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SUMMARY

The political environment of companies plays an increasingly important role in the democratic business world. The practices of representing one’s interest by influencing government officials have inevitably become a necessity in today’s projectified and competitive business environment. Since there is a lack of comparative studies in the lobbying literature as well as no evidence of the attempt to relate project management to lobbying practices, this research particularly aimed at determining how US and EU lobbying practices compare from a project management perspective. Widening the traditional project management view and adopting novel project management ideas while taking a closer look at the choice of either individual or collective action approach in the EU/US for the benefit of companies, helped in achieving the aim of this research.

This comparative qualitative research adopted constructionism as ontological position and interpretivism as epistemological position. Even though the categories of interest were determined prior to data collection, corresponding to the deductive approach, through the qualitative semi structured interview and due to the broad focus of the proposed comparative research, thematic fields were revised corresponding to the inductive approach. From the initially 60 contacted lobbyists, chosen from the register of interest representation or professional networks based on relevant lobbying experience, 8 interviews were conducted (4 from the EU and 4 from the US) through Skype video conversation and email.

Thematic analysis was used for the analysis of empirical material with the focus on PM perspective, EU/US lobbying practices, and choice among individual and collective lobbying approaches. Focusing on the EU/US differences in lobbying practices, it was found that they mostly arose from the underlying divergent political and institutional frameworks. Political action committee contributions were deemed the core reason for the different lobbying types and approaches explaining the more individualistic, aggressive and direct US lobbying style with a higher politization factor and a more collective EU style. It was found that the issue characteristic is just as relevant as the political and institutional frameworks, regarding the choice of approach. The combination of approaches was deemed the best option, using as many vehicles of influence as the company resources allow for. Assuming that a better allocation of resources could be aided with the adoption of the project approach to lobbying, the study revealed that the EU exhibited more tendency in classifying their undertakings as traditionally defined projects, while the major difference was not lying in the individual and collective lobbying approaches of the two arenas, but rather inside of the individual approach. The most evident connection with the traditional PM perspective was found in the individual approach, more precisely lobbying consultancies, while references to the novel PM view were made in all researched groups, exhibiting the trend of general lobbying projectification.
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1. Introduction and problematization

In the wake of the projectification of business (Haniff & Fernie, 2008) and society (Midler, 1995), it can be argued that projects are interest based and contain an inevitable political feature (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, p.91). The political environment of projects is a very important aspect to be considered for companies. Therefore, adopting a project perspective in the management of organization-government relations, hence the lobbying activities can be of benefit for companies.

In today's business world it is very common to come across terms like lobbying, interest representation, advocacy, government relations etc. For some companies, those notions are very well known and are a part of the “business as usual”, considering lobbying a necessity in the business world (de Brelàz & Alves, 2011; Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008; Samuelson, 2008; Graham, 2001 etc.), but for some companies it is an unexplored area which creates confusion and complexity.

The reason for this apprehensiveness lies in the questionable reputation that unfortunately follows the lobbying industry. Butler (2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p. 2) emphasizes that lobbying was once considered to be “all about the dinner party, conversations, and prawn cocktail events, taking people out”. Furthermore, in former Baltic Soviet and Eastern European nations lobbying is still perceived negatively due to the communism heritage. Consequently, in those countries lobbying is “based on personal connections and corrupt practices”, thus lacking sophisticated lobbying techniques (Hrebenar et al., 2008, p. 54), which are used in the United States (US) and western European countries.

There will always be a discussion about this controversial field, because as in any business field there will always be the outliers who will unfortunately keep overshadowing the profession. But what is important to keep in mind, is that lobbying is an integral part of today’s democratic governments and without it the public mechanisms would have a difficult time functioning. Numerous authors in peer-reviewed publications as well as in magazine articles rightfully defend the honor of lobbying (e.g. de Brelàz & Alves, 2011, Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008, Samuelson, 2008, etc.), stating that it actually drives the democracy by fostering the freedom to organize and represent ones interest thereby contributing to the quality of the political decision-making process.

Therefore, neglecting the benefits of lobbying could actually influence the performance of companies and undermine the achievement of their goals. No matter which political arena they find themselves in, companies need to be aware of the possibilities at their disposal for the rightful representation of their interest, whether it is the case of raising awareness of the elected representatives about a matter of company/industry interest, in the case of influencing particular decision prior to or in the aftermath of implementation or simply in the case of developing corporate reputation (Mack, 2005, p.345), in terms of promoting the values, principles and economic impact of the company towards, what Gregory (2004, p.91) refers to as their “biggest customer”, the government. While Baetz & Fleisher, (1994, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 829) generally stress the increasing importance of companies government relations functions, Keffer & Hill, (1997, pp.
particularly stress the importance of hiring government relations specialists in order to determine the best strategic direction through being aware of the political environment. Mack (2005, p.340), claims that both the US Federal Government as well as the European Union (EU) institutions set the competitive environment of companies (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 825) and play a major role in shaping the interests in the industry by affecting shareholder value (Graham, 2001, p.24).

Therefore, it is of upmost importance for companies to anticipate their political and legal environment. Oftentimes, late reactions are unrelentingly punished. According to Mazey & Richardson (1993, p.23), multinationals are aware of the importance of lobbying and the possibilities of achieving competitive advantage by investing in government relations. The problem mostly lies with the SME companies, which still do not seem to grasp the entire benefit of such an undertaking. In considering whether to take on the expense of lobbying, companies must be aware that not doing so might prove to become even more expensive. Especially in a market, characterized by high competitive rivalry, not reacting means giving the competitive edge to the competitor. Not engaging in any form of lobbying, whether it is due to lack of knowledge in the field, fear of the unknown, or plain ignorance, can have the effect of reduced company performance, loss of new opportunities and unexpected outcomes.

Once the notion of the necessity of lobbying is established in the companies’ eyes, it is important to clarify what lobbying actually encompasses, to be able to define the scope of lobbying activities, which are suitable for a particular company. Different ways of lobbying are frequently addressed in the existing lobbying literature through a number of concepts, ranging from, single-firm lobby (Coen, 1999), advocacy’s (Mahoney & Baumgartner, 2008) and interest groups (Heinz et al., 1993), to coalition building (Keim & Zeithaml, 2011), lobbying organizations (Bertök, 2009) and industry associations (Barron, 2011), just to mention a few. Therefore, it can be concluded that in theory, there is a whole array of concepts associated with interest representation, which seem to be used interchangeably, and throughout the years they seem to increase. In practice, with the increasing popularity of lobbying in democratic environments, there are also an overwhelming number of practitioners that add to the complexity of the terminology by defining themselves in different ways, for instance; in-house lobbyist, organizational lobbyist, public affairs professional, independent government relation specialist, consultancy lobbyist etc. It can be concluded that lobbying is a complex activity (Wesselius, 2005) and that there is little consistency in the terminology used, but the aim remains the same, and that is to influence political decision-makers (Woll, 2006).

It can be also argued that the lobbying research field is a fairly unexplored area, starting from the interchangeable usage of notions like public relations, public affairs, government relations and ultimately lobbying, through the divergences in the scope of activities lobbying encompasses, to the lack of relevant comparative studies which could bridge the gap between the theory and practice. Recognizing the vast existent research on competitive and cooperative market strategies, from which companies were able to benefit, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.839) criticize the fact that “the academic community has not paid enough attention to political strategies”. Hall & Deardorff (2006, p.80) on the other hand recognizes the existence of lobbying empirical literature, which tends to be contradictory, as well as extensive theoretical lobbying literature, which fails to provide future research directions. Numerous authors (Mazey &
Richardson, 1993; Mack, 1997; Coen, 1999; Graham, 2001; McGarth, 2002; Woll, 2006; Baumgartner, 2007; Petronela, 2008, etc.) argue for the possible benefits of EU/US comparative studies, which can have synergetic effects in terms of clarification of basic notions and establishment of relevant linkages with management theory. Even though there were attempts to compare the two arenas (Baumgartner, 2007; Coen, 1999; Gibson, 2005; Mack, 1997, Mahoney, 2007; Petronela, 2008; Wesselius, 2005; Woll, 2006), most focus has been devoted to fragmented empirical studies (Woll, 2006, p.458; Hall & Deardorff, 2006, p.80), without a systematic approach in terms of relation to the underlying political and institutional frameworks in that sense. Therefore, it is evident that there is a clear gap in the comparative analysis of the EU and the US lobbying, in which context a research question on the basis of gap-spotting can be determined (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2010, p.28).

Barron (2011, p.320) as well as Keim & Zeithaml (2011, p.828) claim that in the past companies focused on the national political arena only, but nowadays, in the wake of globalization and internationalization of business, companies adopt a broader international view of political strategies. Furthermore, according to Mahoney & Baumgartner (2008, p. 1255), an increased interaction of transatlantic players raised a need for the strengthening of transatlantic harmonization. Especially multinationals who have to adapt to different rules in different political arenas in order to be successful, according to Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.829), increasingly seem to adopt relational, hence long-term relationship fostering characteristics to their lobbying approach, are in need for clarifications of the US/EU lobbying approaches due to the diverging practices of both arenas. Therefore, besides the evident need for clarification of the lobbying practices in the eyes of the 2 biggest political arenas EU and US, hence Brussels and Washington, it would also be useful for the benefit of companies to understand the process and recognize how it can help the sustainability of their business interest in terms of the choice of action (individual vs. collaborative) as well as in terms of taking a project management (PM) perspective to lobbying, depending on the political arena and type of action.

Concerning the choice of action, numerous authors (Heinz et al., 1993; Hillman & Hitt, 1999; Jutterstrom, 2000; Graham, 2001; Gregory, 2004; Mack, 2005; Wesselius, 2005; Mahoney, 2007; Barron, 2011; Gabel & Scott, 2011; Keim & Zeithaml, 2011) recognize the importance of the decision for companies which lobbying approach to take, highlighting the options of the single representation or third party inclusion in terms of representation through associations and even formation of alliances with NGO-s, all for the sake of raising credibility for their case in the eyes of the government. Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.830) summarize these options under the notions of two levels of company participation in the political action, namely individual and collective. The individual approach refers to the single firm approach, whether through an in-house lobbyists or a consultant lobbyist, while the collective approach refers to the collaboration of numerous firms with the same interest through an umbrella organization. The underlying culture, the political and institutional framework, and other factors make companies more inclined towards a certain lobbying approach (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, pp.830-831).

Nevertheless, in taking the decision of which political strategy to apply, hence which lobbying approach to choose, companies have to take numerous factors into considerations. According to Keffer & Hill, (1997, p. 1373) companies are often led by
the rule of the total cost of lobbying not exceeding the expected benefits. However, putting a “price tag” on the benefits might prove itself difficult. Therefore, the continuous strategic alignment of any lobbying undertaking with the business strategy, of an increasingly emergent nature, is of upmost importance for companies. Taking into consideration its political environment, companies need to plan its lobbying objectives in alignment with the business objectives (Mack, 2005, p.342). These considerations reflect the characteristics of projects, which also seek the alignment with the business strategy, a topic researched by numerous authors (Haniff & Fernie, 2008; Srivannaboon & Milosevic, 2006, etc.).

It can be argued that lobbying can be seen as a strategic management discipline (Lange & Linders, 2006, p.131; Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1371), that deals with the companies political environment. According to Ledingham (2003), management processes of analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation can be related to a wider scope of public relations, by taking on an organization-public relationship perspective. Taking on a novel project management perspective (Turner & Muller, 2003; Cicmil et al., 2006; Winter & Szczepanek, 2009), which adds flexibility to the mainstream perception of projects, creates an even wider array of connections between lobbying activities and project management, especially concerning the notion of intangible outputs. It can be argued that the benefit of taking on the project management perspective and considering government relations/lobbying as a management function, as were public relations (Ledingham, 2003, p. 184), is in realizing the advantages of applying the project management processes and the required skills to lobbying endeavors. This would ensure the organization would deliver results effectively while taking into consideration the maximization of stakeholder benefits.

Even though, evidence has been found relating lobbying activities not only to strategic management (Lange & Linders, 2006, p.131; Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1371) but to other project management related fields, as risk management (Smith, 2009), relationship management (Petronela, 2008), reputation management (Thomson et al., 2007), issue management (McGrath et al., 2010) etc., a problem has been identified concerning the lack of clear connection between project management and lobbying in both the US and EU political arena, referring to the federal and European lobbying respectively. More particularly, the following question can be raised:

- How do US and EU lobbying practices compare from a project management perspective?

1.1. Purpose of the research

It can be stated that the purpose of this research is to increase the understanding of the EU/US lobbying practice by taking a project management perspective in a traditional and novel sense. The aim will be achieved through a comparison and closer look at individual vs. collective action for the benefit of the EU/US companies.
2. Research methodology

2.1 Introduction

Methodological considerations of the research are discussed in this chapter. Research philosophy with ontological and epistemological considerations and research approach are defined. Moreover, research strategy and design are explained and finally data collection instruments used in the research are examined. Besides, the reasoning of interviewees’ selection is presented. Moreover, the data analysis is explained. Further, the final part of this chapter explains the quality criteria considered for this research.

2.2 Preconceptions and choice of subject

The interest in the topic arrived due to our working experience with the EU executive bodies and mechanisms for research and application funding. In particular, as project proposal writing coordinators and participants of the EU funded projects, we were exposed to the issues of interest representation. More specifically, one author had additional experiences the EU institutional framework first hand by interning with the European Commission, while the other author participated in the work of European Technology associations in which lobbying was a matter of interest. In the wake of the European experience, we were particularly interested in why some projects are admitted and get financed while others of the same quality and proposed added value, do not get funded. Due to the specificities of our master in “Strategic project management”, we were brought to awareness of the increased projectification of business and society. Consequently, it was assumed that for an increasing number of project organizations, the success of the projects is linked with the existence of business-government relationships. Therefore, the ways of raising the probability of ensuring that success came into the spotlight and the lobbying research area was decided upon. We were intrigued by the questionable reputation that seemed to be following the lobbying practice in the business circles.

By examining to us initially unfamiliar research area, the importance of lobbying for companies in all fields became even more evident. Moreover, evidence was found of the lack in EU/US lobbing practice comparison and it was implied that there should be differences between those two lobbying arenas. Therefore, we aimed to closely examine the existing literature of the EU and the US lobbying, as well as, interview the practitioners in the EU and the US to get the idea of lobbying in practice by taking a project management perspective. The research process has shifted our views and primary slightly negative conception of lobbying to a completely positive perception of this necessary, highly regulated and structured activity of the business world.

2.3 Ontological considerations

Depending on the choice of ontological viewpoints the nature of reality, thus the research social environment, is seen differently (Saunders et al., 2003, p.110). The benefit of constructionism, as ontological position, is in the fact it declares the importance and influence people have on the nature of social entities (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 22), as opposed to for example objectivism, which neglects the impact social actors have on the nature of social entities. For this research it is of upmost importance to consider this impact, due to the fact that the lobbying, as the focus of research, is a
complex activity (Wesselius, 2005) shaped by social and political influence. Even though the criticism of the constructionism position, concerning the lack of referentiality and objectivity (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, p.701) or its frequent usage and buzzword status in European Studies (Checkel, 2004, p.229), was taken into consideration, it is agreed that the position is important to our comparative research due to the fact it aims to enrich the underlying theoretical approaches. Furthermore, Bryman & Bell (2011, p.22) refer to the constructionism view, claiming that people influence the nature of organisation by constant interaction with the properties of organisations (e.g. regulations, rules etc.) and reconstruction of them. This claim supports the specificities of the lobbying undertaking due to the fact that lobbying practice, as acknowledged by Mack (2005), Woll (2006), Thomas & Hrebenar (2008) as well as Petronela (2008) are influenced by the underlying political and institutional frameworks and provoke a particular type of behavior, whether it can be classified as culture (Thomas & Hrebenar 2002, cited in Woll, 2006, p.462) or as a strategic response to institutional requirements (Woll, 2006, p.462). Therefore, it is evident that the lobbying practice cannot be analyzed without the consideration of the linkages with its environment and social actors constructing the reality (Saunders et al., 2003, p.111). Consequently, the constructionism ontological position is adopted.

2.4 Epistemological considerations

As in the case of liberal political theory (Tushnet, 2007), it is believed that the interpretative position suits this comparative research based on underlying political frameworks, because it accepts the subjectivity of a social action (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 386), as opposed to the positions of positivism, which is fully objective and views the generation of knowledge through “gathering of facts”, and realism, which does not distinguish the data collection approaches for social and natural sciences (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15-17). Interpretivism better suits for this research as lobbying is a complex activity. In fact, Saunders et al. (2003, p.115) outlined that positivist position includes “law-like generalizations”, which are inappropriate in a more complex social world. The critique of lack of objectivity, previously also raised for the ontological position of constructionism, does not apply in our research due to the fact that subjectivity is embraced as a vital element of the comparative lobbying analysis in the wake of social science characteristics. In this research the focus is on understanding the lobbying practice in EU & US through the examination of the interpretation of lobbying practice by the interviewees, what confirms an epistemological position to be interpretivism.

2.5 Research approach

The specificity of this research and complexity of comparison, asks for the adoption of both inductive and deductive research approaches. Through the extensive lobbying literature review, a theoretical and conceptual framework is developed with the aim of reinforcing it in the empirical part of the research, which corresponds to the characteristics of the deductive approach, according to Saunders (2009, p.61). Also, through the revision of the US and the EU gathered data, it is possible to contribute to the development or evolvement of lobbying theories in relation to lobbying literature, which corresponds to the characteristic of the inductive approach, according to Saunders (2009, p.61). This approach allows for the connection between the theory and research to be reversed, i.e. after the data has been collected (Saunders, 2009, p. 41),

More particularly, this research is looking to explore how lobbying is done in practice by comparing EU&US through a project management perspective. As there are very few direct linkages between lobbying and project management practices, as well as few attempts of the EU and the US lobbying comparison, in addition to using the theoretical frameworks from the existent linkages between lobbying and project management related fields in the EU and the US collective and individual approaches, this research needs to determine patterns from data in an emergent manner, with the potential to enrich existing theory. It is expected that the theory used to build the theoretical framework for interviews needs to be revisited, as the empirical part is not used to only test the theory, but rather explore the concept through the eyes of the interviewee. Consequently, in the aftermath of the interviews, theory is amended and assumptions adjusted in the wake of emerging issues. “Tracking back and forth between theory and data” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 573), allows for sense making of the collected data.

Therefore, it can be argued that even though the categories of interest are determined prior to data collection, corresponding to the deductive approach, due to the broad focus of the proposed comparative research and the novelty of the research field, freedom is reserved to react to unexpected findings from the data collection in order to revise and categorize the thematic fields corresponding to the inductive approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p.63). This research does not include a substantial number of interviews in order to generate a theory nor is the aim to generalize certain concepts. Our goal is to sense how interviewees see and pursue their lobbying practices while focusing on specific themes and at the same time also being open for new emerging themes while keeping in mind the comparative view.

2.6 Research strategy

According to Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 27) a qualitative research can be explained as a research strategy “that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data”. In fact, it is characteristic to our research since no quantitative data is foreseen. Moreover, the qualitative research, whose importance and influence in management studies is recognized by Bluhm et al. (2010, p.1867), is welcoming to multiple research and reporting styles (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 234; Hakim, 2000, p.40). Moreover, it emphasizes an inductive approach among the theory and research while being in favor of interpretivism with a constructionism view (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 27). In fact, these qualitative research characteristics are completely in line with previous chosen epistemological and ontological positions, as well as the research approach for this research.

2.7 Qualitative research characteristics

Besides, the theory or concepts which can inductively arrive from the collected data, there are other considerations related with qualitative research and reflecting epistemological position. According to Bryman & Bell (2011, pp. 402-405) they are called “preoccupations”. “Seeing through the eyes of the people being studied” is one of them (Bryman & Bell, 2011, pp. 402). Therefore, in order to interpret the data as well as
possible, as emphasized by Alvesson (2003, p.14), it is committed to view the researched objective through the eyes of the interviewees.

Even though the novelty and creativity of qualitative research is often praised (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p. 234), emphasis on context is usually quite strong in qualitative research; therefore it often can become too descriptive. This “preoccupation” of qualitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, pp. 403) is acknowledged in our research, thus only the descriptive detail, which is needed for clear understanding of the research, will be provided. This helps to avoid unnecessary and trivial details. Therefore, emphasis is put on particularizing EU&US lobbying arenas, in terms of political and institutional frameworks, providing an initial explanation for the differences in EU&US lobbying. These contextual details are presented as it is deemed they are the underlying reason for the differences and therefore of high importance for the in depth understanding of the investigated area.

Moreover, it is stated that qualitative research is likely “to view social life in terms of processes” and aims “to show how events and patterns unfold over time” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 404). From the evolution of lobbying in the EU, the strength of the US influence can be accentuated from a historic point of view, as well as other factors leading to differences in lobbying practices in EU, compared to the US. However, the historical evolution of lobbying practices in EU&US is not going to be analyzed in depth. Just the importance of it is stressed as it enables a broader understanding of lobbying practices in EU&US while laying the basis for a comprehensive comparison.

Finally, the fairly unstructured nature of a qualitative enquiry is another important element in qualitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 406). Having a “built-in momentum” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 406) is a very important element in this research as it allows new issues, which have not been thought of before nor found in the literature, to be revealed. It is of high importance, especially, in analyzing how project management practices used in lobbying differ in an individual vs. collective approach (as there are few direct linkages among lobbying and PM practices in the literature).

Without a doubt, the benefits of qualitative research in terms of displaying the authors’ voice, revealing context, and exemplifying transparency (Bansal & Corley, 2011, p.233), are of utmost importance for this kind of proposed social science research. Nevertheless, possible gaps of qualitative research are considered in terms of it being too subjective, difficult to replicate, problematic in generalizing its findings and lacking transparency (Bryman & Bell, 2011, pp. 408, 409), but deemed not to be of concern, due to research specificity or, if applicable, actually contributing to the added value of the proposed research.

2.8 Research design

In accordance with the trend of increased usage and importance of cross-national comparative studies, emphasized by Hakim (2000, p. 11 ), the comparative design is chosen due to the fact it “embodies the logic of comparison, in that it implies that we can understand social phenomena better when they are compared in relation to two or more meaningfully contrasting cases or situations” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 63). Even though Hakim (2000, p. 11 ), emphasized the possible issues of research organization in terms of carrying out the same study in two different arenas as well as the problem of
interpretation of the collected data, the selection of the comparative design is deemed most appropriate for our exploratory and novel research in terms of “gaining a greater awareness and a deeper understanding of social reality in different national contexts” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 64). This research is looking to explore the lobbying at two different national contexts and through two different lobbying approaches; the US and the EU (taking it as a different national context in a way that it is a mix of European countries national and political cultures), as well as individual and collective.

2.9 Literature search

In approaching this task with the elaborated goal in mind, more general publications about the evolving of lobbying are considered, followed by more specific publications stating the gap and need for comparative research. A combination of textbooks, relevant books and articles are used trying to balance the number of American as well as European publications. The selection of relevant readings is supplemented by consulting the syllabus of relevant modules from well known Universities in the area, e.g. syllabus of the module “Interest Group Activism and Representation”, conducted at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, has been consulted.

Furthermore, identifying relevant pieces of literature that could benefit the company perspective, in terms of addressing the different lobbying approaches and tools, narrowed the focus. Due to the fact that interest in the lobbying research field just recently evolved, making it a fairly young and insufficiently explored area, attention is devoted to balancing the timeframe of the publications by determining an older category (up to 2005) and a newer category (after 2005).

From the in-depth literature review it was possible to determine more specific categories, which were used in forming a strong theoretical framework for our research. Our emergent classifications of publications according to the following categories: theory and practice, expansion of lobbying notions, scope, comparative arena, perspectives and timeframe, helped summarize our findings and analysis of the existing literature in relevance to the presented topic and simplify the identification of the research gaps.

2.10 Data collection instruments

The connection of the chosen research strategy (qualitative) and the research design (comparative) represents one of the typical forms associated with this combination - a qualitative interview (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 68). The qualitative interview is chosen for this research due to the nature of the research in which the exploration element is important. Qu & Dumay (2011, p. 244) criticize the neopositivist views of interviews as mere tools assuming complete interviewee honesty by presenting them as complex social and organizational phenomena. Nevertheless, Alvesson (2003, p.24) warns about the unnecessary trade-off between relevance and rigor in the wake of the complexity. Therefore, a more flexible structure of the interview, allowing reactions to the direction interviewees take, is deemed more appropriate as it leaves space for emerging novel issues. It is agreed that in this research the interviewee’s point of view is of great importance, which is strongly emphasized by Bryman & Bell (2011, p. 466), as well as Qu & Dumay (2011, p.261). Moreover, the qualitative interview characteristic allowing several interviewing of the same respondent (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 467) is deemed
very important for this research. The possible need of interviewing the same person after the first interpretation of data is foreseen, in order to strengthen its’ internal validity and reach plausible interpretations.

A semi-structured qualitative interview was chosen, because of a clear focus of the investigation areas and a need to research just the specific issues (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 472). All the interviewees were asked questions, based on the established interview guide (Appendix 1) (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 473), with a list of identified important themes, providing a suitable basis for a comparison. A script of questions was used to cover those important identified areas of the research. However, questions in the interview did not necessary follow the established order; it was just assured that all the identified issues were addressed. Since the traditional project management perspective focused on project management tools, it was inquired about particular PM tools and practices. Greene (1998, cited in Qu & Dumay, 2011, p. 244) argued that it was not the goal of a semi-structured interview to suggest ideas or steer the interview in a desired direction, but rather to completely acknowledge the perspective of the interviewee. Therefore, due to the flexible nature of a semi-structured interview, more questions were asked when the interviewee raised a new relevant issue.

A selection of research participants was attentively done, enabling EU&US comparison; as well as reflecting individual vs. collective approaches (Table 1). There was no focus on a specific industry due to the novel and exploratory nature of the research but a requirement for the choice was that the participants had to be conducting lobbying on either the federal level in the US or European level in EU for the sake of comparison of EU and US practices, referring to Brussels and Washington lobbying practices. Initially, 15 representatives of the individual approach, single companies and consultancies in the US and the EU, as well as 15 representatives of the collective approach, trade organizations and association in the US and EU, were contacted. The basis for selection of contacts in case of the collaborative action was the underlying literature on interest groups as well as the register of interest representation, while in the case of individual action representatives, the lobbying groups on professional networks were scanned and chosen on the basis of appropriate lobbying experience. Finally, from the 60 initially contacted representatives, 8 representatives (4 from the EU and 4 from the US) agreed on the interview. Some of which are very important actors in the lobbying industry in EU&US (i.e. best fit for a comparison among EU&US). What was deemed significant is that while the number of contacted representatives from the individual and collective actions in both the US and EU, was kept balanced, the strongest response was among individual action representatives from the US (3) and collective action representatives from the EU (3). This trend was also taken into consideration in the analysis of the findings.

As can been seen from Table 1, interviews were mostly managed through a Skype telephone conversation and only one through email, although the partial loss of flexibility and this data collection instrument assimilation to a survey is acknowledged (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.661). Concerning the benefits of a Skype interview, as opposed to a telephone conversation, a Skype interview brought along benefits of visual aid, due to the fact that it was easier to respond to the interviewees’ facial expressions and emotions exhibited through the course of the interview. Interviews through email have also significant advantages. Firstly, the interviewees choose the most appropriate time and space for the interview (James, 2007, p.963). Further, James (2007, p. 968)
outlines that through email interviews the interviewees have an “opportunity to reflect in a way that would not happen with the spoken word”. Moreover, the possible positive outcome is stressed for the interviewee (James, 2007, p.969); through follow up interviews the interviewee has to return to what he/she said, therefore, to reflect deeper upon that.

Table 1: Interviewee overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>COLLECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>DATE/HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td>11.12.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td>15.11.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td>16.11.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/3 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td>29.11.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKYPE</td>
<td>30.11.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/2 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, email interviews allow the interviewee to return back to the questions (James, 2007, p.970), therefore it can be a strength when an interviewee is willing to do so as that provides more information, more detailed description on the questions he/she already answered. It can be argued that, since from the 8 respondents, 7 agreed to Skype interviews and only one to e-mail interview, due to interviewees’ time constraints and personal preference, the less time consuming spoken word seems to be more preferred within the lobbying practitioners than the more time consuming written word. A possible reason for the choice of the latter for one interviewee might be the inexperience and the wish of controlling and rethinking the answers.

Interviews were led by one researcher in order not to create confusion for the interviewees. To ensure the validity of the study the interviews were recorded. Further, after each interview (Skype and email), a discussion among the thesis authors was taking place (to note the main ideas, raised during the interview; as well as the observations from both thesis authors). After the interviews were transcribed, the notes were developed by each thesis author and jointly reviewed; the ideas from both authors were merged. Consequently, any identified areas not sufficiently covered by the interview were clarified by e-mail follow up correspondence.

A great importance was given to ethical considerations of interviewing. Therefore, each interviewee was first introduced to the research and its academic purpose and was ensured that their answers will be used only for this research purpose and treated with confidentiality. Moreover, it was adapted to the interviewees by letting them choose the date and time of an interview. Concerning the attempt to maximize the success of the conducted interviews, we were precise and clear in the questions we asked but also careful in being responsive to the issues raised by the interviewees, engaging in longer
conversations about issues deemed important by the interviewees. Lastly, we adopted an increased reflexivity approach in the interpretation of the findings to ensure validity of the research process.

2.11 Data analysis

Opting for flexibility rather than prescribed procedures in building clarifying frameworks concerning linkages between concepts for the analysis of the gathered data, the thematic analysis and the comparative analysis were adopted in this research. Thematic analysis (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p.61; Marks & Yardley, 2004, p. 56) was chosen over content analysis due to the fact it offers more flexibility without the expense of less structure. As opposed to more structured grounded theory, which provides “relatively clear rules” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 571) to handle a large amount of qualitative data in order to have structured pieces of information needed for later data interpretation, analysis, thematic analysis could be considered over-simplistic at certain times. Nevertheless, Van Manen (1990, p. 79) argues for the fact that there simplifying is not taking place and the determined themes should not be considered as "conceptual formulations" and “categorical statements”, but rather as being concerned with meaning. Marks & Yardley (2004, pp.56-63) also reciprocated to the critique by emphasizing the fact that thematic analysis provides the possibility to systematically analyze, while considering the meaning of determined themes. Therefore, this critique is not of concern for the proposed research due to the fact the attribution of meaning to predetermined or revised themes is of upmost importance considering the comparative character of the study.

Themes, or as Van Manen (1990, p. 78) refers to them “frequently occurring elements in the empirical data”, relevant to the research objective are revealed from the collected data (as some emergent themes could appear), as well as, themes set prior to empirical data collection (themes from the literature review and semi-structured interviews) are considered. As opposed to the traditional method in the social sciences of letting the themes emerge during the gathered data analysis (Creswell, 2009, p.187), in this research both deductive and inductive approaches were used in the way that there were predetermined areas of interest and afterwards amended themes (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 506), depending on the collected and analyzed material. For this research, the focus was on two main categories: comparison among the EU and the US lobbying practices and choice among the individual and collective lobbying approaches, both considered taking on a project management perspective.

Thus, the predetermined categories were searched for in the data, whilst at the same time possible emerging themes or lower order themes from the data, which Van Manen (1990, p.79) refers to as “structures of experience”, were considered. Since, lower order themes within the major themes can change during the analysis process (can get more importance or less), self-memos (Creswell, 2009, p.184) were written in order to track those changes and their reasons (Sanders et al., 2009, p. 507) and keep the narrative flow (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 583). After having the collected data from interviews, notes with remarks and observations were made. Then the notes were analyzed thoroughly, looking for the keywords and possible themes. While analyzing the data for newly arising themes, some criteria are considered; the themes reflect the purpose of the research; information collected can be used in creating the themes; no “overlapping or contradictory themes”; each theme is as specific as data allows (Hancock & Algozzine,
Finally, the following twelve themes were determined in the gathered empirical material: scope of business, lobbying experience, political strategies, lobbying practices (targets and organization of lobbying undertaking), type of action (proactive, reactive), choice of approach (individualistic, collective), success of lobbying undertaking, nature of lobbying undertaking (temporary perspective, long term perspective), standardized tools, alignment of the lobbying undertaking with the organizational strategy, insight into the lobbying practices of the other arena, special issues as recommendations for future research.

As this novel and exploratory research focused on comparison of two different lobbying arenas, the EU and the US, a comparative structure of the analysis was adopted. The comparative analysis was conducted in 4 steps, shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Proceedings of the comparative analysis

Therefore, explanations, based on the same themes were provided for both lobbying arenas (Yin, 2009, pp. 176, 177). In order to ensure validity in presenting the qualitative data, the analysis section of the dissertation, includes extended quotations of the interviewees with the accompanying accounts and interpretations. This supports the identified themes by providing evidence from the collected data (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 572). Once all the empirical material was thoroughly reviewed, the themes which got the most support from the material, were extracted and formed into findings (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p.61).

2.12 Quality criteria: Reliability and validity

This section will explain how the drawbacks of a qualitative research are addressed by employing reliability and validity measures.

There are different quality criteria in a qualitative research, whether they are following the quantitative research tradition (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 399), or depending on novelty and transparency standards (Bluhm et al., 2010, p.1869). The most relevant quality criteria to this research are outlined by LeCompte and Goetz (1982, cited in Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 395): external reliability, internal validity and external validity.

Externally reliable research can be replicated, thus similar results could be possible if other researchers would study the same phenomenon. Transparency is important in order to allow replicate the research. Qualitative research is criticized by lack of transparency (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 409), raising the importance of research participants’ selection, as well as of a clear process of qualitative data analysis. In this research the issue of lack of transparency in qualitative research is addressed by simply
ensuring a high level of transparency. The most fitting interviewees for this research purpose are selected by taking into consideration time constraints and interviewees’ availability as well as thematic and comparative data analysis rules. Further, concerning the difficulty to replicate, it is mainly due to the flexibility and unstructured nature of a qualitative research, what on the other hand are integral elements of this research and an advantage of this study. Being not too strict and systematic, i.e. being open for emerging new issues is another important characteristic of our research, which assumes a measure of subjectivity. Concerning the critique of subjectivity, it is described by qualitative findings relying “too much on the researcher’s often unsystematic views about what is significant and important” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 408). Subjectivity is actually welcomed in this research and considered strength due to the fact that significant and important issues in this research were set up by establishing the areas for investigation and basing the questions for interviews on an extensive thorough literature analysis and established categories, reflecting the main research areas. Therefore, in this research the subjectivity is embraced as observations are made of people constructing reality and lobbyists viewing their practices. As previously mentioned, the research focus areas are established before the interviews and could be used as a framework in other similar studies. Therefore, the difficulty to replicate is not of concern for the proposed research.

Internally valid research demonstrates a strong linkage, good correspondence among the observations and developed theoretical concepts. Accordingly, in this research the main themes identified in the theory were sought in the empirical part of the research and consistently used through the data analysis.

External validity represents usually a problematic area in a qualitative research, a degree of generalization of the findings (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 395). The generalization issue (Bluhm et al., 2010, p.1870, Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 409) was reflected upon. From the 60 initially contacted representatives, keeping in mind the balance between the US and the EU, as well as individual and collective action representatives, 8 representatives (4 from the EU and 4 from the US) agreed on the interview. It can be stressed that research participants, individuals, companies and associations in EU&US, were carefully selected in order to have a comparable selection. It is evident that it is not a number, which can represent all the lobbying industry in EU&US, hence Brussels and Washington, but the aim of this study is not to generalize. By making sure the participants are conducting lobbying not only on state and local level but on the federal level in the US and not only on the national level but also the European level in the EU, the seemingly broad scope of the EU and US lobbying practices was narrowed down and it was ensured that the data is comparable. The purpose of this novel research is to explore the lobbying practices of these two arenas and make a first step in comparing the project management perspective in individual companies and associations on a rather small sample, therefore not aiming for generalization but rather realizing the opportunity for a more in-depth analysis.

Moreover, as recommended by Creswell (2009, p.191) in order to enhance the validity of the study multiple strategies are used for assessing the accuracy of the findings and convincing the readers of that accuracy. Firstly, a rich description of the findings is used in order to make the findings more realistic and add to its’ validity. Additionally, in order to ensure validity in presenting the qualitative data, the analysis section of the dissertation, includes extended quotations of the interviewees with the accompanying
accounts and interpretations. Further, the contradictory findings are presented, contrary information is discussed to enhance the credibility of the study, as it is acknowledged and agreed with Creswell (2009, p.192) that the real life has different perspectives; therefore the views do not necessarily coincide.

It can be concluded that qualitative research suits this research and ensures added value as it makes it possible to explore the lobbying practices in EU&US from the project management perspective by seeing them through the eyes of practitioners, as well as identify and explore novel relative issues arising during the semi-structured interviews.

This chapter presented the methodological choices for carrying out our research. The following chapters (3, 4, 5 and 6) present the theoretical framework of this study. First, project management and its related fields are brought into connection with the lobbying practice by introducing PM characteristics possibly applicable to lobbying, for which evidence will be sought after in the empirical part of the study. Secondly, the concept of lobbying and some of its critiques are discussed. Thirdly, the comparative arena of EU and US lobbying is presented followed by a company perspective in comparing the lobbying practice, hence individual vs. collective approach, within the two political arenas.

Furthermore, there was a clear need to define the terms, used for this research. To make clear the meanings of the terms to the readers, key terminology was defined in Appendix 2. The defined terms (first time occurred) in the main document are in *italics* for an ease of usage.
3. Project management perspective

Due to the importance of taking on a project management perspective in the analysis of lobbying practices, the first literature section will introduce the traditional project management perspectives with the emphasis on the distinction between operations and project, but also provide an extended view of project management by emphasizing the novel and more flexible project management perspectives. Lastly, relative notions from the lobbying literature, in relation with project management related fields, will be introduced in this chapter and will be further elaborated on in chapter 9. Since, it is evident that there is a lack of clear connection among lobbying and project management in the existent literature, the empirical part of this study will look into lobbying practices taking on a project management perspective.

3.1 Project and operation

Companies work either through operations or projects. Turner & Muller (2003, p. 2) identify that project management "processes need to be flexible, goal oriented and staged", what is claimed to be the opposite of operations management, where the processes are "stable, activity oriented and continuous". (ISO, 2011, p.11) outline the differences among operations and projects. Operations are said to be “performed by relatively stable teams through ongoing and repetitive processes and are focused on sustaining the organization”, whereas, “projects are performed by temporary teams, are non-repetitive and create original deliverables”.

3.2 Choice of long term or short term approach: operation or project

Even though Gregory (2004, pp. 9, 10) recognizes that the lobbying industry is in a constant trade-off between a more long-term reputational strategic approach and a short-term tactical approach, he claims it turning towards payment by results, resulting in lobbyists focusing on the short-term which demands a tactical approach resembling a project approach. Therefore, Gregory (2004) considers lobbyists to be stakeholder managers.

More specifically, companies might regulate the lobbying endeavour with an open-ended contract (Keffler & Hill, 1997, p. 1372), meaning a long-term operational perspective, or a turn-key contract, hence a shorter-term project perspective. All of these decisions lead to the choice of either relational, hence long-term relationship fostering attribute, or transactional, hence short-term reactive attribute to the lobbying approach, as suggested by Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.829), which inevitably influences the way firms view and handle their lobbying undertaking.

Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.829) outlined several variables, which may affect company's decision to adopt a transactional versus a relational approach: (1) the degree to which firms are affected by government policy, (2) the level of firm product diversification, and (3) the degree of corporatism/pluralism within the country in which companies are operating. Possible companies’ choices are represented in Table 2.
Table 2: Company preferences of relational or transactional approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Relational approach</th>
<th>Transactional approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which firms are affected by government policy</td>
<td>Highly affected</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less affected</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of firm product diversification</td>
<td>Related-product-diversified companies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrelated-diversified products companies</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of corporatism/pluralism in the operating environment</td>
<td>Corporatist countries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pluralist countries</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillman & Hitt (1999, pp. 829, 830) and Barron (2011, p.323)

More in detail, it is outlined how these three variables affect the choice of relational or transactional approach. Consequently, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.830) state that the choice among transactional and relational approaches is influenced by a degree company depends on government regulation. Therefore, in a more regulated environment, businesses usually highly depend on the government policy and in that case companies prefer relational approach. Moreover, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.830) outline that related-product-diversified companies (correspond more to companies focusing on one industry) are opting for a relational approach, allowing to form relationships with policymakers in a specialized policy domain, related to companies’ business. While, companies with unrelated-diversified products (correspond more to associations and consultancies, lobbying for diverse industries) are more likely to act politically by taking a transactional approach due to a wide array of diverse policy issues, relative to their business (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.830). Finally, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.830) assert that companies are more likely to adopt transactional approach in more pluralist countries, whereas, more corporatist countries tend to choose a relational approach to political action. Therefore, a short-term oriented national culture (pluralist), as in the case of the US, sets the stage for the choice of transactional undertakings, while a long-term oriented national culture (corporatist), as in the case of the EU, sets the stage for a relational undertaking (Barron, 2011, p.323).

When looking at the strategic planning of the lobbying undertaking, according to Barron (2011, p.322) the choice of the transactional attribute refers to the tendency of short-term strategizing while the choice of relational attribute shows an inclination towards a long-term strategizing.

Furthermore, depending on whether company has chosen a short-term (transactional) or a long-term (relational) approach and at which stage is the issue lobbied for, some political strategies are more likely to be employed than others.

Hillman & Hitt (1999, p. 835) identified three political strategies: information, financial incentives and constituency-building. Recalling lobbying definition (Chapter 4.1.), employed in this research, it can be seen that lobbying encompasses all these three strategies. The first two strategies provide incentives which can help to gain policymakers’ favour (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 835), such as, offering constituents
support or financial inducements, such as, campaign financing, promises of future employment etc. or providing policymakers with information on policy, what is a critical resource to them.

Ryan et al. (1987, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 835) outline three stages of the "public policy issue life cycle: (1) public opinion formation, (2) public policy formulation, and (3) public policy implementation." First two stages refer to a possibility of taking a proactive form of lobbying, whereas in the last stage is characterized by a reactive form of lobbying (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 835).

Hillman & Hitt (1999) outlined strategies (in this research lobbying components) depending on different variables sometimes are more likely to be employed than others. Table 3 and Table 4 present these dependencies.

Table 3 represents the options, when company employs only proactive lobbying, therefore, only first two stages of issue life cycle are considered. Therefore, if a company or an association has chosen a transactional approach to political action (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 836): they are more likely to opt for a constituency building if the issue is in the public opinion formation stage or they are more likely to choose an information strategy if the issue is in the public policy formulation stage.

**Table 3: Lobbying strategies depending on the issue stage (transactional approach)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue stage</th>
<th>Political strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st stage: public opinion formation</td>
<td>constituency-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd stage: public policy formulation</td>
<td>information, financial incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillman & Hitt (1999, pp. 835, 836)

On the other hand, if a company or an association has chosen a relational approach to political action (Table 4): they are more likely to use an information strategy or constituency building as a long term relationship is based on credibility; or company/association may prefer constituency building if it has "large employment/membership bases"(Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 835).

**Table 4: Lobbying strategies (relational approach)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Political strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opting for credibility</td>
<td>information, constituency-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Large employment/membership bases”</td>
<td>constituency-building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillman & Hitt (1999, pp. 836, 837)

All in all, considering lobbying as an exchange between lobbyists and legislators and looking at the relationship of lobbyists and legislators and their trade-off, McCarty and Rothenberg (1996, cited in Hall & Deardorff, 2006, p.70), recognize the problems of commitment to long-term relationships in the wake of the conflict between short-term and long-term incentives. This fact speaks for the rather short-term, issue-by issue, temporary perspective of lobbying, which draws certain similarities with the project management perspective.
3.3 Traditional and novel project views: project characteristics

In the following section, the traditional view of projects (White, 2002; ISO, 2011) will be broadened by insight on “redefining” (Turner & Muller, 2003) “rethinking” (Cicmil et al., 2006), “reconnecting” (Cicmil & Hodgson, 2006), and “adapting” (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009) project management. Additionally, relevant lobbying literature will be presented which relates project management related fields with the lobbying undertaking.

Mainstream project definitions state that a project is a “unique set of processes consisting of coordinated and controlled activities with start and finish dates, undertaken to achieve an objective by conforming to specific requirements, including multiple constraints such as time, cost and resources” (ISO, 2011, p.8). It can be argued that the view of the traditional project is more of a production view, oriented toward a particular tangible output (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, p.35). The aim of taking on a broader project management perspective is to steer away from the “mainstream images of projects”, originating in construction and engineering industry, which see the project as a “temporary endeavour” with the performance criteria of quality, cost and time (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, p.35). Taking into account the complexity of projects, it is evident that there are more facets of projects which the traditional, mainstream or as Cicmil & Hodgson (2006, p.111) or Cicmil et al. (2006, p. 676) refer to it “normative” or “functionalist/instrumental” perspective, fail to address.

Morris, 1994, cited in (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, pp. 4, 29) as well as Dempsey et al. (1997, cited in Cicmil & Hodgson, 2006, p.115), suggest that particular mainstream project management techniques are not appropriate for the management of modern projects increasingly triggering the interest of governments, while Cicmil & Hodgson (2006, p.111) argue for the introduction of alternative project management approaches. Winter & Szczepanek (2009, p.35) criticize the traditional view of projects as being negligent to some images of projects rather than all-encompassing in that sense, while Cicmil & Hodgson (2006, p.111) argue for the need of examining “perspectives”, “concerns” and “agendas” outside the mainstream movement. Cicmil & Hodgson (2006, p.111) as well as Cicmil et al. (2006, p.677) criticize the sole focus on time, cost and scope and suggest broadening the perspective in considering social, ethical and political aspects. Winter & Szczepanek (2009, p.36) broaden the view even more by suggesting 7 images of projects that should be addressed: social, political, intervention, value creation, development, organization and change. Each one of these images provides a different perspective on the temporary undertaking.

In comparing the lobbying undertaking with the project undertaking, the political image plays an important role due to the fact it focuses on issues of interests, agendas, power and tactics of influence (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, p.29). Winter & Szczepanek, (2009, p.6), argue that projects can be seen differently by different people or even just one person. Therefore, a single view of the project does not necessarily need to be adapted, thus, the usage of multiple images are advisable depending on the issue at hand (Winter & Szczepanek, 2009, p.21). Cicmil & Hodgson (2006, p.115) reinforces this notion simultaneous usage of multiple perspectives by highlighting the need for considering the issues of “social responsibility, judgment, emotions, the operation of dominant discourses, power-knowledge relationship, and practical wisdom” as well as
“boundaries, purpose, application and relationship with other PM related fields” (Cicmil et al., 2006, p.678).

It can be stated that some direct linkages to PM related fields can be drawn from the reviewed lobbying literature. Project management related fields are often the preferred synonyms when it comes to lobbying practices. Besides, previously mentioned authors (Coen, 1999; Smith, 2009) seeing public affairs or public relations as risk management, or Gregory (2004) considering lobbyists as stakeholder managers, McGrath et al. (2010) and Baumgartner (2007, p.485) introduces lobbying as an issue management, i.e. a project management related field. Further, Ledingham (2003) and Petronela (2008) link public relations and lobbying to relationship management. Moreover, Thomson et al. (2007) stress the importance of understanding lobbying and nurturing a good reputation in the media and amongst politicians, by linking public relations to reputation management.

This presented literature overview of traditional and novel project management perspective will be a guide in exploring whether the empirical material provides supporting evidence of “lobbying as a project”. Once the need and the benefit of a project management perspective for lobbying has been presented in this chapter, the following chapter will provide a more comprehensive examination of the defining elements of the lobbying arena.
4. Lobbying arena

4.1. Defining lobbying

In order to define the lobbying activity and place it in a theoretical and practical context, it is needed to commence with adopting a wider perspective of public relations, followed by the presentation of public affairs, in order to be able to narrow the view on government relations which encompass the lobbying activity as we know it today. Finally, by examining the types, forms, activities and tactics of such lobbying it will be possible to define the scope of lobbying for this research and justify its existence in a democratic world.

4.1.1. Public relations

Austin & Pinkleton (2001, cited in Smith, 2009, p.3) give an example of several elements of public relations, such as “community relations, special events planning and promotion, political campaigns, non-profit events, and fund-raising and development”. Smith (2009, p.3) by himself lists many other elements of public relations besides previously mentioned, such as, issues management, crisis communication, lobbying, public information, public affairs, investor relations etc. To sum up, it shows that public relations encompass many other activities, which are not in the scope of this research; however Smith (2009) reveals that public affairs and lobbying are elements of public relations. Further, McGrath (2002, p.7) outlines that public affairs and public relations encompass very different functions, differing in their focus and activities. Harris et al. (1999, cited in McGrath et al., 2010, p.336) clearly outline the difference by stating “public affairs is the management of issues, whereas public relations is the management of the interface between the company and the outside world”.

4.1.2. Public affairs and government relations/lobbying

Due to the previously addressed negative perception of the lobbying activities, the terms “public affairs” and “government relations” are preferred over the term “lobbying” in some cultures (McGrath et al., 2010, p.336); especially Europeans prefer the term “public affairs” instead of lobbying while the author acknowledges that in the US “public affairs” term has a much broader meaning. Consequently, McGrath (2005) outlines that the terms used to describe lobbying vary in EU & US.

It is necessary to make a clear distinction between public affairs and government relations/lobbying. Public affairs comprises of two parts: government relations/lobbying and community relations/corporate responsibility (McGrath, 2002, p.4). Firstly, it can be stated that the terms “government relations” and “lobbying” have the same meaning while Wexler (2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p.5) states that “government relations” and “public affairs” are often used interchangeably. This interchangeable usage of the terms can be misleading. Furthermore, “government relations” suggest focus on legislation without the usage of media routes while “public affairs” assume the usage of media in political issues (Butler, 2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p.3). Therefore, this also adds to even more blurry distinction among the main terms, relative to this research. It is still very difficult to precisely define what each term encompasses due to the fact that the industry itself is still in the process of scope identification. Despite the interchangeable use of the main terms, clearer and more detailed ‘lobbying’ definitions,
found in the literature, will be presented in the next sections, as lobbying is the focus of this research.

4.1.3. Lobbying: types, forms and activities

The usage of the public affairs tool of lobbying at international, national or local level, which according to Wexler (2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p.3) assumes direct contact with government officials, *coalition building* and public outreach, helps the business communities which lack strategic approach when it comes to dealing with the Government in order to manage their complex business environment. In fact, Wesselius (2005) describes lobbying as a complex activity, which needs strategic planning. Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1371), see lobbying as having a role of a strategic marketing tool. Woll (2006, p.465) defines lobbying very broadly as “all activities by private actors which aim at influencing political decision-makers”. Nevertheless, Mack (2005, p.340) acknowledges that formal lobbying definitions in both political arenas, EU & US, can differ, however, the practical lobbying definition stays the same, and that is "making contact with government officials or elected politicians to influence their decisions on matters of interest". More particularly, Keim & Zeithaml (2011, p. 830) define lobbying as “the effort to establish communication channels with regulatory bodies, legislators, and their staffs”. McGrath (2007, p. 269) describes lobbying as a "form of persuasive communication in the political arena". Similarly, Hall & Deardorff (2006, p. 71) see "lobbying as a mechanism of persuasion" while Mack (1997, p.3) describes lobbying as an “attempt to reshape unwelcome public policies”.

Thomson et al. (2007, p. 21) outline several types of lobbying; bill lobbying on legislation in parliament; profile-raising lobbying in terms of developing links with decision makers and; reactive lobbying in case something goes wrong. They can be associated with the arguments of Keffer & Hill (1997, p. 1374) and Hillman & Hitt (1999, p. 828) who indicated two forms of lobbying: proactive and reactive (passive); where “bill lobbying” and “profile raising lobbying” are proactive forms of lobbying whereas “reactive lobbying” is a passive form of lobbying.

Any type and form of lobbying is composed of different activities. Thomas and Hrebenar (2000, cited in McGrath, 2002, p. 8) outline gaining access to policy makers, creating an attitude among policy makers and influencing policy makers, as the activities included in the lobbying process. Moreover, Bowers (1993, cited in Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1373) lists "monitoring and responding to legislation, proposing amendment language, testifying on behalf of the industry and meeting with legislators " as the most common lobbying activities. According to McGrath (2002, pp. 7-14), lobbying activities include atmosphere setting, monitoring, communication with policy makers, *advocacy* and influencing, application of pressure and coalition building. Furthermore, according to Mahoney (2007, pp. 366, 367) networking is an important part of lobbying and can range from very loose to very formal and highly coordinated, as in the case of *ad hoc coalitions* and interest group organizations. Nevertheless, all the activities, performed by the lobbyists are aimed at achieving the objective by “proactively influencing legislation” (Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1373).

4.1.4. Lobbying as tactics

Another classification of lobbying is based on the way it is practically approached. Thus, there are two ways the pressure is applied on the policy makers, Nicoll (2007)
names them tactics: direct lobbying or "insider lobbying" and indirect lobbying or "outsider lobbying". McGrath (2002, p.12) directly calls them “insider tactics” and “outsider tactics”.

Gais & Walker (1991, cited in Nicoll, 2007, p. 827) defines direct lobbying as a "close consultation with the political and administrative leaders". Further, Nicoll (2007, p. 827) stresses the importance of the "one-on-one contact" and the “provision of information”, with the aim of influencing the legislators. This argument is supported by McGrath (2002, p.12), who emphasizes the privacy aspect of direct lobbying. On the other hand, indirect lobbying or “outsider tactics” is directed towards influencing a general public in order to reach the legislators (Nicoll, 2007, p. 827). Therefore, lobbying can take these kind of forms: grassroots lobbying, protests and demonstrations, speaking with the press, etc. (Nicoll, 2007, p.836).

Since direct and indirect lobbying tactics target different audience, lobbyists using direct lobbying devote more time "cultivating friends than denouncing enemies" (McGrath, 2002, p.13), whereas indirect lobbying targets undecided policymakers (Holtzman, 1966, cited in McGrath, 2002, p.14). However, it is stated that outside lobbying tactics can generate constituents' anger, consequently raising policymaker’s dissatisfaction (Kollman, 1998, cited in McGrath, 2002,p.14). This argument is enforced by Hall & Deardorff (2006, p. 69) who state that those legislators are not lobbied when there is a small probability of changing their position. Therefore, "the closest allies" or the “farthest enemies" are not targeted (Hall & Deardorff, 2006, p. 71).

4.1.5. Lobbyist

A question can be asked how a person, engaging in practices of interest representation should be called officially, as the terms lobbying, public affairs, public relations are sometimes used interchangeably as well as what their work encompasses? Baumgartner (2007, p.485) provides an abstract definition by seeing lobbyists as “framers” due to the fact that they largely engage putting their issue forward in a certain manner. Whereas, McGrath (2002, p.20) describes the activities of lobbyists as encompassing direct contact with public officials, monitoring of political environment, advising of political strategies and initiating and organizing a collective lobbying undertaking. Woll (2006, p. 462) similarly outlined the lobbyists’ roles but stated that the monitoring role often requires most of lobbyists' time.

Hall & Deardorff (2006, p. 69) describe professional lobbyists as being "among the most experienced, knowledgeable, and strategic actors” in politics, and therefore support the arguments of Keffer & Hill (1997, p. 1371, 1372) who emphasize that the public negative perception of lobbyists is not accurate. The authors state that a "modern lobbyist" usually employs skills in professional and refined ways while a "successful lobbyist" is firstly an expert on the pursued issues and he/she is very valuable source of information for the politicians and staffers. Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.833) supports the claim that lobbyists are aiding the policymakers by providing them with information while Keffer & Hill (1997, p. 1373) state that lobbyist educate the policymakers and often assist in drafting the legislation. In fact, the relationship among lobbyists and policymakers are characterized by the "mutual interdependence and exchange" (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.833).
4.2. Defining lobbying for this research

Despite a negative perception of the terms “lobbying” or “lobbyists”, McGrath (2002, p.2) highlights that that terminology is the most suitable for a comparative analysis of the lobbying activity. Therefore, in this research the terms “lobbyist” and “lobbying” will be used interchangeably to compare EU and US lobbying practices.

From the literature overview, concerning the main terms definitions, the interchangeable usage of the relative terms can be observed making the lack of agreement on the terminology in the lobbying literature evident. In this research, a person engaged in lobbying activities according to Mahoney (2007, p. 378), Wexler (2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p.3), Woll (2006) and Keffer & Hill (1997), will be referred to as “lobbyist” and the meaning of it is in line with previously discussed Baumgartner (2007, p.485) and McGrath (2002, p.20) “lobbyist” definitions. Thus in this research coalition building, constituency building, political action committee (PAC) contributions and advocacy advertising will be attributed to the lobbying activities. All the other elements lobbying is composed of; types of lobbying, outlined by Thomson & Woodman (2007); forms of lobbying, identified by Keffer & Hill (1997); activities, discussed by Thomson & Woodman (2007), Bowers (1993, cited in Keffer & Hill, 1997, p.1373) and McGrath (2002), also match this research scope.

4.3. Justifying lobbying

According to Mack (2005, p. 339), the “right to petition the government” is proclaimed in the First Amendment of the American Constitution. No matter the political arena, the notion of government decisions directly affecting ones actions inevitably leads to the urge of influencing these decisions in ones favor. It can be stated that representing a point of view, that is considered to be correct, and informing elected representatives in case they lack knowledge in a particular field, should lead to an outcome which benefits both the company and community. Even though these benefits seem obvious, it could be argued about the “appropriateness” of lobbying in a democratic arena. Lobbying will, without a doubt, increase the company chances of achieving what they want, but the question of how this influence can be justified in a democratic sense can be raised.

In some fields and cultures, there is a grey cloud surrounding the lobbyist profession due to its unfortunate image of a goal-oriented, illegitimate and unethical advocacy (Graham, 2001; McGrath, 2002; Thomson et al, 2007). Unfortunately, every lobbying arena has its own lobbying scandals, which damage the image of lobbying (Thomson et al., 2007, p. 6). The problem usually arises in less regulated environments, in which the “democratic deficit” (Mahoney, 2007) raises the need for stronger lobbying regulation (Wesselinus, 2005, p.15; Skocpol, 2003, cited in de Breláz & Alves, 2011, p.210). But even in the 2 biggest political arenas, US and EU, lobbying is perceived differently. In US, more precisely Washington, lobbyists are proud of their profession (McGrath, 2002). In Europe the term ‘lobbyist’ usually associates with a negative meaning (Marlowe, 2001 cited in Woll, 2006). Therefore, it cannot be overlooked or neglected that lobbying has a controversial reputation, frequently brought into connection with political corruption (de Breláz & Alves, 2011, p.208). Often it is being described as the “private club of the richest” and “happy conspiracy” for which elected representatives are only “puppets” (Farrell, 2009) or as a “chaotic mechanism that fosters exclusivity” (de Breláz & Alves, 2011, p.204).
Nevertheless, there are an overwhelming number of voices, from theory as well as from practice (Keffer & Hill, 1997; de Brelàz & Alves, 2011; Thomson et al., 2007; Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008; Samuelson, 2008, etc.), which argue for the benefits and need of lobbying in a democratic environment. Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1375-1378) characterize lobbying as being neither “good” nor “evil”, but do not fail to emphasize that in fact a raising number of interest groups actually enhance democratic activity. Samuelson (2008) challenges the thoughts of lobbying as an anti-democratic act and argues that it is indeed the opposite, hence “democracy in action”. Reinforcing that notion, McGrath (2002, p.7) as well as Thomson et al. (2007, p. 4) state that lobbying plays a "fundamentally important role" in the democratic process. Thomas & Hrebenar, (2008) argue for the benefits of lobbying by proclaiming that societies, no matter if they are pluralist established democracies or struggling new democracies, always had and always will have interest representation. Among other defining elements of democracy, Thomas & Hrebenar (2008, p. 5) highlight the right of free association and free speech, hence the right to interest representation and presentation of different views. Proclaiming the “public good” as debatable, Samuelson (2008) takes the same stand and justifies lobbying by stressing its role as the voice of the “will of the people”, as well as the information provider to the government. Concerning the notion of the will of the people, De Brelàz & Alves (2011, p.202) state that lobbying certainly fosters deliberative democracy, which gives citizens the opportunity to be included in the public decision-making process. Also Letki (2004, cited in Hrebenar et al., 2008, p.63) claims that the involvement of citizens in the political arena is very important for the development and sustainability of democracy. Concerning the conception of the information provider, Mack (1997, p.8) as well as McGrath (2002, p.10) outline that lobbying benefits the democratic system due to the fact that “affected interests” have much more information whereas the legislators and government agencies don’t have. More particularly, Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1373) state that staffers and politicians count on lobbyists' expertise.

Samuelson (2008), particularly addresses the common belief that lobbying gives an advantage to the ones that can actually afford it, hence the wealthy corporations, proclaiming it to be very debatable, according to the fact that the highest tax in the USA is paid by the biggest corporations, which depicts their high power image towards the government. Samuelson (2008) also challenges the common conception of lobbying as a privileged access through previous monetary campaign support, through the exhibition of lobbying as “modern marketing”, in the sense that it persuades the strongest with pure facts rather than monetary initiatives. In the case opposing views exist on a timely and controversial public issue, chances are that by not reacting, one even benefits the opposing side. Without a doubt, an appropriate presentation of ones view would inevitably affect the course of decision-making and the final outcome. Therefore, it can be stated that the avoidance of joining forces to influence the government leaves the government with complete freedom, which can be misused, and therefore democracy can be endangered. This claim is supported by Thomas & Hrebenar (2008, p.6), who even go as far as to tie the restriction of interest group autonomy or the lack thereof to the characteristics of communist systems and undeveloped democracies.

This chapter has defined and framed the lobbying activity in a democratic and business context, providing the basis for the further examination of the particularities of the two biggest lobbying arenas, US and EU, which will be presented in the next chapter.
5. Comparative arena of the EU and the US lobbying

5.1. Political and institutional framework

Scholars agree that the underlying political and institutional framework is of great importance in explaining the different lobbying approaches (Heinz et al., 1993; Mazey & Richardson, 1993; Coen, 1999; Hillman & Hitt, 1999; McGrath, 2002; Levy & Newell, 2005; Woll, 2006; Baumgartner, 2007; Nicoll, 2007; Barron, 2011).

Woll (2006, p.457) recognizes US and EU as the major lobbying arenas, and claims their investigation and comparison could aid in giving an insight on how institutional and political framework influence lobbying methods and styles. More specifically, Woll (2006, p.460) assumes that lobbying styles depend on political frameworks while Baumgartner (2007, p. 485) stresses the importance of understanding the underlying different institutional venues due to the fact that they tend to be more welcoming to a certain type of argument than another. Mack (2005, p. 341) outlines that the political environment has a significant effect on lobbying in both the US and the EU and therefore lobbyists need to understand the procedures of the policy development. According to Hillman & Hitt (1999, p. 830) the political system, together with industry regulation and product diversification, determines the choice of lobbying approach of relational, hence long term, or transactional, hence short-term, nature.

Woll (2006, p. 462) emphasizes that the few existing comparative studies of lobbying in the EU and the US outline the importance of culture and institutions in both political arenas. Murtha & Lenway (1994, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.830), as well as Thomas and Hrebenar (2002, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 462) claim that the political systems are a product as well as a reflection of national culture. Thomas and Hrebenar (2002, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 462) even refer to culture and institutions as being inseparable, meaning that political framework form the EU or the US specific behavior. Nevertheless, Woll (2006, p. 462) suggests that it might not be the national specific behavior that is associated with the political and institutional frameworks but rather a simple strategic response to the institutional requirements.

Therefore, it is beneficial to have a closer look into the political and institutional framework of both the EU and the US, possible differences in democratic accountability of the two systems and determine their inclination towards either the pluralist or corporatist system.

5.1.1. US

Hrebenar et al. (2008, p. 62) refer to the US political system as somewhat diverging from the “traditional corporatism” while Petronela (2008, p. 266) and Barron (2011, p. 321) refer to it as being typically pluralist. Taken into consideration the US low concentration of private and government power (Heinz et al., 1993), wide array of interest groups with the power of influence on decision makers (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 830), as well as the ad hoc nature of engagement with policy makers (Barron, p. 321), it can be concluded that it conveys a more pluralist system.

More specifically, Petronela (2008, pp. 266, 267) characterizes the US system with the conception of electoral politics, monitoring and controlling of elected representatives in
the name of the citizens, self-interest and individualism as well as integrated interest, while Coen (1999, p. 30) summarizes these characteristics in referring to it as “redistributive policy making”.

The Public Affairs Company (2011) recognizes the state and federal government as the two main venues of the US lobbying concerning legislative as well as regulatory frameworks. Furthermore, Petronela (2008, p. 270) claims that the US lobbying efforts seem to be oriented toward fostering the relationship between interest groups and legislature, executive branch, judicial power and in some extent political parties. The State House is the venue of the legislature consisting of the Assembly Chambers and the Senate Chambers (Multi District Institute for Political Education, 1972, p. 32). According to Mack (2005, p. 341) the US Federal Government has the legislative and regulatory power, which is concentrated in the White House, the Congress and executive branch agencies, as well as the power of distributing federal funding. Both of these activities make the US Federal Government a popular lobbying target for companies. Coen (1999, p.31) refers to the US Congress as an “independent actor in the legislative process” claiming companies are more inclined toward influencing committees and individual Congressmen through various means of communication, especially as a target of grassroots mobilization, a popular US lobbying practice. More specifically, Mack (2005, pp. 343, 344) points out that the concentration of lobbying on legislative matters is in the White House, Senate and House of Representatives while regulatory matters require the targeting of different executive branch venues, consisting of political appointees, depending on the issue at hand.

Lobbying in the US is regulated in the sense that lobbyists are required to register with different levels of government separately and adhere to the requirements of the Lobbying Disclosure Act (LDA), originally introduced in 1946 and amended in 1995 (Grobman, 2004, cited in De Brelàz & Alves, 2011, p. 209; Mack, 2005, p.345). If the expenditure of lobbying activities during a period of 6 moths exceeded 2 500$ or the time resources of a particular employee devoted to lobbying exceeded 10 %, according to Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1376), there was a need for registering. It is stated that 16 000 registered lobbyists in 2008 were required to report under the 2005 Lobbying Disclosure Act (Samuelson, 2008). Besides them, there is a number of different actors who also influence the government, ranging from public relation consultants and policy experts to external constituents, bringing the count of the “influence-lobby complex” to about 261 000, according to Thurber (2008, cited in Samuelson, 2008). This fact aligns with the findings of Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1376), who claimed that a large number of lobbyists did not have the obligation to register, stating a count of up to 75% of lobbyists.

In recognizing the key actors within the mentioned lobbying venues, it is important to point out that each lobbyist must be aware of the State Senators and Assemblymen relevant to its particular interest (Multi District Institute for Political Education, 1972, p.32) when it comes to the direct lobbying access, while the support of Congressmen, US Senators, Councilmen, Mayors etc. is beneficial in a more indirect manner to strengthen the particular argument. It is evident that government officials perform their legislative duties on all three levels but one should not neglect the importance of the staffers employed for assistance purposes. It is the staffers who are mainly linked to lobbyists for drafting and educational purposes (Keffer & Hill, 1997, p.1373). An important bill for the regulation of the US lobbying arena of undeniably vast
proportions and its government-business relation has been passed in 1994, prohibiting the “receiving of gifts, meals, or entertainment directly from lobbyists”, but leaving the window open for their clients to do so (Keffer & Hill, 1997, p.1376).

As one consultant in Washington stresses, "if you don't know the rules of the House and Senate, you cannot do public affairs" (McGrath, 2002, p. 5). Therefore, it can be concluded that the knowledge about the underlying US political and institutional framework is of great importance for the understanding of the way lobbying is done.

5.1.2. EU

Mack (2005, p. 344) identifies EU as a transnational organization or a governmental system rather than a political regime. There seem to me mixed opinions on the defining characters of the EU political system, which could be explained by its "multi level nature" (Woll, 2006, p. 459), and strong single nationalistic influence. For instance, Mazey & Richardson (1993) consider the EU political system as being generally pluralist, while Schmidt (1999, cited in Charrad, 2010, p.10 ) refers to it as “quasi pluralist”. Hrebenar et al. (2008, p.62) strongly argues for the non-existence of neo-corporatist elements in the EU as well as linkages with traditional corporatism. On the other hand Schmitter and Streeck (1991, cited in Charrad, 2010, p.10) argue for the existence of some “corporatist patterns” in the political system, while Barron (2011, p.321) refers to the EU government-business relations as simply corporatist. Michalowitz (2002, cited in Charrad, 2010, p.11) recognizes the reasons for such divergence in the fact that the EU does not exhibit characteristics of a typical state, and therefore argues for the possibility of the co-existence of corporatism and pluralism in the EU decision-making, proclaiming the Commission and Council as more corporatist and the Parliament as more pluralist. Woll (2006, p. 459) reinforces that fact by acknowledging that even tough convergence of national traditions has taken place in the EU context, they still play a role in the policy making process of the EU.

Mack (2005, p. 343) as well as Petronela (2008, pp. 268-270), identify the main venues and key actors of political action in the EU; firstly, the European Commission together with the cabinets and private offices Commissioners; secondly, the European Parliament together with the Committees in charge of drafting opinions about proposals for the Plenary Session; thirdly, the Council of Ministers (Member State governments) together with the national offices in the working groups in charge for the preparation of proposals; lastly, the European Court of Justice, when it comes to the legislative level. The practice of establishing formal advisory bodies is not as popular in the EU public policy system (Coen, 1999, pp.29, 35) but technical committees and issue-based forums are existent.

Baumgartner (2007, p. 485) emphasizes the importance of becoming familiar with the specificities of relevant EU institutional venues for assessing their impact on policy matters. Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 70) identify the EC role as “promoting the EU regulatory regime”, the European Parliament role as a “conditional agenda setter”, and the European Court of Justice role in “encouraging the mobilization of individuals at the EU level”. While there is definitely value, in knowing the characteristics of each agency and institutional venue within the EU governance structure, it is important to focus on particular issues at hand. Venue assignments are typical for the EU public policy system, meaning that Directorate Generals are assigned an issue bearing in mind
the policy equilibrium (Baumgartner, 2007, p. 484). Nevertheless, joint decision-making can still be seen as a “shelter”, where policy-makers can hide themselves from the pressure of lobbyists (Scharpf, 1988, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 460).

Mack (2005, p. 399) recognizes the importance of the European Commission, as do Levy & Newell (2005, p. 216), but nevertheless argues that over the years the European Parliament has become the focus of lobbying in Brussels. According to Mack (2005, p. 355) the executive branch, hence the European Commission consisting of career civil servants unlike in the US, can propose legislation, making it the preferred target for lobbyists during the proposal drafting phase. Levy & Newell (2005, p. 216) agree with that statement by arguing that the EC is the primary focus for lobbyists, nevertheless, other EU institutions, as well as Member State governments play still an important role. In the debate of the main institutional focus of lobbyists, Mazey & Richardson (1993, p. 19) defend the importance of European Court of Justice "responsible for interpreting and enforcing EC legislation" to the EC lobbyists.

When it comes to the specific characteristics of the EU political arena, according to Petronela, 2008 (pp. 266-268), the arena is characterized by the strong focus on insulation or strong political parties (p. 226); multilevel decision making process (p.266); visibility of interest group-political party cooperation only at state level due to the European Parliament elections taking place on national level (p.267); direct election of representatives for the Parliament which are not as approachable as the EC (p.267); collective action and solidarity towards the group (p.267); difficulties for the integration of different national interest (p.267); lack of power aggregation (p.268); strong focus on the initiative process (p.268), etc. Mahoney (2007, p. 370) also acknowledges that the EU institutions are "largely not democratically accountable to the people"; e.g. the Parliament is directly elected, but democratic accountability is low "due to the party lists by the member states during Parliament elections"(Kreppel, 2001, cited in Mahoney, 2007, p. 370).

In conclusion, Woll (2006, p. 460) admits that the "EU lobbying cannot be understood without looking at the institutions and policy context in which groups are trying to act". Even though company lobbying is described by Coen (1999, p.30) as having a “low public profile” due to the European democratic deficit, Mazey & Richardson (1993, p.14) confirm the argument of Woll (2006, p. 460), by stressing the necessity of understanding the EU policy process for companies and emphasizing the consequences of not doing so.

5.2. Lobbying practices

The presented underlying political framework formed in conjunction with national culture inevitably influences the types of practices present in each lobbying arena. Due to the longer lobbying history, more scholarship body was found on the practices of the US lobbyists but the EU literature has shown an inclining trend in this matter. Typical practices of both arenas will be addressed separately, followed by an overview of the comparative framework.

5.2.1 US lobbying practices

The first study about the lobbying activities in the US is found in 1930’ (Herring, 1929
cited in Woll, 2006, p. 457), which led to a political theory formulation about the interest groups (Truman, 1951 cited in Woll, 2006, p.457). Probably due to longer lobbying tradition in the US, as well as less negative image of lobbying, Thomson et al. (2007, p. 8) state lobbying in the US to be a “much more widely accepted business practice than it is elsewhere”. McGrath (2002, p.9) states that the US lobbyists are welcomed by the politicians, staffers and members of Congress, because they are seen as experts who provide them assistance.

In looking at how things are actually done in the US lobbying, numerous authors have addressed a vast array of different practices, strategies or tactics and offered their sometimes contradicting opinions on what the US lobbying actually encompasses.

For instance, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.835) provide a comprehensive view of available lobbying practices concerning information strategy, financial incentive strategy or constituency-building strategy, commonly used in government relations. They vary from direct lobbying, supplying position papers and contributions to politician’s parties, all the way to grassroots mobilization, advocacy advertising, press conferences, political education programs etc. Information and financial incentive lobbying strategy identified by Hillman & Hitt, (1999, p.833) take on a direct lobbying path while constituency building, of which grassroots mobilization and advocacy advertising is a part, takes an indirect path to lobbying. The usage of one strategy is not exclusive, meaning that a combination is possible and advisable depending on the specificity of the question at hand. Attributing the choice of financial incentive strategies to the morality debate, Barron (2011, p.323) focuses on the information and constituency-building strategies arguing for the direct lobbying characteristics of information strategies and the indirect lobbying characteristics of constituency-building strategies. Evidently, there are many factors of influence, but it seems as though the national perception of the power of decision-making, hence the aggregation or dispersion thereof, is of crucial importance.

More specifically, Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1377) point out good and bad lobbying practices in the US. As good practices they define official visits, letters and phone calls, briefings, grassroots movements, educational field trips, official fundraisers, etc. As problematic practices they define expensive meals, contributions to parties for “general” purposes, lobbyists gifts etc. In terms of the regular means for reinforcement of lobbying efforts, besides the common formal and informal meetings, Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1373) as well as Keim & Zeithaml (2011) also identified fundraisers, grassroots movements, constituency building and campaign contributions mostly through the means of PAC contributions. Hall & Deardorff (2006, p.80) view those PAC contributions as signals of interest groups and legislators sharing the same policy objectives, which ultimately affects the lobbying access. Nevertheless, PAC contributions are strictly regulated and therefore PAC’s are allowed to contribute up to 10 000 $ for one election cycle and one candidate (Keffer & Hill, 1997,p.1378).

In the wake of the importance of direct representation, financial and legal tactics as well as media and grass-root tactics, Woll, (2006, p.464) provides an explanation to why the availability of legal and financial instruments is so important, stating that it enables targeting legislators prior to election due to a direct electoral system and ensures greater impact of lobbyists. On the other hand, Gabel & Scott (2011, p.91) do not consider campaign financing as a lobbying activity, but highlight the “tactics” of coalition/
constituency building, grassroots support, issue advocacy, legislative services, “revolving door” lobbying etc. as characteristic of US lobbying.

Proposing another view of the grassroots notion, Kollman (1998, cited in Hall & Deardorff, 2006, p.79) considers those movements to be “outside lobbying”, meaning they mobilize the public by indicating to mostly indecisive legislators that a certain issue is relevant among constituents. Thomson et al. (2007, p. 9) offer an explanation for the popularity of grassroots tactics by stating that Congress members in Washington DC are more reactive to constituents than lobbyists. This is due to their interest to be re-elected, thus a need to be seen by the voters. Consequently, it is understandable why, according to the authors, the grassroots’ communications has noticeably grown in the US, thus the use of local media is outlined as the most effective mean in gaining grassroots’ support.

In addressing the success of the elaborated tactics, Keim & Zeithaml (2011, p. 1374) suggest that the US lobbying activities are most efficient if an on-going continuous proactive approach is adopted. Jobson (2001, cited in McGrath, 2002, p. 22) reinforces that statement by outlining that in Washington lobbying activities are mainly defensive, meaning lobbyists are “making sure nothing bad happens”, while Thomson et al. (2007, p. 21) refer to it as ‘bill lobbying’, hence lobbying on legislation in advance. The lobbying style, which is adopted, remains confrontational and aggressive (Coen, 1999, p.31), or as Gardner, 1991 (cited in Woll, 2006, p.461) refers to it, "gangster style".

Baumgartner (2007, p. 485) suggests that the US lobbyists incorporate the geographical impacts of certain policies in their lobbying undertaking due to the geographic basis of congressional representation. Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1373) claim that in addition to the trained public affairs or government relations specialists in the US, CEOs and executives from the business, as the face of the company, are gladly seen in lobbying undertakings, especially if they are also coming from the same state as the government official. Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1374) claim that they are looking to form long-term relationships with government officials.

Coen (1999, p.28) claims that over the years there has been an increase of firm direct lobbying in Congress, mostly through the organization of networks around a specific issue. The downsizing of government relation functions and activities in companies due to the recession, has contributed to a more focused and most importantly, a more economical lobbying approach, in the form of alliances. Furthermore, Hall & Deardorff (2006, p.70) claim that American lobbyists, whether company in-house or organizational lobbyists, focus on lobbying legislators with a similar viewpoint, and back away from spending their resources on legislators who are unlikely to change their position. This fact comes to show that American lobbyists exhibit a strong strategic attribute in the sense of monitoring the environment in order to gather intelligence which will aid the lobbying planning and resource allocation process.

5.2.2 EU lobbying practices

It can be argued that the EU has a short lobbying tradition, is not very regulated and represents a fairly small size of industry (Woll, 2006, p.464). Lobbying got its importance after the signature of ‘Single European Act’ in 1986. From 1986 till 1994 many national actors established their representative offices in Brussels and the lobbying activity truly gained a momentum (Woll, 2006, p.458). In Europe, in the last
decade of 20’s century lobbying activities shifted from interest groups to private actors (de Jesús Butler, 2008). Individual companies became important in lobbying industry arena (Woll, 2006).

Coen (1999, p.29) argued for the strength of influence of large companies, stating that the informal corporate lobby benefits from the expansion of the Commission and the opportunities for informal contact. It is evident that the EU lobbying arena exhibits a multi-level lobbying strategy for multiple levels of influence (Coen, 1999, p.32). The usage of legal and financial instruments is limited due to the fact that there is no possibility of targeting legislators prior to election because officials are being appointed (Woll, 2006, p.458). Therefore a lesser impact of lobbyists can be expected in the wake of the indirect election model. Therefore, Baumgartner (2007, p.485) proposes the usage of technical arguments when lobbying the individual Directorate Generals, political or geographic impact arguments when lobbying the Council, and ideological arguments when lobbying the European Parliament.

Therefore, Coen (1999, p.29) as well as Woll (2006, p.463), describes the EU public policy system as very flexible, which is welcoming to a more informal long-term relationship building between government officials and lobbyists. Woll (2006, p.461) characterizes the EU lobbying style as being constructive, cautious and consensus-oriented with a higher importance of indirect representation through associations. Coen (1999, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 461) defines the style as being "subtle", while Gardner (1991, cited in Woll, 2006, p.461), characterizes it as "soft speaking”.

Furthermore, according to Petronela (2008, pp.266-268), the EU lobbying arena is characterized by holistic strategies of interest groups, informal contacts, simultaneous lobby of more than one institution, the two-fold role of lobbyist, receiving information from and providing information to decision-makers, etc. Concerning the interest groupings, Levy & Newell (2005, p.198) claim that in the EU, corporate interest were represented “in vertical sector terms”, i.e. through national trade associations. The European Institutions issued the EC Green Paper on Governance, where expressed a call for “horizontal alliances”. This was seen as giving a birth to “complex multilevel and institutional advocacy coalitions, ad hoc interest groupings”. Coen (1999, p.39) has also found evidence of the increase of temporary and informal groupings called ad-hoc coalitions in the EU during the 1990. The informal groupings seemed to have the competitive edge over formal associations because they were more goal oriented and the motivation level was considerably higher (Coen, 1999, p.39).

It is beneficial to highlight the existence of not only European groupings but also the US groupings. Coen (1999, p.35) emphasizes the importance of organizations like the American Chamber of Commerce, European Roundtable of Industrialists, European American Industrial Committee and Union of Industrial and Employers' Con-federation of Europe as the most influential US collective players in the EU lobbying arena. Coen (1999 p.35) states that before 1990 the American Chamber of Commerce and the US firms have played a role model to the EU lobbyists because they exhibited a different approach by directly engaging companies and their experienced executives in the European lobbying efforts. This approach raised the credibility of the actors and increased the collective influence of the associations in the eyes of the policy makers. According to Coen (1999, p.36) this realization was proven by the increased number of permanent business representations of the EU firms in Brussels. It can be argued that
the EU companies have over time professionalized their government affairs and have slowly started leaning toward collective representation.

A number of authors have focused on the particular tactics employed in the EU lobbying undertakings. For instance, Mazey & Richardson (1993, p.23) emphasize the importance of effective EU lobbying practices like the commitment of necessary resources; development of advance intelligence; monitoring of national agendas; maintaining of links with national administrators and Commission officials across several Directorates; rationality of presented arguments; cooperation and trustworthiness; alignment of lobbying strategy with European perspectives; turning the EC regulations into opportunities; etc. Therefore, it can be concluded that just like in the case of the US, a proactive lobbying approach, hence anticipation of the political environment and timely reaction, are vital for the success of the lobbying undertaking (Mazey & Richardson, 1993, p.23). According to Woll (2006, p.463), the EU lobbying is most frequent on formulation and revision at supranational level while decision lobbying is pursued through national route. Hrebenar et al. (2008, p.58) emphasizes the EU practice of contacting the Member of Parliament or appointed officials in executive branch as well as civil servants in the executive branch, either directly or indirectly even though Coen (1999, p.32) argues that the previous establishment of firm reputation predetermines the ability for direct lobbying.

It can be concluded that the EU lobbying literature mostly concerned itself with particular lobbying issues, like patterns of interest group intermediation or styles of lobbying, in an empirical manner. This approach was criticized by Anderson and Eliassen (1995, 1998, cited in Woll, 2006, p.458) for the lack of theoretical focus. Woll (2006, pp. 457, 460) criticizes the overly EU focused European lobbying literature and advocates for the benefits of a comparative study of Washington and Brussels, assuming that lobbying style depends on political frameworks.

5.3 Comparison of EU & US lobbying practices

Woll (2006, p.460) argued for the existence of many separate studies on the EU lobbying and the US lobbying, but very few comparisons of the two, and is one of the first authors to attempt an extensive comparison of the two arenas. Woll (2006, p. 457) provides a view of the evolution of US/EU comparative literature by commencing with the interest group literature. Woll (2006, pp. 460, 567) argued that interest arose in the practice of lobbying and the focus of studies has shifted towards phases of the policy process, which enable effective lobbying as opposed to group representation, all of which are inevitably defined and influenced by the political and institutional framework. This claim is supported by the efforts of numerous authors (Coen, 1999; McGrath, 2002 & 2005; Gibson, 2005; Mack, 2005; Baugartner, 2007; Mahoney & Baumgarner, 2008; Petronela, 2008), which place the comparison of the practice of lobbying at the heart of their empirical research.

Each author exhibits a specific focus in the comparative research. Coen (1999, p.35) focuses on the comparison between the US and the EU corporate lobbying practices, particularly on the US firms’ influence on the lobbying industry formation in Brussels. Furthermore, Mahoney (2007, p.367) focuses on the comparison between the EU and the US on identifying the factors influencing company’s decision to form an ad hoc
coalition; and more in detail identifying the type of ad hoc coalitions. Mack (1997) as well as Coen (1999), Woll (2006), Baumgartner (2007) and Petronela (2008) emphasize the existence of particular similarities and differences between the US and the EU lobbying practices, which will be detailed in the following sections.

5.3.1. Similarities

Even though there are ought to be more differences between the US and the EU lobbying arenas, mostly due to the evident differences in the underlying political system, there are also some considerable similarities identified by numerous scholars, which ultimately speak for the benefit of a comparative study in the eyes of companies and for the general European tendency to strive toward a US-like organizational system.

Mack (1997, pp.142, 149) emphasizes the strong EU/US bond throughout the decades in numerous areas. Woll (2006, p. 457) stated that both deal with “fixed sets of institutions that are comparable in terms of the functions and roles they play in the policy process". Petronela (2008, p.266) argues that there is a possibility to lobby in both arenas; that institutions are divided and fragmented; and that there are numerous access possibilities to decision-makers. Woll (2006, p.461) reinforces that argument by stating that EU and US are easily comparable because they have similar institutional frameworks, but different cultures, ultimately influencing the lobbying practice.

In particular, Woll (2006, p.462) recognized similarities concerning few issues; rapid growth of the industry in the last few decades due to the upturn of governmental dynamics; coexistence of direct and indirect representation; consultation based contact for the influencing of policy; role duality of direct firm lobbyists concerning the policy influencing and monitoring in order to inform; and lobbying agenda setting. Similar to the considerations of Petronela (2008) and Woll (2006), Mack (1997) also recognizes similarities between the two political arenas in terms of obtaining unpublished intelligence about potential legislation and communicating to the officials’ information about the impact legislative proposals would have. Moreover, Baumgartner and Jones (1993, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 460) recognize another similarity of the two arenas and that is the notion of access points in the EU, which have the same characteristics as the notion of "venue-shopping" in the US. Mack (2005, p. 346) sees a very important similarity in the dealing with change (e.g. changing political priorities in the US or significant institutional changes in the EU), while McGrath (2002, p.21) similarly underlines how the changes in legislation affect lobbying in both arenas, EU &US; thus stressing the importance of adaptation each time there are changes in the legislation.

Taking on a company perspective, it can be stated that company representative offices in both Brussels and Washington, as well as government relations functions within companies have experienced a dramatic increase in the last two decades, according to Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.829). Both US and EU have an open model of business representation (Coen, 1999, pp.28, 29), meaning their lobbying systems are both based on alliance building, bargaining and compromises, while the power of influence for companies or associations largely depends on the establishment of credibility (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.836). It is important for companies to be aware of their target of influence in any case. Civil servants in the EU, as well as staffers in the US, seem to have more knowledge about certain issues than the members of the Parliament and congressmen respectively (Coen, 1999, p.31). Building relationships with them while taking care of the reputation is seemingly important in any context. McGrath (2002, p.9)
emphasizes the fact that "communication with policy makers has to be issue-based" in both the EU and the US. The emphasis will always be put on the "access to decision makers over the knowledge of the issues" (McGrath, 2002, p.10), or as Mack (2005, p.344) refers to it “relationship with key officials and politicians”.

5.3.2. Differences

Once the most common lobbying practices of the US and EU have been presented, it can be argued that any similarities arising in the wake of globalization are outweighed by major differences. Numerous scholars refer to the differences in the practices employed by the two biggest lobbying arenas in a comparative matter, and therefore it is eminent to point the possible reasons for such disturbances, of which companies operating in one or the other arena should be aware.

It is evident that the US has longer lobbying traditions than the EU, which in many ways seems to be following the US example. The business culture, institutional traditions and codes of political conduct are different in these two arenas (Coen, 1999, p.29). From the existent literature, further evidence about differences in national culture, as well as lobbying regulatory framework have also been identified, to complete the theoretical framework.

Firstly, most reasons for the differences seem to be arising from the underlying political and institutional framework. Woll (2006, p.461) underlines that argument by stating that different lobbying traditions, instruments and policy process are the reason for the different "lobbying approaches". More specifically, Coen (1999 p.29) as well as Barron (2011, p.321) identify the EU government-business relationship as mostly corporatist, which is characterized by long-term relationships, and the US government-business relations as pluralist, characterized by ad hoc and issue-by-issue formation of relationships. Woll (2006, p.461) agrees with the description of the nature of relationships by emphasizing the EU focus on long-term relationships and the US short-term individualistic approach. Petronela (2008, pp. 266, 276) also recognizes the importance of the underlying political and institutional frameworks and therefore highlights, on the one hand the American pluralism and electoral politics and therefrom arising characteristic of prevailing individualism and self interest, and on the other hand the European insulation, multi-level decision making process, dispersion of power and therefrom arising features of informal contact and simultaneous lobbying. As another characteristic of the political system, Petronela (2008, p.271) blames the uncertainty of political agenda setting, which the EU faces every year, for the fact that influence can only effectively be exercised toward the executive branch, meaning the European Commission, while the US has a wider array of venues at disposal.

Baumgarner (2007, p.486) recognizes another difference of the political framework in the functioning of the regulatory process of the two arenas. He outlines that the US lobbying was more “centered on legislative rather than regulatory matters” whereas in the EU the lobbying is centered on regulatory matters, thus lobbying is more focused on the Commission. In conclusion, the EU stronger regulatory focus influences the fact that proposals rarely fail, as opposed to the US, where very few proposals actually get turned into policies. Nevertheless, in the EU there is a need for simultaneous lobbying of several institutions as opposed to a “very different”, more universal US lobbying arena (The Public Affairs Company, 2011). Therefore, it is suggested that the US
Lobbying practices are more unified whereas in Europe they are still very fragmented (Gibson, 2005).

Furthermore, Coen (1999, p.31) acknowledges that the underlying reason for different lobbying styles in the US and the EU is the political activity dependent on the “relative position of the political institutions in Europe and the balance of power among the branches of government in the United States”. Consequently, the fostering of good relationships with government officials seems to have a higher importance in the US than in the EU, according to Mack (2005, p. 344). Lobbyists in Washington are seemingly valued on the basis of who they know, therefore it is not surprising that over the course of their long careers they seem to gather working experience on both sides of the lobbying interaction. The reason for this might be the higher politization factor in the US which makes the EU government officials more easily accessible than the US ones, giving the competitive edge to the strengths of the case rather than the strength of relationships in the EU (Mack, 2005, p.344). Consequently, Coen (1999 p.31) assesses the importance and influence of the US senators much higher than the members of the European Parliament. Constituency politics is strong in the US, meaning the senators are willing to diverge from their parties view for the interest of their voters and their own while in the EU the party loyalty is stronger (Mack, 2005, p.344).

Besides the political and institutional structure, differences also arise from the lobbying regulatory framework. The findings of Mahoney (2007, p.380) show that US advocates have higher rates of formal ad hoc coalitions than the EU. It is suggested that that can be influenced by the lobbying regulatory environment (Mahoney, 2007, p.380), where the EU is less regulated, therefore more prone to loose and informal ad hoc coalitions building. Mack (2005, p.345) reinforces that argument by emphasizing the stronger formal regulation of lobbying in the US as opposed to the EU. Besides, the “democratic deficit” in the European lobbying arena, another factor, “technical nature of governance”, is outlined (Coen, 1999, p.30) as a reason why formations of ad hoc coalitions differ in the EU and the US. Furthermore, in analysing the lobbying regulatory framework, Wessleius (2005, p.15) outlines that lobbyists in Brussels can profit more than their counterparts in US, because of less regulated, thus less transparent lobbying in the EU. Coen (1999, p. 29) also touches upon the issue of less transparency in the EU lobbying arena and therefore identifies that the EU has more informal relationships in lobbying practices than the US.

Furthermore, Barron (2011, p.322) and Coen (1999, p.41) emphasize the national cultural factors of influence, namely uncertainty avoidance, long-term or short-term orientation and individualism or collectivism, as the reason for the EU/US lobbying differences in the choice of managerial action in the wake of corporate political strategizing. Certainly these considerations could provide an explanation for the differences of lobbying activities of the EU and the US. Barron (2011, p.322) assesses the EU as being more uncertainty avoiding, which could explain its tendency to lobby for new regulations, as opposed to the generally uncertainty accepting US companies. More specifically, in comparing the lobbying style, Woll (2006, p.461) presents the US lobbying as much more aggressive and direct than the EU lobbying, due to trust in the relationship of officials and lobbyists. Coen (1999, p.35) reinforces this argument by also characterizing the US lobbying style as quite aggressive and the EU lobbying style as more pacifying with a collective approach.
Concerning the differences arising from the business culture, Petronela (2008, p. 271), emphasized the level of strategic maturity as the main factor of differentiation between the US and the EU lobbying practices and proclaimed the US groups as being stronger than the EU groups (p.268). Consequently, Mack (2005, p.344) draws the attention to the absence of political contributions in the EU lobbying, including monetary or advisory contributions, which seems to be a well-established lobbying tool in the US. Another reason, arising from the business culture, was identified by Coen (1999, p.31) who recognized an increase of grassroots activity in the EU lobbying arena. He claimed that the motives for it differed from the US motives. He argued that the purpose for EU companies is not a greater media exposure, with the increased political support in mind, like in the case of US companies, but rather the increase of credibility in the eyes of the government officials.

In conclusion, it can be argued that up until recently, the comparative research focus was on actors and policy domains through studies on patterns of interest group intermediation around the policy-making process (national interest groups or European Federations) and lobbying styles, while very few studies tried to measure the level of influence interest groups have on the policy process (Woll, 2006) or address the complexity of various venues of policy making (Baumgartner, 2007). More precisely, Mahoney & Baumgartner (2008, p.1254) recognized that the American literature was more focused on researching lobbying styles while the EU literature was more concerned with the underlying political systems. Baumgartner (2007, p.486) criticizes the lack of US lobbying literature focus on policy impact and praises the attention the EU literature has given it. According to Mahoney & Baumgartner (2008, p.1255), even though the EU and US lobbying literature has separately evolved up until the 1990, more recently there seems to be a trend of merging of the two spheres. Mahoney & Baumgartner (2008, p.1270) advocate for the convergence of EU and US literature with the consideration of the inapplicability of concepts from one arena in another, due to the considerable differences between the EU and US political systems functions.

Finally, Woll (2006), who recognizes the fact that different mechanisms and underlying political and institutional frameworks provoke a particular type of behavior, sees a need for further investigating the types of access and participation, lobbyists’ impact, national traditions and policy styles in the EU and US. Similarly, Mack (1997, p.157) states that the way things are done in Washington is certainly the wrong way to go in Brussels, thereby joining the long line of authors who emphasize the need for a comparative study benefitting companies which are debating between establishing its own lobbying office or joining an association.

5.4. Summary

The elaborated findings of the US/EU comparative literature concerning the most common reasons for the differences and how they reflect on each lobbying arena were summarized in Appendix 3. What is worth to be remembered is the existence of 4 general categories of reasons for the US/EU lobbying differences, namely political and institutional framework, lobbying regulatory framework and national and business culture). The most extensive category of political and institutional frameworks, seems to be prevailing as the core underlying reason for the evident US/EU lobbying differences, such as the accessibility and influenciality of government officials, importance and length of government-organization relationships success rates of proposals, party
loyalty etc. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that the differences might also result from cultural aspects, such as the handling of uncertainty or from the lobbying regulatory framework concerning the connection of transparency and profitability of lobbyists, just to mention a few. These reasons and effects will be continuously looked at and referred to throughout the analysis of empirical material.

After seeing the existent US/EU lobbying differences, individual and collective lobbying particularities will be further examined in the next chapter of the literature review.
6. Lobbying for the benefit of companies: individual vs. collective approach

6.1. Lobbying importance for companies

Mack (2005, p. 342) outlines that lobbying needs good knowledge about the external environment, regarding political and regulatory issues as well as about internal environment, hence in depth knowledge of the company’s business. Therefore, any company needs specialists who can develop and realize the strategy, reflecting both, the business objectives, as well as, the political context of the environment. In the next section it will be examined how the external regulatory environment affects business followed by the discussion of how business can affect this external political environment by engaging the experts of the company’s internal environment (thus, managers, companies’ CEOs) in lobbying.

6.1.1. Public policy affects business

Weidenbaum (1980, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.827) emphasizes the importance of lobbying for companies by stating, "public policy is no longer a spectator sport for business". Indeed, Mazey & Richardson (1993, p.14) highlight the urgency of the need for companies "to develop a very sophisticated understanding" of the legislative process.

Various authors illustrate the importance of the external regulatory environment for companies. On the EU side, Mack (2005, p. 341) states that the importance of lobbying arises firstly from the EU’s regulatory power, i.e. 60 per cent of the regulation influencing business in all Member States, comes from Brussels. Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 72) mention that especially in some areas (e.g. trade agreements' negotiation with third countries, issues concerning single market) the EC has a substantial regulatory power. In general, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.825) stress the significant influence the policies have in many areas, directly affecting any business. Therefore, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.826) argues that in many industries companies’ success in public policy field is as important as the success in the market, since the government can "alter the size of markets" or "affect the structure of markets". Accordingly, Bodewyn (1988, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, pp.825, 826) described the government policies to be "critical sources of uncertainty for firms". The fact that numerous public policy issues are created every year, certainly cause the uncertainty and increases the costs for companies (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.826).

Consequently, Baron (1995, Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.826) argues that it is inevitably important for the companies to have political strategies as a part of their company strategy. Yoffie (1988, cited in Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.826) even reasons that the firm's political action should be a priority and viewed as strategic due to its importance for a company's "competitive future". Since a strong interdependence among the companies’ activities and government policy (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 826) exits, it calls for the companies’ attention. In the next section the change company can make to the external regulatory environment will be discussed.
6.1.2. Business affects public policy

In fact, through lobbying a company can affect the government decisions. Companies can use government as a political tool (e.g. for trade protection, regain a market share, hinder rivals' to compete, ensure survival or competitive advantage, create a market opportunity) (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.826). Therefore, Graham (2001) emphasizes the importance of lobbying by the CEOs, thus taking an individual lobbying action, also publicized by Contractor (2007) concerning the importance for the US companies in that sense. Graham (2001, p.24) stressed that many CEO’s do not consider lobbying to be important in their everyday business activity and suggests that CEOs should educate the officials in order to affect the public policy in a stronger manner. Graham (2001, p.26) emphasizes how powerful CEO’s lobbying efforts really are by stating that “at the appropriate time, a well-placed call from a CEO, can provide a meaningful input into important decisions”. Furthermore, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.827) stress companies remaining passive may be endangered by other interests groups proactively shaping the policies for their own benefit. Thus, it enforces the idea that every manager should be aware of lobbying, which is in accordance with the arguments of Mack (1997), Woll (2006) and Thomson et al. (2007).

McGrath (2002, p. 11) argues that the companies are experts in certain issues; therefore the commercial lobbyists state that the clients need to go to see the officials and lobby for themselves. Pijsenburg (1998, cited in Mahoney, 2007, p. 368) supports that position outlining the fact that associations have "intelligence-gathering and information channels" and "forum-related functions"; in this way they enable the group's members to "form issue-specific and ad hoc intra-associational coalitions". Therefore, the lobbyists in both arenas agree that it is the client, who needs to speak with politicians and officials directly. Consequently, this enforces the idea that the manager of the company has to be involved in lobbying.

Many companies are strengthening their lobbying efforts as illustrated by Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.825) and Mack (1997) outlining the launch of international government relations programs. On the US side, McGrath (2002, pp.11, 12) highlight a trend in Washington, where the companies’ CEOs become active and engage in lobbying activities by themselves (the author gives an example of Bill Gates in lobbying for Microsoft). Accordingly, in the EU Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 30) identify that companies become more proactive and turn to lobbying in order to influence the decisions, taken at the EU-level.

Further, companies need to decide on a participation level in lobbying: individual, collective or possibly both? Organizations need to make this decision in defining their political strategy and aligning it to their business strategy, but it is based on numerous factors, which will be elaborated in the next section.

6.2. Factors influencing the individual vs. collective decision

6.2.1. Political and institutional frameworks

Based on the organisational theory and political economy, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p. 828) and Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 72) highlight that decisions on participation levels are affected by institutional differences. Therefore, the importance of political
and institutional frameworks for lobbying is stressed again, this time in taking a choice of political action.

Mahoney (2007, p. 380) emphasizes the institutional design of the operating environment to be critical in the company's decision whether to choose a collective approach or lobby alone. Taking into account that the US is characterized by direct elections while in the EU the officials are appointed, Mahoney (2007, p. 370) suggests that US companies should be forming coalitions because they signal a wider support to policymakers. Other factors, relative to the institutional design differences can influence the decision to ally. Mahoney (2007, p. 371) mentions that in the EU, where there is multi-level governance, ad hoc issue coalitions may be more prevalent at the member state level than in Brussels lobbying arena.

Further, Hillman & Hitt (1999, pp.831, 832) outline that the degree of corporatism/pluralism influence the decision of companies' participation level in lobbying. More corporatist parliamentary systems, similar to the EU at one point, are characterized by a centralized legislative power and emphasis on consensus on policy. Consequently, there are fewer opportunities for lobbyists to influence policy on specific issues in this system. Therefore, in corporatist parliamentary systems lobbying companies participate collectively rather than individually. On the other side, in pluralist parliamentary systems, like the US, companies more likely choose individual approach due to openness for individual lobbyists' pressure on specific issues as the political and economic power is fragmented (due to pluralist structures, institutional procedures). Therefore, companies lobbying on specific issues can gain support due to this fragmentation and diverse views. March & Olsen (1989, cited in Greenwood & Aspinwall, 1998, p. 63) outline that in fact the political institutions predetermine the “preferences of political actors”. In conclusion, depending on the political system, companies prefer different approaches to lobbying. All in all, different institutional frameworks are seen as a reason for companies' different political actions in both lobbying arenas.

6.2.2. Culture

The literature on political activities of firms does not seem to provide sufficient evidence of research on the cultural aspects of company’s political actions (Mack, 2005). However, its influence on company’s political actions is noticed. Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 29) mentions the fact that besides different national institutional patterns, different cultures of the member states create complexity. Furthermore, Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 113) give an example of how historical and cultural traditions influenced German large businesses late involvement in the EU business groups, as their national interest representatives’ associations were strong enough.

Barron (2011) was the pioneer in touching upon this very sensitive and unexplored topic. He recognized a gap in the research field and focused on the human side of the issue in order to stress the strategic aspect of achieving competitive advantage through lobbying and thereby setting the stage for a more in-depth investigation of the effects and moderating factors of national culture on a political action. The reason why managers do choose different participation levels or why internalistic cultures devote more attention to corporate political activity than externalist cultures are just one of the questions associated with the cultural differences.
6.2.3. Issue characteristics

Another factor, influencing the decision to ally or lobby alone is the issue characteristics. Mahoney (2007, p. 381) points out that in the US and the EU, the same issue characteristics influence lobbyists’ decisions to join coalitions or not. Consequently, Hojnacki (1997, p. 62) emphasizes that a strategic choice to lobby collectively or alone has to be done with caution, keeping in mind, first, an issue of interest (whether it is narrow or broad), and secondly, the possibility of becoming a member of an alliance (whether an organisation is active in a policy area, what actions it has taken before). Therefore, if the issue is narrow and the potential alliance members can contribute little, the companies are unlikely eager to lobby collectively. To make this decision, Hojnacki (1997, p. 62) and Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 105) offer to use cost benefit analysis to find out whether joining a coalition can cost more than the benefits it can bring.

Furthermore, Mahoney (2007, pp. 372, 378) outlines other issue specifics playing a role in companies’ decision to choose an individual or collective action; firstly, stating that conflicting issues increase the probability of coalition formation; secondly, notifying that larger-scope issues imply coalition formation too, as these issues are costly due to a need to gain public support. Additionally, Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 123) point out that when the issues to lobby for are sensitive ones, e.g. social policy matters, companies prefer the industry associations representing those issues. Furthermore, Hojnacki (1997, p. 64) stresses that issues having multiple dimensions can cause difficulties in finding a common agreement, if a coalition is formed. Therefore, only on subset of the components of that issue can be agreed in a coalition, thus on the remaining part of the issue companies would need to lobby alone or take no action.

Also, Hillman & Hitt (1999) agree that companies' decision on participation level is influenced by the nature of issues when the company has chosen a transactional approach to lobbying. Hillman & Hitt (1999, p. 832) outline two categories of issues: election issues, which attract much public attention and require large support though collective lobbying, and non-election issues. Mahoney (2007, p. 372) supports this argument outlining that lobbying tactics to deal with these issues can be costly (e.g. advertisements), therefore coalition is attractive as it pools the resources.

6.2.4. Type of organization and opposition

First of all, Mahoneys (2007, p. 377) findings reveal that the EU main political actors are usually the ones representing the whole industry, thus they are already a coalition. This claim is also supported by Woll (2006, p. 463), who outlined the trend of European platform and sectoral peak organisation formation. On the US side, ad hoc coalition formation is the trend (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 79) since the US has smaller specialized interest groups, more eager to align than the EU umbrella organisations.

Moreover, Mahoney (2007) and Hojnacki (1997) generally identify that some types of organizations are more prone to working collectively than others. Hojnacki (1997, p. 76) and Mahoney (2007, p. 381) showed that expressive interest organisations in the US and in the EU is more prone to forming coalitions than others. Furthermore, Hojnacki (1997, p. 76) shows that corporations, representing corporate interests, tend to lobby collectively as well. Whereas, occupational groups are less likely to choose to
lobby in alliance (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 78). All in all, Mahoney (2007), Hojnacki (1997) and Woll (2006) outline the decision to ally or lobby alone being largely dependant on the advocate while Hojnacki (1997, p. 84) does not neglect to specially emphasize the importance of analysing the strength of the opposition in making this decision. Logically, when the opposition is strong, companies would opt for a collective action.

6.2.6. Resources

When adopting a resource-based view, Hillman & Hitt (1999, p.828) classify companies in those with abundant resources and others with poor resources. Hillman & Hitt (1999, pp.831, 832) state that financial and other intangible resources influence the companies’ choice. Companies having fewer financial resources or which don't have knowledge in influencing public policy, opt for a collective representation of their interests, what is in line with Mahoney (2007, p. 372), who considers that coalitions pools the resources. Meanwhile, companies having enough financial resources, hence mostly large companies dominant in the industry or possessing knowledge and experience in influencing public policy are more likely to choose an individual approach. Surprisingly Mahoney’s (2007, p. 380) findings reveal the opposite to what was deemed about the resource-poor companies by Hillman & Hitt (1999). The author suggests an explanation that resource-poor companies would rather use the resources they have to lobby alone and have a possibility for a final decision on the issues rather than join a coalition, which is a too costly option for them. Therefore, there is no clear formula for the correct decision in this case.

In conclusion, based on many authors’ arguments, there are different factors influencing companies’ decision to lobby alone or collectively. The empirical study will be used to find out what factors the practitioners see as the most important when choosing an individual or collective approach to lobbying.

6.3. Choosing an individual approach

As discussed in a previous section, there are various factors influencing company’s decision to lobby alone or collectively. Due to some drawbacks of the collective approach, a company could prefer to engage in lobbying individually, e.g. Jutterstrom (2000, p.19) warns of the possible conflicts between companies within an association (horizontal relations) because of the variety of preferences, often resulting in a parallel action. Further, a company can see a clear advantage of lobbying alone, e.g. in "a crowded environment" with high competition for resources and access to staffers, companies could prefer to lobby alone (especially if they focus on narrow issues) in order to enhance their own reputation, distinguish themselves and create their distinct identity (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 62). Moreover, the success of the lobbying endeavour may depend on the type and characteristics of the company. Wesselius (2005, p. 16) outlines the importance of the power of big players in the lobbying industry stating that big companies prefer to lobby individually.

However, despite the corporate business power in lobbying activities, Gibson (2005) suggests companies to consider a more responsible and transparent approach towards lobbying practice. The article presents the findings from the Standard and Poor's 100 global companies analysis, reflecting their lobbying practice and corporate social responsibility practices. The results show that on the top of the transparency is the UK,
followed by the US and Netherlands (Gibson, 2005, p.1). Further, the article outlines the issue of good reporting, considering lobbying, i.e. whether the reported lobbying activities are supporting the company’s corporate social responsibility and are linked with company’s brand and values. If it is so, these types of companies are called the third generation companies, which possess the competitive advantage, what enables “new market opportunities” (Gibson, 2005, p.3). Therefore, Gibson (2005, p.4) brings in a new perspective of incorporating the corporate social responsibility aspect in lobbying practices, what benefits not only the society, but also from the long-term perspective is of interest for business.

6.4. Choosing a collective approach

Similarly, companies choose to lobby collectively depending on various factors. Wesselius (2005) compares the corporate lobbyists with citizens’ organisations and acknowledges that citizens’ organisations have a greater power if they organise their lobbying efforts well. This is especially evident in the subsequent achievement in the EU lobbying regulatory environment. In 2011, a compulsory European Register of Public representatives (European Commission, 2011) was introduced and this was due to “effective and professional” efforts (Wesselius, 2005, p.17) of citizens’ organizations. Consequently, this example shows that individual lobbying cannot always be sufficient to achieve its objectives. On the other hand, it illustrates the power of a collective action.

There are different forms of collective action. Pijnenburg (1998) and Mahoney (2007) highlight another collective action possibility, as an attractive alternative, for companies, instead of joining an association, and that is choosing to form an ad hoc coalition. Both authors list some benefits of ad hoc coalitions, such as, its flexibility and less formal structure compared to other forms of collective action. Consequently, Pijnenburg (1998, p. 307) suggest it being a good option in the EU lobbying arena, where “agenda-building is unpredictable”, as within ad hoc coalitions it is easier to manoeuvre. On the other hand, authors argue for the disadvantages of ad hoc coalitions, where its strengths may turn into weaknesses, e.g. its flexibility can be a source of instability and fragility since the only tie binding the members is a temporary common interest. Further, a less formal structure can cause problems and conflicts, due to a lack of structure, organisation and management. Finally, considering that the EU lobbying arena, policy-making process can be slow and take much time, it contradicts the temporary nature of ad hoc coalitions, which are established for a short time due to the interest on one issue. Therefore, it is arguable when, in which form and in which political arena a collective approach is better.

Different reasons influence companies’ decision to choose a collective approach. First of all, Mazey & Richardson (1993, p. 23) introduced an important argument, outlining that in the EC besides trustworthy information, lobbyists need to argue "from a European rather than a national perspective", meaning that there is a need for a support from other relevant interest groups in Europe. Consequently, being a part of “European-based interests” coalition can make the company’s position stronger. Secondly, Cram (1995, cited in Pijnenburg, 1998, p. 316) mentions a very important fact that non - EU companies go for a collective action to strengthen their position in the EU policy debate; thus, the US companies seek for alliances with the EU companies. Thirdly, Levy & Newell (2005, p. 216) and Hojnacki (1997, p. 63) outline that credibility and
reputation are very important to gain access to policy process; therefore collective representation can be a key to that.

Many other reasons are in favour of a collective approach such as the possibility to share resources in obtaining policy-oriented goals (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 65); companies sharing the same opinion on the issue may benefit from the collective approach as it enables to share information and skills. Hojnacki (1998, p. 455) adds that in a coalition the resources can be consolidated for a stronger lobbying effort. Whereas, Hula (2001, p.241) and Pijnenburg (1998) outline that other companies join an alliance to gain information. In fact, Coen (1997, cited in Pijnenburg, 1998, p. 318) is a clear illustration how an access to information can be the main driver to stay within an association. The author stresses that regardless the European federations’ membership being costly and not having clear short term effectiveness, companies tend to be active to participate in such federations as they "desire not to be excluded from the club and long-term political games". Other benefits attracting companies to choose a collective approach are: gaining more political contacts, thus a wider range of policymakers can be accessed (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 65; Hula, 2001; Pijnenburg, 1998), having a higher visibility (Hojnacki, 1998, p. 455) and gaining more power. Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1372) statement enforces the latter benefit by outlining that definitely "a larger voice bears greater weight on legislative decision making".

All in all, by providing many reasons for a choice of a collective action, Hojnacki (1998, p. 456) argues for the collective approach as being more effective. However, considering Pijnenburg (1998) criticism, it remains a question whether a collective action is always the best choice.

6.5. Trends in lobbying participation levels

Lobbying importance for companies leads to a strategic choice of participation levels in the activity. There are various factors influencing this companies’ decision. Consequently, various factors influenced the trends observed in the EU and the US lobbying arenas.

Coen (1996, 1997, 1998, cited in Woll, 2006, p. 459) highlights that individual companies were important actors in the EU lobbying arena. However, Hojnacki (1997, p. 64) outlines that a growing number of interest groups and less public resources, US led to a higher interdependence among the companies in the EU & US. Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 63) referred to the emerged “pattern of collective action” in the EU. Likewise, Levy & Newell (2005) highlight that changing institutional pressures in the EU, led to increase in ad hoc coalitions. In fact, Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, p. 125) stresses that at that time a development of ad hoc coalitions (among consumer, environmental organisations and industry) had been detected. Consequently, Woll (2006, p. 459) outlines that previously in the EU lobbying literature there was a focus on private companies and ad hoc coalitions "rather than on traditional interest groups".

However, further change was seen in participation levels in the EU and the US. Levy & Newell (2005, p. 216) and Woll (2006) characterized the EU collective approach as being more usual than in the US. Although, Woll (2006, p.459) does not neglect the importance of single firm representations, the author clearly gives the forefront to collective approach of interests’ representation in the EU. Examining the European
lobbying arena, Hrebenar et al. (2008, p.54) and Jutterstrom (2000) argued for the highest lobbying power of influence laying in the hands of a collective action approach in the form of business associations and trade unions. In fact, Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, pp. 63, 69, 71, 113) call the EU formation a “collaborative European project”, thus it is clear that it aims at further integration of the member state countries, consequently mentioning the trend of transnational businesses combining of efforts. Recently, The Public Affairs Company (2011) raises the awareness about the influence of the EU associations with the EU legislators and advises companies to consider and adopt a more collective approach when it comes to representing their interest. On the US side, a similar trend can be observed. Hula (2001, p.475) mentions that numerous scholars have noticed the increased number of groups working collectively in the US.

All in all, lobbying collectively seems to be a trend in both arenas. Woll (2006, p. 463) outlined the organization of interest representation trends in the EU and the US; on the US side the trend is towards forming ad hoc coalitions, with the possibility of their development into long-standing associations, whereas, on the EU side, the trend is also towards a collective action, where national and peak organizations opt to form European platforms. Therefore, it can be seen as a collective approach within an already prevailing collective participation. However, Pijnenburg (1998, p. 316) outlines and stresses the point, mentioned by other authors, that the EU political system is characterized by "many access points”. With example, the author illustrates that the IT companies lobbied through all the access points. Finally, the Pijnenburg (1998) concludes that the companies are opting for a "multi-pronged approach", using all the possible ways to reach the EU authorities. In fact, Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, pp. 73, 89) state the same by claiming that big companies take multiple strategies in consideration while interest associations use a number of routes. Thus, those already working collectively, still choose whether to work collectively with other associations. Woll (2006, p.462) states that the EU and the US companies often choose both participation levels, individual and collective. Whether, it is still true or as seen from the more recent publications (Hula, 2001; Hrebenar et al., 2008) a collective approach needs to be empirically checked. Therefore, the interviewees from both participation levels, collective and individual will be taken into consideration.

6.6. Summary

Reasons found in the lobbying literature influencing companies’ choice of approach were outlined in this chapter. The main reasons can be put into categories: political and institutional framework, culture, issue characteristics, and characteristics of the company. Appendix 4 summarizes the most important reasons of each mentioned category, and presents the effect on the companies’ choice of individual or collective lobbying approach, such as the nature of government and electoral systems. Therefore, the empirical part of the study will look at those categories of reasons; try to identify which reasons the practitioners deem to be important and what are their effects on the choice of approach.

After presenting the project management perspective to lobbying, defining the lobbying arena and comparing the US and EU lobbying practices, this fourth chapter concerning the comparison of the individual and collective approaches, concludes the literature review. The following chapter will present the material gathered during the empirical research of this study.
7. Empirical material

7.1. EU

7.1.1. Individual view

In examining the views of EU individual lobbying approaches (A1), interviewee 1, identified three pillars of their work in relation to political strategies. He distinguished lobbying, then briefings and speechwriting to their CEO (when he goes to public and political arena), and trying to help their business abroad in terms of foreign business (mediating with embassies, chambers to representatives to enable them to better access certain economies and countries).

On the topic of lobbying practices, interviewee 1 outlined two formats most frequently used; firstly, writing positions papers for modifications to given proposal; secondly, meeting politicians. He reported that meeting the politicians can be done through political parties’ conventions where they have annual conferences in public spaces; or exhibitions with their products where they try to talk to politicians, however outlining it being very costly; or through “one-on-one meetings”. Interviewee 1 pointed out that they assess which practice is the best in targeting needed key politicians, through one-on-one conversations or on public events. He further elaborated on their particular activities included in their collective approach (their practices in associations): writing positions papers, contributing to associations’ positions papers, pushing them when they are not persistent enough, etc.

Regarding the choice of approach, interviewee 1 reported about not so much lobbying individually, but rather through associations due to the fact that they are a small department. On the other hand, interviewee acknowledged their individual lobbying approach as well, through meeting directly with representatives and talking about the challenges their company faces. Further, interviewee 1 debated about the options of opening a representative office in Brussels and hiring a consultancy. He outlined the benefits representative office offers, such as, being “more involved in processes”, knowing the people better, having a possibility to address individual things on their own, but acknowledged it requires a huge investment. However, in the situation where a company does not have enough resources, interviewee 1 expressed “rather hiring a consultancy in Brussels”, what requires less investment and is more efficient than “having an office in Brussels”, due to the nature of needed lobbying in Brussels. Interviewee 1 further outlined the reasons for choosing an individual approach. He stressed that individual companies can have a major impact if they are very important for a certain region and have contacts in that region very close to Commission. Moreover, it was acknowledged that their companies choose individual approach on specific issues (certain standards) on which other chemical companies were not interested (so the associations wouldn’t address that, because it is not relevant to them).

Regarding the forms of collective action, the company choose to approach ministries and representatives via smaller and larger associations. Reason of the choice among larger and smaller associations is explained by the statement “larger are more powerful but it is harder to get their business interest across, because they have to satisfy various positions, whereas the smaller ones are less powerful but in line with what we want”.
Moreover, they also collaborate with others, as mentioned previously on specific issues (not addressed by the associations) they lobby alone or with more selective allies. Further, interviewee 1 outlined the reasons for choosing collective approach. Interviewee 1 gave their own company’s example illustrating that a choice depends on the issue. It was outlined that their company is industrial gases company and energy prices are very important as a competitive factor to them. Interviewee 1 stressed that this kind of issue is true for all chemical industry, thus when chemical industry express something their company is in line with that, so they try to support the whole chemical industry with their resources, membership fees and input. Interviewee 1 outlined that they are happy when the associations speak to legislators on issues the industry shares. Moreover, interviewee 1 listed further reasons of choosing a collective approach. Firstly, it was outlined that in the EU the approach is more collective because of lobbying not having a good reputation. Secondly, many beneficial reasons for choosing a collective approach were presented: “if you do it as an industry you represent more employees, more customers and you can better claim that, maybe you don’t speak for the public interest, but you speak for a larger group of people rather than individual company”, “it is easier to sell by representing the whole industry” as well as “it makes it easier for legislators to sell to their constituency and their party”, “companies tend to organize in associations, because government, politicians are more likely to meet them like that”. In addition, interviewee 1 highlighted that for their company there was not that many associations available and relevant. Choosing a collective approach to their CEO is more for being involved because “it’s important to be part of the game” and also it provides a platform to discuss. However, their company doesn’t do any cost-benefit analysis in terms of memberships fees vs. lobbying output as interviewee 1 outlined that for them “it’s very hard to do it but some companies do it”. All in all, interviewee 1 reported collective approach as being more promising.

Concerning the nature of undertaking, interviewee 1 pointed out that they have “definitely long-term undertaking”. It was mentioned that the main elements they want to influence are: Energy policy and Energy prices (depending on many factors that are politicized), which never go away, thus, it was emphasized being an ongoing long-term process. They set certain milestones, like the revision of legislation, but the issue does not go away so they try to build long term relationships with legislators and ministries. Interviewee 1 pointed out that it can also be a short term relationships, because the political landscape changes very quickly (new people are coming to the government), so they need to keep up building new relationships.

On the subject of type of action, it was reported that their company chooses proactive approach and direct lobby. Referring to the previously mentioned briefings and speechwriting to their CEO, interviewee 1 outlined the point which shows their proactive lobbying type and that they recognize the importance of lobbying; when their CEO goes on panels and gives speeches, he way shapes the public opinion. Interviewee 1 outlined that when they are aware of when their CEO has his appointments, they try to take advantage of it by thinking about the messages they would like him to explain. Interviewee 1 stated “there is no after and before, because certain parts of legislations are renewed and modified every year and if something gets done in 2012, it is a temporary success, because it has to be defended next year that it gets extended”. This argument supported the fact that proactive type of lobbying is relevant to their company as they try to anticipate developments. Therefore, their company is aware of what legislation is relevant to them. Further, interviewee 1 gave a recent example of the
change in energy policy which was a fast, sudden and politicized process triggered by nuclear accident in Japan, they could not anticipate but they had contacts already in place. Consequently, it was outlined that it rarely happens that something comes up and they are not aware of it. Besides, their company proactive style and recognized lobbying importance they lobby directly by directly meeting with representatives and trying to talk to them, shaping the conversation and making them aware of the challenges the company faces.

Concerning the use of standardized tools, interviewee 1 pointed out that their company does not use any special tools. Interviewee 1 commented on possible reasons, outlining that introduction of tools means change of processes, “it is bureaucratic and costs time”, therefore stressing the resistance to change. However, interviewee thought that consultancies think more in terms of projects and see lobbying as a project, whereas interviewee 1 outlined that sometimes companies or people working in a company do not think in a way of a project.

Considering their undertakings alignment with organizational strategy, interviewee 1 proclaimed the choice of approach (collective vs. individual) as a strategic matter which consequently required reassessment of certain formats (practices) used with a higher expenditure, particularly within the individual approach, for the sake of justification of the lobbying undertaking in the eyes of the CEO.

Regarding the perception of the other political arena, interviewee 1 commented on the access to politicians, mentioning that in the US, lobbyists have to be registered, which makes a difference in who can lobby where. Furthermore, interviewee 1 commented on the PAC existence in the US, not in the EU, outlining that PAC is not lobbying, however stressing it as a factor. Further, different political frameworks in both lobbying arenas were underlined as being the main reason of the differences in lobbying. Interviewee 1 stated, “not a different mentality but the political system dictates the best way to approach it”. He elaborated on this point by explaining that the EU has a party system and the EU key contacts are party representatives. Therefore, their company is trying to contact the party organization itself and is trying to win over the party chairman as they have a great amount of power. While in the US it was emphasized that they are more focused on the individual people, trying to win over senior members of a committee. Further, interviewee 1 outlined the culture related aspects relevant to lobbying in the EU, and the US: “after Watergate, America has more awareness of the corruptive aspects of lobbying”; pointing out that for many people (single EU nations), Brussels is far part, hard to touch as people “don’t know what is going on there” and they consider EU lobbying an “insider game”. However, interviewee 1 expressed his opinion that European campaigns are becoming more US-like.

He also commented on the special issues emphasizing that there is much more money in the US politics than the EU politics; and therefore there is more legal corruption in the US due to PAC, as it creates bias and shape dependency. Interviewee 1 explained that in the EU means of influence are not necessarily financial, rather by executing pressure from pressure groups (associations) in terms of political power, support and political opposition, e.g. “when unions can say: we will tell our members not to vote for you”. Lastly, interviewee 1 outlined the matter of the justification of lobbying cost due to lobbying presenting a cost factor for the company. He supported his interest by exemplifying the practical usefulness and need for such further research by stating “if a
new CEO comes to the company and wants to see the numbers, we wouldn’t be able to justify our office existence”. Therefore, lobbying cost benefit analysis could be further researched.

7.1.2. Collective view

Regarding the views of EU collective lobbying approaches (A2), the business scope of the three examined associations greatly diverged. Interviewee 2 defined its business scope as “seeking parliamentary and political support for programs or issues on EU level”. Interviewee 3 focused on the European and the US lobbying arenas, as their goal was to “dismantle the barriers between the EU and US economy, get the freest possible market place”. This organization had members in both political arenas (20 on the European side and 20 on the US side) and was a cross-sector organization. Interviewee 4 reported about being active on even broader level: national, European and international levels concerning the fields of energy, transport and climate change.

Regarding the political strategies all interviewees outlined that they work in coalition with other organizations, thus they used coalition-building strategy. Besides, interviewee 4 reported employing constituency building and advocacy advertising as well. Regarding constituency building, they organized lectures, seminars, workshops and conferences “with the aim to raise the awareness” and gain a wider support. Secondly, interviewee 4 communicated with the media to reach the public and create pressure for policy makers through media.

Regarding lobbying practices, interviewee 2 listed specific steps how they organize their lobbying undertaking. Firstly, they identify all relevant players. Secondly, more deeply analyze their personality, their background, and positions on related matters. Thirdly, they set the goals. Fourth, they set up a sales pitch using the other actor's personality and positions on the main issue. Furthermore, interviewee 2 reported about the organization of lobbying for a new issue, being dependent on the situation. The first element was getting in touch with the right people, by “talking with them on the phone and visiting them, making arrangements and exchanging information”. On the other hand, interviewee 3 did not mention any exact steps, just outlined that when their work is based on projects it includes different stages. Additionally, the interviewee 3 emphasized their function as a coordinator. As a coordinator this association helps their working groups in order to facilitate drafting letters to the Commission, to the US government, to set up meetings with Commissioners’ officials and with the US mission to the EU, while the direct lobbying job is mostly done by their members. Interviewee 3 exemplified two different ways (ad hoc and previously mentioned projects) they do lobbying. Firstly, Ford and Audi successful project example was provided, where interviewee 3 explained that those companies specifically used their organization for this project, because the association has the access to the decision makers. Another example regarding their work based on projects is about several European and American standards setters who came together in Washington. For the first time they had a dialogue and discussed how to set the standards, harmonize the standards for the new technologies. Then interviewee 3 explained that they have to follow up with that and they will do a follow up event in Brussels and another one in Washington. Thirdly, regarding project based work, interviewee 3 reported of having a group that is an innovation working group and that focuses on several projects. Regarding the ad hoc basis, interviewee 3 explained that it happens when, for example, one of their members
comes to them and says “next week there is going to be an endorsement of a certain directive and we need to feed into the process and make the Commission aware or we need to send a letter to make them aware we are not in favor of this Directive for such and such reason”. So when they work on an ad hoc basis, their members provide them with the draft letter and then they send it to their other members, when it gets amended they send it out. Interviewee 3 concluded about the differences between the two ways they do lobbying, outlining that project takes much longer than an ad hoc activity.

Within the two mentioned ways of lobbying, ad hoc and project basis, interviewee 3 agreed that there are different approaches among several members. Therefore, the organization of the lobbying undertakings depended on their members. Interviewee 3 exemplified the case with Ford and Audi as they had a clear incentive and a clear goal and their association helped them to reach a broader stakeholder group; Intellectual Property (IP) issue was mentioned too, outlining that their members came to them with drafted letters and then their association sent a letter providing their members with the access to decision makers. Further, it was outlined that in the last case their members also didn’t want to appear as driving the initiative, thus their members choose to organize their lobbying undertaking, based on the issues. Further, some fragments of the processes were identified in the case of interviewee 3, e.g. planning: “to get together with stakeholders’ group and develop the next steps for this work plan”. Similarly, but more extensively, interviewee 4 reported on the processes they use in their undertakings and those processes are typical PM processes. Interviewee 4 outlined a strategic planning process, applying standard planning procedures, and evaluation process they employ. In addition, it was commented more on the evaluation of their undertakings at the closing phase. Interviewee 4 added that they do review their activities and gave an example when they evaluate “what we do and then what worked well we continue to use, what didn’t work we try to change”. Moreover, interviewee 4 mentioned the process of their activity, namely quality management (when they assess the progress of the activity): “did we do as we said we will do, did it bring desirable results; if we see it doesn’t bring results will we want to change the tactics; so it’s a constant process, we do a lot of this quality management”.

Regarding choice of approach (individual or collective), all interviewees commented very extensively. All outlined using collective approach. Interviewee 2 outlined collaborating with other associations and organizations. Likewise, interviewee 3 commented that they work collectively with other business associations. Interviewee 4 reported choosing a collective approach as well, as they are members of two European Umbrella Associations and they also build ad hoc coalitions with local organizations. Interviewee 2 and interviewee 3 commented on the choices of their members resulting in a conclusion that companies are using both, individual and collective approaches, or according to interviewee 3 even all the ways possible, individual or being a member of several associations, asserted to be the best option.

Regarding the choice of individual approach and its reasons all interviewees did not elaborate enough. They acknowledged or just stated the fact that their members besides collective action take individual action too. Interviewee 2 outlined that the policy makers interacted with both, individuals and collective approach representatives. However, some reasons can be identified from the EU collective side interviews. Looking from the parliamentarian perspective, interviewee 2 emphasized that joint
interest groups sometimes have problems, such as, "they expect that politicians will respond just because they are known to the world and expect cooperation; these are usually non-commercially mindset interest groups who have no industry to protect". Therefore, interviewee 2 outlined that the individual approach can be strong as the company choosing individual approach demands action from a person lobbying for a company, thus the lobbyist needs to be energetic “fighting for your interests”. Moreover, interviewee 4 outlined that individual approach can also be powerful; “there are cases when one company can achieve something”. She gave an example of an organization, which influenced the European Parliament member, who took their idea forward. However, interviewee 4 outlined that individual companies in the EU would have their voice heard only on certain issues; “it’s also more likely that they would happen on the areas that are not extremely politically important, or have financial consequences”. So interviewee 4 commented that the choice of approach “depends on the issue and personal approach”. Further, interviewee 2 outlined other reasons of the choice, namely “depending on the industry and company size”. He suggested, if financially feasible, to have an in-house lobbyist if the industry is heavily influenced by politics or/and if the company is heavily involved with government contracts.

Moreover, all interviewees pointed out reasons influencing the choice of collective approach. Firstly, interviewee 3 outlined that the choice depends on the issues as for some issues companies prefer not to be displayed as having taken an initiative, e.g. their members preferred to lobby using the collective approach in order to promote the letters and get the association brand for Intellectual property (IP) enforcement issue. Further, interviewee 3 pointed out that companies join their association for specific reasons or to benefit from this association’s strengths. It was outlined that one European metals company joined their association to get access to decision makers on the EU and the US sides. Another example, where some their members had more specific interest and had started en e-mobility project, showed the strengths of their association as they could support their members’ initiatives in reaching a broader stakeholders group. Interviewee’s 3 stated, “it is not a narrow topic, it is much broader and includes a wide range of stakeholders”, showing the complexity of the project and needed wide support for it. In the previously mentioned IP initiative example, the strength of being in association was mentioned as well. Jointly signing the letters and sending it to the decision makers was outlined as usual practice. Interviewee 2 and interviewee 4 also outlined collective approach being stronger and having more influence. Further, interviewee 4 added being the members of bigger European Umbrella associations in order to get the sufficient information. It can be concluded in accordance with interviewee 4 that a collective approach has more power in the EU: “together we are stronger, that’s for sure”. This was reflected in all interviewees’ elaborated comments regarding the question of choice of approach.

On the topic of nature of undertaking, there can be seen a temporality element in all organizations’ undertakings. Interviewee 2 outlined, “lobbying on an issue is mainly a temporary element”. Interviewee 3 outlined that they want to present certain case studies again to focus the Government officials on certain projects rather than a long shopping list of items. Interviewee 4 pointed out that they do have projects and campaigns, which are organized in programmes with a long-term vision. Moreover, two interviewees even directly referred to their lobbying undertaking as a project.
With reference to the nature of relationship, all interviewees emphasized long-term relationship with the decision makers. Interviewee 3 particularly stressed a long-term relationship and outlined the benefits of it by stating, “generally, it is obviously helpful to build the network, to really develop relationship with Government Agencies since it makes life much easier when you know who to approach and who to talk to and also to have access to those Government Officials, which does not necessary happen overnight, so it helps of course to have long term relationships and to be in that position”.

Regarding the type of action, interviewee 2 outlined that they usually “go for it directly” by talking with the decision makers. Interviewee’s 3 association contacts the policy makers directly by sending letters, calling the officials and organizing the main EU/US summit and TEC conferences each year to directly reach the policy makers, provide their association members with this opportunity to directly meet the decision makers. Interviewee 4 also reported about indirect lobbying (constituency building and advocacy advertising). Further, all the interviewees seemingly engaged in proactive lobbying. Interviewee 2 and interviewee 4 stressed the importance of their proactive approach in reaching the politicians to gain their support in advance. Interviewee 3 reported about engaging in proactive lobbying by focusing on new technologies, and not trying to regulate and harmonize standards and regulations that are already in place. Moreover, interviewee 3 took a proactive position as they were following the issues in Brussels and informing their members in advance. In addition, their association adapted to any political institutional change, e.g. since the Lisbon Treaty came into force they try to build closer ties with the Parliament. Further, interviewee 3 outlined their members to be proactive too by stating, “they are really active, they have taken an initiative, and they started to draft a road map for e-mobility that includes several steps towards harmonization of standards for this future technology of electric cars”.

Concerning the lobbying success factors, two interviewees commented on this matter. Interviewee 2 identified information sharing and human-social interaction being the success factors. As regards the first one, the need of information to be “full and transparent”, meaning the political actor must be “multisourced and certain of the cause they will be pursuing but cautious about possible leeks of information from third parties”, was stressed. In relation to the second factor, human-social interaction, a need to “come over as confident, reliable and knowledgeable”, was emphasized. Further, the need to be serious but also need to be able to “relax” at the right moments was considered important too. On the other hand, interviewee 3 based her answer of their association successful experience (e-vehicle example) outlining these lobbying success factors: firstly, a bottom up approach (industry starting the initiative), secondly, focusing on the future technology (“which allows for more sort of space to handle regulation in the future”), and finally a broad industry consensus.

Concerning the standardized tools interviewees use, it can be seen the same pattern of all interviewees, who identified the usage of communication tools. Interviewee 2 and 3 categorized all communication utilities as tools used for conversation and information exchange (sending letters, making calls, setting up meetings and following up events). Likewise, interviewee 4 agreed using all kind of possible communication tools to convince the Government, e.g. phone calls, emails, letters, exposing Government’s position in the media. Additionally, interviewee 4 described more specific tools, setting indicators of success with the timeline, they use for the process of their campaign or
project quality management. Consequently, just one of interviewees mentioned tools employed in PM.

Regarding the alignment with organizational strategy, one interviewee (interviewee 4) outlined that they always look in relation what they want to achieve in a long term. Interviewee 3 explained that probably their lobbying undertaking (the success of it) affected their strategy; as the project they were working on at the interview time was the first one when they could really see tangible deliverables.

Concerning the perception of the other political arena, it was emphasized that the US lobbying reaches a larger scale. Interviewee 2 noticed that there are a lot more vacancies for lobbyists (and also publicly labeled as lobbyist) in the US than in Europe. He further added that in Europe lobbyists are mainly disguised as administrative personnel, managing directors, or company specialists, communication specialists, relation managers. Besides, he observed that in the US they have much more junior entry levels than in Europe. Interviewee 3 mentioned the larger scale of US lobbying by stating “Washington is much more sophisticated than Brussels, having bigger offices and more staff”. Furthermore, interviewee 3 and interviewee 4 emphasized the political framework being a source of differences in lobbying in both political arenas. Interviewee 3 stressed the fact that differences between the EU and the US lobbying depend on political and institutional framework. Interviewee 3 gave their example, regarding both the EU and the US, how political and institutional framework influenced their organization of lobbying practices. The political and institutional changes gave more power to the Parliament and the Congress. Therefore their association strengthened their lobbying efforts towards these institutions. Further, interviewee 4 elaborated on differences in access in the EU and the US stating that in the EU organizations have a much easier access to decision makers than in the US. Moreover, interviewee 4 outlined that the decision making process is also different, on EU level and US. All in all, interviewee 4 concluded that culture, political framework, access, decision-making process “brings all those differences in approaches and successes”.

Lastly, interviewee 2 suggested that lobbying done by not funded or low-funded organizations could be further researched. As interviewee 2 mentioned “if issues are interesting<of not funded or a low-funded organization>, a political party will launch the initiative and reach out to them. Politicians will do the direct engagement work that they cannot do due to lack of funds”.

7.2. US

7.2.1. Individual view

In examining the views of US individual lobbying approaches (B1), it can be reported that the scope of business of the three interviewed companies was very broad. Interviewee 5 was a contract lobbyist of a multi-client lobbying consultancy while interview 6 and 7 were corporate lobbyist holding the position of government affairs directors. Interviewee 5 reported of his multi-client lobbying consultancy managing 110 clients from different industries (health care, insurance, transportation, banking, etc.) while interviewee 7 reported that his company also serviced a number of industries, self-regulated through trade associations, by expanding their service offerings from clean-
energy to healthcare; therefore both exhibiting unrelated-diversification. More particularly, interviewee 5 reported about one third of clients being focused on budget work/process and the appropriateness process, meaning how the states spend its tax dollars due to the fact that most of them interact and provide services for the state (universities, colleges, etc). Interviewee 7 also exemplified the specificity of his industries connection with the government and the need for lobbying by stating that they are finding themselves on “both sides of the coin” by using a lot of power, driving a lot of miles and using a lot of fuel, but also developing products that produce clean power. Therefore their areas of concern spread from the natural gas act, tax legislation, labor issues (service legislation), medical field devices and gases etc. Interviewee 6 on the other hand reported of his company solely dealing with the insurance industry, most commonly dealing with liability expansion issues, in other words potential attempts by the plaintive attorneys to expand liability in some area which makes it easier to sue companies, therefore also exhibiting unrelated-diversification. All three interviewees referred to their scope of business taking place at the state level, as opposed to local and federal, at the time of the interview.

When referring to the different political strategies employed by their companies, besides the obvious direct lobbying, criticized by interviewee 6 in terms of scarcity of direct connection to somebody who is running for office, all three interviewees mentioned the practice of coalition building as an effective means of influence. Under the scope of coalition building, interviewee 6 understood the coming together with other companies in the industry to put together a bigger approach than just own company. More particularly, in addition to the classical company to company coalition building, interviewee 6 emphasized the “coming together of the entire business community”, all for the sake of finding people who would be best for office and help the business climate state by state, ultimately making a change. Interviewee 6 exemplified such successful undertakings of states like Texas and Washington during the past few election cycles and emphasized the benefit of the action due to the strict limits for single-company contributions and therefore advocated for the “pulling of resources with other like minded entities” in order to try to make a difference in one state or another. Furthermore, interviewee 7 identified coalition building as an important element of the 4 pillars of government affairs within his company, namely: lobbying, trade associations, PAC contributions and grassroots. PAC contributions were only initiated recently in this clean-energy company and it was picking up steam with a high percentage of employees contributing to it on a voluntary basis. The grassroots initiative had employees write letters, make phone calls, etc. to influence the relevant public opinion with the hope of reaching the legislators.

Concerning lobbying practices employed, keeping in mind the focus of the lobbying efforts of all three interviewees, interviewee 5 named the House and the Senate as well as the State departments (for example, department of agriculture, clinic health, transportation etc.) and the governor’s office as the most common targets of lobbying at the state level. While interviewee 7 reported of their practice of hiring external federal lobbyist for matters outside their scope of reach, interviewee 5 on the other hand praised the convenience of having a Washington DC based office close to the Capitol Hill and reported about the common practice of bringing representatives of entities with the same interest together from outside the city (Washington) or state, so they can jointly work on lobbying undertakings.
When referring to the practices employed in the context of the organization of the lobbying undertaking, interviewee 7 did not identify any structured process attributing it to a more issue-by-issue basis in reviewing where they have employees, which representatives in which districts are responsible for which legislation, and determining if they can leverage, while interviewees 5 and 6 were able to structure their undertakings in a stepwise process, thereby referring to a 5-step and a 3-step process respectively. Interviewee 6 elaborated on the 3 steps of structuring the lobbying undertaking, similarly to interviewee 5, referring to the practice of attempting to foresee the opposing sides undertakings. Firstly, he reported about the need to anticipate “who is going to be with you, and who against you”, in other words, identify a grassroots structure of voters in that district that are already your supporters by having an overview of the past voting history. As opposed to interviewee 5, interviewee 6 did not fail to warn about the need to “confirm that the ones you think are with you, are actually with you”. Secondly, interviewee 6 emphasized the need to take care of the legislators in the middle, or the ones “on the fence” by trying to identify and target key people in their district in terms of stressing why the matter is important to them and to business in that district and how that vote would impact business in that district. Thirdly and lastly, interviewee 6 reported about the step of actually forming a coalition.

Interviewee 5 on the other hand exemplified the practices used in a typical lobbying undertaking, through an example of the Michigan’s auto insurance industry. He stated that the auto insurance companies were pushing the bill, which the multi-client lobbying consultancy was previously aware of, which would limit the amount auto providers were obligated to pay to health care providers for health care claims resulting from auto accidents. A wide array of health care stakeholders (hospitals, doctors, physical therapists etc.) was opposed to that and formed a big coalition. Interviewee 5 reported of approaching the issue in the same manner as all new lobbying undertaking, by going to the Internet and searching lobbyists database to see who represents the opposing company. Interviewee 5 emphasized that this practice of investigating the opposing side was common for both sides in the attempt to foresee what the opposing coalition might look like and referred to it as the first of a longer five steps process used in a typical lobbying undertaking. As a second step, interviewee 5 pointed out the scanning for support in order to anticipate the possible structure of the coalition to be formed. Thirdly, he mentioned the final formation of the coalition, the last step mentioned by interviewee 6. As opposed to interviewee 6, interviewee 5 continued the scope of undertaking when referring to the possible fourth step of bringing in a Public Relations (PR) expert. Interviewee 5 justified his claim by elaborating that this would only take place on a high profile issue due to the oftentimes “parallel fight in the media” in addition to the legislative playground. A PR partner would be handling the media side of lobbying, e.g. working with editorial boards and the papers, developing media packets, setting up a press conference). Lastly, interviewee 5 reported about the final step in the aftermath of the formation of a coalition, namely conducting a threat assessment, e.g. determining who are the opposing sponsors, who is pushing the bill, what is the level of influence and power of the identified person and checking who supports the bill with leadership in each of the different chambers.

When referring to the perception of the choice of approach, namely individual vs. collective, all three interviews made extensive comments referring to the reasons for the choice of each approach, different ways of conducting each approach, their benefits, as well as the implications for the success of the lobbying undertaking. When asked about
which approach is more beneficial for companies, individual or collective, all three interviewees agreed on it depending on the issue. Interviewee 5 concluded that “both approaches have their plusses and minuses” and exemplified that for issues of corporations who want to grow in the state and make a change in the state by making a change in the state law, a far different expenditure than just watching what is going on is required, e.g. hiring an in-house lobbyist, getting council and building a coalition. Interviewee 6 additionally emphasized the fact that the choice has to be affordable; therefore highly dependent on the available resources while interviewee 7 emphasized the dependence on the company’s position toward that issue.

When referring to the reasons for the choice of individual approach, interviewee 6 argued for the adoption of the individual approach when the company’s interest was slightly different from some of their competitors and therefore it could not form a relevant coalition. Interviewee 7 supported that claim by stating that in case an issue is bigger in their own company then in the industry and monitoring and anticipating the environment is done within the company, the single-company’s influence may be enough to make a change. Interviewee 5 reported of the possibility of monitoring and anticipating being conducted by consultancies on behalf of companies, simply to know what’s going on in the state and to “make sure they don’t get hurt by anything”, still representing an individual approach. Moreover, interviewee 7 reported that if as an employer you had a larger percent of constituency, your voice would be heard more. In other words, larger companies had a higher ability to sometimes influence an issue individually, meaning that an employer with a few thousand people in a district automatically had a powerful voice. Another fact that speaks for the power of larger companies in an individual approach was pointed out by interviewee 7, who stated that sheer volume and value of business was of importance because it reflected in tax revenues and tax paid so legislators had to pay attention to those kind of companies. Interview 7 named a further reason for the adoption of an individual approach in terms of direct individual engagement in the states and districts where the single company has more of a footprint, e.g. if the company has representation in a state that has a congressman with influence on a that legislation.

When referring to the drawbacks of the individual approach, interviewee 5 warned of the fact that “having too much power turns off people”, meaning that that kind of influence over a potential elected official, it does not sit well with the voting public. Referring to the contributions companies make to political campaigns, interviewee 6 reported that all contributions have to be reported so it becomes a political issue, essentially meaning, “the market has to decide what the market can bare”. Also, interviewee 6 stated that for any major topic that impacts the entire industry it was virtually impossible for one player to have a significant role without bringing in other key players from that industry and claimed that sometimes “one company simply can’t do it alone”.

When referring to the choice of collective approach, all three interviewees surprisingly reported of frequent adoption of this approach in addition to the individual representation of their interest. Moreover, all reported about employing both approaches in their daily lobbying undertakings.

In stating the different forms a collective approach could adopt, interviewee 6 reported of the most frequent form of collective approach, namely the trade association, a formal
structure composed of different entities in the same industry, which tried to advance a unified position on either, the local, state or federal level. Interviewee 5 reported of many strong ad-hoc coalitions, not only in same industry but representing a business community as a whole, where there is an occurrence of small and large businesses working together. Furthermore interview 6 also pointed out frequent occurrence of ad-hoc coalitions, possibly including NGO-s as well as local governments, formed around a specific issue that impacts a broad base of entities in the attempt to effectuate some change. Interviewee 6 especially emphasized the inclusion of local governments in such formations by exemplifying the case of excessive litigation, where counties and local government entities find themselves sued like other private companies so they join forces in a coalition with general business communities in order to limit the expanse of reach of litigation. Interviewee 5 also referred to a special case of collective approach adoption by mentioning his engagement in helping the American cancer society to lobby for a bill for cancer therapies which his direct client, a Swiss company is also supporting. So, even though the American cancer society is not a client of the consultancy, the consultancy is supporting its lobbying efforts due to the direct interest of the consultancies Swiss client.

When referring to the reasons for the choice of collective approach, interviewee 5 firstly pointed out the most obvious reason and that is that some individual associations were by-default very powerful, because they were big in the community, e.g. the doctors and teachers’ groups etc., and it was highly beneficial to join them. Interviewee 7 advocated for the possibilities of large and small companies leveraging off trade association by making sure they belong to the right one and actively participating while possibly taking positions of influence in trade associations. Secondly, interviewee 7 pointed that being part of trade association does not replace the individual lobbying approach but can do a lot of things in the companied behalf so the company can focus on issues specific to them. E.g. he reported that using trade association reduces the time of action, by stating “instead of doing it for 3 years, you are doing it for 3 months”. Thirdly, referring to the monetary issue, interviewee 6 pointed out another important reason for the choice of collective approach by stating “you cannot do anything by yourself because it is too big a country, too many different players and too many different interests, making it virtually impossible unless you are spending billions of dollars”. Fourthly, Interviewee 6 distinguished between a more direct or indirect collective approach and reported of the choice of collective approach depending on weather an issue is core or peripheral for a company. Issues that impact the company directly and impact their bottom-line required companies to get involved in a direct way, not by themselves but with others in the industry because they would probably feel the same way. Certain legal issues required the companies to get involved somewhat directly, whereas for issues impacting the entire business community, they would not need to get involved directly but rather through the chambers of commerce, lobbying coalition, trade association coalition etc. As a fifth point, all three interviewees reported about a popular reason for the adoption of the collective approach by stating that a lot of times companies, especially which are publicly traded, are very sensitive to having their name associated with actual proposals and therefore rather opt for the collective approach. Interviewee 7 exemplified that situation by stating that if a matter raised emotional reactions of the public, the company would not want to be “the face of the issue” in order to avoid customers associating them with the issues and would therefore rather gather support of trade association. Lastly, interviewee 6 also reported of the power of the collective approach on the legislators by stating that hearing the same message for a
number of players has a stronger meaning because its not just one interest group expressing the concern. Interviewee 6 claimed that the more people expressed their concern, the better, particularly if they were from different industries due to the fact that the legislators understood that their decision would not have an isolated impact. Interviewee 7 added to that argument by stating that “in the end, its all about the votes and about representing your constituencies”. Legislators owed it to the people of the district to keep the district healthy and understand the impact the legislation has on the district.

When questioned about the nature of their lobbying undertaking, all three interviewees reported about the existence of both temporary and long-term views of the lobbying undertaking. Nevertheless, interviewee 5 reported about the adoption of a more temporary perspective, by taking on clients with “issues which make sense, are easy to explain and don’t seem shady” which require a short-term focus for winning the issue itself. Even though interviewee 5 reported of his consultancy having a very low client churn of 10 % and a lot of clients which remained with the company for 10-15 years, he stated that each individual issue of one particular client is viewed as a project while the relationship with the client is fostered in the long term, a claim supported by interviewee 6 and 7 as well, meaning that each year goals of what it needed to be accomplished for each client are set up, making it resemble to a program.

Interviewee 6 similarly reported that, in a company dealing with state issues, interest is high in maintaining close ties with state officials (senators, governors, state attorney generals etc.), but unlike interviewee 5, took on a long-term perspective by reporting of viewing the lobbying endeavor as a “marathon”, meaning rather in the long-run. To support his claim of the long-term perspective, interviewee 6 mentioned 2 parallel activities taking place in the lobbying undertaking, namely political/election activity (prior to the election to office) and government relation/legislative activity (after the election to office). Due to the fact that elections had consequences, interviewee 6 emphasized that it was equally important to “make sure good people are elected in office and once they are, that they do the right thing”. In support of the argument about the long-term nature of the undertaking, interviewee 6 used the example of the differences and competition between states to attract businesses by claiming that Texas and Virginia were the best places in the country to do business, whereas N.Y. and California were not particularly friendly. He reported that the reason for that were the attempts of plaintive lawyers to expand liability, making it more expensive to do business in a number of places by increasing opportunities to sue people. Due to the high importance of the issue for the whole insurance industry, this resulted in constant battles with sectors of trial lawyers everywhere. Therefore, interviewee 6 stated that his company, requiring a constant active involvement in politics wanted to be able to make sure that the business climate, in wherever they operate, was as strong as it can be. Lastly, interviewee 6 and 7 mentioned another important argument in support of the long-term view, and that is the building of lobbying infrastructure for the case of a reactive need. Interviewee 6 warned of the fact that it was needed to build a strong foundation in the long-term, and keep managing that foundation so if an issue arises, the infrastructure is already set up, because otherwise “you cant fight back effectively because the battle is already lost “. Interviewee 7 further emphasized the need to make sure legislators are not met for the first time ever only when an issue arises, by stating “once you are in need to ask them for something, they should have hopefully already
been to your sites, met your employees and become aware that you are a good corporate citizen”, all with the goal of building a relationship based on trust, which required time.

When questioned about the type of action, all three interviewees reported the usage of proactive as well as reactive actions while interviewee 5 highlighted the importance of taking action and getting involved in lobbying by proclaiming “you might not have an interest in politics but politics eventually will have an interest on you”. In further stressing the need for lobbying action, interviewee 6 stated that some legislation might be proposed that would cripple a company’s ability to do business, e.g. favor one company over another. He emphasized the fact that especially heavy regulated industries (financial institutions, oil and gas, energy etc.), had to adopt a proactive action (not just reactive) in dealing with the government to make changes that are beneficial to them. Otherwise they “were going to get killed”. Interviewee 7 supported that claim by stating that it is “impossible to participate in those areas without being involved in government affairs and hearing the voices of Capitol Hill and State Houses”.

While advocating for the proactive action, interviewee 5 pointed out that the choice of action depended on the issue at hand, thereby highlighting that it is possible to anticipate most issues which are in the legislative environment (in the House or Senate) by being involved in the work of associations or just by talking with people all the time. Interviewee 5 stressed the ability of the multi-client consultancy to get a head start on an issue and work on a coalition even before the proposal is even introduced. In terms of particular proactive actions, interviewee 5 stressed the conversations with legislators about how damaging a proposal could be so that once it got introduced they would be able to get back to the legislators and refer to their previous warnings. Interviewee 7 on the other hand proposed another option by reporting about his company’s efforts to raise the awareness of the representatives about them in all their places of operations in terms of who they are, what they do and what position they hold. He emphasized the benefit of such a proactive action, by stating that this action could result in legislators possibly calling the company to ask for their view on a particular matter. Interviewee 6 elaborated on the matter more extensively and further exemplified a proactive action of the insurance industry by pointing out the attempts of plaintive lawyers to try to expand liability to make it more expensive to do business in a number of places, by increasing opportunities to sue people. Since, according to interviewee 6, any specific insurance related legislation was cared a lot about in their industry, the company was always on the lookout for legislation that could limit their ability to do business in a certain state. Interviewee 6 commented to not being able to know everything before a legislative session begins, but he emphasized that based on the intelligence on the ground you could have a pretty good idea of what to expect that year. Due to his wide experience of managing lobbyist around the country as well as being a member of associations in the whole country, he was able to stay current about what is happening in the region, and considered himself to be very well informed on what is going on his states. Nevertheless, he outlined that no matter how well-read you were and how much effort you put in monitoring the developments in a certain region, there was no substitute in being on the ground and having relationships in that state capital. Therefore, interviewee 6 reported about not only staying closely connected to his lobbyists and trade groups, but also keeping close to competitors by exchanging notes on what is happening in places, all with the aim to try and figure out what to expect. In terms of further particular proactive actions, interviewee 6 stressed the action of coming together
of business communities for the sake of discussion about upcoming races and agreements about which races to support. Also, he stressed the benefit of developing and constantly updating a database/grassroots list, which would make it easier to identify supporters in that district that you can call on in case of a “key vote” to express views to the legislators. Interviewee 6 concluded that it was most important to be proactive and gather the necessary intelligence, and stated that “you don’t want to be surprised, it’s the worst thing in the world”.

Even though interviewee 7 outlined to the actions of his energy company previously being entirely reactive, all 3 interviewees in this group did not overly engage in elaborations about the reactive actions. Interviewee 5 and 7 stated that most of the time they were aware of what is coming, and were therefore able to prepare beforehand. Only interviewee 6 engaged more in the discussion about reactive actions by stating that even though there were very few surprises, in case of their occurrence, it was crucial to react quickly and develop a strategy about dealing with it quickly. Therefore, interviewee 6 emphasized the importance of building up lobbying infrastructure that makes it easier to react in these situations. He also exemplified the case of unbenevolent bills being passed after all by the legislator, in which case, they considered influencing the governor to veto the bill. In case that did not work, they would just need to find a way to deal with the newly arisen situation.

In terms of the conducting the most successful lobbying undertaking, all interviewees agreed on the need to adopt both individual and collective lobbying approaches. Due to the specificity of the political environment changing on average every 6 years in the State of Michigan, interviewee 5 claims to have seen enough turnover to be able to conclude that legislators are a lot more responsive to keeping on their district. Therefore, he reported about frequently questioning his clients about “who they have in that district who know those representatives”, because he could “literally talk until blue in face” without any effect, due to the fact that representatives and senators respond best to hearing the arguments directly from their district. Interviewee 6 supported that claim by stating that the most effective way to lobby was localizing the contact as much as possible, or in other words, having someone come in from the legislator’s district that also preferably knows the legislator, to engage in a truthful and fact-based reasoning by emphasizing the direct impact on the legislator’s district. He therefore concluded that there is no good substitute for the personal contact, by stating “the more personal and local you can make an issue to the legislator, the more effective the lobbying can be”.

When questioned about the standardized tools used for the lobbying undertaking, all interviewees had troubles naming particular tools specific for their lobbying undertaking and mostly referred to different means of communication. More specifically, interviewee 5 named conference calls and Skype calls as most common tools, which aided his communication. Interviewee 6 added social media technology to the list by recognizing its importance in modern public affairs campaigns as means of reaching constituents. He reported that social media allowed the company to “cast he net further than you could before” to identify who your constituents might be. Interviewee reported of the usage of the online legislation trackers, which automatically notified the subscriber in case of some change happened, as well as the use of Excel for the purposes of planning the lobbying undertaking. In terms of a proactive type of action, interviewee 7 also reported about the usage of promotion material in the form of a “singe sheet of paper”, one side describing who the company is in general and in that
state and the other side showing different locations the company was at, with the purpose of making a point with the legislators by saying “this is why our opinion should be important to you”. Furthermore, interviewee 7 reported of being in the process of developing more sophisticated tools, which would aid the lobbying undertaking in terms of “ways of tracking what has been and how it has been done”. The proposed holistic database consisted of the following: (1) a map of the companies footprint, including location of facilities and employees, (2) map of representatives including information on what they represent and what cities they are on, and (3) history schedule of who company met with, what they talked about, how they contacted them, etc. Interviewee 7 argued for the benefits of such a database being the unification and availability of information making it easier and quicker to act in a lobbying undertaking. Even though, interviewee 7 outlined not having tools for weighting the “issues of value and impact” on the company, meaning no algorithm that would allow for objectively digesting information with a final answer, he reported about the development of yet another sophisticated tool that would help with the weighting and time allocation of different issue. He justified the need for it by stating “since employees have given their own money to a PAC, they want to make sure their interests are rightfully represented”. Nevertheless, interviewee 6 concluded that, in the wake of new communication technologies upraise and the development of more sophisticated lobbying tools, personal contact still remained the most effective lobbying tool.

When questioned about the alignment of the lobbying undertaking with the organizational strategy interviewee 6 and 7 reported about similar actions supporting the revision of organizational strategy dependent on the outcome of the lobbying undertaking, while interviewee 5 conducted these activities by default due to the nature of the consultancy. More specifically, interviewee 6 reported about the role of the compliance department in dealing with the implementations of a legislation and assessment of its internal impact. He argued for the need of reassessing the strategy of company every step of the way, which might influence the company’s position on a certain issue, e.g. going from neutral to opposing. Furthermore, interviewee 7 reported about the intentions of broadening the responsibilities of the issue management committee, who determined the allocation of the PAC contributions, in taking on the role of Board of Directors of government affairs activities. This encompassed quarterly meetings in which most important issues were prioritized in a form of a discussion. Such attempts to align the strategy of the lobbying undertaking with the organizational strategy, in the opinion of interviewee 7, aided in providing an answer to the leadership team about the return on the lobbying investment.

Even though all three interviewees outlined not having sufficient insight into the lobbying practices of the EU arena, all three reflected on certain matters they deemed to be important in trying to make a distinction between these two political arenas. More particularly, interviewee 5 reported about having some European clients (4 from Switzerland, 5 from London), but dealing with their focus which is US based, more than European based, therefore excusing his limited insight. Nevertheless he reported of being aware of fewer restrictions in EU lobbying as opposed to the US. He supported that claim by stating that in some states “you can’t even take legislators to dinner or coffee”. In identifying another reason for the difference, interviewee 5 recognized the fault of the institutional framework for the quickly changing EU regulatory environment as opposed to the slow US one. He supported the claim by stating that he “can’t tell the last time that there had been changes to the Disclosure act; it hadn’t happened in the 18
years that I have been involved”. Even though, interviewee 6 also outlined, “not being very versed in the lobbying practices of the EU”, he reported about the legal profession in US being a little more predatory than in other countries making a distinctions between the level of sophistication of the lobbying activity in Brussels and London, as opposed to other European capitals. Furthermore, interviewee 6 assumed that there was not as much grassroots involvement in the EU as in the US and therefore more direct contact between the voters in the US than in the EU, thereby hinting the more individualistic nature of US lobbying. Consequently, he warned that the more isolated elected officials get from voting public, the less the trust there is”. Interviewee 6 also recognized another important reason for the EU/US political culture difference, and that is the political activity. He reported that the EU political campaigns were not funded by the state, as was the case in the EU and supported his claim by stating that “in Spain the position gets more money for TV adds than the opposition”. He referred to this possibility of “build in advantages” as an “atrocity”, in the eyes of the US. He argued for an important part of the US political dialogue being the belief in the “free market and the marketplace of ideas” in order to run campaigns and described the US political system as having a more “market based approach” as opposed to the EU, which ensured “direct accountability, which is paramount in the way US does politics”. Interviewee 7 supported that claim by stating that the greatest reason for the difference in EU/US lobbying practices might in fact be the fact that the “laws are different” which influences the EU ability to lobby, e.g. in particular, no opportunity to form a PAC and make political contributions. Interviewee 7 reported that even though PACs solely are “not sufficient to change somebody mind”, in the US they achieve the effect of “putting the company on the radar” projecting a picture of a engaged and opinionated company whose employees pay attention and care about their livelihood and their industry. Interviewee defends the US ability to form PAC contributions by stating that “votes are much more powerful than the money” but nevertheless recognized the negative conception PAC’s have in the EU who certainly engages differently.

In terms of suggesting particular issues that could be researched in the future, interviewee 7 expressed his interest in the issue of determining the return on investments for lobbying undertakings, thereby looking for its justification. He exemplified the issue by stating, “it’s like insurance; you have it and you might not need it, or one day you might need it and then you are glad you had it”. He was interested in the possibly of developing a tool, to be able to tell, “had we not done this, we might have not been successful”. Lastly, interviewee 7 also gave a recommendation concerning the comparison of EU/US lobbying practices of “larger players in a smaller country vs. smaller players in a larger country”. The reason for this was his hope to leverage the good relationship between EU and US because he recognized a need to collaborate more on “shared interest”.

7.2.2. Collective view

Regarding the views of EU collective lobbying approaches (B2), in terms of scope of business, interviewee 8, as the representative of an association comprised of private sector companies in the commodities and financial services market, reported that indeed the annual fees of its members financed the lobbying association. More specifically, interviewee 8 reported about the existence of two bigger categories of members, namely commodities exchanges and end-users that trade on the exchanges (agriculture, energy sectors, etc.), as well as two smaller categories of members, namely large banks who
have commodity trading desks and proprietary trading funds, therefore exhibiting unrelated diversification. Furthermore, interviewee 8 reported that the majority of their members were US based, but also emphasized that they were in the process of expanding internationally.

When referring to political strategies employed in the association, interviewee 8 reported that the association employed two paths for the realization of their goals, firstly, advocating for policies in favor of its members with the government authorities, and secondly, aligning with other trade associations to forward their message to the media.

More particularly, when referring to lobbying practices, interviewee 8 stated that 90-95% of their time, at the time of the interview, was devoted to a massive issue they were working on, at the time of the interview, namely the commodities derivatives’ regulations. In terms of the targets of their lobbying undertakings, interviewee 8 reported about it being the government authorities, e.g. the legislators, regulators and executive branch. He reported about oftentimes involving their companies’ representatives in the lobbying undertaking, because they found that the regulators were highly responsive to that approach.

In terms of organization of the lobbying undertaking, interviewee 8 reported that the organization differed depending on the three avenues of lobbying issues identification (generated by government, members or media) as well as if its concerning the regulatory or legislative level. Exemplifying the government response on the regulatory level, interviewee 8 reported that, on request of the governmental asking for their opinion, firstly the association usually issued a comment letter on a certain proposal stating their opposition or agreement and the underlying reasons for the opinion. Secondly, the association tried to set up the meetings with regulators to further explain what are the issues they discussed in the letter. These meeting frequently involved companies’ representatives, because in their opinion “regulators want to listen not only to association staff, but most directly the company representatives who are impacted by the rule”. When exemplifying the governmental response on the legislative level, interviewee 8 reported about visiting legislators on “Capitol Hill” while they are discussing a Bill before it actually becomes an act of law and they try to influence them by exhibiting what would be most beneficial for the industry. He concluded that it is a very complicated process by stating, “sometimes they agree with us, sometimes not, sometimes a few agree, and others disagree”.

When questioned about his choice of approach, interviewee 8 reported that the decision on which approach to take is a strategic decision depended on the particular lobbying issue. He claimed that proceeded both individually and jointly, by aligning with other trade organizations that share the same views on that particular subject. When referring to the variety of reasons influencing that decision, he mentioned the issue, size of company, industry, the political wins in favor or against that issue, the importance of the issue to a company, a public opinion, how the media is feeding that issue, how the other companies in the industry are impacted or not impacted by the issue etc. He concluded by stating “it really depends from issue to issue as whether it is better for company to lobby directly or via an association, or do both”
When referring to the individual approach, interviewee 8 saw the reason for it in case issues are very parochial and very important only to one or two companies in the industry, in which case he justified companies directly lobbying on their matter of interest. He pointed out the drawback of the individual approach in terms of possibly becoming very unpopular with the regulator or the legislator if they lobby directly on a certain issue, but stated that if the issue is “such a life changer for the business”, companies should take that risk and “go out and do everything they can to lobby on it”.

When referring to the collective approach, interviewee 8 firstly pointed out the most obvious reason for such approach and that is if the issue was important to a broader industry as a whole in which case lobbying was done by trade association but also possibly included single companies lobbying, as a joint effort. Secondly, he pointed out that companies oftentimes did not want to present a direct face to the regulator or legislator because they were concerned that a regulator or legislators would look at them unfavorably or unkindly and could possibly prorogate a rule that would be extremely unfavorable to the company. In that case, he reported that the company may hide behind the trade association, and tell the association “you go and lobby for our behalf on this issue”. In terms of not only that there is also another choice that SMEs or large companies have to make: sometimes there is more than one association involved in the industry. Lastly, he pointed out that the choice of collective approach implied another subsequent choice and that is which of the relevant association a company should be a part of or should it be a part of all, thereby stating that “there are multiple choices that companies have to make”.

When referring to the nature of lobbying undertaking and relationship, interviewee 8 advocated for a more long-term perspective by reporting about their “hands on approach”, constant monitoring of the situation, as well as fostering of long-term relationships with the government due to the awareness of the political aspects of lobbying.

When referring to the type of action adopted in their lobbying undertaking, interviewee 8 stated that it was dependent on weather the issue was generated by the government, their member or the media. When referring to the proactive action, he stated that they are firstly, generated by the members, stating that “members decided that there is an issue in the future which is very important to them, so they want to lobby in advance to make sure that they preempt some kind of threat to their business”. Secondly, he stated that they are also generated by the media and reported that the association monitored domestic and international issues because “regulatory, government, industry communities feel the need of keeping an eye on what is going on outside US as well”, in order to keep their members informed.

When referring to the reactive action, interviewee 8 reported about it being generated by the government in terms of responding to happenings in the regulatory branch or legislative branch, by stating, “we react in case financial or commodities regulators come up with a proposal or somebody from Capitol Hill tries to pass a bill that could impact our association”. More specifically, by exemplifying the response on the regulatory level, interviewee 8 reported that regulators usually issued the proposal they wanted to regulate within the derivatives markets and then asked interested members of the public to comment on their proposal. He stated that after this process there usually was some kind of a final rule issued by the regulator which required the association to
employ its judgment in deciding “is it really the end of the matter” and they were not able to lobby any further on that issue or they were to leave that issue whether they agree on it or not “because the issue is to entrenched in the minds of the legislators or regulators and we cannot make too much of a difference because public opinion is strongly in favor or strongly against”, or as the last option, in case there seemed to be some “wiggle room”, they were able to take the action over to the legislative branch to see if they could have any input. Finally, interviewee 8 reported that most of the times the answer is negative because of the way the system is designed, stating, “once there is a final rule there is very little that anybody can do”.

Referring to the success of lobbying undertaking, interviewee 8 pointed out that is was necessary to apply both choices of approach and thereby keeping in mind the political aspects of lobbying, because “the legislators are elected officials and they have political reasons for either agreeing or disagreeing with you in addition to substantive policy reasons”. Therefore, he suggested getting involved in those aspects as well or at least taking them into consideration. Lastly, he identified that bringing companies representatives along in lobbying undertakings due to the fact that legislators did not want to only listen to association staff, but most directly to the company representatives who are impacted by the rule, increased their chances of success.

In terms of tools used in the lobbying undertaking, interviewee 8 did not report of any particular tools used besides the usual means of communication, mostly referring to written means, e.g. informal comment letter, letters of support or letter of opposition and face to face meetings with regulators and legislators to communicate their perspective.

When referring to the alignment with organizational strategy, interviewee reported of the strategic nature of decision about the choice of approach and the most effective employment of resources for a lobbying undertaking, therewith justifying situation when they are forced to “drop issues even though it’s an important issue for us but we have little scope of influencing”

Commenting on the lobbying practices of the EU lobbying arena, interviewee 8 assumed that lobbying in US is still a little more sophisticated than it is in the EU by stating, “in the EU it is less transactional and more done over a glass of wine, maybe while in the US that would be quite unthinkable”. Due to the fact that as of now there were no official lobbying registries in the EU, he assumed that “in the EU things are much more informal”. He reported that there were no official rules/restictions in the EU as opposed to “extremely tight rules in the US”, by providing an US example and stating “you cannot take a member of an administration, an executive branch staffer or staffer from Congress to lunch if the meal costs more than 10-20$ nor give them gifts of any kind” rules. As another difference, interviewee 8 identified the “overall prescription framework” and sated that the European Parliament went to a much greater detail and left the EC and the European banking authority “limited room for maneuver”, whereas the US Congress, even though it had to pass the act to the president, left the act on the higher level of abstraction making the regulators responsible for bringing down that law in the implementation. In terms of similarities, he pointed out that in the US, as well as in the EU, the regulatory process seems to resemble in terms of the rules being handed out by the regulators, but then again, more often than not the legislators direct the regulators who hand out the rules.
8. Comparative analysis

It was stated that the same number of interviewees was contacted for each researched group. The result of the majority of affirmative responses coming from the EU collective side (3:1) and US individual side (3:1), is indicative of the tendency of the EU lobbying arena to use collective means of influence rather than individual means, as opposed to a more mature and sophisticated US lobbying arena which obviously seems to find a higher need for individual action. This finding might also be relating to a number of realized differences in terms of the political and institutional frameworks, cultural, maturity and monetary value of arena, project characteristics of lobbying undertakings etc. The arguments in support of these assumptions are further elaborated in first two steps of comparison, firstly by taking a closer look at the individual EU and US perspectives and secondly the collective EU and US perspective, followed by the third and fourth step in terms of comparing the individual vs. collective views in their respective lobbying arenas. Every step is conducted by taking on a project management perspective in terms of linking the characteristics of the different lobbying styles and practices of the researched groups with project management related processes.

8.1. EU / US comparison

8.1.1. EU individual vs. US individual perspective

In the first step of this comparative analysis, the individual EU (group A1) and individual US (group B1) perspectives were compared referring to the determined and described thematic areas. Commencing with the business scope, it can be stated that the EU individual representative (A1) exhibited related-diversification characteristics being involved in the fairly small industrial gases sector while the US individual representatives (B1) exhibited more unrelated-diversification characteristics being present in a number of different sectors. The US representatives (B1) directed the scope of their activities to the state level while the EU representative (A1) to the national level, therefore both the EU and US had similar scope of reach, thereby ensuring the practices are more comparable.

The level of diversification reflected on the choice of political strategies, for which can be stated that the EU side (A1) employed direct lobbying and indirect lobbying in terms of raising the awareness about the business through the public appearances of the CEO, joining lobbying associations and lastly aiding in achieving easier access to foreign markets. The US side (B1) similarly reported about also employing direct lobbying techniques and indirect lobbying, but in terms of grassroots initiatives, as well as industry coalition building (trade association etc.) and business community coalition building and lastly PAC contributions. It can therefore be stated that the strategies employed by US and EU companies exhibit strong similarities with the exception of the usage of PAC contributions which is a very important element of the US political culture, but inexistent in the EU lobbying arena due to the publicly funded political campaigns.
When looking at more particular lobbying practices, the EU side (A1) exhibited two formats of practices, firstly, writing positions papers individually and as members of association and secondly, meeting politicians either one on one or on political parties conventions and exhibitions, which tend to be very costly. The US side (B1) demonstrated practices of identifying grassroots structure of supporters and opposition with the objective of forming a coalition, followed by actions exhibiting indirect lobbying characteristics by conducting grassroots movements and threat assessment. It can be concluded that the US side (B1) demonstrates more awareness of the strategic political aspects of lobbying within their practices, whereas the EU (A1) remained concentrated on the cost/benefit of their practices, which can be traced back to the fact that there is just simply more money involved in the more mature US lobbying arena while the EU lobbying is still quite young and unsophisticated.

It was observed that both the US and EU individual representatives are one way or another concerned with the affordability of the association annual fees as opposed to the wages of the internal government relations offices due to the natural corporate restrictions and issue of return on investment. While the EU company (A1) reported being more inclined toward a collective approach, the US companies (B1) reported of equally adopting both depending on issue. This finding could be explained by the more vast US lobbying experience and availability of corporate resources for the lobbying undertakings in the wake of the awareness of the political aspects of lobbying.

Both sides outlined opting for an individual approach in case the issue is specific only to the company and does not have support from other industry players but also raised the issue of the possible tensions within the large powerful association concerning prioritization of issues, which speak for the simplicity of the individual approach. Furthermore, concerning the issues on the federal level/union level, they were not primarily concerned with, both the US and EU companies advocated for the option of hiring a lobbying consultancy on that level rather than bearing the cost of opening an capitol based office, even tough the US side (B1) was more inclined towards taking up that cost, which once again comes to prove their individualistic tendency, their concern of not always wanting to be the face of the issue, and their political culture.

On the other hand, the EU companies (A1) advocated for the collective choice if the issue is of interest for the whole industry. Unlike the US companies, the EU company expressed their concern about the appropriate choice between smaller and larger association in terms of the power and the equal rightful representation of interest amongst their members. The reason for the choice of collective action and for this concern is indeed outlined by the EU company (A1) themselves and that is that lobbying in the EU does not have a very good reputation and therefore it is logical to opt for collective approaches within esteemed associations with a good reputation in the industry making it more likely for politicians to meet with them. Both arenas agreed on the power of influence of the collective approach being higher and the possibility of leveraging of the membership therefore considering the choice of collective approach as a strategic one, even though both raised some concerns about the cost of lobbying, as well as resource allocation in terms of time constraints, following the objective of effectuating change.

Referring to the nature of undertaking, the EU individual representative (A1) as well as the US corporate representatives (B1) described it as long-term, which from the EU side
can be justified by the fast-tracking EU regulatory framework requiring annual amendments to a specific issue and from the US side by their increased awareness of the constant US political parallel-tract required for successful lobbying undertakings. The only exception to the rule is the US consultancy exhibiting a more temporary nature, which can be justified by its organizational structure. Nevertheless, both arenas claimed to be fostering long-term relationships with the government officials, but the fact is that due to the fast changing EU political landscape, the relationships are bound to be shorter than in the US, simply because the EU regulators and legislators change much faster than in the US.

Both arenas also exhibited striking similarities in terms of strongly advocating for the proactive action but also some differences when it comes to the means of achieving the goal. E.g. the US representatives (B1) reported about the usage of grassroots movements to influence and shape the public opinion, while the EU (A1) reported of using the public appearances of the CEO for the same reason. Also, while the US is in a way obliged to adopt this type of action due to legislations being modified every year, therefore requiring constantly proactive action, the pluralist US business society chooses to do so to have a head start on their competitors and possible achieving competitive advantage. When referring to reactive actions, on the other hand, both arenas emphasized the need for building the lobbying infrastructure beforehand so that in the unlikely case of surprise they can be prepared to act fast. The only distinction that can be made is that the EU did not recognize the option of following up on a passed Bill, while the US considered it to be well in their rights of action even if it means getting a governor to veto a bill if it is crucial for their business, therefore not shying away from any expenses. The reason for this distinction of practice could be the US mindset of the “free marketplace” arising from the highly sophisticated US political culture with a long lobbying tradition.

The EU and US companies agreed on the importance and effects of timely lobbying infrastructure building and personalization as well as localization of contact with representatives for the success of lobbying undertaking. Nevertheless, the EU did not exhibit awareness about the importance of the political aspect of lobbying, which was highly emphasized by the US companies (B1) in addition to truthful and fact-based representation. This distinction might be due to the lack of strategic approach to the lobbying undertaking in the wake of a young and fairly unregulated EU lobbying arena but also due to the nature of the EU political framework which allows for publicly funded political campaigns, e.g. the absence of PACs.

Concerning the use of tools for aiding in the successful lobbying undertaking, both arenas demonstrated the usage of communication tools while the US companies (B1) showed more openness to acceptance of new technological advancements and sophisticated tools which can aid their lobbying undertaking while the EU (A1) exhibited resistance to change and concern about the length and costliness of implementation of new tools. The reason for this distinction might once again lie in the level of sophistication of the US lobbying arena which is even in the terms of communication might more advanced than the EU which remains true to personalized communication at this point and the resource allocation for lobbying activities which seem to be higher in the US.
The resource allocation is directly connected to the alignment of the lobbying undertaking with the organizational strategy. It can be stated that both the US and EU arena claimed to view the lobbying undertaking in a strategic manner not making it overly dependent on the cost/benefit perception. Nevertheless, it was observed that the EU (A1) was still slightly more concerned with the justification of the lobbying undertaking in the eyes of the CEO by exhibiting reassessment of the benefit of some costly practices used, while the US (B1) tired to forth come the reassessment of the practice in the aftermath of an action by conducting issue prioritization preceding to an action.

Concerning the perception of the individual representatives about the lobbying practices of the other arena, it can be concluded that both sides exhibited awareness of the other lobbying arena proving that this comparison is deemed relevant in the wake of the globalization. Besides the obvious longer US lobbying tradition, stronger US restrictions, higher level of US sophistication and the US transactional nature, the EU and US companies attributed the differences in lobbying undertakings mainly to diverging political frameworks, particularly the non existence of PAC contributions in the EU, deemed as a platform for corruption by the EU interviewee, providing an explanation as to why the power of influence does not lie in monetary means in the EU, but rather in execution of political pressure from various pressure groups. The reason for this distinction might also be the fact that much more money is involved in the US lobbying arena due to the size of their economy and privately funded campaigns.

8.1.2. EU collective vs. US collective perspective

In the second step of this comparative analysis, the EU collective (group A2) and the US collective (group B2) perspectives were compared referring to the determined and described thematic areas. Commencing with the business scope, it was observed that both groups represented unrelated diversification; hence they were present in various sectors. Therefore the political strategies of both EU and US collective sides included coalition building (the EU side outlined cooperating on national, European and International levels), and advocacy advertising (indirect lobbying strategy).

Since both groups targeted regulatory and legislative bodies, i.e. the EU on national and European levels due to the European Union affecting businesses in its member states and the US on state and federal levels, they reported about directly involving their members in lobbying undertakings due to politicians being highly responsive to companies’ representatives. In fact, The EU side (A2) reported having more facilitator/coordinator functions in lobbying undertakings. Further, The EU representatives organized their lobbying undertakings on an ad hoc basis or as projects, thus viewing the undertaking through the short-term lenses. It was observed that the US side (B2) employed a long-term view regarding their undertakings. The EU representatives specifically identified the steps and commented on the processes they employed in organizing their activities, whereas, group A1 narrated more how they execute lobbying undertakings, depending on the venues. Consequently, it could be observed that the EU side (A2) structured their undertakings more similarly to PM processes. General particular lobbying practices were similar in both groups, e.g. writing letters, setting up the meetings with decision makers.
Regarding their general choice of approach, both groups reported lobbying in both individual and collective ways while using as many vehicles as possible, thus, also choosing lobbying collectively within several associations. The EU representatives emphasized the collective approach as more influential in the EU, thus seeing Europe as more collaborative than individualistic. On the other side, the US side (B2) added that the individual approach can be chosen on specific issues or “life changing” issues even if company can become unpopular lobbying on that. On the other hand, the US representatives outlined that the collective approach is chosen on issues relevant to the number of companies in the industry. The EU representatives also outlined dependence on the issue, size of the company and specificity of industry, as the reasons influencing the choice. The US side (B2) commented more extensively on the factor “dependence on the issue” outlining the preferred choice of collective approach if there is a wish to “hide your face”, the issue is of high importance and influence, public and media opinion is needed and it impacts other companies in the industry. Although both sides emphasized choice dependence on the issue, it can be seen that the US representatives really stressed this factor. Probably, due to possible bias of collective representatives of the EU side (A2) or acknowledged prevalent collective approach in the EU, reasons influencing individual choice were less discussed by the EU side. On the other hand, due to this acknowledged prevalence of collaborative approach in the EU, the EU representatives representing the EU outlined the benefits of choosing a collective action. Thus, the EU side (A2) stressed collaborative approach being stronger, giving access to politicians and broader stakeholder group.

Consequently, these reasons provided an insight into different political frameworks on both sides, which might have affected the nature of lobbying undertaking. Groups perceived the undertakings differently. The US side (B2) stressed a long-term perspective. Opposed to that, the EU side (A2) exhibited a stronger temporary view of their lobbying undertakings, as they work more on issue-by-issue, certain cases or projects. However, the EU representatives mentioned the importance of a long-term perspective too, outlining the long-term vision of their organizations. Nevertheless, both groups outlined aiming to build long-term relationships. The EU side (A2) highlighted the benefits of it by outlining that long term relationships helps to approach the right people and ask the right questions, whereas, the US side (B2) emphasized their awareness of political aspect of lobbying.

After the differences in the nature of lobbying undertaking, there were also observed differences in the type of action employed. Both groups emphasized focusing on the proactive approach, however, the US side (B2) reported on also using a reactive approach when responding to regulatory or legislative branches. On the other hand, the usage of proactive approach in the EU can be attributed to the EU side’s (A2) focus on the legislation, which is not yet in place, thus easier to shape, e.g. focusing on the future technology. However, generally the EU side emphasized the importance of building the relationships before the issues arise as well as emphasized the significance for companies to give “feedback” from the industry to politicians just in order to survive as it was stated that decision makers do not grasp the full picture of the issues. The US side (B2) did not particularly emphasize the importance of lobbying. However, from their proactive engagement it was obvious they were aware of it. Moreover, both sides commented on the proactive behavior their members showed. In addition, both groups reported on their proactive behavior in keeping their members up to date on what is
happening in the political arena. Concerning direct and indirect lobbying, the EU side (A2) employed both, while the US just focused on the direct lobbying.

Due to the previously mentioned differences, both groups outlined very different success factors. Group B2, representing the US side, stressed the political aspect as very important to keep in mind, emphasizing that decision makers besides policy reasons have also political reasons. This emphasis on the US side (B2) can be due to different decision processes in both arenas, where the US side possessed higher decision power concerning individual decision makers, while the EU was “hiding” behind the multi-level decision making aspect. Further, the US side (B2) identified applying both choices of approach as a success factor. This certainly implies an acknowledged power of individual approach in the US. The third success factor, identified by the US side, was bringing companies representatives along in lobbying undertakings. Emphasis on this fact showed that in the US decision makers are more open for companies than in the EU; what is again a supporting argument for acknowledging the power of individual approach in the US. On the other hand, the EU representatives outlined information sharing, human-social interaction, a bottom up approach (industry starting the initiative), focus on areas with no regulation yet in place, and a broad industry consensus as lobbying success factors; what, in fact, reflects the emphasis on collective approach having more power.

Both groups identified communication utilities as tools aiding in successful lobbying undertakings (the EU side: regular meetings, phone calls, emails, letters, exposing Government’s position in the media, organizing actions; the US side: comment letters, letters of support or letters of opposition, face to face meetings). However, the EU representatives identified also more specific tools, e.g. setting indicators of success with the timeline, used in assessing the progress of the activity. It can be an allusion to EU’s closer link in organizing the undertakings as projects. As previously reported, the EU representatives also used different processes similar to PM processes; while the US side (B2) used only communication tools therefore being more associated of thinking in terms of operations. Either orientation required the alignment with organizational strategy. The EU representatives (A2) look at their undertakings in relation to what they want to achieve in a long-term, while the US side (B2) takes a strategic decision on choosing the lobbying approach concerning the most effective employment of resources.

Commenting on the lobbying practices in other lobbying arena, both groups outlined the same fact, that the US is more sophisticated than the EU and reaches a larger scale. Further, both groups emphasized institutional and political frameworks being a main factor for differences (e.g. the US representatives commented that in the EU regulators have little room for maneuver for adding further details in future regulations, while in the US the regulators get the act with higher level of abstraction). Additionally, the US representatives outlined the EU being less formal and referred also to the only recently issued register for lobbyists, further stressing the US having “extremely tight rules” what is the opposite of the EU. Considering the last argument the EU representatives reported on the same facts and commented that in the EU they are still evolving. Thus, the differences are definitely due to a longer lobbying history in the US than in the EU. In addition, the EU representatives mentioned that differences in both political arenas occur also due to different access to politicians, decision-making processes and culture.
8.2. Individual / collective comparison

8.2.1. EU individual vs. EU collective perspective

In the third step of this comparative analysis, the individual (group A1) and collective (group A2) perspectives of the EU lobbying arena were compared referring to the determined and described thematic areas. Commencing with the business scope of the EU individual and collective sides, it can be stated that both of them had different business scopes. From the individual side (A1) the company exhibited related diversification as it focused just on one industry and sector. The collective side represents unrelated diversification organizations, namely a cross-sectorial organization.

Seeing as the level of diversification affects the choice of political strategy, it was observed that on both sides, more than one strategy is prevailing. They mostly reported about collaborating with others and forming coalitions while the individual side representative outlined that they form coalitions with others on specific issues, whereas associations did not identify a specific reason; it was just stressed that in coalitions they are stronger. Furthermore, the collective side (A2) reported using the coalition building strategy on national, European and international levels, whereas the individual side representative (A1) did not specifically mention their engagement level. Moreover, the collective representatives identified using also other two strategies (indirect lobbying strategies): constituency building and advocacy advertising, with the aim to raise the awareness, gain support, and create pressure for policy makers through media. Individual representatives reported engaging in constituency building as well by raising public awareness at public events. However, the individual representative also commented that usage of this additional strategy is costly. Therefore, the collective side was less restricted in using more strategies, as they possessed more resources.

Since both groups targeted national and European regulatory and legislative bodies, the individual representatives outlined the particular usage of political parties’ conventions and exhibitions for their lobbying undertakings. Due to those practices being costly, they reported about assessing the best ways to target key politicians. The collective representatives lobbying practices differed significantly as they used other forms of organizing lobbying undertakings. They organized them on an ad hoc basis (ad hoc initiatives) or as projects. This difference could be referred also to the nature of undertaking, where the individual side (A1) stressed looking at their lobbying engagements, thus practice, as definitely long term, whereas, the collective side (A2) was looking at their practice more as short term activities. More particularly, both groups mentioned writing positions papers, contributing to associations’ positions papers, joining them when associations meet politicians, proactively engaging in lobbying by “pushing associations”, outlining what they ask associations to do, e.g. “we need to feed into the process and make the Commission aware”. Consequently, from the comments of both groups, the prevailing proactive type of action used by individual companies in the EU was observed.

Regarding the organization of lobbying undertaking, the collective side (A2) specifically identified the steps and extensively commented on the processes they employ in organizing their activities, whereas, the individual side (A1) did not outline
any processes nor specifically mentioned the steps. The specific steps identified by the collective side (A2) were the following: analyzing (identifying all relevant players; more deeply analyzing their personality, their background, their positions on related matters), establishing goals (goals setting “what do we want to accomplish”), formulating action, using effective communication and choosing tactics (setting up a sales pitch using the other actor's personality and positions on the main issue; getting in touch with the right people), and implementation (meetings, arrangements, exchange of information). As mentioned, the individual side (A1) did not in particular introduce the steps; just some fragments could be identified. For instance, the individual representative mentioned meeting with politicians, it corresponds to implementation phase; assessing which practice is the best in targeting needed key politicians, corresponding to analyzing phase. However, it is evident that the individual group did not organize their activities in a form of projects. In contrast, the collective side (A2) broadly reported on the processes employed. Collective side outlined their strategic planning processes (“we set specific plan”; “they get together with stakeholders’ group; “develop the next steps for this work plan”), the controlling process (“it’s a constant process, we do a lot of this quality management”), the evaluation process (“we then sit down and evaluate”; “what worked well we continue to use, what didn’t work we try to change”), and of course the implementation of lobbying undertaking (“implement different stages of the work plan”; drafting, amending and sending letters; set up meetings; organizing the follow up events; set up calls and discussions). Consequently, it can be concluded that collective side representatives (A2) approach lobbying in a more structured way and have a systematic approach in organizing their lobbying undertakings.

No matter how systematic the lobbying approach was, both groups reported that companies in the EU lobby collectively and individually. The collective side (A2) outlined that their members lobby individually: “most of them do pursue their own initiatives” and individual side (A1) acknowledged their individual lobbying approach by directly meeting the representatives and talking about the challenges their company faces. On the other hand, both groups also outlined the usage of collective approach. The collective representatives reported about their members lobbying within one or several associations. The individual representatives engaged in lobbying through associations as well. Further, the collective side (A2) outlined that the EU collective representatives used the collective approach as well, choosing collaboration with other organizations by forming coalitions or becoming members of bigger European Umbrella Associations. In relation to choosing individual approach both groups agreed that this choice depends on the issues and companies’ characteristics, however, the groups provided also some other different reasons. The individual representatives stated that the individual approach is chosen on specific issues, not addressed by associations, whereas the collective side (A2) stressed that lobbying individually would rather be chosen in the areas that are not extremely politically important or have financial consequences, thus the choice depended on the issue. Additionally, the individual representatives outlined that the individual approach can be chosen if a company is important in a certain region and has contacts with decision makers; as similarly, the collective representatives referred individual choice dependence on company size, thus company’s characteristics. Further, the collective side (A2) added that the choice depended on the personal approach, e.g. it was exemplified that if the issue personally affected the decision maker, the individual approach could be powerful too. Also, an in-
house lobbyist is suggested if the industry is heavily influenced by politics or the company is heavily involved with government contracts.

When opting for the collective action, both, individual and collective representatives outlined forming alliance with others, more specifically, ad hoc coalitions. In addition, individual companies have choices among the associations, thus the individual representatives emphasized that through smaller associations more relevant to them, issues can be addressed, although they have less power than bigger associations. Any relevant comments regarding existing collective action choices were not observed on the collective side (A2) but many identical reasons for choosing collective approach were identified by both groups. Firstly, dependence on the issue was outlined by the individual representatives, namely supporting associations on the issues true for all the industry. The collective representatives outlined that certain issues are more successful through the collective approach. Secondly, both groups stressed specific beneficial reasons. For example, stronger influence was stressed by the collective side stating the importance to speak in one voice and by the individual representatives stating that collective approach makes it “easier to sell”. Another beneficial reason of collective approach is better access to politicians. The individual representatives stressed that “politicians are more likely to meet us like that” as it makes it easier for legislators to sell to their constituency and their party. Accordingly, the collective side supported these arguments by stating that the collective approach provides access to high-level officials and collective representation is regarded more serious. The collective side reported supporting their members’ initiatives in reaching a broader stakeholders group. Thus, an access to broader stakeholder group is another advantage of a collective approach. Additionally, individual representative added that for company CEO’s, collective approach provides the means of being involved and being a part of the game. The collective side (A2) also provided another reason emphasizing a collective choice of joining bigger European Umbrella associations to get sufficient information. Nevertheless, the costs of choosing one of the approaches seemed to be of concern in both groups. The individual side (A1) commented that some companies do cost-benefit analysis in terms of memberships’ fees vs. lobbying output, while the collective side (A2) referred to financial feasibility, when commenting on both choices, individual (hiring an in-house lobbyist) and collective (when joining a lobby group). Finally, both groups saw the benefits in using both approaches, especially the collective side (A2) outlined it to be the best option in order “to make the voice heard”. However, concerning the choice of individual approach, a more affirmative view towards this choice came from the individual company. It can be assumed that personal position could have affected that, as the individual company is constantly confronted with the choice of lobbying individually or collectively, while the collective side representatives have to argue for the benefits of the collective approach in order to attract companies, thus are focused on collective approach. The collective representatives also expressed the opinion that collective approach is more influential in the EU and stated that lobbying in Europe is more collaborative than individualistic. Similarly, the individual side (A1) stated the fact that the approach in the EU is more collective claiming that it is due to lobbying not having a good reputation. Thus, it can be concluded that both groups see collective lobbying as more promising.

In terms of the nature of undertaking, the individual side (A1) exhibited long term views as their lobbying is focused on energy policy and energy prices, which need constant effort. In contrast, the collective side looked at lobbying mainly as a temporal
undertaking focusing on issues, case studies, and projects. The reason for this difference among individual and collective views of their undertakings may lie in the nature of the entity itself. Associations, representing different companies, in this case also different sectors, have to tailor their messages according to different issues their members have. Consequently, the results show their focus on the temporality element. On the other hand, group A1, representing the individual side, is aware of the need of constant lobbying. Consequently, the individual side (A1) engaged constantly in lobbying taking on a long-term view. On the other hand, the individual side represented just one sector, therefore more specific issues. Consequently, this can be also a reason of choosing a long-term engagement and constantly lobbying on narrow issues. Nevertheless, both groups aimed to build long-term relationships with legislators. They also provided various reasons emphasizing the importance to foster long-term relationships. However, the individual side (A1) identified that short term relationships can also be a case due to the political landscape, changing very quickly (new people are coming to the government), therefore, a need to keep up building new relationships was emphasized as well.

This kind of aim required a proactive approach, which was observed in both groups, with the aim to build the infrastructure before (have relationships in place before the issue arises). Additionally, the collective side (A2) presented a very interesting point regarding their proactive style: they try to shape legislation, which is not yet in place reasoning this approach to be easier than focusing on existent legislation. Similarly, both groups used direct and indirect lobbying. Thus, the individual and collective sides employ a proactive lobbying style using both existing forms of lobbying. The individual side reported taking advantage of CEO meetings by preparing him to deliver a targeted message, while the collective side stated that without interacting with the political world, companies can be highly affected and even become “economically unviable” as politicians decide on the issues directly affecting companies. Consequently, the “feedback” from the industry is stressed to be very important and perceived by both EU sides. Besides the feedback, the collective representatives highlighted the importance of information sharing, human-social interaction, a bottom up approach (industry starting the initiative), focus on areas with no regulation yet in place, and a broad industry consensus for the success of the lobbying undertaking.

More specifically, the usage of standardized tools, could aid in the success of the undertakings. Even though the individual side (A1) pointed out not using any tools, the collective representatives identified all communication utilities as tools and some additional specific tools. In this sense, obviously the individual representatives used the communication tools as well. However, regarding specific tools, only the collective side (A2) identified setting indicators of success with the timeline used in assessing the progress of the activity. The individual side (A1) stressed the “resistance to change” as a reason in not adopting the tools in lobbying undertakings. Further, the individual representatives supported this argument by stressing additional time costs, and added bureaucracy. From identified tools in this section it can be seen that the collective side (A2) used more sophisticated tools, what probably leads to more structured lobbying undertakings (see above the section ‘organization of lobbying undertakings’). On the other hand, referring to the individual side (A1) comments, regarding resistance to change in using specific tools, it was stated that consultancies think more in terms of projects and see lobbying as a project. Consequently, this explanation also fits in the findings, where, collective representatives have chosen a more short-term approach,
thus viewing lobbying undertakings as projects provoking the need for the alignment with organizational strategy. The individual side (A1) outlined reassessing if certain practices are useful or not concerning the alignment issue, whereas, the collective side (A2) similarly stated looking in relation what they want to achieve in a long term. Additionally, in the collective group the short-term evaluation perspective was observed, when a lobbying undertaking is finished (when the total success can be measured; tangible deliverables can be identified).

Showing awareness about the differences of practices in the other lobbying arena, both groups identified reasons such as access to politicians, political framework, decision-making process and culture. Moreover, both groups underlined different political frameworks in both lobbying arenas as being the main reason of the differences in lobbying. Additionally, the individual side (A1) added PAC as being a factor of the differences, as in the US it exists while in the EU not. Moreover, the collective group also emphasized the larger scale of the US lobbying (more sophisticated lobbying).

8.2.2. US individual vs. US collective perspective

In the fourth step of this comparative analysis, the individual (group B1) and collective (group B2) perspectives of the US lobbying arena were compared referring to the determined and described thematic areas. It can be stated that all members of group B1, presenting the individual perspective, namely the corporate entities (insurance company and clean energy company) and the multi-client lobbying consultancy, exhibited characteristics of unrelated-diversification due to the fact there were servicing multiple industries. Similarly, group B2, presenting the collective perspective also exhibited characteristics of unrelated-diversification in terms of providing commodities and financial services umbrella for a number of industries, eg. energy, agriculture etc. Furthermore, while the representatives of the individual perspective (B1) only targeted the state level in their lobbying undertakings, the representative of the collective perspective (B2) targeted both the state and federal level. The reason for this distinction may lie in the limited amount of resources available for lobbying undertakings for the individual representatives (B1), in terms of financials as well as availability of personnel in fairly small government relations departments, as opposed to the collective representatives (B2), which financed they undertakings from the annual fees of their members.

The choice of political strategies employed was reflective of the business scope; therefore it can be argued that all members of the individual group (B1) frequently referred to the word “change” when describing the direction of their efforts, which indicates the lobbying objectives of the individual perspective. The same cannot be stated about the collective representative (B2) who did not put a lot of emphasis on the change process other than in the case of reflecting on the actual individual approach. This also comes in support of the previous claim of the individual view of lobbying being linked with the management of change. More specifically, the individual representatives (B1) stated direct lobbying, coalition building of companies in one industry (e.g. trade associations), coming together of the entire business community and more specifically PAC contributions and grassroots as their political means of influence. The collective representative (B2) on the other hand reported about direct advocating of the association for its members and aligning with other associations to show influence, therefore exhibiting the same behavior as mentioned by group B1 in
terms of single and joint approach. Even though the collective representatives (B2) did not mention any grassroots activities, during the course of the interview they showed awareness about the importance of the political aspect of lobbying, therefore acknowledging the form of political contributions made by the individual representatives (B1).

The target of the contributions and the activity in general depended on the lobbying focus. Individual representatives (B1) reported about focusing on the state level, the House and the Senate as well as the State departments and the governor’s office while the focus of the collective representative (B2) was broader in terms of targeting legislators, regulators and the executive branch, which inevitably had to influence the practices employed in their lobbying undertaking. In terms of particular practices collective representatives (B2), due to the lack of infrastructure on the federal level, reported about practices of hiring a federal lobbyist and opening a representative office in Washington, while group B1, which was evidently in no such need, reported about the peculiarity of oftentimes involving their companies’ representatives in the lobbying undertaking to strengthen their argument. When organizing their lobbying undertaking, it was observed that the representatives of the individual perspective (B1) exhibited practices of; firstly identifying grassroots structure of voters of supporters, opposition and the undecided branch in order to be able to anticipate the formation of the coalition; secondly indirect lobbying characteristics, once the coalition is formed, in taking care of the media awareness of a particular issue while conducting the threat assessment. Collective representatives (B2) on the other hand made a distinction about the practices employed depending on the three avenues of lobbying issues identification (generated by government, members or media) and therefore it can be concluded also the type of action (proactive vs. reactive) as well as the most obvious distinction, namely the level it is concerning (regulatory or legislative). On the regulatory level the described practices seemed more reactive, because the action is initiated on the request of the government, while on the legislative level, practices of visiting legislators before the Bill becomes the Law, exhibited more proactive characteristics. Nevertheless, it can be stated that the majority of individual representatives practices are concerned with the actions leading up to the formation of a coalition followed by actions exhibiting indirect lobbying characteristics, while the collective representatives naturally do not engage in such activities but put more emphasis on the actual direct lobbying on terms of reaching the legislators.

When choosing their lobbying approach, both the individual and the collective group agreed that the choice depended on the particular issue and that both approaches had its benefits and drawbacks. In terms of criteria, the individual group (B1) primarily emphasized that the choice had to be affordable, in terms of annual fees vs. the in-house government relations wages /consultant costs, while the collective representative (B2) considered it to be more of a strategic decision by stating numerous factors of influence besides the lobbying issue, namely: size of company, industry, the political wins in favor or against that issue, the importance of the issue to a company, a public opinion, how the media is feeding that issue, how the other companies in the industry are impacted or not impacted by the issue etc. This could be explained by the previously elaborated restrictions of resources individual companies experienced and their thinking in terms of return on investment as opposed to the associations more flexible and long-term approach. When arguing for the reasons of adopting an individual approach, individual representatives (B1) pointed out that it can be hard to marry all the different
interests inside of an association, meaning an individual approach might be more simple from that aspect, therefore suggested monitoring and anticipating of the environment to be conducted within the company and through consultancies. Furthermore, they agreed that the larger the companies and their constituency and the higher the volume and value of business, the stronger the individual power of the entity. The collective side (B2) on the other had justified the choice only in the case of parochial and very important issues for a company not shared by other members in the industry. The lack of affirmative arguments from the side of the collective representative was expected, because of the natural bias in this matter. Nevertheless, both group B1 and B2 agreed that there are some major drawbacks of the approach in terms of the unfavorably looked upon perception of considerable amounts of power lying with one entity causing unpopularity of the entity with the government officials and the voting public. When arguing for the choice of collective approach, the individual representatives outlined adopting the approach in addition to their individual approach by means of joining trade associations, industry ad-hoc coalitions and business community ad-hoc coalitions, as well as collaborating with the local government and NGO-s, all for the sake of once again effectuating change, as obviously important driver of the individual representatives. The reasons for the choice of this option in the eyes of the individual representatives (B1) were their power of influence due to representation of larger constituency, the possibility of leveraging of off them, reduction of the time of action an individual approach would require for the same issue, reaching cost effectiveness in a fierce and expensive US lobbying arena and ultimately the avoidance of being associated with the issues mostly for the sake of their customers. The collective representatives (B2) supported the claims of group B1 in terms of option for the approach in the case of more companies in the industry sharing the same concerns as well as the last argument of the individual representatives (B1), namely the avoidance of being the face of the issue in the eyes of the legislators and regulators. Therefore, it can be concluded that once again the issue of scarcity of resources is exhibited on the individual side due to concerns about the cost of lobbying, as well as resource allocation in terms of time constraints, which is not the case on the collective side. Nevertheless, both groups share the concern of not being directly associated with an issue, but with a different underlying orientation; costumers in the case of the individual side and government officials in the case of the collective side. This distinction once again emphasized the strategic element of lobbying undertaking on the collective side as previously stated and the more business oriented individual approach.

More precisely, even though individual representatives (B1) implied both temporary and log-term views to the lobbying undertaking, a distinction could be made concerning the case of the multi-client lobbying consultancy, who clearly exhibited a more stronger temporary view of the lobbying undertaking equalizing it with the notion of projects and programs, as opposed to the corporate interviewees which exhibited a more long-term perspective as part of the companies every-day operations. The reason for this long-term view could lie in the exhibited awareness of the corporate representatives about the need for a constant active involvement in the politics track in order to ensure the best possible business climate in their place of operation, an element not emphasized by the multi-client consultancy. The collective representatives (B2) implied taking on long-term views through constant monitoring, similar awareness of political aspects of lobbying as did the corporate individual representatives, as well as the hands-on approach in that sense, once again proving their strategic orientation towards the lobbying undertaking. Therefore it can be concluded that the corporate individual
representatives and the collective representative had a similar perspective of their lobbying undertaking while the individual consultancy representative took on a more temporary perspective remaining true to a more business-oriented characteristic, which could be expected due to the similarities of the multi-client consultancy with the project organization. Nevertheless, both groups seemed to aim to foster long-term relationships with the government based on trust, in order to build a strong lobbying infrastructure.

Since individual and collective representative exhibited a strong awareness about the need for the lobbying undertaking, especially if operating in heavy regulated industries, both reported about the usage of proactive action. Individual representatives displayed actions directed towards raising the awareness of the public and government about their entities as well as constant monitoring of possible treats arising in the environment through close contact with lobbying association as well as competitors. On the other hand, collective representatives exhibited a more structured approach by displaying actions in response to issues generated by the media and by their members. It can be concluded that the individual representatives fed the media/public in terms of indirect lobbying efforts while the collective side was rather fed by the impulses of the media in terms of identifying and directing their future lobbying undertakings. In terms of reactive actions, individual representatives (B1) emphasized the need for building a strong lobbying infrastructure beforehand for such cases while collective representatives (B2) once again exhibited a more structured approach in response to issues generated by the government. Once again the strategic element of the collective lobbying undertaking came into play when referring to the decision of following though an unbeficial outcome or abandoning the matter relating to the strength of public opinion, while the individual side made their decision mostly dependent on their business focus.

This strategic element was also followed through regarding the success of the lobbying undertaking by both groups exhibiting awareness about the importance of the political aspect of lobbying in the US arena. While the individual representatives (B1) focused on the personalization and localization of contact with representatives, the collective side (B2) emphasized the benefit of the presence of the company’s representatives in lobbying undertakings. Even though both sides agreed on the importance of employing both individual and collective approaches, only the individual side put emphasis on the importance of truthful and fact-based representation of the matter. The reason for this finding might also be traced back to the political factors in terms of the individual lack of the power of influence concerning constituency building which comes naturally for large lobbying associations, therefore requiring a stronger individual effort in convincing the government representatives. Concerning the specific tools used in successful lobbying undertakings, it can be stated that individual representatives (B1) relied more on technological advancements in terms of the usage of online aids (Skype, social media, trackers etc.) than the collective side (B2) which seemed to still be focusing on the more personalized means of communication. Furthermore, the individual side seemed to be more concerned with the cost and benefit of the lobbying undertaking in terms of resource allocation and therefore exhibited attempts to develop sophisticated tools for the weighing of such issues. The reason for this might once again lie in the resource scarcity of the individual representatives who have to make the best of their available means, possibly by aligning the lobbying undertaking with the organizational strategy. It was evident that the collective side (B2) made strategic choices about the choice of approach and employment of their resources, but also the individual group (B1) demonstrated attempts to bring the strategic element in the
lobbying undertaking by engaging the compliance department in terms of assessment of internal impact as well as the issue management committee in terms of issue prioritization.

In terms of providing insights into the lobbying practices of the EU arena, both the individual and collective side recognized the higher level of sophistication of US lobbying as opposed to EU as well as higher informality and therefore less transactional approach of the EU lobbying arena. The individual representatives (B1) showed awareness about the specific differences in relation to their scope of activities, namely the higher speed of change of regulatory environment in the EU, lesser grassroots involvement in the EU, as well as less direct contact with the EU voters hinting the more collective EU lobbying nature, and most importantly the political activity in terms of the inexistence of PAC contributions in the wake of publicly funded campaigns in the EU. The collective side (B2) put a strong emphasis on the lower level of abstraction of the EU Parliament, reducing the impact of the regulatory level. The difference in the focus of the two sides can be attributed to the scope of action of the collective side, encompassing both the regulatory and legislative level, whereas that was not the case with the individual representatives.
9. Analysis and discussion

9.1. The project management focus

After the comparison of empirical material (EU/US comparison and Individual/Collective comparison), groups and primary themes were identified, where project management related characteristics have been observed. According to the defined elements of projects from the PM literature (representing both views, traditional and novel), namely risk, aim, change, constraints, recourses, nature of duration and tools and processes, relevant evidence was sought in the lobbying literature. Therefore, the groups and primary themes were used to analyze and discuss the PM empirical evidence by relating it to PM (traditional and novel views) and lobbying literature in order to be able to conclude whether evidence from the empirical material supports the project management and relative lobbying theory, hence whether lobbying is seen as a project by individual and collective action representatives in the EU and the US.

Concerning the researched groups, the EU collective representatives (A2) exhibited traditional PM related characteristics; while the EU individual representatives (A1) just outlined that the project management view was more appropriate to consultancies. However, the reason stated by the EU individual representatives for not utilizing traditional PM tools was outlined referring to resistance to change with the argument “companies or people working in a company do not think in a way of a project”. Nevertheless, in the EU individual representatives group, issue management was observed as the basis for lobbying. Therefore, looking from a novel PM perspective the EU individual side can be seen exhibiting PM related characteristic.

US collective representatives’ data could not be particularly related to the traditional PM view; while the US individual side (lobbying consultancy) claimed at looking at the clients as projects. Consequently, the US individual representatives’ stepwise lobbying processes resemble the traditional PM processes. In fact, the EU individual side (A1) commented about the consultancies viewing their lobbying activities more like projects, which is confirmed by empirical data on the US side. In addition, the US individual side (B1) shows similarities to novel PM views, always indicating change as their objective (i.e. influencing legislation by effectuating change in their favor). Consequently, looking from a traditional PM perspective, only the US individual side exhibited lobbying similarities to projects. However, as on the EU side, the US side lobbying can be seen as project if a novel PM perspective is taken.

Evidence on particular lobbying elements that can be associated with PM were found in some themes more than in others, therefore enabling the identification of primary and secondary themes which were important to look at concerning this matter. Lobbying practices, choice of approach, nature of undertaking, standardized tools, and alignment with organizational strategy can be outlined as primary themes, where most of the evidence concerning PM is lying. However, some evidence can be found in other themes, named secondary themes: business scope, political strategy, type of action and lobbying success factors. This realization aided the identification of evidence referring to PM and its comparison to the suggested theoretical framework. When viewing lobbying through a novel broader perspective, it can be observed that all the groups
exhibited some similarities with project management. When any of the traditional PM elements were not observed, there were always references to novel PM view.

By taking a closer look at each particular PM defining element, starting with the element of risk, it can be stated that Turner & Muller (2003, p. 2) provided a new project definition seeing a project as “an agency for uncertainty management”. This novel perspective seems to be closer to lobbying practices’ characteristics. Firstly, public affairs can be seen as a form of risk management. Instead of waiting for things to go wrong, and reacting once the business climate has already been set, a proactive action towards mitigating, transferring or avoiding that business risk is undertaken (Coen, 1999). Smith (2009) defines public relations through the notions of risk and crisis management as well. Turner & Muller (2003, p. 5) project definition addresses the risk issue by looking at project "as an agency for uncertainty management”. Cicmil et al. (2006, p. 676) similarly outline projects “coping with unpredictability, ambiguity and equivocality”. All these characteristics, extensively discussed by the authors representing novel PM perspective and lobbying literature clearly outline the links of lobbying with risk management and are supported by empirical evidence from all four groups. The EU individual side (A1) outlined unpredictability element of the fast changing policy framework, the EU collective side representatives (A2) and the US individual side representatives (B1): risk of legislation being able to hinder company to do business. Moreover, the US individual side representatives outlined that they mitigate the risk by trying to figure out what to expect, while the US collective side (B2) stressed the risk of becoming very unpopular in the eyes of decision makers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the empirical data supported the novel PM perspective, regarding the risk characteristic of projects, which is summarized in the Table 5.

Table 5: Analysis of the risk characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>NOVEL PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>LOBBYING AS PROJECT</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL MATERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>&quot;An agency for uncertainty management and subject to uncertainty&quot; (Turner &amp; Muller, 2003, pp. 1, 2)</td>
<td>&quot;Public affairs as a form of risk management” (Coen, 1999).</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Managing development risks” (Winter &amp; Szczepanek, 2009, p.25)</td>
<td>“Crisis management vital to public affairs” (Smith, 2009).</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Coping with unpredictability, ambiguity and equivocality” (Cicmil et al., 2006, p. 676)</td>
<td>“Uncertainty avoiding” (Coen, 1999)</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the project aim (Table 6), the traditional view seeks for “original deliverables” (ISO, 2011, p.11), whilst the novel view, besides aiming for “specific objectives” (Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 3) or “certain purposes” (Turner & Muller,
also considers the change perspective seeking “beneficial objectives of change” (Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 7). The empirical data from all the four groups outlined similar aims, e.g. the EU collective representatives outlined making the politicians aware of organization’s opinion on a Directive or the US collective side stated aiming to influence and shape the public opinion and raise government awareness. Consequently, these arguments can be seen to be in line with the project aims provided by Turner & Muller (2003), Winter & Szczepanek (2009, p.29), Cicmil et al. (2006, p. 676). Moreover, the lobbying literature presented lobbying as reputation management (Petronela, 2008). The empirical data provided support for this argument outlining that companies sometimes avoid being the face of the issue for the sake of their reputation with government officials. The lobbying objective is to influence legislation (Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1373), whether directly or indirectly (Nicoll, 2007), reactively or proactively (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 828). Consequently, the lobbying aim includes the notion of change. In fact, all the four groups, showed evidence of change notion in lobbying, e.g. by reacting to change, adapting to change in the political environment, or effectuating change by their lobbying activities. All in all, this analysis brings to the conclusion that all four groups exhibit change characteristics in their lobbying undertakings, therefore relating to this novel projects’ characteristic.

Table 6: Analysis of the characteristics of aim and change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>TRAD. PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>NOVEL PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>LOBBYING AS PROJECT</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL MATERIRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>“Creating original deliverables”</td>
<td>“An agency to achieve specific objectives or certain purposes” (Turner &amp; Muller, 2003, p. 3, 6)</td>
<td>“Established for single legislative or regulatory debate” (Mahoney, 2007, p.368)</td>
<td>“Using association to specifically achieve their goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Defined in terms of scope, schedule and cost”</td>
<td>“Satisfying interests and agendas while considering power and influence” (Winter &amp; Szczepanek,2009, p.29)</td>
<td>“Objective to influence legislation” (Keffer &amp; Hill, 1997, p. 1373)</td>
<td>“Raising the awareness of the public and government”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Product development”</td>
<td>“Value and benefit creation” (Winter &amp; Szczepanek,2009, p.29)</td>
<td>“Reputation management” (Petronela, 2008)</td>
<td>“Making officials aware of their opinion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Reaching set requirements”</td>
<td>“Identification of tensions, power asymmetries and patterns of communicative relating” (Cicmil et al.,)</td>
<td>“Relationship management” (Thomson et al., 2007)</td>
<td>“Seeking political support for issues”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Avoiding being the face of the issue, for the sake of customers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Unpopular ity of overly powerfull singe entities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Avoidance of being face of the issue for the sake of reputation with government officials”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, Turner & Muller (2003, p. 3) questions whether several projects should be managed as one; therefore, the authors look at the project not only "as an agency for change", but also "as an agency for resource utilization". Concerning the notion of resources, the EU collective side reported "using all tools available to convince the Government" while the US individual side mentioned "pulling of human and monetary resources with other like minded entities". In fact, Turner & Muller (2003, p. 4) outline that projects "have been used as an organizational form to provide a vehicle for assigning resources to the delivery of change in organizations since the 1950s". This argument supports one of the core elements determining lobbying success in both arenas, namely strategic undertakings, explained in terms of allocating resources for the achievement of certain objectives (Mack, 2005). Nevertheless, it is important to mention that in the traditional project literature resources are also seen as a constraint (ISO, 2011, p.8). Turner & Mullers (2003, p. 5) project definition also addresses project constraints, namely the uncertainty, the need for integration of resources into projects and the projects into business, as well as the sense of urgency in terms of determined timescale (Turner, 1999, cited in Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 1). The respondents supported these arguments, e.g. the US collective representative joined associations to reduce time and integrate the resources while both lobbying arenas mentioned choosing targeted lobbying on an urgent matter while taking into account the time restrictions and prioritization of issues. Therefore, concerning the elements of constrains and resources, it can be concluded that similar characteristics were found in the empirical study of this research in all four groups (Table 7).
Furthermore, it can be stated that both traditional and novel project views encompass the temporality aspect of a project (Table 8). ISO (2011, p. 6) outlines projects having start and finish dates. Turner & Muller (2003), Winter & Szczepanek (2009), Cicmil & Hodgson (2006), representing a novel project view, admit the transient nature of projects. Cleland & Kerzner (1985, cited in Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 3) stressed the temporality of projects, which resembles the characteristics of ad hoc coalitions defined in the lobbying literature as having a short to medium term outlook “depending on the duration of the legislative or regulatory debate” (Mahoney, 2007, p.368). The empirical material provided evidence of both the EU and the US representatives using ad hoc coalitions. Moreover, all the four groups mentioned the temporality aspect of their lobbying endeavours, e.g. the US individual representatives outlined focusing on the short-term in winning the issue itself, while the collective representatives on both arenas did not neglect to stress the remaining need for a long-term outlook and strategic vision. To sum up, the temporality aspect was observed in all the three theoretical parts (traditional project view, novel project view and lobbying) and strongly supported by the evidence from all the four groups’ respondents.

Table 7: Analysis of the characteristics of constraints and resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>TRAD. PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>NOVEL VIEW OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>LOBBYING AS PROJECT</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>“Deliverables conformable to specific requirement s (time, cost, resources)” (ISO, 2011, p.8)</td>
<td>“Creates a need for integration”; “subject to urgency” (Turner, 1999, cited in Turner &amp; Muller, 2003, p. 1).</td>
<td>“Political and institutional frameworks” (Coen,1999) “lobbying regulatory framework”(Coen,1999)</td>
<td>“Concerned with the affordability of the association annual fees as opposed to the wages of the internal government relations offices” “Restrictions of resources, especially time” “Justification of the lobbying undertaking in terms of ROI”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>“Human, material, financial resources” (ISO, 2011, p. 8) “Knowledg e, skills, tools, and techniques” (ISO, p.11)</td>
<td>“Agency for resource utilization and a vehicle for assigning resources” (Turner &amp; Muller, 2003, pp.2, 3, 4).</td>
<td>“Strategizing about allocating resources for achievement of certain objectives” Mack (2005) “Using all tools available to convince the Government” “Searching for a wider support in order to achieve goals” “Dependency of achievability on availability of money, capacities and the necessities”</td>
<td>“Pulling of human and monetary resources with other like minded entities” “Employees contributing to PACs” “Votes much more powerful than the money”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, it can be stated that both traditional and novel project views encompass the temporality aspect of a project (Table 8). ISO (2011, p. 6) outlines projects having start and finish dates. Turner & Muller (2003), Winter & Szczepanek (2009), Cicmil & Hodgson (2006), representing a novel project view, admit the transient nature of projects. Cleland & Kerzner (1985, cited in Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 3) stressed the temporality of projects, which resembles the characteristics of ad hoc coalitions defined in the lobbying literature as having a short to medium term outlook “depending on the duration of the legislative or regulatory debate” (Mahoney, 2007, p.368). The empirical material provided evidence of both the EU and the US representatives using ad hoc coalitions. Moreover, all the four groups mentioned the temporality aspect of their lobbying endeavours, e.g. the US individual representatives outlined focusing on the short-term in winning the issue itself, while the collective representatives on both arenas did not neglect to stress the remaining need for a long-term outlook and strategic vision. To sum up, the temporality aspect was observed in all the three theoretical parts (traditional project view, novel project view and lobbying) and strongly supported by the evidence from all the four groups’ respondents.
Taking on a traditional PM view, it can be stated that a project is divided in manageable pieces, which all together compose a project life cycle (ISO, 2011, p. 12). Project management processes are those, which are employed "to manage a project throughout its life cycle" (ISO, 2011, p. 13). ISO (2011, p. 15) divides project management processes into five groups: initiating, planning, implementing, controlling, and closing. From the lobbying literature, strategic planning process is deemed to be an everyday process employed by “effective managers in Public Relations” and is of high importance for successful public relations (Smith, 2009, p.2). Therefore, this everyday strategic planning process can be associated with the implementing process, providing an input to the controlling process, and planning process, proving that all the processes are interrelated and interact among each other, as it is stated in ISO (2011, p. 17). Further, Smith (2009) introduces the framework of “9 steps of public relations” (analysing the situation, organization, establishing goals, formulating action, using effective communication, choosing communication tactics, implementation of strategic plan and evaluation), which strongly relate to project management processes. On the other side, the novel project views do not identify all these processes, but emphasizes the “need to be flexible, goal oriented and staged” (Turner & Muller, 2003, p. 2). But one element is certain, and that is reflected in Petronela’s (2008) argument about the need for a clearly defined strategy for the lobbying undertaking. Both, the EU and the US respondents emphasized the importance of strategy alignment, e.g. the EU collective side outlined a strategic planning process while the US collective side outlined lobbying as a strategic political process. Moreover, as Smith (2009) mentioned nine steps of public relations, both political arenas have also structured their lobbying undertaking in a stepwise process, thereby exhibiting certain similarities. For example, the EU individual side stressed using certain planning formats wile the US collective side
identified the dependence of establishing goals according to lobbying venues. All groups reported about controlling and monitoring their activity, i.e. the EU individual side reassessed the usefulness of formats while the US individual side representatives followed up on a passed bill. Similarly, the EU collective side representatives assessed the progress of the activity while the US collective side reported about monitoring constantly. Generally, regarding project management processes, all the four researched groups provided some evidence of using the processes identified in PM literature, as well in the lobbying literature (Table 9).

Concerning the particular PM tools, White (2002, p.8) provides a list of project management tools and techniques. In public relations literature Smith (2009, p. 222) identifies the frequently used project management tools, Gantt chart and Pert chart, as tools for implementation of public relations tactics schedule. All respondents outlined using communication tools in their practices while just one organization from the EU collective side referred to the usage of more particular tools by “setting indicators of success with the timeline and assessing the progress of the activity”, which can be related to tools employed in managing projects (White, 2002, p.8). However, this organization, when looked at it more in depth, generally organizes their work in projects. Therefore, no relevant conclusion can be made for a broader group.

Table 9: Analysis of the tools and processes characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>TRAD. PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>NOVEL PROJECT VIEW</th>
<th>LOBBYING AS PROJECT</th>
<th>EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
All in all, it can be concluded that the respondents from all the four groups provided evidence in the specific categories supporting the lobbying undertakings relevance to projects, especially when taking a novel PM view.

9.2. EU vs. US focus

Concerning the political and institutional framework it can be stated that the arguments of Barron (2011, p.321), Woll (2006, p.461) and Coen (1999 p.29) concerning the long-term EU and individualistic US nature of relationship found partial support in the empirical findings with the emphasis on the fact that both sides were looking to foster a long-term nature of relationships, but the EU relationships were simply deemed to be shorter due to the fast changing political environment, therefore, explaining the high success rate of proposals in the EU (Baumgarner, 2007, p.486). Thus, it can be stated that the fostering of long term relationships is considered to be of high importance in both arenas, from the findings of the empirical data, but it is simply not of such a high necessity in the EU as it is in the US (Coen , 1999, p.31; Mack, 2005, p. 344). Even though Petronela (2008, p.271) claimed that the US had a wider array of venues at disposal for exercising influence, the opinion of the EU individual representatives was that it might have been rather restricted in the US due to the strict lobbying regulations in place concerning the registering of lobbyists. Furthermore, the arguments of Mack (2005, p.344), concerning the higher strength of constituency politics in the US was supported by the arguments of EU individual representatives who emphasized the strong loyalty towards the party, due to the EU party system and the focus on executing pressure on key party officials, as opposed to the US where the interest of voters surpasses the loyalty to the party. The prevailing US individualism and self-interest in the wake of the electoral politics as suggested by Petronela (2008, pp. 266,276), was supported by the US individual representatives (B1), who exhibited a strong business focus in pursuing their issue specific goals. Evidence has also been found concerning the more unified US lobbying practices and the more fragmented EU lobbying practices (Gibson, 2005), due to the fact that the US representatives described their lobbying undertakings in a more structured manner exhibiting similar if not identical steps while the EU representatives exhibited some divergence which can be traced back to the fairly young and inexperienced EU arena. Strong evidence has also been found concerning the higher politization factor present in the US lobbying arena, as suggested by Mack (2005, p.344), making the individual and collective US representatives more aware of the parallel political tract that has to be considered in their lobbying undertaking, influencing their more strategic and long term views of the lobbying undertaking.

Concerning the lobbying regulatory framework, specifically the issues of less transparency in the EU lobbying arena, no evidence has been found from the empirical data supporting the arguments of Wesselius (2005, p.15) who claims higher probability of profitability for lobbyists in the EU arena. To the contrary, arguments have been made from the EU interviewees on the substantially bigger financial turnover in the US lobbying arena than in the young EU lobbying arena. Furthermore, another discrepancy with the literature has been found concerning the claim that due to a less regulated EU lobbying arena there is more informal ad-hoc coalition building in the EU, while the US opts for formal coalition building (Coen, 1999, p. 29; Mahoney, 2007, p.380). To be exact, empirical evidence from the EU collective representatives (group A2) suggests that this conclusion might only be based on the substantially larger US arena, but not on
the basis of the weaker EU lobbying regulations, because the number of formal EU lobbying associations is growing by the day.

Concerning the aspects of national culture, it can be concluded that both arenas exhibit a strong proactive approach aimed at mitigating possible impacts of government action, unlike the claims of Barron (2011, p.322) and Coen (1999, p.41) which argued for the US to be more uncertainty accepting. Nevertheless, the empirical findings completely support another aspect of the national culture suggested by Woll (2006, p.461) and Coen (1999, p.35) concerning the higher US trust in government officials-business relationships allowing a more aggressive and direct US lobbying style. Just from the initial affirmative response of the initially inquired interviewees, show a clear trend towards a more individualistic US lobbying style and a more collective EU style.

Lastly, concerning the aspects of the business culture, trends of increased grassroots activity has indeed been found in the EU empirical data as suggested by Coen (1999, p.31), even though the perception of US interviewees was exhibiting the contrary, no awareness of the existence of increased grassroots activity in the EU. Nevertheless, even though the US definitely exhibited more political aspects of lobbying, the purpose of this activity has not majorly differed between the US and the EU arena as suggested by Coen (1999, p.31), but rather between the individual and collective representatives; political support was the objective of the collective representatives while raising the credibility of the government officials was the objective of the individual representatives. Consequently, it can be concluded that the higher level of US strategic maturity, as suggested by Petronela (2008, pp. 268, 271), certainly resulted in the higher level of US pressure groups influence, especially due to the existence of political monetary contributions as suggested by Mack (2005, p.344) and confirmed by both US interviewees as well as EU representatives who especially criticized the existence of the US PAC contributions. Nevertheless, it can be concluded form the findings of the empirical data that it is indeed the PAC contributions, or in other words the power of money, which is the core reason for the diverging lobbying types and approaches of the individual and collective representatives in the EU and US arena.

9.3. Individual vs. collective focus

Considering the factors influencing companies’ choice of approach nearly all the factors outlined in the literature were mentioned by the respondents. However, in this discussion those which were more stressed and are in line with the literature or contradict the literature will be pointed out.

Regarding political and institutional framework, various authors (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 828; Greenwood & Aspinwall, 1998, p. 72; Mahoney, 2007, p. 380) stressed it outlining as being the main reason when considering the choice of approach. Empirical data completely support this argument. Surprisingly, even some citations in the literature are nearly identical to interviewees’ words, e.g. March & Olsen (1989, cited in Greenwood & Aspinwall, 1998, p. 63) outlined that the political institutions predetermine the “preferences of political actors”, while the EU individual side (group A1) outlined that it’s “not a different mentality, but the political system dictates” the best option of approaches. This argument heads towards another factor, culture, in the literature deemed to be an important factor in choosing an approach, while from the empirical findings it can be seen the opposite view. Therefore, the support from
empirical data challenges Mack (2005) and Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, pp. 29, 113) outlined importance of culture in the decision of choosing the approaches.

Concerning the issue characteristics high importance was given in all four groups, thus empirical data from the EU and the US emphasized the issue factor as very important when choosing an approach. Mahoney (2007, p. 381), Hojnacki (1997, pp. 62, 64), and Hillman & Hitt (1999) outlined this factor too. From the empirical data it can be concluded, that issue importance as just as relevant as the political and institutional framework factor, regarding the importance in the choice of approach. Whereas, the theory does stress this factor or outline as being one of the most important.

On the subject of characteristics of the company, Wesselius (2005, p. 16) arguments found partial support in empirical data regarding size of the company as a factor influencing decision. Literature referred to big companies inclined to choose individual approach. However, it may not always be true. The empirical findings suggest that big companies may prefer choosing collective approach if they don’t want to display themselves, so depending on the issue large companies may be prone to choose a collective approach. However, some empirical evidence also supported the theory, as for example, it was mentioned that big companies, influential in the region, are prone to choose individual approach. Hojnacki (1997, p. 65), Hrebenar et al. (2008, p.54), Jutterstrom (2000), Levy & Newell (2005, p. 216), Keffer & Hill (1997, p.1372), Hula (1995, p.241) outlined that collective approach is chosen in order to gain some benefits, e.g. information, more political contacts, gain more power, higher reputation. In fact, the interviewees in both lobbying arenas outlined that as being relevant when choosing a collective approach.

Relating to the literature overview of trends in participation levels in the EU and the US, it can be seen that empirical evidence confirms the trends found in the literature. Therefore, the EU and US respondents outlined that collective approach is used in both lobbying arenas, what is in line with Hula (2011) and Hrebenar et al. (2008) arguments. However, all the groups gave support for using as many approaches as possible, the US side claiming that using more approaches are better, while EU side outlining to be helpful to use as many vehicles as possible. All this evidence referred to using individual, collective, and “collective within collective” (associations collaborating with other organisations), using all ways or interchangeably their combinations. Consequently, this empirical data supported Pijnenburg (1998, p. 316) and Greenwood & Aspinwall (1998, pp. 73, 89) arguments. Relating to Woll (2006, p. 463) outlined trends, where she discussed them more in detail, empirical data also supported the trends. Thus, the US goes towards building ad hoc coalitions and the respondents additionally outlined two ad hoc coalition building types: between the industry and among whole business society (including NGOs and local governments). On the EU side, the trend of joining bigger collective action associations was confirmed by empirical findings as well.
10. Conclusion

The main purpose of this research was to increase the understanding of the EU/US lobbying practice by taking a project management perspective in a traditional and novel sense. In this study lobbying has been presented as a necessity of the projectified business community and society. Through the analysis of the empirical data, evidence has been found about the existing differences in handling lobbying undertakings in the two biggest political arenas, the EU and the US. Firstly, it has been proven that indeed there are major discrepancies in lobbying practices and styles of the two political arenas. The US has exhibited more transactional, sophisticated, unified, aggressive and individualistic lobbying characteristic as opposed to the less transactional, slightly unsophisticated, fragmented, mellow and collective lobbying characteristics of the EU arena. It has been identified that the most evident reason for that lies in the underlying political and institutional US/EU frameworks, more particular the existence of privately funded political campaign in the US (PAC contributions). Consequently, it has been observed that the US arena exhibited stronger political implications of the lobbying undertaking due to its more mature lobbying arena with a longer tradition and higher value of business. Nevertheless, it has been concluded that the EU lobbying arena is becoming more and more similar to the US arena, e.g. starting to adopt particular US techniques like the grassroots movements and introducing stronger lobbying regulations, which is a natural process on the part of US-like institutionalization due to growth of the union and fiscal power in the EU.

Concerning the choice of individual or collective approach, it has been found that not only big influential companies adopt an individual approach since politicians also gladly see companies lobbying for themselves as they are the experts in the issue and directly influenced by an issue. On the other hand, it was proven that the collective approach provided networking and political contacts, power, reputation and resource benefits, therefore, making the choice dependent on the issue at hand. Consequently, besides the realization that the most beneficial lobbying outputs are achieved through the simultaneous usage of both individual and collective lobbying approaches depending on the issue characteristic in both political arenas, a number of other similarities have been observed with a special emphasis on the project management perspective of this study.

In analyzing the particular lobbying practices, no usage of traditional project management tools has been observed in either arena, which can be explained by the universal usage of certain project management tools, in particular communication tools, which are common for a number of undertakings not necessarily having to be classified in a projectified manner. Therefore, the project management perspective has been extended to a broader novel view of projects as political processes managing the political environment, enabling numerous linkages of lobbying practices and project management processes, nature, aims and constraints in both arenas. Even though it has been observed that the EU had more tendency in classifying their undertakings as traditionally defined projects, it was surprisingly observed that the major difference was not lying in the individual and collective lobbying approaches of the two different arenas, but rather inside of the individual approach, namely lobbying consultancies as opposed to corporate lobbying and collective lobbying entities. It can be concluded that
the lobbying consultancies on both sides of the Atlantic are inclined towards handling their lobbying undertaking by using project management processes, which can be explained by the organizational structure of consultancies resembling a project organization or possibly a matrix organization. Nevertheless, adopting a broader view of projects, certain linkages have been found in all examined groups of interviewees, both US/EU collective and individual approaches, thereby contributing to both the lobbying and project management literature.

10.1. Implications for the theory and practice

In summary, contributions to the project management literature have been made by extending the traditional view of projects and by deepening the novel projects as political process perspective. Contribution to the lobbying literature have been made by not only providing a comparative EU/US lobbying study but also through providing a novel project management perspective on the lobbying undertaking as such. It has been implied that lobbying is a series of temporary undertakings with a strategic characteristic and long-term objective of influencing and controlling the flux of change.

This finding has particular implications for the lobbying practitioners in terms of raising the probability of lobbying success if the lobbying undertaking would be considered, structured, monitored, controlled and evaluated as a project. Since comparing the US and the EU lobbying practices from a project management perspective resulted in the realization that traditional and novel project views apply to both the individual and collective US/EU arenas, it can be concluded that the most efficient way of managing lobbying is indeed through adopting a project mind-set. Companies should learn from the specific example of lobbying consultancies, which were determined to treat the lobbying undertaking as a traditional project, thereby increasing its efficiency and easing its managing. Even though in the wake of the novel perspective on projects lobbying undertakings could more frequently be classified as having such characteristics in both individual and collective lobbying approaches, the usage of particular traditional project management tools or the simple project management structuring of lobbying activities, would inevitably contribute to a better organization and implementation of this crucial aspect of companies’ existence.

10.2. Recommendations for future research

Based on the limitations and weaknesses of this study, specially concerning the fairly broad scope of this research and the small number of interviewees, but also the issues and concerns raised by lobbying practitioners, it is possible to make suggestions concerning the future directions of lobbying research, particularly regarding the marriage of the lobbying and project management field.

It can be suggested that a broader scope of interviewees would contribute to more comprehensive findings from which it would be possible to make generalizations and contribute to possible theory formation in the field. Furthermore, it would be of interest to narrow the scope of the purpose of the study in terms of restricting the interviewees to only lobbying consultancies, which were the only interviewees who exhibited a clear usage of the traditional project management perspective. Since in this study it has been found that the consultancies tend to differ from the remaining lobbying organizations, it
could be advisable to further research the differences in lobbying practices of EU/US consultancies. Consequently, since no usage of particular project management tools was identified due to the scope of the study and the research design, it would be of interest for both the project management and lobbying literature if indeed more particular project management practices could be identified through a survey questionnaire as opposed to a semi-structured interview, taking into account the best way interviewees are able to express their awareness of a particular matter.

Moreover, in terms of issues and interests raised by the interviewees themselves, it can be stated that even though the US arena has a longer lobbying tradition and it was expected for the benefit of lobbying in US companies not to be questioned, both EU and US companies showed a special interest in the justification of the lobbying undertaking in terms of returns on investment, which seems to be a universal issue for the corporate lobbyist departments on either side of the Atlantic. Therefore, it has been suggested to research possibilities of justification of intangible lobbying outputs to the leadership of the company, possibly in adopting project management performance indicators. Furthermore, two issues were deemed suitable for future research, concerning the resource constraints of the lobbying undertaking. Firstly, previously not emphasized in the discussion of opting for either individual or collective approaches, it would be interesting to determine which lobbying association to join; a larger more powerful with the disadvantage of sometimes conflicting interests of members of the organizations; or a smaller less-powerful association but without any tension concerning the representation of interest. Secondly, in the wake of globalization, it would also be of benefit to compare EU/US lobbying practices of larger players in a smaller country vs. smaller players in a larger country, as suggested by the US individual interviewees. Further research on these two matters of interview interest would provide a clearer view of the power relations within countries and political arenas as well as probably suggest the most efficient lobbying practices.

Lastly, it can be concluded that the new and exciting comparative research field of the US/EU lobbying arenas is still welcoming different perspectives and particular focuses of eager and innovative scholars. This challenging and stimulating research has filled the previously existing gap in the comparative field and introduced a never before researched project management perspective in this comparative lobbying field, nor national field for that matter. Therefore, it would be of great benefit for the lobbying and project management literature as well as the lobbying practice, for enthusiastic researchers to engage in this important field of research by building on the foundations formed by this study.
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Appendix 1: Interview guide

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EU & US LOBBYING

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Great importance is given to ethical considerations of interviewing. We ensure you that the answers will be used only to this research purpose and treated with confidentiality. In case you would not like for us to use the name of your company in the thesis, please state your wish. In this case, we will anonymize the data in the presentation of the findings.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

The interview questions are separated in 4 sections, to ensure a clearer overview.

Section 1: (individual)

1. What position do you currently hold? *(Consultant lobbyist, enterprise lobbyist, organization lobbyist)*
2. What is the scope of work you conduct?
3. What is your previous relevant experience in the lobbying field?

Section 2: (company/organization)

1. What does your company do?
2. What does the company lobby for?
3. Are the lobbying issues your company is concerned with specific for the industry you are in/industry you are representing, and how so?

Section 3: (practices)

1. What corporate political strategies does your company use? *(ex. besides or alongside lobbying: constituency building, political action committee contributions, advocacy advertising, coalition building etc.)*
2. Can you briefly describe how you approach a lobbying engagement? *(ex. directly, indirectly or both)*
3. How would you describe your approach to lobbying? How do you consider lobbying activities in your operations and how do you work with it step by step? *(ex. Initiating, Planning, Implementing, Controlling, Closing)*
4. Can you please tell us about your work process on a specific lobbying undertaking you are currently working on? *(Who was included in the lobbying activity? How did you organize the undertaking?)*
5. Would you describe this as a typical undertaking and why? (Do you consider the lobbying undertaking to be of a temporary or permanent nature and if so what does it depend on?)

6. How would you organize the lobbying for a new issue?

7. Do you use any particular tools in your lobbying?

8. Does the outcome of the lobbying undertaking influence your organizational strategy? (Do you review your organizational strategy?)

Section 4: (the system)

A (individual/collective)

1. What would you identify as the most important issues to consider in lobbying? (ex. issues to think about, critical success factors, long term vs. short term business-government relationships)

2. Who would you identify as the most important actors in lobbying? (Who has more power of influence (the single firm representative (individual approach) or the join interest representative (collective approach)? what does it depend on?)

3. How would you assess the importance of lobbying for companies, in general (SME, multinationals), as well as for your company, and what would that be dependent on? (Industry, political arena, time etc.)

4. What do you consider as a better option for companies to represent their interest and what does that depend on? (Is the expense of taking an individual approach by hiring an in-house lobbyist or external consultant worth it, or should they join industry associations?)

B (EU/US arena)

1. Are you aware of the lobbying approaches in the US/EU? (if so, to what extent?)

2. What are your experiences with the other political arena and how would you say it compares with the EU/US? (How do you think your lobbying style, methods and practices differ from your colleagues in US/EU?)

3. What would you identify as the main reason for the differences and why? (ex. different institutional and political frameworks, industry, more collaborative rather than individualistic approach to lobbying?)

C (issues)

1. There are strong voices raised in the media, which associate lobbying with corruption. How do you comment on that?

2. How important do you consider the transparency issues to be in that sense? (Could its linkage with CSR bring competitive advantage to companies?)

3. Is there anything you would like to add or comment on?

Thank you very much for your collaboration and time you devoted to help me in this research.
Appendix 2: Key terms and definitions

**Ad hoc coalitions:** formations established for temporary legislative or regulatory undertakings (Mahoney, 2007, p.368). Its features are: "little or no formalization; limited duration; considerable autonomy of coalition partners; a single-issue profile" (Pijnenburg, 1998, p. 305).

**Advocacy:** defending the interests of groups by using a proactive public interest strategy in order to change established rules and defend against the abuse of public power (de Brelaz & Alves, 2011).

**Advocacy advertising:** action directed towards reaching a general audience with messages regarding public policy issues (Hillman & Hitt, 1999).

**Coalition building:** efforts by companies to find voters sharing common political interests on a particular legislative issue in order to form temporary or more formal alliances (Wexler, 1982, cited in McGrath, 2002).

**Collective approach:** “the investment of resources by individuals or organizations and the bringing together of these individuals or organizations in the collective pursuit of a common interest, which may result in selective or collective benefits” (Greenwood & Aspinwall, 1998, p. 11).

**Constituency building:** corporate efforts to “influence public policy by gaining support of individual voters and citizens”, therefore, providing constituent support to policymakers (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p. 834).

**Corporatism and Neo-corporatism:** a national policy process in which there is high concentration of public-private interaction (Heinz et al., 1993) for the development of economic policies. In state corporatism the government imposes these interactions and plays an active role (Schmitter 1979, cited in Charrad, 2010, p.10) while in neo-corporatism these relationships are voluntary and the participation by certain interests in the public policy process is institutionalized (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.830). Corporatist nations tend to be characterized by cooperation, consensus, competition among firms and individualistic approach (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.830)

**Deliberative democracy:** democracy enabling citizens to be included in the public decision-making process (De Brelaz & Alves, 2011, p.202)

**Democracy:** “legitimization of government based on elections held at regular intervals; the rule of law to which all are subject, including the government; the existence and official recognition of political opposition, most often in the form of political parties; the right of free association (the forming of interest groups); free speech (especially the right to represent views, particularly opposing views, to government) plus the existence of a free press; and the protection of human rights” (Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008, p.7)
Expressive interest organisations: "citizen/advocacy groups, civil rights/social welfare organisations, charitable or community groups, or public interest law firms" (Hojnacki, 1997, p. 76).

Company perspective: practices of corporate lobbying with a special focus on the individual vs. collective approach.

Individual approach: representation of a single interest either by having an in-house lobbyist or by hiring a consultant lobbyist

Influence-lobby complex: the arena of influence consisting of numerous actor (registered lobbyists, public-relations consultants, advertising managers, internet advisers, policy experts etc.) with the same goal of influencing the government (Samuelson, 2008).

Interest Group and Organized Interest: an association of individuals or organizations, which share one or more concerns and therefore attempt to jointly influence public policy in their favor. Such interest groups are of three major types (Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008): groups made up of individuals (individual membership organizations), public or private organizations of organizations (organizational interest), organizations as public and private institutions (institutional interest).

Interest Group: non-political group with the potential of engaging in politics (Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008).

Lobbying: “specific form of advocacy intended to influence public policy” (de Brelàz & Alves, 2011)

Lobbyist: a facilitator between the company and government aiming at influencing public policy in the companies favor by performing one or more of the following activities: (1) directly contacting public officials; (2) monitoring political and governmental activity; (3) advising on political strategies and tactics and (4) developing and orchestrating the group’s lobbying effort (McGrath, 2002, p.20).

Occupational groups: “peak associations, trade associations, labour unions, farm groups, or professional or business associations”(Hojnacki, 1997, p. 76).

Open-ended contract: a lobbying endeavor with no set time limit for completion, contributing to its long-term perspective and operational view (Keffer & Hill, 1997, p. 1372).

PAC contributions: corporate campaign contributions of employees and shareholders to individual candidates advocating their election or defeat for elected office (Coen, 1999, p. 28)

Pluralism: a national policy process characterized by a low concentration of private and government power (Heinz et al., 1993) and a passive government role (Schmitter 1979, cited in Charrad, 2010, p.10) therefore welcoming to a wider variety of interest groups creating competition and presenting opportunities for firms to act selectively (Hillman & Hitt, 1999, p.830)
**Pressure Group:** political groups actively engaging in politics (Thomas & Hrebenar, 2008).

**Project management perspective:** perspective associating lobbying with project management related fields of issue management, risk management, relationship management, etc., as well as with particular PM tools and practices.

**Public relations:** interaction of an organization with all its various publics (Smith, 2009, p.4).

**Relational approach to political strategy:** long-term strategic approach with operational characteristics directed toward building and fostering company-government relationships (Hillman & Hitt, 1999).

**Third generation companies:** companies which exhibit good reporting, considering lobbying thereby creating an competitive advantage, which enables “new market opportunities” (Gibson, 2005).

**Transactional approach to political strategy:** short-term issue-by-issue approach of a rather reactive nature with project characteristics (Hillman & Hitt, 1999).

**Turn-key contract:** hiring of a lobbyist on a lobbying project with the objective of influencing one piece of legislation while taking on a short-term perspective. The company hands over the development of the project without further interfering to the lobbyists and once it is completed, the lobbyists hands the project outcome back to the company.
### Appendix 3: Reasons for the EU/US lobbying differences and their effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>EU effect</th>
<th>US effect</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty of political agenda setting in EU</td>
<td>Effective exercising of influence only toward the executive branch (EC)</td>
<td>Exercising of influence on a wider array of venues at disposal</td>
<td>Petronela (2008, p.271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US aggregation of power / EU dispersion of power</td>
<td>Less influential Members of Parliament</td>
<td>Very influential Senators</td>
<td>Coen (1999 p.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of constituency politics higher in US</td>
<td>Strong loyalty towards the Party</td>
<td>Senators often diverging from the Parties view for the interest of voters</td>
<td>(Mack, 2005, p.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US electoral politics / EU insulation, multi-level decision making process</td>
<td>Informal contact and simultaneous lobbying</td>
<td>Prevailing individualism and self interest</td>
<td>Petronela (2008, pp. 266,276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for simultaneous lobbying of several institutions</td>
<td>More universal lobbying</td>
<td>(The Public Affairs Company, 2011),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragmented lobbying practices</td>
<td>Unified lobbying practices</td>
<td>(Gibson, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher politization factor in the US</td>
<td>Government officials easily accessible,</td>
<td>Government officials not easily accessible,</td>
<td>Mack (2005, p.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of the case prevailing</td>
<td>Strength of relationships prevailing</td>
<td>Mack (2005, p.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative position of the political institutions in Europe / Balance of power among the branches of government in the United States</td>
<td>Low importance of fostering of good relationships with government officials</td>
<td>High importance of fostering of good relationships with government officials</td>
<td>Coen (1999, p.31); Mack (2005, p. 344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU regulatory focus / US legislative focus</td>
<td>High success rate of proposals</td>
<td>Low success rate of proposals</td>
<td>Baumgarner (2007, p.486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lobbying regulatory framework</strong></td>
<td>Less transparent lobbying in EU</td>
<td>Higher probability of profitability for lobbyists</td>
<td>Lower probability of profitability for lobbyists,</td>
<td>Wesselinus (2005, p.15),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU less regulated</td>
<td>Informal relationship building, loose and informal ad hoc coalitions building</td>
<td>Less informal relationships building, formal ad hoc coalitions</td>
<td>Coen (1999, p. 29); Mahoney (2007, p.380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National culture</strong></td>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance (EU) or uncertainty accepting (US)</td>
<td>Tendency to lobby for new regulations</td>
<td>Not inclined towards lobbying for new regulations</td>
<td>Barron (2011, p.322); Coen (1999, p.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business culture</strong></td>
<td>Trend of increase of grassroots activity in EU</td>
<td>Purpose in increasing the credibility in the eyes of the government officials</td>
<td>Purpose in greater media exposure, with the increased political support in mind</td>
<td>Coen (1999, p.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level of strategic maturity in US</td>
<td>Weaker groups, Absence of political monetary or advisory contributions</td>
<td>Stronger groups, Existence of political monetary or advisory contributions</td>
<td>Petronela (2008, pp. 268, 271); Mack (2005, p.344)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Companies’ choice of individual or collective approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Effect on choice of Individual</th>
<th>Effect on choice of Collective</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and institutional framework</td>
<td>Direct elections in the US; Staff appointed in the EU</td>
<td>Individual lobbying is present (EU: all possible ways of lobbying)</td>
<td>More ad hoc coalitions in the US</td>
<td>Mahoney (2007, pp. 370, 371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-level governance in the EU</td>
<td>Ad hoc coalitions-at the member state level (EU)</td>
<td>Mahoney (2007, p. 371); Pijnenburg (1998); Greenwood &amp; Aspinwall (1998, pp. 73, 89);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of the EU (&quot;collaborative European project&quot;; need to argue from a European perspective)</td>
<td>Large companies, representing broader concerns</td>
<td>More ad hoc coalitions in the EU</td>
<td>Mahoney (2007, p. 371); Pijnenburg (1998); Greenwood &amp; Aspinwall (1998, pp. 73, 89);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More complex nature of decision making→higher interdependence among companies;</td>
<td>Less considered</td>
<td>Tendency to lobby collectively; increase in ad hoc coalition in the EU</td>
<td>Hojnacki (1997, p. 64); Levy &amp; Newell (2005); Greenwood &amp; Aspinwall (1998, p. 125); Woll (2006, p. 459);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fast changing EU regulatory environment</td>
<td>Hiring a consultant</td>
<td>Ad hoc coalitions are considered (EU)</td>
<td>Mack (2007); Pijnenburg (1998, p. 307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td>Externalist cultures (US)</td>
<td>Internalistic cultures (EU)</td>
<td>Mack (2005); Greenwood &amp; Aspinwall (1998, pp. 29, 113); Barron (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue characteristics</td>
<td>Issue specifics</td>
<td>Narrow-scope, remaining part of multiple dimension issues not agreed upon in a collective action</td>
<td>Sensitive issues; On a subset of the components of issues having multiple dimensions</td>
<td>Mahoney (2007, pp. 372, 378); Greenwood &amp; Aspinwall (1998, p. 123); Hojnacki (1997, p. 64);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of issues (when transactional approach to lobbying is chosen)</td>
<td>Non-election issues</td>
<td>Election issues</td>
<td>Hillman &amp; Hitt (1999, p. 832); Mahoney (2007, p. 372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent’s characteristics</td>
<td>Weak opposition</td>
<td>Strong opposition</td>
<td>Hojnacki (1997, p. 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the company</td>
<td>Current EU &amp; US political actors (in EU important political actor is already a coalition)</td>
<td>EU bigger umbrella organisations</td>
<td>US specialized interest groups; EU national or sectoral peak organizations</td>
<td>Mahoney (2007, p. 377); Woll (2006, p. 463); Hojnacki (1997, p. 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of the company</td>
<td>Big companies</td>
<td>Small companies</td>
<td>Wessellius (2005, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the company</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Resource-poor companies (Mahoney, 2007); distinguishing themselves in a competitive environment; companies having knowledge or experience in lobbying</td>
<td>Resource-poor companies (Hillman &amp; Hitt, 1999); companies not experienced in lobbying; wishing to consolidate the resources or gain some benefits</td>
<td>Hillman &amp; Hitt (1999, pp. 828, 831, 832); Mahoney (2007, p. 372); Hojnacki (1997, pp. 63, 65;1998, p. 455); Hrebenar et al. (2008, p.54); Jutterstrom (2000); Levy &amp; Newell (2005, p. 216); Keffler &amp; Hill (1997, p.1372); Hula (1995, p.241); Pijnenburg (1998); Coen (1997, cited in Pijnenburg, 1998, p. 318);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>