rated all concepts as very appropriate while others rated all as very inappropriate.

Over 60 percent of the respondents indicated a preference to teaching these concepts in bits and pieces throughout childhood and adolescence rather than exclusively at the elementary, junior high or high school levels. Since Colorado assumes an educational philosophy of local school district control, most legislators opposed the state requiring a personal and family living curriculum. However, some legislators indicated support of the local district requiring this curricular exposure for its students.

#### Factors Influencing Voting Decisions

Seven factors or considerations emerged as influencing legislators'

decisions on how to vote on policies oriented toward family well-being. Most often mentioned was the consideration of the appropriateness of governmental involvement. Other factors mentioned as influencing voting decisions were consideration of the impact of the policy on various groups, assessment of the problem addressed in the study, and the appropriations attached to the policy. Also listed, but with less frequency were the following three factors: the influences of others, the impact of one's personal background and the individual merits of each issue.

### Conclusions and Implications

The findings of this study indicate there are attributes of Colorado legislators that are associated with support of policies oriented toward family well-being. Based upon the degree and frequency of correlations, education, occupation and single family stage of development represented the strongest associations. The other three variables, importance of religion, political party, and urban versus rural district representation produced statistically significant correlations with less consistency and strength than the three previously mentioned variables. However, two of these three, party affiliation and whether the legislator represented an urban or a rural district, were also found to be significant in similar previously conducted research at the University of Minnesota.

Based upon these findings, the following hypothetical profile may be drawn of a Colorado legislator most likely to support policies oriented toward family well-being:

1. Is well educated (holds a master's, JD or doctorate)

2. Is employed as a professional
3. Is more advanced in the stage of single family development (most likely to be in one of the following categories: single, when first child leaves home until last is gone; single, empty nest to retirement; or single, retirement to death)
4. Identified that religion is not very important or not at all important in his/her personal life
5. Is affiliated with the Democratic party
6. Represents an urban district

Results of the interview indicated that in general legislators tend to follow some general lines of thinking in deciding whether or not to support policies that have an explicit effect upon families. In making these decisions, lawmakers identified consideration of the following questions:

1. Is there a justified need for this policy? Is there truly a problem that needs to be solved? If so, does this policy address this need?
2. Is it appropriate for the government to be involved in this area?
3. Is there another segment of society that could better handle this issue such as a private agency or the church?
4. Is this program one that can be managed by the government?
5. Is this issue already being addressed by another segment of society?
6. What are the costs? Do the benefits outweigh the costs?
7. In what way is the proposed program addressing prevention? What precautions are taken to alleviate further societal problems?

8. What incentives are built into the program for people to care for their own in the future?

9. Is the policy or program in any way encouraging a dependency on the government?

10. Is this policy or program giving the government permission to "meddle in affairs" that should be handled privately and exclusively by families?

The aforementioned questions served to guide legislators in deciding whether or not to support proposed policies. Knowledge of these questions can be helpful to researchers interested in the study of policy formation, to professional organizations that serve as policy advocates and to voters.

Family policy advocates should also be advised, that based upon the findings of this study, legislators are most supportive of measures that offer assistance to the elderly and to dependent children. They expressed least support of policies that assure minimum family income and for those that provide for parenting education, family therapy services and abortion.

Those who propose the inclusion of personal and family living in a public school curriculum could be challenged to examine a new type of delivery system in this area. Most legislators in this study indicated a preference for teaching these concepts in segments throughout the elementary, junior high and high school years. At this time in Colorado, most personal and family living education is taught at the high school level. The findings indicate that a delivery system including every educational level should be explored.



Responses related to the concept of mandating personal and family living indicate that public school curricular decisions are made at the local level. Because of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the state from imposing requirements on local districts, state legislators have very little input into Colorado educational requirements. Consequently, if individuals or groups wish to advocate more emphasis on personal and family living education, they need to voice their opinions at the local level.

#### Recommendations

Based upon the results of this study and the review of the literature, the following recommendations are made:

1. As indicated in the review of literature, one of the major challenges in the area of family policy research is the identification of family policies. The framework developed in this study for family policy analysis was used only by individuals in higher education who presented a theoretical approach to family policy analysis. It is recommended that, in order to provide further validation for this instrument, that it be used by governmental officials involved in the applied side of family policy formation. Involvement of professionals employed in drafting legislation could provide suggestions for further refinement of this instrument. In addition, in future studies, if a jury is used to select policies that are oriented toward family well-being, it is recommended that the jury include both family policy theorists as well as governmental officials directly involved in the policy formation process.

2. Since the study of policy formation at the state level lends itself to comparative research between states, it is recommended that this study be replicated in states other than Colorado.

3. Since politics is the art of compromise, involving individual and group dynamics, it is recommended that additional studies be conducted that include an evaluation of the context in which explicit family policies are considered. This would include evaluation of committee hearings and floor debates related to these issues.

4. As discussed in the literature review, progress in family policy analysis has been delayed because of a lack of consensus on related terms. Because of this, the researcher recommends that dialogue continue in an effort to arrive at a consensus of definition for the following terms: family, family policy and family well-being.

5. In this research project, legislators were asked to rate how appropriate they thought selected programs and services were for the government to offer families. In responding to these questions, legislators were asked to consider the needs of families in general. In future studies, it is recommended that differentiations be made between the rating of services that are offered to families in general and services that are offered to families in need.

6. It is recommended that future related research studies again employ the interview technique. It is also recommended that the interview be conducted by a person who is known to the legislators and who has developed a rapport with them. These recommendations are made because several participants in this study indicated they would not have completed a written questionnaire; in addition several indicated they would not have consented to an interview if they had not known the

researcher as a legislative intern. It is further suggested that the interview schedule include several open-ended questions so that participants have the opportunity to discuss philosophies and opinions at length.

7. A limitation of this study was to examine only one form of public policy, state legislative measures. It is recommended that future studies examine other types of public policies for their orientation toward family well-being. This would include the analysis of policies at the local, state, and federal levels that are in the form of statutes, budget, program design features and court actions.

8. Since many legislators indicated that their voting decisions are influenced by colleagues who are perceived as having expertise in the legislative area under consideration, it is recommended that additional studies be conducted to identify attributes of legislators who are perceived as experts in areas related to family policy. This information could be useful to family policy advocates since, through the persuasion of one of these perceived experts, many other legislators may also be favorably influenced.

9. It is recommended that home economists and other professionals committed to the promotion of family well-being work to make families a more visible consideration in public policy formation. By common practice numerous policies are evaluated in light of their impact on the environment or the economy; it is recommended that professionals work to help elected officials consciously consider the impact of policies on families.

10. Respondents in this study generally endorsed a philosophy of a limited and reduced governmental involvement in family life. Instead,

they proposed an increased involvement of churches, charities and private organizations in the offering of family support services. Based upon this finding, it is recommended that home economists and other professionals, in seeking to promote family well-being, examine how other societal institutions independent of the government can be strengthened in their offerings of support to families.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, M. E., and Rorex, C. A. Colorado Legislative Almanac 1981. Boulder, CO: Ackerman Rorex Corp., 1981.
- Aldous, J., Dumon, W., and Johnson, K. (Eds.). The Politics and Programs of Family Policy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame and Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Anderson, L. F., Watts, M. W., and Wilcox, A. R. Legislative Roll Call Analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966.
- Bane, M. J. Toward a description and evaluation of United States family policy. In J. Aldous, W. Dumon, and K. Johnson (Eds.), The Politics and Programs of Family Policy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame and Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Benson, P. L. Religion on Capitol Hill. Psychology Today, 1981, 15 (12), 46-57.
- Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Bill to preserve 'family' draws ire of Virginia senate. The Washington Post, February 17, 1980, p. B5.
- Bivens, G., Fitch, M., Newkirk, G., Paolucci, B., Riggs, E., St. Marie, S., and Vaughn, G. Home economics new directions II. Journal of Home Economics, 1975, 67 (3), 26-27.
- Bock, R. D., and Lieberman, M. Fitting a response model for  $n$  dichotomously scored items. Psychometrika, 1970, 35 (2), 179-197.
- Brown, M., and Paolucci, B. Home Economics: A Definition. American Home Economics Association, 1978.
- Christoffersson, A. Factor analysis of dichotomized variables. Psychometrika, 1979, 40 (1), 5-31.
- Clausen, A. R. How Congressmen Decide: A Policy Focus. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.
- Colorado Legislative Directory. Denver: Colorado Press Service, 1981.
- Colorado Legislators Handbook. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Council, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1981).

- Constitution of the United States National and State Colorado. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1974.
- Darling, C. A., and Bubolz, M. M. Public policy and the family: An integrative course. Journal of Home Economics, 1980, 72 (1), 20-23.
- DeBie, P. J. L. The rationale and social context of family policy in Western Europe. In J. Aldous, W. Dumon, and K. Johnson (Eds.), The Politics and Programs of Family Policy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame and Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Dempsey, J. J. The Family and Public Policy. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing, 1981.
- Derge, D. R. Urban-rural conflict: The case in Illinois. In J. C. Wahlke and H. Eulau (Eds.), Legislative Behavior. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1959.
- Development-the family. Harvard Law Review, 1980, 93, 1159-1381.
- Dexter, L. A. Sociology and Politics of Congress. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Diamond, I. Sex Roles in the State House. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Digest of Bills Enacted by the Fifty-Third General Assembly 1981 First Regular Session. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Drafting Office, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1981).
- Digest of Bills Enacted by the Fifty-Third General Assembly 1982 Second Regular Session. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Drafting Office, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1982).
- Directory 1981 Fifty-Third General Assembly First Regular Session State of Colorado. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Council, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1981).
- Directory 1982 Fifty-Third General Assembly Second Regular Session State of Colorado. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Council, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1982).
- Duvall, E. M. Family Development. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971.
- Eldersveld, S. J. Theory and method in voting research. In H. Eulau, S. Eldersveld, and M. Janowitz (Eds.), Political Behavior. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1956.
- Family Impact Seminar. Interim Report of the Family Impact Seminar. Washington, D.C.: IEL Publications Coordinator, 1978.

- Gilbert, N. An initial agenda for family policy. Social Work, 1979, 24 (6), 447-450.
- Gore, W. R., Grimm, J. W., Motz, S. C., and Thompson, J. D. The family life cycle: Internal dynamics and social consequences. Sociology and Social Research, 1972, 57, 182-195.
- Gould, G., and Kolb, W. L. A Dictionary in the Social Sciences. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Green, K. B. Home Economists' Involvement in Public Policy. Oral presentation. Oklahoma State University, May 6, 1982.
- Green, K. B. Statement before the national advisory committee, White House Conference on Families. Unpublished paper. American Home Economics Association, Washington, D.C., 1979.
- Hawkins, L. The impact of policy decisions on families. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28 (2), 264-272.
- Hill, A. D., Shear, T., Bell, C. G., Cross, A. A., Carter, E. A., and Horning, L. N. Vocational home economics education: A statement by the vocational education coalition. Journal of Home Economics, 1979, 71 (4), 12-16.
- Horst, P. Factor Analysis of Data Matrices. New York: Holt, 1965.
- Johnson, A. S. Toward family impact analysis: Some first steps. Unpublished paper. Family Impact Seminar, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., 1976.
- Kalenova, I., and Reynolds, R. T. Colorado Population Reports 1980 Census Report. Denver: Demographic Section, Colorado Division of Local Government, No. 2, 1981.
- Kamerman, S. B., and Kahn, A. J. Comparative analysis in family policy: A case study. Social Work, 1979, 24 (6), 506-511.
- Kamerman, S. B., and Kahn, A. J. Exploration in family policy. Social Work, 1976, 21 (3), 181-186.
- Kamerman, S. B., and Kahn, A. J. Family Policy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Kass, R. A., and Tinsley, H. E. A. Factor analysis. Journal of Leisure Research, 1979, 11 (2), 120-138.
- Keefe, W. J. Comparative study of the role of political parties in state legislatures. In H. Eulau, S. Eldersveld and M. Janowitz (Eds.), Political Behavior. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1956.
- Lippeatt, S. F., and Brown, H. I. Focus and Promise of Home Economics. New York: MacMillan, 1965.

- Lory, B. Changes in European family policies. In J. Aldous, W. Dumon, and K. Johnson (Eds.), The Politics and Programs of Family Policy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame and Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Lynn, L. E., Jr. Fiscal and organizational constraints on United States family policy. In J. Aldous, W. Dumon, and K. Johnson (Eds.), The Politics and Programs of Family Policy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame and Leuven University Press, 1980.
- MacRae, D. Concepts and methods of policy analysis. Society, 1979, 16 (6), 74-80.
- MacRae, D. The relation between roll call votes and constituencies. In J. C. Wahlke and H. Eulau (Eds.), Legislative Behavior. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1959.
- Mathews, D. R., and Stinson, J. A. Decision-making by U. S. representatives: A preliminary model. In S. Ulmer (Ed.), Political Decision-Making. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970.
- McDonald, G. W. Typology for family policy research. Social Work, 1979, 24 (6), 553-558.
- Mead, M., and Heyman, K. Family. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1965.
- Merkel, P. H. 'Behavioristic' tendencies in American political science. In H. Eulau (Ed.), Behavioralism in Political Science. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.
- Miller, W. E., and Stokes, D. E. Constituency influence in Congress. In F. W. Grapp, Jr., and M. Mauer (Eds.), Political Behavior in the United States. New York: Meredith Corp., 1972.
- Mondale, W. F. Government policy, stress, and the family. Journal of Home Economics, 1976, 68 (5), 11-15.
- Moynihan, D. P. A family policy for the nation. America, Sept. 18, 1965, pp. 280-283.
- Moynihan, D. P. Rescuing the family. America, July 25, 1980, pp. 26-27.
- Muthen, B. Contributions to factor analysis of dichotomous variables. Psychometrika, 1978, 43 (4), 551-560.
- Muthen, B. Factor analysis of dichotomous variables: American attitudes toward abortion. In D. Jackson and E. Bogatta (Eds.), Factor Analysis and Measure. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981.
- New political reality: Conservative. AHEA's Home Economics Washington Dateline, October 1981, VIII (6), 3.
- Nunally, J. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.



- Nye, F. I., and Berado, F. M. The Family Its Structure and Interaction. New York: MacMillan, 1973.
- Otto, H. A. The Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, CA: Holistic Press, 1975.
- Patterson, S. C. Toward A Theory of Legislative Behavior. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1962.
- Rice, R. M. American Family Policy: Content and Context. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1977.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976.
- Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Schlesinger, J. A. Ambition and Politics: Political Careers in the United States. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Scott, P. B. Family policy and the home economics curriculum. Journal of Home Economics, 1979, 71 (3), 22.
- Session Laws of Colorado Second Regular Session 1982. Denver: Bradford Publishing Co., 1982.
- Session Laws of Colorado First Regular Session 1981, Vol. I. Denver: Bradford Publishing Co., 1981.
- Session Laws of Colorado First Regular Session 1981, Vol. II: Denver: Bradford Publishing Co., 1981.
- Shea, J. D., and Jones, J. A model for the use of attitude scales across cultures. International Journal of Psychology, 1982, 17, 331-343.
- State of Colorado (1981) 53rd General Assembly. Unpublished booklet. (Distributed by Colorado Legislative Council, Colorado State Capitol, Denver, CO, 1981).
- United Nations Economic and Social Council. Family, Child and Youth Welfare Service. Report by the Secretary General, 1965.
- United Nations, The International Bill of Human Rights. New York: United Nations, 1978.
- United States Bureau of the Census. General population characteristics: May 1982. Census of the Population, Vol. 1, Chapter B, Part 33. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1982.

- United States Bureau of the Census. Household and family characteristics: March 1981. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 371. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1982.
- United States Bureau of the Census. Marital status and living arrangements: March 1976. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 306. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1977b.
- United States Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 1980 Census of Population. Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population Chapter B, General Population Characteristics Part 7 Colorado PC 80-1-B7. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1982.
- Van Der Slik, J. R., and Pernacciaro, S. J. Office ambitions and voting behavior in the U. S. Senate: A longitudinal study. American Politics Quarterly, 1979, 7 (2), 198-204.
- Wahlke, J. C. Behavioral analyses of representative bodies. In S. C. Patterson (Ed.), American Legislative Behavior. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Wahlke, J. C., Eulau, H., Buchana, W., and Ferguson, L. C. The Legislative System, Explorations in Legislative Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.
- Wahlke, J. C. Theory: A framework for analysis. In J. C. Wahlke, H. Eulau, W. Buchanan, and L. C. Ferguson (Eds.), The Legislative System. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.
- Wallas, G. Human nature in politics. In H. Eulau, S. Eldersveld, and M. Janowitz (Eds.), Political Behavior. Glencoe, NY: The Free Press, 1956.
- Walton, R. A. Colorado A Practical Guide to Its Government and Politics. Fort Collins, CO: Shields Publishing, 1974.
- White House Conference on Families. Listening to America's Families Action for the 80's. (The Report to the President, Congress, and Families of the Nation.) Washington, D.C.: The White House Conference on Families, 1980.
- Zadrozny, J. T. Dictionary of Social Science. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1959.
- Zimmerman, S. L. Confusions and contradictions in family policy developments: Application of a model. Family Relations, 1982, 31 (3), 445-455.
- Zimmerman, S. L. Policy, social policy, and family policy: Concepts, concerns, and analytic tools. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 487-495.

Zimmerman, S. L. The family and its relevance for social policy. Social Casework, 1976, 57 (9), 547-554.

Zimmerman, S. L., Mattiessich, P., and Leik, R. K. Legislators' attitude toward family policy. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41 (3), 507-517.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

POLICY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE POLICIES ORIENTED  
TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING

Policy No., Title, and Description	Explicit Family Policy*		Enables Families to Perform One of Three Functions		
	The family or family members are ultimately the object of the policy.	Policies that support or supplement families to carry out their functions through broadened options or choices.	Membership Functions	Economic and consumer Functions	Socializing, Health and Nurturing Functions

\*Specific programs and policies designed to deliberately do things for the family with the overall goal  
maintenance of family equilibrium

APPENDIX B

JURY POLICY ANALYSIS MATERIALS

**DIRECTIONS:** Under the category of "Explicit Family Policy," write YES if the policy meets the criteria outlined in each box. In order for a policy to be a family policy, both boxes must be checked. Under the category of "Enables Families to Perform one of Three Functions," write YES in the box(es) of the family functions addressed in the policy. Some policies may help families perform more than one function. In order for a policy to be a family policy, only one function needs to be met. If the policy does not help the family perform one of these three functions, write NO in all three categories of functions.

FRAMEWORK TO EVALUATE POLICIES ORIENTED  
TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING

Policy No., Title, and Description	Explicit Family Policy*		Enables Families to Perform One of Three Functions		
	The family or family members are ultimately the object of the policy.	Policies that support or supplement families to carry out their functions through broadened options or choices.	Membership Functions	Economic and consumer Functions	Socializing, Health and Nurturing Functions

\*Specific programs and policies designed to deliberately do things for the family with the overall goal maintenance of family equilibrium



## DEFINITIONS

FAMILY-a group of two or more persons residing together who are related by blood, marriage or adoption. (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1977)

FAMILY WELL-BEING-maintenance of equilibrium so that the family may perform with as few restrictions as possible its functions related to membership, material support and nurturance of members.

## FAMILY FUNCTIONS

MEMBERSHIP: (Programs that might influence whether individuals formed, broke up, expanded or contracted families). In this category, programs are identified as to their effect on membership trends of birth, death, marriage, and separation. Program examples include family planning, abortion, health services, foster care and adoption, child abuse and neglect, community based services for mental health or penal systems, divorce laws, custody provisions, etc. Questions to examine related to membership functions:

1. What effects does the policy have on family membership and stability, to marry, have children, separate, or divorce?
2. What incentives or disincentives exist for family members to live together or live independently?

ECONOMIC AND CONSUMER FUNCTIONS: (Programs that affect families' abilities to provide support for their members through employment, securing of housing, job training, etc.) Listed examples of programs directly addressed to aid families in carrying out their economics and consumer functions include unemployment benefits, welfare assistance, social security benefits, job training and counseling programs, housing subsidies, loans and tax deductions for mortgage interest payments, tax credits for child care, retirement benefits, etc. Questions to examine related to these functions:

1. To what extent does the policy enable the recipient families fulfill their economic support functions more effectively?
2. Does the policy provide resources which help to supplement family roles and thereby strengthen families abilities to provide support on their own?

SOCIALIZING, HEALTH, AND NURTURING FUNCTIONS: (Programs that help families to rear and nurture their dependents, encourage and support their physical, intellectual, and emotional development and to provide psychological sustenance to their members. Examples of these programs are nutrition, preventative health programs, compensatory education programs providing services to vulnerable family members such as handicapped, mentally ill, elderly, and young children. Questions to ask related to these functions:

1. To what extent does the policy help families rear and nurture their young and care for other dependents in non-economic terms such as
  - \*encouraging and supporting children's physical, intellectual, and emotional growth and development
  - \*providing each family member with psychological sustenance?

2. If the policy is aimed at an individual in need, does it attempt (explicitly or implicitly) to identify the roles other family members can play in contributing to the individual's need?
3. What effect does the policy have on the family's ability to nurture, care for and be intimate with other family members?

Second Regular Session

LDO NO. 82 0125/1 Fifty-third General Assembly

SENATE BILL NO. 62

STATE OF COLORADO

JUDICIARY  
APPROPRIATION

BY SENATORS Cole, Stockton, Ezzard, Baca Barragan, Gallagher,  
Holme, and Beno;  
also REPRESENTATIVES Faatz, Kirscht, Marks, Orten, Skaggs,  
Wright, and Eberle.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

- 1 CONCERNING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND PROVIDING STATE ASSISTANCE FOR  
2 SUCH COMMUNITY PROGRAMS AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION THEREFOR.

## Bill Summary

(Note: This summary applies to this bill as introduced and does not necessarily reflect any amendments which may be subsequently adopted.)

Authorizes the state department of social services to distribute certain state moneys to community domestic abuse programs according to a rate set in the annual general appropriation bill. Provides that at least half the revenues received by such programs shall be provided by local or other nonstate sources as a condition for the receipt of any state reimbursement. States that the intent of the general assembly is not to incur excessive state administrative expenses.

3 Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

4 SECTION 1. Title 26, Colorado Revised Statutes 1973, as  
5 amended, is amended BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW ARTICLE to read:

6 ARTICLE 7.5

7 Domestic Violence Programs

8 26-7.5-101. Legislative declaration. The general  
9 assembly hereby finds that a significant number of homicides,

*Capital letters indicate new material to be added to existing statute.  
Dashes through the words indicate deletions from existing statute.*

1 aggravated assaults, and assaults and batteries occur with  
2 the home between adult members of families; that the reported  
3 incidence of domestic violence represents only a portion of  
4 the total number of incidents of domestic violence; that a  
5 large percentage of police officers deaths in the line of duty  
6 result from police intervention in domestic violence  
7 situations; and that domestic violence is a complex problem  
8 affecting families from all social and economic backgrounds.  
9 It is the purpose of this article to encourage the development  
10 of community domestic abuse facilities and programs by units  
11 of local government and nongovernmental agencies. It is the  
12 further purpose of this article to provide a procedure through  
13 which units of local government and nongovernmental agencies  
14 may provide domestic abuse services.

15 26-7.5-102. Definitions. (1) "Domestic abuse" or  
16 "domestic violence" means any act or threatened act of  
17 violence, including any forceful detention of an individual  
18 which results or threatens to result in physical injury and  
19 which is committed by a person eighteen years of age or older  
20 against another person eighteen years of age or older who is  
21 a relation or who is living in the same domicile.

22 (2) "Domestic abuse board" means the governing body of  
23 any unit of local government or a domestic abuse board which  
24 may be appointed by the governing body of any unit of local  
25 government pursuant to this article.

26 (3) "Domestic abuse program" means a community-based or

1 community-oriented facility or program: Which is operated  
2 either by a unit of local government or a private nonprofit  
3 agency or organization; which may provide residential accommo-  
4 dations for victims of domestic violence and their dependents;  
5 which provides programs and services to prevent incidents of  
6 domestic violence and to assist victims and dependents of  
7 victims, including, but not limited to, counseling for victims  
8 and their spouses, advocacy programs that assist victims in  
9 obtaining services and information, and educational programs  
10 relating to domestic violence designed for both the  
11 community at large and specialized groups such as medical  
12 personnel and law enforcement officials; and which utilizes  
13 the resources of the community in meeting the personal and  
14 family needs of participants.

15 (4) "Nongovernmental agency" means any person, private  
16 nonprofit agency, corporation, or other nongovernmental  
17 agency.

18 (5) "Unit of local government" means a county, city and  
19 county, city, town, or municipality.

20 26-7.5-103. State moneys - intent - right of state  
21 department to contract for such services. (1) It is the  
22 intent of the general assembly that no additional state  
23 staffing or administrative expenses in excess of six percent  
24 of the available appropriations be incurred by the state de-  
25 partment acting as a pass-through agency for the distribution  
26 of state moneys under the provisions of this article.

1 It is the further intent of the general assembly that such  
2 state moneys be provided only for programs providing services  
3 for all persons qualifying for such programs pursuant to  
4 section 26-7.5-102 (1), including the elderly and men as well  
5 as women.

6 (2) (a) The executive director may disburse moneys to  
7 any unit or units of local government which have established  
8 or which operate a community domestic abuse program or which  
9 subcontract with a nongovernmental agency for domestic abuse  
10 program services.

11 (b) The executive director may contract for services  
12 with any nongovernmental agency which operates a domestic  
13 abuse program or which subcontracts for services with other  
14 nongovernmental agencies that operate domesti- abuse programs,  
15 which program or programs meet the minimum standards approved  
16 by the executive director.

17 (c) Contracts or agreements entered into between a unit  
18 of local government or a nongovernmental agency and the state  
19 department shall provide that, subject to available  
20 appropriations for such programs, the department shall  
21 reimburse the nongovernmental agency at a rate to be set by  
22 the general assembly in the annual general appropriation bill  
23 which shall not exceed twenty-five dollars per day for each  
24 person who is participating in a residential or nonresidential  
25 domestic abuse program, but in no event shall the state  
26 reimbursements or disbursements exceed fifty percent of the

1 actual costs, with at least fifty percent of the revenue to be  
2 provided by local contributions or sources other than state  
3 funds.

4 (3) The executive director shall have the power to  
5 establish and enforce standards and regulations for all  
6 state-contracted domestic abuse programs and shall require  
7 that each community domestic abuse program operated by a  
8 nongovernmental agency with which the state department  
9 contracts for services meets approved minimum standards and  
10 regulations, and such regulations shall require that such  
11 services do not duplicate existing community services such as  
12 mental health, job placement, and alcohol or drug counseling.

13 SECTION 2. Appropriation. In addition to any other  
14 appropriation, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys  
15 in the general fund not otherwise appropriated, to the  
16 department of social services, for the fiscal year beginning  
17 July 1, 1982, the sum of three hundred thousand dollars  
18 (\$300,000), or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the  
19 implementation of this act.

20 SECTION 3. Effective date. This act shall take effect  
21 July 1, 1982.

22 SECTION 4. Safety clause. The general assembly hereby  
23 finds, determines, and declares that this act is necessary  
24 for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health,  
25 and safety.

APPENDIX C  
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE



## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction

Hello, my name is Carolyn Brink. I am a graduate student in home economics interested in the area of public policy and the family. As part of my research, I am examining bills considered in the Colorado Legislature for their effect on family well-being. My study will attempt to examine variables that have an impact on voting. (\*When appropriate, insert: I realize that you are no longer serving in the legislature, but I am interested in interviewing you because you served during the last session when the bills I am using in my study were considered.)

Today I would like to ask you some questions related to your personal, professional and political life as well as obtain your opinion on some areas related to public policy and the family. By family, I mean one or more persons living together who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption. I want to stress that this is an academic study and that your responses will be kept in strict confidence with all responses being analyzed as aggregate data. I also want to stress that my study is totally separate from the legislative internship work I am doing with Senator Claire Traylor.

I will be asking you some questions for the purpose of validating information I have already obtained. My sources of information were the Colorado Legislative Directory, the Colorado Legislative Almanac, and the 1981 and 1982 Directories of the 53rd General Assembly.

1. In the legislative directory, your occupation is listed as \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ . Has this changed?

1 Yes  
2 No \_\_\_\_\_

2,3. (When appropriate) According to the legislative directory, you are married.  
 How many years in total have you been married? \_\_\_\_\_

4,5. (When appropriate) I understand you have \_\_\_\_\_ children. Is that correct?  
 .        Yes  
       No \_\_\_\_\_

6-24. What are the ages of your children? \_\_\_\_\_

25. How would you rate the importance of religion in your life?

4 Very important  
3 Fairly important  
2 Not too important  
1 Not at all important

26,27. According to the legislative almanac, you first came to the legislature  
 in \_\_\_\_\_. Is that correct?

       Yes  
       No \_\_\_\_\_

So, you have served in the legislature for \_\_\_\_\_ years.

28. Now I would like to shift our focus to the area of family policy. By  
 family policy I mean specific programs and policies designed to deliberately  
 do things to and for the family. Which of the following statements most  
 accurately reflects your views with respect to the proper relationship  
 between government and families?

- 1 Families should be able to take care of their members without help  
 from government; government should not interfere with family life.  
2 Government should help families in carrying out their functions only  
 when necessary.  
3 Government shares with families a responsibility for insuring the  
 performance of family functions.

Every family at times experiences difficulties in performing its functions  
 or meeting its needs. To what extent do you think the government should offer  
 help to families in each of the following areas?

	To a great extent				
	Not at all				
	1	2	3	4	5
29. A. education	1	2	3	4	5
30. B. physical health care	1	2	3	4	5
31. C. mental health care	1	2	3	4	5
32. D. employment	1	2	3	4	5
33. E. housing	1	2	3	4	5
34. F. recreation	1	2	3	4	5
35. G. social welfare services	1	2	3	4	5
36. H. financial support	1	2	3	4	5
37. I. child care	1	2	3	4	5

I am going to list some services the government has or could possibly provide for families in the future. Identify the extent to which you think each service is appropriate for the government to provide.

	Very Inappropriate			Very Appropriate	
	1	2	3	4	5
39. Programs that provide aid to dependent children	1	2	3	4	5
40. Preventative medical care for the elderly through out-patient diagnostic services	1	2	3	4	5
41. Family planning services	1	2	3	4	5
42. Unemployment benefits	1	2	3	4	5
43. Public financing to install intensive-care units for premature newborns	1	2	3	4	5
44. Family therapy services	1	2	3	4	5
45. Parenting education	1	2	3	4	5
46. Medical insurance programs for the elderly	1	2	3	4	5
47. Providing assistance to families who are willing to serve as foster care families	1	2	3	4	5
48. Rehabilitative/restorative services for the elderly in appropriate facilities including skilled nursing homes and home health services	1	2	3	4	5
49. Job opportunity/training programs	1	2	3	4	5
50. Public funding for routine prenatal care and nutrition programs for pregnant women	1	2	3	4	5
51. Public funding for contraceptive services	1	2	3	4	5
52. Policies to assure minimum family income	1	2	3	4	5
53. Programs providing support to families so that foster care may be diverted through such provisions as emergency basis use of in-home caretakers, use of emergency housing, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
54. Public funds for abortion	1	2	3	4	5
55. Programs that provide services that enable the elderly to stay in their own homes such as visiting nurses, home health aides, homemaker aides, etc.	1	2	3	4	5

Some public schools have established a course to help students develop a rational foundation for making responsible choices related to personal and family living. The purpose of such a program is to help students increase their skills in decision making and communication, thus reducing individual stress levels by assisting them in coping with their roles and problems as individual family members. Which of the following areas would you consider to be appropriate in such a course?

	Very Inappropriate			Very Appropriate	
57. Feeding the family nutritionally	1	2	3	4	5
58. Getting along with other people	1	2	3	4	5
59. Preparation for marriage	1	2	3	4	5
60. Child rearing and parenting	1	2	3	4	5
61. Skills for making decisions	1	2	3	4	5
62. Sexual development and adjustment as a family member	1	2	3	4	5
63. Managing money, time and human resources	1	2	3	4	5
64. Personal, family and community health	1	2	3	4	5
65. Dealing with family crisis such as divorce, family violence and alcoholism	1	2	3	4	5
66. The needs of elderly family members	1	2	3	4	5
67. The family in relation to the world of work	1	2	3	4	5
68. Dealing with public policy issues that affect the family	1	2	3	4	5
69. Preparing both men and women for family and work roles	1	2	3	4	5
70. If such a course were offered, at what age do you think it should be taught? <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly in elementary years (6-12 years old) <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly in the junior high years (12-14 years old) <input type="checkbox"/> Mostly in the high school years (14-18 years old) <input type="checkbox"/> In bits and pieces throughout childhood and adolescence					
71. Some states have legislated that all public schools develop an educational course as I previously described. In fact, some states have mandated that this course be required of all students before graduating from high school. How do you feel about the idea of requiring every school system to offer such a course? <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat oppose this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly oppose this idea					
72. How do you feel about the idea of requiring every student to take such a course? <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat support this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat oppose this idea <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly oppose this idea					

1. Two years ago in Virginia a measure was introduced that proclaimed the family to be "protected and preserved as a primary resource to enhance the quality of life for all Virginians." Basically, it proposed state recognition that the family is the "basic unit of society" and would have required that all state employees work to perpetuate the family. It would have required that all state laws be interpreted to aid families and that annual reports be prepared on the efforts to preserve the family.

If such a bill would be introduced in the Colorado legislature, would you

- 4 strongly support this measure  
3 support this measure with reservation  
2 oppose this measure with reservation  
1 strongly oppose this measure

In this study I am particularly interested in bills that are concerned with the following areas:

Child support, custody and abuse, educational, medical and inheritance benefits to dependents

Newborn screening

Marriage and divorce

Displaced homemaker

Housing bills to help families

PERA and unemployment benefits

Care for the elderly and disabled

3. Can you tell me in general how you went about making up your mind on how to vote on these bills?

5. Were there any fellow legislators who had an influence on how you decided to vote?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, why did they have an influence?

If no, I don't mean just following them, I mean looking to them for information and guidance?

9. What influence did the party leadership have?

11. How did informal groups within the party influence your decision?

13. Did you talk to staff people about these issues?

  1   yes  
  2   no

15. How did constituents influence your votes on these issues?

17. Did anyone in the governor's office contact you?

       yes  
       no

19. Did you hear anything from any organizations?

21. Was there anything that you read that affected how you voted?

23. To what extent did your family or friends influence your decisions related to these bills?

25, 26. Now I would like to ask you a few last general questions. First what is the highest level of formal education you have achieved? Please indicate the number of the most appropriate answer.

- 1 Less than high school
- 2 High school
- 3 Vocational/technical training beyond high school
- 4 College, but did not receive a bachelor's
- 5 College with completion of a bachelor's degree
- 6 Graduate work without the completion of a degree
- 7 Completion of a master's degree
- 8 JD (law degree)
- 9 Doctorate
- 10 MD
- 11 Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

27. In what category would you estimate your family income to be? Please indicate the number of the most appropriate answer.

- |                               |                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>  </u> 1 Under \$15,000    | <u>  </u> 6 \$50,000-\$75,000  |
| <u>  </u> 2 \$15,000-\$19,000 | <u>  </u> 7 \$76,000-\$100,000 |
| <u>  </u> 3 \$20,000-\$29,000 | <u>  </u> 8 over \$100,000     |
| <u>  </u> 4 \$30,000-\$39,000 |                                |
| <u>  </u> 5 \$40,000-\$49,000 |                                |

28. I am interested in your future political ambitions. Do you see yourself ever aspiring for a higher political office?

     yes

     no

29. If #28 is No, how probable is it that you will seek the office you presently hold at least one more time?\*\*\* (Appropriate only for those currently serving in the legislature.)

  4   Highly probable

  3   Fairly probable

  2   Not too probable

  1   Not at all probable



APPENDIX D  
CORRESPONDENCE

524 S. Walnut #2  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074  
November 11, 1982

Dr. Robert K. Leik  
Minnesota Family Study Center  
1014 Social Sciences Building  
267 19th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Dr. Leik:

I am a graduate student in Home Economics Education and Community Services at Oklahoma State University. My research is concentrating in the area of public policy and the family with the dissertation topic entitled, "A Profile of Colorado Legislators Who Support Public Policy Oriented Toward Family Well-Being." I will be collecting the data for my dissertation by interviewing selected Colorado legislators.

Last fall you sent me a copy of a questionnaire entitled, "A Survey of the Attitudes of Minnesota Legislators Toward Family Policy." I am now writing to ask permission to use Question V in my interview schedule and to adapt questions II, III, and VI for this study. When my study has been completed, if you are interested in receiving a copy of the instrument, I would be very happy to share it with you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Brink



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Family Social Science  
290 McNeal Hall  
1985 Buford Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
(612) 373-1578

November 22, 1982

Carolyn Brink  
524 South Walnut  
Apt. 2  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Ms. Brink:

This is in response to your inquiry regarding the use of selected items from the questionnaire be developed for our Survey of the Attitudes of Minnesota Legislators toward Family Policy.

You do have our permission to use the identified questionnaire items for your dissertation. Yes, we would like to see your instrument when it is completed. We also would be very interested in receiving a summary of your findings.

Good luck!

Sincerely,

(Signed) Shirley Zimmerman

Shirley Zimmerman, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor

SZ:gl

646 South High Street  
Denver, CO 80209  
January 10, 1983

Mr. Marvin Hatcher  
Box 296  
Gunnison, CO 81230

Dear Mr. Hatcher:

Thank you for your willingness to help me out on my study in public policy and the family. As I said over the phone on Saturday, I am a graduate student in home economics at Oklahoma State University. As part of my research I am examining bills considered in the Colorado Legislature for their effect on family well-being. I realize you are no longer serving in the legislature, but I am interested in interviewing you because you served during the last session when the bills I am using in this study were considered.

In the interview I will be asking you some questions related to your personal, professional and political life as well as obtain your opinion on some areas related to public policy and the family. By family I mean one or persons living together who are related by birth, marriage or adoption. I want to stress that this is an academic study and that your responses will be kept in strict confidence with all responses analyzed as aggregate data. I also want to stress that my study is totally separate from the internship I am currently doing at the legislature.

I will be asking you some questions for the purpose of validating information I have already obtained. My sources of information were the Colorado Legislative Directory, the Colorado Legislative Almanac, and the 1981 and 1982 Directories of the 53rd General Assembly.

Please find enclosed a copy of the interview. I will call you next Saturday, January 15th at approximately 3:00 p.m. for us to go through it together. It will take us about 30 minutes to complete. Should you want to reach me, my telephone number is 698-0865.

Again, thank you for your cooperation. I look forward to talking to you soon.

Most sincerely,

Carolyn K. Brink

APPENDIX E

RESOURCES USED IN DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION  
OF THE RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Resources Used in Development and Execution  
of the Research Procedures

- Adams, J. S. Interviewing Procedures: A Manual for Survey Interviewers. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1958.
- Backstrom, C. H., and Hursh, G. D. Survey Research. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Boss, P. G. Theoretical influences on family policy. Journal of Home Economics, 1979, 71 (3), 17-21.
- Bradburn, N. M., Sudman, S., and Associates. Improving Interview Methods and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, 1980.
- Clairborn, W. L. The results of role-played political interviews on Congress and staff. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1973, 3 (2), 144-149.
- Fine, E. W. Personal Communication, December 21, 1981.
- Gordon, R. L. Interviewing: Strategy, Techniques and Tactics. (Rev. Ed.). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1975.
- Kahn, R. L., and Connell, C. F. The Dynamics of Interviewing. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Kingdon, J. W. Congressmens Voting Decisions. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Krejcie, R. V., and Morgan, D. W. Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30, 607-610.
- Lombardi, L. F., and Bahrych, L. (Eds.). House Journal, Fifty-Third General Assembly, First Regular Session, State of Colorado, Vol. 1. Denver: Xerox Reproduction Center, 1981.
- Lombardi, L. F., and Bahrych, L. (Eds.). House Journal, Fifty-Third General Assembly, First Regular Session, State of Colorado, Vol. 2. Denver: Xerox Reproduction Center, 1981.
- Lombardi, L. F., and Bahrych, L. (Eds.). House Journal Fifty-Third General Assembly, Second Regular Session, State of Colorado. Denver: Xerox Reproduction Center, 1982.
- Matarazzo, J. D., and Wiens, A. N. The Interview: Research on Its Anatomy and Structure. Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1972.

SAS Users Guide, 1979 Edition. Raleigh, NC: SAS Institute, 1979.

Survey Research Center. Interviewers Manual. (Rev. Ed.).  
MI: Institute for Social Research, 1976.

Wallach, H. C. (Ed.). Approaches to Child and Family Policy. Boulder,  
CO: Westview Press, 1981.

Young, P. V. Interviewing in Social Work. New York: McGraw-Hill,  
1935.

Young, P. V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs,  
NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

VITA<sup>2</sup>

Carolyn Kay Brink

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: ATTRIBUTES OF COLORADO LEGISLATORS WHO SUPPORT PUBLIC POLICIES  
ORIENTED TOWARD FAMILY WELL-BEING

Major Field: Home Economics-Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Redfield, South Dakota, January 2, 1950,  
the daughter of Rudolph and Helen Brink.

Education: Graduated from Redfield High School, Redfield, South  
Dakota, in May, 1968; received Bachelor of Science degree  
in Vocational Home Economics Education from South Dakota  
State University in 1972; received Master of Arts degree in  
Vocational Home Economics Education from the University of  
Northern Colorado in 1975; completed requirements for the  
Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in  
July, 1983.

Professional Experience: Vocational home economics teacher,  
Owatonna, Minnesota, 1972-74; graduate teaching assistant,  
University of Northern Colorado, 1975; instructor and  
assistant professor, Laboratory School, University of Northern  
Colorado, 1975-78; assistant professor, home economics, Uni-  
versity of Northern Colorado, 1978-82; currently employed as  
Colorado State Manager of Vocational Home Economics.

Professional and Honorary Affiliations: American Home Economics  
Association, Colorado Home Economics Association, American  
Vocational Association, Colorado Vocational Association,  
Colorado Association of Vocational Home Economics Teachers,  
National Association of Vocational Teacher Educators, National  
Council on Family Relations, American Association of Uni-  
versity Women, Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Upsilon Omicron, and  
Delta Kappa Gamma.